

T.M. WIXTED & CO
(Established 1929)

"In his humiliation justice was denied him"

Reprint Series	STATEMENT TO THE FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BY	Public Forum,
No.1,	DR. H. V. EVATT, LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION	Centenary Place,
March 1968.	<u>CANBERRA -- OCTOBER 1954</u>	BRISBANE, Q.

"I am pleased that the full Executive has been called together in this meeting as the situation which has come into existence clearly affects the general welfare of the Labor Movement throughout Australia.

At the Sydney six Hour Day Dinner, on Saturday 2nd October, I spoke publicly about factional tendencies within the Labor Movement; about the need for unity and about the emergency position which threatened the Parliamentary Labor Party as a result of the systematic use of the Caucus as a forum from which statements made within Caucus attacking the leadership of the Party, statements often distorted and sometimes not, were furnished direct to the anti-Labour press by one or more members of the Caucus.

In effect the position was reached that, although the meetings of the Parliamentary Party were private and confidential in character, there was a deliberate attempt being made by persons within Caucus to set aside the Party decision when I was re-elected Leader by 68-20 on August 3rd last. This attempt including systematic attacks on the leadership, was intended for widespread publication in the press.

Immediately after my re-election, press propaganda started; it being stated in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 10th August, that my opponent in this ballot, opposed me being "disgusted that no one had the courage to challenge Dr. Evatt". I feel certain that Mr. T. Bourke was not responsible for this statement to the press.

The next meeting - 11th August, was reported and falsified in the Press by a statement clearly emanating from Caucus, to the effect that two members had traded blows after an argument.

On Thursday August 12th, the Government and Speaker restricted the area of debate on the Petrov Royal Commission Bill, and as a result I could make only a very confined speech. However, I publicly challenged Menzies outside the House on four points: -

1. Whether he knew on April 13th of the payment of £5,000 to Petrov,
2. The date of his knowledge of the payment of £5,000, to prove his concealment of that fact until after the Federal elections,
3. Whether the Government employed a go-between to assist or procure the defection of Petrov and whether they were paid,
4. What were the free financial benefits, which the Petrovs were getting or going to get?

I then stated my firm belief that the Petrov affair would rank in history as an equivalent of the notorious Zinovieff letter, which was used to defeat the Labor Party in the British Elections of 1924, or the use by the Nazis of the Reichstag fire in the crisis of the general election confirming the Hitler regime in 1933.

In effect, I accused the Government of obtaining the Petrov documents in circumstances and under conditions that were deliberately intended to turn the election in their favour. (See Melbourne "Sun Pictorial", April 14th and subsequently).

I direct to your attention my comment on the Royal Commission Report on Exhibit "J". It was obvious from the evidence of the "go-between" and double spy Dr. Bialoguski, that Petrov had been nursed and nurtured by him for more than two years, with the Commonwealth Government paying Bialoguski's expenses. The obvious purpose of the preparation and deception was the defection of Petrov at an appropriate time. It was completely absurd to suppose that the revelation of April 13th merely "happened" on that particular evening - the very last sitting day of the House of Representatives.

On Tuesday August 31st, there was a bitter attack on Mr. Atlee in the House by Mr. Mullins MP, who took the same line as Mr. Keon had done when he called Mr. Atlee's mission to China a "mission of shame". Even an anti-Labor speaker from Queensland, Dr. Cameron repudiated such extravagant views.

My appearance as counsel before the Royal Commission was due to the naming of two members of my staff - Messrs. Dalziel and Grundeman - they were mentioned in exhibit "J" as informants. They ascertained this only as a result of the comment thereon by the Chairman of the Commission at Melbourne, and my public protest and intervention. It was a shocking comment intended to injure not only myself, but also the Labor Movement.

On August 12th, I was requested by the two members of (my) staff to appear. It was quite impracticable to have a party meeting. However I consulted a number of my colleagues, the majority being in favour of my appearing. But a substantial number was of opinion that I should take personal responsibility on such a personal matter and decide for myself. Ultimately I accepted the responsibility and burden involved. I had done the same jointly with Mr. Chifley when I had succeeded in attacking the validity of the Menzies anti-Communist legislation of 1951.

I also had in mind that the attacks on my staff were also aimed at myself as Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party. I believed that it would be possible to establish the substance of the attack, which I launched against Mr. Menzies on Thursday 12th August, when I compared the Petrov case to the notorious Zinovieff case.

