

For R. W. Connell

Contents

Chapter One

<i>Biography, Autobiography, Life History</i>	9
The Good Old Rule	13
Life Histories	16
Autobiography, Biography and Validity	19
Truthfulness, Saturation and Structure	22

Chapter Two

<i>Childhood</i>	27
Distant Voices	30
Making a Man of Him	35
Exclusivity, Blood and Ancestors	39
Ontological Superiority and Inevitability	42

Chapter Three

<i>Servants</i>	47
The Love of Wonderful People	50
The Hurt that Knows No Salve	53
Work Without End, for Ever and Ever	55
Waiting on Hand and Foot	59
The Enclave Within the Enclave	66

Chapter Four

<i>Schooling</i>	71
The Headmaster	72
Social Networks	78
The Construction and Effects of Hegemonic Masculinity	87
Toughening Up	94
Loneliness	96
Competition	99

Corporeal Discipline	101
Playing the Game	103
Friendship and Sex	107
Varsity	112
<i>Chapter Five</i>	
<i>Space, Bodies, Motion</i>	119
A Man's Castles Are His Homes	125
Interiors	131
Architects	134
Height	136
Housing Prices	138
On Holiday	140
Rich Bodies	146
Conveying the Body	153
<i>Chapter Six</i>	
<i>Time, Work, Leisure</i>	165
Work	167
Time	185
Leisure	189
<i>Chapter Seven</i>	
<i>Love, Sex, Marriage</i>	203
Early Love and Sex	203
Sex, Power, Money	206
Marriage	209
Divorce	215
Extra-Marital Sexual Affairs	217
Prostitutes and Paid Sexual Entertainers	224
Sexual Violence and Coercion	225
<i>Chapter Eight</i>	
<i>Conclusion</i>	231
Bibliography	245

Chapter One

Biography, Autobiography, Life History

Very few people have more money than they can possibly spend in their own lifetime. It is hard to comprehend what it must be like to be able to spend \$3 million on yourself every week of your life and still remain incredibly wealthy. According to Australian political commentator Robert Haupt (1989: 14), this was the fate of Australia's richest man – media magnate Kerry Packer. The Forbes *Rich List* for 2005 ranked Packer at 94 of the 691 billionaires in the world, whose combined wealth amounted to US\$2.2 trillion (Nason, 2005: 8). According to the Merrill Lynch and Caepigimini (2005) Ninth Annual World Wealth Report, there were, in 2004, 77,500 people in the world with at least US\$30 million in financial assets, and David Smith (2003: 128) estimates that the richest 200 individuals in the world have the combined income of 41 per cent of the world's people.

William Davis (1982: 152), in his book *The Rich: a Study of the Species*, argues that the rich are concerned to 'make and unmake' political leaders in order to 'secure new territories or conditions favourable to their enterprises; to gain personal advancement; or just for the hell of it', but 'the basic aim has remained the same: to make the world the kind of place *they* want to live in'. Their power today is immense, indeed 'awesome', says William Shawcross (1992: 559), biographer of international media magnate Rupert Murdoch, a man who, with a few others, effects the lives of millions by not only shaping the foundations of the twenty-first century but by owning them too.

Ben Badgdikian, a former Dean of Journalism at the University of California, Berkeley, believes that:

The lords of the global village have their own political agenda. Together, they exert an homogenizing power over ideas, culture and commerce that affects

populations larger than any in history. Neither Caesar, nor Hitler, Franklin Roosevelt nor any Pope, has commanded as much power [...] (Shawcross, 1992: 465, 55).

A member of the ruling class, comprising between 2–5% of the population, is in Karl Marx's (1867/1976: 254, 739, 989) phrases 'the personification of capital', 'capital as a person', or 'capital endowed in his person with consciousness and a will'. In order for the market to function at all, important decisions must be made by individuals about how, where, and in what to invest; about what constitutes a reasonable rate of return; and about how to deal with those people, organisations or governments who might impede the unceasing movement of profit-making. In making these choices these people, while in some ways being cyphers of the market in that the market works through them, are not detached from it, for the principal determinants of the class in which they live are the vast productive resources which they own, individually and collectively. Not all the men of the ruling class make these decisions, for many quite happily leave that to others, but all of them share in the benefits and in the culture which celebrates and affirms their rites of accumulation.

However, as prolific as the sociological analyses about class continue to be, often these remain within the now very tedious and old argument over class boundaries – who's in what class and why. Or they continue to focus on classes as analytical categories, missing the sense of class as a lived social relation. Certainly, they mostly ignore the salience of class for gender relations – and *vice versa* – and lack any detailed consideration of those whom the class system most benefits.

During the 1990s, perceptive and solid empirical work that met some of these *lacunae* included Gretchen Poiner's *Gender and Other Power Relationships in a Rural Community* (1990), an ethnographic study of the Australian rural township of Marulan in New South Wales (NSW); Michael Pusey's *Economic Rationalism in Canberra* (1991), which was a study of the top bureaucrats of the Australian Government's Senior Executive Service in Canberra; and Drew Cottle's (1998) historical snap-

shot of the denizens of Woollahra, Sydney's wealthiest suburb. Poiner (1990: 59, 64, 168) found that the large landholders in her study were quite clearly differentiated from the rest of the community and were, in fact, much less committed to it. Class consciousness among the 'ordinary' citizens of the area was 'muted and suppressed' because, with such high levels of home ownership and even more who aspire to own large acreages, vast landholders were regarded as 'just like us' in the sense of owning – in their cases rather big – bits of soil.

Poiner's book (1990: 183) and Penelope's *Out of the Class Closet: Lesbians Speak* (1994), have shown how gender relations are critical in 'conferring and defending' the class system. O'Lincoln, in 'Wealth, ownership and power', (Kuhn and O'Lincoln, 1996: 5) has made what he calls 'a broad brush portrayal of the ruling class', and the Research and Documentation Centre for Contemporary History of Brazil has been undertaking a study of what it calls the contemporary Brazilian 'elite', revealing it to be part of a cohesive community with its own forms of reproduction and self-perpetuation (de Camargo, 1981: 193, 194–195).

It is these approaches to class that we wish to develop in this book by looking at the lives of ruling-class men over three generations, both through their own eyes and through the eyes of those close to them. Like Poiner (1990) and Penelope (1994), we intend to situate gender more centrally to the issue of class power rather than keep it on the periphery. Although it is impossible to discuss the two main genders separately, of course, this is not a book about ruling-class women. Susan Ostrander, in *Women of the Upper Class* (1984) and Joanie Bronfman, in *The Experience of Inherited Wealth: A Social-Psychological Perspective* (1987), have already made substantial progress in this regard and we believe that it's time sociologists took a closer look at the masculinity of the hegemonic, and sharpened up our use of the term 'hegemonic masculinity' in the process (see Donaldson, 1993 for more of this). 'Kerry's a bloke', says Packer's biographer, Paul Barry, with a 'big black hole inside him', adds his ex-friend, Phillip Adams (Hawley, 1993: 10).

Apart from the need to do something with the sociology of power, other than study those who don't have much of it and express a voyeuris-

tic curiosity about those who do, we also have a keen interest in developing the historical materialist project. As one quite wealthy man, Frederick Engels (1890/1975: 684), remarked more than a hundred years ago: 'History proceeds in such a way that the final result always arises from conflicts between many individual wills and every one of them is in turn made into what it is by a host of particular conditions of life'.

It is the 'particular conditions of life' of ruling-class men such as the Packers, Murdochs, Kennedys and Windsors, that we are concerned about in this book. We want to see how the world seems to those who benefit from rather than pay 'the enormous price tag of history' (Marks, 1989: 47) and, of course, to have a go at solving that great conundrum, the extent to which men of great power have some insight into the mechanics of its influence (Hill, 1995: 9). Do they really comprehend what they do? Are they really what Manning Clark (1991: 16) has called 'the Ha, Ha men [...] not distinguished [...] for their sensitivity to another man's pain'? Do they understand the negative effects their actions often have on people who are not like them? Is this merely something with which they learn to cope, or do they actually grow to enjoy it?

In confronting these mysteries, we hope to unravel the patterns of socio-structural relations underlying the daily processes of the lives of filthy rich blokes; to identify their contradictions (if we can); and to appreciate their dynamics. That is, we want to uncover these patterns by regarding the lives of men 'who live them, who are put in motion by them and who, in turn, make them work and maintain them throughout time' (Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame, 1981: 169).

Individuals' lives are the place in which societal changes are played out and the actions of individuals make up the history of which they are part. 'A political economist might be satisfied with unraveling exploitation and capital accumulation' but a sociologist has to 'show what such a relation of production does to men's and women's lives' (Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame, 1981: 171–172). In this endeavour, Elder (1981: 83) has argued that the interpersonal world of family and household are a set of linkages between class position and individual personality. We think this is wrong. Family and household and their complex gender dynam-

ics are constitutive of class relations, exist within them and are one of the key means of their historical continuity. We are hoping to dissolve the dichotomy by which most sociologists place 'structure' 'outside' people, and we hope that this may be possible by examining the lives of those in whose beneficence the social system seems, sometimes almost exclusively, to operate. It is, after all, not so hard to see the social system as somehow separate from, over and against, those it dispossesses. And so, perhaps, it may be possible to see how this system operates 'inside' those it benefits, by exploring the patterns of practice in which they immerse themselves and through which they create the social logic that underlies their own lives.

The Good Old Rule

For these reasons it makes sense to look at those who make and benefit from the rules and those whose self-image and experiences are the dominant cultural models. That is, we want to understand how what Poiner (1990: ii) has so eloquently called, after William Wordsworth, 'the good old rule' by which 'they should take who have the power and they should keep who can', actually works; how those who benefit from this 'simple plan' get to do so; and how this benefit is transmitted through time, across the generations.

The difficulties we face in pursuing this goal are basic and profound. 'Let me tell you about the very rich. They are different from you and me,' said F. Scott Fitzgerald (quoted in Thorndike, 1976). When J. P. Morgan died he left an estate of US\$68 million and an art collection worth US\$50 million. 'And to think', exclaimed Andrew Carnegie, 'he was not a rich man!' (Thorndike, 1976: 13). Was Carnegie joking? How would *we* know? That, quite simply, is the problem in a nutshell.

Perhaps, more precisely, this is just one part of what is really a dual problem. Unlike William Shawcross, one of Rupert Murdoch's bio-

graphers and himself an Old Etonian, the son of a Lord and a former British intelligence officer (Nelson, 1992: 9), as a couple of Australian academics we have plenty of distance from the object of our study – really rich men. We are, quite simply, not of *their kind*. This, surely, is a strength. Yet lack of empathy with those whom one studies has long been seen as problematic by many sociologists and anthropologists, and by historians such as Eleanor Hancock, who is critical of the biographer Ralf Georg Reuth for his ‘attitude of detachment towards his subject’. He is ‘unsympathetic’, she writes, and his biography ‘gives little sense of Goebbels the man’ (Hancock, 1995: 9).

Elsbeth Probyn’s (1993: 40) injunction that validity and its usefulness must always be tested ‘on our own pulses’ is one we have always taken seriously, but our pulses still race uncontrollably when we realise that the money Kerry Packer blew in one weekend at the races would, at our current wages, take us 55 years – more than our whole working life – to earn (let alone to save) and that during a three day splurge in Las Vegas he gambled away an amount which would have taken us more than four of our life times to earn using chips each of which was worth more than our homes (Walker, Conway and Southward, 1993). Empathy, in this situation, is elusive. The other side of this is, of course, that even when empathy is present, it’s not without its own problems. William Shawcross was attacked in London’s *Literary Review* for ‘having fallen in love with Murdoch’ and in both the *New Yorker* and the *Independent on Sunday* he was accused of being ‘seduced’ by him (Hicks, 1992: 2; Henderson, 1992: 13). After John F. Kennedy’s assassination, the whole Kennedy family was idealised in so many overwhelmingly positive biographies that these became known collectively as the ‘Camelot School’ (James, 1991: 22). Clearly, too much empathy is a pitfall as well.

In a nutshell, this is our dilemma: distance means that the prospects of ethnography, participant observation, ‘in everyday life the chance meetings along a country road [...] participation in informal social events from dinner parties to handwork sessions, and in formal affairs such as meetings of local organisations’ (Poiner, 1990: 3) are simply not possible

for us. As for interviews, such as the 215 undertaken in Pusey's (1991: 33) Canberra study mentioned above, we lack the cultural capital, political clout, economic resources and social contacts to find ruling-class men who might want us to listen to them.

Michael Gilding (2002) and Richard Walsh (2002) have, however, usefully produced studies of very wealthy men using interview methods. Gilding secured interviews with 43 men and 7 women identified in the *Business Review Weekly* Rich Lists as each having over \$60 million in wealth. Of the fifty, however, only 16 were of second and third generation wealth. Three-quarters of the sample wished to remain anonymous, which makes it difficult to corroborate their claims from other sources. These are busy as well as powerful men, and Gilding did well to garner an average of an hour and a half of their time.

Walsh had been a senior News Ltd executive in the late 1980s, and already had useful contacts with the class. He approached twelve chief executive officers of public companies, of whom four declined, including Rupert Murdoch and Australia's second-richest man, Frank Lowy. His interviews were about the same length as Gilding's. While useful, such methods do not usually deliver the depth and richness of ethnography and life history. Those who have successfully studied the ruling class with such methods, notably Susan Ostrander (1984) and Joanie Bronfman (1987), have either been part of it, or have had an *entrée* to it, which meant that their interviews were lengthy, relaxed and insightful. Bronfman, whose family is known by Conrad Black (1993: 165), has already refused an offer to publish the results of her PhD study.

Quite simply, Kerry Packer, or anyone like him, was not going to want to talk to us, or to tell us much if he did. His unofficial biographer, Paul Barry, was rebuffed by Packer even though Barry is a high profile political commentator in the Australian media. In fact, according to Barry, Packer's polo manager, Jim Gilmore, 'added several expletives, then told me how he'd spread my face. I wrote Packer two letters requesting interviews and received a response from his lawyers warning me off and threatening total legal action' (Hawley, 1993: 10). Barry's

publisher, Judith Curr, received warning letters, as well. In fact, Curr told a reporter from the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 'a lot of people said to me that it was either particularly brave or particularly foolish to publish such a book' (Barrowclough, 1994: 40).

Fortunately, our understanding has been deepened by three socio-logically aware 'class traitors'. Robert Morrell's (1996) work on white settler masculinity in Natal, particularly as it relates to private schooling, is outstanding. Adam Hochschild (1987), apart from being a journalist and author, is also the son of the chairperson of the board of a vast mining multinational centred in South Africa. As an adult, his abhorrence of apartheid led him eventually to question the construction of his own masculinity. The ensuing account in *Half the Way Home: A Memoir of Father and Son* tells a story of his relationship with his father which is extraordinary in its intensity and perspicacity. And Ronald Fraser (1984: 91, 118), who has said that while he was 'objectively a member of a privileged class' he was 'unable subjectively to fill the role into which I was born', has also written about his ruling-class upbringing in his book *In Search of a Past: The Manor House, Ammersfield 1933–1945*. This is particularly interesting as it combines two different modes of enquiry: an oral history containing interviews with the servants who reared him and his own psychoanalysis, uniting a 'voyage of inner discovery' with an account of 'the social past'.

Life Histories

Fortunately, although ethnography and interviews are not possible for us, there seems yet to be a method suitable to the task we have set ourselves. Thomas and Znaniecki (1958), generally credited as the originators of what has come to be called the life-history method, developed this in an attempt to demonstrate that all social becoming can fruitfully be viewed as the product of a continual interaction between individual

consciousness and social reality. In this way, humans are both actively producing and continually produced. Thomas and Znaniecki thought that because this double relation expressed itself just about everywhere and most of the time, one was able, with this method, to obtain access to the reality of life which produced social categories such as classes (Kohli, 1981: 63). Life histories could show how social forces interact at an individual level to form those myriad decisions that cumulatively not only shape each life history itself, but also constitute the direction and scale of major social agencies and their activity (Thompson, 1981: 299). Connell *et al.* (1981: 105) found that the life-history approach enabled them 'to key into class processes, not just class positions' and gave them 'an opportunity to investigate the connections between class relations and gender relations – an interaction whose importance and complexity has become increasingly obvious'.

Life histories, too, have advantages over other forms of social inquiry. For instance, this method sometimes involves very few people. R. W. Connell's intriguing study of working-class men (Connell, 1991) is based on five life histories; and that of men in the environmental movement on six (Connell, 1990). This is trading off scope for depth, of course (Connell, 1995: 89–90). What is important in choosing the people to listen to is that they be aware of, informed about and involved in their cultural world and that they be able to articulate their points of view.

Life histories, at least as conceived by Thomas and Znaniecki (1958), may include not only interviews but also autobiographies, diaries and political memoirs. While each of these is constrained by the purpose for which it was composed and allows only a particular and partial view, they all contain the essential quality of life histories – they span a period of time. 'Life history method always concerns the making of social life through time. It is literally history' (Connell, 1995: 89).

Morgan (1992: 25) has claimed that men have the power, the leisure, and the resources to write, asking, 'Surely there must be something about what "it feels like to be a man" in all those volumes of fiction, of autobiography, confessions, diaries, histories and letters?' Clearly it is possible, then, to regard autobiographies and biographies as 'found

life histories'. Indeed, Sartre had developed this method for a social science of biography – an horizontal and vertical reading of the biography and of the social system, a movement back and forth from one to the other. This is precisely what Thomas and Znaniecki had thought they were doing as well. The effort they made to understand a biography in all its uniqueness became the endeavour to interpret a social system, as the phases and processes which mediate each are revealed in their relation to the other (Ferrarotti, 1981: 21–22).

In theory at least, life histories differ from autobiographies in that the latter are the product of one person, while the former are the product of at least two. Life histories are the product of an interaction, while an autobiography is not (Bertaux, 1981a: 8). In life histories, apparently, the narrator resembles an autobiographer, and the researcher a biographer (Catani, 1981: 212). According to Marcia Wright (1989, 155), while life histories are mediated by another (while retaining the subject's perspective), autobiographies imply the 'greatest degree of self-control' and biography is the study of one person informed by many sources of various significance.

Yet the very difference of the rich collapses these convenient categories. In his autobiography, *My Regards to Broadway*, James Fairfax (1991: vii, viii) – born into a wealthy Australian newspaper dynasty – lists 66 people who 'kindly agreed to be interviewed or talk to me' or who 'gave [...] their frank recollections'. In addition he employed five research assistants who 'provided essential and lucid reports on the areas they covered'. Prince Charles' biographer, Jonathan Dimbleby (1994: xii), was assisted by the Prince's personal archivist, the Royal Archivist, the Librarian and Assistant Keeper of the Royal Archives. Even failed businessman Bob Ansett's (1986) autobiography was written with, and its ownership shared by, Bob Pullan, journalist and biographer of the famous. Several hundred people imparted to biographer Paul Barry (1994: vii) their memories of working for Australia's super-wealthy Packer family and of meeting or doing business with them over the years, and the Belfield, Hird and Kelly (1991) book on media magnate Rupert Murdoch draws on a large number of other sources and four earlier biogra-

phies. In one of those ironies of capitalism, the richer the subject, the more social is the production of their story, it seems. The lonely vigil of the autobiographer, or the one-on-one interaction with the biographer or life-historian, is not for them.

Autobiography, Biography and Validity

‘We are’, remarks Doris Lessing (1995: 14), ‘enjoying a golden age of biography. What is better than a really good biography? Not many novels’. She should know. Five biographies had already been written about her, and three more were on the way when her autobiography, *Under My Skin*, appeared in 1995. Indeed, there seemed in the mid 1990s to be a ‘biography boom’, according to Elizabeth Young (1995: 7) in the *Guardian*, in which the ‘general attitude of the publishers’ seems to be ‘Dead at last? Let the revels begin’, giving the ‘unfortunate impression of the deceased [...] as carrion beneath a squabbling cloud of vultures, clutching cheques in their scaly, scrabbling claws’. Those who are still alive, though, sometimes fight back. Leader of the Australian Democrats, Cheryl Kernot, describing Conrad Black as ‘boorish and incredibly pretentious’, said he ‘exemplified all the things that are wrong with absentee landlords’. She was strongly opposed to Black increasing his control of the Fairfax newspapers at the time that the Fairfax family’s newspaper empire was crumbling and ‘did not like him personally – a view strongly reinforced when she read his autobiography’ (Burge, Porter, Kitney and Davies, 1996: 17). Black (1996: 16) for his part, referred to her, whom he’d ‘happily never actually met’, as ‘banal, bumptious, belligerent and clichéd’.

But will any biography or autobiography, do? Suetonius’ *Lives of the Caesars* (1AD) was ‘bawdy, gossipy and wholly unreliable’ in Young’s (1995: 7) view, and this form was soon replaced by the idealised *Lives of the Saints* which remained pre-eminent until Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*

(1791), which subsequently set the pattern for biographies. However the problems of truthfulness remained.

Conrad Black's ex-wife, Joanna, says that she thought he is 'living in a book, the private Black transforming more and more into his public persona'. Joanna thought that her husband 'had mapped out the life story of a great man and was determined to live it'. Perhaps the character in 'the book' is the true Conrad Black? 'Absolutely not,' she said. 'Absolutely not' (Siklos, 1995: 275, 276). But Tim Heald (1991: 239–240), the Duke of Edinburgh's biographer, disagrees. 'On the whole [...] most people in real life are more or less like their public image [...]. The Duke of Edinburgh 'seems remarkably like the Duke of Edinburgh'.

To make matters even more complicated, as time passes, the divisions between the factual biography and autobiography, and the novel seem to become increasingly blurred. David Thomson's biography of Orson Welles 'smacks a little of fiction' and he even considered writing it as a novel, 'but instead he demonstrates how densely reality and fiction become intertwined' (Romney, 1996: 14). Donald Horne (1975; 1985), on the other hand, has written what he calls a 'sociography' rather than an autobiography, and in it he attempts to show 'what social history can look like when told through *people*', especially the extent to which his 'adolescent revolt' was 'shaped and coloured by social circumstance'.

Then again, Lord Jeffrey Archer has written what he calls a 'novelography' of the lives of media magnates Robert Maxwell and Rupert Murdoch ('80% fact, 20% fiction'), based on: 'copious research [...] I knew Maxwell very well. We were in the House of Commons together [...] Murdoch I have known for years too [...] I like Rupert. He's a brilliant man. I enjoy his company' (Alderson, 1996: 7). Anyway, he owned the publishing house that produced the book. Fay Weldon (1996) was impressed: 'You gasp at the nerve of it. Archer, has simply plagiarised their unlikely lives [...]. [He] presumably knows well – if he says that's how it's done, I'm prepared to believe him. His world, not mine'. But Bernard Crick in *Stranger Than Fiction*, his biography about Archer himself, suggests that Archer has lived a life 'based on half-truths and self-delusion' (Alderson, 1996: 7).

In this book, we have avoided the temptation to delve into fiction, such as Truman Capote's *Answered Prayers*, Lorenzo Montesini's self-published *Cardboard Cantata* and James Hewitt's *Princess in Love* – co-written with romance writer Anna Pasternak.

Diaries seem safer, of course, and are a great source of information. We understand enough about them now to know that those who write them intend them to be read and that this poses its own problems. How much does the diarist 'obfuscate, idealise and fictionalise'? asks Susan Chenery in regard to Brian Eno's diary. Well, in this case, enough to make the diaries 'slightly contrived' and 'too clever' to provide 'an insight into the actual man', she thinks. But how does she know that?

This difficulty of *verstehen* is an old one, of course, and as Chenery (1996: 10s) suggests the problem is not all that different when dealing with oneself. 'How do you know that what you remember is more important than what you don't?' asks Doris Lessing (1995: 12, 13). 'Not only the perspective but what you are looking at changes'. We always encounter a more or less unconscious *post festa* ideologising of past life events, a reshaping and re-evaluation of life according to the special life circumstances of the respondents be they ourselves or someone we are listening to (Karpati, 1981: 136). 'We make up our pasts. You can actually watch your mind doing it, taking a little fragment of fact and then spinning a tale out of it' (Lessing, 1995: 13).

But even the great technical problems of recall and reconstruction pale before someone like Simone de Beauvoir who said that, about some things she had no intention of telling the truth. And Lessing again: 'Telling the truth about yourself is one thing, if you can, but what about the other people? [...] I do not believe it is the duty of friends, lovers, comrades to tell all' (Lessing, 1995: 11).

At least, we suppose, we can say that Lessing and de Beauvoir are not telling a truth that they know can be told. Others seem disdainful of this:

[...] we knew that fundamental truths were embedded and reflected in women's experiences as revealed in their life stories [...] We developed a healthy disdain for reductionist approaches that would have us determine the 'truth' of a

woman's words solely in terms of their exact factual accuracy, the representativeness of her social circumstances, or the reliability of her memory when it was tested against 'objective' sources (Personal Narratives Group, 1989: 14).

Although in the view of some historians, all history is a form of autobiography, compared with history as it is more usually conceived, autobiography is 'freely explorative and open-ended, [...] personal and experiential' (Colmer, 1989: 159). Yet writers of biographies, autobiographies and tellers of life histories are not free to invent situations and characters, dialogue and plot as novelists are. 'Truth matters', as R. W. Connell (1995: 31) somewhat laconically remarked. In writing of ruling-class men, we want to use their own insights into their world, their sense of their place in it, their understanding of themselves as men as they move in it and shape it. We want to make this collective portrait (or perhaps more accurately, 'composite picture' (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 105)) as accurate as we can, in ways that are not 'reductionist' but are rich in nuance and subjectivity, and yet are, in some sense, reliable and representative of the men they are and of the men like them.

Truthfulness, Saturation and Structure

Thomas and Znaniecki emphasised the sincerity of autobiographies produced in their project on the proletarianisation of emigre Polish peasants (Kohli, 1981: 69) and see it as at least some protection against deception. Speaking or writing 'from the heart' may be preferable to its opposite, yet Ronald Fraser (1979), who compiled an excellent oral history of the Spanish Civil War before embarking on an analysis of his own memories in 1984, was worried that people may very sincerely believe what is untrue (Elder, 1981: 110).

The Watergate conspiracy of the Nixon years in the USA produced an unusual answer to the dilemma of oral testimonies. In one study of

corporate executives, sociologists used what they called 'the Woodward-Bernstein principle of verification. Two independent sources had to validate or confirm an observation before we took it as a social fact or common understanding' (Denzin, 1981: 155). But we think it is really Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame who are most helpful in the matter, through their development of the notion of saturation. Their view is that one must try to diversify as much as possible the cases observed until what they call 'saturation' occurs. When certain elements show up with regularity, when it becomes obvious that certain facts are not due to chance personal characteristics, then one has done a valid study. Subsequent life stories again and again revealed for them the same elements, which soon appeared characteristic not just of the respondents but of their social relations. Stories were told once, confirmed, reconfirmed again and again.

Every new life story was confirming what the preceding ones had shown. Again and again we were collecting the same story [...] what was happening was a process of saturation: on it rests the validity of our sociological assumptions. One life story is only one life story [...] Several life stories taken from the same set of socio-structural relations support each other and make up altogether a strong body of evidence (Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame, 1981: 187).

Life stories can be checked against one another, solving the problem of truthfulness (Bertaux, 1981a: 9). 'It took us about 15 life stories to begin perceiving the saturation process; we did fifteen more and confirmed it. [...] By then the structural pattern had become quite clear to us' (Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame, 1981). They stopped at thirty, Bertaux (1981b) saying that 'there was no point going further' for 'the invisible but ever present level of social relations' had been revealed.

Indeed, we want to take the matter a little further, if we can. While trying to move beyond the tiresome and abstracted debate over class boundaries by choosing to examine those who are nowhere near the boundary – male millionaires from at least three generations of wealth – we hope also to draw upon those who are less central to the class for their views of those who are most powerful within it. Australian author

Patrick White (1983: 153, 57, 151), whose family came to Australia 'generations earlier and were granted great tracts of land', placed himself in the practice of his art and his sexuality in a more marginal position from which, for instance, he lampooned members of his class, including Lady Mary Fairfax and Dame Leonie Kramer. 'An artist in the family tree was almost like a sodomite', he remarks rather dryly. 'I have never been able to enjoy what any "normal" member of my parents' class considers his right. What is seen as success, my own included, has often filled me with disgust'. So much so, that his 'militant irony [...] on the bourgeoisie *en bloc* [...] tends to become strident sarcasm' (Myers, 1978: 2). His accounts of his relationships with the servants of his childhood are riveting and, like authors Truman Capote and Gore Vidal, he provides an insider's view of his world, while yet not quite belonging to it.

Judy Cassab (1995), the portraitist for the rich and famous, has some interesting things to say in her diaries, too. She and her husband were invited to dine at Rupert Murdoch's country estate, Cavan, 'in a huge tent, worthy of the Shah of Iran', along with leaders of the Australian political and artistic scenes. Later at home, her husband said that 'it's like Genghis Khan vanquishing the government, and everybody bows, worships, pays court and genuflects'. But the men and women who formerly served the rich personally and daily, such as Prince Charles' valet and bodyguard Michael Varney (1989), his housekeeper at Highgrove, Wendy Berry (1995), and those servants interviewed by Ronald Fraser (1984) to enrich his own memories, have told particularly rich and insightful stories.

Briefly, then, this book is a sociology of ruling-class masculinity which solves the problem of distance and access by using autobiographies and biographies of the men themselves and those around them and which tackles the problem of truthfulness by developing a collective portrait of them through the method of saturation. This portrait will not focus on individual differences and it will leave us with a clear picture of the patterns common to the class itself. These patterns shape their upbringing, education and apprenticeship to the world they are

being groomed to inherit; their relationships to the people who serve them both as personal servants and as employees – people whose lives they both directly and indirectly control; the way they both use (or misuse) and display their wealth; their concepts of time, work and leisure and the way privilege makes these a gross distortion of the world of which they are nominally a personal part; and the means by which they keep the whole class moving forward by contracting appropriate marriages that are designed to ensure the continuity of their class by producing suitable heirs. By this method we hope to do justice to the processes of both gender and class and their living interrelationships and, of course, to tell the story of how these men are the men they are.

Chapter Two

Childhood

When considering masculinity it would now seem commonplace to say that children need to be well cared for in long term loving relationships with adult men and women if they are to become productive, creative and nurturing adults themselves (Donaldson, 1991: 114). Child-minders and day-care workers have confirmed that the children of active fathers are 'more secure' and 'less anxious' than the children of non-active fathers. Psychological studies have revealed them to be better developed socially and intellectually, and the results of active fatherhood seem to last (Hochschild with Machung, 1989: 218, 237; Stein, 1984: 155). Unfortunately this seldom seems to be the experience of boys who grow up with great wealth, nor is it the experience of their sons.

Instead their boyhoods are marked, more than for most other boys, by the physical absence of their fathers. Timothy, the son of J. Paul Getty I, was born two months premature on June 14. His father recorded in his diary that he 'couldn't express his disappointment at not having been with [his wife] but she wasn't expecting the baby until August', but he was so busy that he was unable to visit them until early July, about three weeks later (Miller, 1985: 167). Another of his sons, J. Paul Getty II KBE, said that from the age of four he scarcely saw his father and that when he once wrote to him at age twelve, the letter was returned with the misspellings underlined. In turn, he himself seldom saw his four eldest children from his first marriage and after the death of his second wife he handed their three year old son over to her parents and saw the boy 'for maybe twenty minutes a year' (Barber 1991, 139–140).

Lord Rothermere, the newspaper magnate, used to work so hard that they hardly saw him, his children said (Coleridge, 1994: 284). Kerry Packer, too, has said that he saw little of his parents when he was at school – his father not at all between the ages of five and nine, and his

mother perhaps half a dozen times, even though the school he attended was a 'stone's throw away' from the family home (Barry, 1994: 108, 109). The reason for this neglect is, it would seem, pressure of work for maintaining a vast fortune is, apparently, a mammoth task.

Royalty suffer the same fate. When they embarked on a tour of the Commonwealth, the Queen and Prince Philip did not see their children at all for six months. Although she spoke to them on the telephone, the Queen later revealed that when reunited with their parents, the children 'were terribly polite. I don't think they really knew who we were' (James, 1992: 12). Prince Philip, for his part, says that he was 'always very careful to be with the children at bedtimes' (Heald, 1991: 232).

As chairman of the board of a vast South African mining multinational, Adam Hochschild's (1987: 31, 34) father worked long hours and, except for the weekends, saw his son for 'a few minutes' at breakfast and bedtime. Even within this cramped and scarce 'quality' time, everything in Hochschild's father's life was still only 'by appointment' for which he was always precisely on time. Similarly, if Prince Edward wished to have lunch with his mum, an appointment was necessary and if he wished to speak to his father he would tell his valet to speak to the Duke's valet to see if there was a moment free (James, 1992: 195).

Of course, as Rupert Murdoch once explained, he liked 'spending time with Ann [his wife] and time with the children' but, unfortunately, as he worked 'seven days a week' (Tuccille, 1989: 264) he was unable to indulge this whim. Sir Frank Packer, who worked 'twenty hours a day', was 'rarely around' (Barry, 1994: 106, 114) but Andrew Fairley 'reserved his Sunday afternoons' for his four children (Schmidt, 1997: 7). It seemed to the servants that Ronald Fraser's parents lived only for themselves, seeing their children for half an hour or so before they were sent back to the nursery. Saturday and Sunday lunches were the only meals Conrad Black and his brother took with their parents and Mrs Black estimated that they only saw Conrad for a day and a half a week, on Saturday afternoons and Sundays (Fraser, 1984: 34; Black, 1993: 4-5; Siklos, 1995: 275).

Judy Cassab (1995: 126), writing about a visit to the home of Lady Beatty and Stanly Donen, the film director, observed:

Their country house [...] has a thatched roof and was built in the fifteenth century. It has many bathrooms, central heating and a butler, a maid, a cook, a driver, a Rolls Royce, a station wagon, two sheepdogs, a great dane, a fox terrier and two children for the weekend only, of course.

The children do not take much of their time. Perhaps these were lucky the lucky ones, for other boys had to endure set-piece encounters with their parents:

After I got older and [went] off to school, basically the only time I would see my parents would be for an hour before dinner, which was the cocktail hour, the drinking hour. I was expected to be in the library with them, talking to them, coat and tie, that hour six to seven, dinner was at seven. It never varied. I was there an hour before dinner and I was expected to talk to them and to tell them about my day. They were never very interested particularly. They never asked me about any of my friends at school or anything; so eventually it became a very painful sort of dueling session that I found very maddening and awkward. Then there was dinner, which was a release after an hour of agony (Bronfman, 1987: 36).

Between such busy parents and their children 'spontaneity is rare', noted Prince Edward's biographer Paul James (1992: 195).

Before his son went to boarding school, Sir James Hardy felt that when he wasn't away on business, 'having the time to drive him to school each morning [...] was very important. It gave us a chance for a man-to-man chat', especially since work, 'committees, Lodge and charities resulted in me getting home quite late a few nights each week' (Mundle, 1993: 154). However, when the boy had a cerebral haemorrhage and was rushed to the Children's Hospital in Adelaide accompanied by a police escort, Sir Thomas 'was away on a bloody yachting spree again, like I had [been] for half my life' (Mundle, 1993: 132).

To other children, Rupert Murdoch as a father seemed 'clumsy', 'rather rough' and 'insensitive, verging on dangerous'. He was 'not al-

ways a very patient father', admitted Anna Murdoch. 'He's not a wrestly daddy. He'd rumple his tie. He could seem remote even at home. His son James sometimes asked her, 'Is Daddy going deaf?' 'No,' I'd say, 'he's just not listening' (Shawcross, 1992: 85, 330). However, the life of the parents, as the servants saw it, 'offered them such a lot, didn't it? I mean, they were always in a hurry to go riding or play tennis or to rush off to parties' (Fraser, 1984: 73). Fraser (1984: 92) recalls:

sometimes when I was in bed my mother would come in for a moment to say goodnight. She wore long evening dresses that rustled and she came in so lightly that she seemed to float, and there was a scent she wore which remained in the air after she'd gone. She was there only a moment, I can feel myself still reaching out to her as she floated away [...].

Distant Voices

Even with time spent with their fathers so scarce and so tightly organised, there was something lacking, the boys felt, in their relationships with their fathers. Short, organised, infrequent the time with their fathers might be, but pleasant it seldom was. Adam Hochschild (1987: 27) wrote that his father's emotions 'showed only through the cracks' and that trying to win his approval by being affectionate toward him, simply didn't work (Hochschild, 1987: 58); perhaps, like another rich father described in Joanie Bronfman's (1987: 37) set of interviews, he 'never was affectionate at all'. Edmund White was afraid of his father. 'He was always disappointed that I wasn't more athletic, more aggressive; that I didn't want to take over the engineering business, that I was too cissy, too artistic, too attached to my mother.' His childhood was 'insecure and sometimes terrifying' (Attallah, 1994: 94).

Sir Frank Packer 'seemed strict, a disciplinarian, a frightening figure who was tough on his sons'. He 'used to use a polo whip very well. I got a lot of beltings', said his son Kerry (Barry, 1994: 114, 115). Another of

Joanie Bronfman's interviewees got the hairbrush or the wooden hanger if he 'stepped out of line', but more often the brush because the hangers used to break (Bronfman, 1987: 61). Such thrashings were quickly forgotten, according to novelist Patrick White (1981: 9) who, however, could not forget nor forgive his parents' amusement at his attempts to express his ideas, 'their conviction that what I detested was what I would like', and their 'relentless determination to do everything for my own good'.

Authority, formality, aggression and inexpressiveness were a mark of these men. When Adam Hochschild's father spoke he did so 'in a voice which carried in it the full weight of his authority, of his wide reputation for morality, a voice whose very quietness contained the expectation of unquestioning obedience', for his 'entire bearing and role in life was that of a man who expected to be listened to'. He was 'always formal' and forceful such that 'when he changed the subject, you did not change it back' (Hochschild, 1987: 59, 76, 148). Steven Rockefeller said of his father that while he allowed his children to say what they thought, they were 'also made aware that they would be frozen out if they did. We learned early what the consequences were for deviating from the established position' he told Bronfman (1987: 66).

James Fairfax (1991: 23) felt that his relationship with his father 'was normal for a boy of ten, but with possibly more restraints than in many such relationships [...] He was certainly a stern parent when I transgressed and, until his departure, made genuine efforts to do things with me'. Consequently, Fairfax felt he was 'more self-reliant at an early age'. One of the servants confided to Ronald Fraser that she had never heard his father say hello to him and 'at meal times he didn't talk' (Fraser, 1984: 72) for, like Conrad Black's father, these men were 'prone to be aloof' (Black, 1993: 3, 160), or even 'rough and bullying' like the Duke of Edinburgh, whose affection was 'tempered with brusqueness' and who 'frightened' his son Charles according to a loyal retainer (Dimbleby, 1994: 33).

Prince Charles' bodyguard, Michael Varney, has said that from what he saw of both Charles and Prince Philip during seven years of constant

attendance on the prince, it was clear that Charles had 'enormous respect and admiration' for his father but what else he may have felt for Philip was 'less evident' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 179). When asked if Prince Philip was a 'tough disciplinarian' and whether he'd ever been told 'to sit down and shut up', Charles said, 'The whole time, yes, I think he has had quite a strong influence on me, particularly in my younger days [...]' (Dimbleby, 1994: 65). 'A close relation, who is today on intimate terms with both men', recalled 'the rough way' the father spoke to his son: 'very bullying [...] which had the effect of driving Charles more and more back into his shell'. Friends were also frustrated by the failure of Charles' mother to intervene. The Queen was 'not indifferent so much as detached, deciding that in domestic matters she would submit entirely to the father's will' (Dimbleby, 1994: 49). According to a friend of Charles, Prince Philip 'didn't quite realise how sensitive his eldest son was', not noticing that he made Charles 'curl up' and 'shrink'. Their relationship was characterised by 'impatience on the one side and trepidation on the other' (Dimbleby, 1994: 21–22) and Philip was quick to 'rebuke his son, in public no less than in private, for inconsequential errors. Indeed, he often seemed intent not merely on correcting the Prince but on mocking him as well, so that he often seemed to be foolish and tongue-tied in front of friends as well as family' (Dimbleby, 1994: 49). Michael Varney himself was 'quite taken aback' when he realised that during his years as the Prince's bodyguard at boarding school and at university, where he and Charles 'spoke about many things' that 'of all the boys and young men I spoke to at length he was the only one whom I cannot remember ever talking about his father. Not ever. It took some time for this to dawn on me' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 48).

Clyde Packer, brother of Kerry, was also frequently dressed down and abused in public by his father, Sir Frank. Into his late thirties, Clyde was still treated like a stupid, disobedient little boy until he could take no more and rebelled against such tyranny, splitting clearly and completely with his father (Barry, 1994: 166, 167). Adam Hochschild (1987: 3, 4, 24, 137, 140) was 'always wary' of his father, with whom he dreaded being alone. Even into adulthood, there was invariably a 'stiff-

ness in the air' between them; a 'constant uneasiness' marked by 'awkward silences', 'unease and apprehension'. For Ronald Fraser (1984, 104), there was no possibility at all of a 'human relationship' with his father. His first memories of him are all intimidating ones – including the time he threatened to do his son's hair up in his mother's curlers because he 'looked like a girl'. Fraser knew at that moment that he couldn't 'fill the role, could never be a man like him. Moreover, I didn't want to be like him and, increasingly, I came to fear that I was like him.'

Even in death, parents and children could not be close. The flight home after his father died took Rupert Murdoch three days. He arrived exhausted and upset, to find that his mother had gone ahead with the funeral without him (Shawcross, 1992: 76). J. Paul Getty II, on the other hand, attended his father's funeral, the only son to do so (Barber, 1991: 132).

Patrick White (1981: 60) was to realise later in his life that when he fell in love for the first time as an adult, he was 'probably hoping unconsciously to consummate [his] love' for his father with someone who was 'everything' his father was not. The breakdown of that relationship depressed him, he said, 'as much as my failure to communicate with my actual father' because it brought with it the realisation that 'I might have loved [him] had I dared, and had we been able to talk to each other' (White, 1981: 15).

Not surprisingly, given the strained and emotionally distant nature of these relationships, Bartolome (1974: 102) found during many hours of interviewing business executives and their families, and on many purely social occasions with them, that he saw 'little physical contact between couples and their children'. Prince Charles discovered early in childhood that only in the nursery could he always find a cuddle, for his own parents not only were often away but were, in any case, 'not given to displays of affection even in private' (Dimbleby, 1994: 34).

As one of Bronfman's (1987: 29) interviewees explained:

My mother never touched me except every now and then after I would do all sorts of favors for her and really go all out for some sign from her. [Then] she

would give me back rubs in bed, which were extremely regimented. I got five strokes one night, ten strokes one night, that was a big one and sometimes only two strokes. That was the only time that my mother ever touched me except for when I was a baby which I can't really remember.

Ronald Fraser's nanny told him, when he interviewed her for his book, that 'sometimes [your mother] and her mother would come in [to the nursery] and the baroness would say, Isn't he sweet? [...] but neither of them picked you up and carried you round [...] I don't remember your mother kissing you, there was no physical contact'.

Truman Capote's biographer notes how Barbara Paley could not help keeping most people, including her own children, at a discrete distance. 'She was not a toucher. She would never pick up and hold her children, for example, and they suffered from the lack', said one of her closest friends (Clarke, 1995: 280). Tom Kirk, the gardener to Patrick White's family, told biographer David Marr (1991: 56), 'You wouldn't know she was mother of those children [...]. Ruth patted them on the head like they were pet dogs. They never expected anything from her. You'd think they were strangers'.

As a result, Patrick gave all 'the genuine love' he had to his nanny, Lizzie, who had won his heart with 'sharp reprimands and wet kisses'. Even while a boy he was troubled that he loved her too much and his mother not enough, that 'love would not obey the rules' (Marr, 1991: 29).

One man confided in Bronfman that he had been told by his mother that 'both she and my father didn't like small children' (Bronfman, 1987: 26) and, according to Ronald Fraser's nanny, this was not unusual for Sir Harold, Fraser's father, never visited the nursery, picked him up, or played with him. 'I'm not interested in my child', he said to her once, 'until he can go out shooting with me'. Jack Kennedy resented his mother's 'detached preoccupation' with regulating her children rather than loving them. 'She was never there when we really needed her', he said. 'My mother never really held me and hugged me. Never! Never!' (Andersen, 1996: 23). Distance between family members was appar-

ently endemic. As Colin Fraser later complained to his older brother Ronald, 'Most of the time you were distant, almost a stranger, and that's how you remained throughout my adolescence and early adulthood. You showed no warmth towards me, never comforted me [...]'. There 'wasn't much family feeling in the house', their nanny told Ronald when interviewed (Fraser, 1984: 34, 72, 73, 171).

Making a Man of Him

With their childhoods characterised by the physical absence of their parents for long periods and brief, distant and unsatisfactory encounters otherwise, it is scarcely remarkable that men like Kerry Packer should recall their boyhoods as marred by loneliness, for these are the very things which cause it. 'I have a black hole inside me', he once told his friend Phillip Adams (Barry, 1994: 116, 197). Ronald Fraser (1984: 122) describes the same sense of emptiness when talking about his childhood, 'It's a laceration that's been with me since childhood, a loss, abandonment – I don't have the words, never have had. The pain just exists in me, and I can't give it any other expression'.

Many of her one hundred very wealthy informants told Bronfman (1987: 17) that they felt unhappy with the parenting they had received as children, describing their parents as 'cold, distant, frequently absent' figures 'who delegated much of the child-rearing to servants'. To many of them it seemed that their parents were more concerned with imparting appropriate attitudes and behaviours than with nurturing their children. 'We were lonely', one of them told her (Bronfman, 1987: 20), a fact crystal clear to servants like the cook who told Ronald Fraser that his brother Colin was 'terribly lonely, he came so often to me in the kitchen. All this rich house and everything, there was nothing Colin didn't have – and yet he was so poor in a way' (Fraser, 1984: 137). Fraser himself didn't have anybody to play with either, except when other rich

children came to tea or he went to their houses. Instead he spent many hours in the garden or indoors on his own (Fraser, 1984: 78). Looking back, Fraser sees himself 'dressed in white standing in the garden alone, watching, waiting, not knowing what to do. There is nothing, no one to play with' (Fraser, 1984: 117). He was, like Patrick White, a 'private and solitary child' (Marr, 1991: 33).

Prince Charles was another lonely child – even when he was surrounded by potential companions. Michael Varney recalls how one night there was a knock at the door of his rooms at Gordonstoun school. Opening it, he found Prince Charles asking him if it would be OK if they watched TV together. After a while Charles asked Varney, 'Do you ever get lonely?'. From that time, said Varney, Charles 'allowed his defences to drop when we were alone, and I could see how very miserable he often was' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 41–42, 46). To his credit the school chaplain, Philip Crosfield, noticed this, too. The Prince, he told Jonathan Dimbleby, was 'very lost and very lonely' (Dimbleby, 1994: 246–247).

Partly this was because Charles was taught very early to be wary of those who would seek to cultivate his friendship and absorbed the lesson that decent boys, 'worthwhile potential friends', stood back. His classmates at Gordonstoun harshly treated any boy they thought was 'crawling' to him. He also said that it was just as difficult to make friends at Cheam School and at Cambridge because he couldn't be sure who 'genuinely liked him' and who were 'trying to suck up' to him because of who he was – 'oilers', Princess Diana once called such people (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 42, 46–47; Dimbleby, 1994: 335). With those exhibiting signs of friendship towards him suspect and the worthy boys (by definition) standing back, he subsequently made few friends, none of whom were very close (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 49). In Michael Varney's view, the 'capacity for commitment' that friendship requires did not 'seem to be there' for Prince Charles (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 178). As a psychotherapist, who specialised in treating the wealthy, has remarked:

In the wealthy families whose children become our patients, the appearance of the 'happy family' is not backed up by substance. Communication is often sparse and superficial. Repression of hostile feelings (viz., of being unloved, neglected, unwanted) may be so strong and loyalty to the image of the good family so intense, as to constitute serious impediments to resolution by psychotherapy (Bronfman, 1987: 97).

The fact that physical absence and emotional distance – and its resulting loneliness and fear – are deliberately inflicted on and, in fact, chosen for the boys by their parents, is shown by the way they, in turn, almost invariably inflict this torment on their own children. There is nothing accidental or haphazard about this process. It does not 'just happen' and nor are its consequences unforeseen. 'I was left to cry quite often. I think that's extremely destructive. [But] it was what my parents thought was right at the time', one of Bronfman's (1987: 29) informants explained. Similarly, those close to Prince Philip concluded that he hectored his son because 'it was the only means he knew to achieve his supreme objective – to mould a prince for kingship'; to bring up a son who would be able to 'take over as King in a tough world' (Dibleby, 1994: 21–22, 50).

Even while Rupert Murdoch's relationship to his parents 'remained at the core of his being', according to his biographer William Shawcross (1992: 76–77), when he was asked on television in 1989 if his father had thought he was 'wonderful or a chump' – he nominated the latter, supporting the 'conventional wisdom' that his parents were 'remote and tough [...] preoccupied with their own lives, quick to find fault, slow to praise and even slower to demonstrate affection.' Sir Keith could be 'stern and aloof', and was not 'quick with praise', and Lady Murdoch said that she 'didn't want the children to be spoilt or over-indulged. Keith was much more indulgent than I was, and I think I was counter-acting that' (Shawcross, 1992: 51, 52).

Another forthright mother explained, 'I'm trying to make my children stand on their own feet. I won't express openly my affection for them because I don't want to smother them. I'm quite cold'. 'Expres-

sions of tenderness' were and should be limited, especially towards boys, least they be 'smothered' and made 'too dependent' (Bartoleme, 1974: 102). Like the Queen, who is also a great believer in 'plenty of fresh air' and so ordered that Prince Edward's pram be placed outside every afternoon, regardless of the weather (James, 1992: 19), Lady Murdoch was certainly keen to 'harden' Rupert, for she considered this made him 'adaptable'. 'Like my father, he can suit himself to any kind of company. He has this sort of flair for adapting himself [...] [even] though he's had a lot of material benefits,' she said (Shawcross, 1992: 53–54). Except during winter, as a boy he was not allowed to sleep in his bedroom for she insisted that he spend each night in the garden of their country home, Cruden, in a tree house. 'I thought it would be good for Rupert to sleep out. It was pretty tough. He was more than halfway up the tree. He had no electric light,' she explained. Murdoch said that 'it seemed perfectly OK to me. It never occurred to me that it was a hardship to be there' (Shawcross, 1992: 51, 52, 53).

This 'hardening of the shell' as Kerry Packer called it (Barry, 1994: 113), is thus a deliberate pedagogic strategy. According to James Packer

Dad actively tried to make my life, for short periods of time, difficult. He was not doing that in any vindictive way, but he was doing it to make it easy for me to keep my head sure upon my shoulders, and to make me realise the way most of the world lives (Thomson, 2003: 170).

The boys are strengthened and stiffened, but within a particular environment, one which effectively blocks them off from pernicious influences which might soften their characters and undo the difficult and laborious construction of their masculinity.

Exclusivity, Blood and Ancestors

Rich parents do not generally question the class exclusiveness within which the upbringing of their boys occurs, for it is 'a natural style of living', 'just something you do' (Ostrander, 1984: 91, 94). It is normal behaviour, in fact. 'I think it was a very normal childhood,' Dame Elisabeth Murdoch told the *New York Times* while talking about her son, who had just purchased the paper (Tuccille, 1989: 9). Part of this 'normalcy', of course, involves selecting playmates very carefully so that 'doing the right thing' is learned early and thoroughly. Consequently, 'the puberty of class awareness comes earlier than the puberty of the body'. At about 10 or 11, Adam Hochschild, of his own accord, had stopped playing with the children of servants simply because he realised that they always did what he suggested (Hochschild, 1987: 47). Prince Charles thought that it was not a good idea for his sons to become too close to the two children of Paul and Maria Burrell, his butler and a former housemaid, because of the 'social gulf' between them. After all, '[t]he boys are Princes and should be reared as such,' he told Diana (Berry, 1995: 101).

When children from outside the selected circle did intrude, nothing was said about it, but it was 'just understood' that they should not come into the house itself for they would 'bring illnesses or habits that you might pick up', and they might give you 'strange feelings' and 'interfere with your upbringing'. On a couple of occasions, Ronald Fraser was told off for talking like them and he quickly understood that it was 'common' to do so, that a boy like him 'didn't do that sort of thing' (Fraser, 1984: 83, 152–153). Subsequently, children of wealthy parents only know people like themselves. They are forbidden to associate with others they may encounter from beyond their world, and they are likely to receive 'many overt and subtle messages about [their] inferiority' if they do (Bronfman, 1987: 392).

Breaking the rules of class contact is met with disapproval, however inadvertent the act.

I ran quickly to open the door, exultant at being of use. A man stood there. 'Is your mummy in?' 'Yes,' I said, 'please come in and wait.' I showed him into the hall and ran to find my mother. A couple of minutes later she returned white in the face. 'That was a beggar, Alexander,' she said to my father. And then, rounding on me: 'How did you dare let a man like that in?' As they both started to scold I felt a terrible pang and ran across the fields [...] convinced of my wrong-doing (Fraser, 1984: 106).

The small world they inhabit is so tight that the young master is not permitted to eat with the children of servants, even though in his infancy he ate with their parents and not with his own. At all times, the servants would address him as 'master' even when he was a baby who couldn't understand that or any other word. Even in adulthood and old age, there is still a 'dividing line' which the child of a servant explained, was 'engrained in me' such that 'Madam was Madam and you were Master Ronnie' (Fraser, 1984: 75, 163). There were, as Patrick White (1981: 33) quickly learned, 'the Better Classes and the Lower Classes' or 'the rabble and the more respectable classes' as he later called them (Marr, 1991: 316).

This 'engraining' of class occurs from birth and some events draw it to consciousness more than others. Ronald Fraser, attending a tea-party for over a hundred children most accompanied by their chauffeurs and nannies, was struck by the thought that 'a hundred poor children, could have tea just from what's left over'. It was the only time he made such a comparison for he was 'much too carried away by events, got too much of a thrill from all the new things that were happening [...] to think deeply about these things' (Fraser, 1984: 35). 'As children, we took the established order for granted', remarked James Fairfax (1991: 5).

For those children not from the ruling class, such as the children of servants who did manage to view the inner sanctum, it seemed that rich boys had an 'endless opportunity' to have whatever they wanted. 'You had only to say to your mother and she went to Reading and brought it back, whatever it was [...]' The playroom, separate and spacious, 'was always loaded with stuff', 'an Aladdin's cave full of books and toys and games' (Fraser, 1984: 159, 162).

‘I had everything – houses, maids, chauffeurs, money – the whole world was mine’ Adam Hochschild (1987: 56) thought at the time. As one interviewee told Bronfman (1987: 252): ‘If you did what they wanted’ there was ‘an infinite amount of money’ to buy special material possessions. In *The Rich: A Study of the Species*, it is related how one firm has promised that Disneyland designer Roland Crump could put together a private amusement park for \$2 million per acre and could also provide performances by ‘the world’s largest tented circus’ for only \$47,500. For another \$150,000 it promised to get Andy Warhol to write, produce and direct a home movie of the event, a children’s party (Davis, 1982: 151). Similarly:

An eight year old boy is sitting at a desk in the offices of a children’s party-planning company [...] ‘I want an ostrich, a real one. Not one of those stupid cartoon birds,’ he announces with a sigh. ‘And I want elephant rides, and a Velcro wall, and I want a snake. That’ll be way cool’. His nanny adds it to the list [...] [Her] instructions from his parents are clear: ‘Whatever he wants, he can have’. He has already chosen a giant slide; a Ferris wheel; a shoot-to-splash game; a BMX stunt show; a human hamster wheel; a flea circus; a ‘Vegas-style’ magic show; a four-man stilt-walking rock band; two clowns and several cast members from Star Wars. The total cost is already \$26,000 (Broadbent, 1997: 46–47).

The boy’s mother has promised the nanny that she will attend the party at her home. His father will not be there. He seldom is, according to the nanny (Broadbent, 1997: 47).

Ruling-class boys, then, are taught early that they are different from other children. Their contact with children from other classes is limited and controlled and, if it occurs by accident, is discouraged. The effect, of course, as one whom Bronfman spoke with realised, is that it gave him ‘an unrealistic view of the world because I thought everybody’s father was an executive in a great big corporation. I couldn’t comprehend a life with a father who didn’t do that [...] I felt everybody always had enough money and that wasn’t an issue’ (Bronfman, 1987: 79).

Intrusions of the wrong sort of people, when they occur at all, sometimes incur fear. ‘I never felt safe from nuns and priests, drunks, larries,

or the Mad Woman, till well up the gravel drive, beyond the bunya tree', safe well within his own backyard, said Patrick White (1981: 2). Sometimes the occasional ritual invasion occasioned both fear and a sense of power and superiority:

a line of village children, powerfully awkward in their best suits, some of them twice my size, [bore] down on me when the front gate opened for their annual treat at the Manor. A few I knew by sight but not to talk to; the rest were just faces, anxious and rough. Waiting alone at the bend in the drive for the phalanx to begin its descent was a moment I very much feared. And then, as they began to scatter through the garden on the treasure hunt, I would feel a certain superiority, the superiority of belonging. They were only here – in the garden, not the house, of course – because we were giving them a treat. 'This is *their* treasure hunt, darling, not yours,' my mother said. 'You must help them' (Fraser, 1984: 111).

Rupert Murdoch's mother instilled in him a sense of *noblesse oblige*, too, along with a consciousness of privilege. The wealthy often have a sense of 'superiority', the experience and expectation that 'their kind of people' are better than others. *Noblesse oblige* is the notion that there are responsibilities and obligations associated with this privilege, but it has definite limits, as young Patrick White found out. 'The road took them past the Aboriginals' shanties clustered on the outskirts of town. "There's nothing you can do for these people," his uncle said. Because he was fond of his uncle, he dismissed the blacks from his mind' (Marr, 1991: 57; Shawcross, 1992: 61; Bronfman, 1987: 2).

Ontological Superiority and Inevitability

In addition to learning that they have particular social responsibilities, ruling-class children are taught that they have special talents and abilities which are safeguarded and nurtured. The boys are both 'protected and prodded' so they can become the very best they can be, within well

established class expectations (Ostrander, 1984: 70–71). Their mothers, as they themselves see it, take very seriously the task of enforcing high standards of achievement. Dame Elisabeth Murdoch warned Rupert not to fail her and her warning ‘shook Rupert to the bones’, especially since she ‘clearly doubted that he was as good as his father’ (Shawcross, 1992: 61, 67, 69).

The result of this process, if it is successful, is the sense that one is ‘a being of innate superiority’ simply ‘as a fact from the world’; a creature who requires ‘no doing to confirm its being’ (Fraser, 1984: 75). These boys are marked by a form of masculinity shaped by a thorough and early appreciation of class difference and a sense of their own ontological superiority. We ‘wallowed’ in it, said Patrick White (1981: 19). ‘Everything existed only for me. I could do whatever I wanted. I couldn’t do wrong’ said Karl Lagerfeld (Bernier, 1992: 311).

Thus, Susan Ostrander points out, while ruling-class mothers want their children to have ‘the chance to become the best they can be, to contribute to the community in some way, to develop life-long, enjoyable leisure pursuits, to stay out of trouble, to get a good education, and to have happy marriages’, all these anticipations and expectations have strong class-specific meanings which appear and are experienced as solid and inflexible to those living in and through them. Parents demand ‘the best’ of their children who must be ‘the best,’ because they are ‘the best’ and in the process, they wish them to have a sense of ‘accomplishment, self-satisfaction, and self-confidence’ and to achieve whatever they want – as long as it’s what is expected of them (Ostrander, 1984: 76, 77, 94). As far as James Fairfax (1991: 57) was concerned, ‘at no stage had I ever contemplated doing anything but joining the family business. There was no parental pressure over this, nor was it necessary. I had been brought up to believe it was both my destiny and my duty and I had no interest in any other career’. So, too, for Prince Charles, whose:

life had been programmed, if not packaged, by others: every major decision – about school, university, the armed forces – had been taken for him by his father or by Mountbatten or by committees of ‘the great and the good’, all of

whom went through the forms of consultation but took his compliance for granted (Dimbleby, 1994: 245).

Childhood in this way was ‘not much more than an anxious wait for manhood’ and the ‘ascent to adulthood’ was seen as a ‘series of steps’ that lay ‘like granite before you’ such that life ‘was like a factory [...] in which cogs pulled me along, conveyor belts pushed me out’ (Fraser, 1984: 73, 92, 103, 110). It was ‘all a predictable trajectory’. They ‘ha[d] a plan for me’, wrote Adam Hochschild (1987: 93, 99).

