

Santamaria's Hidden Agenda and Other Neglected Aspects of the Labor Split

Robert Corcoran

Introduction and Personal Involvement

The aim of my presentation is to show that B.A. Santamaria planned to change Australia's political landscape to match his own idealistic dreams. This was Santamaria's hidden agenda – and it was the most important factor in the Labor Split. I will also contend that a distorted account of this important phase of Australian political history has been widely accepted and badly needs correction.

In the 1950s you had to be Labor and Catholic to understand the Movement and the Split. I was both. Since then much information has gradually been revealed. But it is still useful to have lived through and participated in the events of the Split to assess the reliability and value of published accounts and opinions.¹

My own insights into these matters began in the 1940s. In the years leading to the Split I was active in the Labor Party and in Catholic Church affairs. I was aware of the activities of the Movement from its earliest years and was invited to join but refused. I disliked its autocratic methods and its secrecy and I believed it was adversely affecting the Labor Party. I expressed these views to members of the Movement.

For several years before the Split occurred I had been an ALP office-bearer and saw, at first-hand, the consequences of the Movement's activities at various levels within the ALP, including selection ballots for parliamentary candidates.²

By the early 1950s my concerns about the Movement had developed to include a firm belief that the Movement was a threat to the existence of the traditional Labor Party. I was caught in a conflict of loyalties. I believed that Santamaria had political ambitions far beyond simple anti-communism and that the Movement was on its way to destroying the Labor Party, but I was reluctant to say or do anything that might harm the reputation of the Church and Catholics. In 1951, I decided it was time to 'blow the whistle' on the Movement.

In October of that year I explained at an ALP branch meeting in Dandenong, Victoria, what the Movement was, and how it operated. The branch decided to officially request an investigation by the Victorian ALP Central Executive but its only formal reply was a brief acknowledgment which made no reference to the subject matter of our letter. The real response was made personally to the Dandenong ALP president, E.C. (Ted) Smith. It was a blunt warning. Unless the matter was dropped, the Dandenong branch would be disbanded and Corcoran would be expelled from the ALP.³

Three years later Dr Evatt made his statement of October 1954 about a 'minority group' and I thought, with relief, that the truth of the whole matter would come out into the open for everyone to see and judge. But I was to be badly disappointed. The daily papers pretended to be unaware of the Movement and of Santamaria's leading role in the organisation. They printed superficial articles and suggested that Dr Evatt alone should be blamed for the dispute. Within the ALP there was confusion and conflict, with Movement supporters continuing to deny the existence of their organisation.

When the ALP Federal Executive inquiry of 1954 was announced I offered to give evidence and a few weeks later I accepted an invitation to attend. I related, from my personal experience and knowledge, the facts about the nature of the Movement and its activities over the years. I supported my evidence with

sworn statements confirming its existence, some details of its activities, and Frank McManus's participation.⁴

According to one of the members of the Federal Executive, some delegates had very little knowledge of the nature of the Movement when the inquiry began but learnt a lot from evidence they heard at the inquiry.⁵

I would like to tell you more of what I saw of the Movement's activities and the people involved in the Split but I will mention just one more incident, in which I participated, as it includes firm evidence about the Movement's nature and tactics. In 1948 I was invited to a meeting – because of my position as a Catholic Young Men's Society branch president – and I attended, unaware that the meeting had been arranged on behalf of the Movement. Its purpose was to arrange for the secret training of young Catholics considered suitable to become Movement-supporting trade union officials. That evening the Movement's policy of extreme secrecy was explained to those present, including detailed advice on tactics to hide its name and existence.⁶

People like myself who were involved in the events of the Split know many incidents that might make interesting stories, but today it is more important to focus on the main picture and to deal with the continuing misperceptions.

New Evidence and the Need for Reassessment

Documentary evidence and other material has slowly become available since the 1950s and I suggest that there is now the opportunity to take a fresh look and make revised assessments that take account of the new information.⁷

This is badly needed as some well-established perceptions are distorted or simply wrong. Contemporary newspaper reports were misleading and early writers, such as Robert Murray, were unduly influenced by Movement and DLP members or supporters. For many years after the Split the Movement and the DLP were still actively involved in politics so it is not surprising that evidence was released selectively and damaging facts were hidden.⁸

Two important factors contributed to flawed perceptions about the Movement and the Split. The first was that the early writers disregarded, or were unaware of, Santamaria's far-reaching political aims. The second was the mass media's co-operation with the Movement's secrecy. It is puzzling why the media's unprofessional performance has been ignored as it should have been obvious to serious political observers at the time.⁹

Santamaria: Idealist and Political Activist

To understand the Movement and the Split it is essential to know something of Santamaria's beliefs and ambitions. He was passionate about politics; deeply involved in his Catholic religion; and he believed in direct action to promote his beliefs and theories.

