

T.M. WIXTED & CO.
(Established 1929)
“In his humiliation justice was denied him”

Pamphlet No. 22,
First Issued:
19/12/1965

Public Forum,
Brisbane, Qld.
Australia.

THE TACTICS OF THE AUSTRALIAN PRESS

Some years ago two British journalists were jailed for refusing to disclose, to a British court, their sources of information. The London **Times**, in an editorial, which was republished in the Brisbane **Courier Mail** of 22nd March, 1963, recorded the reaction of the British people towards the jailing of the two journalists.

The whole of the London **Times** editorial should be read as an introduction to this pamphlet. You may find a copy in your nearest public library. It is sufficient to point out here that the British people accused the press of intrusion, triviality, distortion, muck-raking and inversion of values, while the press in its turn, accused the people of being incredibly naive, ignorant, complacent and apathetic.

Recent events seem to illustrate that the London **Times** editorial was not read, noted and inwardly digested by some sections of the Australian press. This pamphlet therefore provides the means whereby some, at least, of the Australian people, will be able to impress upon this particular section of the press that not all Australians are as naive, ignorant, complacent and apathetic as their British counterparts are alleged to be.

* * * * *

You will see that our investigation of the tactics of the press takes us into strange fields – the nature of Australian politics, the aims of the Roman Church, the Royal Commission into Espionage. For your convenience this pamphlet is divided into the following sections:

- Section 1 – Roll call and key to abbreviations,
- Section 2 – Newspaper tributes to Dr. Evatt,
- Section 3 – The errors of the **Australian**,
- Section 4 – Correction of the errors of the **Australian**,
- Section 5 – What the **Australian** article concealed,
- Section 6 – The Petrov controversy,
- Section 7 – Evatt at the Royal Commission,
- Section 8 – The split in the ALP and the entente between the Liberal Party and the Roman Church,
- Section 9 – Quotations and index of sources.

Section 1: Roll call and key to abbreviations

CM - Courier Mail	Menzies - Mr. R.G. (now Sir Robert) Menzies
BT - Brisbane Telegraph	Fadden - Mr. A. (now Sir Arthur) Fadden
ST - Sunday Truth	Evatt - Dr. H.V. Evatt
Petrov - Vladimir Petrov	Owen - Mr. Justice Owen, Royal Commission Chairman
Mrs. Petrov - His wife	Barwick - Sir Garfield Barwick
ALP - Australian Labour Party	Windeyer - Mr. W.J.V. Windeyer, Q.C. Commonwealth Counsel
Dalziel - Mr. A. Dalziel (Evatt's staff)	Richards - Mr. G.R. Richards, Deputy Director Security Services

Section 2: Newspaper tributes to Dr. Evatt

Dr. H.V. Evatt, leader of the Australian Labour Party throughout most of the decade 1950–1960, passed away on Tuesday 2nd November, 1965. In the following week tributes appeared in a number of newspapers. It is usual for an article of this kind to be carefully 'researched' in advance. We might, with reason, expect them to be factually accurate.

On the front page of the **Australian** – a newspaper with a nation-wide circulation with headquarters in Canberra – there appeared on 3/11/1965 an article, which purported to be a review of Dr. Evatt's life and work. The article contained a number of factual inaccuracies. The same trend was discernible in an article on a later page of the same issue. Were we naive we might consider these errors to be the result of journalistic incompetence. But as we are not naive – and as we noticed similar tendencies in other newspapers – we realised that the falsifications were both significant and deliberate, competently performed in the best traditions of the Australian Press.

Let us discuss the errors. Then let us see what it was that the errors were designed to conceal.

Section 3: The errors of the **Australian**

To appreciate the significance of the episodes with which Dr. Evatt's name was associated in the decade 1950-1960 it is necessary to be aware of the correct sequence in which events occurred. Here, in part is what the **Australian** said in its front-page article. The errors are representative; some were repeated elsewhere.

1. “It was the Petrov affair, following the ALP split, which brought Dr. Evatt's greatest humiliations.
2. After first supporting a proposal for a Royal Commission into the allegations of Vladimir Petrov, Dr. Evatt found the inquiry would reach into his own office, and was vehement in his opposition.
3. He appeared before the Commission in 1955 to defend his personal secretary, Mr. Alan Dalziel and his assistant personal secretary, Mr. Albert Grundeman.
4. Dr. Evatt claimed the Petrov documents were forgeries, and was so emotional in his defence of his staff that he was ordered to leave the inquiry.
5. In the 1955 Federal election which followed, the voters judged him harshly, and many intimates believe he never recovered from this...”
6. “In 1960 the Heffron Government appointed Dr. Evatt Chief Justice of NSW. The appointment was highly unpopular.”
7. “That he should apply these abilities to the defence of Communists when he believed their civil liberties were endangered....”

Section 4: Corrections of the errors of the **Australian**

The article was an obvious attempt to vindicate those who had opposed Evatt. And to do this it was necessary to falsify history. Herein we find a testimony to the real stature of Evatt.

The correct sequence of events is as follows. (Details are given in later sections).

The items below are numbered in the same order as in section 3.