Similarly, in Patrick White’s world there are no ‘accidents of birth. We are what we are born to be, free only to shape the lives fate has given us [...] Escape is impossible’. White believed in ‘blood and ancestors’, said his biographer, David Marr (1991: 4), and he felt ‘caught, irresolute and uncomfortable’ in that journey encompassed by the circle of his parents’ friends – ‘business, the law and the land’ – who met not only ‘at the races, ate at the Golf Club, played bridge and sat on the margin of the dances held to mark each stage their children took into the world’ (Marr, 1991: 101) but shared other rituals too, such as that of ‘bleeding’:

Under the trees hounds were milling about, snarling and yapping. Riders on horses and others on foot, amongst them a man in a red coat, watched as the hounds pulled bits of meat about between them. The man in the red coat took a bit from one of them, stuck his fingers in it and rubbed the blood on your cheeks and forehead. The smell was repulsive, but worse was not knowing which part of the fox the bloody meat came from. No one explained, it was just another of those mysteries of childhood. But when people began to offer their congratulations, a twinge of fearful pleasure filled the inner void, if only momentarily, bloodily, with the satisfaction of becoming one of the elect. Another of those steps that lay frighteningly immutable on the path through childhood had been overcome [...] That evening there was a knock on the bedroom door and the huntsman [...] approached the bed with a brown paper bag. You sat up in surprise and he opened the bag to show you the grinning fox’s head and the tail which he had brought as an additional sign of election [...] you accepted them as of right [...] and gravely thanked [him], who was offered five shillings for his trouble by your father downstairs (Fraser, 1984: 80).

Life's and history's courses in this way seem inevitable and of deep significance one for the other, especially when celebrated by public ritual which visibly excludes lesser men who, at best, may discreetly serve but never belong. Prince Charles loved the fox's penis bone mounted on a silver pin, given him at a Beauvoir Hunt supper and chose to wear it pinned to his lapel when he met the King of Greece (Berry, 1995: 181). Those who serve do so because they are, for one reason or another, not 'the best' and the children of the ruling class, whatever their ability, 'are simply not allowed to fail academically or personally', for they are, after all, superior. While this gives these children 'striking advantages over children of other classes', this also, as we shall see, provokes its own forms of apprehension and uncertainty (Ostrander, 1984: 84).

In short, as we have seen, the childhood of the wealthy produces disconnection from others – a lack of intimacy and nurturance, compounded by an upbringing that stresses the repression of loving feelings and intimate relationships. In an atmosphere of formality that inhibits the possibility of a close family life, the resulting loneliness and fear is not unforeseen but is, in fact, planned and perpetuated. For by these means parents quite deliberately attempt to mould young boys to fit the ruthless sphere into which they will move as men – to toughen, harden and discipline them within a limited social environment which isolates them from everyone who is not like them and gives them the sense that this is, after all, the natural order of things. During such a childhood boys are brutalised and protected at the same time.

Ruling-class boys, then, are taught from an early age that friendship, even within their own restricted circle, is unreliable and, indeed, dangerous because it threatens the distance established with such effort and maintained with such difficulty, between themselves and others. Such an upbringing produces men who are 'aloof; insecure; insensitive to their own and others' feelings, desires and mistreatment; capable of surface sociability rather than [...] meaningful relationships' (Bronfman, 1987: 387–388). In this way the masculinity of the hegemonic is deeply implicated in the maintenance and continuation of the class which

shapes its character. Above all, it teaches those who bear it that it alone is the masculinity that they most need to survive in the world they create in their own image.

Chapter Three

Servants

Although ruling-class fathers are seldom available to their sons, the boys are never alone, for the chasm of parental absence and what Siklos (1995: 24), Conrad Black's biographer, has called 'emotional isolation', is filled by servants. Manoli Lascaris, Patrick White's longtime companion, recalls his own boyhood in which: 'First mother went away. Then it was our father. [We were] not really alone, of course, for there was Fräulein Hoffmann, and Mademoiselle Leblanc, and Kyria Smaragda our housekeeper, and Eurydice the cook and the two maids from Lesbos. The house was full of the whispering of women [...]' (Marr, 1991: 215).

The number of servants employed by the rich in their households seems to vary from about half a dozen to more than one hundred, and it seems to matter to them how many they employ. A fellow student at school recalls that Conrad Black was the most 'ostentatiously rich' boy in his class: always inquiring of his classmates how many servants they had (Siklos, 1995: 30).

Upon analysis, the basic unit seems to be four servants per household – a butler, a cook and a driver plus a maid or a nanny depending on the circumstances of the family. It apparently requires a nanny, a gardener and a groom to take a child hunting, according to Ronald Fraser (1984: 76), and a ratio of two servants per adult seems to be the base line (Cassab, 1995: 126; Siklos, 1995: 121). James Fairfax (1991: 5) was raised in a household of ten servants. Adam Hochschild's (1987: 65–66) parents had a staff of 'five or so'; and Patrick White's family had a horse trainer, an 'astonishingly handsome chauffeur', the major-domo Mabel, a cook, two parlour-maids and gardeners in Sydney and on Mount Wilson (Marr, 1991: 34, 111). When American actress Katharine Hepburn moved in with the super-rich Howard Hughes she brought her own staff with her: including her maid, chauffeur and cook, who

‘meshed easily’ with Hughes’ housekeeper and his majordomo. To this, they added a part-time barber and a laundress (Higham, 1993: 77). Hammersmith farm, where Gore Vidal and the Auchincloss family (including Jacqueline Bouvier, later Jackie Kennedy) spent their summers, had a resident staff of sixteen to care for its twenty-eight rooms, seventeen bathrooms and fourteen fireplaces. Before marrying Aristotle Onassis, then, Jackie would already have been well prepared and able to take in her stride his 325 foot yacht, *Christina*, with its gold bathroom fittings and barstools upholstered with sperm whale scrotum, which sailed with a crew of sixty, including two chefs, two hairdressers, a Swedish masseuse and a band (Andersen, 1996: 66, 356).

At the Viceroy’s house in New Delhi, Lord Mountbatten was attended by 2,000 servants (Lucas, 1998: 75). At lunch in the household of the Maharani of Jaipur, reveals Australian painter, Judy Cassab, one servant slid back her chair, another placed a serviette on her lap, a third served the food and a fourth brought the drinks. Next morning, on the marble terrace near the fountain, three servants served her breakfast and another brought her a rose. All were resplendent in white gloves and orange turbans (Cassab, 1995: 93).

As a new footman, James Berry reacted with ‘total shock’ to his first glimpse of the Royal Family at home:

That first sight of the Royals sitting down at table chatting about commonplace things such as the day’s walking and riding was unremarkable, of course. What was remarkable was the number of staff – the footmen, butler, Queen’s page, cooks, pastry chefs and cellar staff all waiting on their every whim (Berry, 1995: 5).

During their six-year marriage, the Duke and Duchess of York were looked after by a Private Secretary and Treasurer, a Comptroller and Assistant Private Secretary, an Equerry, an extra-Equerry and four ladies-in-waiting, in addition to their private domestic staff (James, 1992: 100). Princess Margaret and her husband were accompanied by a staff and crew of 121 for their six-week honeymoon on the *Britannia*. Prince Charles employed thirty-eight staff in his office, including Princess

Diana's staff, ten executives (private secretaries, assistant private secretaries and press secretaries), a management team of three (an accountant, an administrator and a personnel officer) and a contingent of secretaries, typists and telephonists. He employs an additional thirty-six people full time, some at Kensington Palace and others primarily at Highgrove. The basic staff – two chefs, two butlers, two valets, two orderlies and two chauffeurs – is available to travel with him overseas or to Sandringham, Balmoral and to other parts of his mother's realm. One of each pair travels with him, while the other is preparing for the next visit or tidying up after the last one. This staff of seventy-four does not include those employed by his parents such as the archivists and librarians or the outside staff, gardeners, grooms, huntsmen, or the police who serve as 'personal protection officers' (Dimbleby, 1994: 505). In 2004, the number of staff Prince Charles employed jumped to 113, including 28 'personal staff'. Before their marriage, Charles also provided Camilla Parker Bowles with two secretaries, a driver, a gardener, bodyguards and an adviser (Barnett, 2004).

The larger the house and its surroundings, of course, the more servants are required. Judy Cassab (1995: 163) painted the Astors, Sir Gavin who owned the *Times*, and Lady Irene the daughter of Field Marshal Haig, at their home, Hever Castle where Henry VIII once lived with Anne Boleyn. 'Afternoons I walk in the Italian garden where every stone is ancient, pillars from Rome, Etruscan vessels with flowers, the lake. There are chess figures sculpted out of shrubs [...] There are eight gardeners'.

Some of the rich, like Lord Hartwell, have (real) servants at the office, too. In Fleet Street, Hartwell has a butler to look after his private apartment there and a gardener to maintain the fifth-floor garden adjacent to his office (Siklos, 1995: 121).

All of the very rich have more than one home. When travelling between his homes, each looked after in his absence by at least half a dozen servants, Prince Charles is accompanied by ten staff, including policemen (Berry, 1995: 15). Rather more modestly, and in search of solitude after the loss of the family newspaper business, James Fairfax (1991: 274, 277) retreated to write his autobiography to a very small

mountain village an hour from Kyoto. Following his 'traumatic final departure' from the family media empire, he hoped to find 'the necessary tranquillity' along with a staff of three to care for him: a domestic servant, 'a superb cook in both Japanese and Western styles' from Toronto, and a chauffeur/maid of all works.

Even the usually very private act of dying is accompanied by a paid public. Patrick White's mother Ruth, 'linger[ed] in immense comfort'. As well as two nurses to attend her during the day, she had a night nurse, a housekeeper and a woman who came a few days a week to clean and sew. It was the White tradition that servants were buried next to their masters (Marr, 1991: 51, 422).

But it is not simply the quantity of servants, or even their ubiquity, but the constancy of their attention that so differentiates the rich from the rest of us. Adam Hochschild's (1987: 46) governess 'hovered not far' from him at all times during his boyhood and, as boys and men, the Windsors are not supposed to be out of sight of their bodyguards (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 30). It was 'inevitable', said Prince Edward's biographer (James, 1992: 17, 35, 40), that Edward saw more of his bodyguard than anyone in his family and more of Mabel Anderson, his nanny, a nurserymaid or a footman than he did of his parents.

The Love of Wonderful People

Given that time spent with their fathers is brief, arranged, uncommon and marked by distance and emotional reserve and that it isn't often that such boys would see their mothers 'one on one' (Mundle, 1993: 17), it is not surprising that servants are 'the real human beings' whom the boys 'felt close to' and who provided 'attention and human contact' for them. Relations with the hired help were 'permanent and familiar', the servants 'always available' and often warmer, more approachable, relaxed and down to earth than parents (Fraser, 1984: 111; Bronfman

1987: 39, 48). Not parents but servants provided 'deep affection and a sense of security', 'comfort', 'continuity and stability', 'support', and were 'the great haven' to be first turned to (James, 1992: 19, 40; Fraser, 1984: 94; Dimbleby, 1994: 34, 52). Prince Charles held Colin Trimming, his personal protection officer, 'in extremely high regard', depending on 'a level of trust between them that could never be doubted or broken', especially concerning his visits to Camilla Parker-Bowles in the early days of their adulterous relationship (Berry, 1995: 26).

But while the servants were the children's friends, confidantes and sometimes their surrogate parents and most of their behaviour was correct and helpful, some were distant and disagreeable, and a few mistreated their charges (Bronfman, 1987: 40). For example, Sir James Hardy's mum came home one day to find him in a harness attached to the clothesline with a wire and a dog clip. To prevent him from getting too hungry, the maid had tied a piece of string to a lamb chop and pinned it to his shirt (Mundle, 1993: 14). Another would use soap slivers as enemas if the children did not have their bowel movements at the right time and Bronfman (1987: 53, 54) was told of one boy who was held under the water in the bathtub until he felt like he was drowning. Luckily for him, his mother came in on one of those occasions, hearing him screaming.

Partly to avoid such situations, the rich would sometimes attempt to redefine their servants' work responsibilities to their children as family or friendship obligations. A common, almost universal, expression of this was to address servants by their first names (Romero, 1992: 116), particularly in the diminutive – Mamba, Kimpo, Mispay, Totie, Lizzie – and to refer to them in the possessive, as in 'Do you still have your marvellous Ellen?' (Hochschild, 1987: 65–66).

Gift giving is another expression of this. Sixty per cent of the 200 servants in one survey reported that they received used clothes from their employers, a practice unique to domestic service in the world of wage labour, but not uncommon between family members. Explained one employer: 'I certainly feel that I have more than enough food and clothing here, and she must need some of these things. I don't mind

sharing them. We are so fortunate, you know, and these things are still good. I think it cheers her up' (Romero, 1992: 110). The maid's view, however, was somewhat different: 'They like to give me their leftovers. She gave me sneakers so worn, I wouldn't give them to anyone. But I know their feelings are so delicate, I take it' (Romero, 1992: 110).

This deliberate elision of personal and market relations ensures employers access to both the emotional and the physical labour of their employees (Romero, 1992: 123). This is important in child-rearing. As the *Ladies Home Journal* advised its readers:

If you are so fortunate as to find a maid you love with your whole heart, you might try binding her to you by having a child or two born during her tenure. Not high wages or Christmas gifts of blue-chip stock or every weekend off will prove so much a lure as children to whom she has grown attached (Romero, 1992: 107).

One servant described how she was manipulated into this caring and nurturing role: 'I remember when I first took the job with the family. She brought the children home from the hospital, and put the babies in my arms and told me, "These are your two children; raise them"' (Romero, 1992: 107). As another informant explained, 'I enjoy the children and I guess I stayed because they become so attached to me' (Romero, 1992: 101).

Thus the 'real day-to-day direction' in the lives of the young boys comes not from their parents but from their nannies who, with other servants, taught them the basic human skills of eating, walking, talking, playing and loving (Shawcross, 1992: 52–53; Dimpleby, 1994: 16). In Jonathan Dimpleby's (1994: 16) view, 'the bonds of affection that grew between [Prince Charles] and devoted nannies were at least as powerful (and in the case of Mabel Anderson as enduring) as those between the child and his parents'. Rupert Murdoch's wife, Anna, said that she thought that Nanny Russell was Rupert's 'mother figure' and even Rupert's mother, Dame Elisabeth Murdoch admits, 'of course Nanny Russell was always their first love' (Shawcross, 1992: 52–53). Conrad Black's (1993: 17) nanny wept when she heard of his expulsion from school, and Manoli

Lascaris' cook 'broke down' when he left Egypt (Marr, 1991: 250). Nothing Patrick White experienced as a man would equal the love of Lizzie Clark, his 'real mother'. He 'loved her and was adored in return'. When his mother arrived to fetch him from school instead of the servant, he spat in her face (Marr, 1991: 66, 84, 512; White, 1981: 22).

Sir James Hardy's dad died when he was almost six and although throughout his life he 'stretched [his] mind to its boundaries' seeking a memory of him, Hardy could find not one in his recollections of those times, although he could readily find vivid memories of Totie the maid (Mundle, 1993: 13).

The Hurt that Knows No Salve

Nannies usually arrive when the first child is born and, in theory anyway, remain until the last child turns seven or eight and goes to boarding school, at which time they 'become obsolete' (Cassab, 1995: 244). Some stay longer. Mabel Anderson had originally been employed as a nurserymaid to Prince Charles but she became the nanny, first to Prince Andrew and, after him, Prince Edward, until he was thirteen when she was moved to Gatcombe Park to look after Princess Anne's son. When she finally retired it was after more than thirty years' service (Dimbleby, 1994: 35; James, 1992: 17, 43). Catherine Peebles, 'Mispy', had taught Prince William and Prince Richard of Gloucester, as well as Prince Michael of Kent, before being employed to teach Prince Charles, then Princess Anne, followed by Prince Andrew. It 'came as a shock to the Queen and her family when [...] Mispy was found dead in her room at Buckingham Palace, the month before Prince Edward was due to start' (James, 1992: 24–25). James Fairfax's father's nanny, Louise Meyer de Boyl, 'came to' him when he was seven and subsequently became James grandmother's maid, working at Fairwater for fifty-four years (Fairfax, 1991: 377).

These are isolated cases, however, and losing those servants they had come to love and who had come to love them was by far the most common experience of rich children. Sister Stafford, who looked after both Caroline and James Fairfax (1991: 12), was replaced by a new nanny, Bertha Mary Tamblin. Ronald Fraser's nanny experienced the rupture with her charge as 'heart-breaking' saying that she was 'not sure the hurt can ever be totally overcome' (Fraser, 1984: 83, 84). When he interviewed her years later for his book, she described their relationship by telling him that, 'In a sense you filled my life. You were always with me, I was there for you. We slept in the same bedroom until your brother was born, when we went out you always held my hand. You were unhappy on my afternoons off, I know because you made a great effort to appear cheerful' (Fraser, 1984: 84). Fraser (1984: 122) himself wrote of the 'laceration that's been with me since childhood, a loss, abandonment – I don't have the words, never have had. The pain just exists in me, and I can't give it any other expression'.

Prince William would usually climb into bed with Barbara Barnes for a morning cuddle (Berry, 1995: 18) and, since such relations of intimacy and affection are not uncommon, many of the rich who talked to Bronfman (1987: 43) spoke of the pain of separation: 'I was definitely closer to her than I was to mother or any other woman and I just was heartbroken when she left' (Bronfman, 1987: 43). Barbara Vanderbilt (1996: 194) has written of being 'prepared and never quite that surprised – each loss somehow echoes the first loss [...] something falls into place, so familiar it is almost a relief'.

As children, Bronfman's informants could not comprehend why the servants, who were often their closest friends or substitute parents, were simultaneously treated 'like second class citizens'. They were good enough to take care of them but they ate in the kitchen (Bronfman, 1987: 50, 235). Even worse, they realised that these people they valued so much and depended on so completely would most probably leave them (Bronfman, 1987: 44): 'Mother didn't like her. One day she fired her and turned up her nose at her and had no understanding that here was an important person in my life for three years who I prob-

ably depended on, loved, adored, and she was just gone' (Bronfman, 1987: 45).

In fact, many of Bronfman's (1987: 48) informants reported that their parents became jealous of their children's attachments to the servants. 'A nanny is a barrier, always a barrier'. One nanny didn't want the child's mother, let alone the father, to have anything much to do with the child in her care (Fraser, 1984: 57, 77).

Thirteen-year-old Prince Charles was deeply upset and tearful at what he considered to be the injustice of the sacking of his personal protection officer, Don Green, his long-time friend and confidant. It was a 'gruesome' time, he said. Prince Philip told his son that 'it was time for [him] to grow up, behave like a man'. Following that episode, future policemen would take turns to do the duty, to avoid any possibility of Charles again becoming too attached to any one officer (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 33, 34, 41).

Work Without End, for Ever and Ever

While the reliance on any one servant is fraught and difficult, dependence on servants collectively is almost total and mostly pleasurable. Prince Andrew took 'delight in strutting around his apartment with nothing on, barking instructions as staff hurriedly picked up wet towels and dirty clothes strewn around the bed' (Berry, 1995: 37). It makes them feel 'special' and important, Bronfman (1987: 68–69) was told. 'Being waited on and the fact that I never cleaned my room in my whole life made me feel special. But as a child I never made a bed. I would drop clothes on the floor and they would magically disappear and come back clean.'

Later in his life it occurred to Adam Hochschild (1987: 170) that 'so many of the very sounds... which can produce a burst of nostalgia in me still, were the sounds of other people labouring to make the place

run for my benefit'. The servants' work was never done. It wasn't simply that their work required an intensity of labour not required in other households, such as moving furniture to vacuum beneath it, cleaning the refrigerator, the oven and the walls every week, scrubbing floors on hands and knees rather than simply mopping (Romero, 1992: 99, 104), but also that the work seemed to be deliberately created, often quite unthinkingly, as part of a way of living that was simply 'natural' to those born to it. As one servant complained: 'She throw everything on the floor. She leave all the cabinets open, you bump your head every time of the day. She leave all the drawers out' (Romero, 1992: 102). Another of Bronfman's (1987: 237) respondents explained that it was 'the norm' to live 'a lifestyle in which they would ask someone to hand them a pencil even if the other person had to walk across the room to get the pencil'.

As Fay Marshalsea, Princess Diana's dresser, explained 'All we are here for is to skivvy around after some very spoiled people who [...] are ridiculously demanding' (Berry, 1995: 28). When Princess Diana heard of her complaint, she said

Do you quite realise, Fay, how lucky you are to be here? It costs us a great deal to look after you all, you know. We feed you and house you. Where do you think you would be without us? [...] How *dare* you complain about things when you have literally everything done for you (Berry, 1995: 29).

One of the jobs that Fay Marshalsea was not allowed to do was repair Prince Charles' most constant companion, his ancient teddy bear, which generally remained on his bedspread. His valet, whose job includes laying out his clothes, running his bath and attending to other personal matters (James, 1992: 18), would pack it in a shirt-bag to accompany the Prince on his travels, except when it was being repaired by nanny Mabel Anderson, the only person permitted to do such repairs, to whom it was chauffeur-driven for that purpose (Berry, 1995: 28). Charles' sheets were changed at least every five days, and his special crest-embazoned hand-made linen hand towels were replaced after every use, sometimes dozens of times each day (Berry, 1995: 18, 19). The Prince's servants

take his personal towels and even toilet paper to every house where he stays, and actually stipulate in written instructions the 'dimensions and texture' of the royal sandwiches (Hastings, 2002: 335–336).

Such attention to detail is not confined to royal circles. The lady's maid at Government House in Canberra not only unpacked Judy Cassab's suitcase and ironed her clothes for her during her stay there, but each time Cassab returned to her room she found the towel had been changed and the toilet paper folded back at a sharp angle (Cassab, 1995: 161).

In the view of some servants, their employers always wanted more and more and could not be satisfied with the service they received (Romeo, 1992: 104). After all, the servants were always there to fix up after them. However demeaning, however embarrassing, whatever the mess, someone is always on hand to tidy up: '[Prince Andrew's] bedtime habits as a single man left a lot to be desired, and a collection of scrunched-up, soiled tissues usually lay scattered around the bed each morning for staff to collect after they had made his bed' (Berry, 1995: 37).

However big, however small, however ridiculous, there are servants to do it all. One day, when Judy Cassab was in the household of the Maharani of Jaipur preparing to paint a portrait, she remarked that:

'The light in the studio is wrong'
'Can we push the dais to the other side?'
'Yes.'
'Come on then.'
'No, no.'

Tula Bunnag [a prince and the 'Master of the Household'] claps. The servants come in and push it.

'Would you be so kind and sit on the chair, so I can see if the six-foot canvas casts a shadow on the sitter?'

He claps, servants come in. They take the chair off the dais and put another chair on. Even though Tula Bunnag is a prince, he can't sit on the chair the queen is going to sit on. The servants comb the fringes of the Persian carpet under the chair (Cassab, 1995: 148).

The transition from boyhood to manhood does not seem to be marked by any diminution in the attention that the rich receive or any increase

in effort on their part to attend to their own personal wellbeing. Below is an account of a morning in the life of Prince Charles as a baby, followed by an account of an evening in the life of his son, Prince Edward, as a young man:

The day began when the night nursery curtains were opened at 7.00 a. m. Prince Charles was washed and dressed, and then fed breakfast. At 9.00 a. m. he was taken down to the second floor for a thirty-minute session with his mother, before returning to play until 10.30 a. m. when he departed for the morning perambulation, accompanied by one of his two nannies, Helen Lightbody or Mabel Anderson, and the ubiquitous personal protection officer [...] Luncheon (boiled chicken and rice being favoured by the infant) was at 1.00 p. m., followed by a rest, and possibly an outing (Dimpleby, 1994: 15).

With the Queen already in bed, Prince Edward is invariably the last person to return to Buckingham Palace at night. After an official engagement, his chauffeur drives the car under a stone portico on the north side of the Palace and deposits him quietly at the Garden Entrance. Crossing the stone floor interlaced with small black squares of Belgian marble, past the honey-suckle frieze adorning the walls, the Prince makes his way along the red-carpeted corridor to the nursery lift where a footman escorts him to the second floor. Here, in Prince Edward's apartment overlooking Constitution Hill, his valet will have left a cold supper (in the refrigerator, a plentiful supply of carbonated mineral water and soft drinks). Earlier in the evening the housekeeper, Miss Colebrook, will have arranged for the curtains to be drawn, the bedcovers folded back... There are fresh flowers, the aroma of Roger & Gallet soap, and a box of Charbonnel et Walker chocolates (James, 1992: 88).

Such all encompassing attention can have curious effects. Wealthy people often never learn basic living skills such as cooking, bed making, shoe polishing or driving. Prince Edward's angry response to the Palace kitchen staff that he would 'come and show you how to cook' in the face of pasta too *al dente* (James, 1992: 99) was completely idle, because like Peter Lewis (in Roper and Tosh, 1991: 184) he didn't 'ever learn or need to cook'. At a party attended by Jean Paul Getty, Moira Lister's French aristocrat husband told Judy Cassab (1995: 114) that the reason he and

his wife didn't go to Australia was that they had heard that there was nobody to clean their shoes there.

Patrick White was unable to drive until well into his adulthood for there had been no need to, and both he and Manoli Lascaris were in their late thirties before either had cooked and cleaned for himself (Marr, 1991: 257), something which most rich men never do at all. Lascaris once startled the owners of a house in Sydney he and White were to buy by asking where the servants' quarters were (Marr: 1991: 257). White was so proud of his late-developing culinary skills that, when he won the W.H. Smith and Son Literary Award, he declined to attend the ceremony at the Savoy and explained to the Smiths in a letter, that on Sundays friends would visit, 'when I cook lunch myself'. Domestic labour 'keeps me in touch with reality', he said (Marr, 1991: 350, 527).

Waiting on Hand and Foot

The children of the rich are brought up, in the words of Wendy Berry (1995: 36–37), Prince Charles and Princess Diana's housekeeper at Highgrove, 'to be waited on hand and foot'. As a result they tended to 'barge around the house, expecting to be looked after and served for every whim'. It was explained to her that this 'wasn't their fault', but was because they had 'been reared in a system that allowed [them] practically anything [they] wanted' and within which they learnt early just how to treat servants.

Conrad Black treated his nanny in a 'brusque manner' in the recollection of one of his classmates (Siklos, 1995: 30) and in his autobiography Black tells how as an adult it gave him 'the greatest pleasure to rouse the security unit' from his sleep in the 'middle of a howling blizzard [with] calf-deep snow' to send him to a chemist for aspirin (Black, 1993: 342–343). When Howard Hughes sacked Noah Dietrich, who

had been his loyal servant for thirty years, he didn't bother to see him even though it was a trivial matter that triggered the sacking. Hughes would regularly insist on having face-to-face conferences with his various assistants while he was on the toilet (Andersen, 1996: 5; Higham, 1993: 35, 193).

Clearly the children of the rich had seen at close hand their fathers exercising on servants the 'frightening demonstrations of power [which] lay close to the surface beneath the charm and the understatement' (Lewis, 1991: 173) and were not slow, at ages 10 or 11 or even earlier, to exercise some of it themselves. The secretary to Sir Warwick Fairfax recalled young Warwick giving her instructions when he was around ten years old. He would send the chauffeur and car to collect things from her and once when he had asked her to get some books for the school project he was doing and she had tried to be helpful, he told her, 'I've asked for the books I want, just get them, that's all' (Fairfax, 1991: 292). James Fairfax (1991: 9–10), too, marvelled at 'the excitement of a speaking tube through which I could give instructions to Comfort, the chauffeur' when he visited Moss Vale as a boy.

'Falling maids' were, it seems, 'a hazard of life' in the Whites' circle. When Dorothy the maid collapsed, 'the boys laughed ... and Paddy laughed with them, but he remembered the maids stepping over the body to get on with their work' (Marr, 1991: 61). Servants were 'no more than a heap of dirt' to their employers, 'you were nothing', one of them told Ronald Fraser (1984: 29) with obvious feeling.

One of Bronfman's (1987: 237) informants told her that she was raised in an atmosphere in which it was 'okay to pay people a very small wage to run around and wait on you hand and foot. In fact what you were doing was giving people a job'. Certainly the wages were often small indeed. It costs less to keep a groom than one of the horses. While an evening meal in the homes of the very rich would typically be of six or seven courses and breakfast a selection of at least six cooked dishes (Fraser, 1984: 23, 24), things were a bit different for the staff. As one of Ronald Fraser's former staff told him: 'I was only seventeen. And all we got for breakfast was a streaky rasher of bacon, half a piece of fried bread

and a cup of tea. They were a bit mean with the food where the staff was concerned [...]’ (Fraser, 1984: 23).

The maids ‘in all the houses’, might get a piece of left over fried bread if they were lucky (Fraser, 1984: 23) and this contrasted ‘uneasily’ with terrible waste. Much of the vast amounts of food ordered was thrown out according to Wendy Berry (Berry, 1995: 77) and Ronald Fraser was told that more food went into the garbage after a party ‘than we’d have probably for a month’ (Fraser, 1984: 37). And yet one mistress would ‘rummage through the garbage bins looking for scraps of fillet to prove the maids were cheating her’, David Marr (1991: 164) was told.

Private service workers were always thought to be able to earn less than other workers because of ‘the little things you got in lieu... But we never got anything in lieu, that was the trouble’ (Fraser, 1984: 20, 21). Admittedly, others were more fortunate. Said Karl Lagerfeld’s chauffeur, ‘there never was a kinder man than Monsieur Lagerfeld. When he brings things home he bothers to show them to us and talk about them. I’m only his driver, but when he goes to a book shop he often comes out with something for me and says this will interest you’ (Bernier, 1992: 312). When his driver was dying of cancer, Rupert Murdoch was generous to him and his family, appearing embarrassed when thanked by the other chauffeurs (Shawcross, 1992: 249). On the other hand, the wife of one of Kerry Packer’s pilots told one of the authors that after six months in the job, her husband was the longest serving. ‘The pilots seem to last about three months’, she said. ‘He flies into rages, won’t listen to anyone or anything, and sacks them on the spot’.

Australian writer, Bob Ellis (1997: 605), tells a story of the now deceased Labor Party politician Mick Young who, as a shearer, sought work at a property owned by Alexander Downer’s father – a property ‘the size of a small country’. He went up to the most palatial house he had ever seen and knocked on the door to be told that he had arrived at the servants’ quarters. This, however, is not always how the servants tell it. At Highgrove the servants’ quarters resembled the rooms of ‘a rather dilapidated public school’. The walls were of drab beige and badly needed painting and the furnishings were cast-offs (Berry, 1995: 8, 11).

The regimen under which servants live, then, is strict and intrusive. There is little leisure for the staff. Fourteen to sixteen-hour days are 'far from unusual' and twelve-hour days are quite normal. Time off varies from place to place; some have a half day and alternate Sunday mornings and afternoons off each week (Berry, 1995: 112; Fraser, 1984: 25). Not much has changed in the working time of domestic servants in 100 years (See Donaldson, 1991: 113). Being 'on-call around the clock', servants of the very rich often find little time for romances, marriages or children of their own. They may not know what city or even what country they will find themselves in on any particular weekend, so it is difficult to make or accept invitations to go out with a partner. Consequently, many remain celibate. One told Conniff that 'she could not think of any personal assistant who has two children' (Conniff, 2003: 133, 134).

Their movement is rigidly circumscribed as well. The butlers cannot enter the family rooms, which are the valet's territory; the housekeeper cannot go into the nursery. No servant is allowed to 'wander round', go into the front garden, or speak to their employers unless spoken to (Berry, 1995: 12; Fraser, 1984: 146). At Amnesfield Manor House support for political parties that were not conservative was a sackable offence (Fraser, 1984: 38).

While the relationship between masters and servants was hierarchical by definition, the 'unwritten rules' of the household ensured that the relationships between the servants assumed a similar form. The first housemaid was brought tea by the second or third maid; the nanny had a nursery maid to wait on her; the butler a footman to look after him (Fraser, 1984: 12). At Highgrove, the Comptroller was more important than the housekeeper who was on 'a higher level' than a chauffeur. Prince Charles' valet was more powerful than Prince Andrew's; Prince William's nanny shown more respect than Princess Beatrice's (Berry, 1995: 10). None of the fourteen indoor staff at the Melbrays would start tea before the butler had sat down (Fraser, 1984: 42). As Wendy Berry (1995: 10) observed, 'Working for the royals, perhaps the most class-ridden organisation in the world, generates a similar class system among those in their service'.

Their employers' expectations and their refraction amongst themselves, set the pattern and tone of servants' working lives. The first question anyone asked when they came on duty at Highgrove was 'What mood are they in?' (Berry, 1995: 5). On days when Prince Charles felt he had played badly at polo, he would return to Highgrove in a 'filthy temper, shouting and cursing' (Berry, 1995: 105), making life particularly difficult for those physically closest to him, like the dresser whose position in the household is one of 'the most intimate and therefore potentially the most dangerous' (Berry, 1995: 97).

Seconds later the phone went in the pantry. 'I want Ken,' he shouted. 'I don't believe it [...]. Where are my special bloody cufflinks? Ken should know by now *not* to pack everything and leave me stranded by myself.' Paul, who was holding the receiver away from his ear at arm's length, timidly offered to come up and help. 'No,' screamed Charles. 'No, No, No. I want Ken' (Berry, 1995: 161–162).

Prince Charles, then, was 'extremely up and down in terms of temper tantrums' but 'as long as he got his own way everything ran smoothly'. When he didn't, he was 'difficult and bloody-minded' and then 'nothing could dissuade him, and he could be extremely intransigent and ruthless' (Berry, 1995: 4, 5). For some workers this proved intolerable. James Berry left his job as a footman, confiding in his mother Wendy that his employers' 'unhappy lives are destroying my own' (Berry, 1995: 69).

Some employers stormed and raged, others were simply rude and offensive. Ruth White, for instance, 'enjoyed insulting you, enjoyed getting you going. An unpleasant woman [...] She laid down the law about everything that was going, especially gardening. Fred Swainson the gardener would keep on saying "Yes Ma'am" as she blew the tripe out of him' (Marr, 1991: 56).

While some families attempted to 'ritually deny' that they employed servants at all (Hochschild, 1987: 51), being ignored by the likes of Master Ronnie Fraser was more common.

And then a boy who was two years younger than me arrived, a very snooty boy who didn't say 'Good morning', who wouldn't even answer sometimes when I spoke. You just pushed past. I don't know who you thought I was [...]. You probably thought I was just your mother's cook's daughter. You were very stern, we never saw you smile or anything, you just went striding out of the back door by the kitchen without a word (Fraser, 1984: 146–147).

While servants no longer literally have to hide as they once did if there was any chance of encountering a member of the Royal Family in the corridor (James, 1992: 35), invisibility still remains the typical experience of most of the maids whom Romero (1992: 117) interviewed. They worked around the house, 'ignored as if they were invisible, their existence acknowledged only when their services are required', speaking only when spoken to, and then with deference (Fraser, 1984: 29). As one servant told Fraser (1984: 30), 'They've got no manners because they don't speak to the working class, don't have any conversation with them. A pig can't speak, he's got no conversation, therefore they're more or less the same [...]'. One man's employer of many years had spoken to him only once in that time and that was when the sewage pump on the estate blocked up (Fraser, 1984: 37).

One of Bronfman's (1987: 229) informants told her: 'Mother had a cook, a maid, a nurse, a chauffeur, a man for the horses, a gardener, and a houseman, so we could have seen that there were people who were different from us, but we just didn't see them. They were givens in our lives and it was only when I was pretty old that I even noticed that they waited on us [...]'.

The corridors of Buckingham Palace have 'the hushed and tranquil atmosphere of a museum'. Even the nursery lift has been specially adjusted to a 'genteel' speed. Staff move soundlessly. In some households a bell is used to summon the help, although a discrete button under the table is preferred. Best of all, though, are servants who need no summoning, so well trained that their timing is always impeccable (Davis, 1982: 139).

Certainly, to men like Prince Andrew, the servants were 'practically invisible... since they were there to serve and not to question his ac-

tions' (Berry, 1995: 37). He and Prince Philip would often walk about the house and property 'as if nobody else was there' (Berry, 1995: 66), the servants unnoticed unless their white gloves were dirty or they had made some error, perhaps in cooking or place-setting, then they 'heard all about it' (Berry, 1995: 69; Lewis, 1991: 173).

Yet there are times when servants are there specifically to be noticed. 'We went to a grand party in the Agnellis' vast, vast palace in Turin. When I say grand, I really mean it. There was a footman behind every chair. No royalty has ever lived like the Agnellis', wrote Truman Capote (Clarke, 1995: 424). He was wrong. Some royalty do live like the Agnellis. In fact, some live even more lavishly and a substantial part of that extravagance is not just a product of the labour of others but the very display of the bodies of those who do the work.

There was the prime minister and his son, and the women in orange, sky blue, and plum silks. The king in a white dinner suit, the queen in purple robes. I sat with them and the servants, on their knees, started serving cocktails [...] The king and queen sat down on the upper level. Beside them are triangular pillows over which they lace their arms. I was seated below them so I had a few inches over which I could hang my feet to the next level but even so it was an unusual position. On the left side of the great room was the orchestra. On the right sat the singers, a level lower. The ladies-in-waiting were kneeling. The servants also knelt, with their elbows on the floor. The servants, one to each guest, brought low tables (one for each guest). The plates were gold (Cassab, 1995: 151).

The servants for their part felt that they had to be 'industrious, loyal and characterless' (Fraser, 1984: 13). They were trained to be discreet and materialised only when needed, knowing that to be seen or heard without purpose would be intrusive (Dimbleby, 1994: 31). 'I wouldn't speak and was related to as if I wouldn't hear', one former servant told Romero (1992: 118).

But the rich like their own feelings to be 'noticed and considered' and to be regarded as important (Romero, 1992: 132), unlike the feelings of those who serve them. Servants can be trusted and make safe

confidants because they do not have access to the social world of those they serve. 'Most employers like to talk to people who work for them because you're not in their circle, you're not going to tell anybody who's important to them' (Romero, 1992: 108).

Yet the relationship is very one-way. Paddy Whiteland was one of Prince Charles' 'longest-serving and most faithful' servants whose 'special relationship' with the prince involved 'secrets and trust', with Charles 'pour[ing] out his heart regarding Diana and the state of his marriage' (Berry, 1995: 12, 50). They spent hours together on long fishing and walking expeditions, Whiteland becoming a 'surrogate father figure' who 'seemed to touch a chord with Charles that his own father never discovered'. Whiteland's fellow workers were allowed to hold a party for him in the hall at Highgrove for his eightieth birthday. Charles however, told his Highgrove housekeeper, Wendy Berry that he wanted everyone out within a couple of hours. 'We don't want everyone hanging around all night, do we?' he said rather dismissively as he went up to his room to bathe. 'And anyway I am having the P-Ts round for dinner, so I want to have the house cleared by then' (Berry, 1995: 50, 181).

The Enclave Within the Enclave

Notwithstanding their isolation, the very rich with whom Nicholas Coleridge (1994: 14) spoke felt strongly that they had a 'special rapport' with ordinary people. While in the navy, Prince Charles, already well acquainted with bodyguards, chauffeurs and grooms, warmed to the ordinary seafarers with whom he served, saying that he felt they were the 'salt of the earth' (Dimpleby, 1994: 171).

And yet for all this amity with ordinary folk, the very rich are, in fact, surrounded by at least two layers of social insulation. One lot distances them from the everyday world which surrounds their own and comprises a layer of mainly male servants, chauffeurs and security per-

sonnel in particular. These servants are placed between their employers and the rest of humanity by undertaking a wide range of activities, even those of a mundane kind such as the purchasing and paying for a drink at the polo or shopping for socks and toothpaste (Berry, 1995: 113). Even at school, Prince Charles did very little shopping (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 109) and, when the rich do shop, they frequently don't carry money around with them – 'as I found out to my cost and embarrassment', said one of Prince Charles' bodyguards (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 27). A woman who dated Jack Kennedy recalled 'Like a lot of rich people he was very offhand about money. He never carried cash and I never saw him pick up the [bill] [...] If we got into a cab, I dug into my purse to pay the fare' (Andersen, 1996: 42). 'They *never* seemed to pay for anything!' said an exasperated housekeeper of Charles and Diana. 'On top of this were all the free gifts sent by the lorry-load', many of which were burnt in big incinerators at the back of the house (Berry, 1995: 30).

Each lunch time at 1.32 precisely, Robert Hersant would descend in the lift and cross the gleaming lobby to the silver Mercedes which would arrive at the ramp leading down to the entrance to his office tower. Two minutes later there is a flurry in the lobby, and the chauffeur walks round the car to open the passenger door. Meanwhile, two 'sinister' security guards appear on the pavement alongside Nicholas Coleridge (1994: 375), who was keen to talk to Hersant for his book *Paper Tigers*, intentionally blocking his view of Hersant's departure.

'You are searching for a taxi, *non?*' said one firmly grasping [his] arm, 'You will best find a taxi at the other end of the street'. 'No taxi will arrive here,' warned the second. 'This is a bad place to wait.'

Boys who grow up in ruling-class enclaves may have 'no direct experience of the difference between their lives and those of the bulk of humanity', notes Bronfman (1987: 87). It was Mabel Anderson who first provided Prince Charles with reports of a world beyond the household (Dimpleby, 1994: 52) and the first consciousness the boys have of difference often comes in relation to servants or the children of servants.

I had a little girlfriend. She was six or so. Her dad was one of the maintenance personnel. We got talking and somehow the figure ten thousand dollars came up and I said, 'Well your dad can always take it out of the bank.' And she said, 'No, we don't have ten thousand dollars.' And I said, 'Oh, come on, of course he has ten thousand dollars.' There was no question, you just go and write a cheque. Money obviously had no significance to me in terms of scarcity. All of a sudden it dawned on me that there was a difference (Bronfman, 1987: 229).

Another informant, at nine or ten, had the idea that there were people who lacked money but thought that there were 'maybe ten poor people' in the world until the understanding slowly dawned that the black man who came to do the gardens was not rich like them (Bronfman, 1987: 230). But so sheltered are their lives that some last until university before they are 'shocked' by the realisation that people could 'not do things because they didn't have the money' (Bronfman, 1987: 231).

The Frasers' groom, William Carvell, recalled how one morning while out riding with Ronald Fraser's mother, her Alsatian caught a pheasant. He jumped quickly off his horse, took it from the dog and broke its neck.

'What are you going to do with that?', she asked. 'Well', he replied, '*that* will go into the pot'. 'But you can't eat it, William', she said, 'it hasn't been shot.' [...] I don't believe [said Carvell] she had any idea at all how other people lived. I was very fond of her, she was the idol of my eye on a horse as you know, but I don't think she could imagine what we had to do to live (Fraser, 1984: 67).

Thus social insulation creates a very closed world, a world in itself (Fraser, 1984: 13–14). Within this is another layer of servants – mainly female particularly nannies, maids and housekeepers – who mediate the relationships of the rich with the physicality of their own homes and their relationships with their own family. The rich do not have to engage in any domestic or caring work at all, unless they choose to do so, of course. Certainly the presence of large numbers of people paid to do it for them, reduces the possibility of and the opportunity for intimacy, should they consider it appropriate, between family members (See Bronfman, 1987: 35).

One man told Bronfman (1987: 35) that when he was old enough to ride a bike, rather than showing him how, his father paid someone to teach him. Similarly, a few of her informants said that a secretary always typed letters from their fathers. One nanny explained:

The parents have never been to a school parents' evening, never been to one of their son's basketball games, or their daughter's tennis tournaments. I go instead. They've never read them a bed-time story, never swam with them in the pool. Their mum's idea for an outing for them is to take them shopping with her, then set them loose in the toy store where they are allowed to pick out whatever they want (Broadbent, 1997: 49).

And Prince Charles' bodyguard 'suddenly realized – for the first time: it was to come back to me a hundred times again – that there are many other homely, ordinary things, too, that members of the royal family can never know. These trips to watch the trains that Andrew made with me were the sort of outings that parents take their kids on themselves, not have to send them with the hired help' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 24).

Even those servants not concerned with childcare affect the atmosphere of the home, making it more formal. Many servants wear uniforms (Romero, 1992: 113), as do the rich in their way, in their own homes and outside them. 'The whole thing was that you could never dress like a worker', Bronfman (1987: 95) was told.

A meal cooked, dished up and cleared away by dad and mum is quite different from a dinner prepared by three chefs with a waiter for each diner, as Judy Cassab's (1995: 161) was at Government House in Canberra. Some of the rich behave in 'particular ways' around servants, as well. Family members often censor what they say in front of them and the Windsors speak 'quietly' in case they are overheard by them. Manoli Lascaris' aunt decreed that he and his siblings had to be dressed and down to breakfast by 7am every day of the year to 'keep the respect of the servants'. The habit stuck. As Lascaris once said to Patrick White: 'You can't lie round in the bed till 10.30 because there are servants and we can't live like that in front of servants. He said, send them away. But I said no, you have to get up' (Marr, 1991: 215, 239; cf Bronfman,

1987: 36; James, 1992: 35). According to Fraser (1984: 172): 'We always had a role to play, an image to project, which meant not expressing some very real feelings'.

Rich boys grow up with the fact that most of the nurturance they receive is provided by those whose services are provided for money. The absence of human touch, the lack of intimacy experienced and sense of formality compounded by the presence of servants in very large homes, intensifies the repression of emotions which are normally expressed only with and to those whose presence was typically uncertain and frequently short-lived. It is the servant's job to provide essential warmth, assistance and understanding, compensating for lacks in the parenting the boys received, while simultaneously decreasing the possibilities for intimacy with parents and siblings in the home. There is rarely a great deal of continuity in this nurturance, however, and whilst this is painful for the children at the time, it also reinforces the lesson that, although love can be bought, it can only be relied upon fleetingly. There was always 'more where they came from' and, while the relationships that the market provided could be and often were painful and transitory, the market itself remained reliable in its ability, apparently, to provide for every human need in ways that non-market mechanisms clearly could not.

And yet the really rich would seek to use non-market mechanisms to control the relations of the market. Especially in the treatment of their children by servants, they attempt to elide the relations of the market and those of affection, backed of course by the sanction of separation. This they do, too, in their own emotional dependence as adults on those whom they pay and whose trust and confidentiality they use, sufficiently confident that their worlds are far enough apart that the affection and regard so purchased will not prove an embarrassment in their own circles.

At the same time as it provides their every need, the market removes from the rich the need for basic life skills, intensifying their dependence on it and reinforcing the centrality of the market in their own lives. Thus do they and the world reflect to each other their inadequacies and harshnesses, the commodification of feeling, the price of love bought and paid for.

Chapter Four

Schooling

Ruling-class schools are not unique institutions in their close combining of class and gender processes but, within them, the two seem almost fused. 'Cradles of masculinity', they are simultaneously not only an instrument of their class but also an active part of it. There is a 'sort of synchronization of activity' by the school which is 'the locus of what is usually a mutually-supporting set of family, school and peer practices', making the elaboration of a specific style of masculinity and the process of class formation 'virtually one and the same' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 98).

These gender and class practices are not produced by some mystical or remote force but by the repetition of gendered tasks, themselves located within, and forming, fixed hierarchies. The relationships between teachers and boys, between prefects and other students, and between the pupils themselves, all form the masculine character of the institution within which they live. The boys are 'obedient choristers' of the masculine educational order which they actively create (Morrell, 1996: 48).

Not only does the school furnish a vital means by which class power and its benefits are transmitted across the generations, it also provides a medium by which the class organizes itself, and some of the crucial ways in which it renews and reproduces in a world of permanent change (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 149). The educational practices in and through which the class recreates, coheres and re-constitutes in response to changes in its own arrangement and the general social environment in which it endeavours to prosper, are complex and arise from the school's simultaneous location in the market and in an embracing, trans-generational and sharply gendered social network which is the *sine qua non* of the school's existence and operation (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 113–114).

While the ruling class is unified in its opposition to other classes, it is also internally differentiated. Mining corporations may have interests

different to manufacturers; finance capital to retail; multinational capital to local; large capital to small. The tumultuous processes of capital accumulation may pit different kinds of capital and individual capitalists against each other. Such disagreements are a 'permanent, necessary feature' of the ruling class. Overcoming their disunifying effects by continuously developing and imposing a common educational curriculum and culture is a 'permanent, necessary task' of ruling-class schools (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 152). The masculinity they produce is one of the harmonizing set of practices which elite schools create, share and further.

The Headmaster

Nowhere are the educational market and the private school network more closely articulated than in the person of the head teacher. Describing this job is 'rather like trying to write a job description for the captain of a rigger team', according to one head, for the principal is such a crucial figure in the cultural work of class formation that 'there is nothing which is not included within [his] responsibility' (Cameron, 1997: 116–117). While he is unlikely to be rich, 'in terms of position, function and social relations' he is part of the class he serves (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 155). He is drawn into the social networks of his constituents-and-customers who exist partly because of the school he manages. One principal laments that there are more invitations to parents' dinner parties than time to spare, but Dr. Eric Anderson, the former teacher of Prince Charles whilst he was at Gordonstoun and subsequently the headmaster of Eton, did not decline regular invitations to dine with the next king at Highgrove (Dimbleby, 1994: 454; Berry, 1995: 139; Connell *et al.*, 1982: 148).

Another principal networks not dinner parties but whole groups, appearing as an after-dinner speaker at business, civic and fund-raising events (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 148). Party invitations must also be

carefully considered. Dame Elisabeth Murdoch's eightieth birthday party was not only for the family, 'the cream of Melbourne's Establishment – political, commercial, academic, social – was there. The governor of Victoria, the chairmen of the banks, directors of industry, vice-chancellors of universities [...]'. Also present was Rupert Murdoch's Geelong Grammar headmaster, Sir James Darling. 'Well, you get your way, Rupert', he said, as they shook hands that evening (Shawcross, 1992: 442).

Principals then remain significant to their former students. When he was appointed Principal of St Andrew's College of Sydney University, Peter Cameron invited, on separate occasions, several of the headmasters of the most prestigious Sydney private schools to dinner 'in Hall'.

The extraordinary thing was that [their former] students, great hulking fellows in their fourth or fifth year at University, were invariably still in awe of their old headmasters [...] I noticed that his old pupils sitting opposite and hanging on every word had a special face for him: they had reverted to eager schoolboys, they were like puppies wagging their tails at the slightest sign of approval [...] (Cameron, 1997: 110).

One principal is such a familiar presence in the ruling circles that even those parents who dislike him intensely, still address him by his school-boy nickname, and yet another is 'plugged into a circuit of social relations that embraces the city's leading boys' private schools' (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 106–107, 111). Club membership can be important for heads too. South Africa's Victoria Club, whose 'membership lists read like a who's who of Natal', included elite private school headmasters (Morrell, 1996: 103).

Such is the degree of consonance between the principal and the parents, developed through this social inclusion, that they can talk to the fathers of their pupils 'as one executive to another' and find they 'understand each others' problems' (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 106). The knowledge and insight gained by this entrée into the wealthiest circles enabled one head to produce:

at the drop of a hat, an astonishing (until we had thought about it) run-down of the leading financial and industrial corporations in his city, their principal executives and degree of prosperity, the social geography of the city, the changing class composition of different suburbs (with predictions for the next ten years that could doubtless have been sold for good money to a real-estate firm), and the impact of multinational corporations on local capital (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 111).

School and family can ‘understand each others’ problems’ because they are linked by encounters between family members and the school’s staff and a few are connected through marriage and kinship. However, like the relationship with their servants, the relation between parents and teachers is still structured by their different class situations. Ruling-class parents typically see teachers as their paid functionaries; highly trained technical specialists, but subservient nonetheless. ‘We hire teachers and preachers’, one of them remarked ‘and then often waste our money by not listening to them’ (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 51; Fairfax, 1991: 2).

These parents are richer and more powerful than all teachers, and sometimes better educated than most, and this gives them a ‘marked confidence’ and a ‘strong sense that they have rights to exercise’ in their dealings with those who teach their children (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 128). Because of the expectations and refinements shared by the ruling-class homes and schools, their communication, especially with the head, although sometimes unpleasant, generally appears as a consultation between like-minded professionals (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 51, 59). When Rowena Danziger, the principal of Sydney’s elite girls’ school Ascham, told Kerry Packer that she had expelled his daughter Gretel, he asked, ‘How much is it going to cost me?’. ‘A school auditorium’, she replied, ‘and don’t do it again’ (Koch, 1999: 62). Kerry Packer did give \$1 million to construct The Packer Theatre at Ascham, but Danziger, who sits on the board of Packer’s Publishing and Broadcasting Ltd and whose husband is Ken Coles of the prominent retailing family, says the story is ‘an absolute lie’ (Wyndham, 2003: 52).

In the view of Connell *et al.* (1982: 62), the fact that parents can walk away from one school and pick another is the ‘defining fact’ about

private schools. The uncoerced nature of enrollment required by the market means that the habit of calculative appraisal saturates parents' relationship with their children's schools (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 81, 135). Many of them speak in precisely this way, and are deeply concerned with the efficacy of their investment. Poor performance can lead to a change of regime. The market once turned on one principal who had set about refurbishing a 'somewhat stuffy' school with pupil-centred pedagogy, socially-relevant curricula, coeducation, and a relaxation of discipline on issues like uniforms and allowing senior students to smoke at school. The parents then decided that he was 'going too far' and threatened to exercise their free choice. The school board replaced him with a more traditionally-minded head who quickly got the school 'back on the rails' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 134, 136).

The market, however, can also have detrimental effects on the well-being of the boys. While Eton, Gordonstoun and Harrow have introduced random drug testing (O'Brien, 1999: 103), private schools 'cannot afford to deter fee-paying clients'. According to Francis Potter of the Drugs in School Helpline:

the worst place for a child to be if drugs become a problem is at private school [which] are much more likely to respond to drug taking with instant dismissal, which may protect the reputation of the school but does nothing for the child. What's more the parents will probably still have to pay to the end of the year (Burne, 1999: 122–123).

Caroline Noortman, with a son at a high-profile exclusive boarding school, has established the Independent Schools Parents' Association to represent apprehensive parents, said, 'There's too still too many schools trying to cover up or play down what is really happening. Schools will admit so much, but they worry that, if they are too honest, parents won't entrust them with their children' (O'Brien, 1999: 103).

While there has never been a strike in these schools, given the 'blue-ribbon conservatism' of the school's customers, it would be very hard for young teachers, initially at least, not to be to the political left of the parents and, while some principals allow their staff to 'put the other

point of view' as a sign of their school's intellectual vitality, parents can get staff sacked, a reality admitted by one principal. As another principal observed at an end-of-year dinner for retiring staff: 'Some are born redundant, some achieve redundancy, and some have redundancy thrust upon them' (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 107, 108, 111).

One parent told Susan Ostrander (1984: 82), 'I know some of the teachers were communist, and I think the parents were too permissive too. I know several teachers like that at [the local private school] and I recommended that they be fired'. And, as science teacher Alan Milson explained, 'If you don't match up, you're out. My colleague, an English teacher here, wasn't very good. And the parents, a deputation of parents came to the school, and at the end of second term, he was out [...] That's how it operates' (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 107).

While working-class children depend significantly on their teachers for the possibility of social advancement through education, if anything, private school teachers depend on their pupils, for a consequence of the constant competition between students is an 'unremitting pressure' on their teachers' performance (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 90; 1981: 110).

The kids sort you out. If you're no good you'll get kicked out. The kids will see to that. (That does happen then?) Very much. It's controlled by – the school's run by – the kids. I mean, the level at which the teachers work – and they work very hard here – is controlled by the kids, their expectations (Alan Milson, science teacher, quoted in Connell *et al.*, 1981, 107).

The social inferiority of teachers is pronounced and obvious to both pupils and teachers. Prince Edward quickly realised that his teachers would not dare to be too strict with him (James, 1992: 31) and young Conrad Black remarked, 'E.P. Taylor [a prominent business acquaintance of his family] could buy up this land and forty more parcels like it without blinking. These jerks that control our lives are pure flotsam' (Siklos, 1995: 30).

Most teachers have been educated in state schools and many in the USA earn less annually than the cost of a year's tuition, working through the summer to make ends meet, while their students holiday in Palm

Beach or in the Hamptons (Hochschild, 1987: 96, 97). James Fairfax's 'first real art purchase' at the age of twelve, was a painting by the art master at Cranbrook, Eric Wilson (Fairfax, 1991: 309). Celebrated artist Brett Whitely was a schoolboy at Cranbrook when he and his mother saw a painting by Judy Cassab and bought it (Cassab, 1995: 390). A General Duties Master at Cranbrook received \$32–38,000 per annum in 1998. The job advertisement explained that while the successful applicant would be 'assisting in a variety of out of hours activities' and would be 'expected to participate in the full life of the school', 'the ability to co-ordinate the rowing programme would be a special advantage in which case accommodation for a single person may be available' (*Sydney Morning Herald* 17/1/1998: 5e). About half of the teachers at the King's School live at the school and are 'committed to making themselves available to boys long after formal school hours have finished' (The King's School, 1999a: 7).

Despite this difference in class background, some children befriended their teachers at an early age. James Fairfax (1991: 2) invited Miss Joan de Messier and Miss Kate Challis to his sixth birthday party at Barford, an invitation they accepted, and Fairfax continued to visit them at their home. Both he and his sister Caroline found as they grew up that they could tell another of their teachers, Miss Van Heukeleman, 'all sorts of things we could not tell anyone else and be sure of a sympathetic response' (Fairfax, 1991: 3) finding in her someone who would do for them the things they had been brought up to see as being the duty of their maids (Lewis, 1991: 179).

But all did not necessarily run smoothly between the scions of the very rich and those paid to educate them. David Gyngell was suspended from Cranbrook for telling the art master to 'get fucked'. The teacher told him he was a 'spoilt brat' (Guinness, 2002: 3s). Rupert Murdoch was contemptuous of his Geelong Grammar headmaster, Sir James Darling: 'He used to tell us a lot about our duty to God, then he'd go to Melbourne, to dinner parties at the Melbourne Club. He wanted it both ways, I thought. I thought he was a bit of a poseur and still do' (Shawcross, 1992: 61).

Darling himself, always discreet about his former pupils, has hinted that he disapproved of Murdoch, whom he felt to be hypocritical. While Murdoch regularly broke school rules, for instance slipping off to the races on a motorbike he kept at a nearby shop, he would also often approach Darling and other masters, apparently to seek advice on his prospects. Darling thought he actually did this ‘to make me sweet. He wanted all this and heaven too. He wanted to have his own way and at the same time to be respected and promoted’ (Shawcross, 1992: 59, 61).

Murdoch claims that his education at Geelong Grammar was ‘terrible’ and blames his teachers, two of whom were the eminent historians, Manning Clark and Russel Ward, and included Ludwig Hirschfeld-Mack, a former Bauhaus member (Shawcross, 1992: 59). Black (1993: 12), for his part, was ‘profoundly revolted’ by his school, at which taught ‘several sadists and a few aggressively fondling homosexuals [...] and the more numerous swaggering boobies who had obviously failed in the real world and retreated to Lilliput where they could maintain their exalted status by constant threat of battery [...]’

Social Networks

For the ruling class, a ‘good education’, Susan Ostrander (1984: 94–95) notes, ‘means an education at a private, upper-class school, which implies not only the best possible academic training but also invaluable social networks’. In Murray’s (1997: 18) study, 55% of company directors attended private elite schools and only 19% went to ordinary state schools. Most of the parents whose children attended these schools had themselves been to private schools (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 48).

Connell *et al.* (1982: 150–151) show how the school establishes connections and sets up networks not only by making useful contacts possible but by excluding unsuitable children and by being very useful in helping pupils and parents to ensure the right sort of marriage. Of

course the networks pre-exist the experience of schooling, but the schools consolidate and enlarge them. The King's School, for example, advertises the 'many opportunities' it provides 'to develop lifelong links with boys and their families' (The King's School, 1999d: 2.0B). James Fairfax (1991: 1) spent three years at kindergarten 'with many of our friends'. Prince Andrew 'was joined in his studies by Lady Sarah Armstrong-Jones, James Ogilvy, Princess Tanya of Hanover (grand-daughter of Prince Philip's sister), and occasionally the offspring of family friends and senior members of the Royal Household' and later by one of his Mountbatten cousins, Amanda Knatchbull and by the son of Stavros Niarchos, the Greek shipping tycoon (James, 1992: 25–26, 46).

These networks also benefit the schools themselves and are actively built by them. A number of parents (including fathers) are involved in fund-raising, and plaques commemorating the results of their work often name the principal donors on the new library, pool, gymnasium and so on. The auditorium at Sydney's Ascham School is called 'The Packer Theatre'. James Lloyd and Richard Slatter, 'gentlemen [whose] service to the school is legendary' and who sit on the Council of the King's School, had two quad sculls named after them in 1998. Governing boards and finance committees are the form of parental involvement most favoured by men but every school maintains a variety of Ladies' clubs, Old Boys' associations, parent / teacher meetings, fete and canteen committees and fund-raising committees (The King's School, 1999f: 17, 22; Connell *et al.*, 1982: 52, 147–148). The space these activities create and fill is seen by parents, teachers and students as belonging to all of them. As one teacher explained, 'Here you get the feeling more that it's all a big family, everyone knows everyone' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 148).