As a result of my intervention, my staff has been substantially cleared and the substance of my references to the Zinovieff letter has been proved. But for that, Menzies could have claimed that

the defection of Petrov was merely coincidental with the last sitting day of the Parliament, when in fact the very opposite was the case.

It was organised and timed. If I had not intervened, Labor would have been under a cloud for 20 years.

Subsequently I was excluded from the Petrov Commission merely because I protested against the French Government's action in spiriting Madame Ollier out of Australia to Noumea, thus preventing her from answering the imputations of the two Petrovs, which were made at a special private hearing of the Petrov Commission. As the result of an incidental reference by me to the Petrovs, my right to appear was terminated although every anti-Labor newspaper and magazine in Australia were writing articles glamorising the Petrovs, eg "Sydney Bulletin", Melbourne "*News Weekly*". Subsequent investigation has shown that Petrov perjured himself in regard to Madame Ollier, and he is now suffering from the special Royal Commission disease vulgarly called "perjuryitis".

On the 9th September there was again a false report of the Caucus proceedings, after I had explained fully the Petrov case to Caucus. The majority was clearly supporting me, but on this occasion the sensation was an alleged threatened bout of fisticuffs between two other members of the Caucus. It was a distortion worse than a lie. There is not the slightest doubt that these distorted reports were deliberately furnished to the press by one or more members of the party.

So bad was the falsity, that on September 10th, in a public statement I referred to the distorted reporting of a tiny incident at the end of a Caucus meeting and said that the basic information had clearly come from one or more regular informers to the press from within the party, who possibly or probably were paid for the job, but who were certainly acting in a spirit of cold and malevolent treachery.

The deliberate attempt to destroy the Leadership continued even to the extent of abusing the occasion of speaking to the minutes. In every case the news was featured as a sensation in the press either in an inaccurate, exaggerated, or grossly exaggerated form. In all cases the statements had some tenuous basis of fact from actual statements at the meeting, but the plan and purpose were becoming increasingly clear.

I became convinced that there was a deliberate attempt by a small but determined group to subvert the Leadership of the Party by methods of systematic defamation; it being perfectly well known to all in the Caucus that critical remarks made in confidence would find their outlet in the anti-Labor press through one or more traitors.

The situation gradually reached a stage, which extended quite beyond jurisdiction of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party. That body has, as you know, no disciplinary jurisdiction over its members. It is quite impracticable for a Leader of the Party coming from (say) New South Wales to make complaint to the State Executive of another state from which any particular MP might come. I believed, and subsequent events have proved, that there was a plan to destroy my

leadership, the persons taking part in the plan acting in strict accordance with a prior understanding.

On Tuesday 12th October, the special meeting of the Parliamentary Executive was held to deal with some vital questions of foreign policy including SEATO. There were 13 members present. Even from that Executive meeting there was a deliberate leakage to the newspapers foreshadowing our most confidential recommendations to the Party that there should be no further public statements made on any intra-party disputes, pending the meeting of Federal Executive.

I agreed to this with some doubt because I felt that attacks would be made on me by persons outside the Labor movement, and this indeed actually occurred.

On the next day Wednesday 13th October, I proposed to Caucus the acceptance of a recommendation to the Executive. Once more there was a short but violent attack on me, which attack was of course, featured in both the afternoon and morning anti-Labor press.

The recommendation of the Executive was ultimately carried by a substantial majority. Notwithstanding a violent attack on myself arising out of the Executive recommendation, Senator Cole of Tasmania moved that all offices in the Parliamentary Labor Party be declared vacant, his stated intention being to remove me from the Leadership of the Party. He described the Federal Executive as an "outside" body and it was plain that the intention of those supporting him was to achieve a *fait accompli* before the meeting of this Executive, in which case I would not even be heard as Leader.

Once again the "move" had been notified to the press before it was even mentioned to the Party meeting. Once again all criticism in speeches hostile to me were featured by the anti-Labor press in a way which was grotesquely one-sided and proceeded from a deliberate and treacherous leakage.

Immediately prior to October 13th, (when the Cole notice was ruled by myself as requiring notice) and also prior to October 20th, many thousands of telegrams were sent to members of Caucus improperly exerting pressure upon them. One Senator received no less than 500 telegrams. Nearly all these came from individuals many were anonymous. In many cases there was a simultaneous deposit at Post Offices of telegrams *en masse*. The expense involved must have run into thousands of pounds.