Santamaria grew up during the Depression of the 1930s and became interested in politics while still a schoolboy. He entered Melbourne University in 1932 and was active in campus politics. In his autobiography Santamaria wrote that his formal studies became 'peripheral to the main business of my university years'. His top interest was politics. He was an active member of the Champion Society and became the first editor of the *Catholic*

Worker in 1936.¹⁰ It was then a highly political publication that forthrightly opposed capitalism as well as communism. He took part in a much-publicised University debate on the Spanish civil war in 1937 – supporting Franco – and in 1939 he organised a huge peace demonstration in the Melbourne Exhibition Building, at which he was one of the main speakers.¹¹

For lengthy periods from the 1930s to 1955 Santamaria held senior positions in two publicly-known official Catholic organisations – the National Secretariat of Catholic Action and the National Catholic Rural Movement. But, from the early 1940s, his main work was that of leader of the Movement, which he had established 1941 with the patronage of the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. Mannix.¹²

Santamaria's positions in the two publicly known Catholic organisations provided a 'cover' for his leadership of the secret political organisation known as the Movement. He directed the three organisations from the same office in Melbourne.

Santamaria was heavily involved and influential in the affairs of political parties and factions from the early 1940s until 1955 and his power, through the Democratic Labor Party, continued for several more years. At the height of the controversy in 1954 Santamaria publicly denied having any close interest in politics.¹³ His public assertions that he had never been a member of a party may have been correct in a legalistic sense, but his very carefully worded statements at the time of the Split gave the completely false impression that, except for anti-communism, he played little part in politics.

As the Movement gained strength Santamaria planned and worked towards dominating the ALP in order to put his own idealistic political theories into practice. But events that are now history intervened. After his decision in 1955 to break away from the ALP, Santamaria dominated the Democratic Labor Party. His authority within the DLP was sufficient to give him the power to choose its public leader and he offered the position to John Kerr, as indicated in Kerr's autobiography and confirmed in other publications.¹⁴

To add a personal comment about Santamaria and politics, I believe that he possessed great natural ability, but he had a weakness that hampered him as a leader. Those colleagues who disagreed with him were ignored or discarded and consequently Santamaria lost the benefits that come from frank advice and criticism. This isolation and self-confidence may account for his over-optimistic assumptions that turned out to be his undoing. He believed that he could gain control of Labor Party policy-making, and then, through a Labor government, take the next step and re-shape Australian legislation. Santamaria may have been an adept organiser of the political 'numbers' and a superman or saint to his followers, but he was out of touch with the broad community.

The Movement – Its Inception and Aims

A combination of religious and social circumstances shaped the attitudes of Catholics in the first half of this century and made the Movement possible. Catholics in Australia were then a closely knit community. They believed they were the victims of discrimination; they were fiercely loyal to the Church; and most Catholics supported the Labor Party. These feelings gradually faded after the Second World War but were still strong in the 1940s and 50s.

The Movement relied upon these attitudes among Catholics and maintained a close relationship with the Church, using its halls and facilities, and it had the support of many priests. But there was a problem. If this close relationship with the Catholic Church became widely known the organisation would be seen as sectarian. So the fateful decision was made to keep the Movement and its activities secret.¹⁵

It is hard to imagine that a political organisation as large and active as the Movement would be able to remain secret, and it may seem surprising that such a risk was taken. But, in the event, the helpfulness or complicity of the mass media ensured that a high degree of secrecy was sustained.

It may now seem astonishing, but the existence of the Movement was publicly denied by its members and supporters. For example, the Federal Member of Parliament, Stan Keon, denied that he knew of its existence when giving evidence to the Federal Executive inquiry in late 1954, despite being a leading member of the Movement at the time, and one of its founders in 1941.¹⁶

The Movement's rank-and-file members were encouraged to believe that anti-communism was the reason for the organisation's existence, and it is a fact that it was active within trade unions and gained control of some of the major ones over which communists previously had control or considerable influence. But it is now clear that Santamaria had aims far beyond anti-communism.