In this network building system, relations between the private schools are also very important and the schools interact officially in a variety of ways, particularly in sporting competitions. In Australia, the Great Public Schools (GPS), which include the oldest and most expensive private schools, hold their own exclusive competitions in rugby union, rowing, tennis, basketball, athletics and debating during which 'excellence, de-

termination, fair play, honesty and teamwork are learnt' (The King's School, 1999b: 16–19; 1999c: 30F). Relations between boys and girls' schools are encouraged at school dances and in dramatic and musical productions. The King's School is famous for its annual musical with the neighbouring exclusive, girls-only school, Tara, with whom they also perform a Prom concert. They also share a 'day of music making' with the exclusive young ladies of Frensham (The King's School, 1999b: 7). And, of course the schools are connected by a range of related but unofficial functions sometimes built around the more formal events, like the parties on Regatta day (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 151, 153). As a pupil explained, 'I think most of the kids that go to a private school, you know, St. Peter's and Auburn or Milton and St. Margaret's sort of go to parties together, but they don't really invite any outsiders' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 150).

The organisation of kinship and friendship is the most immediate class-maintaining effect of these networking activities. Bruce Gyngell made a fortune in television and was a friend of Kerry Packer. His son David Gyngell was Packer's godson and Kerry's son James Packer's 'best mate'. They went to Cranbrook together, where Gyngell, Packer, Ben Tilley and Chris Hancock became friends in 'The Band', as they were known. Gyngell believes that the 'utilisation of connections is paramount in any business [...] Of course I use connections, that's what it's all about'. 'Did I have an inside run? Of course I did. If I didn't know the Packers I wouldn't have an understanding of certain things that a lot of people don't understand' (Guinness, 2002: 3s; Day, 2003: 1).

Contacts with like-minded people first met at school are maintained after it (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 149), with sometimes interesting results. 'Tiny' O'Reilly capitalised on the fact that he and President Robert Mugabe were taught by the same teacher when he was seeking to establish Heinz's baked beans and washing soda factories in Zimbabwe (Colridge, 1994: 472–473). It is a 'sense of belonging' deeply imbued by and redolent with connotations of race and class that remain with Morrell (1996: 13) decades after he left school.

I had taken retrospective pride in having survived the cruelties and emotional deprivations of the school [...] It has been more than twenty years since I was at that school. Inactive in the old boys' society, I nevertheless take quiet satisfaction from the academic and other successes of the school, presented in its quarterly magazine. These experiences basically left me with no doubt that the school experience produced a we / they dichotomized sense of belonging, which was fiercely partisan and produced loyalties under the most unlikely circumstances. As an academic reflecting back on these boyhood memories, it became manifestly obvious that the sense of belonging reverberated with race and class connotations (Morrell, 1996: 13).

The school is also important in maintaining what Bronfman (1987: 67) calls 'traditionalism'. The King's School's uniform, based on that worn by British troops in the conquest and colonisation of Australia, will retain its red piping, military jacket and epaulettes for the foreseeable future. Said Headmaster, Dr Timothy Hawkes, 'Kings will always have its traditional uniform. There is an obligation in having Australia's oldest military uniform to keep it and ensure that it is worn in some way' (Raethel, 1998: 12).

Susan Ostrander (1984: 85), too, notes that 'particular boarding schools are, thus, one of the traditions that upper-class families maintain – a tradition often passed along with wealth, from generation to generation, enhancing the stability of the class'. A sense of the historical continuity and existential inevitability of these class and gender processes is sustained by the generational attendance at the same school. 'Anthony Graves is going to "Churchill College", his brothers are going to "Churchill College", his cousins went to "Churchill College", his father went to "Churchill College", his uncles went to "Churchill College" and his grandfather went to "Churchill College"' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 134).

The King's School application form asks fathers whether they have attended the school, when, and in what House. It asks for 'details of maternal and paternal links' with the school, and requires two referees from all applicants, but not from the sons of old boys (The Council of the King's School, 1994).

Occasionally, though, the family will break with the old school. Cranbrook was built on land owned by the Tooth family, a wealthy brewing dynasty in Sydney, and was the residence of three Governors of New South Wales before being purchased from the Labor government by a syndicate including big businessmen Samuel Hordern, Rodney Dangar, Sir Kelso King and others who had outbid the Papal Legate to use the property for the purposes of Anglican schooling. Victor White was a member of that syndicate and during the war, an Anglican boys' school opened there which had as a founding purpose to keep Patrick White from 'the hell of The King's School at Parramatta' which his father and many Whites had attended (Marr, 1991: 45, 58; Cottle, 1998: 27).

Stability is also achieved through those staff who stay 'for thirty or forty years' strongly transmitting 'an in-built tradition' in the school. In 1998, five of the staff leaving the King's School had served over 30 years, and six had averaged 28 (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 49–50; The King's School, 1999g: 10, 15).

The formal association of most of the elite private schools in Australia with one of the four old-established European religions reinforces this sense of tradition and succession (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 134). The new head for the King's School is the second lay Australian principal of 19 in the school's 161 year history. He was 'officially commissioned as headmaster at a traditional service' in St Andrew's Cathedral (Jamal, 1998a: 2; Raethel, 1997: 4). Six of the 19 members of The Council of the King's School are Anglican clergy, and its President is the Archbishop of Sydney (The King's School, 1999g: 22).

A sense of permanence is nourished within the school by honouring and remembering successful former pupils, some of whom will become members of the school board. Prince Andrew was a member of the governing body of Gordonstoun (Heald, 1991: 233) and the Honourable Mr Justice Lloyd Waddy was Chairman of the Council of the King's School and is styled as 'a remarkably skilled Old Boy' (The King's School, 1999g: 22). Great pride is taken in past sporting and scholarly victories. 'The school photographs lining the corridors and the gold-lettered lists of teams in the gym showed us our predecessors [...] we certainly sensed

the movement of time which made hierarchy tolerable, indeed, which gave it meaning and dynamic' (Lewis, 1991: 176).

Scotch College and Melbourne Grammar have been playing each other at Australian Rules football for 140 years. According to Scotch College Headmaster Gordon Donaldson (1999), it is 'as much about camaraderie as rivalry', a sentiment echoed by his counterpart at Melbourne Grammar, Paul Sheahan who said, that 'like any piece of culture, it's something that gets handed down the generations' (Schubert, 1998: 10).

Eton was founded in the seventeenth century 'for the education of the sons of noblemen and gentry' (Dimbleby, 1994: 35) whom it outlasted. What the Duke of Wellington actually said in that oft-quoted remark was that 'the Battle of Waterloo was one of [not "won on"] the playing fields of Eton' (Burrell in Campbell, 1999: 15). Geelong Grammar was created in its nineteenth century image for the sons of Australian squatters who had grown rich. It teaches the sons of the largest landowners and captains of industry (Shawcross, 1992: 57), as do a comparatively small number of very similar private boys' schools in other parts of Australia and in the other former British colonies. As well as historical continuity and succession, the elite private schools have a planetary spread. The Collegiate of Wanganui, attended by Prince Andrew, has been described as 'the Eton of New Zealand' (James, 1992: 60). The schools which educated rich boys, then, as Conrad Black (1993: 10) notes, 'emulated English progenitors', giving a curiously homogeneous feel to education in the USA, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore, India and Canada, 'precisely because the elite schools and their products defined masculinity, their influence reached every corner of the settler world' (Morrell, 1996: 55) and even places outside the English sphere of colonial influence. The King's School has student exchanges with King's School Canterbury, Gordonstoun, Bishops in Capetown, Ridley College in Ontario and Raffles Institution in Singapore (The King's School, 1999f: 8). The children of the rich move from school to school, city to city, from country to country, each generation succeeding the former, without really moving very far at all.

What makes these travels through time and space appear so effortless is a certain cultural style. As the boys consume a quality education, they also enjoy academic advantages that are largely unavailable to most children (Ostrander, 1984: 96). Figures obtained by the *Sydney Morning Herald* from the New South Wales Department of Education under Freedom of Information laws 'expose a gulf in literacy and numeracy standards' which 'educational theorists and teachers agree' are due 'largely [to] the socio-economic background of students' families and parental expectations'. In the federal electorate of Wentworth, represented in parliament by the millionaire merchant banker Malcolm Turnbull, 81 per cent of students attend private schools (Noonan, 1999: 1, 7; Noonan and Baird, 1999: 7; Doherty, 2003: 1).

Carolyn Jones (1998: 7) remarks, 'it appears money – lots of it – still has a distinct edge' when it comes to the final year university entrance examinations. In New South Wales in 1998, five of the ten schools whose students received 90% or more in their university entrance examination, were elite private schools. In Victoria in 1997, the number of first year university students from private schools was 11% greater than those from government schools, despite the fact that the government schools enrolled 43% more students (Healy, 1998: 37).

The academic achievers in the top stream, especially in the senior school, set the predominant 'tone' of the institution which matches the teachers' definitions of the aims of private education generally. But the school also offers or reinforces a particular cultural mark, one important sign of which, as the Australian author Patrick White found to his disadvantage at English Cheltenham, is a form of speech, almost an accent, quickly learned by most and never lost (Marr, 1991: 71; Connell *et al.*, 1982: 106–108). School training stressed the importance of clothes, too. The class and team photos show earnest faces, confident smiles or stiff-lipped determination, the collars, ties and jackets of their wearers marginally departing from the uniform 'with degrees of casualness as [they] gained the privileges of seniority' (Lewis, 1991: 179–180).

Almost 'a set of objective criteria', this cultural style excludes most boys and creates a sense of social superiority and social cohesion amongst

the few (Steedman, 1987: 133). Peter Lewis (1991: 186) claims that amongst his peers and companions a 'pretentious aspiration to correctness, of class and culture, was common', so pretentious in fact that Lorenzo Montesini (1999: 80), Prince Giustiniani, considered whether it was possible 'to tell all about a person by knowing which of the four Mozart operas they preferred'. Concretely, the polish, taste and wit which children from the working class can acquire only with very great difficulty, seems 'natural' to members of the ruling class and is 'naturally expected' of them precisely because these things are the culture of their class (Bourdieu, 1976: 165). Truman Capote thought that although money could not buy this style which he prized, its cultivation was nonetheless impossible 'unless it was watered daily from a deep well at a prominent bank'. 'When I was young,' he said, 'I wanted to be rich, terribly, terribly rich. My mother, after divorcing my father, married a rich man, but they were upper-middle-class rich [...] There's no taste in middle-class rich [...] I've always known rich people, but I was *so* aware of not being rich myself' (Clarke, 1995: 273–274).

Thus, as Morrell (1996: 55) points out, the elite private schools practice exclusion much more than inclusion. In South Africa, the vast majority of boys, African, Indian and white working-class boys, remained 'outside the charmed circle' into which he was admitted. He himself had enjoyed 'the snobbery that went with wearing the well-known (and respected) school uniform. I had flaunted my membership of the school as a source of power in the face of those who felt themselves inferior because they'd only been to a government school' (Morrell, 1996: 13).

The exclusion of others and the continuation of privilege and power are thus concretely addressed and publicly acknowledged by principals and parents alike. According to the King's School head, Timothy Hawkes, 'The reality is that schools like King's produce a disproportionate number of people who are likely to be leaders in society and I don't think there is much to be gained from being coy about that' (Raethal, 1998: 12). Nor was he, writing in the King's School Headmaster's Annual Report for 1998 that 'it was a pleasure to note how many Old Boys and friends of the School were recognised in the Australia Day Honours List

and the Queen's Birthday Honours List this year' (The King's School, 1999g: 21).

One American parent explained to Susan Ostrander (1984: 85), 'You don't go to private school just for your education. You go there to be separated from ordinary people'. From this, Ostrander (1984: 85) concluded that:

Attendance at upper-class schools is, thus, one way that members of the upper-class create and maintain the exclusivity of their way of life and their social interactions. The women I interviewed were cognizant of these class functions of private schools and fully supported them as necessary for their children's well-being.

At Adam Hochschild's school in New England, USA, the boys were 'all white and mostly wealthy' (Hochschild, 1987: 96). At St Andrew's in Christchurch, Maoris and Pacific Islanders make up 3% of the pupils and at Kristin School in Auckland, the largest Polynesian city in the world, they make up less than 1% (Brett, 1998: 39, 45). In Sydney, the students come from the most expensive and prestigious suburbs and their parents include 'the very rich and very powerful [...] owners of large family capital as well as the affluent salariat'. There is a 'definite lower bound' of 'brokers, middle-ranking civil servants, dentists, corporate executives on the way up, pastoralists on the way down, and even professors'. Full fees in 2005 at Scotland's Gordonstoun were \$50,000 per year, substantially more than the \$16,875 'tuition only' that Year 12 was costing at the Kings School and the \$17,082 fee at Cranbrook in 2004. Combined boarding and tuition fees at Trinity Grammar School cost \$26,510 in 2001 for Year 12. Average earnings for all employees in Australia in November 2000 were \$33,488 (Connelly and Grant, 2005: 39; Doherty, 2004: 4; Coorey, 1998: 4; Trinity Grammar School, 2001). Not many scholarships are offered by the elite schools. The King's School offered 14 for 1999, Sydney Grammar offered 20, and received 500 applications in 1998, and Scots College, which has one of the largest scholarship programs, offered 30 to 260 applicants (The King's School, 1999g: 12; Raethal and Jamal, 1998: 3). As one principal explained,

school scholarships were not given to the working-class who ‘would not fit in, and it would simply be “cruelty” to sponsor their entry’ to the school (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 106).

Those who were in some way ‘different’, were indeed treated cruelly. ‘The chaps who were given a bad time were the Jews’, (Marr, 1991: 71) and the boys at Scots College ‘chanted “Abo” at [future career diplomat] Gordon Matthews because of his dark skin, until the chorus reverberated around the school quadrangle’ (Read, 1996: 22). Patrick White sensed that his schoolmates ‘despised because they mistrusted’ his ‘feminine sensibility’ (Marr, 1991: 75) and Jackson (1990: 124) ‘succumbed to [the] pressure to identify myself in [...] homophobic terms’.

As a result, I not only tried to bury deep within myself any giveaway traces of softness, weakness, gentleness, effeminacy but I also tacitly acquiesced in the rampant, institutional homophobia of my school life. To confirm my manliness in public I needed to join in on the constant jokes about ‘queers’, ‘browners’ and ‘nancy boys’, and show disapproval about boys and teachers who showed traits of weakness [...]

Those boys who tried to form deeper emotional relationships had to conceal them, whether they were platonic or sexual, and homosexual relationships were forced into invisibility and guilty secrecy (Morrell, 1996: 66).

The Construction and Effects of Hegemonic Masculinity

In August 1999 the authors heard Steven Biddulph – described by R. W. Connell as a ‘half-baked essentialist [and] pop psychologist’ – and Dr Peter West (1999), who describes himself as a ‘high-profile academic [who] has developed an expertise on issues to do with men, boys and families’, speak to about 400 parents and friends in the chapel of the King’s School on ‘Raising Boys’. The Headmaster, Dr Timothy Hawkes,

introduced them as ‘prophets of our time’ in which ‘men in general seem to be having something of a hard time’ and he spoke intensely and with conviction of ‘an extraordinary victim’ who had come to him ‘filled with frustration and confusion’ after he had ‘thumped’ a girl whose verbal acuity was superior to his own. Dr Hawkes was ‘outraged’ for, he says, boys are being ‘sacrificed in schools on the altar of gender equality’.

What Dr Hawkes was defending, of course, is a special masculinity which is still widely accepted as natural and desirable and is ‘easily observed’ and ‘very effectively’ produced in the schools of the rich. Defined against the otherness of femaleness, colour and homosexuality, it is a ‘competitive, physically aggressive, space-occupying’ masculinity which limits diversity and organises other masculinities into a hierarchy of types, topped by a masculinity which motivates boys to compete, makes them ‘strong in the sense of their own abilities, able to dominate others and to face down opponents in situations of conflict’ (Lewis, 1991: 170; Connell *et al.*, 1982: 73, 96).

Even those who didn’t ‘just passively accept’ this stress on ‘toughness, pugnacity and aggressive competitiveness’, and who knew their own ‘devious ways’ of getting around them (even sometimes of sending them up), nevertheless were marked by ‘those brutalising values [...] Perhaps not in the way you would expect, but they certainly scarred me for life,’ writes Jackson (1990: 204) in his book *Unmasking Masculinity A Critical Autobiography*.

This ruling-class style of masculinity is, of course, defined by the absence of women from all but helping and serving functions. In 1998, no women at all sat on the 19 man governing body of the King’s School and none on the eight man School Executive. None of the ten Boarding Housemasters and only one of the 19 Heads of Department was a woman (The King’s School, 1999g: 9–10). Certainly a few women do have a place at the school. For instance, a ‘well-run hospital [was] under the direction of Sister Dobbin’; Mrs Grimes ‘faithfully supported’ Mr Grimes, the Head of the Preparatory School with ‘graciousness and practical help’; the Women’s Auxiliary were ‘enthusiastic and devoted helpers’ who gave ‘wonderful service’; and Jane Hawkes, ‘not only held

the family unit together, but has provided the love and emotional support which has helped to make my job easier' according to her husband, the Headmaster (The King's School, 1999g: 10, 15, 22, 23).

Love and emotional support cannot be provided by men, however, for 'feminine' qualities and emotions 'weaken resolve and impede progress to manhood'. The school not only ostracises women from nearly all positions of authority while using their services, but systematically maligns and deprecates 'womanly' characteristics and attributes wherever they appear, defining them as manifestations of a vulnerability, passivity, softness and incompetence thought by the boys to be typical also of homosexuals (Lewis, 1991: 168–169; Jackson, 1990: 202, 210). 'We could spot wet or cissy behaviour,' writes Peter Lewis (1991: 171) in his account of his own school life, *Mummy, Matron and the Maids*. 'We admired and imitated the indices of successful masculinity conveyed by language, dress, movement'.

The masculinity of success separates sexuality, emotion and friendship from each other and assigns a low or even negative value to caring and nurturing (Lewis, 1991: 182). Manliness is about the qualities of might, strength, aggression, honour, daring and cool indifference (Jackson, 1990: 202, 210). 'The policing of experience and the competitive dynamic of a hierarchical system fill the emotional vacuum [...] as a preparation for the world of work that was to follow' (Lewis, 1991: 180).

In Jackson's experience even tolerant and kind-hearted boys 'trampled' each other to redefine themselves in opposition to women so they could gain admission to the real men's club whose members cohered 'by isolating and victimising any boys who in their weakness, oddness or awkwardness they could connect to a despised culture of effeminacy' (Jackson, 1990: 176).

Acting hard and talking tough were the main ways boys proved their masculinity in school, largely at the expense of the marginal students who couldn't or didn't want to confirm their identity in that way. The line of conventional masculinity led straight from the brutalising behaviour of certain teachers [...] to the swaggering, bullying behaviour of the 'cocks of the class' (Jackson, 1990: 202).

A 'language of masculine control' pervaded school life. Bossing, accusing, lecturing, admonishing, interrogating, debating were some of the regular, everyday actions and institutional practices which, along with imaginings, daydreams and night-time fantasies, says Jackson, 'actively produced masculinity in my body and my head' (Jackson, 1990: 207, 149). Sport and games, played and practised over and over, produced an 'ever-increasing dissociation between action and effect' and an obsessive single-mindedness in 'being able to shut out all questions of the other person [...] in the drive for success and performance [...] I was never so ruthlessly exposed, night and day, to so many contexts and pressures to mask the full range of my feelings, desires and interests and to buy into the dormitory framework of a strutting heterosexual culture' (Jackson, 1990: 176).

Jackson learned to conceal his emotional life and survived by 'playing up those aspects of my character that might gain me credibility in the suspicious eyes of the bully boys' (Jackson, 1990: 204). But he was 'terrorised' into publicly approving a masculinity that 'effectively stole away my emotional self [...]' (Jackson, 1990: 205) like 'the lonely young [Prince] Charles [who] kept his emotions tightly within himself' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 47).

This bullying, normal to school life, 'common practice' at Geelong Grammar (Edgar, 1999: 20), was such that Jonathan Dimpleby (1994: 61) commented:

The casual brutality that erupted once [Charles'] housemaster had retired for the night revealed a corruption which would have appalled the school's founding father: a gang of thugs roamed the house beating up smaller boys, extorting food and money, pilfering, and creating an atmosphere of genuine terror.

Gordonstoun's founding father, Kurt Hahn, would probably not be surprised at all for, as the work of Morrell (1996) confirms, this offhand terror seems to have been built into such schools from their inception. This tyranny of the big over the small and the many over the few had its counterpart in the formal systems of power and authority which were expressed in extremes of hierarchy and regulation.

As an outsider, the police officer, Michael Varney, was ‘totally baffled’ by the system of hierarchy he found at Gordonstoun during the time he spent there, minding Prince Charles:

the various ‘ranks’ were: School Uniform, Junior Training Plan, Senior Training Plan, White Stripe, Colour Bearer Candidate, Colour Bearer (prefect, elected by fellow pupils), Helper (head of house, appointed by the housemaster) and Guardian (head boy, appointed by the headmaster) (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 41).

Things are a lot clearer, however, at Gordonstoun’s brother school in Sydney – the King’s School. Here the Cadet Corp is fully integrated into the school hierarchy, and the officers’ ranks are displayed on the school uniform, clear for all who can read the language (The King’s School, 1999g: 19).

Similarly, Conrad Black found ‘extreme regimentation and lack of privacy’ at Upper Canada College (Black, 1993: 17; Coleridge, 1994: 325). ‘This place is a concentration camp, but most of the inmates are oblivious to the fact’, he said (Siklos, 1995: 30). Lewis’ number was 31, ‘labeled over clothes peg and locker, sewn on every item of uniform, painted on my regulation-size sweet-tin and stamped in little brass tacks on to the instep of shoes and football boots’ (Lewis, 1991: 175).

Pupils were closely controlled for almost every minute of every day through clear and firm limitations on their spatial and temporal movements and on their noise and speech (Jackson, 1990: 194), which denied any clear boundary between formal and informal, authorized and unauthorized, public and private life. As Jackson (1990: 190) recalls, ‘My everyday school life [was] governed by an elaborate repertoire of official and unofficial punishment, discipline, routines and constraints; caning, cuffs around the ear, master’s detentions, extra school for inadequate homework, order marks for bad behaviour in class [which lead to loss of free time] and prefects’ detentions.’

Despite occasional rebellion, boys in groups tended to support rather than undermine this regime. ‘Hints of non-conformity were suppressed by the boys themselves, and their informal culture was at every point

bound up with, and supportive of, the ethic of the school' (Tolson, 1977: 35).

'Fagging', common in private schools, meant that bullying became integral to the formal school system itself. It involved junior boys doing 'house work' for older boys in a peculiar mimicry of domestic service, in which the work of servants, making beds, polishing shoes, running messages, cleaning sports' gear, would be undertaken by young boys for older boys. Fagging connected bullying with formal school life and rules, forming part of a set of institutional practices which regulated school life outside the classroom and beyond the view of teachers. The fagging system established and reinforced hierarchy.

Your inferiority would be drummed into you throughout these [first] two years ceaselessly. You were at the mercy of prefects and seniors. You could be caned for not watching 1st XV rugby or for not remembering the names of the cricket or rugby teams. In boarding houses with tyrannical prefects and seniors you could be summoned and forced to do anything [...] To remind juniors of their place, on Friday evenings, they would be subjected to the 'Hot Oven'. [Senior students] sat on the beds with their legs against the wall while [juniors] were forced to scuttle beneath, being flayed by the older boys as they went. A further, more regulated, reminder of place came after evening cocoa break when prefects beat offenders for offences such as 'walking over the grass' (Morrell, 1996: 59).

And while its concern for hierarchy was obvious, both fagging and bullying extended surveillance, created and enforced sameness and forbade difference. For those perceived as weak and dissimilar, a grim fate was in store because of the fierce intolerance of sexual, social, morphological difference. 'If one's voice was too high, one's legs too thin, ability at games absent, one became the object of ridicule' (Morrell, 1996: 60). According to a fellow new boy, Prince Charles was picked upon 'maliciously, cruelly, and without respite' and one of his class mates, William Boyd, remembers overhearing, 'We did him over. We just punched the future King of England' (Dimbleby, 1994: 62, 63). This abhorrence of difference was called loyalty (Morrell, 1996: 59) and being loyal be-

came a means of survival for, as Jackson (1990: 177, 178) writes, ‘to survive I had to keep silent *within* the pack [...] we all knew that if we didn’t join in, it would be our turn next [...] the pack hunts down any outsiders, and forces them to forget their own contradictory resistances, and teaches them to snarl, like the rest’ (Jackson, 1990: 177, 178).

Occasionally, at Conrad Black’s school, boys judged from amongst their own number those to be punished:

One particularly irritating technique was that of the faculty member who described a student’s transgressions in pseudo-judicial terms and then called for a vote of the class on whether he should be caned or not. The vote was always overwhelmingly in favour. My foolish classmates enjoyed and legitimised the system (Black, 1993: 11).

As Black himself left the school, which expelled him for stealing and selling exam papers, ‘some of my dear colleagues, including a couple who had ardently initiated commercial discussions with me in the preceding several days, bellowed abusively and righteously, like Camus’ mob’ (Black, 1993: 16–17). But even apart from these collective rituals, the enforcement of conformity was routine. It was, as Jackson says, ‘always there in the banter, the incessant jibes and the repetitively brutalising actions’ (Jackson, 1990: 178).

Thus were boys loyal to each other and to the school, accepting their place within the institutional hierarchy, for to challenge it and its supporting conventions was to invite victimisation. Bullying, according to Victor Stiebel, was experienced by ‘those boys who expected to be persecuted (knowing that they did not fit in), the bumptious and the timid’ (Morrell, 1996: 62), and in order to avoid continual mortification, the boys fitted in. ‘Difference was suppressed, uniformity championed’ (Morrell, 1996: 60), for at the end, the formation of ruling-class masculinity is all about ‘learning to [...] come to terms with public opinion and to know one’s place, rising to be a house prefect, school prefect or games captain, and arriving at the end with that quality of self-confidence and poise which came to be the hallmark of the public school man’ (Honey in Morrell 1996: 57).

Toughening Up

The fact that the private elite schools were boarding schools increased their power and influence according to Morrell (1996: 52). Some time between the ages of 7 and 11, the boys are sent to boarding school. This they will attend for about a decade, living with their peers and school masters for much of the year, broken only by their holidays and occasional long weekends (Fraser, 1984: 147; Shawcross, 1992: 56; Morrell, 1996: 52). Even those whose parents live near the school experienced the same isolation from their families: Fraser's school was only ten miles from home and Princes Andrew and Edward's only seven. 'I could have got home easily enough, even if it meant walking. Instead, I wrote anguished, homesick letters to my mother [...]' (Fraser, 1984: 147).

'Sending away' the children was very much 'the thing to do'. Robert Holmes a Court's son Peter was 'sent off' to Geelong Grammar at age 11, at his father's insistence (Edgar, 1999: 19). As one interviewee told Bronfman (1987: 31–32):

But my parents said, 'No, we want you to go away, that's the right thing to do with this age. The family's always done that, it's good for you, we think you'll like it once you do it.' I really didn't want to do it [...] Perhaps underlying that was a sense that maybe most people have when they're sent away to school, being thrown out of the house to make it on your own [...]

'Sending away' was associated in parents' minds, of course, with the toughening process discussed earlier – the Gordonstoun ethic of self-reliance and independence; 'character building' Robert Holmes a Court called it (Edgar, 1999: 20). When a friend suggested to the father of Howard Hughes that it was time he 'make a man' of his son because he was 'altogether too over-refined, nervous, and sissified', Hughes was duly 'sent off'. Reinforcing the rightness of this action, the Head shortly wrote to his mother, saying, 'I am glad to say that I have noticed very few of [Hughes'] faults to which you have called my attention. However, I shall make every effort to rid [him] of his sensitiveness as soon as

possible'. He added that Hughes was 'much better off away from over-protective parenting' (Higham, 1993: 20, 23–24).

Truman Capote endured a similar experience. It was clear to his mother, that he was not becoming the 'ordinary, masculine boy' she wished him to become. Her own brother had been to military school and she thought that where she had failed 'tough drill instructors and the company of other, more virile boys' might not. After a 'dreadful year' at St. John's Military Academy, Capote seemed to have successfully 'hardened himself' (Clarke, 1995: 44–45, 47).

The Duke of Edinburgh, too, was clear about the nature of his old school and about why it was chosen for his son. He felt that a school should mould a boy for manhood:

Children may be indulged at home, but school is expected to be a Spartan and disciplined experience in the process of developing into self-controlled, considerate and independent adults. The system may have its eccentricities but there can be little doubt that these are far outweighed by its values (Dimbleby, 1994: 36).

The Arundel Herald of Arms has recorded that the Queen knew that her eldest son's years at Cheam 'had been a misery to him' and, according to a member of the household who spent some time with him in his last year at the school, Charles 'loathed' it. In notes for an essay on 'The Advantages of Boarding Schools', he found only one: 'Preparing you for the outside world' (Dimbleby, 1994: 44).

'All his life' Patrick White was to speak about how he felt his parents were 'abandoning' him when he was sent away to Cheltenham school (Marr, 1991: 81). The Whites farewelled their son on the railway platform at Villars.

The wounds I suffered on the snowbound platform were of a duller kind which promised suppuration. I was determined to keep my grief within the bounds of that manliness I was being taught to respect, when I would have liked to tear off the rabbit skin glove [my father] was wearing and hold the sunburnt hand to my cheek (Marr, 1991: 77–78).

Not surprisingly, returning to school after the holidays was difficult. According to the school rules, Prince Edward was allowed home to Windsor Castle for one weekend each term, but Edward and his brother Andrew would frequently be collected by a chauffeur and taken to have tea with the Queen on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon. No other boys were allowed such treatment (James, 1992: 34). Nonetheless, after one holiday, Prince Edward simply refused to go back to his boarding school.

Neither Mabel Anderson [his nanny] nor Michael Perry, the nursery footman, could persuade him. He held tightly to his bed and had to be physically dragged away. Once inside the nursery lift he clung tightly to a rail and refused to come out. Eventually the Queen had to be summoned and after a few quiet words together Edward finally agreed to go. 'That was very painful indeed,' said the Queen as she waved good-bye to her son (James, 1992: 49).

Most of these separations, if less dramatic, were still reluctant. Edward's attendants noticed how he would develop a cold or upset stomach as the day of departure approached. In a television interview Edward said, 'A school is a school. I don't agree with the statement that school days are the happiest days of your life' (James, 1992: 49). In this he echoed Rupert Murdoch, who said, 'I hated Geelong Grammar. I've said many times that I would never make the mistake of calling my school days the happiest days of my life' (Shawcross, 1992: 56).

Loneliness

Unlike his son James, who said he found Cranbrook 'a bludge, there was no discipline, there were no rules, we had a great time' (Fitzsimons, 1994: 1s), Kerry Packer 'hated' school and seems to have been 'a rather lonely child', like many sons of the very rich (Davis, 1982: 218). Morrell (1996: 13) experienced his years at Hilton in South Africa as 'lone-

ly, traumatic and confused' and Prince Charles was 'shipwrecked by loneliness' and 'yearned for news from home' (Dimbleby, 1994: 74). Indeed, the Duke of Edinburgh did write 'bracing letters of admonition' in which he urged his son to be 'strong and resourceful' (Dimbleby, 1994: 66) but, needless to say, these would hardly have alleviated the very real loneliness Charles was experiencing.

For Ronald Fraser (1984: 147) the hurt began even earlier in life.

Standing on the frost-hardened school lawn, I watched the older boys kicking a rucker ball around. I was hollow, bloody inside, as though someone had mangled the last protective inner lining. I had just turned nine, and I knew there was nothing I could do.

Ronald Fraser's pain was to manifest itself in nightmares and illness. Night after night he awoke with nightmares of 'whirling through space, terrified of being lost in nothingness', his screams waking the others in his dormitory. During the day he suffered from constant chest pains which he still feels when something goes wrong (Fraser, 1984: 155–156). The cure, according to Jackson (1990: 148), was to learn 'how to "master anxiety", anaesthetize pain through language, open a wide gap between mouth and heart'. The routines, daily business and incessant competition were designed to divert the boys from thinking of home. For some boys this worked. 'You're always doing something so you don't have much time to get homesick', said 14 year old Blake Jennings at Scots College in Sydney (Jamal, 1998b: 12).

However, once in bed in the seclusion of the night, homesickness could hit, and for many boys it did.

Everyone's self-respect was at stake: if one boy blubbed, the others would be poignantly reminded of their own unhappiness and brought dangerously close to blubbing themselves. He had therefore to be repressed at all costs. For most of us this was the beginning of that process by which our feelings were first numbed and then disconnected, giving us the distinctive quality of the boarding-school 'man' (Lewis, 1991: 177).

Unfortunately succour was not generally found amongst fellow pupils. A clique of boys made Ronald Fraser's life 'hell'. Older boys 'enjoyed the privilege of beating younger boys' as Jodee Rich found at the hands of Rodney Adler when they were at Cranbrook (Marr, 1991: 21; Fraser, 1984: 155–156; Barry, 2002: 7). Prince Charles 'dreaded' going to bed as he got hit 'all night long' (Dimbleby, 1994: 64, 66.). In fact, according to his bodyguard, Michael Varney, Prince Charles was 'the archetypal victim of boarding school nasties [...] Tormenting him obviously appealed to a cruel streak in some twisted minds [...] It was a cheap and easy way for certain pupils to assert what they thought was their own superiority' (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 56).

And James Fairfax (1991: 27) found that the 'mockery prevalent [at boarding school] took varied and ingenious forms and although I was by no means the only victim, I always felt that I got more than my fair share'. Such ingenuity, former Gordonstoun boarder Ross Benson told Jonathan Dimbleby, included the tradition of greeting new starters

by taking a pair of pliers to their arms and twisting until the flesh tore open. In all houses boys were regularly trussed up in one of the wicker laundry baskets and left under the cold shower, sometimes for hours (Benson in Dimbleby, 1994: 61–62).

Similarly at Trinity Grammar in Sydney in 1984:

He was beaten regularly and unmercifully by senior boarders, always on back, upper arms and legs where the bruises would not show. Once he was tied between two ladders and beaten with a cricket bat. On another occasion he tied in a laundry bag and left all night [in winter] on the school oval. He was subjected to systematic bullying to a level that could only be described as torture. The house master, himself an old boy, turned a blind eye to all this (cited in Walker 2001b: 6).

Prince Charles has claimed that his 'chronic burden' of 'low self-esteem' was not eased by his experiences at Gordonstoun (Dimbleby, 1994: 73) and Conrad Black (1993: 12) commenced a novel about 'the excesses of the Ontario private schools and the psychological damage to certain

alumni'. Jackson (1990: 205) complained that as a man he was left with 'self-hatred, and a destructive habit of despising the emotional, vulnerable aspects of myself'. Similarly, 'a strong vein of self-loathing marked [Patrick White] for life' for 'the faith Cheltenham gave him was not in God but in the awfulness of human beings' (Marr, 1991: 75, 81). As his biographer explained:

Miserable and proud, the boy looked about for evidence that the human race was no better than himself. So he reached a bleak but reassuring view that people in the ordinary run of things are as shoddy, greedy, jealous, stubborn and contemptible as he, in despair, thought himself to be (Marr, 1991: 75).

Competition

It is not surprising in such a situation, that the boys' school lives are dominated by schoolwork and one of the things they demand from the school is exact knowledge of their competitive situation (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 110). In most private schools, 'streaming' is immediate, explicit, and sometimes intricate. At the 'fiercely competitive' Wellington College, for example:

65 to 70 boys formed the Grade 5 level at Wellington, and they were divided into three forms, and they're graded according to their ability, and this is done on a test in the first few days [...]

As far as we [the parents] know, but it hasn't actually been spelled out to us, that he is in the lower of the 'B' form. And they go so far as to put a child 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 and so on right through the class – it's absolutely incredible! So a child knows whether they come 1st or 22nd (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 115).

The organisation of learning as individual competition is a 'vital feature' of private school life and a lot of what happens in and around the school is about mastering methods of surviving and winning in the 'arena of

competition'; about becoming a 'self-conscious and efficient competitor' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 123–125). As Lewis (1991: 176) remembers,

I was an assiduous collector of marks and 'stars'. Competition was keen and I moved up the school in the company of friendly rivals [...] we fought each other to come first in 'fortnightly orders' and exams, and for places on the school teams [...]

While the arrangement of learning as individual contest is not exclusive to ruling-class schools, of course, it is culturally congenial, 'organic', to them. In working-class schools, in contrast, this produces 'failure' for the majority; in the schools of the rich it is an integral part of the culture of success (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 121).

There is no doubt about the gendered nature of this extreme emphasis placed on competition. The construction of a particular form of masculinity lies at the heart of rigid hierarchy and aggressive competition.

From the ages of 11 to 19 the continual assembly talk of cups, results, trophies, winning, school colours, and the hothouse rivalry between teams, players and houses [...] were applauded and encouraged every day by obsessive housemasters and by the familiar hectoring of the head teacher from the dais (Jackson, 1990: 213).

In this way, aggressive masculinity is not only socially condoned but is also psychically required by the 'hierarchical logic' of beating others, fighting for marks and winning positions (Jackson, 1990: 190–191). Morrell (1996: 13) writes of experiencing 'the ecstasy' of being in a winning team. Boys must learn to value winning; that winning entails others losing; and that losing is to be feared. Competition develops in boys the habit of winning so they will want to be, and be able to be, successful in the corporate world (Bronfman, 1987: 75). As Bronfman (1987: 76) was told, 'You had to be the best. It felt as if that was the push all along [...] The girls got caught up in the competition, but the competition was mainly structured for the boys to be the best; so that they could grow up and be the best and earn a whole lot of money'.

So early and so rigorous is the demand to 'be better' than the other children at school, that one child, who was told she was 'better' but couldn't understand how, went around the playground trying to smell the other children to see if she could find out how she was different (Bronfman, 1987: 72–73).

Boys brought up to feel and to be better than others learn to expect this of themselves. No matter how difficult or frustrating a task, one must 'measure up' because one must. There are precious few allowances for lack of ability, none at all for failure. On the other hand, 'if you really are good, you shouldn't have to try too hard' (Bronfman, 1987: 73–74, 76). 'The fear of public failure has stayed with me ever since,' writes Jackson (1990: 217).

Corporeal Discipline

Competing and being 'toughened into men' (Morrell, 1996: 50) had a definite bodily aspect. The founder of Gordonstoun considered that physical hardship gave boys what he saw to be 'genuine values' (James, 1992: 45). Gruelling physical activity and cold showers came to be a hallmark of the elite boys' schools. Ross Benson recalls that the windows at Gordonstoun were 'kept open throughout the night, which meant that those closest to them were likely to wake up with blankets rain-soaked or, in winter, covered with a light sprinkling of snow'. Whatever the weather, every boy was required to wear shorts and to go for a run before breakfast, followed by a cold shower (Dimbleby, 1994: 61).

According to Prince Charles' own account in the *Gordonstoun Record*, when at Geelong Grammar's bush annexe, Timbertop, 'the first week I was there I was made to go out and chop up logs on a hillside in boiling hot weather. I could hardly see my hands for blisters after that'. One of his former class mates, however, recalls a different scenario, claiming that other students daily had to chop firewood for Charles' private fire-

place (Lunn and Hawes, 1998: 25). At Geelong Grammar, too, many of the school's verandahs were open to the elements and the boys had cold showers in the morning and a hot bath once a week (Shawcross, 1992: 57). Robert Holmes a Court recalled daily black porridge and cold showers in winter at Cordwalles in Natal (Edgar, 1999: 20).

While Prince Edward did not have to endure the cold showers that Prince Charles had suffered a decade before, the 'emphasis on physical fitness' still remained at his school (James, 1992: 43). Charles still follows his daily hot bath with a cold shower and he now insists that his schooling at Gordonstoun, which at the time he regarded as 'a prison sentence', was in fact 'beneficial'. 'We were made to do things you didn't want to do, which we were told were jolly good for you'. These, he thought, instilled in him 'self-discipline and a sense of responsibility', without which he might have 'drifted' (Dimpleby, 1994: 44, 57–58, 66).

Corporal punishment was, until very recently, a feature of private schooling. It was part of an arsenal of punishments which included writing lines, detentions and athletic activities. According to Conrad Black (1993: 11), 'as we aged and grew and became more physically resilient, the beatings became each year more severe'. Many, perhaps most, boys preferred physical to non-physical punishment and some competed with one another even in this, measuring their capacities to suffer against their classmates'.

After the beating it was the privilege of one's dormitory mates to inspect the damage. I was disappointed that there was not more enthusiasm. 'What, no blood?' said Crowe minor. 'Don't call that much,' said Heathfield. 'Alfie (the teacher) took pity on you, you weed,' jeered Elison, who was measuring my bruises with a ruler. Nevertheless, for the remainder of that day I was a little hero and for ten days after, the discolourations were there for all to inspect in the bath-house (Stiebel, quoted in Morrell, 1996: 56).

There was also an 'acceptance that it was "right"'. As one former pupil of Ixopo High School in the mid-sixties explained, 'I am sure we are all the better for it' and another said that caning didn't upset him but that

‘it purged my guilt’ (Morrell, 1996: 56). Apparently, these days Prince Edward also approves of corporal punishment in schools, telling his biographer that: ‘A beating or a thrashing, if used in the right context, is, I think, very valuable’ (James, 1992: 75–76).

Playing the Game

Like childhood overall, the rituals of sport which it contains are about toughening and distancing, and like the early dancing classes and particularly the crucial debutante balls (Ostrander, 1984: 94), are about exclusion, collusion, coherence and corporeal discipline. In this way, sport both manifests and reinforces the masculinity of the hegemonic, while in itself it is deeply implicated in the maintenance and continuation of the class which shapes its character.

Polo, hunting, skiing, shooting and yachting are particularly popular with the rich, and are tightly linked to the social rituals of ‘The Season’. All require money and most require substantial space – commodities which no ruling-class man is ever short of as we will see in the next chapter. Not only the type of sport, but the manner of the induction of the rich into sport is somewhat different, too. Prince Edward was coached in real tennis by the ex-world champion Chris Ronaldson and round-the-world yachtsman Peter Blake coached him in yacht racing (James, 1992: 196, 197). He and Prince Andrew had private cricket coaching with Len Muncer, the former Glamorgan county player, learned tennis from ace Dan Maskell, and champion motor racer Graham Hill taught Prince Andrew to drive. They had access to their own football and rugby fields, cricket pitch and swimming pool (James, 1992: 34).

The attachment to sport, or more particularly to certain forms of sport, begins early. By the time he was eight, Prince Charles was ‘indocinated into the culture of a sporting estate, he did not recoil from the sound of gunfire or from the brief death throes of a fallen stag’ (Dimbleby,

1994: 31–32). At the age of five Prince Edward presented a cup at a Windsor polo match (James, 1992: 6, 196).

Sport is another place where particularly masculine values are constructed, learned, disseminated and, occasionally, disputed (Morrell, 1996: 69). The schools themselves intend that ‘character-building’ in schoolboys, a central focus of the private school ethos, be partly achieved in competitive sports. These fostered the schools’ identities in ways that seem anachronistic: badges, songs, flags, sporting colours, clearly identifiable uniforms, encourage a sense of oneness and purpose (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 152). The belief is that team games, especially football and cricket, significantly instil the manly ideals of courage, perseverance, stoicism, adventurous action, resourcefulness and the ability to inflict suffering. Teachers believed that it was necessary (and good) for boys to suffer hardship, to be toughened up (Morrell, 1996: 55).

For many boys, sport is a significant experience through which they learn particularly to gain a sense of power and some skill in the use of their own bodies, to relate to the bodies of others and generally to develop their sense of the social world and their place in it (Connell, 1983: 18; Morrell, 1996: 69). Jackson (1990: 212, 220), for instance, found that sport ‘shaped my body in a particular way’ and ‘taught me to impose my will on my body and other people’ while it ‘severed emotional and social commitments and responsibilities from my physical actions’, simultaneously teaching him ‘corporate loyalty and deference to a tightly rule-governed authority’. The smarter boys, however, realised that in sport, as elsewhere, rules exist to be pushed to the limits and that everything is legal until they are told otherwise (Mundle, 1993: 96). It was, according to Conrad Black (1993: 10), the ‘triumphant heroism of the human will’ that interested him in sport.

In ruling-class boys’ schools the project of ‘making men of them’ has always been explicit, and sport, especially football, is one of the most visible masculinising practices of private schooling (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 93). Sport is the ‘central experience’ of schooling for many (Connell 1983: 18) and in learning and participating in it, boys develop a particular relationship with their own bodies. As Connell (1987: 84) notes:

The physical sense of maleness is not a simple thing. It provides size and shape, habits of posture and movement, particular physical skills and the lack of others, the image of one's own body, the way it is presented to other people and the ways they respond to it, the way it operates at work and in sexual relations.

But not only do boys learn about their own bodies, they simultaneously learn about the social world and their place in it. Connell (1983: 18) argues that through sport boys learn about power, the ability to win against opposition. Sport taught Jackson (1990: 217, 218) about the 'physical occupation of space', how to 'achieve a swaggering, confident physical presence' and how to become the 'embodiment of strength, determination and competence'. So much so, that sport occupied his dreams, too. 'With their fierce striving for goals, the players presented me with a view of thrusting masculinity that I was supposed to admire and accept as normative. In this way they became a powerful source of daydreams and night-time dream fodder'.

The range of sports that rich boys have to choose from is not only extensive but is also substantially different from those available to other boys, typically including football, rowing, hockey, tennis, cricket, fishing, scuba-diving, climbing, skiing, athletics, cross-country running, swimming, riding, yachting, shooting and golf. According to Melbourne principal Dr Gordon Donaldson, Scotch College boys have 23 sports to choose from. At the Glengarry campus of Scots College in beautiful Kangaroo Valley, boys can learn caving, abseiling, rock climbing, snorkelling, bushwalking and cross country running (Jamal, 1998b: 12; The King's School, 1999c: 3.0F; 1999g: 16–19).

The 1998 Headmaster's Annual Report devoted more words to the King's School Rugby Union successes than it did to English, Maths, Science and History combined, for sport is about 'the pursuit of excellence' (The King's School, 1999c: 3.0F; 1999g: 5–6, 16–18). Football – including Rugby Union, Australian Rules and soccer but not Rugby League, of course, as this is a working-class sport – is considered by its advocates uniquely to combine team-discipline with the occasion to

experience and test one's masculinity in 'violence and fury' (Jennings in Morrell, 1996: 83). Football offers boys the chance to express their physicality in ways punished in other parts of the school and often includes 'the use of misogynist and homophobic language and excessive verbalizing and venting of emotion' (Morrell, 1996: 83), significantly producing the particular masculinity that the boys are heading towards and which they will continue to practice as adults. Seldom played by women, like polo it is unequivocally masculine. It is physically confrontational in ways unlike other games. Rough and competitive, it is a constant test of what some of the men of power interviewed by Connell et al. (1982) called 'drive'. In it, a player is 'constantly running up against someone and having to overcome him in a test of personal superiority' (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 94).

But not everyone liked such sport. Prince Charles did not enjoy rugby 'as his fellows seemed to take excessive pleasure in burying him under the scrum' (Dimbleby, 1994: 43). Although he played soccer 'with more vigour and application than skill', this did not prevent him from being made captain of the First XI (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 61).

Rupert Murdoch has said that he 'hated the organized sport. Maybe it was just laziness. I used to row to get out of playing cricket'. At school he did not do well at tennis, either, although as an adult he has played this with considerable aggression and persistence (Shawcross, 1992: 57–58). Kerry Packer, who said he found 'being an academic failure was very painful', tried to compensate at sport. 'I used to play everything. I was never a great natural talent, but I worked hard at all the sports that I played and I became reasonably competent at all of them' (Davis, 1982: 218).

Friendship and Sex

Dyadic friendships may undermine team spirit and school loyalty and threaten masculine heteronormativity because they may permit the development and investigation of emotional intimacy and homosexuality, which seem to the beneficiaries of hegemonic masculinity, to be always inextricably linked (Morrell, 1996: 63). Nonetheless, small, defensive unstable groupings of young boys emerge which have little effect on the school or on their place in it. However, by adolescence, no longer seeking or expecting comfort, boys exist alone or in another loose informal group, the gang. This larger group is accepting of ruling-class masculinity; is easily accommodating and celebrating assertions of toughness; and is frequently based on the well-known and accepted principles of male hierarchy. A senior boy, prefect, first-eleven or first-fifteen team member and his mates might constitute the core with younger boys who might be brothers, relatives or sporting code aficionados, forming a periphery. The gangs are generally defined in opposition to other gangs and to juniors and they 'add to the regime of toughness, violence and intolerance which characterises the schools' (Morrell, 1996: 63, 67).

But even within the group, there was 'no recognised channel by which a boy can either communicate his feelings to others, or discover their possibilities within himself [...] feelings of tenderness, and especially sexuality, remain beyond recognition' (Tolson, 1977: xx).

Teasing better exemplifies the relationship between these boys than affection. As Lewis (1991: 181) puts it:

You push someone till they lose control, break down, cry or lash out in anger. Then *you* have won and *they* have lost. If you can keep your head [...] split off your head from your heart and emotions, pretend you don't care, you're a good sport. You can take a joke [...] you'll be a man, my son.

Boys who did talk about their feelings were under suspicion, for to be hegemonically masculine is to allow few emotions and to control them

carefully. Power is implicated in this ability to 'split head from heart' and ruling-class schools are crucially about learning its deployment. These schools, above all, produced the real men of their class because 'in the end, a trigger had to be pulled, a button pressed and it took "men" to do it because only men were capable of surrendering all compassion'. Establishing close friendships, then, was very difficult and concealing solicitude, empathy and affection, if they did erupt, was important (Lewis, 1991: 186, 187).

Although 'a boy, as lonely and desperate as I, climbed into my dormitory bed each morning and we held each other tight, finding a human warmth which, for the rest of the twenty-four hours, seemed denied to us' (Fraser, 1984: 147), such close relationships were relatively uncommon even though they were the 'only available substitute for the relationships that had been cut short, starved or forgotten as a result of our being sent to school'. The school system itself effectively undermined rather than encouraged friendships and 'the ultimate step of the ladder', becoming a prefect, involved 'cutting dead' any friends who were not prefects, since 'any sign of friendship would have compromised discipline'. Peter Lewis 'put limits' to friendship in the knowledge that it 'might not last'. 'For most of us', he says, 'companionship is not a reliable port in a storm' (Lewis, 1991: 180, 181). Nonetheless, it did happen, even though Prince Charles at Timbertop had to have three 'friends' assigned to him by the Headmaster (Morrell, 1996: 63; Lunn and Hawes, 1998: 25).

But when a friendship did emerge and survive, however non-erotic it might be, homophobia was a factor in its establishment and maintenance. Forms of friendship which might have challenged the emerging hegemonic masculinity were ineffectual. One on one male friendship, whether inclusive of a sexual component or not, remained marginal. The homophobia of boys and teachers alike discouraged intimacy. 'There was no one you could turn to, not the staff and least of all one's fellows,' says Peter Lewis (1991: 177; see also Morrell, 1996: 67). Thus close friendship was not common in the schools of the rich (Lewis, 1991: 180). It was forced underground or denied. Team sports and group

bonding were the prescribed form of male companionship and close friendships are not an accepted form of male relationship. Consequently, resistance to the dominant form of masculinity such as occurs in other contexts, even where it did arise, remained tentative and peripheral in a milieu which was simply 'too hostile and all-encompassing to provide the space' (Morrell, 1996: 66). Instead, boys attempting to form close friendships had to appear properly virile to avoid stigmatisation.

Most boys were not interested in establishing such bonds nor in exploring their sexuality intimately with another but instead seemed 'over-sexed' and were mainly concerned, according to Stiebel (quoted in Morrell, 1996: 65), to satisfy 'their desires in a variety of ways'. Masturbation, the most common of these, occurs in an atmosphere of 'moral disapproval backed by hints of harmful effects ensur[ing] that the pleasure of "sex with the one you love [...] was blighted by anxiety and guilt"' (Lewis, 1991: 178).

'You look worn out. When did you last masturbate?'
I gulped and tried to avoid my housemaster's searching stare.
'Yesterday.'
'Yesterday?' He was shocked. 'But yesterday was Sunday!'
(Lewis, 1991: 177)

Within the gang, 'circle jerks' and games involving measuring erections and displaying ejaculatory speed and skill (Morrell, 1996: 66) are widespread and were sometimes the precursor of mutual masturbation sessions and clandestine sexual experimentation between two boys.

[...] a fellow pupil, Jack, said quite suddenly, 'I say, why don't you and I have a flick (masturbation) together?' Although not entirely surprised by the question I was nonplussed. 'But where could we do it?' I asked. Without hesitation Jack replied, 'In the Bogs (lavatories) after Lights Out. Any night you like, man' (Stiebel in Morrell, 1996: 66).

According to Morrell (1996: 65), Stiebel's description of his time at Michaelhouse is 'by far the fullest and most candid' account of private

schoolboys' sexuality. While Stiebel (quoted in Morrell, 1996: 66) refuses to believe that there was any 'full-blooded homosexuality' at his school, 'sex-stimulation [...] was accepted and no one was shocked to see in broad daylight a big boy pressing urgently with his body against a wall or a tree or a boy who was smaller' for this was 'a natural part of school life', indeed 'thematic'. Edmund White claims that he had had about 500 sexual encounters by the time he was fifteen and writing the first draft of his novel *A Boy's Own Story* at boarding school (Attallah, 1994: 94).

As Patrick White (1981: 27) explained of his school days:

Sex was the theme developed in the dormitories, in the tunnels of drought-stricken laurels, and the long grass hedged in by hawthorn. Often barely explicit, like a crush on the music mistress as she smelled a bunch of violets or guided one's hands at the piano, or spasms of admiration for a sportsmaster's hairy, muscular arms, there were also brutal, boyish orgasms. I imagined I was in love. I suffered my first agonies of sexual jealousy.

But when 'brutal orgasms' became a sensual or loving act, it was disparaged as 'homosexual' and left the participants open to violence, persecution (Morrell, 1996: 64) and even expulsion, although in some schools it was 'a subject of gossip, little more'.

Some boys seem to have been coerced by those older and bigger, perhaps in return for 'protection'. Truman Capote, the 'smallest and prettiest' boy in his class, was sexual prey to several tough, manly adolescents and, after lights out, he was sometimes forced into the beds of those whom he was supposed to emulate. He recalls that none of what happened went 'beyond adolescent sex play – kissing, fondling, and "belly rubbing", with him providing the belly and some bigger boy doing the rubbing'. Still, the fear of violence turned these sexual games into something repulsive and upsetting. 'I was afraid of most of the boys at St. John's,' he said. 'They took sex very seriously. Instead of making me happy and secure, being chased after like that had the opposite effect. It was as if I were in prison' (Clarke, 1995: 45–46). It was much better, Stiebel (quoted in Morrell, 1996: 65) remarks, 'if a partner could be found to co-operate', particularly if the relationship in-

volved friendship and the younger performed domestic labour in return for assistance from his elder and better.

Sex between boys in some cases did ease loneliness and despair and, while some speak of 'feelings of affection and emotional satisfaction in relations between small and older boys', most regarded this as a harmless stage some passed through on their way to inevitable heterosexuality (Lewis, 1991: 178). But not all. Truman Capote was unable to really love again after his first school lover jilted him and was killed at war.

He was the handsomest boy I've ever seen, and the most popular boy in school [...] Everyone, boys and girls, was crazy about him. And the funny thing was – he chose me! We used to go off in his car and neck, and we had an active mutual-masturbation scene. Finally, one day I decided that this had gone on too long, and I reached down and gave him a blow job. For some reason that bothered him, and he felt very guilty about it. But not guilty enough to stop. Then on my sixteenth birthday he gave me a book of poems by Edgar Allan Poe, in which he had inscribed, 'Like ivy on the wall, love must fall.' That tore me apart, and I cried, because I really did love him. We had sex after that, but emotionally it was never the same. Some connection had been broken (Clarke, 1995: 64).

Patrick White (1981: 34, 35) couldn't 'remember being much worried by evidence of sexual ambivalence' and 'never went through the agonies of choosing between this or that sexual way of life. I was chosen as it were, and soon accepted the fact of my homosexuality'.

Truman Capote was also 'chosen' by one of his teachers, who sometimes walked him home, 'stopping on the way at a movie theatre [...] They would sit in the privacy of the back row, and while the teacher fondled him, Truman would masturbate the teacher' (Clarke, 1995: 44).

The absence of girls and the long duration of the school year made heterosexual relations difficult to initiate and sustain. 'The secrecy and detailed planning involved was more of a thrill than the actual encounter. I simply did not know what to do to pass from talking to what I took to be the point of the escapade – kissing' (Lewis, 1991: 179). Although boastful and exaggerated stories of sexual conquest, assisted

by an illicit trade in pornographic magazines, are an important way of gaining standing amongst peers (Jackson, 1990: 127; Dimbleby, 1994: 67), ignorance is common and the limited opportunities for meeting girls made it, as one boy explained, 'desirable to squeeze as much sex into the relationship as possible' (Lewis, 1991: 179).

There was almost no chance of having close friendships with women beyond the family, although Stiebel was fortunate to develop a friendship with his music teacher:

Whilst I was at Michaelhouse a friendship developed between us which became so close that it lasted after I had left the school. It would be difficult to overstate her importance, but I can say that without her warming presence I do not know what would have become of me (Stiebel, 1968: 157 in Morrell, 1996).

According to Peter Lewis the 'only chance' of meeting girls of their own age and class were 'those days staged by other families for their daughters' (Lewis, 1991: 179). For Sir James Hardy, there were occasional parties at the yacht club, but the 'right' girls weren't allowed to go to them. Their parents were 'certain they knew what happened in the sandhills behind the clubhouse. They were probably right. The only girls you'd find at the yacht club were from outside the district, but that was OK by us' (Mundle, 1993: 67, 68).

Varsity

The rich, as Connell *et al.* (1982: 48) observe, almost invariably do 'go on' to university. Certainly 95% of the pupils at St Leonard's College in Melbourne do and, in fact, their families expect this to happen (Raethel, 1998: 12) and prepare their sons for this event from an early age. James Fairfax (1991: 40) and his father 'often had talks about life at Oxford as we walked round the Leura golf links'. Like his father, Fairfax regarded Oxford as 'one of the most important experiences of [my] life

[...] even though academic rewards continue to elude me'. With mediocre grades and an abysmal record, Conrad Black was accepted by Carleton University in Ottawa (Siklos, 1995: 32) but even if lacking the marks (or even the age in Howard Hughes' case), a 'handsome donation under the table' could secure entry (Higham, 1993: 29). Prince Edward's biographer remarks that:

No doubt there are others who achieved better 'A' level results and did not gain admission. It is, however, perhaps fair to point out that his admission to Jesus College was a matter entirely for college authorities, and there was no question of any pressure being brought to bear on them to ensure his admission (James, 1992: 66).

Certainly, nothing was left to chance in the case of the heir apparent. On 22 December 1965, the Queen arranged a dinner party at Buckingham Palace which included the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chief of the Defence Staff (Prince Charles' uncle Lord Mountbatten), the Dean of Windsor and Sir Charles Wilson, who was Vice-Chancellor of Glasgow University and Chair of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors. At her request, they formed an *ad hoc* committee chaired by the Duke of Edinburgh, who was the Chancellor of Cambridge University, to further the education of her eldest son (Dimpleby, 1994: 103; Heald, 1991: 120).

At university, a few of the sons of the very rich find a home away from home at residential university colleges. The oldest university in Australia, the University of Sydney, has three all-male colleges, St Paul's, St Andrew's and St John's. St Andrew's College is 'part of the Sydney establishment' and 'includes many [of its] pillars' (Cameron, 1997: vii). Established by an Act of Parliament in 1867, St Andrew's was founded by the Presbyterian Church within ten years of the university's founding, as was Ormond College at the University of Melbourne. Ormond's Head was charged with indecent assault for sexually harassing two women students in 1992 and became the subject of Helen Garner's *The First Stone* (1995), and the 'reply' to it, Jenna Mead's *Bodyjamming* (1997). Far less controversial, and perhaps more insightful than both books,

was *Finishing School for Blokes* (1997) in which former St Andrew's Principal, Peter Cameron, 'reveals, from a unique perspective, what goes on' in the university college which he once ran and from which he resigned because of its misogynist attitudes and practices.

If Helen Garner (1995) 'felt the halls in their grandeur to be overwhelmingly masculine: spartan, comfortless, forbidding', she did so as an outsider. Cameron's account is even more compelling because he was part of the college itself and believed in its stated mission. The students come, of course, mostly from all-male boarding schools and form a 'coterie of ex-private school boys who have been through this sort of thing before and are therefore able to survive it, whereas those who [have not] do not come to such a college at all or else leave in disgust after two weeks' (Cameron, 1997: 28–29, 127, 197).