Very few of these telegrams came from *bona fide* Labor organisations, and I believe none at all, from trades unions. There was clearly a central organisation, which directed the high-pressure campaign against Senators and MPs, many letters being multiple typed and many telegrams being obviously bogus. In my opinion the organisation responsible for the American high pressure campaign is a permanent organisation which is endeavouring to capture control of the Labor Movement, the methods used being typical of Communist pressure tactics, the object being falsely to suggest overwhelming strength of numbers.

On October 20th, Senator Cole's motion was debated and defeated 54-28. As the attack was upon myself, I allowed the widest latitude of discussion. Most opponents spoke without violent denunciation, but the speech of Mr. Mullins was most extravagant and that of Messrs W.M. Bourke and Keon only a little less so. All the attacks were of course, featured in the anti-Labor press. I refer by way of example to the Melbourne "Age" of Thursday 21st October.

In my statement of October 5th, I referred specifically to a small minority group of Labor members located particularly in the State of Victoria. I had in mind Messrs Mullins, Keon and W.M. Bourke. These members not only failed to obey the decision to work for the defeat of the Communist Referendum of 1951, but in addition, paraded their abstention, which of course meant the sabotage of our campaign. But they apparently acted in the belief that the governing Executive of the Labor Party in Victoria would not discipline them even if they conspicuously absented themselves from Labor's campaign. They were included no doubt, in the persons censured by this Federal Executive for not obeying the binding instructions of the meeting to oppose the referendum in which I led the "NO" case.

I must add that I did not press for special penalties against any Federal Labor member in connection with this referendum. In the case of South Australia, I actually intervened to suggest that it was the wrong policy to seek penalties. My only object was to reconcile and to unite. I went further and made many attempts to conciliate - probably too many. I am now satisfied that there is a small group which is quite irreconcilable to the principles of Labor's platform and policy. Their attitude is that they will get control of the Party and restrict its advanced policy to one of anti-Communism both in internal and external affairs.

The attitude of the group or faction is expressed from week to week in the Melbourne paper "*News Weekly*" which acts as their organ and which they never oppose.

This was well illustrated after Mr. Menzies' statement on April 13th last, referring to the allegedly spontaneous defection of Petrov. On April 28th 1954, this newspaper accepted as gospel the Petrov story in its widest and most extravagant form.

In the course of this particular issue in a special paragraph, page 1, which they headed - "We tipped you off 15 months ago", they quoted themselves as of January 28th 1953, as follows: -

"Startling repercussions are expected to follow disclosures soon to be made on the activities of certain members of the Russian diplomatic staff in Australia.

As a sample of what will be revealed in the anticipated disclosures, take the case of the Third Secretary attached to the Russian Legation in Canberra."

The paragraph in "*News Weekly*" of April 28th 1954, states the Third Secretary's name was "Petrov"

Despite recent and frantic denials of this paper, here is the plainest unequivocal statement that "disclosures" were about to be made early in 1953 on the activities of Petrov. There is no denying this - that is exactly what was stated in the *"News Weekly"* of January 28th 1953.

This clue gave those appearing with me in the Petrov Commission grounds for believing that even at this time (early 1953), Petrov was being nursed and prepared in the interests of the Menzies Government, for his ultimate defection. Acting on this belief we insisted that the witness Dr. Bialoguski should be called. We ascertained that he had been "nursing" Petrov for over two years, actually making 200 reports to Security, the expense to the Commonwealth being very considerable. The facts that we elicited completely destroyed the Menzies falsity that the Petrov case resembled the Gouzenko case in Canada when Gouzenko sought asylum in desperation and in danger of being captured and perhaps killed by other Russian officers. The extract proves clearly that those controlling *"News Weekly"* were early in 1953, in close contact with Security and Bialoguski. It is significant that in Caucus I was bitterly attacked by W.M. Bourke for having caused Bialoguski to give evidence. It was one of the best day's work I ever did. Messrs Bourke, Mullins and Keon were actively concerned in the progress of the Commission. Mr. Mullins showed a foreknowledge of confidential and supposedly secret exhibit.

I mention this matter of *"News Weekly"* and the Petrov affair preparatory to stating my firm belief that in certain electorates in the State of Victoria, there was a deliberate sabotage of the candidature of certain Labor candidates at the Federal Election. The case of the Isaacs electorate is merely a case in point.