By 1954 his program to use the Movement to control the Labor Party was well advanced and he seemed assured of dominating the 1955 federal conference of the ALP with a large majority. Santamaria was convinced he could then ensure the passage of legislation in accord with his own singular political and religious dreams.

This ambitious plan and Santamaria's confidence in it is well supported by evidence including two letters from Santamaria to Archbishop Mannix. One was written in 1948 advocating the '...creation of a Christian Social order by means of large-scale action in the social, economic, political and cultural spheres...'. In the second letter, of 11 December 1952, Santamaria wrote:

The Social Studies Movement [the Movement] should, within a period of five or six years, be able to completely transform the leadership of the Labor Movement, and to introduce into Federal and State spheres large numbers of members who...should be able to implement a Christian social programme ... this is the first time that such a work has become possible in Australia, and, as far as I can see, in the Anglo-Saxon world since the advent of Protestantism.¹⁷

These letters show that Santamaria not only aimed at controlling the ALP and forcing through legislation to suit his policies but, in 1952, he believed that he could do so 'within very few years'. The letters also show the strong religious component in Santamaria's political aims.¹⁸

The Mass Media and the Split

Earlier in this talk I commented that, in the 1950s, you had to be Labor and Catholic to understand the Movement and the Split. Similarly, only those who already knew about the Movement from other sources were in a position to notice, at the time, that the daily papers were failing to publish the facts behind the growing tensions and conflict within the ALP in the years leading to the Split.

People interested in this phase of political history are now aware of the broad facts about Santamaria and the Movement. Furnished with this information, it has become possible for anyone to examine the newspaper files and to confirm the inadequacy and misleading nature of press accounts published at the time of the Split and in the years immediately afterwards. Unfortunately, that was the period when popular perceptions of this segment of Australian political history were being formed.

My own memory and recent research confirm that the popular press failed to publish the more significant facts and that their headlines and other material gave gravely misleading impressions. For example, in the days and weeks that followed Evatt's October 1954 statement, most newspapers gave the controversy front page headlines but, remarkably, they did not mention

Santamaria's leading role, nor did they explain the nature of the Movement.¹⁹

Another example was the treatment of the result of the Federal ALP Executive inquiry, which was completed in December 1954. The Melbourne *Herald* gave a front page report of its outcome but again failed to mention the Movement, despite the fact that it featured centrally in the Federal Executive's findings.

Whatever the motives of their owners or editors, it is now obvious that the daily papers chose not to publish the full facts about Santamaria and the Movement at the time of the Split. This press policy continued for several years afterwards when the Movement was still active in politics, supporting and influencing the Democratic Labor Party which diverted its preference votes to the conservative parties.

Distorted Perceptions

The mass media contributed to the development of distorted perceptions by leaving the general public unaware of the truth about Santamaria and the Movement. Dr Evatt was widely blamed by the daily papers as being the cause of the trouble.

Robert Murray's book, *The Split*, published in 1970, has also been important in the development of misperceptions. It contains a mass of data and has achieved almost Biblical status but it fails to clarify, or even to discuss, some of the most important matters associated with the Split. The book shows the influence of Movement members or supporters upon its author, and his acceptance of incomplete or distorted evidence provided by Democratic Labor Party officials. They had possession of many relevant documents and could choose what they showed.²⁰

The lopsided nature of the book is exacerbated by Murray's failure to include a balancing weight of views and information from opponents of the Movement, especially those Catholics who were critical of the Movement. They possessed real insights into the Movement and the Split and could have added to the substance and quality of Murray's book.²¹

In his 'Acknowledgments' Murray pays tribute to the daily press as a source of information but, remarkably, does not comment on the failure of the newspapers to publish information about the Movement when it was of current public importance.