Seven out of the eight lay members of the College's governing Council had attended single-sex private schools (three of them the same one, two another) and two of the four clerical members were St Andrew's old boys. Many of their families had been represented at the College 'for generations'. Ten of the eleven member Student House Committee, and all five of the Senior Students, had attended, and three had been head boy at, elite private boys' schools (Cameron, 1997: 20, 62, 79, 90, 92–193).

Cameron found that it is 'axiomatic for the students that women are outsiders; at best a necessary evil, at worst a threat to their liberties and to their very identity'. They regard women with fear, resentment and insecurity, either bully them or are bullied by them, and retreat from them to the college which is simultaneously a 'male fortress' and a 'glorious pleasuredome'. There is, he thought, 'undoubtedly something sexual not only in the downgrading of women, but also in the male bonding and the mateship' they enjoy at university (Cameron, 1997: x, 127, 197). The Principal of the Women's College of the University of Sydney, Quentin Bryce, finds this behaviour 'deeply disturbing' and 'not confined to St Andrew's'. 'It is still a case of yobbos in tuxedos', according to an outside observer, well connected to St Andrews and the Presbyterian Church (Garcia, 1997: 38).

Male bonding and heterosexuality came together most graphically for Cameron in the sporting songs the young men sing.

What these songs do is degrade women in the most violent and obscene manner to the level of beasts [...] There seems to be almost a feeling that women have let the side down by being female and not male, and they are to be punished accordingly. Their genitalia, which figure in these songs in the most unappetising way, are the site of their disgrace and therefore the target for all the abuse (Cameron, 1997: 47).

Not surprisingly, this misogyny was accompanied by an ‘exaggeratedly homophobic atmosphere’ and by racism (Cameron, 1997: 19, 69, 71, 201).

‘Bastardisation’ and ‘bullying’, ‘traditional’ in the College according to Cameron (1997: 28–29, 81), are directed at the ‘weaker members of the College, those who don’t seem to fit in with the stereotype of an Andrewsman’. The College chef had complained to him the morning after one victory dinner (‘not just another booze-up [...] a tribal ceremony, a ritual celebration of supremacy and belonging’), that the students had ‘spewed under all the tables and wee’d in the pepper and salt’ (Cameron, 1997: 49–50, 57). They were ‘in the habit of causing damage to College property of \$20,000 every year’ and their ‘usual behaviour’ involved ‘vomiting in the corridors, relieving themselves out of upstairs windows, dropping glasses and old TV sets down the stairwells, and [...] all one night a female had been heard moaning incessantly – whether in agony or ecstasy wasn’t made clear’ (Cameron, 1997: 6, 74). In 1986, the Council minutes reported that ‘a city restaurant was trashed by 25 students, causing thousands of dollars of damage and involving the police; two students were suspended for “blasphemy and sacrilege of the worst type” concerning St Paul’s College chapel; and a crowd of drunken Andrewsmen wearing nothing but academic gowns [...] had created a disturbance at the Women’s College after a victory dinner and were alleged [...] to have run through the corridors masturbating’ (Cameron, 1997: 37–38).

Former Andrewsman Richard Ackland (2001: 17) tells how at certain times of the academic year, some students would be blindfolded in

the dead of night and driven to and dropped off in some far-flung suburb. Clothed only in their underpants, they were left to make their own way home.

In this milieu and within its established codes of behaviour, Cameron (1997: 9) maintained that 'it was my function to create and preserve an atmosphere which would enable [the students] to grow and develop, an atmosphere as free from constraints as possible'. When one of the students was reported to him by the College security officers, the student told him that 'the girl he had gone to the Formal with had to retire early because she was violently sick from too much drink, that he had been found urinating against the security guards' car, and that when they had remonstrated he had "retaliated a little"'. Cameron, it seems, told him to 'put it down to experience' (Cameron, 1997: 11).

Another Andrewsman was caught on his way back to the College with the portrait of one of the former rectors of St John's College which had been cut from its frame and had suffered \$40,000 worth of damage. Said Cameron (1997: 13), 'it seemed to me inconceivable that any portrait of any head of any college could be worth anything like that, but the student, or his family, was able to pay and did, and so avoided expulsion'.

Given the protections afforded by these Colleges, old boys say, not unexpectedly, that those days were 'the best of their lives', 'overwhelmingly positive' and responsible for the formation of their 'closest friendships' (Cameron, 1997: 18; Garcia, 1997: 38). These friendships remained after university, for when a student arrives at the College he has 'frequently been a prefect, or a member of the first eleven, or first fifteen, or of the crew' at his school and 'the general feeling is that he must forget that when he begins his College career; he must be humble' (Cameron, 1997: 18, 28). This 'humbling' 'conditions' the new student to seeing his humblers as 'having authority over' him, and they are 'conditioned to see [his] sole function in life as being humble'. It is 'difficult to resist and shake off [...] the controlling influence of someone who was [your] senior', thus the 'bonding of the fresher year is a profound and almost mystical phenomenon which has lifelong effects' (Cameron, 1997: 94).

When this deference to seniors is not forthcoming, violence can result and on occasion members of the College Council 'got drunk at College functions and were involved in fights with students' (Cameron, 1997: 102). When Cameron sought to take action about such conduct, the QC he consulted suggested that a court might 'conceivably take the view that the conduct I complained of was now the accepted norm in the Australian business world and should simply be endured'. This, Cameron claims, is 'a reflection of the corporate ethos in the outside world, where one hears and reads daily of thuggish methods in the boardroom and not infrequently of actual coming-to-blows' (Cameron, 1997: 102, 103).

The connections with the boardroom are close. Ex-Andrewsmen comprise 'innumerable' establishment figures and international sportsmen. Members of the College Council included the chairman of James Hardie Ltd and a director of Westpac. The Council of the College entertains the elected representatives of the undergraduate student body in one of the oak-panelled private function rooms of the very exclusive Australian Club, to which six of its eight lay Councillors belong. A seventh is a member of the Union Club (Cameron, 1997: 18, 19, 24). Cameron has 'dined at Government House and the Australian Club with millionaires, vice-chancellors, politicians and judges' and in his five years as its head, he invited five speakers to the College, the Governor of NSW, the Chancellor of the University of Sydney, a member of the House of Lords, a captain of industry, and Nick Farr-Jones, the former captain of the Australian national rugby team and an ex-Andrewsman (Cameron, 1997: 64, 191). For these men, the College is a 'kind of epitome of everything they stand for, it sums up their values, it is the emblem of their social existence – in much the same way as the Australian Club' (Cameron, 1997: 97, 198).

School and university comprise a vehicle by which class power and its advantages travel through time and they are also a medium in and through which the class organises, renews and reproduces itself in a world of enduring fluctuation. The school and university college sit at an intersection of the market in educational services and an extensive, abiding social network both of which they help to reproduce and with-

out which they could not survive. Such networks not only make useful connections possible, indeed inevitable, but by excluding children who do not fit, they very practically ensure the right marriages and the consolidation and continuity of the networks themselves.

Thus these institutions are also important in maintaining 'traditionalism', and attendance at a particular school or university college is one of the traditions that ruling-class families maintain: a tradition often passed through the generations, providing stability for their class. A sense of chronological continuity and historical inevitability is sustained by this generational attendance, enhanced by those loyal staff who stay on for decades. These pupils, their fathers and their sons, nourish a sense of permanence within the school by the pride they take in past sporting and scholarly achievements and in commemorating successful past students, some of whom will become members of the school board and school committees and many of whom will support the school with tax-deductible bequests and donations.

What makes these continuities in time appear so fluent and inevitable is a certain cultural style inclusive of beliefs, attitudes, expression. This 'snobbery of style', as Jack Kennedy's friend Joseph Alsop called it, is bigger than the school itself, but crucially formed by and in it (Andersen, 1996: 44). It appears timeless, seamless, edgeless and impervious to those it excludes, creating in its natural heirs a sense of social superiority and social cohesion. This is no figment of anyone's imagination. The exclusion of the overwhelming majority and the perpetuation of privilege and power are acknowledged and endorsed and their reality is in no way evaded by parents, Heads, teachers and students.

Defined against the otherness of femaleness, colour and homosexuality, a special masculinity is obviously and effectively produced in these institutions. Might, strength, aggression, honour, daring and indifference to the feelings of others, are among its characteristics. It is an imperious, physically combative masculinity which confines diversity and ranks other masculinities within the hierarchical logic of scrambling for future rewards. It is also, as we shall now see, space-appropriating and larger than life.

Chapter Five

Space, Bodies, Motion

The ordering of space is a consequential for social organisation and vice-versa. We have already seen that in a ruling-class childhood the material environment promotes a lack of intimacy and encourages family members to remain physically distant to one another. How people constitute their lives partly depends on where and in what they live which 'in turn, depend both on the resources they personally command' and on the way they use space to create, maintain and display class and gender divisions (Bronfman, 1987: 39; Connell *et al.*, 1982: 67–68).

Location and movement are important to the rich, as portraitist Judy Cassab (1995: 60) reveals in this incident.

After I finished his portrait, [Warwick Fairfax] took me and the children to show us the dachshund puppy he wants to give us. In his car Johnny asked, 'Gee, what sort of car is this? I wish we would have a car like you instead of the old Austin.'

We turned into Fairfax Road. 'Gee,' Johnny said, 'is that road named after you?'

And when we got there, 'Gee, is that a hotel?'

'No, this is my house.'

'How many families live here?' asked my son.

'Only us', Warwick answered, but he was quite red by then. There were three cars in the garage.

'Whose cars are these?'

'Mine'.

In Sydney the very wealthy pay at least two or three times the lifetime earnings of a working-class family to own a home around the glistening harbour and on the leafy ridges of its North Shore, most choosing to live some of the year within a rectangle of about 50 square kilometres centred roughly on Sydney Harbour Bridge. These families are able to choose their homes based on 'proximity to work; kin, friends and

leisure interests; trees and gardens; quiet, pollution-free surroundings; and the choice of schools available for their children', as well as, of course, on resale value and return on investment. Parents 'can decide which of a range of private schools they will employ' for they, too, are concentrated in these same suburbs (Connell *et al.*, 1982: 70, 71).

Sometimes the school itself, will move closer to the rich. Edgecliff Preparatory School, favoured by the Fairfax family amongst others, was relocated 'stone by stone' close to Ascham (named after the tutor of Queen Elizabeth I), which along with Kambala, was the girls' school in wealthy Woollahra. It is not far from Scots College which is a five minute stroll up Bellevue Hill from Cranbrook. All are only a few kilometres from the exclusive Royal Sydney Golf Club (Fairfax, 1991: 12; Cottle, 1998: 26, 28).

Around the world, such schools are extremely 'handsome and spacious and very clean'. Gordonstoun, for instance, stands in 300 acres (Connell *et al.*, 1981: 106; James, 1992: 44) as does the King's School, which is situated close to the geographic centre of Sydney. 'We run three and a half boys to the acre', the Headmaster explained, but it is actually 123 acres to the boy, if the school's Cootamundra farm is included in the acreage count. At the school itself, sports *in situ* include ornithology and fishing and the thousand boys enjoy 11 cricket fields, 10 rugby fields, 10 tennis courts, 5 basketball courts, 4 soccer fields, an eight-lane, 50 metre pool and a variety of cross-country courses (The King's School, 1999a; 1999c; 1999g: 20).

The rich are also introduced young to the pleasures of luxury travel. Iven Mackay, the Headmaster of Cranbrook in 1933, was 'astonished' at the number of boys, most of whom lived close by, who were chauffeured to school. Conrad Black's parents were often still in bed when he was driven to school a few miles away by Tommy, the chauffeur, and James Fairfax was driven by Hookey in the family Rolls, 'until we objected and were allowed to walk the short distance' (Siklos, 1995: 26; Fairfax, 1991: 2). James Packer was helicoptered to primary school in the Southern Highlands of New South Wales from his home in Bellevue Hill (Personal communication, 18 December 1999).

When they are very young the children of the rich become well-used to extensive travelling, arrivals and departures. Interestingly, Caroline Kennedy's first words were 'goodbye', 'New Hampshire', 'Wisconsin' and 'West Virginia' (Andersen, 1996: 207). Thus, by the time they go to secondary school, the boys are well-travelled even though they experience on arriving little that is different to their point of departure. Long before the era of mass travel, Iven Mackay had to send some of his Cranbrook boys home to 'remove from their attaché cases a show of hotel stickers – Raffles, Shepherds, Galle Face, Savoy, Waldorf-Astoria, Imperial' (Chapman in Cottle, 1998: 27). Adam Hochschild was 'always whisked from one familiar place to another behind the rolled-up windows of a taxi or a limousine'. Everywhere on his extensive travels he was 'met by smiling men who smoothed the way'. Even as an adult, he wrote, 'I still half expect a smiling man to be there anytime I arrive in a new country'. His family always stayed at the very best hotels at which displays of boxing, dancing and racing were put on to entertain him (Hochschild, 1987: 13, 63, 71, 72).

Once at university, such children continue these peregrinations during holidays, sometimes accompanied by servants. While at Oxford University, Rupert Murdoch went with a friend on a motoring holiday in France, in a car his parents had given him. As a matter of course he always chose the restaurant to eat in and the place to stay and, when his fellow traveller demurred, Murdoch told him that since he owned the car, he would make the decisions (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 15–16). Similarly, 'the great experience' of James Fairfax's (1991: 50) years at Oxford was 'discovering northern Italy [...] Germany, Greece, Egypt, Syria and Lebanon' although 'Paris was really home, and our summer holidays spent in the south of France continued sporadically for a number of years'.

The children of the very rich quickly become habituated to the amount of space available for them, occupying from a very early age very large amounts of what is for others a scarce commodity. Prince Edward's nursery consisted of a day room, two bedrooms, a bathroom and kitchen and on a good day at Sandringham eleven-year-old Prince

Charles alone killed 23 pheasants on the 20,000 acre estate. Balmoral Castle is both the Queen's and Prince Charles' favourite residence, tranquil in the midst of about 50,000 acres of private grounds with its own loch suitable for boating. When Prince Edward was at elementary school, the pupils in his class were asked to draw their homes. Not surprisingly, Edward drew a palace (Varney and Marquis, 1989: 83; James, 1992: 17–18, 20, 32). Most of the boys grow up in more than one house simultaneously, with a town house, a country house and a holiday house being the basic properties.

While at university, the young men enjoy five star accommodation both inside and outside the University colleges. Rupert Murdoch, while at Oxford, had one of the best rooms in his college – the De Quincey room. While at Cambridge, Prince Edward was given a balconied room in the modern Chapel Court, known as 'Millionaire's Row', and the exclusive use of a floor that would normally have accommodated four students. Conrad Black, 'not much of a joiner', took a flat in the Savoy Hotel to secure adequate space (Shawcross, 1992: 67; James, 1992: 66–67; Siklos, 1995: 32).

Location is tied to permanence and the sense of tradition alluded to in the previous chapter and although Keith Murdoch named his ninety acre property, about thirty miles south of Toorak, Cruden, after the Scottish village of his grandparents, the presence of these men is not just nominally global. When Rupert Murdoch bought the *Times* he called his wife Anna from London – at home, as she thought, in Australia.

[...] we had sent our daughter Elisabeth to Geelong Grammar School for a term. I had fixed up the house [at Cavan], putting in a new kitchen, and I remember being there, trying to get the house together and Rupert called to say he had bought the London *Times*. And I burst into tears, because I knew I was on the wrong side of the world.

She asked him where they would spend most of their life from now on. He thought about it and said, 'More than half in the northern hemisphere'. So I thought: Well! that narrows it a little bit (Shawcross, 1992: 220).

The properties the rich occupy, then, are substantial and are located in several exclusive enclaves between which their movement is restricted, private and multi-modal. Within the relatively small and very exclusive clusters in which they live, their properties are huge, the houses on them are large and the rooms within them are spacious and many. ‘Conrad needs, I think, to have “big” around him,’ observed a friend of Conrad Black’s (Siklos, 1995: 214). He certainly did not know what ‘small’ was like. As his editor, Max Hastings recounts:

Conrad would enquire with, I think, sincere curiosity: ‘And how is life, Max, at Rose Cottage?’ He found it bizarre that a relatively important figure in his life should be domiciled in, well, former peasant accommodation. When time came at last for us to part, he expressed his regret that he had never seen inside Rose Cottage. ‘But what would I have done with you there, Conrad? There’s no library and no ballroom [...]’ (Hastings, 2002: 256).

Despite ‘having a larger garden than most of our friends, with access to an equally big one adjoining it,’ James Fairfax didn’t think that ‘had much effect on us’ (Fairfax, 1991: 5). Not so Patrick White:

Til well into my life, houses, places, landscape meant more to me than people. I was more a cat than a dog [...] As a child at Mount Wilson and Rushcutters Bay, relationships with even cherished friends were inclined to come apart when I was faced with sharing surroundings [...] (White, 1981: 16).

A sense of being crowded is largely absent from the experience of the rich because the necessity of sharing space is uncommon. Within their homes, space is carefully defined and allocated. As one of his parents’ servants explained to Ronald Fraser, the Manor House in which she worked and in which he grew up was ‘a very closed world, a world to itself’, sharply divided in two, ‘two worlds living under one roof’ (Fraser, 1984: 13–14).

[...] the old at the rear, a place of small, pleasant rooms with bulging beams and walls thick enough to withstand a siege where servants, nanny and children lived; and the superimposed and imposing new Manor at the front [...]

belonged to the parents. The large Victorian dining and drawing rooms, separated by a dark hall, the smoking room and the sweeping stairs which led to the main bedroom, guest-rooms and the tower were semi-alien territory where I ventured with caution (Fraser, 1984: 4–5).

Those who transgressed these spatial boundaries were soon put back in their place. The idea that personal concepts of space were, in fact, rigid started early as Sir James Hardy's biographer records in the following incident:

[My father] came into the kitchen one day while we were eating and started talking to me about something or other. God knows what it was, but when he left I stood my ground. 'Why did he have to come in here?' I asked the maid with considerable consternation. 'This is not his room, it's our room. He should stay in the grown-ups' room.' I knew my place in the home so he should know his place (Mundle, 1993: 14).

The servants, of course, were even more prohibited in their movements. Their space was even more rigidly defined:

[...] she wasn't allowed to wander round the house or go into the front garden; she wasn't to speak to the lady of the house unless spoken to, or to little Master Colin; she mustn't under any circumstances go into the nursery (Fraser, 1984: 146).

The housekeeper at Highgrove, Wendy Berry (1995: 12), was told that only she, the valet and the dresser would have access to the Prince and Princess of Wales' bedrooms. The butlers were ordered not to enter the royal rooms, which were the 'jealously guarded' domain of the valet.

Sometimes, however, such restrictions were relaxed but this, in itself, was considered to be a special dispensation.

As soon as Charles left Diana returned to Highgrove with William and Harry and their new nanny, Jessie Webb. Again she threw a large barbecue in the royal part of the garden near the Chamomile Walk, for any staff who were around. She loved to see how we enjoyed being allowed into the restricted area. 'It's just like school, isn't it?' she laughed. 'Being allowed into the teachers' area as a special treat' (Berry, 1995: 129).

A Man's Castles Are His Homes

The Aga Khan's grey stone 17th century chateau, an hour's drive from Paris, sits in a 200 acre enclave.

Through a window into the garden I could see a black marble pool, so designed that the perfectly still surface remains unbroken as a film of water laps soundlessly and incessantly over its edges (Coleridge, 1994: 384–385).

Like all rich men, the Aga Khan has several homes. It is 'quite common' for American magnates to own 'a penthouse in New York, a weekend home in the country, and another house in Florida, Mexico, Hawaii or the Caribbean'. Some additionally retain 'lavish, fully-staffed residences' in London or Paris. Conrad Black had homes in London, Toronto, New York and Palm Beach (Davis, 1982: 130; Matchett, 2005: 9).

Although only thirty miles from the Melbourne suburb of Toorak, Cruden, the home in which young Rupert Murdoch spent some of his childhood, had been remade into a spacious American colonial style country home with Georgian porticoes and big open fireplaces. Outside were sunken gardens, stables with English fittings, a tennis court, rockeries and a drive bordered by eucalypts. 'Home' to the adult Rupert and his wife Anna ranged from a villa in Beverly Hills, USA; a ski lodge in the mountains of Aspen, Colorado; a flat in London; a penthouse in Manhattan where Laurence S. Rockefeller once lived worth US\$44 million; an apartment in Sydney's Elizabeth Bay; and a farm at Yass near Canberra (Tuccille, 1989: 259; Shawcross, 1992: 51; Chancellor, 1996b: 1; *Sun Herald* 2/1/05).

The huge Beverly Hills residence was sold to them from the estate of Museum of Contemporary Art founder Jules Stein, along with its eighteenth century furniture, some of which Stein had bought from William Randolph Hearst's famed estate at San Simeon. There Anna designed an English garden as her mother-in-law Dame Elisabeth had done at Cruden. A large helicopter lowered fully grown trees into posi-

tion to give it, instantaneously, that long-established look. Their New York apartment also contained eighteenth century English furniture – of which some had belonged to Sir Keith – alongside paintings by twentieth century Australian artists, especially by Fred Williams and including a portrait of Dame Elisabeth by Judy Cassab (Shawcross, 1992: 330–331, 539; Tuccille, 1989: 259).

Worth about \$5 million in 1996, the Murdoch's five-bedroom Aspen retreat in Colorado's Rocky Mountains, was set on one hectare inside Starwood's gated community. It had been bought in 1983 for \$3 million from Texas oil tycoon Tom Thompson and substantially rebuilt in 1987 with heavy timber trusses and rock features. With its cathedral ceiling, the main suite, located above the jacuzzi, is entered over a sculptured masonry bridge which arcs over the 50ft pool (Chancellor, 1996b: 1; 1997a).

The Murdochs' London home was an exquisite duplex overlooking St James Park, with a marble staircase and brilliant Australian paintings. Rupert had bought his 6,000 acre Australian home Cavan in 1966 with the help of John McEwen, then Deputy Prime Minister. In 1995, he extended his holdings in Australia's 'Golden Triangle' of prime agricultural land by acquiring the extensive property, Bloomfield, from his neighbour the mother of the now deceased Princess of Wales, Frances Shand Kydd (Cornell, 2003: 28; Fish, 1996: 2; Shawcross, 1992: 2; Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 19).

Murdoch's Sydney apartment in Elizabeth Bay's Kincoppal, an apartment building with discreet 24-hour security, whose occupants include Conde Nast's Bernie Lesser, and at one time, pop superstar David Bowie, was close to his son Lachlan's former apartment and the Fox family's Boomerang, and not far from Kerry Packer's Elizabeth Bay apartment in the Toft Monks building, with its superior views and its own marina. Handy also is the elegant art deco Del Rio, formerly owned by Lady Primrose Potter, one of whose occupants is John Alexander, Kerry Packer's head of media, and former editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* (Alderson and Blok, 1996: 12; Mychasuk, 1996b: 23; 1997c: 99; Chancellor 1997b; 2005a).

After his marriage to model Sarah O'Hare, Lachlan Murdoch purchased a new home in Point Piper on the other side of the Royal Sydney Golf Course. He sold his flat in Elizabeth Bay, which he bought for \$6.85 million in 1995 to actor Russell Crowe in 2001 for \$9.2 million. He paid \$12 million for the house which has five levels of marble floors, sandstone balconies with cushioned benches to take in the expansive city and Opera House views, a glass atrium-style lounge with a fireplace, servants' quarters, a glass lift, a 'New York style' bathroom, garden jacuzzi and a boat shed. Murdoch bought the property from mining magnate Robert Friedland who made his fortune in Canadian nickel. Friedland paid \$9 million for it in 1996, plus another million to keep the interior design work of Frank Grill, who had refurbished Lady Mary Fairfax's New York apartment. Lachlan's father noted when he saw the house, that it wasn't suitable for children, and Lachlan sold it for \$20 million in 2005 following the birth of his son, spending \$7 million on a three-storey home in nearby Bronte Beach and extensively refurbishing his New York apartment. (Mychaskuk, 1997d: 35; Brown and Byrne, 1999: 24; Chancellor, 1997d: 4; 2005b: 18).

At Point Piper, Lachlan Murdoch was a neighbour of Frank Lowy, Australia's second-richest man, member of parliament and merchant banker Malcolm Turnbull, and of Kerry Packer's friend Ben Tilley. Tilley sold his home for \$12 million to buy the house next store, Craig-y-Moor, from Rene Rivkin for \$16 million, not long after the house was raided by federal investigators scrutinizing Rivkin for insider trading. 'An urbane confidante' to Kerry Packer, Larry Adler and Robert Holmes a Court, Rivkin had bought the house from union smasher Chris Corrigan of Patrick Corp for \$10.7 million in 2001 (Chessell, 2004: 6; Tyndall and Harley, 2004: 3; May, 2002: 6).

Rivkin's son, Jordan, meanwhile had bought into Bellevue Hill, opposite the Royal Sydney Golf Course, not far from Kerry Packer's main home and the \$11.25 million home of his daughter, Gretel. Valued at between \$30 and \$40 million Packer's Bellevue estate, Cairnton, comprises five properties bought by Frank Packer and four purchased by his

son, Kerry. It contains three mansions, one of which was his son James Packer's until he purchased his \$2.7m apartment in nearby Bondi, which he shared with his wife, model Jodhi Mearns. With the departure of Mearns and the arrival of model and singer Erica Baxter, the apartment was refashioned by Barbara Turnbull, the mother of one of his good mates and a friend of Maggie Tabberer. The apartment in Campbell Parade was close to a house Packer 'settled' to his ex-fiancée, model and actress, Kate Fischer and sold in 2000 for \$2.8 million. In nearby Bronte, Kerry Packer had bought a house for Jodhi's mother which was secured as part of the property settlement at the end of her short marriage to James and sold for \$3.4 million in 2003 (Blok, 2004: 36; Chancellor, 2004: 5; 2003a: 2; 2003b: 80; Lawson, 2004: 3; Sharp, 2003: 56; Martin, 2003b; Reines, 1999: 206; 2003: 134).

In addition to Cairnton, the Bellevue estate, and an apartment in Elizabeth Bay, Kerry Packer also had a holiday home at Palm Beach; a villa in the Hyatt Regency Resort in Coolumb, Queensland; a suite for skiing holidays permanently available at the Perisher Valley Hotel, which he owns; and an estate in England (Koch, 1999: 62). Just down the road from the White's Belltrees, Ellerston, visited by Prince Harry in 2003, is one of five adjoining properties that constitute Packer's 250,000 hectare holding near Scone in the Hunter Valley north of Sydney. 'Entire mountains' were razed for the polo fields, heated ovals, stables and for 'dozens' of houses for staff and visiting polo players which hosted much of the US polo team when it came to Sydney for the 2000 Olympics. Greg Norman designed an 18 hole 'brutally tough and very private' golf course, one of the best three or four in Australia at a cost of \$6 million. According to D.D. McNicoll, Kerry Packer never played on the course, and James is apparently the only regular player. The property also has tennis courts and a clay pigeon shooting range. The house, equipped with a cinema with leather couches, is set in hectares of landscaped gardens which include life-sized bronze statues of animals. At nearby Tomalla, a ruby mine went into operation in 2003, the only one in Australia (McNicoll, 2003: 10; Ramsey, 2003: 68; Robins, 2003; Koch, 1999a: 62; Reines, 1999: 206).

As the fifth largest landowner in Australia, Packer owned an estimated 5 million hectares with more than 240,000 head of cattle. Newcastle Waters in the Northern Territory, which covers 10,300 square kilometres and runs 45,000 cattle, is far vaster than Packer's English estate, Fyning Hill with its 176 hectares of gardens and polo fields. The eight bedroom mansion with five reception rooms sold to Russian oil tycoon Roman Abramovich for \$40m (O'Connor, 2005: 48; Koch, 1999: 62; Robins, 2003).

Valentino Garavani has five homes. His favourite, the rose brick Louis XIII chateau near Paris, sits in 120 acres. Built around 1600, it was the home of the Finance Minister of Louis XIII, and subsequently of a mistress of Louis XIV. Her bedroom had a chapel with mirrored walls and a thirty foot high ceiling. It was converted into a bathroom. In addition, Valentino has a villa in Rome, a town house in London, a chalet in Gstaad, Switzerland, and an apartment in Manhattan (Tyrnaeur, 2004: 245).

The British Royal Family have four main homes: two official residences at Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle, and two estates, Sandringham House in Norfolk and Balmoral Castle in Scotland. Life at the 50,000 acre Balmoral and Sandringham estates centres around riding, shooting and fishing. The Royal Family retire to Sandringham during January, visiting the royal studs where the Queen's racehorses, event horses, carriage horses, polo and other ponies are bred along with show dogs, labradors, corgis and pigeons. 'The whole atmosphere is one of relaxation' (Leete-Hodge, 1981: 138) and the family and friends frequently eat a meal in the private room of a pub in one of the six villages which form part of the 20,000 acre estate (Dimpleby, 1994: 30, 46, 47, 48; Varney and Marquis, 1989: 83; James, 1992: 20).

When Charles married Diana they were uniting some of the largest pieces of real estate in Europe. Prince Charles had inherited the Duchy of Cornwall, measuring over 128,000 acres, and Althorp in Northamptonshire, the ancestral home of Diana's father, the eighth Earl of Spencer, is surrounded by a 15,000 acre estate. However, the duke owning the most land is thought to be the Duke of Westminster,

Gerald Cavendish Grosvenor, whose favourite regiment trains on his vast estates, some of which are farmed by generations of tenant farmers. He cheerfully admits that the huge amount of property he owns in London resembles the Monopoly board with him owning the best squares, including Mayfair, Park Lane and Oxford St. His sister, Jane, married another wealthy nobleman, the Duke of Roxburghe, whose seat, Floors Castle, is set in 80,000 acres. Next to the Duke of Westminster, the largest ducal landowner is the Duke of Buccleuch. He has more than a quarter of a million acres of England and Scotland, together with a number of magnificent homes and one of the finest collections of furniture and paintings in the world (Leete-Hodge, 1981: 62; Davis, 1982: 64, 85, 86, 87–88).

The colonials, of course, continued this tradition. The eldest son of William John Turner Clarke, William John Clarke, became the first Australian baronet in 1882, the year in which he began building Rupertswood, reputed by some to be Australia's most impressive home. His town residence, Cliveden in Melbourne, had a 100-by-50-foot ballroom, numerous reception areas, twenty-eight bedrooms, and seventeen rooms for servants (Davis, 1982: 224).

In the White's Belltrees, one of the most famous country houses in Australia:

Light filtered into the gloomier rooms through art-nouveau windows of rambling flowers. Even on days of blazing summer sun, the hall that runs a hundred feet from front door to kitchens lay in a cream and silver twilight. An opulent staircase with cedar columns, screens, urns and balconies, built like the companionway of an ocean liner, leads up to an acre or two of bedrooms (Marr, 1991: 23).

Belltrees sat in 140,000 acres. A school, post office, hall, store and church were built for the 250 people living on it. 'Who made the world?' a parson visiting the school once asked. 'Please sir,' a boy replied, 'Mr. H. L. White' (Marr, 1991: 22).

One interesting result of this love of multiple residences has been the growth of the compound, or multiple estate, containing many large

residences for different members of an extended family. The 11,100 square metre three mansion Packer property in Bellevue Hill, has been mentioned already, but the Kennedy compound at Hyannisport, Massachusetts, is the most publicised example of this style of living. The Rockefeller estate at Pocatino Hills, New York – of which it has been said that ‘God would have built if he had the money’ – is another. Completely surrounded by high stone walls, it has scores of buildings, including a recreation building which holds bowling alleys, a tennis court, swimming pool and squash court. In the year 2000, when the average household in very wealthy Medina used 80,000 gallons of water, Bill Gates’ compound used 4.7 million (Conniff, 2003: 174; Davis, 1982: 129).

Islands are very attractive to the rich for they are comparatively easy to secure and a number of prominent American families have them off the US coast or in the Pacific and the Caribbean. They rarely change hands. In Europe, Greek millionaires have long shown great fondness for island retreats. When Aristotle Onassis bought Skorprios, he spent \$3 million turning it into ‘a flower-decked gem with six miles of roads and riding paths through the olive groves, a harbour for his yacht, a villa, a dozen luxurious guest chalets, stables and a telephone exchange’. His rival, Stavros Niarchos, remade Spetsopoula, fifty-three miles from Athens, from ‘a barren tract into a personal Arcadia’. His villa is encircled by bungalows for his guests who arrive in his two helicopters which are parked in hangars on the landing field near his own church (Davis, 1982: 129).

Interiors

According to Davis (1982: 131) in *The Rich: A Study of the Species*:

For today’s wealthy families three or four stunning bathrooms are an absolute must [...] you should also have a sauna, a jacuzzi, a large swimming pool (outdoors in warm countries, indoors elsewhere), a squash court and several tennis courts. You will also be much admired if you have a private zoo.

As a young child, Prince Charles spent some time at Windsor Castle on the nursery floor which comprised six rooms, including one for both his personal servants, Helen Lightbody and Mabel Anderson. He developed a fondness for a small chapel between the Grand Corridor and St. George's Hall, from the pulpit of which he preached to an invisible but attentive congregation (Dimbleby, 1994: 19, 22).

Buckingham Palace is the largest functioning palace in the world and the over two hundred people employed inside it, travel along its one and a half miles of corridor and inhabit its 600 rooms. It is 'almost a village', with its own police and fire stations, telephone exchange, post office, petrol station, smithy, maintenance workshops, infirmary and shop (Leete-Hodge, 1981: 141).

Prince Edward chose the 155-foot-long Picture Gallery in which to celebrate his 21st. It occupies the whole central area of the first floor which is reached by the magnificent Grand Staircase and joins the Blue Drawing Room, 68 feet long and originally a ballroom, and the Music Room into which the 600 guests could drift. Since the Picture Gallery has a glass ceiling, which can seem cold at night, Prince Edward decided that it should be draped with a silk canopy borrowed from the Sultan of Brunei, creating an enormous marquee in the centre of the Palace (James, 1992: 127).

In the early 1980s Conrad Black ripped down the old mansion on the eight acre estate in which he had grown up, replacing it with a Georgian manor designed by Thierry Despont, who also planned the restoration of the Statue of Liberty. 'I felt that I got at least equal time with the world's most famous monument', said Black. The piece de resistance of the new home was the drum-shaped, domed library influenced by Renaissance Venetian architect Palladio and the Radcliffe Library at Oxford University. Including the dome, the library is twenty-six feet high and twenty-two feet in diameter and contains fifteen thousand volumes. His detractors claimed it looked like an MX-missile silo set in the grandeur of Toronto's exclusive Bridal Path neighbourhood (Siklos, 1995: 143, 144, 289, 290).

Shortly after Conrad's marriage to Shirley, the Blacks paid about £3.5 million for a four-storey mansion previously owned by the failed Australian tycoon Alan Bond. On Kensington's Cottesmore Gardens,

the house consists of two large homes joined together by a new grey slate mansard roof – causing some opposition from the local council because it threatened the harmony of the street – and a single front door. The house featured an environmental chamber, which blows cold or warm winds to simulate virtually any climate. ‘It’s an all-round paradise and you can transport yourself to any part of the world,’ according to the real-estate agent. The redesigned house contained a gymnasium, jacuzzi and pool, eleven bedrooms, eight bathrooms and two lifts. The environmental chamber, however, did not survive the many revisions the design underwent. ‘I was always skeptical it would work properly,’ Black said. ‘It’s not my style to sit there and try to simulate a South Sea island’. He sold the house for \$31 (£13.5) million to a former beauty queen (Hoyle, 2005: 37; Siklos, 1995: 289, 290).

Coles Myer chief Brian Quinn was of the view that if the chief executive officer required a residence ‘where he recovers so that he may well perform for the corporation in the best possible way, any preservation of that property is in the interests of the shareholders’ (Gregory, 1997: 3). Covering the equivalent of five suburban blocks, his hilltop home had four bedrooms, three or four bathrooms, a family room, a billiard room and a four-car garage. Its \$6 million renovations added a tennis court and tennis pavilion, a cricket pitch, swimming pool and spa house, a grand entranceway, several chandeliers, marble in the bathrooms and granite in the kitchens and increased the garage to accommodate eight cars for Quinn’s Bentley, Ferrari and Mercedes (Gregory, 1997: 3; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1997: 3).

A bridge was installed by a crane over the swimming pool. Travertine marble featured in the tennis pavilion and the exterior latticework was painted six times to provide a mirror finish. Inside, the house had three main chandeliers, silk wallpaper, an entrance hall with a domed ceiling and special lighting effects, and a dining room with a ceiling waxed to resemble the sky, with clouds. The Quinns had four front windows replaced twice, and the rest of the windows changed once, because the design on the glass was not apparent. Dissatisfied with its colour and grain, Mrs. Quinn had the marble replaced on the walls of a

guest powder room. Painters stripped all the new paint from the wrought iron balustrades with a grape leaf design, filled every leaf with metal filler, rubbed them back and then repainted them because she was unhappy with the finish. Wall panelling in a lounge bar had 10 to 12 coats of clear finish, each one applied after the previous one had been rubbed back with steel wool (Gregory, 1997: 3).

The average floor size of a new home in Australia is 221 square metres. While building a 4000-square-metre third or fourth home on the sea in Palm Beach USA, the owner complained that the walk-in bedroom wardrobe was too small. 'It's as big as my living room,' the architect said, to which the owner asked, 'Why do you live in such a small house?' (Gittins, 2003: 15; Conniff, 2003: 197).

Architects

While the rich, apparently the fiercest of competitors in business, have no trouble buying each other's properties, they also share architects, builders, designers and decorators. For instance, Guilford Bell was the Melbourne architect who designed houses for the squattocracy, a round house in Point Piper for Mary Hordern and a swimming pool pavilion in Bowral for James Fairfax. Espie Dods, however, seems specially favoured. When Dods was boarding at the King's School he befriended Robert Ashton, a son of one of the four famous polo-playing Ashtons, for whom he designed his first house in Woollahra in 1980. When Ashton sold it to NSW Premier Neville Wran, he moved into another Dods'-designed home, just up the street. This he later sold to businessman Adrian Burr, who in turn on-sold it in 1988 for about \$2.8 million. Ashton then asked Dods to design a palatial house for him in adjoining Paddington (Lawson, 1997: 3).

James Fairfax is another Dod's friend and client and Sandie Walker, the wife of Richard who trekked the temples of India with James, shared

City Gym workouts with the architect. 'Espie gives you absolute style,' she said, as indeed he had in three different Walker homes, the most recent not far from Ben Tilley's home and 'a five iron and two putts' from the Sydney home of his godfather Kerry Packer, for whom Dods designed the homestead with its 20-metre-high steel roof on his cattle station *Newcastle Waters*. Antiques collector Ruth Simon says that with Dods the 'detail is unbelievable' and he 'does beautiful work', including designing for her and husband Peter, a seven-car garage beneath the swimming pool. In 1996, the Simons sold the house for \$9.8 million to Nati Stoliar and they now live nearby in the Adler's old house, which they bought for \$12 million. Dods also designed a seven-bedroom house, inspired by colonial architect John Verge's Elizabeth Bay House, which apart from the lawn tennis court, covers much of its 6,400 square-metre site and comes with a dining table to seat 50, a wine cellar and cinema (Lawson, 1997: 3; Chancellor, 1998e).

Dods, for his part, has confided to one of his clients, Caroline Simpson (nee Fairfax), that he was 'so sick of the very rich'. He was, she explained, 'a wonderful man. Charming. No, charming is not the right word. A head waiter can be charming'. Perhaps the fees Dods charges help assuage his nausea. Matt and Fiona Handbury spent \$11.5 million on their property at Point Piper, rebuilding the palace Altona, and demolishing the house next door to build a tennis court. Dods earned 10 per cent of the cost of the multi-million dollar renovation. He normally charges 14 per cent of the cost of the finished work unless it's over \$1.5 million, twice as much as the usual 7 per cent for an architect. But then the Dods name 'adds \$200,000 to \$300,000 to a house's value'. He 'doesn't charge enough', insists Caroline Simpson (Lawson, 1997: 3).

But the 'sharing of the best' tradespeople can prove disappointing. Ros Packer, wife of Kerry, had employed decorator Michael Love, as had Sam and Sue Chisholm. On visiting the Chisholm's new Sydney home, she is said to have remarked on the similarity of the soft furnishings she thought had been imported especially for her (Lacy, 2003a: 27).

Height

Size is one thing, height is another. Hill tops have traditionally been the habitat of the wealthy and, in the era of apartment dwelling, penthouses are the equivalent. In Sydney, the record price for a penthouse by 1998 was \$5.5 million. In the Kings Cross skyscraper the Elan, the top floor is 18 times the legal minimum size for an apartment, 7.5 times the size of most homes. At 645 square metres, it is about the size of a large suburban housing block. Priced at more than \$3 million, it was 150 metres above sea level (*Weekend Australian*, 1998a: 12; Chancellor, 1998d: 6; 1998f: 6).

Casino boss Lloyd Williams sold his luxury, full-floor, 20th storey Melbourne penthouse for the same price. Transport magnate Lindsay Fox owns an apartment on the entire 18th floor and Sir Roderick Carnegie owns half the 16th floor, while trade union *bête-noir* and former Industrial Relations Minister, Peter Reith, paid only \$385,000 for his apartment in the same building. But even this falls in comparison to Lord Lever's apartment in London's stylish Eaton Square, which he calls 'My Taj Mahal', with its marble hall, Louis XIV staircase, ten bedrooms and seven bathrooms (*Weekend Australian*, 1998a: 12; Chancellor, 1998d: 6; 1998f: 6; Davis, 1982: 113–114).

Sydney has moved from being the tenth most expensive Asia Pacific city in 1996 in which to buy prime apartments to the sixth in 1997. Then, a 'typical' Sydney CBD three-bedroom apartment of 130 square metres cost about \$762,000. Sydney's most expensive home units went on sale in 1998 with prices ranging from \$3.75 to \$6.5 million (Dixon, 1998: 60; J. Sexton, 1998: 9; Chancellor, 1997e: 1).

The nine-unit Ritz Cremorne, located on Cremorne Point between Mosman and Neutral Bay, houses a maximum of eighteen people, although 'It is unlikely you'll see anyone in the gym or pool, which is what wealthy people like,' according to architect-builder Simon Symond. It has views across the harbour of the Botanic Gardens, the Sydney Opera House and the Sydney Harbour Bridge and includes housekeep-

ing services. The recreation area has a twenty metre lap pool and another large pool bordered by two spas and dominated by a fountain and a giant sandstone statue of Zeus. A weights room overlooks a soundproofed squash court with a separate gym at the other end of the floor. The exercise machines are hooked up to audio systems and television sets. There is a kitchen/cafe area, in which each apartment has a kitchen locker for snacks and drinks with a matching locker for clothes and towels. The toilets, dressing rooms and showers are all soundproofed and equipped with hair dryers. A stretch limousine can turn around in the garage and a walk-in, refrigerated garbage room stops the smell of household waste from pervading the parking area. High-speed remote controlled lifts propel the residents to their units, which have lounge room walls finished in noise-muffling suede and bedroom walls upholstered in silk. The vein lines in the Italian marble match and the cabinet work is of English sycamore, sweet-smelling African ash and Canadian maple (Dixon, 1998: 60; J. Sexton, 1998: 9).

Two of the apartments were available for rent for \$6,000 and \$4,000 a week. Costing more than a suite at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, the annual bill would pay off a \$200,000 mortgage in less than 12 months. 'But large companies can write it off in their overheads and outgoings,' Mr Symond said. This price equals rates in London and Hong Kong, where the best residences cost \$5,500 and \$7,500 a week respectively in 1998, but do not come near the US\$100,000 a month payed by Donatella Versace for singer Johnny Hallyday's St Tropez house in which she hosted Chelsea Clinton. The most expensive property in Bellevue Hill, Potts Point, Darling Point, Point Piper, Woollahra and Watsons Bay could be rented for about \$3,500 per week. John B. Fairfax charged Bob and Margaret Rose \$4,000 a week for his Double Bay waterfront house Elaine. Fairfax chairman, Brian Powers, paid \$4,500 a week in Vaucluse and his former Consolidated Press executive colleague, Al 'Chainsaw' Dunlap, paid the same to rent a house in Hunters Hill in 1992. The rich can pay \$3,000 a week in Melbourne for a mansion in Toorak, South Yarra and Kew. Not surprisingly, Nicole Kidman considered that a few visits to Sydney each year justified buy-

ing a \$4.2 million Darling Point mansion (Peretz, 2004: 123; Chancellor 1998b: 6; 1998c: 16; Chancellor with Lawson, 2000: 24; J. Sexton, 1998: 9; Attwood, 1996: 83).

Housing Prices

In 1997, 2,700 homes in Sydney were built on land valued at over \$1 million. The houses built on the land are worth at least as much again. Almost 1,200 Sydney residential properties sold for more than \$1 million in the same year, making up just over 1 per cent of the volume of sales and about 7 per cent of their total value. They averaged \$2.25 million each (Chancellor, 1997d: 4; 1998: g; E. Sexton, 1998: Business 97).

Homes in Sydney built on land valued at over \$1 million

<i>Suburb</i>	<i>Median Price 1997</i>
Bellevue Hill	\$1,205,000
Darling Point	\$1,500,000
Point Piper	\$3,425,000
Vaucluse	\$1,205,000
Balmoral	\$1,350,000
Clifton Gardens	\$1,265,000
Longueville	\$1,103,000
All Sydney	\$233,000

Source: Australian Property Monitors, cited in E. Sexton (1998).

In Longueville, six houses in Mary St alone have sold for more than \$1 million between 1993 and 2000 (Dale, 2000: 24). This suburb, in common with all the suburbs listed above, lies within the 50 square kilometre rectangle drawn around the Sydney Harbour Bridge and are less than a hour's drive to Palm Beach.

The Top 30 House Values in Sydney circa 2004

1. *Carthona*, Darling Point, Anthony Oxley, \$40m.
2. *The Hermitage*, Vaucluse, John & Merivale Hemmes, \$30m.
3. *Altona*, Point Piper, Deke Miskin, \$28.5m.
4. *Cairnton*, Bellevue Hill, the late Kerry Packer, \$25m. (estimate).
5. *Fairwater*, Double Bay, Lady Mary Fairfax, \$24m.
6. *Villa De Mare*, Point Piper, Julia Ross, \$21.5m.
7. *Boomerang*, Elizabeth Bay, Lindsay Fox family, more than \$20m.
8. *Rona*, Bellevue Hill, Terry Agnew, \$20m.
9. *Mandalay*, Point Piper, \$20m.
10. *Paradis sur Mer*, Point Piper, Geza Seidl, \$19.2m.
11. *Coolong*, Vaucluse, Coe family, \$18.9m.
12. *Elaine*, Double Bay, the late Sir Vincent & John B. Fairfax, \$17m.
13. *Craig-y-Moor*, Point Piper, Ben Tilley, \$16.15m.
14. *Garden Reach*, Hunters Hill, Gail Collins, \$16m.
15. *Craigend*, Darling Point, Bruce Davey, \$16m.
16. Vaucluse, Harry Triguboff, \$16m.
17. Vaucluse, Sir Alexis Albert, \$15.5m.
18. *Rivendell*, Mosman, Keith Lambert, \$15.5m.
19. *Glanworth*, Darling Point, James Fairfax, \$15m.
20. Coolong Rd, Vaucluse, Gillian Walton, \$14.7m.
21. Vaucluse, Colin & Maree Reynolds, \$14m.
22. Vaucluse, Deiter Kahlbetzer, \$14m.
23. *Banks House*, Point Piper, Banks family, \$14m.
24. *Tabourie*, Mosman, Roy Manassen, \$13.9m.
25. *Neidpath*, Darling Point, Kenneth Howison, \$13.5m.
26. *Shellcove*, Neutral Bay, \$13.5m.
27. *Redvers*, Point Piper, Brian White, \$13.2m.
28. *St Neots*, Vaucluse, Dr Stephen Larkin, \$13m.
29. Point Piper, Frank & Shirley Lowy, \$12m.
30. *The Haven*, Hunters Hill, John Beresford, \$11m.

Eight of the houses in this list are in Point Piper which with a median house price of \$12 million, is the most expensive suburb in the country.

Houses in the area appreciate by about \$1 million per year (Bell, 2004: 12). Point Piper, Elizabeth Bay, Darling Point, Rose Bay and Vaucluse, are all adjacent harbourside suburbs in Sydney. Their exclusivity dates to colonial occupation. For a time, Lindesay, built as the residence of the Colonial Treasurer, Campbell Drummond Riddell, was the only house on Darling Point. In 1828, the New South Wales Governor, Sir Ralph Darling, approved the subdivision of Woolloomooloo Hill about a mile from Sydney Town overlooking the harbour, into fifteen 8–10 acre blocks. These became the property of the ‘Exclusives’: a group of rich officials and businessmen. ‘Soon the pleasant slopes overlooking Double Bay were sprinkled with Gothic cottages and Italianate villas’ and, within 50 years, there were 30 grand homes, mostly belonging to important businessmen and politicians.

Swifts, the largest remaining privately-owned Darling Point estate, was conceived in 1874 by the Eton-educated Robert Lucas-Tooth, heir of the powerful Tooth brewing family. The property became the official residence of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, including the consecutive cardinals, Gilroy, Freeman and Clancy. Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II, stayed there when they were cardinals. In 1996, Mr. Spies, a reclusive property investor who enjoyed a Howard Hughes-like reputation, paid \$9 million for it (Chancellor, 1996a: 1).

On Holiday

Fashions change, but in the late 20th and early years of the 21st century the rich liked to holiday in the following places:

- St Tropez, France
- Gstaad and St Moritz, Switzerland
- Aspen and Vail, Colorado
- The Cote d’Azur, France

- The Hamptons, New York
- Lyford Cay, Bahamas
- St Barths, Caribbean
- Marbella, Spain
- Acapulco, Mexico
- Geneva, Switzerland
- Palm Beach, USA
- Mayfair, London
- Beverly Hills, Los Angeles
- Montego Bay, Jamaica
- Bermuda, Barbados, Antigua

(Davis, 1982: 130–131; Fairweather and Southall, 2004: 271–280; Koche and Tohme, 2002).

In recent years, three places in Australia have also become acceptable as holiday destinations for the very rich. *Sydney Morning Herald's* Property Editor, Johnathan Chancellor (1997c: 136), says that Palm Beach in Sydney, along with Portsea, south of Melbourne, is now like 'ultra chic' East Hampton in the USA in that it is 'so trendy [...] that scores [...] fly in from Europe and the US, many with their chefs and nannies in tow'.

The area attracted its first home-buyer in 1914 and by the 1920s wealthy graziers from the Hunter Valley and central west were bringing their families to holiday by the sea. According to David Edwards, a real estate agent with L. J. Hooker at Palm Beach, 70 per cent of the properties on the Palm Beach peninsula are still weekenders and there will 'never be any more' than 1,267 titles worth having (Russell, 1996: 4). In 1997, Lady Sonia McMahon paid \$975,000 for her Palm Beach weekender because Lady Burton-Taylor had decided to downsize and move just around the corner. A proximate weekend home sold for \$2.4 million, well under the 1996 peak of \$3.74 million. By 2004, the median price was \$2.4 million, but the most desirable properties don't usually come onto the market, but are passed down through the family. (Chancellor, 1997e: 139; 2003b: 80; Blok, 1997: 8; Bourlioufas, 1998: 9; Bishop, 2003: 5; Sloley, 2004: 395).

Sam Chisholm bought the beachfront bungalow, Melaleuka, in Ocean Rd next to his ex-boss Kerry Packer's salmon-coloured weekend-er to go with his estate Bundarbo close to Canberra which is near the home of his ex-boss, Rupert Murdoch. He paid \$3.1 million for the property and demolished the house. A vacant block tucked between the Packers and the Chisholms sold for \$6.3 million in 2002 to developers Bob and Margaret Rose. The Forysth family, the owners of Dymocks are there. Trent Nathan is a neighbour, his place is not far from the Fairfax's large Tudor-style house, Boanbong which was just along the street from the Hordern family's Kalua in Ocean Rd. Prime Ministers visited, among them Bob Menzies, a friend of several Palm Beach habitués who included the Whites, the Moses, the Fairfaxes and the Packers (Tyn-dall, 2003a: 4; Martin, 2003a: 70; Bishop, 2003: 5; Chancellor, 1997e: 1; Fairfax, 1991: 15).

Kalua is owned by businessman Ian Joye who also owns a 5,500 square metre mansion in Bellevue Hill. Joye rents it out, along with round-the-clock security, for \$33,500 per week, the average annual wage in Australia in 2002. Nicole Kidman, one of the richest women in Australia, and Mick Jagger have rented the property. Rupert Murdoch and his wife Wendi Deng have stayed there; as have son Lachlan Murdoch and his wife Sarah O'Hare. Rupert Murdoch told his friends that he was 'hugely impressed with the house and Palm Beach's holiday environment'. Not so happy, however, was style master Tyler Brule founder and creative director of chic interiors magazine *Wallpaper*. Brule happily spent the summers of 1998 and 1999 in Palm Beach, but in the Christmas holidays in 2002, Brule and his mother moved out of their \$15,000 a week 'Dr No style beach house' because the furniture was not up to scratch (Sloley, 2004: 395; Browne, 2003a: 56; Martin, 2003a: 70; Calvert, 2003: 10; Williamson, 2002: 3).

Lady Renouf holidayed in Palm Beach along with television presenter, Jana Wendt. Opera singer, Dame Joan Sutherland, merchant banker, partner to former NSW Premier Neville Wran and son of former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, Nick Whitlam, Rachel Griffiths and her partner Andrew Taylor, actor Bryan Brown and Rachel Ward, own

places there. Billy Connelly, Pamela Stephenson, Cate Blanchett and Julian McMahon have visited (Bishop, 2003: 5; Chancellor, 1996b: 1).

Renouf sold her oceanfront pink palace, Villa Balena, to advertising executive Greg Daniel, who gave it as a surprise Christmas present to his wife Louise, a summer visitor to Palm Beach since childhood. The Pink Palace as it is known, looks like a Tuscan Villa with *trompe l'œil* walls and olive tree bordered paths. Union-buster Chris Corrigan of Patrick Corp paid \$4.1 million to enjoy the neighborhood, not far from UBS Warburg's Mark Chiba who bought a place for \$6.1 million in Florida Rd about the same time as Deutsche Bank's Ken Border paid \$3 million for his in the same street (Sloley, 2004: 388; Harley, 2003: 18; Chancellor, 1996b: 1).

All this is just 40km from the centre of Sydney. While 'modern and adventurous architecture' is prevalent, nearly all of Australia's most famous architects have designed something at Palm Beach and/or Port-sea: Peter Muller, Jim Keepman, Harry Seidler, Alex Popov, Stan Symonds, Philip Cox, Ken Woolley, Susan Rothwell, Wally Barda, Andre Porebski, Guilford-Bell, David McGlashan, Wayne Gillespie, Espie Dods, Nicholas Day and Robbie Robertson. Peter Muller was given 'an open cheque book' by Arnold Richardson in 1955 to plan Kumale in the style of Frank Lloyd Wright. The rising and falling of the tides were taken into account in the design, for Richardson wished to commute from Palm Beach by seaplane. Floor to ceiling glass panels framed in bronze can disappear into cylindrical columns built of specially made curved bricks, opening the house up as a series of four sun-drenched terraces. The swimming pool becomes part of the living area, extending inside under a glass-covered walkway. Underneath it is a circular sitting room lit largely by glass prisms in the pool's floor. The final price is not known, but the cost of the doors and windows alone would have built 30 ordinary houses (Chancellor, 1997c: 138; Lawson, 1997: 3; Hock, 1999: 59, 60, 63, 64).

Sam Gazal welcomed in 1997 at the Beach Road restaurant with eighty guests. The year before, his New Year soiree was the best in Palm Beach thanks to 'copious quantities of French fizz' and his 'offspring

and their gorgeous friends'. The guests included multi-millionaire grocery and liquor wholesaler John David, Country Natwest's Ken Allen, Baillieu's Neville Miles and BZW's Simon Mordant. The previous year, Kerry Packer had lost a bet to give up smoking, handing over a new BMW to socialite Di Jagelman and Robert Whyte who had interests in property development with Packer and John Singleton and had plans for more gambling following Packer's return from the casinos of Los Angeles to 'balmy Palmy'. When Packer asked Gazal how much he needed to live on each year, Gazal replied that he could get by on \$200,000. 'I'm the same. I'm a simple bloke', said Packer. His son James fell over laughing, 'Try \$105 million, like last year', he said (Porter, 1996: 33; Mychasuk, 1996a: 27; 1997a: 27; *Business Review Weekly*, 1999: 82; Koch, 1999a: 62).

In Portsea, a seaside town two hours south of Melbourne in the Mornington Peninsula National Park, prices mirror those of Palm Beach. In 1995, Ilyuka sold for \$5.15 million with prices ranging from \$50,000 for a Victorian boatshed to \$6.25 million for Mileura overlooking Port Phillip Bay. The Baillieus, the Laycocks, the Hortico Blazey family, the Andersons, Sir Robert and Lady Southey and the Keils, among other very wealthy families, have holiday homes there. In 2003, the Ballieus' nine-bedroom holiday mansion was expected to sell for around \$7 million. In the 1920s, the Armytages, one of Melbourne's best-known society families, built 'the castle on the hill', a replica of an ancestral Irish castle set in a five hectare formal garden with tennis courts and a croquet lawn. The furniture is by Dattner and the pictures on the walls are originals from the voyage of the *Astrolabe* (Tyndall, 2003b: 12; Chancellor, 1997c: 139; Slamet, 1998: 33, 194).

In Australia's north, Queensland's Noosa is the trendiest and brightest holiday destination. Green policies have paid off handsomely here. According to Kevin Seymour, who has built apartment towers in Brisbane, 'developers over the years have been critical of Noosa Council with its green policy, but it is now a fact that the policy has been proved right'. Said Noosa councillor, Noel Playford, developers have 'made more money because of the limits put on development'. The population of

the Shire of Noosa is capped at 56,000, and is currently about 40,000. Much of the value of the properties is 'in the surroundings', which include the 477 hectare Noosa National Park and 'no one will be allowed to put up a high-rise next door to block out their views'. Prices have doubled every five years since 1978 (Tyndall, 2003b: 12; Massey, 1999: 209; Mercer, 1998: 26).

Noosa's 'lively cafe and restaurant scene, fabulous shopping, stunning beach and sub-tropical climate' make it a 'hedonists' dream' (Mercer, 1998: 25). The temperature has an average winter maximum of 22 degrees and an average summer maximum of 29. The restaurants combine alfresco dining and gourmet food, while boutiques are selling clothes that 'would not look out of place at the Melbourne Cup'. Tourists are welcome if 'they bring their money and their manners and know their couscous from their carpaccio' (Mercer, 1998: 25; Tabakoff, 1996a: 5s).

BHP's managing director paid \$1.65 million for an uncompleted house with commanding views of Main Beach and then spent hundreds of thousands completing it. According to realtor, Laurie Prentice:

You had John Prescott buy No 6 Park Road. Well, all the top CEOs around Australia thought, 'Well, Prescott's got a house up there. Maybe we should, too.' I think that happens. That's what makes some suburbs more exclusive than others (Tabakoff, 1996b: 5s).

In 1996, the talk of Noosa was Cintamani, the just-completed home of the Austrian-born tennis player Thomas Muster who paid \$990,000 for the land and spent about \$2 million on the house. Brinbara, a house on Sunshine Beach where Evonne Goolagong, Australia's twice Wimbledon champion lives, sold for just under \$3 million. A few weeks before another had sold for \$2.85 million to a Melbourne businessman. Playwright David Williamson and Test cricketer Shane Warne have bought in there as well. A number of apartments on the beachfront have sold for more than \$2 million and a home in Little Cove broke the \$4 million barrier in 1999. But this pales compared to the US\$45 million paid for a 1670 square-metre Hamptons retreat on Long Island in 2005 (Tabakoff, 1996a: 5s; Massey, 1999: 209; *Sun-Herald*, 2/1/05).

Other faces familiar to Noosa are Lady Sonia McMahon, Jerry Hall, and Tom Cruise before his break-up with Nicole Kidman. Television presenter Jana Wendt is frequently seen around, as are Kylie Minogue, Jason Donovan, Elton John's mum, Mel Gibson (staying at his brother's place), Madonna, Elle's sister Mimi Macpherson, and former rock star and Member of Parliament, Peter Garrett. Sean Connery has a house on the coast which he's 'keeping a secret'. And it was at discrete Noosa that Packer associate the now jailed Brad Cooper passed HIH Insurance group's finance manager, Bill Howard, an envelope of cash as part of a \$124,000 cash payoff while he holidayed there with his family (McDonald, 2004: 2; Tabakoff, 1996b: 5s; Safe, 1999: 10).