1. The Petrov affair did **not** follow the ALP split.
The Petrov Royal Commission was announced on 13th April, 1954.
The split in the ALP began in October 1954. The split arose as a natural **consequence** of the Petrov affair.
2. Menzies announced the Royal Commission on 13th April, 1954, in the same statement that he announced the defection of Petrov. Here is Evatt's comment as recorded in the **Courier Mail** of 14th April, 1954:

“Dr. Evatt said that the Labour Party would **support** the fullest **inquiry** into all the circumstances connected with the **statement** made by Mr. **Menzies** and the matters contained in, or relevant to, the **statement.**”

Evatt never at any time deviated from this position. But a full inquiry into Menzies' statement was apparently what Evatt's opponents did **not** want. They opposed, reviled and defamed Evatt at every turn. And their lies pursued Evatt even to the grave.

In July, 1954 the Royal Commission, in an atmosphere of odium, named two of Evatt's staff. Evatt protested at the methods of the Commission and requested that his protest be recorded in its proceedings.

If you read the conflicting statements made by Menzies and the Commissioners concerning this naming of Evatt's staff (see section 9) you will realise not only that Evatt was right in his protest, but also why it was necessary for Evatt's opponents to falsify history.

3. Dr. Evatt appeared before the Royal Commission in **1954**, between 16th August and 7th September.
4. The statement that Evatt was forced to leave the enquiry because he was emotional in defence of his staff – a statement which also appeared in another newspaper – is in particularly poor taste. Evatt was debarred from the enquiry because he protested publicly, in his role as Leader of the Opposition, at the action of the French Ambassador in causing Madame Ollier to be removed from Australia before she could answer the defamation of her by the Petrovs. The Commissioners accused Evatt of mingling legal and personal interests and debarred him. But the Ollier incident was infamous and Evatt's protest remains valid in every respect.
5. The Petrov Royal Commission was announced on the eve of the 1954 election. This election held on 29th May, 1954, returned Menzies-Fadden with a small majority. It could not possibly be confused with the 1955 election which took place on 10th December, 1955. At this latter election a group of former ALP members, now calling themselves Anti-Communist, fought the election against the ALP. Their party, forerunner of the DLP, was almost entirely obliterated.
6. When Evatt was appointed Chief Justice the press remained true to its best traditions. We were treated to yet another stunt. The **Australian** could have included a few words –
“The appointment was highly unpopular in certain quarters” This would be the truth.
7. The writer of the obituary in the London **Times** did not see Evatt as a defender of Communists. He saw him this way:

“... for to Evatt all that he fought for was serious and the forces against him very personal, especially when he felt justice or freedom or constitutional liberty, **as John Stuart Mill understood them**, to be at stake ...”

If Evatt’s concepts on Liberty were in agreement with those of J.S. Mill, it would appear that those of the **Australian** are not. The **Australian** might, with profit, acquire a copy of the work by J.S. Mill. Might we further suggest that it be shelved in a place not too far removed from a copy of the London **Times** editorial we referred to in the beginning?

Section 5: What the **Australian** article concealed

The construction of the article – and the repetition of similar errors elsewhere – shows that the errors were not slips of the pen or misprints. Nor were they innocuous. They were designed to conceal what the history of the period reveals.

In 1954 the working propositions of Evatt were these:

- a. There was a white-ant group in the ALP.
- b. Menzies and the newspapers utilised the services of this group to foment intestine divisions within the ALP.
- c. It was of advantage to this group that Evatt, the great defender of civil liberties, should be discredited, and it was their intention to take control of the ALP once this had been achieved.
- d. The Petrov affair was a stunt. It was not bona-fide at all but designed only to isolate Evatt and to assist Evatt’s opponents.
- e. At the 1954 elections the white-ant group did assist Menzies.
- f. Newspapers frequently printed items of an anti-Evatt nature, which could only have been obtained from the white-ant group.
- g. The references to Evatt and his staff in the Petrov documents was part of this general conspiracy.
- h. Evatt regarded one part of one document (Document J), as having been specifically “commissioned” to further the conspiracy.

The subversion of organizations by well-organised minorities working within them is not altogether unknown in history. The Barry Goldwater fiasco in the recent Presidential elections in the United States is a case in point. But in 1954 if you were to believe the Australian newspapers, Evatt was the disturber of the peace. Until the very day that Evatt forced his white-ant opposition into the open, the Australian newspapers were like the three wise monkeys. They heard nothing of a white-ant group, they saw nothing of a white-ant group, and they certainly printed nothing of a white-ant group.

Events since 1954 have confirmed all but the final point of Evatt’s propositions and even on this final point there are a number of interesting facts never satisfactorily explained away by his opponents.

The pattern of events is, however, clear. Evatt was involved in much controversy connected with civil liberties prior to 1954, but we shall commence our examination of the pattern at the point where events were leading up to the Petrov Royal Commission. We can then trace it through Evatt’s exposure of the industrial groups, the 1955 pastoral letter of the 33 Roman Catholic bishops supporting the industrial groups, the activities of certain of these bishops at subsequent Federal elections, the acknowledgement by the Melbourne Archbishop of his early connection with the movement led by Mr. Santamaria, the grants to

church schools for science blocks by Menzies, the entente cordiale between the Liberal Party and the Roman Catholic Church made evident at the Cardinal's dinner in 1964, and Menzies' recent announcement that church school buildings will be provided at government expense.

The pattern reveals something of the nature of politics in Australia in the latter half of the 20th century. It demonstrates that the practical result of all the professional 'anti-communism' of the last decade or so is simply that Menzies is now paying, with government money, for schools, which become the property of the churches.