The power and pervasiveness of a flawed version of the history and background has affected later writings, including Ross McMullin's *Light on the Hill*. He appears to have been strongly influenced by Murray's *The Split* but ignored Ormonde's *The Movement* which reveals detailed evidence of that organisation's nature and methods. McMullin mentions different opinions, but does not sufficiently probe the deeper causes of the Split. Like Murray, he makes no mention of the mass media's failure to inform the public of the facts about Santamaria and the Movement.²²

Evatt's Role in the Split

Dr H.V. Evatt has been repeatedly blamed as the cause of the Split. The claim extends to the assertion that the Split would not have occurred if the ALP had been led by someone else. Considering the latter opinion realistically, the only person who could have been the Labor leader at the time was Arthur Calwell. If he had been in charge in 1954 he may have tried to conciliate the Movement and it is possible that the Split would have been postponed. This is speculation. The reality is that Santamaria was heading towards domination of the ALP in 1955 and was intent on implementing his own policies, whoever the Labor parliamentary leader might be.

Ben Chifley had been aware of the danger to the party as early as 1949 and said so very publicly in 1951. If he had lived, Chifley would have confronted the Movement well

before 1954. Santamaria knew Chifley's attitude and feared his reputation and influence, even after Chifley's death. Santamaria pressed for the destruction of what he termed the 'Chifley legend'.²³

Whether the Labor split had become inevitable is a controversial question but in the words of political journalist, E.H. Cox:

Despite all the criticism that has been piled on him, the stalemate Evatt is seeking to handle was never of his making. The conflicting forces were sharply aligned long before he became Labor's leader.²⁴

Critics have accused Evatt of hypocrisy in attacking the Movement because he had spoken to Santamaria on a number of occasions seeking Federal election support and therefore, his critics claimed, he must have been well aware of the Movement's activities long before October 1954.

This criticism of Evatt is based on the assumption that Santamaria would have told him the Movement's secrets. Santamaria clearly indicates in his autobiography that he was already hostile towards Evatt before their conversations occurred. Evatt had defeated the Communist Party Dissolution Act in the High Court and, in 1951, he had successfully campaigned against the referendum to ban the Communist Party, which the Movement supported.²⁵

Evatt's October 1954 announcement was vague in relation to the Movement and is consistent with his having little detailed knowledge of the organisation.²⁶ Dinny Lovegrove, the Victorian ALP secretary in the 1950s, who was in a much better position to know about it than Evatt, was mistaken about the Movement's real nature and unaware of Santamaria's plans to change the character and policy of the Labor Party.²⁷

When all the surrounding circumstances are considered, the theory that Evatt was solely responsible is not tenable. It was the divisive situation created by the Movement that caused of the Labor Split of 1955.

Need for More Study and Clarification

Some of the neglected aspects of the Movement and the Split, especially Santamaria's ultimate aims, have been briefly discussed today. I hope they will be studied more fully. Several other matters have been given too little attention over the years and they also need investigation.

They include the relationship that existed between the Movement and the conservative political parties, together with the little-publicised but lengthy personal relationship between Robert Menzies and Santamaria. The brief marriage between the DLP and the Country Party in Western Australia is a fact of history and there is the probability of less formal but more important political liaisons in Canberra.

Among other questions needing research are the Movement's connections with secret intelligence agencies and the identities and motives of the various providers of funds and other forms of assistance. The circumstantial evidence pointing to the existence of such alliances and mutual help are strong. There was the paranoia of the Cold War period and the readiness of the United States to assist anti-communist groups anywhere they appeared.

In Australia, whether it was deliberately planned or otherwise, the Movement provided long-sustained and decisive assistance to the conservative side of politics and the political parties who profited from this situation would have been keen that it continued.²⁸

Conclusion

Santamaria and the Movement are inseparable. He founded, shaped, and controlled it. He hoped to use the Movement to destroy communist influence, and also to use it to control the Labor Party and to change that party's policy to conform to his own

ideals and theories. Next, he intended to have his ideas embedded in Australian legislation. This was Santamaria's hidden agenda.

It was fantasy, and the fact that he failed is not surprising. He lived in an artificial environment of supporters who did not, or dared not, warn or contradict him. Santamaria was out of touch with the attitudes of ordinary Australians.

The Movement was the main cause of the Split. The Movement grew and flourished with the assistance of the daily papers, which failed to publish the facts about it over a period of several years. This was an abdication of professional responsibility on the part of the press and should be a cause of shame.

Popular perceptions of this segment of our history are vague and distorted. Now, with the gradual release of documentary evidence and while people possessing first-hand knowledge are still available to give information, it is time for re-examination of the Labor Split, with a sharp focus on Santamaria's hidden agenda and the performance of the news media.