We were told by officials that the selected candidate was a "Com", which is of course, a name used to cover any person who deviates in any way from extreme Right Wing Labor. I pointed out to the Executive Officers in the Victorian ALP that the candidate had been selected and endorsed and should be fully supported. I suggested moreover, in the interests of polling the maximum vote, there should be attached to the electorate a recognised Right Wing advocate such as Mr. Keon. Further, I suggested that Mr. J.P. Bourke State MLA for St. Kilda should be directed to assist in the campaign. This was never done despite my personal request to Mr. J.P. Bourke MLA.

I have no doubt that a careful inquiry would show that there was a systematic attempt on the part of prominent members of the Victorian Labor Party to defeat the selected and endorsed Labor candidate for Isaacs. I hand in a telegram to the effect that the Isaacs Federal Campaign Council has advised the Victorian Executive that in Isaacs Electorate there had been subversive activities against the selected and endorsed Labor candidate.

I have little doubt that in some other electorates the same treachery took place. Those were the electorates where the candidate was regarded as a "Left Winger", and readily denounced by unscrupulous people as a "Com" or a Communist. At the other extreme was the Labor candidate in McMillan, Mr. Devlin, for whom I spoke on the last meeting of my Victorian campaign. His

anti-Communist diatribes were so ridiculously extravagant and extreme, that I believe that he repelled a large section of the great audience at that meeting.

I mention these matters not to indulge in personal attacks. I have no personal feelings whatever. But they reinforce my view that there is an emergency situation facing the Labor Movement in certain parts of Australia. I think the emergency situation is clearly the most serious in Victoria.

It may be found on looking into the substance of the matter, that it is not so much a case of individual disobedience or misconduct, as the almost universal belief in Victoria, that any Labor member or supporter can go as hard as he likes to the extreme right in his advocacy of anti-Communist measures; even although that means the rejection of bona fide Labor candidates who are absolutely loyal to the platform and policy of the Australian Labor Movement. That platform is based on practical, Socialist aims and objects to be attained by democratic and constitutional means. It is about time that everybody was made to realise the fact.

An illustration of this inadmissible Right Wing extremism were the bitter and insulting attacks made on the Leader of the British Labor Party Delegation to Asia (including Communist China). Mr. Mullins not only absented himself from the function given by the Australian Labor Party at Canberra in honour of Mr. Atlee, but added a few insulting words to the press for good measure. I was compelled to reply publicly and pointed out that Moscow "Pravda" was equally opposed to Mr. Atlee - a very great Labor leader in war and peace alike.

All these things indicate a serious position in the State of Victoria. Nothing could be worse for the Australian Labor Movement than a feeling of hostility between British Labor and Australian Labor. Nothing could be more injurious to our support of Australia as a great modern progressive force. There is no political Labor Movement in the United States. If some people had their way, the Australian Labor Party as we have understood it, would dissolve. What remained would be to the right even of the Menzies-Fadden Government.

A further illustration of the point I am making is provided by the public speeches of Mr. W.M. Bourke MP, against the authorised party policy of abolishing the Means Test over a three-year period. These were open, cold, prepared attacks. Mr. Bourke was hailed as a hero in expensive advertisements of the Liberal-Country Party published from one end of Australia to the other. Obviously nothing could be done by way of disciplining Mr. Bourke before the elections, and it is not the function of the Federal Leader to institute disciplinary measures in a particular state.

But the trouble goes deeper. I doubt whether such gross and treacherous indiscipline could have happened in any state in Australia except Victoria.

The activities of the small group mentioned as within the Federal Labor Party corresponds closely with the line of the Melbourne "*News Weekly*". In particular Mr. Keon and Mr. Mullins frequently express the detailed argument of "*News Weekly*". These arguments and views are substantially the same as those of Mr. Santamaria as quoted by Mr. Dougherty, Secretary of the Australia Workers' Union, in the "*Worker*" of 20th October. That quotation by Mr. Dougherty is

an extract from a long speech of Mr. Santamaria delivered in March 1953, apparently at a meeting comprised of members of what is called the "Movement". The whole of Mr. Santamaria's speech is important. If given effect to, it would subvert and destroy the Labor Movement.