But more than anything else, the pattern reveals the tactics of the Australian Press.

Section 6: The Petrov controversy

Newspaper files for the year 1954 reveal the sequence of events.

The lull before the storm:

The Royal Visit to Australia lasted throughout February and March, 1954. On 1st April, Queen Elizabeth departed from Australia. During her 58-day visit there had been a lull of in political activity on the Federal level. The election was set for 29th May. According to Evatt this was the last date permissible under the constitution. A close election was in prospect with a good chance of the ALP being returned as the government. Parliament was due to terminate its sittings on 14th April, 1954.

But on 2nd April, 1954 – 35 days after he had discussed his impending defection with a high officer of the Security Service – Vladimir Petrov, a member of the staff of the Russian Embassy, signed a statement seeking political asylum in Australia. The following day, 3rd April, he was paid the sum of £5,000. By 10th April, 1954, Menzies was aware of the names of all Australians referred to in documents, which Petrov handed Australian Security Police. Much, much later, Menzies was to label the significant references as "completely innocent" and "a bit of petty political gossip". But that was not how he described them on the evening of 13th April, 1954.

Signed, sealed, and . . .

The 13th April, 1954, was the second last day of the sittings of the 20th parliament. Evatt went to Sydney after being present in Canberra until about 5.00pm. Calwell was notified at 7.45pm that a "**statement of importance**" would be made at 8.00pm. Menzies' later actions are better measured by these simple facts than by any of his own protestations.

The statement of which Calwell had been notified at 7.45pm proved to be the announcement by Menzies that Petrov had renounced Communism and was seeking asylum in Australia. Menzies stated that he had ordered a Royal Commission. He quoted Petrov as having declared:

"I no longer believe in the Communism of the Soviet leadership – I no longer believe in Communism, since I have seen the Australian way of living."

The more unkind amongst us might reach the conclusion from subsequent events that Petrov was more familiar with Harpo Marx than with Karl Marx. Certainly, he had more cogent reasons for leaving Soviet employ than the youthful idealism voiced in his statement. But at the time this statement appeared in print in the morning newspapers of 14th April, 1954, the sentiments expressed in it bore Security's stamp of authenticity and the imprimatur of the Australian Prime Minister.

The 20th Parliament terminated the day following Menzies' shock announcement. After approving – almost without discussion; there was nothing to discuss – an amendment to the Royal Commission Act requested by Menzies, Parliament rose on the Wednesday of Easter week.

And so the week of the Petrov announcement drew to its close. Parliamentarians scattered throughout Australia to seek for votes and the world remembered how Truth was crucified.

... Delivered into the hands of the newspapers :

It is not known why Menzies refrained from notifying Parliament until the last moment. It is not known why the Leader of the Opposition was not informed. We may conjecture that it was because of Menzies' embarrassment. (See section 9). Whatever the reason, the practical effect of the late notification was to deliver Australia into the hands of the newspapers.

On the 13th and 14th April, 1954, Parliament had been dependent on the integrity of Menzies. For the next 6 weeks Australia was dependent on the integrity of the press.

The tactics and techniques of Australian newspapers throughout the crucial period following the rising of Parliament would well repay a detailed study. Assertions, imputations, innuendos, anonymous sources, pseudo-authoritative sources, irrelevancies, over-emphasis, the conveying of judgements instead of facts by means of careful choice of language, selective reporting . . . the list goes on and on. Periods of crisis demand detached and objective reporting. In the artificially created crisis of the Petrov era this is exactly what Australia did not receive.

Let us remember one or two instances which demonstrate the tactics of the newspapers. There was the time we were told that Mrs. Petrov had called out in Russian, when boarding the aircraft for Russia at Sydney airport – "I don't want to go back." (CM 20/4/1954). The authority for this headline was given as 'many New Australians in the crowd'. On the following day (CM 21/4/1954) we learned, on the authority of unnamed cabinet ministers, that Mrs. Petrov was a terrified woman when she sought asylum in Darwin.

A large photograph showed a distressed Mrs. Petrov escorted by two Russian couriers. The caption read:

"Mrs. Petrov broke from this."

Evatt made short work of this kind of nonsense when he cross-examined Mrs. Petrov at a sitting of the Royal Commission later in the year. But at the time these statements appeared, the newspapers knew no judgement to come.

We conclude our brief examination with one sentence taken from the **Courier Mail** of 14th April, 1954:

"But **Cabinet** yesterday morning was **alarmed** at the prima facie evidence of a **spy ring** centred in the national capital, operated by a **foreign power**, and allegedly using Australians as **agents**."

The statement is sufficient comment upon itself.

We may reach the conclusion that Australian newspaper editors know no history, know no philosophy, know nothing of public administration, know no ethics and know no bounds.

Election by hysteria:

The press established the intellectual climate in which the election of 1954 was fought. The central theme of the newspapers was the Petrov defection. Here was a “communist” who had chosen “freedom”. It was unthinkable that “free” Australians would elect “communists” or those who sympathised with “communists” An election in the Australian pattern ensued:

- Fadden linked Evatt with Communism in a specially prepared 13 point formula,
 - Liberal Party advertisements linked Evatt with Communism,
 - Menzies accused his opposition of protecting and defending Communism,
 - Ministers hinted that startling revelations would emerge from the Petrov Royal Commission,
 - Ministers revealed that Mrs. Petrov, who sought asylum in Darwin on 20th April, 1954, had been terrified,
- and
- Windeyer announced, at the first day’s sittings of the Royal Commission, that the Russian Secret Service had 5 aims in Australia.