Endnotes

- 1 The unofficial name 'the Movement' is widely accepted. In the 1940s its members claimed it had no name but suggested it could be referred to as 'the Organisation' or 'the Show'. From 1945 it was, officially, the 'Catholic Social Studies Movement' (CSSM), changing to the 'Catholic Social Movement' (CSM) in 1956 and to the 'National Civic Council' (NCC) in 1957. After 1957 the name 'National Civic Council' became well known, although little information about its real nature was published in the popular press. Essentially, it was the same organisation, led throughout by B.A. Santamaria from its foundation in 1941.
- 2 Ormonde, Paul *The Movement*, 1972. The Movement's operation and techniques are described in some detail in various parts of Ormonde's book, including Appendix B, written by the present author.
- 3 The text of the 1951 Dandenong ALP letter and the response from the Victorian ALP executive are given in Ormonde, 175-6.
- 4 McManus sat alongside the author. The inquiry halted briefly for afternoon tea and Corcoran, then on first name terms with Frank McManus, quietly asked him how he would respond. McManus's answer was curt, 'I'll deny everything', and he quickly turned his back. Next day, when questioned by the executive, he answered questions guardedly and gave very little information. It has been confirmed that he was a senior Movement organiser.
- 5 From a statement by Federal Executive member Gil Duthie to the author in November 1954.
- 6 The meeting took place in August 1948 in the Cathedral Hall, Brunswick Street Fitzroy, and was attended by about 200 officials of parish branches of the CYMS. Those present were warned that the business of the meeting was strictly secret. It was also asserted that the organisation had no name but previously had been referred to as 'the Movement' but this term was no longer used. It could be mentioned, if necessary, as 'the Organisation' or 'the Show'. (In later years it has become public knowledge that the Movement did have an official name at that time – the Catholic Social Studies Movement.)
- 7 Among the evidence released after decades of non-disclosure are documents referred to in Andrew Campbell's PhD thesis, *Politics as a vocation: a critical examination of B.A. Santamaria and the politics of commitment, 1936-1957*, Deakin University, 1989. These documents contain definitive evidence that Santamaria planned to gain control of the Labor Party and to use it to have legislation passed to promote his idealistic policies. In these documents Santamaria expressed confidence that he would succeed in his aims.
- 8 Murray, *The Split*, 1970 passim. Murray implies that the Movement was not a major threat to the ALP, although he does acknowledge that its activities were 'a cause for concern'. He criticises Evatt over his exposure of the Movement and describes Evatt's statement as 'panic-stricken' and 'unscrupulous'. He also describes Senator Jim Ormonde, who advised Evatt about the Movement, as 'irrationally obsessive' This, and other material through the book, suggest that Murray was unduly influenced by DLP officers and Movement supporters who supplied material for *The Split*.
- 9 Evidence of the performance of newspapers is readily available in newspaper files. Even limited research into their editions in the latter months of 1954 will show their failure to disclose the facts about Santamaria and the Movement.
- 10 Santamaria, B.A. *Catholics and the Free Society*, 83-4, '...in the 30s there developed a group of young Catholics seriously interested in ideas. Their fathers were Labor men. So were their sons. But the sons' ideas derived from Belloc and Chesterton; they were decentralist and strongly opposed to Marxism'. (Santamaria is referring to members of the Campion Society and the founders of *The Catholic Worker*.)
- 11 The author remembers standing, as a schoolboy, in the tightly packed crowd, reported as 60,000, in the Exhibition Building and hearing speeches by Archbishop Mannix and Santamaria. The attitude of Catholics towards overseas wars was still influenced by the conscription controversy of the First World War in which Mannix had taken a leading anti-conscription role.
- 12 Santamaria, B.A. *Daniel Mannix*, 1984, 203 '...encouragement, and financial assistance to the extent of £3000'. An article in the Melbourne *Catholic Tribune*, 28.12.1961, reported that Dr Mannix stated about the Movement, 'As far as I know there was no secrecy about it'. (Perhaps the elderly archbishop had not been adequately informed of the secret nature and methods of the Movement.)
- 13 Melbourne *Argus*, 21.10.54. In a newspaper article that quoted his words, Santamaria gave the impression that his only official position was with the 'Catholic Rural Movement', despite the facts that he was also the director of the National Secretariat of Catholic Action and, more significantly, the leader of the Movement. Also, in the Melbourne *Herald*, 13.10.54, Santamaria was reported as denying that he had 'any close interest in politics'. (The newspapers made no explanation of the real facts about Santamaria to their readers, nor any criticism of his deception or lack of frankness.) According to Gerard Henderson in *Mr. Santamaria and the Bishops*, 156, the existence of the CSSM [the Movement] 'was not publicly admitted by Santamaria until April 1956'.
- 14 Short, Susanna *Laurie Short*, 1992, 223. 'He [Kerr] allowed his ALP membership to lapse after 1954. At the same time, he refused an invitation from Santamaria to head the newly-formed DLP'. See also Kerr, John *Matters for Judgment – An Autobiography*, 1988, 148, and McClelland, James *Stirring the Possum*, 1988, 107-9.
- 15 Campion, Edmund *Rockchoppers*, 1982, 106-9. Campion describes Santamaria's use of 'the parish structure' and 'census cards' marked with symbols to indicate the so-called 'reliability' of individual Catholic unionists. The parish structure is confirmed by Santamaria himself in *The Movement-1941-60*, Hawthorn Press (n.d. c.1961) '...we founded a large number of groups ... on a parish basis'. (This information is similar to the present author's description of the organisation's activities published in Ormonde's *The Movement*.)
- 16 Duthie, Gil *I had 50,000 Bosses*, 1984, 148, Stan Keon denied any knowledge of the Movement when addressing the ALP Federal Executive inquiry in 1954. Duthie and others present did not believe him. Evidence is cited by Campbell that Keon was one of the four people who founded the Movement in 1941 – a fact that was kept secret from the general public for more than forty years.