A substantial cause of the dispute relates to policy, because the policy as expressed by Santamaria is not in accordance with Labor platform and principles. The attempt to associate themselves with Mr. Curtin as opposed to Mr. Chifley is ridiculous in fact, and only a disguise for embracing a policy of following America at all costs both in foreign and internal policy.

The point is well illustrated by an extract from "*News Weekly*" dated September 15th 1954. This condemns (me) because of my intervention (and) in effect I am harking back to my "heresy" in opposing the referendum of 1951. The extract deserves careful study.

There is a basic difference of policy expressed here, and not merely personal hostility. If anti-Communism is to be the basic and primary policy of Labor, then the logical application of this policy inevitably means world war to suppress Communism and internally the introduction of the methods of the Police State to curb and restrict Left Wing opinion. To them every Left-Winger is a "Com". Yet all Labor members are broadly Left-Wingers.

I can understand people having these views. But I am irrevocably opposed to them. The views are opposed to the platform and policy of the Australian Labor Movement. Yet they are the views expressed quite frankly by "*News Weekly*" and also by Mr. Santamaria who can not deny that he is a prominent spokesman for the "Movement" and actually pretends to exercise powers within the Labor Movement and trade unions.

The problem before us is far deeper than a personal one. I am satisfied that it is not so much an objection to myself as Leader personally which caused such desperate attempts to terminate my leadership after I had been re-elected Leader of the Party for the life of the present Parliament. Those controlling the "Movement" as expressed by "*News Weekly*" hailed the Petrov case in order to advance and support their own extremist policy. It was dangerous to them if the defection of Petrov proved to be not spontaneous but part of a carefully organised and prepared plan for election purposes.

From a human point of view, why should anyone object to my appearance for two members of my staff? I received thousands of letters from Leagues and Unions alike as the Parliamentary Labor Party and most of its members.

The real objection was that I was fighting a battle similar to the battle fought when the Communist referendum was defeated in 1951; namely a battle against the intolerable policy that any method and any means, whether just or unjust, whether right or wrong, whether decent or indecent, is permissible so long as it is directed at the destruction both of Communists or any person who is a Socialist or a Leftist and therefore regarded as a "Com".

That is why the Petrov affair has been used so fiercely against me. It is quite logical that it should be so used. *"News Weekly"* says as much. It is prepared to join with the anti-Labor press in the State of Victoria to subvert the Labor Movement and to destroy my Leadership.

Similarly Mr. Santamaria takes the same line in his reply to Mr. Dougherty. So did Mr. Lovegrove in his public attack on me, where he alleged that my statement was "motivated" by my "difficulties before the Petrov Commission". He actually repeated defamatory insinuations against my staff. His statement also expressed his belief that the Petrov Commission had disclosed a "conspiracy against Australia". In other words, Mr. Lovegrove made the honesty and validity of the Petrovs the feature of his reply. That is, he accepted the Menzies - *"News Weekly"* - Santamaria version of it. Before Mr. Lovegrove's attack on me he consulted both Mr. Keon and Mr. McManus at the Trades Hall. The whole line he took was identical with that taken by *"News Weekly"* which Mr. Santamaria undoubtedly is able to control, and in which Mr. Keon has a very considerable influence. Similarly vicious criticism against me came from Mr. Short, who I am informed, was in close touch with Mr. Santamaria by telephone before he denounced me as a "millstone around the Labor Party's neck". Mr. Short did not regard me in this way when he personally appealed for my help in connection with his successful campaign in the Ironworkers' Union. I gave help in many such cases ungrudgingly. But I discovered that in New South Wales, Mr. Kane had used my name without authority to issue messages in extravagant and absurd language to which I strongly objected. I was, let it be understood, quite willing to give them a general message of support.

It seemed to me that the questions I have raised are of fundamental importance. They clearly affect the Labor Movement of Australia as a whole. They give rise to questions of basic policy, control and organisation. It is obvious that if there is a group or faction of persons organised from without to gain control of the Australian Labor Movement, both politically and in the trade unions industrially, solely on the basis of a policy of extreme anti-Communism, the fabric of the Labor Party will be subverted. If members of this group or faction act unitedly within the Labor Movement, it will be comparatively easy for them to in a short time to seize control of the Party machinery. It was a similar evil which led to the eradication of Communists and Communist influence from the Labor Party such as occurred when the Federal Executive acted against the Hughes-Evans Group in New South Wales in 1940.