Rich Bodies

Rich men are just as unapologetic, deliberate and competitive in the use of their bodies in the occupation of personal space. A group photograph of a board of directors:

demonstrates better than anything [Conrad] Black's Agnelli-like seizure of the advantage and reluctance to lose it. The directors are formed up in two ranks, in the manner of a school photograph, the more senior pupils afforded the privilege of sitting down on chairs in the front row, while the lower boys stand behind them [...] Conrad Black, as headmaster and chairman of the school governors, sits majestically in the center of the front row in a black leather armchair – the only chair with arms – splaying his hands wide on the squashy, padded armrests, looking powerfully fulfilled and substantial as he occupies more than twice the space of both the Lords Hartwell and Camrose behind him (Coleridge, 1994: 335–336).

There is a clear correlation globally between national wealth and body size. Nearly 40 per cent of the inhabitants of the richest country on the planet are obese and, on present trends, three-quarters of Americans will

be obese by 2050. But this is not the case within populations. The picture of the archetypal capitalist man as fat and cigar-smoking is now archaic. 'Look at Lachlan Murdoch and James Packer and compare them to businessmen a generation ago' said Peter Morrissey, one of only four designers to have their own men's wear show at Fashion Week in 1998. 'They look after their bodies, they're very healthy, they exercise, eat well and work extremely hard. And they dress well' (Owens, 1998: 47; Steyn, 1998: 8s).

Rich people by and large enjoy reduced stress, greater social support, and a distinct sense of personal control. Rich people have longer, healthier lives than the rest of us and the more money they have, on average, the better their health. They tend to use the same private health services and practitioners. Rupert Murdoch's and Frank Lowy's back problems were fixed by Duy Long Nguyen and they jointly wrote the foreword to his life story, *The Dragon's Journey* (2004). The wealthy suburbs of eastern and northern Sydney record the lowest incidence of obese and overweight men and the lowest death rates in the New South Wales, and close to 70 per cent of their men are physically fit. And although cigar-smoking corporate raider Robert Holmes a Court smoked 30 or 40 Henry Winterman long panatellas a day, the wealthy suburbs contain the lowest proportion of smokers (Lamont and Clennell, 1998: 6; Edgar, 1999: 20; Jillett, 2003: 10).

Rich people live longer, and in better health (Scott and Leonhardt 2005). The 1990 Longitudinal Study in the United Kingdom found a 'continuous gradient' of decreasing mortality from the most deprived areas to the most affluent (Conniff, 2003: 45). These men are

so sure of themselves, and so used to controlling every aspect of their lives, that they tend to take good health very much for granted [...] The possibility that all this may be cut short seldom occurs to them or, if it does, they brush it aside. 'I don't have ulcers, I give them,' said movie mogul Harry Cohn (Davis, 1982: 168).

But once they or those close to them have confronted death, and survived, they are at pains to make sure that round-the-clock medical support is close by, and that the most up-to-date surgical procedures are

available. Should their superior health be impaired, they know that they can have the very best health care. John D. Rockefeller, for instance, funded one of the world's great medical research facilities, Rockefeller University. He also reserved four private rooms in the first sixty-bed hospital exclusively for his family (Conniff, 2003: 47).

Sam Chisholm has had a double lung transplant, and Kerry Packer, with one cancerous kidney already removed in the 1980s, was provided with a new one by one of his personal pilots and friend, Nicholas Ross, when his other one went bad in November 2000. Ross, a sixty-year-old veteran of the Royal Navy, had worked for Packer and been his close friend for almost twenty years. Packer referred to Ross as 'Biggles' and despite the two-year age difference, the pilot liked to address him as 'father'. Kidney donors themselves risk a one-in-five-hundred chance of kidney failure. It was 'an extraordinary act of kindness and generosity,' said Packer's son James. Three years later Ross received a \$3.3 million property as a gift. (Conniff, 2003: 138–139; Lacy, 2003a: 27; Reuters, 2003; Barry, 2002: 274; Chancellor, 2003c: 74; 2003d: 3).

Having just survived a massive heart-attack in 1990 and with constant severe heart troubles subsequently, Kerry Packer kept a small medical team always at hand. Such was Packer's power, that 'an ambulance has only to turn down [his] street for a siren to go off at the stock-market' (Macken, 2003: 20). Indeed, following a heart operation in 2003, shares in his company, PBL, which owns Australia's biggest television broadcaster, a magazine empire and Melbourne's casino, dropped 2 percent in a flat market (Reuters, 2003). Corporeal vigour, or the appearance of it, is important for corporate health. When, to the undisguised glee of many trade unionists in Australia and overseas, Chris Corrigan fell ten metres down a cliff while gardening at his \$4 million Palm Beach week-ender, his company described what his friends considered a near-fatal incident as a 'gardening accident', and stressed that he 'did not miss any time at work', in case the news undermined Patrick Corporation's share price (McIlveen, 2003: 1).

Sometimes being alive and in certain company is enough. Telecommunications business man Richard Li does not get on with his father,

billionaire Li Ka-shing, Hong Kong's most successful tycoon, even though Li's father ventured \$125 million to start his son's first company, Star TV, which he soon sold to Rupert Murdoch for \$950 million. When his Internet company, Pacific Century Cyberworks, was going under, Li was able to organize lunch with his father in the dining room of the Shangri-La Hotel. According to *Fortune* magazine, Pacific Century opened on the stock market that day at 5.375 and closed at 5.6875. The fact that the two of them had been seen lunching together was worth about US\$671 million (Conniff, 2003: 267).

However, according to Davis (1982: 169), some of the very rich are 'childish' about their health.

The idle rich are often dreadful hypochondriacs – they have so much time on their hands that they tend to be obsessively concerned with self. Every minor ailment – even a common cold – is treated as a disaster which requires maximum attention from everyone around.

One of the best known hypochondriacs, Paul Getty, said that the biggest liability of being rich was that 'One feels one is a target'. One of architect Espie Dods' attractions is that 'he makes his houses look secure'. Kerry Packer's Bellevue estate has 'the best security in town' and 24 hour medical staff. Homes can be protected by security systems which may include jemmy-proof, pick-resistant locks, bullet-resistant glass, armour-plated doors, internal movement detectors, high-intensity floodlights, alarms, video and back-to-base security, a security entrance, remote control gates and a 'safe room' with emergency lights, a metal reinforced door, food, medical and perhaps even oxygen supplies, and of course, gated communities with private and highly armed police (Koch, 2002: 146; Davis, 1982: 176, 177; Parsons, 1997: 12; Rowlands, 1998: 12; Lawson, 1997: 3).

As well as ensuring the safety of their persons, the rich can ensure the health of their bodies by taking advantage of personal or private and exclusive gyms, but those who lack the motivation to exercise on their own or who dislike gymnasia, can hire a personal trainer, at a cost of \$80,000 to \$400,000 a year, so that health and fitness become another

‘appointment’ in their working day. Rupert Murdoch’s personal trainer has easier access to him than his wife and children or world leaders, and accompanies him on his travels. Peter Holmes a Court and film star Russell Crowe share the same personal trainer, former Rugby League international Mark Carroll. Travis Bell, a former champion swimmer and ironman, offers a complete service involving health, fitness and nutritional advice and has more than 30 clients. Also available for hire are boxer Jeff Fenech, footballer Todd Viney, runner Darren Clark, hep-
tathlete Jane Flemming and kayaker Shelley Oates (Lawson, 2005: 79; Hooton, 2004: 120; Macken, 2003: 20; Murphy, 1996: 94, 95–96).

According to Joanie Bronfman (1987: 349), being overweight is ridiculed by the rich as a sign of lack of self-discipline and control. ‘Working-class people are fat and people who are dumb are fat and people who don’t have will power are fat’, she was told. James Packer’s loss of 25 kilograms in three months is attributed to his girlfriend Erica Baxter, a daily workout with a personal trainer and the guidance of weight-loss company SureSlim (Hornery with Dasey, 2003: 20).

For those who want to be in shape without stress, at Les Thermes Marins which has connecting corridors to Monaco’s most famous hotels, The Hermitage and Hotel de Paris, Dr Yves Treguer flushes out the toxins, tightens the stomachs and aids the circulation of the rich who can be restored without forgoing comfort, exquisite food and beautiful surroundings. At the Chedi in Bali, the Mandara Spa, surrounded by tranquil gardens and lotus ponds, has two private pavilions, in each of which two therapists provide treatment which combines shiatsu, Hawaiian Lomi Lomi, Thai and traditional Balinese massage techniques. At the Legian Hotel is the Suite Indulgence, which contains a spa, a sunken bath filled with lavender essence and fresh petals, massage tables set up on the palatial balcony overlooking the waves breaking on the beach; and as ‘the sky turns from pink to purple, we are tantalized by a candle-lit dinner, created by chef Zainal Hussan’ (Barwell, 1998: 246; Meppem, 1998: 252, 254).

If this is too far away, there are other options. Mike Canizales, a former Microsoft executive who came to Australia to establish Chan-

nel 9's Internet network, has opened a 'day spa', Spa Chakra, in Potts Point and the 30 per cent of his clients who are men enjoy a massage, a body polish, facials, acupuncture, manicure and pedicure. Canizales explains that:

When you're putting in a 60 hour week, you don't think too much about spending \$100 on your health and well-being. It's different if you work 40 hours a week, when body maintenance becomes a luxury. If you work 60, it's a necessity. Valet parking takes the stress out of arrival and overworked executives can have a whole day of pampering – the 'Apollo package' (Owens, 1998: 47).

If all this is too slow and too inefficient, a million Americans a year were using cosmetic surgery in the early 1980s. At least one in ten was a man, although many surgeons say that they make up between 15–30 per cent of their patients and that the ratio is rising (Davis, 1982: 170).

Rich men wear suits, of course, for flamboyant clothes are regarded as evidence that their wearer cannot be taken seriously. The suit has hardly changed in 200 years. 'It's man's protection and camouflage,' according to English fashion historian Colin McDowell. It 'allows him to bond with other men' and to 'attack other men [who] turn into denizens of the jungle'. The rich are not generally fashion leaders and tend to dress conservatively in public while keeping up with trends, for men's suits date through the changing widths of lapels, width of trouser and turn-up (Davis, 1982: 150; Cosic, 1998: 5; James, 1992: 186). 'For one of the troops, any old shopping-mall suit will do. But if you are a leader of business or government, you need superior quality' runs an advertisement in the *Melbourne Age* (14/11/1996) entitled 'How can you tell a \$1,500 suit?'

The most expensive British and US tailors made Jack Kennedy's suits. He wore three every day. Prince Edward, described by fashion experts as 'the young fogey of the Royal Family', has most of his suits made by Hawes and Curtis Ltd., who also make clothes for Prince Charles and Prince Andrew. Their tailors make evening jackets and 'dresswear' as well and will have Turnbull and Asser shirts made to co-ordinate with the suits. Some of Edward's shoes are made by John Lobb Ltd. of

St. James – who makes the Duke of Edinburgh's. 'One of the reasons I am going so well,' he told Lobb when he congratulated the Duke on his fiftieth birthday, 'is that I have always been so well shod'. The Duke's socks sport an old pattern called the 'Tenova'; a pattern also worn by Prince Charles and the managing director of Austin Reed, whose subsidiary, Stephens Brothers, makes them along with Prince Philip's shirts (Andersen, 1996: 265; James, 1992: 186; Heald, 1991: 240).

Then there is the 'smell of money'. In his novel *Turn of the Century*, the rather wealthy Kurt Andersen described a media magnate as smelling of 'the daily haircut plus fresh flowers plus cashmere plus BMW leather plus the executive-jet oxygen mix plus a dash of citrus: That is, [he] smells luscious. He smells rich.' (Conniff, 2003: 131). And there is no doubt that the 'lower orders' smell different. Staff of the Royal family were advised to 'avoid garlic and strong spices for fear of offending the delicate noses of visiting VIPs and other royals' (Berry, 1995: 97). Men spend about \$80 million on fragrance each year and the men of France, the USA, Britain and Australia are the four-largest per capita consumers. The Duke's aftershave is from the company first started by William Henry Penhaligon, barber to the court of Queen Victoria. His Admiral's uniform is made by Gieves & Hawkes, the tailors to Lord Nelson who are preferred by the officers of Her Majesty's armed forces. His suits come from John Kent. He appears, according to his biographer, in 'the kit of an English gentleman' (Heald, 1991: 240; Owens, 1998: 47). Apparently, this is a good thing to do. Mistakes are possible to the uneducated – media magnate Lord Rothermere 'looked like an English duke setting off for Sunday church, except that the salt and pepper silk tie was a shade too prosperous for the English countryside. It was the classic tycoon tie' (Coleridge, 1994: 273).

Conveying the Body

Quite naturally, such holy and beautifully presented bodies need attractive framing and appropriate conveyance. By the 1920s, the Rolls Royce had established itself as ‘the classic tycoon’ car, although, as the table below indicates, there are several challengers. The super-rich ordered Rollers with some of the features of the private railway carriage of the time, such as the opulent motorized drawing room built in 1927 with upholstery by Aubusson and a ceiling painted with rococo cupids (Davis, 1982: 142).

Exclusivity is the hallmark of the cars of the rich, with the Australian market being allocated only 300 of the Mercedes Benz SLK in 1997 (\$98,500), when 600 were ordered and 1,000 could have been sold. All nine Ferrari 550s (\$451,897) allocated to Australia and New Zealand in 1997 were sold by the time of the vehicle’s launch (McKay, 1997: 3; McDonald, 1997: 17; Kable, 1997: 1–2; 1998: Motoring 1). Between 1914 and 1997, fewer than 14,000 Aston Martins were built, mostly to order for an exclusive clientele including Prince Charles (Corne, 1998: 3) and in 2004, Porsche in Australia expected to sell 800 of its Cayenne (below) (Ross, 2003: 184).

Luxury Car Prices, 2003

Porsche 4WD Cayenne Turbo	\$225,000
BMW 760Li	\$332,400
Aston Martin DB7	\$351,500
Ferrari Maranello	\$577,000
Bentley Continental	\$765,000

Source: Ross, 2003: 184.

The median house price in Sydney in 2003 was \$470,000 (Casella, 2003: 11).

The Mercedes Benz Cabriolet CLK designed by Giorgio Armani – ‘It had to be the ultimate in luxury’, he said – costs less than the Rolls

Royce Phantom, which sells for \$1 million. The Mercedes Benz Maybach costs the same, and Mercedes has calculated that there were enough customers with incomes of \$30 million per year or with wealth of at least \$40 million, to make it profitable to build 1000 each year. One potential buyer in Australia 'sniffed that \$40 million amounted to his private art collection'. The 2.7 tonne Maybach Exelero can travel at 350 kilometres per hour. Maybach buyers most of all want exclusivity, and no two cars will be the same for there are two million options for the buyer to consider on the car, including individualised champagne flutes and a system that holds them and the champagne bottle in place at speed. The rear seats can recline to almost horizontal in the 6.2 metre car without touching the back of the chauffeur's seat. An armoured version is available. Kerry Packer was said to be a likely customer (Ross, 2003: 184; Bitz, 2003: 4; Hanscombe and Ashby, 2003: 214; Dowling, 2002: 6).

Cars, perhaps even more than yachts and aeroplanes, are about luxury, ostentation, power, success and vigour. 'Success is a long, hard road. Enjoy the drive [...] You've earned it, now enjoy it,' urged an advertisement in 1996. When driving the Alfa Romeo Spider:

you're aware that not only is everyone looking at you (surely the compelling purchase reason for some), but that you are scarcely aware of the effort of driving. There's no 'effort' [...] instead, there is [the] engine purring like a fuel injected pussy cat [...]; seamless gear changes; graceful gliding between lanes and a succession of sexless six cylinder sedans striving to rectify the indignity of your strolling past them (Pottinger, 1998: 45).

When out at his property near Scone, Kerry Packer drove a Hummer, a very large, very serious, all-weather, all-country, four-wheel drive military vehicle as seen on the TV news during the USA's Desert Storm, and as driven by Arnold Schwarzenegger. According to local accounts, Packer bought it after a regular four-wheel-drive vehicle 'showed an unforgivable weakness by stalling in a creek with the owner at the wheel' (McKay, 1996: 53).

The use of very large private cars on ordinary public roads, however, is not without its problems. After their wedding reception, Jack and

Jackie Kennedy headed off to the airport whence their private plane was to fly them to New York. Hardly were they out of the driveway and into Ocean Drive when they were 'stuck in a colossal traffic jam caused by several hundred out-of-town chauffeurs drunk on French champagne' (Andersen, 1996: 12). Kerry Packer provided limousines for all of the 750 guests at his son James's wedding, causing 'traffic chaos' in the exclusive suburb of Bellevue Hill. Several stretch limousines couldn't turn the corners in the street leading to the Packer compound. The traffic soon backed up four kilometres causing the police to intervene (Milo-hanic and Blake, 1999: 4; Koch, 1999: 1; Koch and Reines, 1999: 2).

While size and exclusivity are important issues in regard to transport, so is choice. Lachlan Murdoch must choose whether to drive his \$25,000 Bimota motor bike, his Harley-Davidson, his \$34,000 Ducati 916 SP, or his silver BMW sedan. The Royal Family have twenty cars available to them, all specially fitted with bullet-proof glass, but oil magnate Pat Burke maintained 27 motorcycles and 29 cars at his Espie Dods' designed house on Sydney's Upper North Shore, rather fewer than Rene Rivkin's 69 (Shand, 2003a: 6; Lang, 1997: 102; James, 1992: 20, 184; Chancellor, 1998a: 1).

Choice between transport modes, and the regular use of two or more sequentially to achieve a single destination, is a normal feature of the life of the wealthy. Rupert Murdoch flew into the Hamptons, an exclusive and expensive beach resort on Long Island, New York to pick up one businessman with whom he flew to an estate in Pennsylvania to discuss a deal over lunch with another. They finalised the details at Sunnylands, a 273 acre property in Palm Springs, California (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 203).

From Toronto to Montreal for dinner and back home by eleven p. m. is not difficult for Conrad Black with a jet to connect two limousines. When Valentino travels by private jet, he needs three buses to deliver him to and to meet him at the airport; one for himself, friends and staff, one for his luggage and one for his six dogs, Margot, Maude, Milton, Molly and Monty. Kerry Packer flew internationally and back in a day for a meeting with Rupert Murdoch, who travels overseas most weeks.

His chartered jet landed at Northland Airport whence he was helicoptered directly to *Morning Glory*, Murdoch's \$30 million Italian-designed luxury ketch anchored in New Zealand's Bay of Islands. Son James crossed the Tasman and returned by private jet, a Falcon 200. He flew to New Plymouth and thence travelled by helicopter to visit his friend Tom Cruise on set in New Zealand (Tyrnauer, 2004: 242; O'Rourke, 2003; *New Zealand Herald*, 2003; Siklos, 1995: 312; Coleridge, 1994: 479; Davies and Kidman, 1997: 23).

Jodee Rich could fly his \$10 million Cessna Citation seven-seater jet from Sydney to an airport in the Whitsundays and then travel by his \$2 million six-seater Eurocopter Squirrel helicopter to his \$4 million property. There he could play with his several motorbikes and AWD buggies and his off-shore racing boat *Plus One* driven by three MerCruiser V8s which Jodee had installed to make it go faster. A journalist took it for a spin to test it for a boating magazine. 'On more than one occasion the boat was totally clear of the water, soaring across the valleys between the crests, before cleaving back amidst a welter of spray and foam'. He also had a Riviera 4000 worth about \$450,000, more than \$10,000 per foot. It was similar to *Plus One* but came equipped with a double bed, cocktail cabinet, leather trim and teak decks. The sales literature explained why it was important for a man like Jodee to own it.

Achievement has always been your goal. Now, with the Riviera 4000 you truly have a performance cruiser that reflects your need to outperform those who choose to compete with you at work and at play [...] The Riviera 4000 offers your whole family the opportunity to share the privilege of achievement and the respect of your friends and associates.

He also had a 9 metre Scarb Thunder worth \$200,000 (Barry, 2002: 145–146, 322).

Tim Heald (1991: 153) wrote of a 'brief visit' to Glasgow, Edinburgh and Coventry with the Duke of Edinburgh using train, helicopter and Rolls-Royce 'which creamed through London to Euston at break-neck speed with traffic parting before us like the Red Sea before the Israelites'.

Prince Charles used the Royal Train more often than other members of the Royal Family. He 'enjoyed the isolation,' he said, and the train ensured that he could reach 'faraway destinations on time'. It gave him 'precious hours' in which to

read documents, write letters and prepare speeches before retiring for the night to the accompaniment of Mozart, while he was trundled gently to the following day's official function (Dimpleby, 1994: 510).

These days the Royal Train no longer exists as such, replaced instead by special carriages containing sleeping cabins 'enormous by usual railway standards'; a bathroom; a saloon with a two-seat sofa with its back to the engine and one armchair opposite raised on the Duke's instructions so that the occupant can see out the window better; and telephones with 28 lines (James, 1992: 184; Heald, 1991: 154, 159).

Tim Heald, who travelled with Prince Philip on the train, comments,

Incidentally someone has made the point that there is no such thing as the 'Royal Train', just royal railway coaches. Fair enough. The only thing I could see in this train which marked it out as the Duke's was an enlarged copy of his senior citizen's rail pass in a frame by the door (Heald, 1991: 154).

Heald recorded his impressions at some length.

Inside [the Duke] held the door [of the salon] open for me and asked, genially, 'Like a drink?' There was a bottle of Famous Grouse and another of Malvern water on a side table. I said yes please and he poured me a stiff one, with water, another for himself and a beer for the Brig. Then we sat down. The Brigadier was in the armchair facing the engine, the Duke by the window, me on his left. On the low table in front of us a plate of miniature sausage rolls and sandwiches and nuts. 'Have something to eat,' said the Duke. 'Keep the wolf from the door,' and seconds later we pulled out of Euston with me sipping nervously at my Scotch [...]

And so to bed. The steward came in and asked about breakfast orders. The Duke went for haddock. 'Kippers,' I said. 'Kippers would be great.' 'Kippers!' said the Duke, with his look, quizzical, amused, insisting that you explain yourself properly.

'Oh, all right, kipper. A kipper would be wonderful.' We laughed. Next morning my kipper, beautifully filleted, was served with a style I don't normally associate with British Rail. 'Have some cream with them,' said the Duke. 'Cream?' 'They can be terribly dry otherwise,' he said, and so I poured a trickle of cream over them. They were extremely good. Next night I said I'd like the Dover sole. My father, who had traveled on the Royal Train some twenty-five years before, had been surprised to see the Duke having sole for breakfast. I ordered the sole for him. An absurd act of remembrance. 'Have some scrambled egg with them,' said the Duke. 'Scrambled egg with sole! You're joking.' 'Not at all. It's very good.' 'Are you sure?' 'Yes.' 'Well if you say so.' And so I breakfasted off Dover sole with scrambled egg. Unorthodox, but very good. Worth a try (Heald, 1991: 153, 154).

Meanwhile the Duke perused 'all the [morning] newspapers', the tabloids first, which had somehow found their way on board as 'we slid in between the grubby commuter trains with their passengers' heads suddenly jerking up in surprise' (Heald, 1991: 154, 155).

The 14-seat Challenger jet [Giancarlo Giammetti] will take to Paris idles on the tarmac. Giammetti is a nervous flyer, so standing around airports is disagreeable for him. Along with a chef, a major-domo, a valet, two butlers, and a maid, he is waiting for one of Italy's most famous men: Valentino Garavani [...] After takeoff Maude [a dog] is released by a butler. She runs forward and jumps up on Valentino's lap, but before she can settle in, another staff member appears with a light-blue linen cloth, which he unfurls and places under the dog to minimize the effects of shedding (Tyrnauer, 2004: 242).

A private plane is the 'real equivalent of the golden coach or the private railroad car, though some people will tell you that a yacht is even better' (Davis, 1982: 143). The men in this book, of course, usually have both, and sometimes more than one of each. Rupert Murdoch has a Gulfstream IV-SP jet – mentioned in the seven-page December 1996 fea-

ture on jet-set etiquette in *Vanity Fair*. Named 'Sun King One', New York's ex-mayor Rudi Giuliani travelled in it to Cavan. Conrad Black, too, has a Gulfstream, equipped with silver cutlery. Facing charges for fraudulence in 2005, he wrote to a colleague 'There has not been an occasion for many months when I got on our plane without wondering whether it was really affordable. But I am not prepared to re-enact the French Revolutionary renunciation of the rights of the nobility' (Hoyle, 2005: 37; Chancellor, 1996c: 45; Lacy, 2003b: 27). Frank's son, David Lowy, the chief executive of the Westfield Shopping Centre group and Australian aerobatics champion in 1998, likes to fly an A-37 Cessna Dragon Fly. Used by US troops in the Vietnam War, it's the only one of its kind and can accelerate from zero to 200 kilometres per hour in four or five seconds. He claims it's 'the ultimate toy' (Mychasuk, 1996b: 23; *Illawarra Mercury*, 6/6/05). Joe Kennedy bought a ten passenger DC-3 for his son Jack, prior to his presidency. Called Caroline, 'it was luxuriously appointed with sofas, reclining chairs, a curtained-off sleeping area, a dining area [...] a galley' and a flight attendant, Janet Des Rosiers, 'whose other responsibilities included massaging Jack's neck and combing his hair' (Andersen, 1996: 202, 222). Its contemporary equivalent, the Boeing Business Jet 737, which costs \$64 million unfurnished and \$74 million furnished, has an 800 square foot cabin with room for a lounge, private suite, conference facilities, emergency medical facility, satellite communications centre and an exercise suite. It costs about \$9.6 million to run for 100 hours, and 28 have been sold since 1996. Kerry Packer enjoyed a commercial-sized 727. Henry Fok, the Hong Kong mogul, likes to travel in a private 747 with a second private 747 following behind with his staff. King Khalid of Saudi Arabia's 747 is equipped with a gyratory prayer room forever oriented toward Mecca. The upper deck has been converted into an intensive-care cardiac unit with state of the art medical equipment (Conniff, 2003: 130, 135; *Sunday Telegraph*, 2003; Chancellor with Lawson, 2000: 24).

Priced at the bottom from between US\$950,000 and US\$1.7 million, private helicopters are 'seldom seen' in Australia, according to the *Financial Review's* Mark Lawson. Dick Smith is thought to have a Huey

(Bell UH1) while Kerry Packer had a Bell and a S76 Sikorsky, valued at \$14 million. Seating 8–12, it is one of the few in private hands. The British Royals have the Queen's Flight available to them, comprising three Andovers and two Westland Wessex helicopters. 'When looking at the cabin of the Queen's Flight aircraft, there is the Duke's seat, dark blue, adjustable, and there right opposite is the Queen's identical one'. When the Royals are forced to travel by commercial jet, a section of the first class passenger compartment is reserved for them (M. Lawson, 2002; Heald, 1991: 232; James, 1992: 184, 185). The Kennedys, however, booked an entire airliner for a trip to Paris for Dr 'Feelgood' Jacobsen and his wife Nina so that the supply and administration of their 'magic elixir' (speed plus vitamins) would continue to be available while they were overseas and suspicion would not be aroused in the press. It was 'the strangest flight I ever made', said Jacobsen. 'We were the only passengers on the plane' (Andersen, 1996: 292, 293).

But even for those reduced to 'normal' first class travel, the difference is very substantial. At a cost of about \$30,000 for an around the world ticket, the seats are big with a lot of space between them. The footrest rises and the back reclines making the seat as 'flat and wide as a bed'. Breakfast on the Sydney to London flight one morning was 'slabs of salmon on chunks of warm bread', for an entree, followed by a fruit salad of pear-shaped green guava, mango, papaya and pineapple, followed by eggs and ham steak with whole tomato. The major meals have four or five courses and a choice of two entrees and three mains from menus designed by renowned Chef Neil Perry of Rockpool and Wokpool fame. 'Most memorable was the warm lobster [which] had sloughed its shell – even from its claws – nestled in a potato and cepe salad' (Ross, 2003: 184; Lenthen, 1998: 5T; McMurrick, 1996: 35).

In cars and houses, so in boats. Size does matter. Things have come a long way since Sir Frank Packer built Australia's first America's cup challenger, *Gretel*. Costing \$4 million and featuring hand-rubbed teak woodwork in a satin finish, five toilets, an onboard garbage container, refrigerator, freezer and cooled vegetable locker, Lachlan Murdoch's 80 foot yacht *Ipix Una* impressed the members of Sydney's Cruising

Yacht Club, conveniently located just down the hill from his home. It is almost double the size of the yacht he sailed in 1997 in the Sydney to Hobart yacht race. But it is nowhere near the size of the Sultan of Brunei's brother Jefri's 181-foot yacht *Tits* equipped with speedboats named *Nipple One* and *Nipple Two*. At 74 metres Frank Lowy's motor cruiser *Iлона IV* is four times longer than the average house. Named after the Westfield magnate's mother, the \$110 million yacht is the 32nd biggest in the world and contains 18 guest cabins, a massage room, a 14 seat cinema and a helipad with helicopter. Teak swimming decks hydraulically extend over the water, and the landing deck for the \$2.5 million five-seater Eurocopter Squirrel retracts below decks. It has 28 crew, including a helicopter pilot, housed in 13 cabins and costs about \$10 million a year to run, including berthing costs in Sydney of about \$7,000 a day (Conniff, 2003: 235; Hornery with Malkin, 2004: 20; Brown, 2003: 10; Mychasuk, 1997b: 27; Johnson, 2004a: 14; English, 2004).

Charles Curran, who has large holdings in and sits on the boards of QBE Insurance and Perpetual Trustees, owns the \$1 million-plus yacht *Sydney* which has acquitted itself well in the annual Sydney–Hobart yacht race. At 20 metres, *Sydney* is generally considered pretty large, but is five times smaller than Howard Hughes' motor yacht which accommodated a crew of thirty and was the world's seventh largest ocean-going vessel in private hands. He paid US\$850,000 for it in 1933 – about US\$15 million in 1990s currency – and hired the Irish captain Carl ('Jock') Flynn to sail it from Scotland across the Atlantic to Newport where it was

elaborately refitted, with sumptuous furnishings of white and gold, and solid gold taps and fixtures in the bathrooms [with] a master stateroom with a vast double bed covered in wolf skins in which the owner could enjoy the company of his various companions.

But Russian billionaire Roman Abramovich's 355-foot *Grand Bleu* has its own dry-cleaning plant, while the 69.5 metre *Aussie Rules* built for Greg Norman carries enough fuel to sail directly from the South to the North Pole without stopping, a spa for 12 and a \$1 million entertain-

ment system. The largest privately-owned aluminium motorised yacht in the world cost \$70 million, and painting it costs \$2 million. The yacht contains a game fishing boat and more than 200 fishing rods, a watercraft and four jet skis. In addition to his US\$100 million *Tatoosh*, Microsoft's Paul Allen has the 127 metre *Octopus* with room for a million litres of fuel, a basketball court, two helicopters, and a garage for several cars (Ross, 2003: 184; Higham, 1993: 65–66; Holder *et al.*, 2003; Lloyd-McDonald, 2003; Peretz, 2004: 116–118; Johnson, 2004b: 15).

Cowes Week, the annual yachting regatta off the north coast of England's Isle of Wight and one place where the big yachts regularly park, has had royal patronage almost from its beginning and, until the Royal Yacht's recent decommission, members of Royal Family always stayed on the *Britannia* at the start of their annual summer holiday (James, 1992: 39). One year, the Queen took the family on a leisurely cruise to Norway, where they joined King Olav on his yacht Norge and sailed along the Norwegian coast to Andalsnes, Molde and into Trondheim Fjord (James, 1992: 28). *Britannia* was rather a large vessel to be styled a yacht. Judy Cassab was 'amazed' to find herself dining on it with fifty-six guests including Sir James Rowland, the Chief Justice, two archbishops and the architect, Harry Seidler (Cassab, 1995: 418).

At 87 metres Kerry Packer's 'floating resort' is much longer than a large suburban block. The \$40 million blue-hulled *Arctic P*, took one year to refit after its purchase in 1994. It emerged with grand dining rooms, a cinema with reclining couches, a wine room, swimming pool, helipad and spa baths in each cabin. There is room on the bow for at least 10 people to sit allowing a half metre space between them. Unfortunately, the boat is too big to berth at some of the a la mode Mediterranean harbours (Mychasuk, 1997b: 27) but to cope with this dilemma there is a \$360,000 speedboat (Walsh, 1997: 25). The boat is maintained by a permanent staff of 14, who were on hand when James entertained his ex-wife Jodhi as one of their first 'official dates'. He had already flown her around the world to join the vessel, which is usually moored in the Caribbean, although it sometimes appears in the Mediterranean in the European summer. It was the venue for a \$1 million

millennium party in Sydney Harbour, attended it is said by Bill Gates, Harry Adler and a 'middle-eastern royal with connections to the horse racing industry' amongst others (Sweetman and Luff, 1999). In July 1996 James Packer cruised the Greek islands with Jodee and Maxine Rich, Liberal Party power broker Michael Kroger, Nick Falloon, the chief executive of the Packer's public company, PBL, and James' executives and friends. According to Rich, 'the service was magnificent, the boat amazing [but] it seemed to him like a Roman court, with his fellow passengers [...] all vying for the emperor's favour' (Barry, 2002: 119).

The Aga Khan, however, can leave even *Arctic P* far behind in his jet-propelled *Shergar* (named after his missing horse), which is one of the three fastest boats in the world. The crew of seven can focus on the essentials like preparing and serving lunch, for they can simply dial in the destination and the satellite-linked navigation system clicks on to automatic. But if he should arrive at St Tropez he can be expected to pay US\$100,000 a week berthing costs and to make a contribution to the upkeep of the harbour master himself (Peretz, 2004: 118; Coleridge, 1994: 395).

Number four on the *Forbes* 400 rich list, spotted number three's yacht close by. He ordered his captain to advance his yacht's three engines to top speed and overtook number three's yacht at forty miles an hour, creating an enormous wake that sent the man and his guests flying. 'It was an adolescent prank,' he told the *Washington Post* afterwards. 'I highly recommend it.' (Conniff, 2003: 78). Meanwhile, the Neiman Marcus catalogue is offering a \$20 million private submarine which can stay submerged for up to twenty days (Conniff, 2003: 174).

Those who wish to combine real-estate with sailing, along with exclusivity, isolation and security, can buy a two bedroom, two bathroom apartment with a starting price of US\$2.25 million on board the 45,000 tonne cruise ship *ResidenSea* where they can join the 320 residents and 320 staff and follow the sun (Ross, 2003: 184).

In ways such as these, space and motion are experienced and constructed differently by the very wealthy. Their world is both homogeneous and spatially dispersed; far-flung and yet familiar; simultaneously

global and seamless. Their fabulously swift, extremely comfortable and intensely private multi-modal means of travel compress space. The locations they move between, the buildings in which they live, are very large, and one rich man occupies easily one thousand times more space than most people do. Their properties have been passed down both through the generations and between families, maintaining and enhancing their value while ensuring the social isolation and internal cohesion of those who own them. They are their own property market and price is a most effective way of restricting access to their neighbourhoods. Within the relatively small and very restricted clusters in which they live, their properties are large, the houses on them are splendid and the rooms within them are spacious and many.

The children of the very rich quickly become accustomed to large amounts of personal space. Feeling crowded is largely absent from these men's understanding. So much so that they find the infrequent sharing of space discomforting. Not surprisingly, others sense them as beings who are 'large' and spatially imposing. Consequently they seldom experience human closeness, rarely having their personal space intruded upon. Thus are they remorseless, intentional and belligerent in filling space with the bodies that others look after for them. Tasty and nutritious food is constantly and instantly available to them and their time regimes allow for exercise in their clubs and resorts and for body-maintenance in health clinics and private hospitals.

These bodies are well-habituated to motion, arrivals and departures in luxuriously appointed cars, yachts and planes which are driven and maintained by their servants. Travel is not only about their purposeful movement but also concerns magnitude, extravagance, display, potency and achievement. It also involves choice within and between transport modes, and the regular use of two or more private forms of travel consecutively is a commonplace feature of the lives of the wealthy, connecting quickly, comfortably and effortlessly their globally dispersed but culturally consonant possessions. However, they need to do this, they stress repeatedly, because, as we will see in the next chapter, their lives are so busy – they work so hard and, as a corollary, they need to play so hard.

Chapter Six

Time, Work, Leisure

Class is not a conspiracy. The power of ruling-class men is more a matter of living; it is about how they exist, whom they meet, what they say, what they can do. But it is also organised and routine and is manifest, grows and is exercised in spaces and in networks such as gentlemen's clubs, leisure resorts and boardrooms. Wielding power is part and parcel of the work and pleasure of being a ruling-class man.

Once formal education has been left behind, a ruling-class young man needs to learn his way in the business world. When Rupert Murdoch left Geelong Grammar, he was sent to Oxford at his mother's insistence, and was mentored in England by one of his father's employees, journalist Rohan Rivett. Sir Keith wrote to his son constantly with news of the family newspapers, in order to develop his interest and commitment (Shawcross, 1992).

Murdoch befriended the new owner of London's *Daily Mirror*, the nephew of Lord Northcliffe, Cecil King. His letters showed 'an instinctive feel for money and power, and how to use them both' (Shawcross, 1992: 73, 76), but he proved a poor scholar and, despite private cramming help with the exams, emerged with only a third-class Honours degree. To complete the degree, however, was obviously important because Dame Elisabeth had let him know that if he dropped out or failed he would lose her 'last shred of respect' (Shawcross, 1992: 69, 79). Released from an ill-fitting student life, he 'served a brief apprenticeship' at Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* in London, before returning to Australia after his father's death to assume his role as publisher of the *Adelaide News* and *Sunday Mail* at the age of twenty-two (Tuccille, 1989: 11). Even before formally taking the reins, however, he was already issuing directives to Rivett about what was suitable for publication in Adelaide family newspapers. Details of the shocking Kinsey Report 'muck'

definitely were not but fortunately, the 22-year old Murdoch asided, the average American woman was totally unlike the creatures Kinsey described (Shawcross, 1992: 80–91).

Murdoch's son, Lachlan, had a similar apprenticeship, although his father has lived longer and married more than once. According to his close friend George Betsis, who runs one of Sydney's top advertising companies, Lachlan 'is not overawed by his destiny. He was born to rule and has been groomed for it all his life' (Barry, 2002: 335–336).

James Fairfax worked on a Scottish newspaper where he had

a permanent invitation to join [...] the board of directors for lunch every Wednesday [...] I had been warmly welcomed by these men and I retain the happiest memories of the lunches there and up the street at the Western Club where I had been made an honorary member. I worked as a reporter for three months and then moved to the sub-editors' table for two, repeating this process with the *Evening News* (Fairfax, 1991: 61, 62).

After his Cranbrook education, Kerry Packer's son James was shoehorned directly into the middle management of his father's media empire to learn how to do business. Kerry appointed mentors to teach him how to be a tough businessman, including stockbroker Rene Rivkin, whom he told, 'I'm sending my fuckin' son over and I want you to lose him some fuckin' money on the stock market so he understands the fuckin' value of the fuckin' dollar' (Sharp, 2003: 9). In his case, his post-school education was without the earlier phase as an uninspired university student, but included a year as a jackeroo on his father's properties, but the pattern is much the same for the scions of wealth. Some of them, however, do not take to their planned future, despite its elaborate preparation, which we have documented in the previous chapters. Why on earth would these men want to work? And if their objective is to take over the empire, waiting for the vacancy, as Prince Charles is finding, can take a lifetime.

Work

The compelling difference about work for very rich men is that they chose to do it. Many chose not to. As Davis (1982: 14) explains, ‘Heirs and heiresses either try to emulate the dynamoes who built their fortunes (the “I’ll show them” motive all over again), or decide early on that they cannot possibly hope to do as well and devote their lives to some other pursuit – the arts, perhaps, or luxurious idleness’. George Hayhurst, a close boyhood friend of Conrad Black, claimed that ‘There were plenty of guys who had equal privilege and equal access to money who went on to do absolutely nothing’ (Siklos, 1995: 24). Truman Capote considered the very wealthy as ‘heaven’s anointed, the only truly liberated people on earth. “The freedom to pursue an aesthetic quality in life is an extra dimension,” he explained, “like being able to fly where others walk. It’s marvellous to appreciate paintings, but why not *have* them? Why not create a whole aesthetic *ambiente*? Be your own living work of art?’” (Clarke, 1995: 273). Reginald Claypoole Vanderbilt ran through US\$17 million in seven years and drank himself to death at 45, while Sir Thomas Hardy regarded his life as that of a gentleman. ‘My travels were seen as gallivanting by some and prompted my long-time friend in the wine industry, the famous Len Evans, to once say to me: “Hardy, you’ve never done a hard day’s work in your life.” My response: “It’s a poor family which cannot afford at least one gentleman”’ (Higginbotham, 2005: 23; Mundle, 1993: 272).

Certainly for men like Ronald Fraser’s father, who ‘occupied himself solely with sport [...] without doing anything really useful’ (Fraser, 1984: 5), sport could provide ‘meaning and sharpness to lives which [...] had little focus’ (Adams in Morrell, 1996: 70). These are people, after all, ‘who could do whatever they liked, who didn’t need to work, who could live to ride and hunt and shoot, play tennis, bridge, entertain one another [...] their talk was of horses, their life was taken up with sport’ (Fraser, 1984: 14). The Duke of Edinburgh loves horses, too, and in the White’s circle, the men talked of ‘sheep, weather, racehorses and sport’

and Patrick's father 'had little to do but read the *Sydney Morning Herald* exhaustively, keep an eye on his shares and check that his trainer was looking after his horses' (Davis, 1982: 66–67; Marr, 1991: 101, 90).

The livelihood of tycoons does not depend on their turning up to the office and directly occupying themselves with the affairs of their business. Profit will be extracted and capital will accumulate without them doing anything at all. The functions of decision-making, supervision, planning and so on will be performed by the executives and experts hired for these purposes. Conrad Black's 'right-hand man', David Radler, when asked what would happen if a tragedy were to strike Black, replied, 'Well, it would be lighter on the payroll. We'd lose about four club memberships [...] Absolutely nothing would happen, okay? I mean [...] not one aspect of business will be affected by the demise of the ownership'. Radler made it possible to test his prediction when he ratted out Black to US Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald in return for a reduced jail sentence. Fitzgerald alleged that Black had 'lined his pockets' and had 'lived large on millions of shareholder dollars' allegedly skimming \$US 83 million from Hollinger International, the company he controlled, and in 2005 he faced eleven charges of defrauding shareholders and taxation authorities. In this view of things, the absence of both Radler and Black will improve profitability for Hollinger, and even if found guilty, their life-style will not change substantially in the longer term (Elliott, 2005: 37; Coultan, 2005: 41; Hoyle, 2005: 37; Chandler, 2005: 75; Siklos, 1995: 297, 298).

Lord Vere Rothermere elaborated on what work meant for him:

I don't 'have' to do it, not financially. I have to do it for my family pride and for my enormous interest in the newspapers. I want to do it but I don't 'have' to do it. You 'have' to do it because you haven't got any money! And that makes a big difference with your wife because she knows you're doing it to be successful, to make money, to do things for your children, to advance yourselves. I don't have to advance myself. If I gave up tomorrow and went to live in Jamaica it wouldn't make the slightest difference to me financially and [my wife] can't understand why I have to do it. She thinks I've lost interest in her or have got a beautiful secretary, she doesn't understand that it's the biggest thing in my life to succeed (Coleridge, 1994: 272).

One of Australia's richest men, Richard Pratt, often works a seven-day week even though he is seventy years old, because 'it's exciting and fun, and it satisfies my yearning to be busy all the time' (Hart, 2005: 28).

But what does success mean for those who have inherited so much from their parents, grandparents or family, who have been bought up with the best of everything, and have every possible support that the market can provide? Donald Trump sneered at the inheritors of wealth as members of 'the lucky sperm club' (but his own father's estate was worth more than US\$150 million), for the very rich can never be sure what they have achieved on their own as apart from what is gifted to them by family riches and name. John D. Rockefeller Jr. grumbled that 'even the girls in the office [...] can prove to themselves their commercial worth. I envy anybody who can do that' (Conniff, 2003: 266).

Bronfman (1987: 368) then, considers that although wealth frees men from the need to fulfil the traditional role of provider, those who do not work lose self-esteem. One of Gilding's interviewees could not conceive of life outside the family business because he was 'really unemployable elsewhere', but working in it made him miserable. Eventually he suffered 'the beginnings of psychotic depression triggered by a feeling of helplessness'. He was, he said, 'a prisoner of the system' (Gilding, 2002: 101). Some men have killed themselves, as did a son of the self-made multi-millionaire Doug Moran, Brendan Moran, who penned a ten-page diatribe against his family as he gassed himself in a car. 'The bashings, beatings and humiliations, publicly and privately, have become so great that I have nothing to live for', he wrote (Gilding, 2002: 103). Subsequently, it was revealed that his brother, the first-born son, had made his life hell, 'including hanging him up by his own tie in the company car park, and biting his finger to the bone' (Gilding, 2002: 104).

Sir John Harvey-Jones, former Chairman of ICI, discussing life after retirement, explained the attraction of working to Conrad's Black's *Daily Telegraph* editor, Peter Hastings:

You'll find you miss all this ... You'll miss *knowing*. When I was Chairman of ICI, any one from the Prime Minister to the Prince of Wales downwards would

take my calls. Nowadays it doesn't matter how much money one's got or how nice a life – I don't *know* things in the same way (Hastings, 2002: 108).

'There is', observed Hastings (2002: 109), 'an intoxication about access, about being told from the very top about what is going on'.

Weeks after the collapse of One.Tel which cost the Packers and Murdochs an estimated \$950 million, Kerry Packer who was very ill and said to be in semi-retirement, was skipping in to work, in a better mood than anyone could remember. 'He's as happy as a sandboy', one investment banker observed. 'It has put five years on his life, because it has shown him he's needed.' (Barry, 2002: 337–338).

They work, then, because they chose to, because they enjoy it, are driven to it and are addicted to it. Kerry Packer, provides another instance of this. He well knows he can leave business to the editors, bankers, executives, managers and lawyers unless he *wants to* intervene. Siklos (1995: 245–206) writes of Conrad Black's recollections of the Fairfax takeover Black planned with Packer and Malcolm Turnbull:

From Packer's standpoint, an investment of around A\$180 million wasn't a huge amount to fret over. 'Okay guys, we've now done the deal,' Packer declared at one point. 'You go and fix it, and I'm going to go and play polo'.

Similarly, James Fairfax (1991: 205) writes in his autobiography:

It was time for us to move on Queensland Press and, after a telephone round-up of directors, Gardiner launched the Fairfax bid at \$20 a share (\$890 million) at midnight on Sunday, January 4th. I left for Tahiti and Santiago at midday, having entertained H. H. the Aga Khan for drinks at Lindsay Avenue the evening before. Gardiner and I had agreed on the timing and last minute details of our bid just before the Aga's arrival. I decided to go ahead with an Antarctic trip I had planned as our most important decision had been made [...]

Since the work of ruling-class men is optional, obviously they exercise their options to different extents – or at least to a less intensive timetable – for their working day, week and year is extremely flexible when they wish. Conrad Black, for instance, might wake up at nine a. m. but

he often stays in bed making telephone calls and reading newspapers. When he finally gets to his office, he 'spends most of his time thinking', he says (Siklos, 1995: 391–392). His biographer Siklos sees this routine as learnt from his father. 'He too is not prone to prolonged exposure to his office, can spend umpteen hours each day on the telephone – particularly in the midst of a deal – and rises late, having often stayed up until the early morning working, socialising or reading' (Siklos, 1995: 22).

Despite his own penchant for late rising and long lunches, Conrad Black has decried 'Australia's ostentatious lack of martyrdom to the work ethic' (Siklos, 1995: 272). He could manage to be indignant when a security guard dozed on duty at the wheel of his waiting car and took 'the greatest pleasure' in waking him and ordering him to go and buy aspirin 'in the middle of a howling blizzard' (Black, 1993: 342–343). Black's anecdote typifies the self-centredness of ruling-class men expressed in relation to those much less powerful than themselves and their obvious pleasure in the gratuitous exercise of power. It exemplifies, moreover, the extent to which they routinely rely, from childhood onwards, on the domestic labour of servants – daily in both major and a myriad of minor ways – to free their own time for more enjoyable and profitable pursuits.

Work-time, clearly, is much more bounded for those who work for wages. After the takeover of the *Post* by Black his new 'hired hand', imposed 'a new right-wing order' there: 'One of Levy's first actions was to install a time-clock for employees' (Siklos, 1995: 199). Ideally for capitalists, wages, if not hours of work, are flexible. Black 'devised what he described as the elastic compensation system for the reporters and debated with them at the end of each week what they "deserved" on the basis of the volume and quality of their journalistic production' (Black, 1993: 68).

When he bought the *Sunday Times* in 1976, Murdoch fired the majority of the staff and hired replacements more in tune with his media style. 'Rupert's a tremendous sacker,' said a syndicated financial columnist who has known Murdoch for over twenty-five years. 'The fear of losing jobs concentrates one's mind,' Murdoch has said (Tuccille, 1989: 13, 83). Davis describes Murdoch as ruthless when it comes to

sackings, although ‘he once told a television interviewer that he hated sacking people: “The first person I ever fired,” he said, “I went and walked him round the park and I think I ended up in tears instead of him.”’ Davis comments drily that ‘He must have shed a lot of tears since then; in true Beaverbrook tradition editors have been fired, long-term companions have been discarded, and his closest friends have had to take that symbolic walk around the park’ (Davis, 1982: 164). When he wanted to get rid of *Times* editor, Harry Evans, for failing to toe the Conservatives’ line, Murdoch summoned him to his office and dismissed him on the day of his father’s funeral (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 80; Shawcross, 1992: 252–253).

Evans himself has commented on the fear such an approach instils:

Somebody said to me the other day [...] Mr. Murdoch couldn’t possibly dominate editors all over the world. Well, in fact, he can because they know what he wants and they live in fear [...] (Tuccille, 1989: 87–88).

‘When Rupert asks you to do something, well, you just do it’, said television news presenter Maury Povich (Tuccille, 1989: 227–228). At a meeting with his senior executives, Kerry Packer’s irritation boiled over: ‘Listen up, you dead cunt, just tell me how much money I’ve made and how you’re going to make me more’, he snapped, and on leaving the meeting he told them that it had been ‘fucking boring’ (A. Lawson, 2002: 20). Sam Chisholm, as Murdoch’s B Sky B’s chief executive, was just as tough.

[He] arrived with a fearsome reputation for toughness and brutality. He quickly made his mark. He lined up the B Sky B managing directors, asking each of them: ‘Who are you?’ and ‘What do you do?’ He told them not to talk to the press. ‘Some of you may get a bulge in your trousers when you speak to journalists [...] but how you act with regard to the press will influence what I do about your termination packets’ (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 188–189).

Chisholm himself explained the process as it related to those further down the hierarchy.

Where people haven't got it, I think you've just got to say goodbye [...] Where there is no spirit – and, it generally follows, no talent for anything else – you're better to just say goodbye [...] We fired about three and a half thousand people [out of a workforce of 4,000] over the course of about ten days or something. Because in England there's an awful lot of bureaucratic paperwork and so on, I actually employed a team – a sort of firing team. I said, 'You've got to do this as quickly as you can because we're really losing astonishing sums of money'. It was amazing stuff. And so, after the ten days was up, these guys came and reported to me that they'd fired all these people. I said, 'Well that's fantastic. Thank you for what you've done. However, you know,' I said, 'now I've got some bad news for you. Because I'm now going to fire all of you guys.' So they looked a bit depressed at that [...] I got [the remainder] all together and I said, 'Look, my assessment is this is a company run by the staff for the staff.' I said, 'It's going to be a new company; it's going to be a company run by the management for the shareholders. Because you must understand that it is the shareholders that you serve (Walsh, 2002: 160, 166–167).

When the same thing was about to happen to Chisholm himself, however, the strength of his network prevailed.

But, I mean, it was [Alan] Bond's intention to sack me. He was going to give the job to David Aspinall but Kerry [Packer] said – because he had left \$200 million worth of preferences in the business – 'I'm sorry, but Sam's going to have to run the business.' And that's the reason I ended up with Bond, otherwise he would have fired me (Walsh, 2002: 173).

Similarly, when Black took over the London *Daily Telegraph*, he directed his new editor Max Hastings to sack about 2,000 workers. 'I believed that an editor should inspire fear as well as respect' said Hastings. Conrad Black declared 'approvingly before an audience that "Max is good at drowning kittens"' (Hastings, 2002: 76, 87). This attitude is too much for James Strong, former CEO of Qantas and chairman of Woolworths who told Walsh (2002: 83), 'You know, I think anyone who either tries to portray themselves as enjoying getting rid of people, or actually does enjoy it, I think there's something wrong with them psychologically'. In fact, Hastings had boasted, most of the names he had marked on the

staff list during his train trip home from work 'were gone within six months'.

One of these names belonged to Margaret Thatcher's daughter, Carol, notwithstanding the Prime Minister's support for Black and his admiration for her (Siklos, 1995: 158, 160). Black wryly remarked that Hastings 'once correctly told our directors that "It would be too much to ask that Mrs Thatcher would see my firing of her daughter as an example of Thatcherism in action"'. Carol had been employed in the paper's features department by Bill Deedes, Hastings' predecessor, who was a family friend of the Thatchers, and a golfing companion of Margaret's husband, Denis. Thatcher was 'furious' (Black, 1993: 451; Hastings, 2002: 58, 78).

One obvious place of work for these men is the boardroom, and a key work activity is meeting with other wealthy men who are directors of other companies. If the networks of power which these men inhabit have a centre, this is probably it. Of the 10,541 largest publicly listed companies in Australia in the Dun and Bradstreet *Directory of Directors*, 22 per cent form a 'single continuous network' central to which are Australia's top 100 companies (Harrigan, 2005: 10). Of the top 250 companies in Australia in 1992, 175 were linked to at least one other through a shared director, with their average being close to five links. Those that are not linked ranked lower in terms of their revenue (Alexander, 1998: 113, 114). The compelling feature of life in the boardroom is its masculinity. Perhaps only the military and the churches come close to its stark maleness. Just under two per cent of board members in Murray's (1997: 18; 1998: 126) study were women in 1996, up from 0.4 per cent in 1990.

Catherine Livingstone, chair of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), is remarkable in that she sits on a number of boards including Telstra, and Goodman-Fielder. In response to questioning from Richard Walsh (2002: 36–37) she was not prepared to predict that three percent of the CEO's of Australia's top one hundred companies would be women in twenty years time. One of Bronfman's respondents explains how it worked in her family:

My grandfather is a big question mark on women's issues. He's got four granddaughters and two grandsons and he gives [them all] equal amounts of money. There's no obvious discrimination; yet on the other hand when someone has to be appointed to the board, it is of course [the male cousin] who married into the family. None of the women in the family are appointed (Bronfman, 1987: 377).

Board members are appointed because of whom they know, are connected to, and because of the other organisations they run. Sir David Griffin was appointed to the Fairfax Board because he was a friend of Sir Warwick Fairfax, a former Lord Mayor and the chairman or director of several major companies (Fairfax, 1991: 113). When Rupert Murdoch was extending his empire into the United States, clearly his choice of board members would be important. Donald D. Kummerfeld, who was to be his chief operating officer at News America, joined the board of directors of News Corporation Ltd. 'His list of accomplishments and credentials, his contacts in New York and Washington, D. C., his influence in both the business and political spheres provided him with a resume that is perhaps comparable in length to that of President George Bush' (Tuccille, 1989: 73). The few women who sit on boards are no exception to the rule that power breeds power. When he took back the *Herald and Weekly Times*, Murdoch appointed his sister, Janet Calvert-Jones to the board. Her husband was a stockbroker whose company handled business for News and for Cruden, the Murdoch family company (Coleridge, 1994: 488). He also appointed his first wife, Anna to News Corp. He explained, 'I find Anna's the most critical of all our directors at board meetings [...] She'll speak up, you bet she does. She's got least to fear! She's there because I just want the assurance, should anything happen to me, that there'll be someone keeping the door open for the children to come along' (Shawcross, 1992: 437).

Conrad Black (1993: 166) explains quite clearly how and why he set about to obtain certain board positions on his rise to power.

In furtherance of my campaign to become a plausible corporate player, I set out to attain the principal criterion of that status, to become a director of one of the

major Canadian banks. My strategy for this minor undertaking was to convince my generous and enthusiastic friend Bill Twaits, the long-time chairman of Imperial Oil and board vice-president of the Royal Bank, that I would be a welcome addition to the board of that bank. Since it would not be the height of propriety for me to make the case myself, I got my old friend John Hull, who had done a good deal of work for my father, and was intimately associated with Twaits in some projects at the Business Council on National Issues, to lobby for me. Bill Twaits rose admirably to the cause and set on the Royal Bank's chairman, Earle McLaughlin, to the same effect. Earle had me to lunch with some of his directors and officers, and duly invited me on to his board.

When he himself was in a position to do so, Black created an International Advisory Board described by an observer as 'a sort of *Almanach de Gotha* of the international right'. It brought together Dwayne Andreas, chairman of US agricultural giant Archer Daniels Midland Co., Lord Hanson, financier Sir James Goldsmith, Lord Rothschild, former US Assistant Secretary for International Security Policy Richard Perle (architect of President Reagan's Star Wars), former Canadian Ambassador to the US Allan Gottlieb, former Chairman of the US Federal Reserve Paul Volcker, former assistant to the US President for National Security Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Kissinger, former British Foreign and Defence Secretary and secretary-general of NATO Lord Carrington, Fiat Chairman Giovanni Agnelli, the former President of Israel Chaim Herzog, and well known American pundits David Brinkley, William F. Buckley Jr., and George Will. Margaret Thatcher, the Board's only woman, was appointed three years after she left politics. 'Conrad's role to some extent is to ingratiate himself in certain circles, and this does help,' says David Radler. And Black himself explained, 'But my purpose is that celebrities who are justly celebrated can be very useful to you. I'm interested in relationships that can be useful. I'm not interested just in trotting these people around.' (Siklos, 1995: 229, 230; Black, 1993: 263).

Networks, like wealth itself, can be made or inherited. The Fraser and Fairfax families have been friendly for several generations – James Fairfax's parents and Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser's had travelled on the same liner to England on their honeymoons in 1928,

and Fairfax and Fraser had kept in touch over the years. When Fraser hosted the Commonwealth Heads of Regional Governments Meeting in Australia in March 1978, Edwina Baillieu had their wives to lunch at Milton Park while their husbands were in conference, and Fairfax had them all to dinner at his Bowral estate, Retford (Fairfax, 1991: 154). When Fairfax needed the support of Dame Nellie Melba's granddaughter, Lady Pamela Vestey, in his position as head of the Fairfax press, this was not problematic. Fairfax had known Pamela, whose husband Lord Vestey had owned a global land-owning and meat-exporting company, for some years, and her parents had been friends of his mother (Fairfax, 1991: 231–232). So while Black worked hard to build his networks, for others it seemed effortless. Andrew Knight, Chief Executive of Conrad Black's *Daily Telegraph*, said to its editor, Max Hastings,

'Going to Paris, why don't you see Giscard?' 'You've *never met* the Prince of Wales?' – this with an eyebrow lifted in gentle surprise at such a lacuna in one's social education – 'I'll take you around there one evening' [...] Andrew cherished an inherent regard for the possessors of riches, nicely graduated in accordance with scale. Conrad Black featured at about a median point. Rupert Murdoch stood near the top, up there with the Agnellis and Fords (Hastings, 2002: 45).

However 'being connected' is achieved, invisibility is the fate of those who are not. Max Hastings, as editor of Britain's largest newspaper, was influential and well-off because of it. He sometimes had to move in exalted circles, not that they noticed him. 'I have always believed that the social radar of the very rich simply does not engage acquaintances worth less than, say, a hundred million dollars', he remarked. And of the Royal Family, he commented 'a notable characteristic is an inability to display even polite interest in other people's lives' (Hastings, 2002: 238, 338).

While Clyde Packer, Kerry's older brother, went into the New South Wales Parliament as a member of its upper house and James Packer joined the Point Piper Branch of the Liberal Party to support the pre-selection of Malcolm Turnbull for the safe seat of Wentworth, for the

most part the very rich distance themselves from the minutiae of party politics. Their attitude to politicians is for the most part dismissive. They have to be able to deal with each of the major parties in their turn in government. A former executive of Murdoch's has said that what Murdoch liked most of all is 'order' (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 230). And Hastings (2002: xiv, xv) says that whatever the professed beliefs of the rich may be, 'most are moneylogues rather than ideologues' and that the political convictions of most British newspaper proprietors 'throughout history add up to an uncomplicated desire to make the world a safe place for rich men to live in'. This was presumably Sir Frank Packer's desire when he offered US President, Richard Nixon, 'any use you may like' of his media network shortly after the USA resumed the bombing of Vietnam at the end of 1972, because he was 'disturbed at the comments' of the recently elected Labor Prime Minister of Australia, Gough Whitlam (Stephens, 2005).