Despite this favourable intellectual climate, Menzies’ party stated that it refused to capitalise on the Petrov defection by making it a party-political issue in the election. (The tactics referred to above were normal. Believe it or not they were not related to the Petrov defection).

Moreover, as far as the methods to be followed by the Royal Commission were concerned:

“The government had made it clear that it does not intend to indulge in ‘McCarthy tactics’. It believes that no Australians named should be linked with allegations until the persons concerned have the opportunity to give an immediate answer to the commission.” (CM 14/4/1954).

With these and similar assurances of the dignity of the Liberal Party appearing in the press, the country went to the polls on 29th May 1954.

When the numbers went up, Menzies found himself returned with a small majority. He had delivered Australia into the hands of the newspapers and the newspapers had delivered the votes.

Section 7: Evatt at the Royal Commission

A Confrontation:

With the election over, attention focussed on the proceedings of the Royal Commission. It had failed miserably to live up to the startling revelations hinted at by cabinet ministers on 14/4/1954. It had failed signally to uncover the spy ring operated by a foreign power, which had alarmed the same cabinet ministers on 13/4/1954.

Then came the 15th July, 1954. On that day, at the commission, in an atmosphere of odium and without warning, two members of Dr. Evatt’s staff were named in connection with Document J.

Evatt moved with alacrity. His telegram of protest was received by the commission on 16/7/1954.

On 16/8/1954 Evatt appeared at the Royal Commission in person to defend his staff.

Gulliver among the Lilliputians:

While the confrontation of the Royal Commission by Evatt lasted from 16th August 1954, to 7th September 1954, his intervention may more properly be dated from 16th July, 1954, the day his telegram of protest was recorded in the proceedings of the Commission.

The period of Evatt's direct involvement neatly divides the history of the Petrov affair into two parts. All matters or statements connected with the Commission may be evaluated according to whether they were made before or after the period of Evatt's intervention. Several instances are quoted in section 9. Note the somersaults by Menzies and Owen.

As the nature of the evidence became more generally understood, the status of the Royal Commission declined.

A truer perspective began to emerge.

Mrs. Petrov, under Evatt's cross-examination, provided sudden illumination as to the mental state of her husband for a period of 18 months prior to his defection. Gone was the precision and assurance, which characterised her evidence at her previous appearance before the Commission early in July in Melbourne.

Document J, too, underwent much closer scrutiny. The order of this document was different from what it had been when Petrov delivered it to security. A significant page, placed where it was because of its meaning, had been typed by a different machine from that used for the rest of the document.

On 1st September, Evatt was subjected to an intense cross-examination by the Commissioners concerning allegations of a conspiracy. Despite this examination the initiative remained with Evatt.

Prestige restored:

On 3rd September, 1954, the secretary of the Royal Commission announced "from a guarded house at Rose Bay" that Madame Ollier, former second secretary at the French Embassy in Canberra, had been arrested. A statement by the French Ambassador concerning the arrest was also released at the same time. The effect of this announcement was twofold:

- a. The Royal Commission had uncovered its first "spy".
- b. The prestige of the French Government had been used to bolster the status of the Commission. (For not only had the French Ambassador acted on advice from the Commission, he had also acted through it).

The Ollier episode:

We need not detain ourselves here with the facts of the Ollier arrest. The relevant dates are recorded in section 9. Suffice it to say that Madame Ollier was acquitted when eventually brought to trial in France on a charge of "indiscretion". At the conclusion of her trial she expressed no desire to return to Australia, which is – all things considered – rather a pity.

Evatt debarred from the Royal Commission:

Evatt protested, in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, at the action of the French Ambassador and the action of the Royal Commission.

Here is portion of the statement Evatt made inside the Commission on the day he was debarred:

“Why should the commission make a statement in relation to any public statement I make in carrying out my public duty? It has nothing to do with my appearance before the Commission. . .

What is it I have done which is in any way an interference with the commission? I have protested publicly against the conduct of the French Ambassador in Australia, and I have done it in the performance of my public duty.

I do not retract from it in any way. It is a public statement not made under the cloak of privilege, and it was a statement to protest against the circumstances by which Madame Ollier was, in effect, deprived of putting her case in Australia in answer to those making foul accusations against her.

The substance of the protest is that she was spirited out of the country for three months. She could have been sent to France in two days.

The result was a defamation of her on a worldwide scale without the opportunity of answering it. I protested publicly against the conduct of the French Ambassador in Australia.

The French Ambassador actually issued his statement through this commission.

It is an unheard of thing. Is this commission an agency of the French government? . . .”

On being told he was debarred, Evatt said: “I protest the judgement . . .”

Mr. Justice Owen replied: “Will you please resume your seat? We have withdrawn permission for you to appear.”

Outside the court, Dr. Evatt said: “I protested inside the court against the commission’s decision. I protest publicly outside the commission.”