In New South Wales the situation may not be so serious as in the State of Victoria. But I entirely agree with the analysis of the position by Mr. Charles Anderson reported as having been made at the NSW Executive on Friday last.

There is no doubt that in those two States the character of Labor Party membership is changing. Those who are concerned about this threatened revolution are not to be dismissed as "old fashioned" or "traditionalist". They are all Labor people determined to maintain the integrity, autonomy and authority of the greatest political movement in the world and the greatest in Australia. But it is a movement which must remain opposed to Governments like the Menzies-Fadden Government which acts in the interest of the Monopoly Capitalism and which works for

the complete eradication of State ownership of utilities as witness their policy in relation to COR and the Commonwealth Shipping Line.

If mere anti-Communism is to be the primary policy of Labor, all the great principles we support will become of minor importance. It will be sufficient to condemn any proposal to show that Communists or Communist papers have supported it. So absurd is that argument that it would follow that if Communists supported additional margins it would be the duty of Labor to oppose additional margins.

This is the extravagant theory behind the activities of the "Movement". The theory has been used against myself in "*News Weekly*" and in the Caucus. "He is critical of the Petrovs. So are the Communists". Therefore he is a Communist supporter.

There is a more serious and intimate aspect of this matter which I must mention. Complete frankness is called for. The matter is too urgent. Time is short. All my life I have been closely associated with hosts of Catholic friends. At the Bar I took part in great cases where the defence of Catholics was concerned. Never in my life have I been condemned for "Sectarian activities" until a week or so ago. The charge is wickedly false.

But it is the Labor Movement's advancement which matters to us at this place. Similarly there is grave danger to the Catholic Church in the activities of the organised faction known as the "Movement" in its attempt to gain a dominating part in Labor Leagues and trade unions, through organised infiltration while remaining a separate group. As I understand it, the "Movement" as such is not at all identical with Catholic Action. It is a minority group and the members of it are bound to secrecy. It is organised on a cell system comparable to the Communist system. It has nothing to do with the Lay Apostolate which all Catholics and Christians honour. Leading Catholic Ecclesiastics have, I understand, attacked the "Movement".

It is believed that many members of this organisation have taken part in Industrial Group and Labor Party activities although they themselves have no sympathy with Labor's objectives and policies but are concerned solely with organising opposition to Communism. The experience of devoted Catholics like Mr. J.P. Ormonde of New South Wales would, I believe, be of value as illustrating the dangers of this present situation. Mr. Anderson's opinion is convincing. So is that of Mr. Dougherty.

In my own electorate in 1951, it was brought to the notice of the then Executive that boys from one of Sydney's Catholic Colleges were armed with buckets and paste brushes to go into my own electorate to destroy Labor's posters by sticking them over with the "hammer and sickle" signs and the like. No doubt the boys enjoyed the fun and really thought they were fighting Communists. But what of the people who organised these lads? They had no respect for the Labor Party or for the boys or for the great Church to which they belonged.

It was difficult for the then Executive to handle such a matter because, I understand, the inner core of what is known as the "Movement" is secretly controlled, is operating in industrial groups

and branches and is especially absorbing into its membership young professional or semi-professional people who have little or no conception of the Labor Party's history, policy or democratic structure.

It is certain that a cell method of organisation will sap confidence and comradeship with the Labor Movement and change it into something comparable to the Conservative Centre Parties of European countries.

Moreover, there is concealment and duplicity involved in the actions of those who combine for the purpose of gaining control of a movement like the Labor Movement in the doctrines of which they do not fully believe. The motives may be honest but the actions are calculated to bring down, subvert and destroy the character of the great Labor Movement for which we are trustees.

The greatness of the Labor Movement is that it continues after our death for the noble purposes of still carrying on and carrying out its great objectives. Any secret organisation, the object of which is to gain control of the Party in order to concentrate of a policy of sheer anti-Communism must in the long run assist Communism just as McCarthyism has done in the USA. "The Movement" and its members have a right to be as anti-Communist as much as they wish. They have no right to subvert the Labor Party in order to dedicate it solely or primarily to anti-Communist activities. They have a complete right to their own opinion. But they have no right to infiltrate into and seize control of the Labor Movement or the trade union movement. Labor can not survive on the basis of a party within the party. Once it was the danger from Communism. Today it is a danger perilously akin to Fascism."

CANBERRA, ACT. 27th October 1954.