The exercise of political influence is perhaps more obvious for media magnates than for other men of the ruling class because it is more direct and more public. Yet their political might is ubiquitously practised behind the closed doors of the elite clubs, at the turf or the polo, at high society dinners, and at the other social locations we have glimpsed. The support of the Thatcher government in crushing union opposition was fundamentally the same during the miner's strike as it was during Murdoch's confrontation with workers at 'fortress Wapping'. Support was as enthusiastically promised by Thatcher when Conrad Black sought it in case it was needed at the *Telegraph*. In turn, Murdoch and Black both proved valuable – and in the former's case indispensable, allies – putting the support of their newspapers behind the task of ensuring Thatcher's continued hold on government. Says Black (1993: 450):

We owned serious newspapers and reported fairly, but went as far as we could in rational editorial argument in favour of the government. In the last *Sunday Telegraph* before the election [...] most of our most powerful and elegant writers, fired every cannon we had in promotion of the government's cause. I had called Perry Worsthorne from Florida the week before, after he had virtually

endorsed Labour, so colourless and convictionless did he find the Tories. I urged him to contemplate the full horror of a Labour win and he gamely responded in the last pre-election *Sunday Telegraph* with an endorsement of the government because it would not abolish fox hunting, an activity Perry did not participate in or even particularly approve but regarded as a worthwhile tradition.

While the *quid pro quo* is perhaps more obvious in the case of media magnates, Conrad Black (1993: 448) writes quite openly about the way in which both he and Kerry Packer exert power to convince politicians – even prime ministers – to further and safeguard their interests, or at least to avoid crossing them. All ruling-class moguls do so in their individual interests, just as the class as a whole does so in an organised way. Hastings (2002: 242–243) explains:

Like most tycoons, Conrad was seldom unconscious of his responsibilities as a member of the rich men's trade union. Those who have built large fortunes seldom lose their nervousness that some ill-wisher will find means to take their money away from them. They feel an instinctive sympathy for fellow multimillionaires, however their fortunes have been achieved. When one of the tribe falls from grace, they share the sensations of French aristocrats in the Reign of Terror, watching a laden tumbril lurch over the cobbles towards the guillotine: hairs prickle on the backs of the spectators' necks.

Not every 'battle', of course, is won, for the competition is also at work importuning, cajoling, hectoring, threatening and blandishing politicians and there are other political factors at work simultaneously. The media ownership laws were not to be altered in Australia for Conrad Black, although, according to Black (1993: 448) incoming Prime Minister Paul Keating was apparently apologetic: 'It was "shitty and outrageous, of course", but would I leave him six months for matters to settle, whereupon he promised to put things right? Of course I would, having no choice'. Later, times being different, the media ownership laws were, however, changed in Australia for Murdoch.

As Black himself wrote (1993: 485), 'Newspapers, especially quality newspapers, remain powerful outlets for advertising, information and political influence', a point well understood by Murdoch.

On a public level, Murdoch used [the *Post*] as almost every baron of the media has done, to exert political influence. [It] gave him a unique and valuable platform in one of the most important cities of the world. He had used it to help elect the Mayor of New York and he had wholeheartedly supported Reagan for President in 1980 (Shawcross, 1992: 268).

Lord Beaverbrook had done the same in the past. He admitted, quite openly, to a royal commission on the press in 1948 that he ran his papers 'purely for the purpose of making propaganda, and no other object'. Beaverbrook was not the first media baron to exercise power in this way as William Randolph Hearst and Lord Northcliffe had behaved before him in the same manner (Davis, 1982: 160, 162).

Murdoch's press was effective in getting Gough Whitlam's extremely popular Labor government unelected in Australia in 1975 after only a few years. It is not reducing class rule to conspiracy to analyse the concerted power of the ruling class as it maintains its hegemony. A good example can be seen in Connell and Irving's (1980) analysis of the deposing of an earlier Labor government following its attempts to socialise banking in Australia. Our point here is that such class power is organised in ruling-class men's spaces and networks such as gentlemen's clubs and board-rooms and is part and parcel of the work of being a ruling-class man.

Men of the international ruling class exercise this power globally. Thus Black intervened to make sure his British papers did not place tension on the Anglo-American alliance in their reportage of the US bombing of Libya which assassinated members of President Gaddafi's family (Black, 1993: 343–344). Murdoch put pressure on Frank Giles, editor of the *Sunday Times*, calling him a communist because his views were 'more pro-detente and less passionately anti-communist than [his]', and used this slur against journalists and articles in the paper which were critical of President Reagan's policies in Central America. Murdoch, in fact, saw Giles's more liberal stance as 'limp-wristedness' (Shawcross, 1992: 248).

The notion of building and controlling a business 'empire' is an example we take for granted in everyday language and indeed, ruling-

class men often do see their work as akin to statesmanship or to war. Their accounts of what they do are full of such metaphors. Murdoch himself once said, 'My past consists of a series of interlocking wars,' and Malcolm Turnbull explained to Conrad Black during the attempted Fairfax takeover, 'if you want to be an assassin, you have to be prepared to have a little blood on your hands' (Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 12; Siklos, 1995: 262). According to Siklos (1995: 28), 'Conrad [Black] will often draw analogies to something Napoleon did in one of his battles.' Kerry Packer is reported by Black (1993: 432), as having said, following the stymieing of their Fairfax takeover, 'A good general must know when to attack and when to retreat and this is the time to retreat'. According to Sam Chisholm who worked 'long and loyally' for both Packer and Murdoch, 'a general can't pick his army – you've got to take what you've got and make of it what you will.' (Walsh, 2002: 159, 160).

Work can also be much like a game. Siklos (1995: 4) writes of Black, 'His business dealings are complex chess games, usually multi-layered, rarely without conflict'. Black 'has tried his hand at most sports and games of skill. In his view, none can compare in challenge or excitement with big business, and none requires more skill or better timing' (Siklos, 1995: 16). Conrad Black's older brother Montegu was confronted by his wife's exasperation: 'I really don't understand what all of this is about. What is it worth? We live in the same house. The kids have always gone to private school. What's the benefit?' He replied, 'It's a monopoly game. It's a lot of fun.' (Siklos, 1995: 68). When Janet Holmes a Court remarked 'We can never spend this money. "It's impossible to spend it", her husband responded, "It was the score!" like a cricket game. It was no longer relevant in terms of personal gain' (Gilding, 2002: 151). One former Packer adviser says of James that he 'admires people who have made millions: players, movers and shakers. His motto is, "Whoever dies with the most money wins"' (Barry, 2002: 332) and according to Ted Turner, the *Forbes* 400 rich list is 'the Super Bowl' of the super-rich (Conniff, 2003: 104).

Similarly, 'Rupert's a man who's always thrilled with a new challenge,' the *Times* quoted Howard Rubenstein as saying of Murdoch,

and his lifelong friend and fellow board member, Richard Searby, was fond of saying: ‘Fundamentally Rupert’s a fidget’ (Tuccille, 1989: 136; Belfield, Hird and Kelly, 1991: 13). One of his associates, speaking off the record, explained for Tuccille (1989: 79) Murdoch’s motivation for taking over the unprofitable London *Times*.

I think he was getting bored at the time [...] He was well established in the U.S., he had that big success in Australia with the television and [...] well, what was there to do? Go down to the stone and write more headlines, fire some editors, drive everybody crazy with questions about the cost of newsprint? He’s a terrible fidget. When he doesn’t have a deal to do, he travels around and checks up on his people, gives them fits until he leaves.

Speaking in 1986 of his takeover of the Herald and Weekly Times Ltd, then Australia’s biggest newspaper conglomerate that had been lost by his father in 1952, Rupert Murdoch conceded to the *New York Times*: ‘It’s the challenge of the game [...] It gives me a great thrill, and it would be very wrong to deny that it is emotional’ (Tuccille, 1989: 165). As fellow media magnate Conrad Black (1993: 341) wrote of Murdoch, ‘[n]either money nor influence seem to weigh as heavily as the artistry of corporate building, the agility of buying and selling, the exhilaration of the tight-rope walk over the debt mountain’. As Nelson Aldrich succinctly put it: ‘The whole point of inculcating the peculiar aesthetic of the class is to lift its habitat above the quick and nasty transactions of the cash nexus to the exalted plane of disinterested delight’ (Conniff, 2003: 188).

The link between the corporate player as ‘general’ and ruling-class business as a game of chess is a fairly obvious one but their sense of work as a game also ties in with the propensity of ruling-class men to indulge in gaming and gambling. Sometimes it is more reality than metaphor: Murdoch ‘loved to gamble on foreign exchange markets’, according to Shawcross (1992: 202, 267), who attributes this to the influence of Murdoch’s grandfather Rupert Greene, ‘[G]ambling [...] had always been part of both Murdoch’s leisure and working life [...] Murdoch and Sangster went into partnership with a far more seasoned gambler, Kerry Packer, to form Lotto Management Services’.

According to his biographer, Shawcross (1992: 19), 'He contains within his character an extraordinary gambling instinct'. Douglas Brass, friend and employee of Murdoch's father, who was co-opted as editorial director of News Ltd, later wrote in the *Australian*, 'in those terrible hours and days, when we realized our predicament, Rupert showed some of the steel, the gambler's recklessness and the foresight that have since grown to such immense maturity on the world stage' (Shawcross, 1992: 110, 118).

In a similar vein, here is Conrad Black talking about Murdoch:

He's a plunger by nature, you know, both financially and otherwise, and he falls in love with places and industries [...] He's much more peripatetic and much more courageous than I am. I wouldn't roll the dice like that. As a friend of mine in New York says, 'He's the only guy I know who'll bet a billion dollars of borrowed money to make a point' (Siklos, 1995: 370–371).

And Sam Chisholm adds, 'Amazing, that's him. Murdoch – I mean this – will put it all on the line' (Walsh, 2002: 173).

Black (1993: 327) describes his own acquisition of the the *Daily Telegraph* as 'the greatest gamble I had taken'. 'To some degree, I bought into the *Telegraph* because I was betting in industrial relations matters on Mrs Thatcher and Mr Murdoch as much as on myself, and they proved not to be bad people to bet on' (Black, 1993: 349). He later writes, 'I thought that South African newspapers, properly marked down in price to allow for political risk, could be worth a modest bet' (Black, 1993: 477). In a sense he sees all of his capital accumulation in these terms:

I was like the man who went to the horse races and kept winning, parlaying up his initial two-dollar bet by re-enlisting and winning in each subsequent race. Apart from years of effort and personal credibility, I was not gambling more than my original \$500 in 1966 on the Argus project (Black, 1993: 215).

And, apparently, having 'balls of steel' helps (Black, 1993: 274).

From this perspective, it follows that profits and wealth are generated through the skill and intelligent risk-taking of the top player and

that wars are won by generals and not soldiers. In fact, Black pronounced that ‘one of the great myths of the newspaper industry is that you need journalists to produce a newspaper’ (Siklos, 1995: 310). It is not surprising, then, that the people whose wage-labour actually generates the profit for these ‘captains of industry’ are regarded with contempt. ‘The basic problem,’ said Eric Beecher, employed as the editor of the Melbourne *Herald* by Murdoch, ‘is that Rupert has contempt for those who work for him, and total contempt for those whom he can bend’ (Shawcross, 1992: 440–441).

Conrad Black has repeatedly shown that he has a low opinion of journalists.

Many journalists and most of the more talented ones [...] are happy to chronicle the doings and sayings of others, but a significant number, including many of the most acidulous and misanthropic are, in my experience, inexpressibly envious of many of the subjects of their attention (Siklos 1995: 292–293).

Black’s submission to the Senate Committee on Mass Media, chaired by Keith Davey, opined:

My experience with journalists authorises me to record that a very large number of them are ignorant, lazy, opinionated, intellectually dishonest, and inadequately supervised. The so-called ‘profession’ is heavily cluttered with abrasive youngsters who substitute what they call ‘commitment’ for insight, and, to a lesser extent, with aged hacks toiling through a miasma of mounting decrepitude. Alcoholism is endemic in both groups. (Black, 1993: 71; Siklos, 1995: 46)

He wrote of investigative journalists as ‘a sniggering mass of jackals’ (Siklos, 1995: 211). and in his autobiography he identified with ‘Jimmy Goldsmith when he broke a journalists’ strike at *L’Express* in Paris in 1981, by summoning all the employees and when a production worker expressed support of him, replied: “Of course, my good man, because you have red blood in your veins. These journalists have only pus in theirs” (Black, 1993: 472–473).

Belfield *et al.* (1991: 219) record that Murdoch also ‘has a low regard for journalists, particularly those who regard themselves as “writers”’. Davis (1982: 147) writes of ruling-class disdain for journalists and indeed other workers, when describing the Royal Enclosure at Ascot, ‘To get into the Enclosure one has to secure permission, well in advance of the meeting, from Her Majesty’s representative. Up until the early 1960s people who had been through the divorce courts were banned; so were journalists and members of other unsuitable trades and professions’.

Time

Those ruling-class men who do work often say they work very long hours, and indeed many apparently do. But their days contain not one moment of the unpaid work which occupies the lives of other men. Domestic work, child-minding, care of others, is work that rich men never do, for that is the work of their servants. On closer inspection, the hours of the working day of very rich men are not as clearly delineated as those whose livelihood is earned in wage labour. The boundary between their work and leisure, as we shall see, is quite blurred.

Sir Frank Packer is said to have spent twenty hours a day on his business until he built it up, and wandered around the building late at night switching off lights (Davis, 1982: 218; Barry, 1994). Bartoleme’s (1974, 102) study of 140 executives similarly recorded their complaint that their jobs left too little time for family and other things, and some ‘were indeed putting in a lot of hours’. It took not only most of their time, but nearly all of their energy, so that they felt ‘drained’. As one explained, ‘A lot of executives are seduced by their jobs. They become fanatical about their jobs because they like the work and because their companies reward their fanaticism’ (Bartoleme, 1974: 104).

Fairfax boss Stephen Mulholland, while explaining to the ‘troops’ why cost-cutting would not include a reduction in his own salary, told

them that '[e]xecutives just work very hard [...] and we worry like hell. We don't sleep much and that's the sacrifice we make, in return for which we get paid great deals of money' (Siklos, 1995: 271) He, too, had been 'seduced by a capitalist system'. 'I'm a victim', he said.

Rupert Murdoch is reported to get by on four hours sleep a night and claims that he works seven days a week (Tuccille, 1989: 264). But when one of Murdoch's biographers deems him a 'prototypical workaholic', it doesn't mean the same thing as someone who works very hard earning wages or conducting small business. 'He can't stop. His average day is crammed full with meetings, telephone calls to and from editors, bankers, executives, managers, lawyers, politicians and other dignitaries. There's barely a second of his time that's unaccounted for' (Tuccille, 1989: 267). Many would have difficulty recognising making phone calls and meeting with dignitaries, for example, as *work*, but his fellow magnates certainly do. Gerry Harvey, chairman of Harvey Norman, explains:

I was saying to Kate [managing director and his wife] the other day, 'You know, since we opened Singapore, this global thing is becoming a real reality. But, shit, I'm fucking 62, you know – who's going to do all this?' I said to her, 'You work so bloody hard and everything. Does this mean we're going to be on an aeroplane, and I'm going to be in Europe and America and England and all over the place? When will it stop? Will they pull us out of the chair at 80? Why are we doing this?' And then sometimes you come home from there, and you've had all these people troubles all day, and you think, 'Whew!' You know 'Give me a drink!' I mean, I've never felt jealous of Rupert Murdoch in the slightest – I've always felt terribly sad for the bloke because I know how hard he works. He works like 24 hours a day. He's 71, and he works so hard. He's an absolute total workaholic, and he's in an aeroplane with meetings all his life. I don't want that lifestyle, OK? I don't want Rupert Murdoch's lifestyle (Walsh, 2002: 128–129).

Murdoch himself said, 'I'm stressed out all the time' but laughing ruefully, added, 'Actually I don't think I call it stress. Normal day-to-day stress is excitement and I love it and handle it very well. If you can handle it, it's *fun*, and most times I can absolutely' (Coleridge, 1994: 479).

Are those sumptuous and notoriously long lunches indulged in by big businessmen really part of their ‘working’ day? Certainly crucial introductions are made, political influence is exercised, intelligence is exchanged, deals are clinched. Conrad Black’s autobiography (1993) and his interviews for biographies (eg Siklos, 1992) are replete with references to repasts in clubs, exclusive restaurants, dinners: the elevated company, his judgements of the relative intelligence and charm displayed by his hosts, guests, or fellows, the politics of dinner conversations and after-dinner speeches – and details of the food.

I went via New York (and sat next to Nancy Reagan at Jayne Wrightsman’s splendid dinner for her), and on the second day of my London visit went to Chequers for lunch with Margaret Thatcher [...]

The American raid on Libya occurred on the day I arrived in London and I made one of my rare interventions in the *Daily Telegraph’s* editorial policy by telling Max not to take up a policy that would give aid and comfort to Gaddafi and that would strain the Anglo-American alliance. Two weeks before I had attended David Rockefeller’s dinner in New York for Lord Carrington and when the guest of honour, who was then secretary-general of NATO, [...] It was against this backdrop that my visit to Mrs Thatcher occurred. Charles Powell, her secretary in foreign policy matters and an official of almost super-human versatility, talent and discretion joined the Prime Minister, Andrew, and me (Denis was at a football match) (Black, 1993: 343–344).

This is the sort of account that is seamlessly interwoven by Black (1993: 345) with the business import of such meals and meetings:

After lunch I gently began to ask [Prime Minister Thatcher] what would happen if, in the unlikely event we had a work stoppage at the *Daily Telegraph* over introduction of the most modern newspaper technology in our new plants and had to import production personnel from Canada, and I got no farther. ‘I would sign the work permits myself,’ she declared.

As a young man Conrad Black frequented the Toronto Club, ‘the exclusive enclave to which Angus Corporation chairman Bud McDougald had presented [him] with membership on his twenty-first birthday’

(Siklos, 1995: 52). Later in life he would play host there with Margaret Thatcher as guest of honour, and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Governor-General Jean Sauve, and Henry Kissinger as guests (Siklos, 1995: 184). Black and his brother used the private dining room of the brokerage firm, of which their father had bought a 25 % share to ease them into business, to host weekly roast beef lunches, where they 'entertained the local financial and political heavyweights in the finest Old Toronto WASP never-too-early-for-a-stiff-drink tradition' (Siklos, 1995: 52).

Later, Black would 'power dine' at the 'Establishment' restaurant, Winton's, which the entertainment writer for the *Globe and Mail* described as 'the leading noshery for movers and shakers of Toronto's business community' (Siklos, 1995: 63, 103). Later still, he would describe London as 'more interesting than Toronto [...] an endless sequence of sumptuous lunches and dinners with terribly interesting people from all over the world' (Siklos, 1995: 213).

Indeed, there are no distinct lines dividing business from leisure for this class of men. Rupert Murdoch's biographer, Shawcross, points out that the media billionaire was in fact 'at the races when the door to Fleet Street opened to him'. Several pages detail a succession of contacts and negotiations involving a merchant bank director baron, the good offices of a knight who was a board member of AUC and chair of News Ltd, a knight and a lady from the family with the controlling interest in the *Times*, and the good name of Murdoch's mother Dame Elisabeth. The account also features 'dinner at the Mirabelle, one of London's smartest restaurants' and 'lunch at the Coq d'Or' with the *dramatis personae*.

The story is similar to this one about Conrad Black:

Black asserts that if he hadn't known Andrew Knight through the Bilderberg Meetings, he never would have pursued the *Daily Telegraph*; if he hadn't known Henry Kissinger, he would not have got out of Norcen just as oil prices were heading south; if he hadn't known Sir James Goldsmith, he would not have been at dinner that fateful night when he and Kerry Packer first met and laid plans to bid for Fairfax (Siklos, 1995: 397; see also Black, 1993: 330).

Leisure

The leisure pursuits of ruling-class men tend to often be those exclusive of other classes and those whose cultural processes resemble their life's 'work'. Gambling has already been mentioned as a motivation for 'work' as has the penchant for ruling-class men to talk about their work as akin to gambling. Apart from this, they also admit to enjoying gambling – sometimes prodigiously – for recreation. If this leisure doesn't always involve winning, it does involve dealing in money – like their work: 'investing', calculation, risk-taking, gains and losses. Kerry Packer's penchant for gambling is legendary. According to one report, Packer lost \$28m in three weeks gambling at the Mayfair Club and he lost in one weekend at the races what it would take us 55 years of work at our current wage to earn, let alone save; and during a three-day splurge at Las Vegas he gambled with chips each one worth more than our homes (Koch, 1999: 62; Robins, 2003; Walker, Conway and Southward, 1993).

The elite aspects of 'the turf' and the ownership of thoroughbred racehorses is another sport that unites work with leisure in a single stroke. Yachting, as we saw in the previous chapter, is also a popular pastime with millionaires, as is skiing, an exhilarating sport with a good deal of cachet if it is practised in exotic winter retreats or exclusive resorts far from the plebeian ski slopes frequented by everyone else. Expensive travel and lodging is routinely undertaken for the purpose – often abroad or afar: St Moritz in Europe or Aspen in North America, for instance. One executive quoted by Bartoleme affirmed, 'Doing things is more important than people [...] I want my children to learn to ski well. In skiing one only needs man and hill; nobody else is needed' (Bartoleme, 1974: 102). Wal King, Chief Executive of the Leighton Group, has been helicopter skiing in Canada and the Himalayas. He enjoys it because his mind is 'focused on other things, like surviving' (Walsh, 2002: 53).

For the more youthful tycoon, tennis, like golf, requires access to expensive spaces and infrastructures and can be an aggressive, one-on-one pursuit. The houses of the very rich invariably include a tennis court

or two (Davis, 1982: 140). Shawcross (1992: 126) writes that Murdoch had 'loved to play the country squire' at his Australian property, Cavan, and that there were 'constant house parties' there in the late sixties and early seventies. He recounts how a News Ltd executive came to Cavan one weekend and Rupert insisted that they play tennis. 'The man had no shoes, but did not dare to disobey the command. Murdoch always played tennis as if the future of the world hung on his winning. At the end of a typically aggressive match, the executive's feet were raw; Riddell thought that Murdoch did not even notice' (Shawcross, 1992: 126).

Mixed tennis can also provide ruling-class men with an occasion for meeting prospective wives or entertaining mistresses. The importance of contracting the right marriage in maintaining class relations are, as we have already seen, part of the rationale for elite schools and colleges and their social networks. The loves, sexual relationships and marriages of ruling-class men are addressed in the next chapter but suffice it to say here that the production of heirs to the father's fortune is of as vital importance as it is in any royal succession.

Equestrianism is in many places an important part of ruling-class cultural capital, especially on country properties where the animals can be kept, ridden and bred. Polo combines horsemanship with competition and ownership of suitable ponies, the means to convey them, paddocks, stables, grounds and sheds, the employment of players, grooms and assistants. As the Duke of Edinburgh (1984: 132) has eloquently put it, '[...] polo is not exactly cheap and anyone wishing to play must either be well-heeled, have a good job or be supported by an indulgent parent or sponsor'. Prince Charles used his connections with school authorities to make some concessions to his sons which would combine polo with royal duties (Lateo and Davis, 2002: 10–11). So important are horses in the lives of the British Royal Family that many of the young Prince Charles' assignments with young women were procured for him by his equerry. Queen Victoria's son, Edward, would 'eye the audience from his box in the theatre and send an equerry to invite the most attractive woman to join him. It was an offer that was rarely refused' (Conniff, 2003: 235).

Polo is also a test of 'the right stuff'. According to Sinclair Hill, the wealthy grazier who coached both Prince Charles and Kerry Packer and only coaches 'the ones I like', Charles lacks the 'killer instinct', while Packer certainly had it, and Prince Philip had more of it than Charles (Cameron, 2003; *Gold Coast Bulletin*, 2003: 8). In 2003, Prince Harry stayed at Tooloombilla Station owned by Sinclair Hill's son Noel, whose wife Annie had flatted with Diana Spencer in London (Thomas, 2003: 27). According to publicity from his Duchy of Cornwall officials, at 54 Prince Charles no longer regularly competes, but only plays for charity occasions, raising £800,000 a year through this 'work'. 'The Prince of Wales works staggeringly hard,' said the source (Johnston, 2003: 4). Kerry Packer actually 'died' in 1990 while playing polo, but was revived thanks to his personal intensive-care ambulance attending the game. His country retreat in the Hunter Valley has 'extensive recreational facilities and fully equipped polo grounds'. Packer spent three months of every year playing polo in England where he had his own team, and outlaid millions of dollars annually on horses, stables and players (Siklos, 1995: 259).

Rupert Murdoch learned to ride horses at the age of five (Tuccille, 1989: 9), for Cruden Farm, where he lived as a child, had a stables and a tennis court. When he was at boarding school at Geelong Grammar, Murdoch used to sneak off to the races to have a bet (Shawcross, 1992: 59). By 1989, Murdoch practised 'a bit of tennis, skiing at Christmas'. The homes of Rupert and Anna Murdoch (his second wife) at this stage included a ski house in the mountains of Aspen, Colorado and a country property outside Canberra as well as their triplex apartment in New York, their Beverley Hills villa and their flat in London (Tuccille, 1989: 259, 264).

Dinners and balls such as 'charity' balls and other leisure events call for the presence and participation of ruling-class men. Although competitiveness here is largely the province of ruling-class women, this does not prevent ruling-class men from using these to practise their rituals of hierarchy or make business contacts and exchange business information. Artist Judy Cassab (1995: 400) observed the following in the marquee of the Murdochs'.

Anna and Rupert Murdoch greeted the arriving guests, passing us to an army of waiters with trays of champagne and Pims and flies. With the exception of Tim Storrier there are no artists among the 250, but all the well-known faces from television and politics are visible. The prime minister and Hazel Hawke, Punch Sulzberger, chairman and publisher of the *New York Times*, and John Howard, the Wrans, James Mollison, the Capons.

We are in a huge tent, worthy of the Shah of Iran.

I glimpse Rolf Harris, John Spender, Paul Keating, senators, Adele Weiss, Dame Leonie Kramer. White orchids and bush flowers fill the six-foot-long glass tubes across the tent.

Rupert and Hawke made speeches.

Later at home Jancsi said that it's like Genghis Khan vanquishing the government, and everybody bows, worships, pays court and genuflects.

‘[B]ecoming a regular supper guest or black-tie companion’ of the ‘London Establishment’ was instrumental in their ‘rallying around’ Conrad Black (Siklos, 1995: 213, 224). Black himself explains:

I don't spend all my time just chatting with people, shmoozing [...] but it is important to have contacts who are well placed just to keep in touch with them. If you're trying to build a business to find out what's available, what's going on, it's important. That's what I'm interested in (Siklos, 1995: 397, 398).

And sometimes, of course, display itself is instrument enough. On New Year's Eve 1999 two magnates and their wives held a US\$1.1 million party for 250 guests on top of the World Trade Centre at Windows On the World. Pre-dinner drinks featured a light show in which faces famous in the disappearing millennium were projected onto actors sheathed in white. One of the hosts had his own head projected onto Thomas Edison's body while the other was projected as Copernicus. When the guests went in for dinner, blackout screens blocked the famous view, centering attention on the tables on each of which were two hundred roses differently arranged and dusted with gold. A new light show began featuring images of the rise of Manhattan projected onto sails attractively adorning the room. The music grew to a crescendo.

The blackout curtains swept up revealing the sparkling cityscape to the song 'I'll Take Manhattan' (Conniff, 2003: 61).

Day to day meetings are, of course, not as extravagant or pointed. In Sydney, certain restaurants, Machiavelli, the Imperial Peking Harbourside, Tre Scalini and more recently Otto, are 'a mecca for heavy hitters from politics, business and the law, with celebrities providing additional frisson' (Alderson, 1996b: 2).

In the elevated back left-hand corner of the restaurant, the best table is also known as Mr Packer's table. It commands the best view of the room, which is otherwise divided by obscuring pillars, while offering a back-to-the-wall facility for two people. Tre Scalini mythology has it that it was also Sam Chisholm's favourite table when he was head of Channel Nine. On the days when both men were dining in the restaurant, Mr Packer always got the table (Alderson, 1996b: 2).

Exclusive restaurants are places for leisurely conspicuous consumption as well as for negotiation, briefings and sexual liaison. Sometimes the newly wealthy like to show off in them, as did Czech multi-millionaire Viktor Kozeny who spent US\$21,000 on dinner for four at Le Gavroche in London – tasting an US\$8,300 Romanee-Conti 1985 burgundy, and sending it back for the staff because it was 'too young' (Conniff, 2003: 59).

But there are some places he wouldn't get in to. Clubs such as the Guards, Garrick, Macquarie, Melbourne, St James, Carlton, Jockey, Union, Victoria, Australian, Atheneum, Canadian, Toronto, Porcupine and, of course, 300 year-old White's, can serve the same function as exclusive restaurants but avoid the vulgarity of the *parvenus* and the gawking of the *hoi polloi*, for their exclusiveness is guaranteed not only by market mechanisms but also by membership rules (*Economist*, 10/7/1993).

A study of directors of large corporations by Georgina Murray (1997: 18) found that 49 per cent of them favour clubs as a way of networking. The mean of club memberships for her sample was three clubs per director whilst the maximum number of club memberships was nine.

Clubs most favoured in Australia are the Melbourne Club, Atheneum Club and The Australian Club in Melbourne, the Union Club and The Australian Club in Sydney and the Commonwealth Club in Canberra (Harrigan, 2005: 21). Australian Clubs cost about \$1000 per annum and while most no longer overtly exclude Jews, Asians and blacks, they are men-only spaces and are as exclusive of women as the boardroom. The clubs are international and networked, with reciprocating memberships around the world, and private in the sense that aspirants need to be nominated for membership.

The best select their members with considerable care. Wealth alone does not guarantee admittance, but without it one cannot even get a hearing. Once in, one shares all the privileges and obligations associated with such institutions but there is usually a strict social order. A new member is expected to take a back seat, even if he has more millions than any of the others [...] It is taken for granted that everyone is rich; the actual amounts do not matter (Davis, 1982: 130).

In Britain and the USA in particular, club membership is firmly established as part of the university education of the rich. At Cambridge Prince Charles belonged to the Wapiti Club and the Pitt Club in which he joined Wykhams and Old Etonians and some of the wealthier members of the university (Varney with Marquis, 1989: 116, 117). Both President George W. Bush and his rival Senator John Kerry were members of the Skull and Bones Club which has only about 800 living members and admits only fifteen Yale juniors each year. It admitted women in 1991. One of the first gatherings Bush held in the Whitehouse after his election was a reunion of the club's 1968 members, followed by a subsequent reunion at Camp David a few years later. He appointed at least ten former members to important positions in his administration (Robbins, 2004: 137–138).

Some clubs are more exclusive than others. The Union League Club in New York, is the home of the America's Cup Hall of Fame which includes Sir James Hardy, Sir Thomas Lipton, Sir Frank Packer, Ted Turner and Harold Vanderbilt (and in 2003 the disgraced tycoon and ex-criminal Alan Bond) (Wright and Tate, 2003: 4).

Membership of these clubs typically requires nomination and references from up to five members, vetting by a committee and then a vote of all members in which a small number can veto the prospective membership. Sydney's reticent Union Club, nearly 150 years old, has only 1200 members including former New South Wales Premier, Nick Greiner, former National Party leader Tim Fischer and former leader of the conservative opposition, John Hewson. At both it and the Australian Club, prospective members need a proposer, a seconder and six supporters before the nomination can be voted on. At the Union Club, the aspirant must be approved by 90 per cent of the membership (Harrigan, 2005: 21; Harvey, 2003: 24; Richards, 2003: 14).

Shand and Ryan (2002: 1) suggest that the Melbourne Club network is 'breaking down as a whole generation of establishment Melbourne directors retire', but the President of the Business Council of Australia, Hugh Morgan is a member, as is Don Argus, Chairman of BHP-Billiton, Australia's largest corporation (Harrigan, 2005: 21). The clubs in Melbourne show a tight connection with exclusive private schools, particularly with the old boys of Melbourne Grammar, Scotch College and Geelong Grammar (Harrigan, 2005: 34). One businessman from a migrant background on the *Business Review Weekly* Rich List says 'Melbourne is still run by the Melbourne Club in politics and business and wealth'. Another when asked if he has run into the 'old school tie network' said, 'Oh yes, oh yes, yes, very often, yes, oh God yes!' One more explains, 'It's a question of breeding. It's a question of being around at the right time, going to the right school, having the right friends' (Gilding, 2002: 151). In 1953, the Melbourne Club rejected Kenneth Myer's nomination as a member, apparently because he was of Jewish descent. In 1970, it also rejected his son Baillieu. Simon Warrender, from the English aristocracy and related to the Myers by marriage, resigned in protest (Gilding, 2002: 149). It now has seven Jewish members, but women are still not permitted in 2003 (Stewart, 2003: 10).

Club food is not special. Members come for the 'silver service and the atmosphere' said one (Harvey, 2003: 24). Former Principal of

St Andrew's College, the largest all-male university college in Australia, Peter Cameron (1997: 198) commented that 'the atmosphere in the Australian Club, from the outsize painting in the foyer of the Battle of Waterloo to the kidneys and rice pudding in the members' dining room which "always remind me of Nanny", is redolent of privilege and class'. When Cameron himself was inducted into the club, he was advised not to bring guests of 'Asian extraction' lest this offend some of the older members (Cameron, 1997: 19).

Some clubs, like the Melbourne Club, enforce a ban on deal-making within the club, while allowing members to talk about business generally. As an investment banker explained, 'You can go to one of the clubs and have lunch for an hour but you can't discuss business. So you then have to arrange another meeting'. Or, you can play golf. Eighteen holes pretty much guarantees five hours with a captive audience and there are no restrictions on what can be discussed (Gluyas, 2003). Golf combines exercise with exclusivity. Kerry Packer belongs to the Australian Golf Club in Rosebery, Sydney, along with Prime Minister John Howard, and to the other exclusive club nearest his home in Bellevue Hill, the Royal Sydney. Despite the \$15,000 joining fee and the \$5,000 annual fee, there is a long waiting list (Harvey, 2003: 24; Richards, 2003: 14). Golf lends itself to business conversations on the course, and embodies competitive individualism – but only with those people considered appropriate. Membership of the right clubs, or indeed ownership of private golf links, can ensure the requisite privacy.

Neighbours in the elite resort of Palm Beach can play golf together at the exclusive Elanora Country or Terrey Hills Clubs – if they can afford the \$40,000 membership fee. However, no amount of cash can secure membership of the adjacent Pacific Club and the Cabbage Tree Club next door to the Packers' holiday house. The Cabbage Tree Club in 1996 still banned Japanese and Koreans and anyone married to them (Loane, 1996: 2). Membership to the clubs can be gained by serving seven years in the Palm Beach Surf Life Savers' Club, next door, just across the road from the main beach. But joining the exclusive Surf Club is not easy. Applicants must know five members, and half of them

are rejected each year. About half the new members do not last the first year's instruction and initiation. In December 2002, in front of about fifty club members including 'freshers', Club captain and merchant banker, Sam Espie and his vice-captain, 'tore down a trophy made of five boomerangs and two spears carved by Aboriginal elders from Brewarrina, broke it into pieces, then doused them with flammable fluid and burnt them'. They said it was 'just one of those surf club things you do when you get drunk and silly'. A spokeswoman for the Aboriginal community said she would be 'very surprised' if the elders would have 'anything to do with them' (Cornford, 2002: 3; Sloley, 2004: 388; Harvey, 2003: 24; Chancellor, 1997c: 135).

Like gambling casinos, some religions have separate facilities for the very wealthy. Following the crashing of One.Tel in 2002, James Packer turned to Scientology at the urging of his friend Tom Cruise. Scientology has eleven 'celebrity centres' around the world. It costs US\$376,000 to attend a course at the celebrity centre in Los Angeles (Lawson, 2002a: 3).

Charities afford a remarkable opportunity to network and to do good. Some, however, are more useful than others.

Newcomers to Palm Beach [USA] often start by working with the opera, for instance, until they realize this does not get them invited to the better parties [...] So people soon trade up to cancer, which is a B-list charity. 'You see so much trading up in this town'. With patience they may ultimately arrive at the A-list of the Crippled Children's Society [...] or the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach (dedicated to the noble philanthropic cause of keeping Palm Beach charming for the rich) (Conniff, 2003: 180).

There is a 'certain uniformity' in the charities the rich support. Aid to rebuild East Timor was not a popular option. According to one charity committee chairman, 'we like to choose causes which are appropriate to our lives'. Breast cancer and organ transplantation were hot in 2003, and sick children are an evergreen favourite. The Sydney Children's Hospital annual Gold Dinner raised \$1.5 million in 2005, successfully struggling back from a dip in 2002 caused by its association with failed HIH director Rodney Adler, and Princess Mary and Prince Frederick of

Denmark were guests of honour at the \$2000 per head dinner for the Starlight Foundation at Boomerang in Elizabeth Bay. But perhaps the premier charity in Sydney remains the Victor Chang Foundation for cardiac research, its status confirmed when its 1996 annual fund-raising dinner was attended by Princess Diana in her deep blue Versace gown. The foundation was established by a \$2 to \$3 million donation by Kerry Packer after he suffered a near fatal heart attack on the polo field. Chaired by former New South Wales Premier Neville Wran, its committee included Telstra director and Foxtel chair Sam Chisholm, Ros Packer, wife of Kerry, and Barbara Ell, wife of property developer Bob Ell. James Packer chaired a subcommittee to raise \$15 million for a building program at St Vincent's Hospital, which included Westfield's Steven Lowy, Macquarie Bank's Mark Johnson and broadcaster Alan Jones. The tenth anniversary dinner in 2004 was attended by the Governor-General Michael Jeffrey (Saville, 2005: 53; Porter, 2005: 24; Grigg, 2004: 48; Shand, 2003b: 19).

The ballet is a perennially popular charity. Multiplex, Ansett Airlines, Coca-Cola Amatil and Westpac each paid \$5,000 for a table at the ANA hotel's grand ballroom which was decked out in the manner of the Hermitage with chandeliers, gilt-framed mirrors and candelabra. Footmen greeted the guests handing them bread, salt and a shot of Smirnoff black label vodka. The meal of Russian haute cuisine including borscht, swordfish, salmon stuffed veal and rich desserts, was eaten with the 'Imperial family', Prince Michael of Russia and his wife, Princess Guilia, who were the guests of honour. Liberal Party supporter and son-in-law of Rupert Murdoch, John Calvert-Jones, came up from Melbourne, joining fellow Australian Ballet board members Lady Marigold Southey and Robert Albert, while Lady Sonia McMahon made an appearance with Bankers Association's Arthur Delbridge (Mychasuk, 1996a: 27).

But in the end, Julie Singleton, wife of advertising supremo John Singleton, summed up the charity scene succinctly: 'Rich people like to eat together'. Max Markson's Sydney agency, Markson Sparks, organised forty charity functions in Australia and New Zealand in 2003,

charging them each \$50,000. He estimates that he has raised \$25 million in the three years since he brought Raquel Welch to a function for the Sydney Children's Hospital. 'The cause is almost irrelevant', he claims. 'The wealthy elite want a chance to meet people like Nelson Mandela or former US President Bill Clinton, to have dinner with them and look them in the eye and they will pay for it. You walk into property developer Harry Triguboff's office and you'll see a picture of Harry with Bill Clinton, Harry with George Bush Senior'. When Don D'Cruz from the neo-liberal Institute of Public Affairs suggested that the wealthy should forget the parties and public face and pay their fair share of tax instead, merchant banker and conservative member of parliament, Malcolm Turnbull, whose wife Lucy is a former Lord Mayor of Sydney and mover and shaker on the Sydney Children's Hospital Gold Dinner committee, was miffed. 'One of the virtues of charity is that it creates a network of support in the community for various causes. If the government is responsible for all redistribution of wealth, it tends to disintermediate people', he said (Saville, 2005: 53; Shand, 2003b: 19).

Buying a \$1000 ticket to or a \$10,000 table at a charity dinner shows that one is rich enough to afford it and generous enough to do it. According to Max Markson, the main reason for attending such gatherings is to network in the name of benevolence. 'It's entertainment, it's for a good cause and it's also an upmarket form of networking,' he said. The charity committees themselves – the Black and White Committee, Cornucopia, Peter Pan, the Gold Committee, and the Silver Committee which raised \$93,000 for the Sydney Children's Hospital from its party at the Sydney Opera House in 2002 – cement relations between the wives of the wealthy. Charity, too, does seem to be its own reward. 'I have learned,' said Ted Turner, 'the more good I do, the more money has come in' and businessman Robert H. Lorsch said that he receives between \$1.01 and \$2 for each dollar he gives to charity. It 'just works out that way'. Besides, philanthropy feels good. One of Gilding's informants told him, 'I say to myself, "The more I give, the happier I feel about myself and the more I can look at myself in the mirror and say,

you're okay". You look in the mirror, you look at yourself – without any bullshit – and say, *I'm okay*' (Gilding, 2002: 178; Conniff, 2003: 104, 105; Browne, 2003b: 51; Hoyer, 2002: 23).

Vacation leisure time for ruling-class men is often spent in exclusive resorts and their environs. As a child, Conrad Black wintered in Nassau, where his father belonged to the elite Porcupine Club. Here the eight-year-old shook hands with the Prince of Wales, something he recalls with pleasure (Siklos, 1995: 25, 26).

Since 1978, the year he took control of Argus, Black had spent his winters in Palm Beach, that bastion of dynastic opulence on Florida's Atlantic coast. To winter there was not only to follow in the footsteps of former Argus head Bud McDougald, but to rub shoulders with the cream of American tycoonery. 'Palm Beach isn't everyone's cup of tea,' Black told writer Peter Newman. 'Some people are offended by the extreme opulence, but I find it sort of entertaining.' (Siklos, 1995: 83, 84). It was so enjoyable that Black purchased a colonial-style estate with rose and herb gardens, nine bedrooms, seven bathrooms, a double onyx stairwell, a wood-panelled library, a \$3.4 million fountain, a swimming pool and a tunnel decorated in ceramic tiles leading directly to the private beach (Hoyle, 2005: 37).

Here he was a neighbour to the second Viscount Rothermere, a fact he also recounts with pride (Black, 1993: 3). He writes lovingly of retreating here to 'the huge, splendidly maintained mansions, the swarms of Rolls Royces and Ferraris and Mercedes Benzes and Aston Martins, the violently rich winters in the Everglades and Bath and Tennis Clubs' (Black, 1993: 47).

Forty kilometres north of Sydney, Australia's Palm Beach is now a suburb. It has been exclusive to the very rich for more than one hundred years, keeping its beautiful bushland, rainforest and beach relatively intact as the other northern beaches drown in a sea of apartments and cheek-by-jowl houses. There are very few blocks of flats or high rise developments there, however, and little in the way of public transport, no freeways or railway stations. Hotels, motels, caravan parks, camping grounds or suburban malls are conspicuously absent. There are few foot-

paths and even fewer children's playgrounds and no bike tracks (Loane, 1996: 2).

Is this leisure, however? Certainly it is hard to argue that it is as the 'teenage daughters of the establishment' are networking as well as their fathers and mothers and their job is to maintain continuity and cement alliances between families. Holidaying in Palm Beach, Florida is, after all, unashamedly an opportunity to network – 'to rub shoulders with the cream of American tycoonery'.

In this way the time of ruling-class men is by no means clearly divided between work and leisure for the two merge perceptibly and there is little in the way of a division between the working day and recreation. Yet this class is keenly aware that the labour time of their workers means capital accumulation and they resent and resist the intrusion of anything approaching 'leisure' into the work time of these inferior but necessary beings. For tycoon businessmen, work often resembles leisure, and leisure pursuits resemble work. At dinner parties or in the boardroom, relations with their peers are instrumental. As Harrigan, (2005: 26) concluded, 'a unique combination' of almost exclusively male businessmen's clubs, golf and country clubs, yachting and tennis clubs form a preserve for the traditional part of the Australian establishment. Even so, close and lasting friendship between ruling-class men is rare although alignments of mutual interest and ruling-class solidarity sometimes punctuate the prevailing ruthless competition which prohibits trust. At play, as at work, the competitiveness, manipulation, control and the excitement of apparent risk is what obsesses ruling-class men; without it they are bored and lack purpose.

The work of ruling-class men is characterised by obsessive competitive individualism spurred by a keen sense of their superiority, and ceaseless acquisitiveness reinforced by their feelings of deservedness. It involves the habitual exercise of power expressed in hierarchy, bullying, manipulation and determination to prevail. Detachment from, and ruthlessness towards, others is virtually universal among this class of men.

The lack of distinction between work and leisure means that ruling-class men rarely 'retire'. At death there is, in the manner of royalty, a

succession. Towards the ends of their lives, they become obsessed with the logistics of passing on their empires, usually to family and mostly to sons. The succession is, however, generally secure. For they have spent a lifetime learning to perfection the skills of a ruling-class man and they have expended considerable money ensuring that the next generation will be, as near as possible, an accurate image of their own.

Chapter Seven

Love, Sex, Marriage

We have seen how the childhood of very rich men is characterised by emotional distance from parents and anxiety in relating to them. The absence of parental warmth is substituted by the deferential closeness of servants, whose services are hired and who can be, and often are, replaced. Relations with siblings are competitive. Friends are few, and trust is heavily circumscribed. From boarding school to college, the objects of desire of either sex are viewed brutally, instrumentally. With filial love, fraternal love and friendship so fraught, what forms of romantic, sexual and spousal relations might these men then develop?

Early Love and Sex

Peter Cameron (1997: 126–127), former Principal of the exclusive St Andrew's College at the University of Sydney, wrote of the disposition towards women developed in all-male private schools and colleges:

Now if you have been boarding at a boys' school for the past five years and you come to an all-male College, and half your mates were at similar schools, and you don't really know what to make of women, and the only women you see in College are there in their capacity as objects of sexual pleasure, and if the talk is all of scoring and rooting and so on, then you are not making much progress in the art of seeing women as fellow human beings... You don't understand women and you are frightened of them and confused by them, but you overcome all this by pretending that you don't need them at all – except for rooting. You reassure yourself by asserting your superiority and your independence and your self-sufficiency, and you retreat into the male fortress.

This imagined masculine self-sufficiency could be shattered by a crisis. Cameron recounts how, after a young Andrewsman was run over and killed by a car in front of a bar near the college, women were permitted in the hallowed halls to take part in the mourning. 'The presence of women students at the Student Club meeting and at the funeral service seemed to indicate how helpless our students were without women, how illusory their self-sufficiency was, how their whole world was as artificial and ultimately unsatisfying as the Australian Club' (Ackland, 2001: 17).

While sequestered at boarding school, the opportunities for meeting young women were extremely limited, though rushed and more or less brutish liaisons with the despised 'local girls' took place occasionally and were boasted about often, as we have seen in Chapter Four. Sexual encounters between the senior boys and the school's maids were also not unheard of (Dimbleby, 1994: 67). In the short time that ruling-class male youths were in the family home, of course, romantic and sexual experimentation with servants and their families was also possible. Prince Edward was 'dating' Princess Anne's stable girl, Shelley Whitborn, during the school holidays (James, 1992: 38). Ronald Fraser became close to Janey, a servant's daughter, with whom he shared an interest in Rider Haggard novels, which he rented to her at a halfpenny for three. She recalled later to the adult Fraser, when he asked why she put up with it, 'Because you were who you were. I felt dreadful about it. You were Master Ronnie and I was made to feel I shouldn't be there wasting your time' (Fraser, 1984: 150). She reminisced, 'When we were in the playroom together you were human, free and easy, I'd say, you could talk as you liked. But you'd talk more as a gentleman when you were with your mother [...]'. Janey wrote to him nearly every day at boarding school, for which his classmates tormented him mercilessly (Fraser, 1984: 155–156).

Competitiveness and conspicuous performance are as common in this milieu, as they are in later life. Bettina Arndt (2003: 13) reports an incident where schoolboys from years 8 and 9 at a Sydney ruling-class school rented a hotel room and 'invited girls over for a competition to

see who could be serviced most quickly' with oral sex. The sexologist and journalist notes dryly that with fourteen-year-old boys, it would not take long. The youthful dalliances of ruling-class men are not always dignified. Prince Harry reportedly disappeared into a pub toilet for twenty minutes with his blonde Zimbabwean girlfriend, Chelsy Davy, described by the tabloid *Sunday Telegraph* as a 'nubile [...] temptress' (B. Wilson, 1994: 84).

Pre-marital sexual encounters of young ruling-class men are a matter of the ubiquitous competitiveness of their class, of proving of themselves to themselves and to others, including against their fathers. One of the Rothschild family, Philippe, wrote in a 1984 memoir, 'I was a tremendous success [...] leaping from bed to bed like a mountain goat [...] I was always convinced [my father] had won his spurs riding my grandmother's chambermaids. No, mine were ancient titles, fashionable beauties, stars of stage and screen, salon queens and one mutinous lesbian, only one' (Smith, 1997: 100).

Youthful promiscuity is not only tolerated or indulged, but is recommended and encouraged by ruling-class mentors. Septuagenarian Lord Louis Mountbatten, the only family member with whom the young Prince Charles could confide about his affairs, repeatedly counselled his great-nephew, 'I believe, in a case like yours, that a man should sow his wild oats and have as many affairs as he can before settling down. But for a wife he should choose a suitable and a sweet-charactered girl before she meets anyone else she might fall for'. Charles 'did not refrain' from taking Mountbatten's counsel. He was 'flattered by the attention of so many sparkling women [...] but he seemed to derive precious little joy from these encounters.' 'His closest friends began to worry about the rate at which young women came in and out of his life, too often – it seemed to them – picked up and discarded on a whim' (Dimbleby, 1994: 181, 205, 260).

Mountbatten may also have advised Charles' father Prince Philip, a generation earlier, since the latter was well known for his 'secret girlfriends'. One such was the 'beautiful belle of Sydney society', Sue Other-Gee, who had 'rubbed shoulders with royalty, aristocrats and mili-

tary top brass'. Their 'special friendship' continued after his marriage and he introduced her to the Queen on the royal yacht *Britannia* in Sydney during their coronation tour. There were many such special friends. Advisers had pointed out to the King young Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten's indiscreet womanising, casting doubt on his suitability as a suitor for his daughter, Princess Elizabeth (Shears, 2004: 22; Vincent, 2002: 19).

Clan patriarch Joseph P. Kennedy's philandering was notorious and his son John F. Kennedy's affairs were well-known, before and after his marriage to Jacqueline. His father had advised Jack to 'get laid as much as possible'. On a trip with best friend Lem Billings around the Continent in 1937 in a Ford Convertible, the young JFK heeded this counsel. He 'described himself as "not [a] gentleman!" in no fewer than ten of the 26 hotels, pensions, youth hostels and salvation Army billets in which he and Billings stayed'. Jack Kennedy was having an affair with actress Audrey Hepburn at the same time as he was secretly courting Jackie. In his turn, John F. Kennedy Jr, 'handsome and charming' like his father, continued the family tradition. His romantic links in between long-standing relationships included Princess Stephanie of Monaco, singers Madonna and Apollonia, the protegee of rock superstar Prince; and actresses Brooke Shields, Molly Ringwald, Sarah Jessica Parker, Daryl Hannah and Catherine Oxenberg (James 1991: 31, 86, 114; Andersen, 1996: 10, 26, 81, 100; Athorne, 2003: 26).

Sex, Power, Money

Such proclivities are not exclusive to ruling-class young men, of course. Yet, as Phyllis Chesler puts it, 'economically richer and more powerful men do command more sexual attention, more easily and for a longer period of time, than economically poorer men do' (Chesler 1978: 233). Journalist Barbara Amiel, who later married Conrad Black, wrote in a

magazine article that 'power is sexy, not simply in its own right, but because it inspires self-confidence in its owner and a shiver of subservience on the part of those who approach it' (Siklos, 1995: 278). Higham described the bisexual Howard Hughes, for instance, as 'handsome, slender, with hard muscles; he had a vulnerable, little-boy-lost quality and immense charm; but even if he had not been good-looking and desirable, his wealth and power would have acted as an aphrodisiac on the men and women he wanted' (Higham, 1993: 100). Former journalist Nancy Dickerson, who dated Jack Kennedy and also reported on his politics, said of him, 'He was so gosh-darn physically, animalistically attractive [...]. And of course power is the ultimate aphrodisiac and with that combination he was really something' (Andersen, 1996: 93). Actress Angie Dickinson, who had bathed naked with Jack Kennedy on the night of his presidential nomination, met up with him as he slipped away from Jackie in his presidential box on the evening of his inauguration. She was on a date with his old navy mate, Red Fay, whose wife was out of town. She subsequently described the furtive sex with the new president that night as 'the most exciting seven minutes of my life' (Andersen, 1996: 253).

It is likely, then, that such men's attitudes toward 'playing the field' are qualitatively different from the masculinities of other classes. Nancy Dickerson observed of Jack Kennedy, 'All his life he was trained to view women as objects to be conquered, possessed. Jack had really no respect for women. You can hardly blame him. After all, Jack learned at the foot of the master' (Andersen, 1996: 17). After ending an affair with a suspected Nazi spy, Inga Arvad, Kennedy was secretly engaged to Alicja Darr in 1951, according to an FBI file (Andersen, 1996: 92), and was obliged by his father, Joe, to abandon his fiancée because of her Polish-Jewish background. Bobby Kennedy paid Darr half a million dollars in an out of court settlement of the breach of promise. She later married Edmund Purdom, who eventually named John F. Kennedy as a correspondent in his divorce counter-suit, when she divorced him for infidelity. Brother Bobby delivered another cheque to ensure a 'quiet Mexican divorce'. At the same time, Jack Kennedy was having an affair with

Pamela Farrington, a model, as well as Nancy Dickerson. The latter said, 'To Jack, sex *was* just like a cup of coffee – no more or less important than that'. Kennedy once remarked, with a conspiratorial wink to trusted reporters, 'I'm never finished with a girl until I've had her three ways' (Andersen, 1996: 93).

Higham (1993: 69, 113) describes the seemingly insatiable Howard Hughes as 'cool, detached and impersonal' in his liaisons with both men and women. He writes of one partner's discovery, 'that for Hughes sex was no more than relief (or proof of potency), that he wasn't inventive, tender or considerate, that he was using human orifices for his satisfaction, and that men and women were merely entrances for his pleasure'. According to Higham (1993: 150),

Hughes began renting apartments in which he stashed numerous actresses. He seldom visited them, but wanted to be sure that, if he felt aroused at, say, three a. m., and in the unlikely event he was alone, or too lazy to call a service, he could drive to that young woman's home, ring the doorbell, enter – no other man was ever allowed to share their beds – strip, penetrate, climax, dress and go home.

While in a relationship with Terry Moore, Hughes sent her for a pregnancy test, and the doctor gave the positive result to the billionaire without telling his patient. Hughes wanted to avoid the damage to his reputation of the unwanted pregnancy; an illegitimate child would have been even worse, and he despised children. The same doctor eventually was given charge of the premature delivery, in Munich after a twenty-four hour flight from Los Angeles, where he did tell Moore that Hughes did not want the child, that 'it would be an inconvenience to him'. 'Moore became hysterical; the birth was even more than usually agonizing, and after twelve hours of life, the little girl was dead of septicemia... Hughes made no secret of his relief. Moore charged him with making sure the baby was killed. For years, she was certain he had had the child murdered' (Higham, 1993: 166–167).

Relationships could be ended instrumentally, without remorse, a practice again not unique to ruling-class men, but one which they de-

velop the character to excel at. Conrad Black wrote in his autobiography, 'I more or less co-habited for about half the period 1972–1974 with a sequence of interesting and attractive women, all intelligent and rightly ambitious career people'. He describes parting with a girlfriend after a two-year relationship: 'After lunch, I supervised the loading of my belongings onto an independent East Montreal moving van, whose owner had never been in Ontario before, took leave in another poignant parting with my French-Canadian girlfriend of two years of ever pleasant memory and drove to Toronto [...]' (Black, 1993: 106, 129).

Marriage

It is a social-scientific commonplace that marriage and the family reproduce class and gender relations, and the place of each person within these. For ruling-class men, this entails the preservation of their family's class power and privilege for future generations, and crucially therefore, the ownership and control of its capital. One third of Georgina Murray's (1989: 129) sample of the directors of major companies had fathers who were likewise placed, compared to two per cent of the overall population of New Zealand. As we have seen, a very particular form of masculinity has been needed for this; thus the marriages of very rich and powerful men must lend themselves to the production of appropriate heirs, as well as to the maintenance of the incumbent patriarch.

Morrell (1996: 175) describes how, in ruling-class families of the South African midlands, wives and husbands 'vested themselves in the reproduction of the family name. For many a father this became his major goal and focus of life', for families, unlike other social institutions, 'can "die" as a result of biological or social misfortune (the failure to conceive a male heir or to see him reach maturity and himself marry a woman and have children)'. But ensuring progeny was one thing. The fortune that to be bequeathed has to be substantial and could not

be dispersed too widely, among too many offspring. 'It was of little use to beget heirs and leave them without resources. In such instances, the family might as well have died, because it was the family name (and implicitly its influence and status) which patriarchs sought to ensure, rather than just the biological fact of conceiving children' (Morrell, 1996: 175).

One of Michael Gilding's multimillionaire interviewees gave two-thirds of his estate to his sons whom he hoped would join the family business. Favouring sons, he thought, would improve the chances of a family business dynasty surviving across generations because the family shareholding remained concentrated in fewer hands (Gilding, 2002: 90). While producing progeny is crucial to succession, too many heirs can dissipate an inheritance. John D. Rockefeller and Henry Ford each managed to produce a single male heir (while the former had three daughters, the only son inherited the lion's share), thus propagating two of the most successful abiding dynasties of the very rich. By contrast, Isaac Merrit Singer, the manufacturer of the ubiquitous sewing machine, sired twenty-seven offspring whose families, while hardly impoverished, have lost their dynastic potential (Conniff, 2003: 251–256).

The Rothschilds recognised this function of succession quite formally and structurally:

As other leading European families withered, the Rothschilds maintained a remarkable cohesion, even though offspring dispersed as far as California. The third and fourth generations intermarried extensively, but more crucial was a strict patrilineal structure set down by Mayer Amschel in his will. Only sons could own and run the family banks. While this consigned the Rothschild women to secondary status, it protected the family from interloping husbands (Smith, 1997: 102).

By contrast, Gloria Vanderbilt (1996; 2004), the only child of an inveterate gambler and playboy who died of alcohol abuse at 45 after spending \$17 million in seven years, and whose mother left her in the care of her nanny, Dodo, while she lived the high life with his legacy, eventually lost her fortune to her therapist and his lawyer friend: 'They robbed

me of everything'. In the meantime, she had been a girlfriend of Howard Hughes, then married his abusive press agent and reported procurer, followed by a couple more marriages.

Howard Hughes eventually married Ella Rice, 'one of Houston's most sought-after debutantes', the grand-niece of the founder of 'the prestigious Rice University' whose family was 'the top of the city's elite'. Their wedding was described in the *Houston Chronicle* as the 'notable event of the year on the social calendar' (Maguglin, 1984: 16). She was 'ideally eligible, since she had money, was good-looking, was an expert on a dance floor, and didn't drink'. Both the Rices and the Hugheses were keen to connect their families, and Ella's sister Libby was married to William S. Farish, a friend of Howard's father and the founder of Standard Oil of New Jersey. Three major dynasties of wealth and power would be linked through the one marriage (Higham, 1993: 31). The Hughes' heir, however, was never produced and Howard died intestate, an unwashed derelict recluse with a fortune frittered down to a mere \$650 million. Legal wrangling over his estate continued for two years (Higham, 1993: 326, 329).

Another legacy which failed to sustain a dynasty was that of Larry Hillblom, who had established DHL Worldwide Express. When he was killed in 1995 in a plane crash,

it came out that he had a special fondness for teenage virgins in Asia. Four of his children by separate unmarried mothers successfully sued for the bulk of his \$650 million estate [...]. Hillblom's disapproving mother, who'd been left out of his will, sold a sample of her blood to the plaintiffs for \$1 million to help them prove that Hillblom was the father (Conniff, 2003: 235).

Intermarriage, which we have already noted is common among the Rothschilds, is another way of keeping capital within the reproducing family. According to Nelson Aldrich 'the best way to describe Old Money families is to call them families of cousins'. He notes that the Livingstons, Jays, Beekmans, and Astors have intermarried for generations (Conniff, 2003: 273). Ruling-class marriages sometimes secure business succession within family, as is the case with Marks and Spencer.

Simon Marks, the son of the firm's founder, married the sister of Israel Sieff. Sieff in turn married Simon's sister. The two men transformed the business, but it was the Sieffs, not the eponymous Marks, who provided the succession in management (Davis, 1982: 34).