The scene shifts:

On the 43rd day of the Royal Commission, 16th September, 1954, Evatt applied for readmission. He made the following statement:

“My exclusion from the Commission was directed on September 7th the very day appointed for the cross-examination of Mr. G.H. Richards (Deputy Director of Security). It was also the day that Sir Garfield Barwick, QC, (council for Mr. Richards and the Security Service) came into the case. In the absence of counsel an attempt was made to secure from my clients a withdrawal of charges that had been made.” (CM 17/9/1954).

Evatt was not readmitted to the Commission.

His application, as he probably knew very well himself, was doomed to failure. But he had written his protest into the history books, together with the reasons for it, and at that stage could do no more than await the judgement of history.

If the reader would care for some light entertainment at this stage, he could do no better than turn back to the statement of the Australian (3/11/1965) – reproduced in Section 3 – concerning the reasons for Evatt’s being debarred from the Commission. There you will discover that Evatt was debarred because he became too emotional.

**Section 8: The split in the ALP and the entente between
The Liberal Party and the Roman Church**

Throughout the period we have just discussed, the Australian newspapers professed no knowledge of any white-ant group working within the ALP for the destruction of Evatt. But Evatt had had enough of this hypocrisy. The London Times summarised his next move this way:

“In October, 1954, with his eyes wide open to the long-term consequences, he deliberately precipitated the great sectarian split in the Labour Party when he declared that the political wing of Catholic Action was plotting to capture control of the party through the industrial groups. Evatt was not a Roman Catholic, but even Chifley who was a Roman Catholic, had foreseen that the split must come if Labour was to remain true to its principles” (Times 3/11/1965).

The story is most conveniently told in a succession of newspaper headlines and statements:

CM 6th October, 1954: Labour men accused. EVATT CALL: PURGE PARTY. “undermined at election by disloyal group.” . . . Dr. Evatt’s statement is a final warning to a group of members sometimes described as a Catholic Action group.

CM 7th October, 1954: WIDE-OPEN SPLIT IN LABOUR THREATENS. Evatt’s demand creates crisis . . . This follows the demand by the Opposition Leader (Dr. Evatt) that the Labour Party Federal Executive stamp out a ‘disloyal and subversive group’ within the party. Dr. Evatt claimed that the minority group was located particularly in Victoria.

BT 19th April, 1955: The Victorians who have formed themselves into a new Anti-Communist Labour Party are Messrs R. Joshua (leader), S. Keon (deputy leader), J. Mullins, W. Bourke, J. Cremean, T. Andrews, and W. Bryson

When Mr. Joshua resumed his seat, the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) caused a laugh when he said to Mr. Joshua:

“I congratulate you and the Deputy Leader.”

Dr. Evatt then rose and said: “I note the congratulations of the Prime Minister and I see a secret alliance now transformed into fact.”

ST 1st May, 1955: CHURCH STAND ON GROUPS. Bishops rebuke and warning. (This headline referred to a pastoral letter issued by 33 Roman Catholic bishops which had stated: “It is most deplorable that the

only effective way yet found of defeating Communism in industrial life has been destroyed for the moment by political intrigue.”

Evatt replied, and the sequence of events shows him to have been correct:

“The object of this outside organisation, controlled by Mr. Santamaria, was not merely to capture control of the ALP. It was to carry out Santamaria policy, which is quite opposed to the letter and spirit of the Labour platform.”)

CM 6th December, 1955: A Federal election was due on 10th December. Archbishop Mannix (Melbourne) was quoted as having said: “No matter what the result of the election, I think the history of Australia will vindicate the stand taken by Mr. P.L. Coleman and others for God, country and Christianity.” (Mr. Coleman, a former Victorian Labour Transport Minister, was one of the leaders of the breakaway group.)

CM 21st November, 1958: RC ARCHBISHOPS ISSUE ADVICE ON ELECTION. Two Roman Catholic archbishops yesterday made statements on tomorrow’s Federal election. The Archbishop of Melbourne (Dr. Mannix) said: “Every Communist sympathiser wants a victory for the Evatt (ALP) party. This is alarming. . . .”

CM 25th November, 1958: 10 CATHOLIC PRELATES UPBRAID EVATT ON MANNIX. “Impertinence” alleged. Ten leading members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Australia yesterday attacked the Federal Opposition Leader (Dr. Evatt) for his criticisms of Dr. Mannix’s pre-election praise of the DLP’s stand against Communism.

SUN 22nd November, 1958: DR. MANNIX VIEWS ON ELECTION PERSONAL: Catholic spokesman. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. Mannix, could not impose on Roman Catholics his personal views about the election, said Dr. L. Rumble, spokesman for the Roman Catholic Church in Sydney.

(Note: At this stage the statement by Archbishop Mannix betrayed an involvement with those ALP members who had previously constituted the white-ant group. The Pastoral letter of the 33 bishops demonstrated the connection of the church with the industrial groups. Ten Catholic prelates had upbraided Evatt over Mannix. The question of whether Mannix was giving advice as a churchman or as a person was hardly relevant to the main issue, ie. acknowledged church support for the former opponents of Evatt).

Australian Broadcasting Commission interview with Dr. Mannix, January, 1962:

Interviewer: “Now there’s a Catholic organisation which was set up, in 1941 I understand, to fight Communism in the Australian Labour Party, in the trade unions, which I’ll call the Movement. Now was the idea of the Movement originally yours?”

Dr. Mannix: “I don’t claim that it was originally mine, but however it originated I was in favour of it anyway.”

Interviewer (later): “Would you like to say, Archbishop, whose idea it was to form this organization we call the Movement, originally . . . ?”

Dr. Mannix: “My own idea is that the conception really came first of all from Mr. Santamaria and those who are associated with him.”

Interviewer: “And you supported this?”

Dr. Mannix: “And I supported it, yes, with all the help that I could give.”

May, 1964: House of Representatives passed the State Grants Bill.

Amongst other things this bill provided Federal grants for science blocks at church schools.

ABC News Bulletin 29th July, 1964: “...Sir Robert was speaking to more than 500 Roman Catholic laymen and women at the annual Cardinal’s Dinner in honour of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, Cardinal Gilroy ... Sir Robert said he personally favoured church schools because without them Australia might become highly intellectual but also highly pagan ...”

ST 2nd August, 1964: “Menzie’s signs up. LIBERAL BOND WITH CATHOLIC CHURCH. The entente cordiale between the Federal Liberal Party and the Roman Catholic Church in NSW, signed in the Federal election last November, was sealed and delivered in Sydney this week ... the Prime Minister’s reception, apart from his address at the annual Cardinal’s dinner, was one of the most significant milestones in the political history of NSW.”

Australian 11th November, 1965: “New state aid to repay full cost of buildings. The Government would in future repay the capital borrowed by the schools .. as well as continue to meet interest charges on approved capital borrowings.”

Observations derived from the above:

Evatt’s working propositions of 1954 were confirmed by later developments.

The press of Australia enjoyed the rights of a free society but declined to accept its obligations. The immediate interests of the press – destruction of the ALP as a political force and removal from politics of Evatt – overrode other considerations. Evatt’s altruism was misrepresented as egotism, his fight to preserve a free society as a fight to preserve himself politically. The press professed itself unaware of any threat to the free society – except from communism – and ostensibly knew nothing of the political aims of the Roman Church.

Yet the one constant factor emerging from the history of Australia for the period we have reviewed, is the quest for power by the Roman Church. Methods varied but the end remained the same. Aid by the government for church schools is part of the struggle for power: it enables the hierarchy to impose obligatory intellectual segregation upon its membership. And in the struggle Roman Catholics have been used as pawns – as pressure points – in the hands of the Roman hierarchy.

The nature of the Australian press remains as it was during the period of the Petrov controversy. Today it professes ignorance of any long-range aims of the Roman Church in Australia, just as it once professed itself ignorant in 1954 of the operations of Catholic Action inside the ALP. The legitimate opposition demanded by the situation is not being voiced.

One last observation would seem to be demanded. Mr. Menzie’s has been very generous to the hierarchy of the Roman Church, and the hierarchy of the Roman Church, in its turn has been very generous to Mr. Menzie’s. It has allowed him to think that he is really Prime Minister of Australia.

Section 9: Quotations and Index to Sources

In the following quotations the sign // Evatt // indicates commencement of Evatt’s intervention in the affairs of the Royal Commission.

For elucidation of its significance see section 7. Note the change in the nature of the evidence before and after the sign.

Assassination by lapsus calami: See front page of Australian 3rd November, 1965.

Assassination by lapsus linguae:

Windeyer stated that there were “grave matters” in the Petrov documents (CM 18th May, 1954). This general statement set the tone for the commission. Mr. Justice Owen said: “It is very disturbing to me that the writer claims to have got the information from persons who are in the secretariat of a man (Evatt) who holds a position in political life ...”

(CM 16th July, 1954).

Menzies said: “From 3 days before I made the statement to this House (on 13th April, 1954) I knew all the names of the people who had been or were associated with the Right honourable gentleman (Evatt) and whose names were mentioned in the Petrov papers and I remained silent.” (Cheers from Government benches).

“I remained silent from beginning to end of the election campaign. I thought that was playing the game fairly.”

The honourable gentleman does not ask me why I did not in this House on April 13th tell the people the contents of the Petrov papers, because if I did he would not be here tonight.” (CM 13th Aug. 1954).

// Evatt //

Dalziel to Menzies (by telegram): “You are reported as mentioning my name under cover of Parliamentary privilege.

This would seem to conform to the pattern followed by your duly appointed instrument, which publicly named me without warning, on the basis of the infamous Document J. It would now seem you are following the same methods which allow some persons mentioned in J to be cited while other names, which are said to include your own and other anti-Labour politicians, are suppressed.” (CM 14th August, 1954).

Owen to Dalziel: “Don’t you think it reasonable to say publicly that the gossip to which you referred in your telegram to the Prime Minister has turned out to be mere gossip?”

To which Dalziel replied: “I don’t suppose you could make a similar request to the Prime Minister, could you?” (BT 13th September, 1954).

Barwick: “Page 35 was published, and what is in it that is worth a farthing of hurt or harm to Dr. Evatt? ...How this material could harm the Australian Labour Party is beyond all comprehension.” (CM 7th October, 1954).

Menzies, speaking about Evatt in the House of Representatives: “He had come into the Commission at a time when the reference to Alan Dalziel was completely innocent, merely that somebody had told Dalziel something. The reference to Grundeman related to a bit of petty political gossip not associated with Dr. Evatt.” (CM 29th October, 1954)

Menzies did not explain how a “Completely innocent” reference, or a “bit of petty political gossip” (CM 28th October, 1954) could have the effect of removing Evatt from parliament (CM 13th August, 1954).