Women of the class, then, are expected 'to marry and produce more heirs; they are not expected to stage boardroom coups and build even bigger empires' (Davis, 1982: 32). Joanie Bronfman (1987: 6, 356) whose family was 'visibly wealthy', wrote that 'upper class women are expected to marry upper class men, and to continue the class by bearing upper class children [...] and conform to the needs of her husband'. The wealthiest women in Australia have an average of 3.6 children, almost twice the national average (Dickins, 2005: 89). Bronfman (1987: 357) noted perceptively of her class that, 'although women are expected to bear and raise children to continue certain religious and ethnic groups, no other economic class places major importance on the continuity of the class itself'.

Ruling-class wives, then, are chosen as potential mothers of heirs, as suitable company and hostesses, and often as sources of further capital and powerful contacts. One of Bronfman's ruling-class women interviewees told her, 'The men [...] represented the family and the women had to appear nicely along with them and, as kids we had to appear nicely with them. We were a social backing for the men in the family' (Bronfman, 1987: 360).

Just as long lunches and dinner parties are an opportunity for political and business connections, as well as indulgence, for ruling-class men, as discussed in Chapter 6, so charity events and organisations, in addition to altruism, offer their wives the possibility of contacts which advance their husbands' business interests and thus the standing of the family. Bronfman (1987: 362) observed,

Good volunteer work [...] of course made contacts available to many people in many cases where contacts wouldn't have been available before [...] I can remember being asked when the wives of prominent businessmen in Boston were asked to a Harvard Business School course that was given at Radcliffe.

They asked how certain contacts were made and how certain deals were started. I can remember putting my naive hand up and saying, 'Oh well, there's no question about that that's done at a dinner party'.

For the extremely wealthy, marriage is a business relationship. Prince Charles complained to his friends that his wife Diana, irrationally, could not live within the terms of the conditions he set out before proposing: 'A contract is a contract' (C. Wilson, 1994: 120). When the Kennedy marriage was on the point of divorce, Jackie accepted a million dollars from Joe Kennedy not to divorce Jack (Andersen, 1996: 171). Howard Hughes once insisted that his lawyer, Greg Bautzer, convey to starlet Elizabeth Taylor's mother his offer of one million dollars for her daughter to be his 'bride' (Higham, 1993: 156).

A weird echo of the movie, *Indecent Proposal*, was recounted to the London High Court in a defamation case in 2003. Brian Maccaba, the chief executive of the international technology company, Cognotec, had allegedly offered the equivalent of a million US dollars to the husband of Nathalie Attar, an orthodox Jewish newlywed teacher in the school he founded, to divorce her and allow her to marry him. Rabbi Lichtenstein, whose was being sued by Maccaba for defamation, had 'allegedly told prominent members of the Jewish community that Mr Maccaba had slept with one or more married Jewish women and kept a list of women he wanted to seduce'. When Mr Attar approached Mr Maccaba and asked him to leave his wife alone, the 45-year old pursued her younger sister of 19 years, and proposed marriage to her (Chrisafis, 2003; Davies, 2004: 13).

But of course it is usually the prospective wife to whom the riches are offered in the exchange of marriage. For example, when Johnson and Johnson scion, J. Seward Johnson, was seeking matrimony in 1938, as his wife, Lucinda, recounted:

'He kept proposing to me all the time', she later recalled. 'One day he came with some papers, they were Johnson & Johnson lists of figures. I wasn't interested in figures, but I remember that one of the figures was \$92,000, which he told me was his quarterly allowance from his stockholdings. Seward said,

‘Lucinda, you know I do nothing constructive with my money. You have friends, you have causes, you could do something with my money.’ I thought about that, and the next time he proposed, I accepted’ (Conniff, 2003: 228).

Marriage can also be an important and useful vehicle for conserving threatened assets. The very day before the Australian Securities and Investment Commission raided his house and Sydney offices, Jodee Rich reached agreement with his wife Maxine under the *Family Law Act* effectively to transfer all his personal property into her name. The \$6 million family home was passed over to her, with an agreement that he would meet payments of the \$3.7 million mortgage. She was also given most of Craigend, the Darling Point mansion which Jodee purchased in 1999 for \$14 million (Barry, 2002: 321–322).

The function of producing heirs to reproduce the ‘bloodline’, not just the family name, must be maintained not only by monogamy, but by safeguarding the fidelity of women in the formally monogamous marriage. Though it is no guarantee of later marital faithfulness, official status as a virgin (or perhaps a widow) is demanded of brides of the Prince of Wales, as future king, and childbearing capacity is crucial if he is without heirs. In 1981, Lady Diana Spencer was obliged to submit to a gynaecological test. Her uncle, Lord Fermoy, announced what was officially found: ‘Diana, I can assure you, has never had a lover’. Diana herself commented, ‘I knew I had to keep myself tidy for what lay ahead’ (Arndt, 2002: 4).

Ruling-class men can often appear to be pampering their wives and lovers with numerous household staff. But for the women themselves, these attendants may appear as *de facto* guardians of their virtue. ‘Indeed, with a page in the house, a coachman or a postilion to take me for drives and a groom to accompany my rides,’ Consuelo Vanderbilt observed in her memoirs, ‘my freedom was quite successfully restricted’ (Conniff, 2003: 245). Outside the house, rich men often entrust their wives to suitable male escorts like Ros Packer’s ‘walker’ Johnny Baker (Lacy, 2003a: 27). ‘Walkers’, notes Conniff (2003: 246–247), ‘are usually “appropriate”, meaning homosexual’. Howard Hughes employed a retinue of clean-

cut Mormon drivers, often handsome and homosexual. 'One reason for having them take his various starlets around for shopping was that they wouldn't go to bed with the girls; another reason was that, in a few instances, Hughes could have access to them' (Higham, 1993: 132–133).

Marriages of the very rich are frequently distant relationships – emotionally, and as we have seen in Chapter 5, spatially. French president Francois Mitterand and his wife addressed each other with the formal 'vous'. Similarly, Prince Charles insisted early in their relationship that Lady Diana call him 'sir' (Hammond, n. d.: 16). Not only were their respective parents 'calculatedly cold' to each other, but White House staff found the Kennedys 'oddly stiff' in each other's company. This was an extension of Jack's aversion of being touched and his well-known derision of husbands and wives who insisted on 'hanging all over each other in public' (Andersen, 1996: 265, 266).

In 1956, when Jackie was eight months pregnant, Jack embarked on a week's sailing cruise on the Mediterranean with his brother Teddy, George Mathers and several female companions, including 'a stunning blond Manhattan socialite who had previously been keeping Jack company in New York' and who referred to herself as 'Pooh', while Jack called her 'P'. Jackie went into premature labour and delivered a still-born baby girl three days before Jack, Teddy, Pooh and crew pulled into port. Jack's first reaction, on hearing the news from Jackie, was to announce that he would continue his cruise (Andersen, 1996: 167–168).

Divorce

Divorce is as much a business transaction for ruling-class men as marriage is, the payment involved usually, though not always, appearing in their debit column. The famous Hollywood actress, Billie Dove, was married to director Irvin Willat when she became romantically involved with Howard Hughes. Hughes phoned Willat and asked him how much

money it would take for him to allow a divorce on grounds of cruelty. Willat demanded \$500,000, but Hughes bargained him down to \$325,000, though it had to be paid in cash. When Hughes' biographer Higham asked him if he had any regrets, Willat replied, 'I should have stuck Hughes for a half million'. Billie Dove's relationship with Hughes was the talk of the town, and they were widely expected to marry. They did not, for reasons which Billie Dove never disclosed, saving Hughes a fortune in alimony (Higham, 1993: 50).

Typically, however, the very rich man parts with as much as half of his fortune in divorce settlement, and moves on to marry a younger or otherwise more suitable woman. When former General Electric chief Jack Welch was divorced by his wife Jane after he embarked on an affair with *Business Review* editor Suzy Wetlaufer, he was liable for \$730 million, or half his personal wealth, according to divorce experts (Johnston, 2002). By contrast, Prince Charles was obliged to hand over to Princess Diana his entire personal fortune in their divorce settlement, according to his former personal adviser, Geoffrey Bignell. This amounted to £17.5 million plus an allowance to maintain her personal office. The Prince is not left in penury, however, since he earns an annual £12 million from the Duchy of Cornwall, which could not be included in the deal, since the Prince has no rights to its capital, worth £400 million in 2003 (*Telegraph*, London, 26/7/04: 6; Johnston, 2003: 4).

The wife of the Aga Khan, the Begum Inaara Aga Khan, sought the services of the same lawyer who handled Princess Diana's settlement, Maggie Rae. In early 2005, she was seeking half the Aga Khan's fortune of \$2.4 billion. The Begum Inaara seemed to have the whip hand in the negotiations, since her knowledge of the Aga Khan's financial affairs could cause him considerable grief with the British taxation authorities (Leake, 2005: 26). Jodhi Packer's settlement after 20 months with James, is thought to have been about \$12 million, marginally more than Kate Fischer received at the end of their engagement. Jodhi also kept her blue Mercedes convertible, which had been a present from James, and the \$2.4 million Bronte house which Kerry had bought remains the property of her mother (Koch, 2002: 7; Sharp, 2002: 52).

When Rupert and Anna Murdoch divorced, Anna was believed to be seeking (of his US\$7 billion wealth in 1998) \$100 million in cash and property, plus assurances about her three children's inheritance. One property developer and multimillionaire talked his wife out of going to the Family Court, saying that the court was only for 'people with no money, not people like us' (Loane and Verrender, 1998).

Extra-Marital Sexual Affairs

While both men and women of all social classes have always had affairs, the lives of high-bourgeois men lend themselves particularly to this institution. They have the money to 'keep' a mistress – or a number of them, the temporal flexibility to spend time with them, the power to hide or sustain the relationship(s) in the face of marital, perhaps even filial, or societal, disapproval. There is little disincentive, for even if their indiscretion does endanger the marriage, it does not imperil the all-important passing on of inheritance.

We have noted above Philippe Rothschild's reveries, competing with his father's tally, as if he were discussing his rich man's collection of things, or a display of trophies. The competitiveness, however, seems to distinguish bourgeois men. James Hewitt, the former lover of Princess Diana who sold her love letters, was asked in a television documentary, *Confessions of a Cad*, 'How many women?' 'This week or this year?', he responded. 'What do you normally score a year?', pursued the interviewer. 'More than the England cricket team,' replied Hewitt (Devine, 2003). Gore Vidal said, of the Kennedys, 'In their world, infidelity simply doesn't matter [...] They lived in a world where sex is something you do like tennis. It can become quite competitive. Who can sleep with the most Hollywood stars, for example [...]' (Andersen, 1996: 200).

To charges of moral licentiousness against the nineteenth-century communists, who were accused of proposing communal sexual rela-

tions, Marx and Engels (1968: 50) replied famously in the *Communist Manifesto* that: 'Our bourgeois, not content with having wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives. Bourgeois marriage is, in reality, a system of wives in common [...]'. While the bourgeoisie developed sex as a competitive sport, the privilege of such practice (without sanction) historically belonged to the nobility, and royalty have always been adept at it. The Duke of Windsor, in the years before his marriage to Wallis Simpson, had 130 one night stands (Hellen, 2003). This was in addition to his relationship, while Prince of Wales, with Mrs Dudley Ward, the wife of a Liberal MP, which lasted 15 years, though both she and the Prince pursued other affairs (*Daily Telegraph*, London, 2001). After her marriage to the erstwhile Prince of Wales, the Duchess of Windsor, according to an FBI memo, continued her contact with Nazi Germany's Foreign Minister, Joachim von Ribbentrop, whom the FBI recorded had slept with Simpson seventeen times. Von Ribbentrop reportedly sent her seventeen carnations every day while he was German ambassador in London in 1936. In 1951, the Duchess had an affair with heir to the Woolworth fortune, Jimmy Donahue, who was twenty years younger, 'good looking, good company, very wealthy and 99% homosexual'. A *menage a trois* with the tolerant and devoted Duke persisted for over four years (Boyd, 2003: 28).

A more contemporary love quadrilateral illustrates graphically the 'system of wives in common'. In 2003, it seemed that Princess Anne was to 'rekindle her flame' with Andrew Parker-Bowles – estranged husband of Prince Charles' consort, Camilla – and the combinations and permutations continue (Wilson, 2003: 40). An earlier love interest of Prince Charles, Davina Sheffield, had been widely tipped as a royal bride until an ex-boyfriend with whom she had co-habited, James Beard, spilled the beans matter-of-factly about her prior sexual experience, calling down a swift veto. Christopher Wilson observes delicately that 'Davina had enjoyed the same circular relationship with Charles and his sister as the Parker-Bowleses: her former boyfriend, Old Etonian Robert Rodwell, also used to escort Princess Anne' (Wilson, 1994: 63).

What is remarkable, then, to those outside their orbit, is the smallness and closeness of the world of the super rich. Mark Shand, brother of Camilla, had a relatively prolonged relationship with Caroline Kennedy while he was young and single. She presented him with a pair of boudoir slippers, but the relationship did not last beyond Caroline's return to the USA after her studies in Britain, and Mark moved on to Bianca Jagger, American heiress Avril Payson Meyer, and model Marie Helvin (C. Wilson, 1994: 30–31). John F. Kennedy Jr, for his part, had a 'passionate affair' with Princess Diana who was 'bowled over' by his charm when they met in New York in 1995, but the relationship did not survive her return to London (*Australian* 28/6/05).

Early in the new millennium, actress Kate Fischer, former consort of James Packer, was seen on the arm of millionaire property developer Patrick Yu, in search of her ideal man. 'I really like conservative men. Someone a bit old-school who doesn't show much emotion. A man who has his work and sport but can still be vulnerable with a woman'. But Yu was more interested in reporter and pin-up girl Fiona Argyle. Argyle had left the polo at Werribee Park in the helicopter of Old Etonian Nick Barham who was dating former Miss New Zealand Annie Hewitt and was linked to English widow, Alison Davies, worth about \$500 million. Barham had been married to James Packer's sister, Gretel. Gretel had dated Phillip Brenner who was Jodie Rich's best friend at school, and Jodie married Phillip's sister. Following the break up of his three-year marriage to Jodhi Meares, James Packer was seen in the company of model and author Tara Moss, but has formed a relationship with model Erica Baxter. Baxter was a 'good friend' of Jodhi who meanwhile had taken up with Hamish Gordon, previously on with former Prime Minister Paul Keating's daughter, Katherine. Baxter, who had worked with Jodhi as a model and has modelled her Tiger Lily swimsuits, was a long-term girlfriend of singer and actor Jason Donovan, and has dated one of the English millionaire Aspinalls and Russell Crowe, who are both friends of James Packer. Jodhi was interested in buying Kate Fischer's Bondi house, which she had purchased with the settlement she received from James Packer after their break-up. Crowe's wedding

was attended by James Packer and Peter Holmes a Court whose brother Paul was set to marry Zara Evans, step-daughter of John Walton, likely inheritor of the vast retailing fortune (Barry, 2002: 54, 62; Hoyer, 2002b: 9; Reines, 2002: 142; 2003a: 134; 2003b: 142; 2003c: 126; 2003d: 126; Sharp, 2003a: 52; Smith, 2002: 14; Tsvadaridis, 2003: 3; Zachariah, 2003: 96).

And just as they connect through the memberships of boards of directors and exclusive clubs, rich men are linked to each other through the women they share. Elie Rothschild, for instance, 'supported a series of well-known mistresses'. The first was Winston Churchill's former daughter-in-law, Pamela Churchill, during the 1950s. When she fled to New York to marry a Broadway producer, Elie took up with Françoise de Langlade, an editor at French *Vogue*, who later married Oscar de la Renta (Smith, 1997: 111). Pamela Harriman apparently 'enticed Elie de Rothschild at least in part because he knew he would be following in the footsteps, as it were, of a Churchill, a Harriman, a Whitney, and an Agnelli', according to Conniff (2003: 249). Harriman herself, eldest daughter of the eleventh Baron Digby, observed of her peers, 'They went to bed a lot with each other, but they were all cousins, so it didn't really count' (Conniff, 2003: 251). Gianni Agnelli who had had an open affair, while single, with Pamela Harriman would later lavish attention on Jackie Kennedy while holidaying off the Amalfi coast (Andersen, 1996: 337).

Pamela Digby Churchill Hayward came, by the standards of great wealth, from a somewhat impoverished family, as had Jacqueline Bouvier. Advised 'never marry for money, love where money is', she did just that. Then having 'fulfilled her obligations by producing a male heir, according to high society's self-indulgent code, she was free to take her pleasure where she could find it' as long as she maintained appearances and behaved circumspectly. She became friendly with John F. Kennedy's sister, Kathleen, and intimate with a bevy of extremely wealthy and powerful men. These included the son of Winston Churchill (her first husband), chairman of the C.B.S. board William S. Paley, John Hay Whitney who had inherited an enormous fortune, Prince Aly Khan,

Gianni Agnelli, Baron Elie de Rothschild, General Fred Anderson, Time-Life chief Henry Luce, the enormously privileged William Averill Harriman (whom she married late in life), and C. B. S. newscaster Edward R. Murrow. She was the 'the greatest courtesan of the century', according to William S. Paley (Smith, S., 1996: 174, 175, 188).

Like Jack, brother Teddy Kennedy 'cavorted' with actress Angie Dickinson, and also dated author and actress Beverly Sasso, the ex-wife of celebrity hairdresser Vidal Sassoon and 'squired' Texan beauty Charlotte Brewer, the vice president of a Boston department store (James, 1991: 117). Infamously, he was alone in a car with Mary Jo Kopechne, one of 'the Boiler Room Girls' who had worked on Bobby Kennedy's 1968 campaign, the night she died after the car crashed. Teddy had hosted a party in a rented Chappaquiddick cottage and, fueled by alcohol, had left with Kopechne (James, 1991: 71). After Chappaquiddick, he had a very public affair with Amanda Burden, a former aide to Bobby and daughter of William S. Paley (James, 1991: 99).

The Kennedy brothers shared a lot. The FBI obtained tapes of Hollywood idol Marilyn Monroe having sex with both John and Bobby Kennedy (Andersen, 1996: 309, 336). Phyllis McGuire, then girlfriend of mobster Sam Giancana (with whom Jack Kennedy shared a mistress, Judith Campbell/Exner (Higham, 1993: 202; James, 1991: 27)), said of Marilyn Monroe: 'The initial relationship was with John [...] And there was definitely a relationship with Bob. And, you know, that's very like the Kennedys, just to pass it down from one to the other – Joe Kennedy to John, John to Bobby, Bobby to Ted. That's just the way they did things' (Andersen, 1996: 309).

In 1963, Jackie was introduced to Aristotle Onassis by her sister Lee Radziwill, and holidayed on his 325-foot yacht, the *Christina*, while recovering emotionally from the death of her and Jack's premature son, Patrick (Andersen, 1996: 355). Onassis was having a 'sort of romance' with Lee Radziwill; it was rumoured she planned to divorce her Polish prince husband to marry Onassis. This was despite Onassis's long-standing and ongoing relationship with his famous opera singer mistress, Maria Callas. J. F. Kennedy's personal secretary, Evelyn Lincoln

believed Jackie's relationship with Onassis began before Kennedy was murdered.

Onassis fell for Jackie [...] and then it turned out that he became more than just a friend [...] Jackie loved money, Onassis had money. That might have been what she saw in him. And she didn't like President Kennedy's political friends. She didn't like that kind of life [...] Kennedy couldn't change his career because he was a politician. So you shape up or get lost in the shuffle (Anderson, 1996: 357).

Maria Callas's cuckolded husband wishfully told the press that Onassis had abandoned Maria so he could be with Lee Radziwill. Washington columnist Drew Pearson speculated, 'Does the ambitious Greek tycoon hope to become the brother-in-law of the American President?' (Clarke, 1995: 383). The ambition, as we now know, was the other way. When Onassis married the President's widow, Jackie's prenuptial agreement with him provided for a \$3-million advance payment and the interest on a \$1-million trust fund for each child until they were 21. Jackie inherited \$26 million from his estate when he died. Onassis's daughter, Christina, called her stepmother 'the Black Widow'; his son Alexander shared these sentiments, publicly calling her 'the courtesan' (James, 1991: 93).

There were transatlantic couplings in the next generation. The twenty-two year-old Mark Shand, younger brother of Camilla (later Parker-Bowles), bridged the generations in an affair with Lee Radziwill, two decades older. At her house in Barbados, he met her niece Caroline Kennedy, then still a schoolgirl, and became romantically involved with her when she came to England to study the course he recommended. At the time, Shand was involved in an affair with American actress, Barbara Trentham. At about this time, Camilla Shand became the Prince of Wales's mistress (Wilson, 1994: 29–30).

Higham described both Howard Hughes and his lover Cary Grant as 'cool, detached, impersonal in their liaisons' (Higham, 1993: 69).

It seems to have occurred to neither that they had commitments, Hughes to Corinne Griffith and Cary Grant to Randolph Scott. Nor did they complain

when the high-powered *Hollywood Reporter* columnist Edyth Gwynne reported one of their supposedly secret voyages. When Hughes visited with Grant and Scott at their apartment, it was on a friendly basis. Soon afterward, Scott took off to his hometown, Orange, Virginia, and married money: the man-hungry, tweedy heiress to the multimillion-dollar Du Pont textile fortune, Marian Du Pont. That left Cary open to Hughes's interest in him. The relationship of the pair was to continue on and off until the 1950s (Higham, 1993: 69).

When Katharine Hepburn was making the movie *Holiday* with Cary Grant, Hughes began to date Bette Davis while he was still seeing Ginger Rogers as well as Grant, and living with Hepburn (Higham, 1993: 79). Founder of a dynasty, though in a smaller league, Australian media magnate Sir Frank Packer had a succession of affairs, which his first wife, Gretel, was obliged to overlook. One story recounts how Syd Deamer caught Packer unawares in the act of seduction on his office sofa, and said, 'I'll come back later. I see Mr Packer's not in' (Griffen-Foley, 2000).

With the power relations arranged as they are, it is no surprise that the act of sexual intercourse is often a very one-sided instrumental relation, as is much else in their lives. Howard Hughes, for instance, conducted a brief affair in London with Woolworth heiress, Barbara Hutton, who later was to marry Cary Grant. Hutton wrote in her diary, of Hughes's 'impatience as a lover; his inability to help her over her problems in obtaining a climax; and how he finally just gave himself pleasure – a complaint others had made, and would again'. He was a thoughtless, dispassionate lover, seeking only control, recorded one biographer (Higham, 1993: 34, 77). When one of Howard Hughes' aides said he was missing his wife, Hughes suggested that he 'spend the night with her in a motel to satisfy his desire and return the next day. He couldn't imagine that anyone would want more with a marital partner than a quick fuck. "Why," he asked the aide, "should you need more than that?"' (Higham, 1993: 316).

Not unexpectedly for a man a favourite phrase of whose was, 'Wham, bam, thank you, ma'am', sexual finesse was not Jack Kennedy's strong suit. His *modus operandi*, according to his friend Gloria Emerson, was

strictly 'Up against the wall, Signora, if you have five minutes. That sort of thing'. Actress Jayne Mansfield complained: 'Jack's not much of a lover [...]. It's just in and out with him. No sweet talk before sex [...] I feel sorry for his wife' (Andersen, 1996: 81; James, 1991: 31). For Jodee Rich, millionaire son of a millionaire, the thrill of relations with the opposite sex was like that of a good business deal. 'I love getting a good sale and enjoying a lovely lady' (Barry, 2002: 24).

Prostitutes and Paid Sexual Entertainers

The Sultan of Brunei and his brother Jefri used some of their billions to import a rotating harem of beautiful women. For a fee of \$3,000 apiece per day, the women, including a Penthouse Pet and a Playboy Playmate, were encouraged to perform karaoke, and other indecent acts (Conniff, 2003: 235). Procurement is still frequently part of the unwritten job description of personal assistants to the rich. One told how her former boss '[...] once offered me a \$1,000-a-month raise to get him a date with a woman at the law firm down the hall.' The relationship lasted three months. 'He also offered me \$10,000 to get him a date with Sigourney Weaver. We offered her a part in a commercial that didn't exist.' Weaver's staff wisely screened that call. Hiring prostitutes is at times also part of the job. 'They don't call them that,' said another West Coast assistant. 'I hire "dancers"' (Conniff, 2003: 236).

Howard Hughes would 'compel very young and inexperienced mechanics or their aides, men whose sexual desires were inhibited, to give him sexual satisfaction; he had a mania for the typical aircraft mechanic, who was muscular, clean-cut, athletic, and buyable. He must have paid them, in cash or advancement, because the likelihood is that accepting payment would (paradoxically) assuage their guilt' (Higham, 1993: 42). Once he reached his mid-forties, Hughes found he was not as attractive to sexual partners and had more recourse to buying the

sexual services of men and women. He would pay handsomely for call boys provided by a 'well-known male madam', who supplied the wealthy with muscled young men, oiled and suntanned, seeking acting jobs in Hollywood. Hughes also frequented brothels supported by the Hollywood studios, where beautiful girls specialised as doubles of Lana Turner, Ava Gardner, Betty Grable and the like (Higham, 1993: 148). Kerry Packer was named in Hollywood madam Heidi Fleiss' federal trial for money laundering, as hiring at least four prostitutes to spend a week with him for US\$10,000 each after nine of them had been flown to Los Vegas to meet with him (Horn, 1997).

On one occasion, Hughes was arrested, taken to the station and fingerprinted for kerb crawling, paying a boy prostitute for oral sex in his car. When asked by police for proof of identity, he pulled out a cheque book and wrote a cheque for one million dollars, signing 'Howard Hughes'. He was released without further ado (Higham, 1993: 147).

Sexual Violence and Coercion

We are not arguing in this section that ruling-class men are more prone to acts of sexual violence than other men, though their characteristic self-centredness, their remorselessly instrumental use of other human beings, and their enjoyment of imposing their power – often brutally – on others, would make this a question worth pursuing. We do consider, however, that when they do engage in rape, sexual abuse and other forms of sexual violence and coercion, they are more likely to get away with it. They undoubtedly know this, as do their victims and those responsible for enforcing the law.

When Howard Hughes was a boy, he was incestuously seduced by his paternal uncle, Rupert Hughes but did not proceed to the authorities with the crime (Higham, 1993: 26). An anonymous author claiming to be the son of one of Australia's most powerful men and a well-

known public figure, writes that he was incestuously abused by his father since childhood, including in the company of other men on his property (Anonymous in Briggs, 1995).

During my childhood, my father was one of the most powerful men in Australia. Although unhappy and unsociable, he had the magic touch in his business life. I was probably the only person in the world who hoped that the collapse of the stock market would leave him bankrupt. But he's still there [...] as arrogant and as untouchable as ever [...] I cannot escape from the perpetrator of my abuse. He appears (uninvited) in my home via the television screen. Sometimes, I open a newspaper and find his face staring at me (Anonymous in Briggs, 1995: 152).

He recounts being initially disbelieved, then fobbed off, by the police.

On the first visit, the Detective Sergeant paid careful attention to my statement until he heard the name of the accused perpetrator.

'Do you mean *the* [...]'

'Yes.'

He paused momentarily then tore up the partially completed report form into tiny pieces (Anonymous in Briggs, 1995: 159).

But he and his mother persevered.

Shaken but not deterred, we tried again. On the next occasion, we asked to speak to the regional Detective Inspector. He showed considerable interest until, once again, we gave him the name and address of the offender and then he laughed. It was a nervous kind of laugh. He realised that laughter was inappropriate and apologised. When he recovered composure, he said: 'Look son, you're over the age of eighteen [...] it's a case of consenting adults'.

'But he was six or seven when it started,' my mother said. 'He was too young to give consent.'

'Sorry, I can't help you,' the Inspector replied (Anonymous in Briggs, 1995: 159).

In 1975, Michael Skakel, nephew of Robert F. Kennedy's widow Ethel, mortally bashed in the head of fifteen-year-old Martha Moxley with a

golf club in their exclusive gated community of Belle Haven in Greenwich, Connecticut. On the night of the murder, he had climbed a tree next to her house, thrown sticks and rocks at her window and masturbated there, since she had 'spurned his advances' (Campbell, 2002: 55; *Daily Telegraph*, 2002: 17). Skakel told a former classmate, Gregory Coleman, that he would get away with it because he was a Kennedy. Coleman testified that Skakel had returned two days after the killing and masturbated over the corpse, under a tree on the Moxley family lawn (Beach, 2001: 27). He did get away with it for 27 years, though he was convicted in 2002 and sentenced to 20 years imprisonment. A high-profile campaign by Moxley's mother and residents of the wealthy neighbourhood had led to the conviction. Skakel had spent most of his adult life since the murder in drug rehabilitation clinics for the rich, where authorities claimed he was hidden away by his family to avoid being prosecuted (McKenna, 2003: 29).

Another member of the Kennedy clan, William Kennedy Smith, was charged with a 1991 rape, but was acquitted. Willie was represented by the Kennedy family lawyer, Herbert 'Jack' Miller who had advised Teddy Kennedy after the 1969 death of Mary Jo Kopechne at Chappaquiddick. The victim had told police soon after the incident that Willie told her, 'No one's gonna believe you'. In the Kennedy tradition, as James puts it, Willie's mother, Jean, 'continues to steadfastly support her son, despite statements from three other women who recently came forward with similar stories about him' (McKenna, 2003: 29; James, 1991: 103, 126).

According to the prosecution documents, Willie Smith allegedly raped one woman at his Washington townhouse in May 1988 after a post-exam party. Another woman claimed Willie had attempted to rape her in the spring of that same year. A third said she had been a victim of an attempted attack in New York City in the summer of 1983 (James, 1991: 126).

Kate Wentworth, a daughter of one of Australia's oldest wealthy families, in 1985 mounted a court case accusing her husband, advertising executive, Gordon Rogers, of rape and buggery. She said he had also

ordered his dog to attack her. Her own family, however, closed ranks behind Rogers. He was acquitted by the court after a hearing in which the defence QC called her 'a morally degraded person', and said that she was 'a foul-mouthed woman' with 'the morals of an alley cat'. Having failed to obtain the justice she sought in the courts, she studied to be a barrister, but was banned from practising because of her supposedly vexatious litigation over the alleged rape and associated matters. In 1994, the NSW Parliament discussed a special motion that she be admitted as a barrister. Speaking to the motion, independent MP John Hatton, said that although damages of \$571,000 had initially been awarded against Wentworth, a subsequent appeal in June 1994 'found liability against Rogers and awarded damages to Ms Wentworth', showing that she was the victim (Hansard – Legislative Assembly, 19 October 1994).

In 2000, a case came to public attention of sexual assault in the boarding house of Sydney ruling-class Anglican boys' school, Trinity Grammar. It involved at least 75 sexual assaults over a four-month period – 50 on one victim and 25 on another – often 'in front of "spectators"' (Connolly, 2000) who 'stood by and cheered them on and laughed as the victims screamed' (Overington, 2001: 1). The group sexual assaults involved elements of torture – tying up and beating were part of the ritual violence.

Each young man had his own team of lawyers, as did the school which also, initially anxious to hush matters up, hired a public relations expert to 'spin' the rapes as 'bullying'. The offenders agreed to plead guilty to lesser charges and the prosecution 'agreed to accept the pleas and drop more serious charges of sexual assault', in return for the guilty pleas which 'saved the victim the stress and trauma of having to give evidence [...]' (Walker, 2001a: 6). In one instance, 'two counts of aggravated sexual assault were reduced to one count of intimidation'. In all, twelve other charges were dropped in exchange for the guilty pleas on the basis of this agreement (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 2001b: 2).

Eventually, two 16-year-old offenders were given twelve-month good behaviour bonds and had no conviction recorded (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 2001a: 40). The one youth who admitted using his school tie to

bind one of two victims who had been sexually assaulted more than 75 times over four months, was found guilty of intimidation and released on a good behaviour bond of six months without a conviction recorded. A fourth boy was allowed to plead guilty to intimidation in return for the withdrawal of two charges of aggravated indecent assault, and was placed on a good behaviour bond of six months, with no conviction recorded (Poynting and Donaldson, 2004).

For ruling-class men, romantic, sexual and marital love, in summary, appears as a series of distant, strangely impersonal and instrumental transactions which pass for close relationships. Love, sex and marriage in which competition, acquisitiveness and accumulation can apply, are eminently commodifiable and exchangeable for equivalents. Certainly, power relations are central to them, and relationships with wives, girlfriends, sexual partners and mistresses often involve bullying and humiliation. Sexual violence is not unknown, but ruling-class men often avoid sanctions for this through the deployment of their class and patriarchal power. In love, sex and marriage, as in other areas of their lives, rich and powerful men are indeed what Lorenzo Montesini, Prince Giustiniani (1999), who knew their ways well, has called 'sacred monsters', imposing their will and demanding to be satiated and appeased.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

‘I’m the same. I’m a simple bloke’, Kerry Packer said on hearing his friend Sam Gazal claim that he could ‘get by on \$200,000’ a year – an income at least five times the Australian national average. As a comment made by the richest man in Australia enjoying the lifestyle we have described in this book, this is obviously absurd. Certainly his son James was amused, referring to the previous year’s \$105 million; as we saw in Chapter Five (*Business Review Weekly*, 1999: 82; Koch, 1999: 62).

Perhaps there was an intended irony in Packer’s words but there would have been, as we have seen, an underlying lack of comprehension as well. For neither of the Packers have had to or ever will have to ‘get by on \$200,000’ a year and their concept of what would constitute a ‘simple life’ would be outside the wildest dreams of most people.

The idea that classes are no longer either real or significant is as absurd as supposing that one of the richest men in the world could possibly be ‘a simple bloke’. Globalisation has, if anything, made the inequality between classes even more glaring over the last two decades and has, indeed, been the source of lively discussion. The *Wall Street Journal* in 2005 and the *L.A. Times* late in 2004 both ran a multi-part series on the concentration of wealth and income in the USA. In May 2005, the *New York Times* commenced a series of eleven articles, ‘Class Matters’, based on the work of a team of reporters who had spent more than twelve months ‘exploring ways that class influences destiny’. The journalists found that inequalities between classes were accelerating, that social cohesion amongst the rich was intensifying, and that class had come to play a greater role in life over the last three decades (Scott, 2005; Scott and Leonhardt, 2005).

This book has shown that not only is the ruling class alive and well but that it remains as historically continuous, integrated, networked

and impervious to change with in-built mechanisms smoothly operating to keep it this way. Always global, it is now even more fluidly so and the power it wields is waxing rather than waning, making the necessity for examining the position and characteristics of this class, including its gender dynamics, all the more important. The members of this ruling elite, which comprises between 2–5% of the world's population, have regularly demonstrated that they have the power to 'make' or 'unmake' political leaders in pursuit of their own interests and they make no pretence that this isn't so.

Media magnate, Conrad Black, boasted of having secured, over lunch, the full personal support of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in anticipation of a battle with the workers over the 'introduction of the most modern newspaper technology in our new plants and his decision to import production personnel from Canada' to crush the unions. "I would sign the work permits myself," Thatcher declared (Black, 1993: 345).

The men of this class have demonstrated that they will use their power and influence for personal gain whatever the social costs – sometimes 'just for the hell of it' to satisfy a whim or an urge to gamble; sometimes to counteract the possibility of personal boredom through lack of what is seen as 'challenge'; or other times purely for the physical and mental excitement that wielding such power apparently generates.

As we have seen, their power effects the lives of billions by not only shaping the foundations of the twenty-first century but by owning them too. Nor is it only the lower paid or even middle managers who are controlled by men such as these. The highest level executive is held tightly on a short lead as well. Harry Evans, former editor of Murdoch's prestige newspaper the *Times*, was unceremoniously sacked for failing to support sufficiently the Tory line in the newspaper. 'Rupert's a tremendous sacker,' according to one reliable source, although Murdoch himself has claimed that he has a tender heart when such matters are concerned. Conrad Black, on the other hand, is by no means as coy about 'drowning the kittens'. Ultimately, power cannot be jeopardised by sentiment or squeamishness.

Sentiment, as we have seen, has no part in the makeup of a ruling-class man and there are very good reasons for this. Indeed, the consequences of their actions are immaterial to this class of man, because their belief in their own superiority and their inflated vision of their own talents fuel their opinion of the inferiority of everyone else. This arrogant sense of superiority is not achieved by accident. It is carefully husbanded and rigorously inculcated from birth – created by a deliberate regime of emotional distance and lack of intimacy that produces disconnection from others, and the repression of loving feelings and the distortion of any intimate relationships that hinder capital's accumulation.

This upbringing is steeped in class tradition and has as its justification in its continuity. It is instigated by parents whose own education has been drawn up on precisely the same lines and continues, even today, to be perpetuated by each succeeding generation. Rupert Murdoch has said that his parents were 'remote and tough [...] preoccupied with their own lives, quick to find fault, slow to praise and even slower to demonstrate affection.' His mother agreed with this upbringing, saying that she 'didn't want the children to be spoilt or over-indulged' (Shawcross, 1992: 51, 52). When fathers find time for their sons, it is so scarce and tightly organised that it lacks spontaneity and emotional involvement.

The absence of love and intimacy in the childhood of the wealthy creates distance from others. In an atmosphere of formality that inhibits the possibility of a close family life, the resulting loneliness and fear is not unanticipated but is, in fact, designed and perpetuated. For by these means parents quite deliberately attempt to shape their sons to fit the ruthless world into which they will move as men – to toughen, harden and discipline them within a limited social milieu which segregates them from everyone who is not like them. This gives the boys the sense that this is, after all, the natural order of things, the way things must and should be.

This class is 'nurtured' by servants in the nursery, thus making love and emotion appear as a commodity provided by the market. Since all needs can be met in this way, the market releases the rich from the need

for basic life skills while intensifying their dependence on it. They need no one person in particular, for the market meets their needs. This reinforces its centrality in their lives. Thus do they and the world they inhabit reflect to each other the harshness of the commodification of feeling, the price of love lost.

Nanny Russell, according to one of Rupert Murdoch's wives, appears to have been his 'mother figure'. She was, his mother Dame Elisabeth Murdoch says, matter-of-factly, in regard to all her children, 'always their first love' (Shawcross, 1992: 52–53). Compounding this idea that emotion is a commodity, is the knowledge that those servants they had come to love – and who had come to love them – would be regularly moved on. This, too, was a deliberate strategy designed to be 'character building'.

Rich boys grow up with the fact that most of the nurturance they receive is provided by those whose services are paid for. The absence of human touch, the lack of intimacy experienced and sense of formality compounded by the presence of servants in very large homes, intensifies the repression of emotions which are normally expressed only with and to those whose presence was typically uncertain and frequently short-lived. It is the servant's job to provide essential warmth, assistance and understanding, compensating for lacks in the parenting the boys received, while simultaneously making less likely the possibilities for intimacy with parents and siblings in the home. There is rarely a great deal of continuity in this nurturance, however, and while this is painful for the children at the time, it also reinforces the lesson that, although love can be bought, it can only be relied upon fleetingly. There was always 'more where they came from' and, while the relationships that the market provided could be and often were painful and transitory, the market itself remained reliable in its ability, apparently, to provide for every human need in ways that non-market mechanisms clearly could not. This is the case, too, in their own emotional dependence as adults on those whom they pay and whose trust and confidentiality they use, sufficiently confident that their worlds are far enough apart that the affection and regard so purchased will not prove an embarrassment in their own circles.

Servants aren't the only ones to be moved on, for once they reach the right age these boys are 'sent away' to school. It is here in the hierarchical environment of ruling-class schools and, later, in elite university colleges, that 'character' is brought to fruition. At these exclusive schools boys absorb a masculinity that is competitive, repressive, aggressive and autocratic – a masculinity forged in a deeply traditional structure that assigns gendered tasks within a system of fixed hierarchies and inculcates these so firmly that they are transferred intact to the world outside. The objective of this masculinity is domination, to lead and to win, and the logical corollary of this is that those who either can't or don't are rightly despised. The boys learn early that friendship, even within their restricted circle, is unreliable and dangerous because it threatens the distance that protects them from others and from their own feelings for others. At the same time, these shallow and fragile friendships are enough to support invaluable social networks, establishing connections and making useful contacts possible whilst excluding unsuitable associations.

At school the boys form gangs, usually around a more dominant leader, and these inflict the tyranny of the big over the small and ostracise those who 'do not fit' into the accepted image of men of their class. For the weaker boys, running with the herd is the safest strategy, for this is an aggressive masculinity that accepts bullying as normal behaviour and necessarily links competition to ruthlessness in an indissoluble union. Conformity – to class – is a key product of this privileged education. With principals and some teachers often 'old boys', who have been steeped in the school's traditions for the most of their lives, the transmission of this code of conduct is unquestioned.

Any 'exposure' of bullying at school in the media usually comes from 'outside' and is determinedly squashed, especially as parents, also products of this same system, are generally quicker to close ranks to defend the reputation of the school than they are to object to the victimisation of their own children. In terms of ruling-class masculinity, victims are losers, and fear of being seen as one ensures silence and complicity. The bullies, admired often by their victims, in turn try to

assert and maintain their dominance over all they perceive as their inferiors. In the words of one former schoolboy, 'to survive I had to keep silent *within* the pack' because 'we all knew that if we didn't join in, it would be our turn next'. To survive a society that 'hunts down any outsiders' it is necessary that the weaker boy learns 'to snarl, like the rest' (Jackson, 1990: 177, 178).

This hegemonic style of masculinity is, of course, defined by the absence of women from all but helping and serving functions. It systematically maligns and deprecates 'womanly' characteristics and attributes wherever they appear, defining them as manifestations of a vulnerability, passivity, softness and incompetence, thought by the boys to be typical also of homosexuals (Lewis, 1991: 168–169; Jackson, 1990: 202, 210).

Such an upbringing produces men who are 'aloof; insecure; insensitive to their own and others' feelings, desires and mistreatment; capable of surface sociability rather than [...] meaningful relationships' (Bronfman, 1987: 387–388). In this way the masculinity of the hegemonic is deeply caught up in the preservation and continuance of the class which shapes its nature. Above all, it trains those who embrace or suffer it, that it alone is the masculinity that they most need to succeed in the world they create in their own image.

This survival of the fittest mentality combines with a sense of class superiority to produce contempt for the world outside their closed circle. On occasions this gets out of hand. In September 2002, for instance, a gang of 70 boys from Waverley College went on a rampage through the streets of Bondi, Sydney's most famous beach-side suburb, causing thousands of dollars of property damage and terrorising an elderly woman who strayed into their path (*Australian* 4/10/02).

This same thuggish behaviour is endemic in the elite university colleges as well. A former St Andrew's College principal, Peter Cameron, has written that, following a successful sporting event, the students' victory dinner is 'not just another booze-up' but 'a tribal ceremony, a ritual celebration of supremacy and belonging'. This destructive pack behaviour means that drunken thugs are regularly 'causing damage to College

property of \$20,000 every year' (Cameron, 1997: 49–50, 57). Such damage, of course, is easily paid for and, because of this, their immunity from the consequences of their own behaviour is reinforced. The lesson of their infancy, that they can do whatever they want and suffer little or no harm, is reinforced.

School and university comprise a vehicle by which class power and its advantages travel through time and they are also a medium in and through which the class organises, renews and reproduces itself in a world of enduring fluctuation. The school and university college sit at an intersection of the market in educational services and an extensive, abiding social network both of which they help to reproduce and without which they could not survive. Such networks not only make useful connections possible, indeed inevitable, but by excluding children who do not fit, they very practically ensure the right marriages and the consolidation and continuity of the networks themselves.

Thus these institutions are also important in maintaining 'traditionalism', and attendance at particular schools and university colleges is one of the traditions that ruling-class families maintain; providing stability for their class and for its style of manhood. A sense of chronological continuity and historical inevitability is sustained by this generational attendance, enhanced by those loyal staff who stay on for decades. These pupils, their fathers and their sons, nourish a sense of permanence within the school by the pride they take in past sporting and scholarly achievements and in commemorating successful past students, some of whom will become members of the school board and school committees and many of whom will support the school with tax-deductible bequests and donations.

What makes these continuities in time appear so fluent and inevitable is a certain cultural style inclusive of beliefs, attitudes, expression. This 'snobbery of style', as Jack Kennedy's friend Joseph Alsop called it, is bigger than the school itself, but crucially formed by and in it (Andersen, 1996: 44). It appears timeless, seamless, edgeless and impervious to those it excludes, creating in its natural heirs a sense of social superiority and social cohesion. This is no figment of anyone's imagination. The

exclusion of the overwhelming majority and the perpetuation of privilege and power are acknowledged and endorsed, and their reality is in no way evaded by parents, Heads, teachers and students.

Defined against the otherness of femaleness, colour and homosexuality, a special masculinity is obviously and effectively produced in these institutions. Might, strength, aggression, honour, daring and indifference to the feelings of others, are among its characteristics. It is an imperious, physically combative, space-appropriating masculinity which constricts diversity and ranks other masculinities within the hierarchical logic of scrambling for future rewards.

When Shane Maloney (2001) addressed the assembly at Scotch College which he described in his speech as 'a machine for the transmission of inherited privilege', he said to the students:

It is not your fault, after all, that your families decided to institutionalise you. It is not your fault that your mothers and fathers elected to place you in the emotionally distorting and educationally deficient environment of an all-boys school [...] Right now you are the victims. Later, of course, society will be your victim, and will suffer from the attitudes with which you are indoctrinated here.

It is a short step from life in the educational institutions of the wealthy to the boardroom, where the strategies learned at school and college are consolidated and rigidified into a fully developed product. Young ruling-class men are eased into the world of business by their fathers or their fathers' appointees and are generally groomed for the inheritance of their 'empires'. They slip into the existing business networks, not the least part of which are in the form of marriage alliances.

For ruling-class men, romantic, sexual and marital love appear as transactions; as distant, strangely impersonal and instrumental as all their other dealings which pass for close relations. Sex and love are commodities, purchasable and exchangeable, to which even acquisitiveness, accumulation and competition can apply. Certainly, power relations are central to them, often involving bullying and humiliation. Sexual violence is not unknown, but ruling-class men often avoid sanctions for

this through the deployment of their class and patriarchal power. In love, sex and marriage, as in other areas of their lives, rich and powerful men are indeed sacred monsters, imposing their will and demanding to be entertained, satiated and appeased.

Reared to consider themselves unaccountable to the rules that apply to the rest of society, the only code of conduct they accept involves self-interest. A bout of failed companies early this century caused public outrage when their board members could be seen blatantly rewarding themselves with bonuses while taking individual shareholders and the smallest investors with stakes in superannuation funds to the wall. So engrained is this behaviour into the lives of the young men of this class that it promotes itself as 'natural' and universal in a way that excludes all other possibilities as it moulds them to fit into the ruthless and bullying sphere in which they will move as adults. It forms them into calculating businessmen and schools their future function as captains of industry. It creates, what Kerry Packer has called a 'hardening of the shell' (Barry, 1994: 113). It turns arrogance and self-centredness into determination and drive; it elevates stunted or crippled emotions into strength and vigour; and it transforms ruthless power plays into heroic acts. If, as Phillip Adams has said, Kerry Packer sees himself as a man with a 'big black hole inside him' (Hawley, 1993: 10), then that is a terrible burden for him to have to bear. But that black hole is not just his problem, it is a predicament of men of his class and, because of the controlling power this class exercises around the world, the type of people these men are, is in itself a social catastrophe.

The functioning of the market requires important decisions to be made by individuals – decisions about when and where to invest capital; about what constitutes a reasonable rate of return for this investment; and about how to deal with those people, organisations, or governments who can help, limit or impede the profit-making possibilities of a venture. In making these decisions, these men at once shape and are shaped by the market. The market profits them, provides for them and brings them power and wealth but they are also, in disturbing ways, in its thrall.

Not all the men of the ruling class make these decisions equally but all of them share in the benefits and in the culture that celebrates and affirms their rites of accumulation. They display their membership of a global and very privileged club by wearing the handcrafted and usually conservative uniform of affluence whilst consuming, collecting, possessing and controlling far more of the earth's scarce resources than any other class. Their lifestyle, as we have seen, is beyond the comprehension of most of the world's population. Retreating to a very small mountain village an hour from Kyoto in search of 'tranquillity', James Fairfax (1991: 274, 277) was accompanied by a staff of three to attend to his needs: a domestic servant, 'a superb cook in both Japanese and Western styles' and a chauffeur and maid of all works.

The multiple homes this class owns take up vast amounts of space and consume unimaginable amounts of money, energy and others' labour just to keep running. Crowded as the world is, this class never has to suffer from such discomfort and the servants that cluster around them catering for their every need, are discreet and, for the most part, invisible to them. In this atmosphere, the children of the very rich quickly become habituated to large amounts of personal space, and remain that way – the Packer family vault is the largest in Sydney's South Head Cemetery (Maynard, 2003). Feeling crowded is largely absent from these men's understanding – so much so that they find the infrequent sharing of space discomforting. Not surprisingly, those from outside their circle sense them as beings who are 'outsized' and spatially imposing. Consequently they seldom experience human closeness, rarely having their personal space intruded upon, and are themselves remorseless, intentional and belligerent in filling space with the bodies which others look after for them, 24 hours a day, every day.

Appetising and nourishing food is always and immediately available to them and their lifestyle allows for exercise in their clubs and resorts and for body-maintenance in health clinics and private hospitals. These bodies are well-used to movement, arrivals and departures in sumptuously appointed cars, yachts and planes which are driven and looked after by their servants. Travel is not only about their purposeful

movement but also concerns size, extravagance, exhibition, power and triumph. It also involves choosing within and between transport modes, and the use of two or more private forms of travel consecutively is routine in the lives of the wealthy, linking swiftly, comfortably and easily their globally dispersed but culturally consonant possessions. They travel without the need to encounter change for they move around the world in privacy and luxury and their experience on arrival is little different to that at their point of departure, for they reside in exclusive hotels, their own privately owned or rented mansions or those owned by their acquaintances. Their own servants usually accompany them to maintain for them an effortless and seamless transition and to ensure their every whim is satisfied quickly and without fuss.

Space and motion are, therefore, experienced and constructed differently by the very wealthy. Their world is both homogenous and spatially dispersed; far-flung and yet familiar; simultaneously global and seamless. Their fabulously swift, extremely comfortable and intensely private multi-modal means of travel compress space. The locations they move between, the buildings in which they live, are very large, and one rich man occupies easily one thousand times more space than any ordinary person.

The exclusivity of the suburbs of the wealthy is maintained over time as their properties are passed down both through the generations and between families, maintaining and enhancing their value while ensuring the social isolation and internal cohesion of those who own them. They are, in essence, their own property market and price is a most effective way of restricting access to their neighbourhoods as well as to their social networks.

This social networking allows them to keep the whole class moving through time as they can contract appropriate marriages despite having no feeling for what makes for a close family life. Sex and love, after all, can be purchased in the marketplace. This, combined with their fluid and rather fuzzy concepts of what constitutes time, work and leisure, is a measure of the way privilege makes their social relations vastly different to those experienced by other people.

As this book has shown, ruling-class power is not a conspiracy but an all encompassing way of life that, perhaps more than most, is channelled along institutionalised and usually self-fulfilling paths from the cradle to the grave. It is their class that determines how these men live, whom they meet, what they say, what they do and what they are capable of emotionally expressing or unconsciously repressing. Their potent mixture of obsessive work and extravagant sport and pleasure – they work hard and they play hard for large stakes – fuels their conviction that their personal work ethic outshines all competitors and leaves them in the belief that their wealth is personally earned rather than inherited and that it rightly serves as a marker of the superiority that distances them from the rest of the population.

Their ceaseless acquisitiveness, commodifying all facets of their lives, becomes to this mindset a moral force. They tower above the world. Ruling-class men often speak of their work in metaphors implying that they are monarchs, statesmen and generals – they rule or build their business ‘empires’ and they regularly engage in ‘battle’ to defeat their competitors or takeover each other’s empires. Contradictorily, perhaps, they also use the image of work as a game – or a gamble – where profits are generated through their skill and intelligent risk-taking that marks them out as so very special and so deserving of the riches they flaunt.

The work of ruling-class men is characterised by obsessive competitive individualism spurred by a keen sense of their superiority, and ceaseless acquisitiveness reinforced by their feelings of deservedness. It involves the habitual exercise of power expressed in hierarchy, bullying, manipulation and determination to prevail. Detachment from, and ruthlessness towards, others is virtually universal among them.

In this way, the time of ruling-class men is by no means clearly divided between work and leisure for the two merge perceptibly and there is little in the way of a division between the working day and recreation. Yet they are keenly aware that the labour time of their workers means capital accumulation and they resent and resist the intrusion of anything approaching ‘leisure’ into the work time of these inferior but necessary beings. For tycoon businessmen, work often resembles

leisure, and leisure pursuits resemble work. At dinner parties and in the boardroom, relations with their peers are instrumental. Close friendship is rare; alignments of mutual interest and ruling-class solidarity occasionally punctuate the prevailing ruthless competition which prohibits trust. The lack of any tangible distinction between work and leisure means that ruling-class men rarely 'retire' as their lives are their work and their work is their leisure. At play, as at work, the competitiveness, manipulation, control and the excitement of apparent risk is what obsesses ruling-class men; without it they are bored and lack purpose.

Towards the ends of their lives, they become obsessed with passing on their empires, usually to family and mostly to sons. Many become involved in leaving monuments to themselves – acts often interpreted (as they would wish) as generosity, altruism or civic-mindedness, qualities altogether out of keeping with the way they have lived their lives. Their lives, devoid of friendship, trust, loyalty or meaningful love, are ultimately made meaningless by their ceaseless pursuit of profit. George Black's last words to his son Conrad, before he crashed through the balustrade of a staircase and fell to his death, were 'Life is hell, most people are bastards and everything is bullshit' (Coleridge, 1994: 323).

Bibliography

- Ackland, R. (2001) 'Tick, tock ... time's up for Andrewsmen,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 November, p. 17.
- Age (1996) 'How can you tell a \$1,500 suit?', Advertisement, 14 November, B3.
- Alderson, M. (1996a) 'Lord of the flyleaf', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 June, p. 7.
- Alderson, M. (1996b) 'Tres chic Tre Scalini looks for new order', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 January, p. 2.
- Alderson, M. and Blok M. (1996) 'Sydney's top twenty apartment buildings', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 March, p. 12.
- Alexander, M. (1998) 'Big business and directorship networks: The centralisation of economic power in Australia', *Journal of Sociology*, 34, 2, pp. 107–122.
- Andersen, C. (1996) *Jack and Jackie: Portrait of an American Marriage*, Random House Australia, Sydney.
- Anonymous (1995) 'One law for the rich and another for the rest of us', pp. 152–161 in F. Briggs (ed.) *From Victim to Offender. How Childhood Abuse Victims Become Offenders*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, N. S. W.
- Ansett, R. and Pullan, R. (1986) *Bob Ansett An Autobiography* John Kerr Pty Ltd, Hartwell, Victoria.
- Arndt, B. (2002) 'Bodies without evidence', *Sydney Morning Herald, Spectrum*, 21–22 September, pp. 4–5.
- Arndt, B. (2003) 'A kiss is just a kiss, but intimate sexual practices should remain so', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 August, p. 13.
- Athorne, S. (2003) 'Travel and Broads', *Weekend Australian Magazine*, 8–9 November, pp. 24–27.
- Attallah, N. (1994) 'White light', *Harpers and Queen*, May, pp. 92–95.
- Attwood, A. (1996) 'Why Dunlap the chainsaw refuses to cry', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 June, p. 83.
- Australian* (2005) 'Diana went all the way with JFK', 28 June.
- Barber, L. (1991) *Mostly Men*, Viking, London.
- Barnett, A. (2004) 'Charles' cash contortions face scrutiny', *New Zealand Herald*, 31 January, B2.

- Barrowclough, N. (1994) 'Between the covers with Packer and Richo', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 March, p. 40.
- Barry, P. (1994) *The Rise and Rise of Kerry Packer*, Bantam, Moorebank, NSW and ABC Books, Ultimo, NSW.
- Barry, P. (2002) *Rich Kids. How the Murdochs and Packers Lost \$950 Million in One Tel*, Transworld Publishers, Milsons Point.
- Bartolome, F. (1974) 'Executives as human beings', pp. 100–106 in J. Pleck and H. Sawyer (eds) *Men and Masculinity*, Prentice-Hall, Inc, New Jersey.
- Barwell, C. (1998) 'Hotspots', *Harpers Bazaar and Mode*, March, p. 246.
- Beach, M. (2001) "'Kennedy" case witness took heroin then testified', *Daily Telegraph* 20 April, p. 27.
- Belfield, R., Hird, C., and Kelly, S. (1991) *Murdoch. The Decline of an Empire*, McDonald and Co, London and Sydney.
- Bell, A. (2004) 'Paved with gold', *Sunday Telegraph*, 12 December, p. 12.
- Bernier, R. (1992) 'The emperor's new lair', *Vogue* (U. S. A.), December pp. 218–224, pp. 311–312.
- Berry, W. (1995) *The Housekeeper's Diary Diana and Charles at Highgrove*, Triple Press, St. Leonards, NSW.
- Bertaux, D. (1981a) 'Introduction', pp. 5–15 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Bertaux, D. (1981b) 'From the life history approach to the transformation of sociological practice', pp. 19–28 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Bertaux, D. and Bertaux-Wiame, I. (1981) 'Life stories in the bakers' trade', pp. 169–189 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Bishop, K. (2003) 'Golden sands', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 January, p. 5.
- Bitá, N. (2003) 'Armani makes his Merc on fashion', *Australian*, 1 October, p. 4.
- Black, C. (1993) *A Life in Progress*, Random House Australia, Sydney.
- Black, C. (1996) 'Last word', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 December, p. 13, p. 16.
- Blok, M. (1997) '\$2.4m sale shows things are hot at balmy Palmy', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 March, Real Estate p. 8.
- Blok, M. (2004) 'Sydney's ten most expensive houses', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 June, p. 36.
- Bourlioufas, N. (1998) 'Land tax no deterrent to Palm Beach buyers', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 January, p. 9.

- Boyd, W. (2003) 'The Devil in Mrs Simpson', *Sunday Life*, 18 May, pp. 27–8.
- Broadbent, L. (1997) 'Spoilt rotten,' *Elle*, September 1997, pp. 46–49.
- Bronfman, J. (1987) *The Experience of Inherited Wealth: A Social-Psychological Perspective*, PhD Dissertation accepted by the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Department of Sociology, Brandeis University.
- Brown, M. (2003) 'New laws help sink classic boat charter business', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 January, p. 10.
- Browne, R. (2003a) 'Jo Beth's split with Muster has \$10m tag', *Sun-Herald*, 12 January, p. 52.
- Browne, R. (2003b) 'The Diary', *Sun-Herald*, 19 January, p. 56.
- Browne, R. (2003c) 'Sweet charity', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 February, p. 51.
- Browne, R. and Byrne, H. (1999) 'Sarah and Lachlan's love nest', *Sun-Herald*, 17 October, p. 24.
- Burge, G., Porter, J., Kitney, G. and Davies, A. (1996) 'Blackout. The Fairfax sale: what happened and why', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 December, p. 17, p. 22.
- Burkes' Peerage (2005) <http://www.burkes-peerage.net/sites/Contents/book/UK/FHP/Peerage/fhp-BATH.asp>.
- Burne, J. (1999) 'A place of greater safety', *Harpers and Queen*, January, 122–123.
- Business Review Weekly* (1999), 'The great accumulator', 28 May, p. 82.
- Calvert, J. (2003) 'Fortunate few are now fewer', *Herald Sun*, 22 May, p. 10.
- Campbell, D. (2002) 'The Kennedy who killed', *Sun-Herald*, 9 June, p. 56.
- Campbell, F. (1999) 'Don't quote me, sir', *Weekend Australian*, September 25–26, Review p. 15.
- Casella, N. (2003) 'Palm Beach palace fetches \$9m', *Daily Telegraph*, 10 October, p. 11.
- Cassab, J. (1995) *Judy Cassab Diaries* Random House Australia, Sydney.
- Catani, M. (1981) 'Social-life histories as ritualised exchange', pp. 211–224 in D. Bertaux (ed.) *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Chancellor, J. (1996a) 'Beer baron's mansion is a brilliant jewel', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 October, Real Estate pp. 1–2.
- Chancellor, J. (1996b) 'Title Deeds', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 October, Real Estate p. 1.
- Chancellor, J. (1996c) 'Title Deeds', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 December, p. 45.
- Chancellor, J. (1997a) 'Developers wrap the Cristo in chic', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 May, Real Estate pp. 1–2.
- Chancellor, J. (1997b) 'Gladswood in its new-found glory', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 March, Real Estate p. 1.