Owen did not explain why a piece of “gossip” (CM 13th September, 1954) had caused him to be very disturbed. (CM 16th July, 1954).

The answer may lie in the sign // Evatt //.

See also ‘McCarthy tactics’.

Bialoguski:

We are told how he obtained certain information: “He had looked through his (Petrov’s) wallet when Petrov was asleep in his flat.” (CM 11th September, 1954)

Courage rewarded: £5,000.

This amount was paid on 3rd April, 1954, to Petrov. (CM 7th July, 1954).
Menzies stated that he first knew about the payment on 9th May, 1954.

The following statement appeared in the Courier Mail of 14th April, 1954:

“Cabinet Ministers last night declared that Petrov was a man of undoubtedly great courage.
They are determined to see that his courage is rewarded”

This prognostication was the only one by the said Cabinet Ministers which proved correct. Unfortunately it was made 10 days after Petrov’s courage had already been rewarded.

Document J :

// Evatt //

The order of Document J was not the same as when handed by Petrov to the Security Service. (Windeyer – CM 20th August 1954).

Inspector Rogers, a handwriting expert, agreed with Evatt that one page of Document J had been typed on a different typewriter from that used for the other parts.

This page had been placed where it was “because of its meaning”. (CM 28th August, 1954).

There were about 60 to 70 names in Document J. (CM 8th September, 1954).

Few of these were mentioned except these connected with Evatt.

The Commission refused to allow Dr. Monteconi, a handwriting expert nominated by Dr. Evatt, to inspect the documents. Mr. Justice Ligertwood said the Commission could make up its mind on Rogers’ evidence without the assistance of some other expert. Evatt, after commenting that the commission was failing to enquire into the genuineness of the documents, stated:

“Judicial processes are not being observed.” (CM 3rd Sept. 1954). And that, as far as Evatt was concerned, remained the position with regard to Document J.

Embarrassment (Menzies)

Menzies made the following comment in reply to Evatt on 14th April, 1954, concerning his announcement of Petrov's defection:

“The whole thing is an embarrassment to the Government, happening as it does through circumstances beyond our control, because this man – Petrov – finished his term of duty recently. Some people would always be disposed to think of it as having some election significance, happening as it has not long before the election.” (CM 15th April, 1954).

It is hard to imagine any naive, ignorant, complacent and apathetic Australian being disposed to think of it that way. (Refer London Times editorial).

Evatt debarred: See Section 7.

Idealism rewarded: See Courage rewarded.

Liberal Party: High Principles:

Menzies instructed every candidate at the 1954 election “There is to be no reference to the Petrov case.” (CM 13th Aug. 1954).

This confirmed statements made by Liberal Party officials during the election. (See CM 15th May, 1954).

Vote catching:

Here is the wording in full of a 1954 Liberal Party election advertisement measuring 8” x 22”.

“During eight years of Labour Government in Canberra – the Communist Conspiracy was the greatest threat to Progress and Security.

DON'T GIVE THE REDS A SECOND CHANCE. Remember that Labour's history of appeasement of the Reds fermented class warfare, promoted strikes, arrested Australia's development. The Menzies Government defeated the Communist Conspiracy. WHAT HAPPENED IN 1949 COULD HAPPEN

AGAIN IF DR. EVATT WERE PRIME MINISTER. Dr. Evatt was the Red's advocate in the Arbitration Court. Dr. Evatt was a bitter opponent of the Secret Ballot Legislation that has destroyed Red Power in the unions. Dr. Evatt was Attorney General when Red sabotage was undermining the Australian economy.

COMMUNISM IS A WORLD MENACE. IT COULD BECOME A MENACE IN AUSTRALIA AGAIN IF DR. EVATT RUNS TRUE TO FORM! RETURN THE MENZIES GOVERNMENT IN MAY 29th.”

A photograph of Mr. Menzies and a hammer and sickle completed the advertisement. (CM 25th May, 1954).

See also: Embarrassment (Menzies); McCarthy Tactics; Courage rewarded.

‘McCarthy Tactics’:

“The government had made it clear that it does not intend to indulge in ‘McCarthy Tactics’. It believes that no Australians named should be linked with allegations until the persons concerned have the opportunity to give an immediate answer to the commission.” (CM 14th April, 1954).

“The document quotes as sources for various matters, some of which are very confidential, three members of the secretariat of the Leader of the Opposition.” (Owen, CM 16th July, 1954).

Evatt telegraphed the commission, and stated: “ ... The course taken in naming persons ... is quite opposed to the basic procedures of justice which were outlined at certain stages of the Commission.

No notice having been given, injury to individuals is immediate and may be irreparable ...” (CM 17th July, 1954).

To which Mr. Justice Owen replied:

“As we have already pointed out, this inquiry can not be conducted efficiently without the names of persons being mentioned. The persons to whom the telegram refers will be given an opportunity of refuting the allegations.” Elsewhere he was reported as saying: “This inquiry cannot be conducted effectively without the mention from time to time of the names of persons who will have no warning. The persons mentioned in this telegram will be given an opportunity ...”_(CM 17th July, 1954).

// Evatt //

For comments subsequent to above see: Assassination by lapsus linguae.

The virtue of the government in declining to adopt ‘McCarthy Tactics’ had been rewarded at the election on 29th May 1954. By its own definition, ‘McCarthy Tactics’ were indulged in by the Commission subsequent to the election in this naming of Evatt’s staff.

Menzies:

For Embarrassment, see under Embarrassment.

For Fair Play, see under Seats in Parliament.

Ministers (Cabinet):

For alarm at Petrov disclosures, see section 6.

For hints of sensational developments, see section 6.

For revelations of Mrs. Petrov’s terror, see section 6.

Ollier (Madame Rose Marie):

Madame Ollier had been told to leave Australia on 19th May, 1954.

She left for Noumea on 21st May, 1954.

Evatt intervened by telegram in the affairs of the Commission on 16th July, 1954.

Madame Ollier’s arrest followed evidence at a secret sittings of the Espionage Royal Commission held in Melbourne on 19th July, 1954.

Evatt appeared in person at the Royal Commission on 16th August, 1954.

Madame Ollier was notified of the charges against her on 22nd August, 1954. (CM 4th Sept. & 6th Sept. 1954).

“Former second secretary at the French Embassy in Canberra, Madame R.M. Ollier, has been arrested and will be tried in France for an alleged breach of security ... The Royal Commission secretary (Mr. K. Herde) released this information last night in a guarded house at Rose Bay. He said Petrov had said Madame Ollier had given him secret information about loading of arms in Australia and New Zealand for French forces in the Indo-China war ... Mr. Herde released full details of the evidence and a statement by the French Ambassador in Australia (Mr. Roche).” (CM 4th September, 1954).

Some months before, the Courier Mail had carried this information”

“The Radnor is the second ship to load equipment under an agreement reached last year by which Australia gave surplus obsolete equipment to the French for use in Indo-China.” (CM 9th April, 1954).

Madame Ollier was acquitted of the charge of “Indiscretion” in France.

Petrov (Vladimir):

- Idealism – As announced by Menzies on 13th April, 1954 (CM 14th April, 1954):
“I no longer believe in the Communism of the Soviet leadership – I no longer believe in Communism since I have seen the Australian way of living.”
- Indecision – As it emerged from evidence at the Royal Commission:
Prior to his defection Petrov had met a Security agent 200 times.
He had received immigration forms in 1953. He met Richards (DDSS) on 27th February, 1954, and defected 3rd April, 1954. (CM 8th September, 1954 & 10th September, 1954).
- Instability – As attested by Mrs. Petrov under Evatt’s cross examination:
Evatt: - “What signs did he show of madness?”
Mrs. Petrov: - “He could not speak without crying, his hands were all shaking and trembling, he was very nervous and very often without reason. He would raise his voice against me. Evidently all the circumstances had put him into that state.”

Mrs. Petrov later modified the term ‘madness’. The condition had been in evidence for 12-18 months prior to Petrov’s defection.

- Integrity – As attested by Bialoguski, Mrs. Petrov and Barwick:

Bialoguski: - “He was frightened to go because he knew what was in store for him in Russia. He said he would get 10 years or more in Russia, but he said he did not know what was in store for him here in Australia.” (CM 11th September, 1954).

Mrs. Petrov: - “My husband was very upset, and very frightened of meeting”

Evatt: - “With some disaster?”

Mrs. Petrov: - “Yes.” (CM 1st September, 1954).

---- **Evatt debarred from Commission 7th September, 1954** ----

Barwick: - “Any idea of conspiracy or of dereliction of duty must involve a negation of all the basic facts of Petrov’s defection. Petrov was deciding to forswear his country from now to the day he dies,” Sir Garfield said. “Petrov will never feel secure. Neither he nor his wife will be able to lead a normal carefree life. That Petrov was willing to do all this against a pittance of £5,000 is remarkable and bears greatly in whether your Honours can place reliance on his word.”

(CM 7th October, 1954).

Reliability - See Idealism, Indecision, Instability, Integrity.

Petrov (Mrs. Evdokia):

Concerning Darwin: Mrs. Petrov – “I felt at the time I was leaving my husband, and that I was going to the USSR as a victim ... it was difficult for me to stay here ... but fear, the fear that I might be shot – a perfectly honest person – took the upper hand and I decided to stay.” (CM 9th July, 1954).

// Evatt //

Evatt: “Will you try to be serious about it. You received a letter from your husband and you believed he was alive but might have been kidnapped?”

Mrs. Petrov: “On the day I received his letter I thought he was alive, but I was not sure, and my chief objective was not to remain at Mascot.”

Evatt: “What has that got to do with your husband being alive or not?”

Mrs. Petrov: “If I had known that he was dead I would not have remained.”

Evatt: “If you had known that he was dead, you would not have remained in Australia?”

Mrs. Petrov. “That is so.” (CM 1st September, 1954).

Other slight, but significant changes in evidence could be given.

// Evatt //

Petrov Commission: See Courage Rewarded.

Petrov Royal Commission: Royal Commission into Espionage in Australia.

Prestige: For effect of Ollier arrest see Section 7.
For details of Ollier arrest see: Ollier (Madame Rose Marie).

Radnor: For connection with Ollier arrest see: Ollier (Madame Rose Marie).

Seats in Parliament: See Assassination by lapsus linguae.

Smear technique: See: 'McCarthy Tactics'
See also Section 6.

----ooooo0ooooo----

AUTHORISATION:- This pamphlet has been compiled by:
E.P. Wixted,