- Chancellor, J. (1997c) 'Playing Hard', *Vogue Australia*, December, pp. 135–139.
- Chancellor, J. (1997d) 'Silvertails feel the sting in land tax rise', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 May, p. 4.
- Chancellor, J. (1997e) 'Title Deeds', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 May, Real Estate p. 1.
- Chancellor, J. (1998a) 'Prices on an upward spin', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 February, 1R.
- Chancellor, J. (1998b) '\$4m 'resort' on offer', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 May, p. 6.
- Chancellor, J. (1998c) 'Bullish Balmoral attracts tea and biscuits magnate', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 May, p. 19.
- Chancellor, J. (1998d) 'High-rise penthouse price tag put at more than \$3m', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 March, p. 6.
- Chancellor, J. (1998e) 'Title Deeds', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 January, Real Estate p. 1.
- Chancellor, J. (1998f) 'Waterside mansion may fetch millions', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 May, p. 15.
- Chancellor, J. (1998g) '\$2.7m house now needs \$1m to fix it', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 June, p. 1.
- Chancellor, J. (2003a) 'Domain – Title Deeds', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 January, p. 2.
- Chancellor, J. (2003b) 'Jodhi's beach beauty draws \$3m smiles', *Sun-Herald*, 9 March, p. 80.
- Chancellor, J. (2003c) 'Singo hangs on to his Woodlands pride', *Sun-Herald*, 13 April, p. 74.
- Chancellor, J. (2003d) 'Packer donor gets \$3.3m property', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 September, p. 3.
- Chancellor, J. (2004) 'Agnew buys Rona estate', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 October, p. 5.
- Chancellor, J. (2005a) 'Sale nets Murdoch a quick \$2.2m', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 March.
- Chancellor, J. (2005b) 'Murdoch buys Bronte bolthole', *Sun-Herald*, 15 May, p. 18.
- Chancellor, J. with V. Lawson (2000) 'High-flying ministers eye luxury VIP jet', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March, p. 24.
- Chandler, S. (2005) 'Black life view. The heart of Conrad's darkness', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 August, p. 39.
- Chennery, S. (1996) 'A dose of Eno's', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 September, 10s.
- Chesler, P. (1978) *About Men*, The Women's Press, London.

- Chessell, J. (2003) 'Packer puts punters in their place', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 31 October, p. 17.
- Chessell, J. (2004) 'Rivkin on the move after selling his \$16m mansion to his next-door neighbour', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 June, p. 6.
- Chrisafis, A. (2003) 'Indecent proposal' man sues rabbi: Slander case over sexual rumours', *Guardian*, 14 May.
- Clark, M. (1991) 'Two new boys in Melbourne', pp. 6–18 in A. Daniel (ed.) *Social Democracy and Social Science. Essays in Honour of Sol Enkel*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Clarke, G. (1995) *Capote A Biography*, Abacus, London.
- Coleridge, N. (1994) *Paper Tigers* William Heinemann Ltd, London.
- Coleman, P. (1997) *Finishing School for Blokes. College Life Exposed* Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, N. S. W.
- Colmer, J. (1989) *Australian Autobiographies. The Personal Quest* Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Connell, R. W. (1990) 'A whole new world: remaking masculinity in the context of the environmental movement', *Gender and Society*, 4, 4, pp. 452–478.
- Connell, R. W. (1991) 'Live fast and die young: the construction of masculinity among young working class men on the margins of the labour market', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 27, 2, pp. 141–171.
- Connell, R. W. (1995) *Masculinities*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Connell, R. W., Dowsett, G. W., Kessler, S. and Ashenden, D. J., (1981) 'Class and gender dynamics in a ruling-class school', *Interchange* 12, 2–3, pp. 102–117.
- Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D. J., Kessler, S., Dowsett, G. W. (1982) *Making the Difference Schools, Families and Social Division*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Connell, R. W. and Irving, T. (1980) *Class Structure in Australian History*, Longman Cheshire, Sydney.
- Connolly, E. (2000) 'Trinity boys tied up and raped, court told', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 December, p. 5.
- Connolly, E. and Grant, S. (2005) 'Lessons fit for a king – or MP's son', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 August, p. 39.
- Conniff, R. (2003) *The Natural History of the Rich, A Field Guide*, William Heinemann, London.
- Coorey, M. (1998) 'Private school economics ... second fee increase in two years', *Australian*, December 30, p. 4.
- Corne, A. (1998) 'The Beast of British', *Weekend Australian*, 20–21 June, Prestige Motoring p. 3.

- Cornell, A. (2003) 'Barons of the Bush', *Australian Financial Review Magazine*, 24 April, p. 28.
- Cornford, P. (2002) 'Pass the lighter fluid – we're Palm Beach captains', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 December, p. 3.
- Cosic, M. (1998) 'Buttoned-up bags of fruit suit law of the jungle', *Weekend Australian*, 22–22 February, p. 5.
- Cottle, A.R. (1998) *Life is Oh So Sweet on the Sunny Side of the Street: a Study of the Rich of Woollahra During the Great Depression, 1928–1934*, Minerva Press, London & Sydney.
- Coultan, M. (2005) 'Lord Black hit with US fraud charges', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19–20 November, pp. 41, 43.
- Council of The King's School (1994) *The King's School Application Form*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- Cullen, D. (2003) 'Money – splitting the difference', *Age*, 19 May, p. 6.
- Daily Telegraph* (2001) 'Edward VIII was ready to abandon royal life years earlier', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7 June.
- Daily Telegraph* (2002) 'Kennedy cousin jailed', 31 August, p. 17.
- Daily Telegraph* (2004) 'Kerrys may be richest first couple', 29 June.
- Daily Telegraph*, (London) (2005) 'Harry's blood test to prove heredity', 29 June.
- Dale, D. (2000) 'Money in the Med', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March, p. 24.
- Davies, A. and Kidman, M. (1997) 'Super League deal born in sleepy NZ bay', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 January, p. 23.
- Davies, C. (2004) 'Indecent proposal: Let me buy your wife for \$1 million', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24–25 April, p. 13.
- Davis, W. (1982) *The Rich A Study of the Species*, Sidgwick & Jackson, London.
- Day, M. (2003) 'New kid on the block – chip off the old block', *Australian*, 14 August, p. 1.
- de Camargo, A. (1981) 'The actor and the system: Trajectory of the Brazilian political elites', pp. 191–202 in D. Bertaux (ed.) *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Denzin, N. (1981) *The Research Act*, Aldine Chicago.
- Devine, M. (2003) 'Hewitt, man most likely to let a princess down', *Sun-Herald*, 26 October, p. 15.
- Dickins, J. (2005) 'Married men top rich lists', *Sunday Telegraph*, 22 May, p. 89.
- Dimbleby, J. (1994) *The Prince of Wales, A Biography*, Little, Brown And Company, London.

- Dixon, A. (1998) 'All yours for \$6.5m', *Sun-Herald*, 10 May, p. 60.
- Dodds, J. (2003) 'Pukka chukka', *SydneyCity*, 26 November, p. 24.
- Doherty, L. (2003) 'ALP torn as its voters go private,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7 November, p. 1.
- Doherty, L. (2004) 'Privates made public,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 January, p. 4.
- Donaldson, F.G. (1999) Scotch College Web Page, 28 October, <http://www.scotch.vic.edu.au/Osca/Oscareer/Oscareer.htm>.
- Donaldson, M. (1991) *Time of Our Lives, Labour and Love in the Working Class*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Donaldson, M. (1993) 'What is hegemonic masculinity?' *Theory and Society*, 22, pp. 643–657.
- Dowling, J. (2002) 'Motoring – price no object', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 November, p. 6.
- Duy Long Nguyen and Knight, J. (2004) *The Dragon's Journey*, Harper Collins, Sydney.
- Economist* (1993) 'Toff's museum: White's Club', 10 July, p. 55.
- Edgar, P. (1999) 'The good wife', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, 27 March, pp. 16–24.
- Elder, G. (1981) 'History and the life course', pp. 78–115 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Ellis, B. (1997) *Goodbye Jerusalem. Night Thoughts of a Labor Outsider*, Vintage, Random House, Sydney.
- Engels, F. (1975) 'Letter to J. Bloch in Konisberg, August 21, 1890', pp. 682–684 in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- English, B. (2004) 'Lowy goes overboard', *Weekend Australian*, 13 November.
- Fairfax, J. (1991) *My Regards To Broadway A Memoir*, Collins Angus and Robertson, Sydney.
- Fairweather, C. and Southall E. (2004) 'Playgrounds of the rich and famous', *Harper's Bazaar*, September, pp. 271–280.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1981) 'On the autonomy of the biographical method', pp. 19–28 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Fraser, R. (1979) *The Blood Of Spain: An Oral History of the Spanish Civil War*, Pantheon, New York.
- Fraser, R. (1984) *In Search of A Past The Manor House, Ammersfield 1933–1945* The Thetford Press, Thetford, Norfolk.

- Garcia, L. (1997) 'Men behaving badly', *Sydney Morning Herald*, March 27, pp. 16–23.
- Garner, H. (1995) *The First Stone: Some Questions about Sex and Power*, Picador, Sydney.
- Gilding, M. (2002) *Secrets of the Super Rich*, HarperCollins, Sydney.
- Gittins, R. (2003a) 'Why the filthy rich keep a close eye on the piggy bank', *The Age*, 18 April, p. 1.
- Gittins, R. (2003b) 'How we've become a spent force', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 June, p. 15.
- Gluyas, R. (2003) 'Big shots on golf course', *Australian* 17 September.
- Gregory, P. (1997) 'The (lavish) life of Brian', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April.
- Griffen-Foley, B. (2000) *Sir Frank Packer: The Young Master*, HarperCollins, Sydney.
- Griffiths, S. (1996) 'Grand English manor-style living', *Age* 16 November, C1.
- Grigg, A. (2004) 'Don't wait your dinner will go cold', *Australian Financial Review* 30 June, p. 48.
- Guinness, D. (1997) 'Return to Eden', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 November.
- Hammond, G. (n. d.) 'Andrew Morton's fame', *Sunday Telegraph*, pp. 16–19.
- Hancock, E. (1995) 'Selling the myth of the master race', *Age*, 12 August, p. 9.
- Hands, N. (1998) 'Hotspots', *Harper's Bazaar and Mode*, March, p. 248.
- Hansard (1994) <http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/hanstrans.nsf/v3ByKey/LA19941013>.
- Hanscombe, J. and Ashby, D. (2003) 'Wheels of fortune', *Harper's Bazaar*, September, p. 214.
- Harley, R. (2003) 'Prices soar for beachfront sites', *Australian Financial Review*, 11 January, p. 18.
- Harrigan, N. (2005) 'Recent innovations in the study of Australian political elites', Australian Political Studies Association, Australian National University, <http://auspsa.anu.au/proceedings/publications/papHarriganpaper1.pdf>.
- Harvey, A. (2003) 'The elite club where you're not welcome – unless you're rich, famous and well connected', *Sunday Telegraph*, 13 April, p. 24.
- Hastings, M. (2002) *Editor An Inside Story of Newspapers*, Macmillan, London
- Hart, B. (2005) 'Seven-day week: He's 70 but life's still full for Pratt', *Daily Telegraph*, 10 January, p. 28.
- Haupt, R. (1989) 'The pulling power of Packer', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, 2 February, 13–21.
- Hawley, J. (1993) 'The second son also rises', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, 31 July, p. 10.

- Heald, T. (1991) *The Duke: A Portrait of Prince Philip*, Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- Hellen, N. (2003) 'Windsor pro-Nazi files open', *Australian*, 13 January, p. 15.
- Henderson, G. (1992) 'Digger biography not dirty enough for some', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 November, p. 13.
- Hewett, J. (1997) 'Clinton's glamour a-go-go: Take II', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18. January, p. 19.
- Hicks, I. (1992) 'Row over Sun king is a sizzler', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 October, p. 2.
- Higginbottom, A. (2005) 'A Very Rich Life', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, 8 January, pp. 22–23.
- Hill, B. (1995) 'A friendship on paper', *Age*, 12 August, p. 9.
- Hochschild, A. (1987) *Half the Way Home: A Memoir of Father and Son*, Penguin Books, New York.
- Hochschild, A. with Machung A. (1989) *The Second Shift. Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*, Viking, New York.
- Hock, P. (1999) 'Getting Frank Lloyd right', *Northern Beaches Journal*, 2, pp. 58–63.
- Holden (1996) Advertisement, 'Holden Calais', *The Qantas Club*, October, p. 18.
- Holder, P. et al. (2003) 'Sydney Confidential', *Daily Telegraph*, 14 February.
- Hooton, A. (2004) 'The moment I wake up', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, 18 November, pp. 116–125.
- Horne, D. (1975) *The Education of Young Donald*, Penguin Books, Ringwood.
- Horne, D. (1985) *Confessions of a New Boy*, Viking/Penguin, Ringwood.
- Hornery, A. with Dasey, D. (2003) 'Packer's heavy loss', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 November, p. 20.
- Horn, J. (1997) 'Australian media magnate was among Hedi Fleiss' customers', Associated Press, <http://www.gwb.com.au/gwb/news/packer/fleiss.html>, accessed 24/01/05.
- Hornery, A. with Malkin, B. (2004) 'Rival for affections', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 October, p. 20.
- Hoyer, M. (2002a) 'The new faces of charity – the women who touch Sydney's generous heart', *Sunday Telegraph*, 10 November, p. 23.
- Hoyer, M. (2002b) 'James model date – Packer enjoying new companions', *Sunday Telegraph* 24 November, p. 9.
- Hoyle, B. (2005) 'Rise and fall of the doyen of decadence', *Weekend Australian*, 19–20 November, p. 37.

- H. R. H. The Duke of Edinburgh (1984) *Men. Machines and Sacred Cows*, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Illawarra Mercury* (2005) 'Saviour in a spitfire flies into town', 6 June, p. 47.
- Jackson, D. (1990) *Unmasking Masculinity: A Critical Autobiography*, Hamish Hamilton, London.
- Jamal, N. (1998a) 'New king's head on a mission with a mint machine', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 March, p. 2.
- Jamal, N. (1998b) 'Outdoor learning', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 May, Education p. 12.
- James, A. (1991) *The Kennedy Scandals and Tragedies*, Publications International, Illinois.
- James, P. (1992) *Prince Edward: A Life in the Spotlight*, Judy Kiatus Publishers, London.
- Jameson, J. (2003) 'The rise and rise of Jodhi Packer', *Daily Telegraph*, 15 March.
- Jillett, N. (2003) 'Why the rich tend to be taller and live longer', *Sunday Age*, 22 June, p. 10.
- Johnson, M. (2004a) 'A harbour of floating palaces', *Sunday Telegraph*, 12 December, p. 14.
- Johnson, M. (2004b) 'Not so cheap to keep', *Sunday Telegraph*, 12 December, p. 15.
- Johnston, D. (2002) 'First the marriage, now Welch's perks are gone', *Daily Telegraph* 18 September, p. 37.
- Johnston, P. (2003) 'Prince opens accounts to show record £10m income', *Daily Telegraph*, London, p. 4.
- Jones, C. (1998) 'Dux of '97: wealthy, private, female', *Weekend Australian*, 8–9 November, pp. 24–27.
- Jones, J. (1996) 'Autobiography and scholarship', pp. 111–130 in P. Cimbala and R. Himmelberg (eds) *Historians and Race. Autobiography and the Writing of History*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Kable, M. (1997) 'Good times roll with \$100m fun car splurge', *Weekend Australian*, 10–11 January, p. 7.
- Kable, M. (1998) 'Fast Lane', *The Australian*, 20–21 June, Prestige Motoring p. 1.
- Karpati, Z. (1981) 'The methodological use of the life history approach in a Hungarian survey on mobility and urbanisation', pp. 133–148 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- King's School (1999a) *The King's School*, North Parramatta, Sydney.

- King's School (1999b) *The King's School. Preparatory School*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- King's School (1999c) *Sport: Learning Through Leisure*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- King's School (1999d) *About the Preparatory School*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- King's School (1999e) *Co-Curricular Activities*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- King's School (1999f) *The Outdoor Classroom*, North Parramatta, Sydney.
- King's School (1999g) *Headmaster's Annual Report 1998*, The King's School Foundation, Parramatta, Sydney.
- Koch, P. (1999) 'Jodie's taste of Packer power', *Sunday Telegraph*, 24 October, pp. 62–3.
- Koch, P. (1999) 'The security', *Sunday Telegraph*, 24 October, p. 5.
- Koch, P. (2002) 'Out there', *Sunday Telegraph*, 15 December, p. 146.
- Koch, P. and Reines, R. (1999) 'Jodi, James celebrate at party of year', *Sunday Telegraph*, 24 October, p. 2.
- Koch, P. and Tohme S. (2002) 'Its Christmas time and the celebrities are off to their favourite holiday destinations', *Sunday Telegraph*, 22 December.
- Kohli, M. (1981) 'Biography: account, text, method', pp. 61–75 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Lacy, C. (2003a) 'Sam and Sue's do takes the breath away', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 June, p. 27.
- Lacy, C. (2003b) 'Young James a bit grumpy in the garden', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 August, p. 27.
- Lamont, L. and Clennell, A. (1998) 'Why prospering and living longer is a Shore thing', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 March, p. 6.
- Lang, J. (1997) 'Hot gossip: Extra', *Woman's Day*, 4 August, p. 102.
- Lawson, A. (2002) 'Channel Nine special: new faces', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 December, p. 20.
- Lawson, A. (2005) 'I have a profile because of my last name ... big deal, I learnt to live with it at 12', *Sun-Herald*, 25 September, p. 79.
- Lawson, M. (2002) 'Private helicopters still the reserve of the very wealthy', *Australian Financial Review*, 12 December.
- Lawson, V. (1997) 'Private and first class', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 March, p. 3.
- Lawson, V. (2002) 'Tom foolery or new faith – James won't say', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 November, p. 3.
- Lawson, V. (2004) 'Out go Rona's treasures for \$5.19m', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 May, p. 3.

- Leake, C. (2005) 'A taxing divorce for Aga Khan', *Daily Telegraph*, 10 January, p. 26.
- Leete-Hodge, L. (1981) *A Souvenir of The Royal Wedding*, Optimum Books, England.
- Lessing, D. (1995) *Under My Skin. Volume One of My Autobiography to 1949*, London, Flamingo, Harper Collins.
- Lewis, P. (1991) 'Mummy, matron and the maids. Feminine presence and absence in male institutions, 1934–63', pp. 168–188 in M. Roper and J. Tosh (eds) *Manful Assertions. Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, Routledge, London.
- Loane, S. (1996) 'Balmy Palmie's egalitarian grandeur', *Sydney Morning Herald, Spectrum*, 20 January, p. 2.
- Loane, S. and Verrender, I. (1998) 'For richer, for poorer', *Sydney Morning Herald, Spectrum*, 19 December.
- Lunn, S. and Hawes, L. (1998) 'Grind and gum trees', *Weekend Australian*, November 7–8, p. 25.
- Lloyd-McDonald, H. (2003) 'Shark rules Bay's waves', *Herald Sun*, 28 January.
- McDonald, A. (2004) 'High-flier to face criminal charges over HIH collapse', *Weekend Australian*, 23–24 October, p. 2.
- McDonald, N. (1997) 'Ferrari focuses on next millennium', *Australian*, 6 March, p. 17.
- McKay, P. (1997) 'Executive Express', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 February, Motor-ing p. 3.
- McKenna, M. (2003) 'Blemished reputation', *Daily Telegraph*, 25 January, p. 29.
- McIlveen, L. (2003) 'Corrigan cheats death in cliff fall', *Australian*, 3 June, p. 1.
- McMurrick, F. (1996) 'The bottom line', *The Qantas Club*, October, p. 35.
- McNicoll, D. (2003) 'Cash for tee-time', *Australian*, 2 June, p. 10.
- Macken, D. (2003) 'The hierarchy of needs', *Australian Financial Review Magazine*, 24 April, p. 20.
- Maguglin, R. (1984) *Howard Hughes: His Achievements and Legacy*, Wrather Port Properties, Long Beach.
- Maloney, S. (2001) 'Address to Scotch College', August, <http://www.shanemaloney.com>.
- Marks, S. (1989) 'The context of personal narrative: Reflections on *Not Either An Experimental Doll – The Separate Worlds of Three South African Women*' pp. 39–58 in Personal Narratives Group, *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Marr, D. (1991) *Patrick White A Life*, Random House Australia, Sydney.

- Martin, C. (2003a) 'Best houses in the best streets', *Sun-Herald*, 5 January, p. 70.
- Martin, C. (2003b) 'Private Property', *Sunday Telegraph*, 27 April, p. 79.
- Marx, K. (1867, 1976) *Capital*, Vol. 1, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1968) *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In *Selected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, pp. 35–63.
- Massey, M. (1999) 'The Noosa premium', *Business Review Weekly*, 28 May, pp. 208–209.
- Matchett, S. (2005) 'Paint it Black', *Weekend Australian*, January 1–2, Review pp. 8–9.
- Maynard, R. (2003) 'The other side of Sydney', *Courier-Mail*, 12 April.
- Mead, J. (ed.) (1997) *Bodyjamming*, Vintage, Milsons Point, N. S. W.
- Meppem, V. (1998) 'Hotspots', *Harper's Bazaar and Mode*, March, p. 254.
- Mercer, L. (1998) 'Red-hot and blue', *Weekends for Two*, 21, pp. 24–28.
- Merrill Lynch and Capgemini (2005) *World Wealth Report 2005*, Merrill Lynch and Co. Inc., New York.
- Miller, R. (1985) *The House of Getty* Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Milohanic, S. and Blake, S. (1999) 'Guests left stranded in traffic', *Sunday Telegraph*, 24 October, p. 4.
- Montesini, L. (1999) *My Life and Other Misdemeanours*, Viking, Ringwood, Victoria.
- Morgan, D. (1992) *Discovering Men*, Routledge, London.
- Morrell, R. (1996) *White Farmers, Social Institutions and Settler Masculinity in the Natal Midlands, 1880–1920* Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Economic History, University of Natal, Durban.
- Mundle, R. (1993) *Sir James Hardy An Adventurous Life*, Margaret Gee Publishing, Double Bay, NSW.
- Murray, G. (1997) 'Ideology and the globalising strategy of big business in Australasia in the 1990s', Mimeo, Arts Faculty, Griffith University, Queensland.
- Murray, G. (1998) 'New Zealand corporate class networks', *New Zealand Sociology*, 4, 2, 115–163.
- Murphy, F. (1996) 'Fitness for hire', *The Australian Way*, November, 94–96.
- Mychasuk, E. (1996a) 'In tutu, Brute', *Sydney Morning Herald* 23 May, Business p. 27.
- Mychasuk, E. (1996b) 'Rich and loving it', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 December.
- Mychasuk, E. (1997a) 'Balmy Palmie, where the rich are charmy', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 January, Business p. 27.

- Mychasuk, E. (1997b) 'Home is the sailor, and the boat's for sale', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 February, Business p. 27.
- Mychasuk, E. (1997c) 'CBD, Signs of appreciation', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 October, Business p. 99.
- Mychasuk, E. (1997d) 'A house each-way', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 November, Business p. 35.
- Mychasuk, E. and Fray, P. (2003) 'The sky's the limit', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8–9 November, p. 36.
- Myers, D. (1978) *The Peacocks and the Bourgeoisie, Ironic Vision in Patrick White's Shorter Prose Fiction*, Adelaide University Union Press, Adelaide.
- Nason, D. (2005) 'Stokes joins Aussie mega-moguls on billionaires' row,' *Weekend Australian*, 12–13 March, p. 8.
- Nelson, V. (1992) 'How Gerard Henderson whitewashed the saviour of St Rupert', *Broadside Weekly*, November 18, p. 9.
- New Zealand Herald* (2003) 'High flying mate drops in for chat', 13 January.
- Noonan, G. (1999) 'Great divide in our children's literacy', *Sydney Morning Herald*, September 27, p. 17.
- Noonan, G. and Baird, J. (1999) 'Poor, remote children left behind', *Sydney Morning Herald*, September 27, p. 7.
- O'Brien, C. (1999) 'Your worst nightmare', *Harper's and Queen*, January, pp. 100–106.
- O'Connor, B. (2005) 'Russian revolution', *Sunday Telegraph*, 23 October, pp. 48, 61.
- O'Lincoln, T. (1996) 'Wealth, ownership and power: the ruling class', pp. 5–21 in Kuhn R. and O'Lincoln, T. (eds), *Class and Class Conflict in Australia*, Longman Australia, Melbourne.
- O'Rourke, A. (2003) 'Tom's friend causes airport flurry', *Daily News*, 13 January.
- Ostrander, S. (1984) *Women of the Upper Class*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Overington (2001) 'School goes on trial in unholy Trinity case: Dormitory of shame', *Sunday Age*, 4 February, p. 1.
- Owens, S. (1998) 'Pride and groom'. *Sun-Herald*, 10 May, p. 47.
- Parsons, K. (1997) 'Coach house too good for the horses', *Weekend Australian*, 5–6 July, Property p. 12.
- Penelope, J. (1994) *Out of the Class Closet: Lesbians Speak*, Crossing Press, New York.
- Personal Narratives Group (1989) *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

- Peretz, E. (2004) 'Saint-Tropez Babylon', *Vanity Fair*, July, pp. 115–126.
- Poiner, G. (1990) *Gender and Other Power Relationships in a Rural Community*, Sydney University Press in association with Oxford University Press, South Melbourne.
- Porter, J. (2005) 'Schmoozing with stars – at a price', *Sydney Morning Herald Weekend Edition*, 16–17 July, p. 24.
- Pottinger, P. (1998) 'Alfa Romantic', *Australian Magazine*, 27–28 June, p. 45.
- Poynting, S. and Donaldson, M. (2004) 'Snakes and leaders. Hegemonic masculinity in ruling-class boys' boarding schools', *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 7, N° 4, pp. 325–346.
- Probyn, E. (1993) *Sexing the Self: Gendered Positions in Cultural Studies*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Pusey, M. (1991) *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-building State Changes Its Mind*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Raethel, S. (1997) 'New head for King's focuses on future', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 February, p. 4.
- Raethel, S. (1998) 'The King's maker', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 January, Education p. 12.
- Raethel, S. and Jamal, N. (1998) 'Pens are poised as fight for private school places begins', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 March, p. 3.
- Ramsey, T. (2003) 'Years finally getting to Jack – age is a barrier even for the greatest golfer who ever lived', *Sunday Telegraph*, 20 April, p. 68.
- Read, P. (1996) 'The bitter price of Aboriginality', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 November.
- Reines, R. (1999) 'From horses to courses', *Sunday Telegraph*, 28 November, p. 206.
- Reines, R. (1999) 'Hotspot', *Sunday Telegraph*, 28 November, p. 206.
- Reines, R. (2002) 'Passion at the polo', *Sunday Telegraph*, 17 November, p. 142.
- Reines, R. (2003a) 'An affair that quietly lingers', *Sunday Telegraph*, 19 January, p. 134.
- Reines, R. (2003b) 'Kate to bid adieu to Yu', *Sunday Telegraph*, 2 February, p. 142.
- Reines, R. (2003c) 'Barham laps up bachelor life', *Sunday Telegraph*, 16 February, p. 126.
- Reines, R. (2003d) 'The flying ace and the pin-up', *Sunday Telegraph*, 2 March, p. 126.
- Reines, R. (2003e) 'James in search of his reality', *Sunday Telegraph*, 28 September, p. 134.
- Reynolds, R. (2003) 'Blackout', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2–3 July, pp. 43, 46.
- Reuters (2003) 'PBL shares drop on Packer health reports', 4 April.

- Richards, S. (2003) 'Tired of waiting – join the club – when exclusive proves elusive', *Daily Telegraph* 22 February, p. 14.
- Robbins, A. (2004) 'Powerful secrets', *Vanity Fair*, July, pp. 93–96, 135–138.
- Robins, B. (2003) 'A big part of the Packer family farm', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 August.
- Romero, M. (1992) *Maid in the U.S.A.* Routledge, New York.
- Ross, E. (2003) 'Whatever they fancy', *Business Review Weekly*, 22 May, p. 184.
- Rowlands, L. (1998) 'Waterfront estate may top \$4m', *Weekend Australian*, 28 February–1 March, Property p. 12.
- Russell, M. (1996) '\$6m Palm Beach site signals hot property summer', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26. October, p. 4.
- Safe, M. (1999) 'Bill Watson, Noosa's iceman cometh', *Australian Magazine*, June 12–13, pp. 9–10.
- Saville, M. (2005) 'Pot of gold', *Sydney Morning Herald, the (sydney) magazine*, 28 July, pp. 48–53.
- Schmidt, L. (1997) 'The unquenchable Andrew Fairley', *Qantas Club*, April, pp. 7–8.
- Schubert, M. (1998) 'Old school tie kicks on', *Weekend Australian*, 20–21 June, 10.
- Scott, J. (2005) 'Life at the top in America isn't just better, its longer', *New York Times*, Class Matters, A Special Section, 16 May.
- Scott, J. and Leonhardt, D. (2005) 'Class in America: Shadowy lines that still divide', *The New York Times*, Class Matters, A Special Section, 15 May.
- Sexton, E. (1998) 'Overlude', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June, Business p. 97.
- Sexton, J. (1998) 'Room with a phew what a rent bill', *Weekend Australian*, 4–5 July, p. 9.
- Shand, A. (2003a) 'The ultimate insider's life on the inside', *Australian Financial Review*, 30 May, p. 6.
- Shand, A. (2003b) 'Not another canapé, darling', *Australian Financial Review*, 6 September, p. 19.
- Shand, A. and Ryan C. (2002) 'The network rates mates before money', *Australian Financial Review*, 4 December, p. 1.
- Sharp, A. (2002) 'What Jodhi got: cash, house, car and the dog', *Sun-Herald*, 15 September, p. 52.
- Sharp, A. (2003a) 'All pals together', *Sun-Herald*, 26 January, p. 52.
- Sharp, A. (2003b) 'Gretel looks grim away from the business', *Sun-Herald*, 16 March, p. 56.
- Shawcross, W. (1984) *Rupert Murdoch, Ringmaster of the Information Circus*, Random House Australia, Sydney.

- Shears, R. (2004) 'Prince's secret "special" friend', *The Daily Telegraph*, 18 September, p. 22.
- Shoumatoff, A. (1996) 'Battle of the bluebloods', *Vanity Fair*, October, pp. 184–196.
- Siklos, R. (1995) *Shades of Black. Conrad Black and the World's Fastest Growing Press Empire*, William Heinemann Australia, Port Melbourne, Victoria.
- Slamet, D. (1998) 'Mornington ride', *Weekends for Two*, 21, 30–33, pp. 194–5.
- Slattery L. (1996) 'Our man on China', *Weekend Australian*, 9–10 November, p. 23.
- Sloley, E. (2004) 'On the beach', *Harper's Bazaar*, September, pp. 388–395.
- Smith, B. (1997) *Vanity Fair*, January, p. 100.
- Smith, B. (2002) 'The Fischer queen', *Age*, 13 November, p. 14.
- Smith, D. (2003) *Free Lunch*, Profile Books, London.
- Smith, S. (1996) 'Oh, what a lovely war!', *Vanity Fair*, October, pp. 168–189.
- Stein, P. (1984) 'Men in Families', *Marriage and Family Review*, 7, 3–4, pp. 143–162.
- Stephens, T. (2005) 'Frank Packer to Nixon – forget Gough, we back bombing', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 December.
- Stewart, S. (2003) 'Clubs racist past traps rabbi in the headlights', *Weekend Australian*, 7–8 June, p. 10.
- Steyn, M. (1998) 'Absolutely flabulous', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 March, Spectrum 8s.
- Sun-Herald* (2005) 'New York pad a snip at \$57 million', 21 January, p. 47.
- Sweetman, K. and Luff, D. (1999) 'Kerry's exclusive venue', *Daily Telegraph*, 15 December.
- Sydney Morning Herald* (1997) 'Ex-Coles' chief accused of \$4m home extension rort', 18 February, p. 3.
- Sydney Morning Herald* (2001a) 'Bullies and cowards', 10 February, p. 40 [editorial].
- Sydney Morning Herald* (2001b) 'Trinity charge reduced', 24 February, p. 2.
- Sykes, T. (1996) 'The world according to Al', *Australian Financial Review*, 15 November, p. 3.
- Tabakoff, J. (1996a) 'Sydney's newest northern beach', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 December, Spectrum 5s.
- Tabakoff, J. (1996b) 'Those who feel looser at Noosa', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 December, Spectrum 5s.
- Telegraph*, London, (2004) 'Di took Charles to the cleaners, says adviser', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 July, p. 6.

- Thomas, H. (2003) 'Hiding Harry', *The Courier Mail*, 27 September, p. 27.
- Thomas, W. I. and F. Znaniecki (1958) *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, First published 1918–1920, Dover, New York.
- Thomson, J. (2003) 'Teach the children well', *Business Review Weekly*, 22 May, p. 170.
- Thompson, P. (1981) 'Life histories and the analysis of social change', pp. 289–306 in D. Bertaux (ed.), *Biography and Society, The Life History Approach to the Social Sciences*, Sage Studies in International Sociology 23, Beverly Hills.
- Thorndike, J. J. (1976) *The Very Rich. A History of Wealth*, New York, American Heritage / Bonanza Books.
- Tolson, A. (1977) *The Limits of Masculinity*, Tavistock, London.
- Trinity Grammar School (2001) 'Fee schedule 2001' retrieved June 18 2001 from <http://www.trinity.nsw.edu.au/pospectus/fees.html>.
- Tsvadaridis, D. (2003) 'Jamie's heart has healed and he doesn't care who knows it', *Daily Telegraph*, 1 July, p. 3.
- Tuccille, J. (1989) *Rupert Murdoch*, Donald Fine, New York.
- Tyndall, F. (2003a) 'New record for Palm Beach: \$9m', *Australian Financial Review*, 9 October, p. 4.
- Tyndall, F. (2003b) 'The pull of the tide', *Australian Financial Review*, 17 October, p. 12.
- Tyndall, F. and Harley, R. (2004) 'Rivkin sells mansion to Packer pal', *Australian Financial Review*, 30 June, p. 3.
- Tyrnauer, M. (1997) 'Dietrich lived here', *Vanity Fair* September, pp. 286–293.
- Tyrnauer, M. (2004) 'So very Valentino', *Vogue Australia*, November pp. 422–251, 280.
- Vanderbilt, G. (1996) 'A mother's tale', *Vanity Fair*, May, pp. 192–204.
- Vanderbilt, G. (2004) 'An heiress heart', *Vanity Fair*, September, pp. 170–183.
- Varney, M. with Marquis, M. (1989) *Bodyguard To Charles*, Robert Hale, London.
- Vass, N. and Chancellor, J. (2004) 'A bit rich', *Sydney Morning Herald – Domain*, 13–14 November, p. 8H.
- Vincent, S. (2002) 'By appointment to Her Majesty', *Sydney Morning Herald Good Weekend*, March 29–31, pp. 18–22.
- Wade, M. (2005) 'The Lucky Country falls short', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 July.
- Walker, F. (2001a) 'Trinity Victim: "We were all bullied"', *Sun-Herald*, 11 February, p. 6.
- Walker, F. (2001b) 'Others speak out against decades of bullying', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 February, p. 6.

- Walker, F., Conway, A. and Southward, J. (1993) 'Packer drops \$13m in Los Vegas', *Sun-Herald*, February 21, p. 3.
- Walsh, M. (1997) 'Renaissance – it's a lifestyle to dye for', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 February, p. 25.
- Walsh, R. (2002) *Executive Material*, Allen and Unwin, Crows Nest, Sydney.
- Weekend Australian* (1998a) 'Sale makes child's play of royal link', 2–3 May, Property p. 12.
- Weekend Australian* (1998b) 'Casino boss cashes in', 4–5 July, p. 12.
- Weldon, F. (1996) 'Caution: storyteller at work', *Sunday Times*, May, p. 12.
- West, P. (1999) "Steve Biddulph and Peter West on Boys", All Staff E-mail, University of Western Sydney, 28 July.
- White, P. (1983) *Flaws in the Glass: A Self-Portrait*, Penguin Australia, Ringwood.
- Williamson, B. (2002) 'Buy this car, earn the average salary for 12 months or rent this house for \$33,500 a week'. *Daily Telegraph*, 27 December, p. 3.
- Wilson, B. (1994) 'A very tiresome royal tearaway', *Sunday Telegraph*, 2 January, p. 84.
- Wilson, C. (1994) *A Greater Love: Charles and Camilla: The Inside Story of their Twenty-three-year Relationship*. Headline, London.
- Wilson, C. (2003) 'Royal family love rectangle: Charles, Anne and the Parker Bowles', *Daily Telegraph*, 6 June, p. 40.
- Wright, L. and Tate, L. (2003) 'Alan bonds with friends', *Sunday Times*, 21 September, p. 4.
- Wright, M. (1989) 'Personal narratives, dynasties and women's campaigns: Two examples from Africa', pp. 155–171 in Personal Narratives Group, *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Wyndham, S. (2003) 'Class Act (Part 2)', *Sydney Morning Herald Sydney Magazine*, 29 October, p. 52.
- Young, E. (1995) 'Bring out the dead and pick at their guilty secrets', *Age*, 12 August, p. 7.
- Zachariah, R. (2003) 'Crowe mate a would-be cattle king', *Sunday Telegraph*, 6 April, p. 96.

Subject Index

- Absence 27, 35, 37, 47, 111, 164, 203, 233, 234
Accuracy 22
Adolescence 107
Aeroplanes 154
Affection 31, 33, 37, 54, 70, 107, 108, 111, 234
Aggression 89, 118, 238
Ascham 79, 120
Aspen 189, 191
Aston Martin 200
Australian Club 117, 194, 195, 196, 204
Authority 90
Autobiography 18, 20, 22, 24
Bellevue Hill 120, 131, 137, 142, 149, 155, 196
Belltrees 128, 130
Bentley 133
Biography 18, 20, 22, 24
Board 175, 176, 182, 220
Board members 239
Boarding School 29, 32, 53, 81, 94, 98, 110, 114, 203, 204
Boardroom 117, 165, 180, 194, 201, 212, 238, 243
Bodies 101, 104, 146, 153, 164, 240
Brutalising 45, 88, 89, 93
Buckingham Palace 113, 132
Bullying 31, 32, 89, 90, 92, 93, 98, 114, 115, 201, 228, 229, 235, 238, 239, 242
Cambridge 36, 113, 122, 194
Capitalism 19
Care 89, 185
Cavan 24, 122, 126, 159, 190
Charity 197, 198, 199
Cheam 36, 95
Cheltenham 84, 95, 99
Childhood 203
Class 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 24, 25, 39, 40, 43, 45, 71, 72, 74, 81, 108, 112, 117, 118, 119, 179, 180, 182, 205, 209, 212, 231, 232, 233, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242
Class formation 72
Clubs 44, 73, 112, 164, 165, 166, 168, 178, 180, 187, 189, 193, 194, 200, 201, 220, 240
Cohesion 118, 164, 237, 241
Colleges 113, 115
Companionship 109
Compassion 108
Competitiveness 88, 97, 99, 100, 101, 106, 146, 190, 201, 203, 204, 205, 217, 218, 229, 235, 238, 243
Corporate loyalty 104
Cranbrook 77, 80, 82, 86, 96, 98, 120, 121, 166
Cricket 104, 105, 106, 120, 181
Cruden 38, 122, 125, 191
Death 33, 50, 201
Deference 104
Diaries 21, 27

Directors 174, 175, 193, 209, 220
 Discipline 101, 108
 Divorce 215, 216
 East Hampton 141
 Education 43
 Emotions 30, 70, 89, 90, 107, 233,
 234
 Eton 72, 75, 83, 140
 Family 71, 73, 74, 79, 89, 112, 119,
 169, 174, 185, 201, 202, 204, 209,
 210, 212, 214, 237, 238, 241, 243
 Fathers 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 41,
 43, 66, 69, 79, 233, 237, 238
 Fear 33, 37, 114, 172, 173, 175
 Feelings 35, 45, 65, 90, 107, 118,
 234, 235, 236
 Ferrari 133, 153, 200
 Football 104, 105
 Frensham 80
 Friendship 36, 45, 51, 54, 55, 80, 89,
 107, 108, 111, 112, 116, 119, 123,
 172, 201, 203, 205, 206, 235, 243
 Gambling 182, 183, 189, 242
 Gang 107, 109, 235
 Geelong Grammar 73, 77, 78, 83, 90,
 94, 96, 101, 102, 165, 191, 195
 Gender 25, 71, 88, 100, 119, 232
 Gender relations 10, 11, 17, 209
 Golf 105, 128, 196, 201
 Gordonstoun 36, 72, 75, 82, 83, 86,
 90, 91, 94, 98, 101, 102, 120
 Great Public Schools (GPS) 79
 Hamptons 77, 155
 Headmaster 72, 73, 82, 83, 89, 238
 Health 147, 148, 164
 Hegemonic 45, 107, 236
 Hegemonic masculinity 87, 107, 108
 Heirs 190, 209, 210, 212, 214, 237
 Helicopter 156, 159, 161, 162, 219
 Heterosexuality 111, 115
 Hierarchy 107, 191, 201, 242
 Homophobia 108, 115
 Homosexual 87, 89, 110, 236
 Homosexuality 88, 107, 110, 111, 118,
 238
 Hunting 103
 Individualism 201, 242
 Intimacy 45, 54, 68, 70, 107, 108, 233,
 234
 Kambala 120
 Leisure 43, 120, 185, 188, 189, 200,
 201, 241, 242, 243
 Liberal Party 177, 198
 Life history 15, 16, 17, 18, 22
 Life stories 23
 Loneliness 35, 36, 37, 96, 97, 108, 111
 Love 27, 33, 34, 45, 52, 53, 54, 55,
 70, 89, 110, 111, 203, 229, 233,
 234, 238, 239, 241
 Loyalty 107
 Marriages 25, 74, 78, 118, 190, 203,
 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215,
 217, 229, 237, 238, 239, 241
 Masculinity 16, 24, 38, 43, 45, 46,
 71, 72, 83, 88, 89, 90, 93, 100,
 103, 106, 109, 118, 236, 238
 Melbourne Club 77, 83, 194, 195, 196
 Mercedes 67, 133, 153, 200, 216
 Michaelhouse 109, 112
 Millionaires 23
 Mistresses 190, 217, 229
 Nanny 34, 35, 40, 41, 47, 50, 52,
 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 68, 69,
 96, 123, 124, 210, 234
 New York Times 39, 182, 231
 Noosa 144, 145, 146

Nurturing 89
 Oral history 16, 22
 Ordinary folk 66
 Ordinary people 66
 Ormond College 113
 Oxford 112, 121, 132, 165
 Palm Beach, Australia 128, 138, 141,
 142, 143, 144, 148, 196, 200
 Palm Beach, USA 76, 125, 134, 141,
 197, 200, 201
 Penthouses 136
 Philanthropy 199
 Planes 158, 240
 Politicians 178
 Polo 63, 67, 103, 106, 128, 129, 134,
 170, 178, 190, 191, 198, 219
 Portsea 141, 143, 144
 Power 9, 11, 17, 71, 85, 90, 105, 108,
 117, 165, 171, 174, 175, 201, 206,
 207, 209, 211, 217, 223, 225, 232,
 237, 238, 239, 241, 242
 Principal 72, 73, 75, 76, 82, 86, 235
 Punishment 102, 103
 Racism 115
 Rolls Royce 153, 153, 200
 Royal Family 64, 69, 129, 155, 162,
 177, 190
 Royal Sydney Golf Club 120, 127, 196
 Ruling class 10, 11, 12, 15, 24, 40, 41,
 45, 47, 67, 71, 72, 74, 78, 85, 88,
 93, 104, 107, 108, 165, 170, 171,
 178, 179, 180, 182, 185, 189, 200,
 201, 202, 204, 205, 208, 209, 214,
 225, 229, 231, 233, 235, 237, 238,
 240, 242
 Saturation 23, 24
 School 118, 120
 School, private 181, 203
 Scotch College 83, 195, 238
 Scots College 86, 87, 97, 105, 120
 Servants 30, 35, 39, 40, 47, 48, 49,
 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63,
 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 74, 164,
 171, 185, 203, 204, 233, 234, 235,
 240, 241
 Sex 110, 111, 112, 203, 205, 206, 207,
 208, 217, 224, 229, 238, 239, 241
 sexuality 89, 107, 109, 110, 114, 223
 Skiing 103, 105, 128, 189, 191
 Space 119, 121, 123, 124, 163, 164,
 240, 241
 Sport 90, 103, 104, 105, 106, 167,
 218, 219, 242
 St Andrew's College 73, 113, 114,
 196, 203, 236
 St Moritz 189
 St Tropez 137, 140, 163
 Style 118, 237
 Success 90, 169
 Superiority 42, 43, 84, 118, 201, 233,
 237
 Sydney Grammar 86
 Tara 80
 Tennis 103, 105, 106, 128, 132, 133,
 189, 190, 191, 201, 217
 Terror 90
 The King's School 77, 79, 80, 81, 82,
 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 105, 120,
 134
 Time 28, 29, 171, 185, 186, 200, 201,
 241, 242
Times 122, 182, 232
 Toorak 125, 137
 Toughness 107
 Trinity Grammar 86, 98, 228
 Truth 21, 22

Truthfulness 20, 23, 24
Union Club 117, 194, 195
University 32, 113, 116, 117, 121,
122, 148, 237
University college 114, 118, 235, 236,
237
University of Melbourne 113
University of Sydney 73, 113, 114,
117, 203
Validity 14, 23
Verification 23
Verstehen 21
Violence 107, 110, 117, 228, 229, 238
War 184
Watergate 22
Waverley College 236
Win 181, 235
Winning 183, 189
Wives 190
Woollahra 120, 137
Work 65, 66, 89, 164, 167, 168, 170,
174, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186,
187, 189, 191, 201, 241, 242, 243
Work, unpaid 185
Workers 66, 69, 185, 201, 232, 242
Working class 17, 64, 76, 85, 87, 100,
105, 119, 150, 187
Yachts 103, 105, 154, 158, 160, 161,
162, 163, 164, 189, 201, 240
Yale 194

Name Index

- Adams, Phillip 239
Adler 135
Adler, Harry 163
Adler, Larry 127
Adler, Rodney 98, 197
Aga Khan 163, 170, 216
Agnelli 220
Agnelli, Giovanni 176, 220, 221
Agnellis 65, 177
Alexander, M. 174
Andersen 34, 48, 60, 67, 118, 121,
152, 155, 159, 160, 206, 207, 208,
213, 215, 217, 220, 221, 222, 224,
237
Andrew, Prince 53, 55, 57, 62, 64, 79,
82, 83, 94, 96, 103, 151
Anne, Princess 53
Ansett, Bob 18
Archer, Jeffrey 20
Argus, Don 195
Aspinall 173, 219
Astors 211
Baillieu 177, 144
Barber, L. 27, 33
Barry, Paul 11, 15, 18, 28, 30, 32, 35,
98, 148, 156, 166, 170, 181, 185,
214, 220, 224, 239
Bartoleme 33, 38, 185, 189
Beauvoir, Simone de 21
Beaverbrook, Lord 165, 180
Belfield, R. 18, 121, 126, 155, 172,
178, 181, 182, 185
Berry, Wendy 24, 45, 49, 51, 54, 55,
56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67,
72, 124, 152
Bertaux, D. 12, 23
Bertaux-Wiame, I. 12, 23
BHP-Billiton 195
Biddulph, Steven 87
Black, Conrad 15, 19, 20, 28, 31, 47,
52, 59, 76, 78, 83, 91, 93, 98, 102,
113, 120, 122, 123, 125, 132, 146,
155, 159, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171,
173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179,
180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 187, 192,
200, 206, 209, 232, 243
Boomerang 125, 139, 198
Boswell 19
Bourdieu 85
Bouvier, Jacqueline 220
Briggs 226
British Royals 160
Bronfman, Joanie 11, 15, 30, 31, 34,
35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 50, 51, 54, 55,
56, 60, 64, 67, 68, 69, 81, 94, 100,
101, 119, 150, 169, 174, 175, 212,
236
Brzezinski, Zbigniew 176
Bush, George W. 175, 194, 199
Business Council of Australia 195
Cairnton 127, 128, 139
Cameron, Peter (St Andrew's Principal)
72, 73, 113, 114, 115, 116, 191,
203, 204, 236, 237

- Capote, Truman 21, 24, 34, 65, 85,
95, 110, 167
- Carnegie, Sir Roderick 136
- Carrington, Lord 176, 187
- Cassab, Judy 24, 29, 47, 48, 49, 53,
57, 58, 65, 69, 119, 126, 162,
191
- Charles, Prince 18, 31, 32, 33, 36,
39, 43, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 58,
62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 72, 90, 91, 92,
97, 98, 102, 106, 108, 122, 124,
129, 132, 151, 152, 153, 157, 166,
190, 191, 194, 205, 213, 215, 216,
218
- Chisholm, Sam 135, 142, 148, 172,
173, 181, 183, 198
- Clark, Manning 12, 78
- Clarke 34, 65, 95, 110, 111, 222
- Coleridge, Nicholas 27, 66, 67, 91,
146, 152, 156, 163, 168, 175,
186, 243
- Coles, Ken 74
- Connell 17, 22, 87, 104, 105, 180
- Connell, R.W. et al. 17, 22, 71, 72,
73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84,
87, 88, 99, 100, 104, 106, 112,
119, 120, 180
- Conniff 62, 131, 147, 148, 149, 152,
159, 163, 169, 181, 182, 191,
193, 197, 200, 210, 211, 214, 220,
224
- Corrigan, Chris 127, 143, 148
- Cottle, Drew 10, 82, 120, 121
- Dangar, Rodney 82
- Danziger, Rowena 74
- Darling Point 137, 138, 139, 140, 214
- Darling, Sir James 73, 77, 78
- Davies 213
- Davis, William 9, 41, 96, 106, 125,
130, 131, 136, 141, 147, 149, 151,
153, 158, 167, 168, 171, 172, 180,
185, 190, 194, 212
- de Camargo 11
- Denzin 23
- Diana, Princess 36, 39, 49, 56, 66, 67,
124, 129, 198, 213, 215, 216, 217,
219
- Dimbleby, Jonathan 18, 32, 33, 36, 37,
44, 49, 51, 52, 53, 58, 65, 67, 72,
83, 90, 92, 95, 97, 98, 101, 102,
103, 106, 112, 113, 129, 132, 157,
204, 205
- Dods, Espie 134, 135, 149, 155
- Donaldson 11, 27, 62, 229
- Downer, Alexander 61
- Dunlap, Al 'Chainsaw' 137
- Edinburgh, Duke of 20, 31, 95, 97,
113, 152, 156, 167, 190
- Edward, Prince 28, 29, 38, 50, 53, 58,
76, 94, 96, 102, 103, 104, 113,
121, 122, 132, 151, 204
- Elder, G. 12, 22
- Ellis, Bob 61
- Engels, Frederick 12, 218
- Espie, Sam 197
- Fairfax 19, 74, 120, 175, 177, 188
- Fairfax family 19, 120
- Fairfax, James 18, 31, 40, 43, 47, 49,
53, 54, 60, 77, 79, 98, 112, 120,
121, 123, 134, 139, 166, 170, 176,
240
- Fairfax, John B. 137
- Fairfax, Lady Mary 24, 127
- Fairfax, Sir Warwick 60, 119, 175
- Fairley, Andrew 28
- Ferrarotti, F. 18

Fitzgerald, F. Scott 13
 Fraser 28, 30, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44,
 50, 51, 55, 61, 62, 64, 65, 94, 98,
 108, 124, 167
 Fraser, Malcolm 176
 Fraser, Ronald 16, 22, 24, 28, 31, 33,
 34, 35, 39, 47, 54, 60, 61, 68, 97,
 98, 123, 204
 Gazal, Sam 143, 144, 231
 Getty, J. Paul II. 27, 33
 Getty, Jean Paul 58
 Getty, Paul 149
 Getty, Paul I. 27
 Gilding, Michael 15, 169, 181, 195,
 199, 200, 210
 Goldsmith, Sir James 176, 184, 188
 Griffen-Foley, B. 223
 Gyngell, Bruce 80
 Gyngell, David 77, 80
 Hancock, Chris 80
 Hanson, Lord 176
 Hardy, Sir James 29, 51, 53, 112, 124,
 167, 194
 Harriman, William Averill 221
 Harrow 75
 Harry, Prince 124, 128, 191, 205
 Hartwell, Lord 49
 Harvey, Gerry 186
 Harvey-Jones, Sir John 169
 Hastings 57, 170, 173, 174, 177, 179
 Hastings, Max 123, 177
 Hastings, Peter 169
 Hawkes, Timothy 81, 85, 87, 88
 Heald, Tim 20, 28, 82, 113, 152, 156,
 157, 158, 160
 Hearst, William Randolph 125, 180
 Hepburn, Katherine 47
 Hewitt 21
 Higham 48, 60, 95, 113, 162, 207,
 208, 211, 213, 215, 216, 222, 223,
 225
 Highgrove 24
 Hill, Sinclair 191
 Hird 18, 121, 126, 155, 172, 178, 181,
 182
 Hochschild, Adam 16, 27, 30, 31, 32,
 39, 41, 44, 47, 50, 51, 55, 63, 77,
 86, 121
 Holmes a Court, Peter 150, 220
 Holmes a Court, Robert 102, 127, 147
 Holmes, Robert 94
 Hordern, Samuel 82
 Horne, Donald 20
 Hughes, Howard 47, 48, 59, 94, 113,
 140, 161, 207, 208, 211, 213, 214,
 215, 222, 223, 224, 225
 Irving 180
 Jackson 87, 89, 91, 93, 97, 99, 100,
 101, 104, 105, 112, 236
 James, Paul 14, 28, 29, 38, 48, 50, 51,
 53, 56, 58, 64, 70, 79, 96, 101,
 102, 103, 104, 113, 120, 122, 132,
 151, 152, 155, 157, 160, 162, 204,
 206, 221, 222, 224, 227
 Karpati 21
 Kelly 18, 121, 126, 155, 172, 178, 181,
 182
 Kennedy, Jack 14, 34, 67, 118, 151,
 155, 159, 206, 207, 215, 220,
 221, 222, 223, 237
 Kennedy, Jackie 48, 213, 215, 220, 222
 Kennedy, Joe 213, 221
 Kennedy, John F. Jr 206, 219
 Kennedy, Joseph P. 206
 Kennedy, Robert F. 207, 221, 226
 Kennedy Smith, William 227

Kennedy, Teddy 215, 221, 227
 Kennedys, The 160, 217
 Kernot, Cheryl 19
 Kerry 216
 Khan 125
 King, Sir Kelso 82
 Kissinger, Henry 176, 188
 Koch, P. 74
 Kohli, M. 17
 Kramer, Madame Leonie 24
 Kuhn 11
 Lagerfeld, Karl 43, 61
 Lessing, Doris 19, 21
 Lewis, Peter 60, 65, 77, 83, 84, 85, 88,
 89, 91, 97, 100, 107, 108, 109,
 111, 112, 236
 Lowy, Frank 15, 127, 139, 147, 159,
 161
 Lowy, Steven 198
 Margaret, Princess 48
 Marks, S. 12
 Marquis 32, 36, 50, 55, 67, 69, 91,
 98, 106, 122, 129, 194
 Marr, David 34, 36, 40, 42, 44, 47,
 50, 53, 59, 60, 61, 63, 69, 82, 84,
 87, 98, 99, 130, 168
 Marx, Karl 10, 218
 Maxwell, Robert 20
 Miller, R. 27
 Mitterand, François 215
 Montesini, Lorenzo 21, 85, 229
 Morgan 17
 Morgan, Hugh 195
 Morgan, J.P. 13
 Morrell, Robert 16, 71, 73, 80, 81, 83,
 85, 87, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 100,
 101, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109,
 110, 167, 209, 210
 Mountbatten, Lord Louis 48, 205
 Mulholland, Stephen 185
 Mundle, R. 29, 50, 51, 53, 104, 112,
 124, 167
 Murdoch 14, 24, 28, 29, 78, 126,
 171, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183,
 232
 Murdoch, Anna 30, 52, 125, 191
 Murdoch, Dame Elisabeth 37, 38, 39,
 43, 52, 73, 125, 126, 165, 188,
 234
 Murdoch, James 30, 96, 156
 Murdoch, Lachlan 126, 127, 142, 147,
 155, 160, 166
 Murdoch, Rupert 15, 20, 33, 37,
 42, 43, 52, 61, 73, 77, 96, 106,
 121, 122, 125, 142, 147, 149,
 150, 155, 158, 165, 175, 177,
 186, 188, 191, 198, 217, 232,
 233
 Murdoch, Sir Keith 37, 122, 126, 165,
 183
 Murray, Georgina 78, 174, 193, 209
 Myer, Kenneth 195
 Myers, D. 24
 Nixon, Richard 178
 Northcliffe, Lord 180
 O'Lincoln, T. 11
 Onassis, Aristotle 48, 131, 221, 222
 Ostrander, Susan 11, 15, 39, 43, 45,
 76, 78, 81, 84, 86, 103
 Packer 14, 15, 146
 Packer, Clyde 32, 177
 Packer family 18, 240
 Packer, Frank 127, 178
 Packer, James 38, 120, 128, 144, 147,
 148, 150, 163, 166, 177, 181, 197,
 216, 219, 220

- Packer, Kerry 9, 30, 32, 35, 38, 61, 74, 80, 96, 106, 126, 127, 128, 135, 139, 142, 144, 148, 149, 154, 155, 159, 160, 162, 166, 170, 172, 173, 179, 181, 188, 189, 191, 193, 196, 198, 225, 231, 239
- Packer, Ros 198
- Packer, Sir Frank 28, 30, 32, 160, 185, 194, 223
- Paley, William S. 220, 221
- Parker-Bowles, Camilla 51, 218, 219, 222
- Patrick Corporation 127, 143, 148
- Penelope 11
- Philip, Prince 28, 31, 32, 37, 55, 65, 152, 157, 191, 205
- Poiner, Gretchen 10, 11, 13, 14
- Point Piper 127, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140
- Poynting, S. 229
- Probyn, Elspeth 14
- Pusey, Michael 10, 15
- Queen 28, 32, 38
- Radler, David 176
- Reagan, President 180
- Reith, Peter 136
- Rich, Jodee 98, 156, 163, 214, 219, 224
- Rockefeller, David 187
- Rockefeller, John D. 148, 169, 210
- Rockefeller, Laurence S. 125
- Rockefeller, Steven 31
- Romero, M. 51, 52, 56, 57, 64, 65, 66
- Romney 20
- Roper 58
- Rothermere, Lord 27, 152, 168, 200
- Rothschild, Elie de 220, 221
- Rothschild, Lord 176
- Rothschild, Philippe 205, 217
- Rothschilds, The 210, 211
- Sartre 18
- Shah of Iran 24
- Shawcross, William 9, 10, 13, 14, 30, 37, 38, 42, 52, 61, 73, 77, 78, 83, 94, 96, 106, 122, 125, 126, 165, 166, 172, 175, 180, 182, 183, 184, 188, 190, 191, 233, 234
- Siklos, R. 20, 28, 47, 49, 76, 91, 113, 120, 122, 123, 132, 133, 167, 168, 170, 171, 174, 176, 181, 183, 184, 186, 188, 191, 192, 200, 207
- Simpson, Caroline (nee Fairfax) 135
- Smith, David 9
- Spencer, Lady Diana 191, 214
- Steedman 85
- Stiebel, Victor 93
- Strong, James 173
- Sultan of Brunei 132, 161, 224
- Thatcher, Margaret 174, 176, 178, 183, 187, 188, 232
- Thomas 16, 17, 18, 22
- Thompson, P. 17
- Thorndike, J.J. 13
- Tilley, Ben 80, 127, 135, 139
- Tolson, A. 92, 107
- Tosh 58
- Triguboff, Harry 199
- Trump, Donald 169
- Tuccille, J. 28, 39, 125, 165, 171, 172, 175, 182, 186, 191
- Turnbull, Malcolm 84, 127, 170, 177, 181, 199
- Turner, Ted 181, 194, 199
- Vanderbilt, Harold 194
- Vanderbilt, Reginald 167

Varney, Michael 24, 31, 32, 36, 50, 55,
67, 69, 91, 98, 106, 122, 129, 194
Vestey, Lord 177
Vidal, Gore 24, 48, 217
Volcker, Paul 176
Wales, Prince of 169, 200, 214, 218
Walsh, Richard 15, 173, 174, 181, 183,
186, 189
Ward, Russel 78
Warhol, Andy 41
Waterloo, Battle of 83
Weldon, Fay 20
Wellington, Duke of 83
West, Peter 87
White 60
White, Edmund 30
White, Patrick 24, 31, 33, 40, 42, 43,
44, 47, 50, 53, 59, 69, 82, 84, 87,
95, 99, 110, 111, 123
White, Victor 82
Whitely, Brett 77
Whites, the 142
White's, the 167
William, Prince 53, 54, 62, 124
Windsors 69
Znaniecki 16, 17, 18, 22