- 17 Campbell, 196-7. See also abbreviated references in Henderson, Gerard *Mr Santamaria and the Bishops*, 1982, 172, and Campion, 167.
- 18 Short, 277, Gerard Henderson gave evidence to her that Santamaria planned to take over the Labor Party and did not want Labor to win in 1954. Henderson said 'He was looking ahead to 1957. [the next federal election]. By 1957 his own people would be that much stronger in the ALP and in a position to take over.'
- 19 An exception to the general rule was an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7.10.54, headed *Catholic Action, the "Movement" and the Labour Party*, attributed to the *SMH's* independently-minded editor of the time, J.D. Pringle – a relative newcomer to Australia and its political undercurrents. If other newspaper editors had been genuinely unaware of the Movement at that time they should have been alerted to it by Pringle's article.
- 20 Democratic Labor Party secretary, Jim Brosnan, stated that Murray wrote much of *The Split* in a room next to his in the Melbourne office of the DLP. Brosnan's statement was made in an interview conducted by Lyle Allan for his University of Melbourne MA thesis on 28.1.1976.
- 21 When Murray was writing the book the DLP and the Movement were still politically active and their members were secretive about the Movement. Many Catholics who were opposed to the Movement were available to give candid information, but this source of information was insufficiently utilised judging from the material that was published. For example, an incorrect account of the present author's evidence to the Federal Executive was published in *The Split*. A brief interview could have eliminated the errors.
- 22 McMullin, Ross *Light on the Hill*, 1991, 278 A minor but telling example of the disproportionate influence of pro-Movement sources is the discussion of the Federal Executive 'numbers' at the time of the 1954 inquiry. The complaint by Frank McManus that the Federal Executive 'would have been tied at six-six' but for the absence of Beazley is included, but there is no mention of the affect on 'the numbers' of the more sinister and equally significant forced resignation from the Federal Executive of the anti-Movement delegate, Charlie Anderson. He also resigned from his position as NSW ALP secretary at the same time for undisclosed reasons.
- 23 Crisp, L.F. *Ben Chifley—a Political Biography*, 1963, Chapt. 23; and Whittington, Don *The House will divide*, 1954, 180. Whittington asserts that a major division in the Labor Party would have occurred if Chifley had lived. See also Short, 188, for a reference to a speech by Santamaria to the annual Movement convention in 1953, advocating destruction of the 'Chifley legend'.
- 24 Melbourne *Herald*, 8.10.54, 4.
- 25 Santamaria, *Against the Tide*, 141. The attitude of Movement people to the 1951 referendum was shown by Frank McManus. He was then the ALP's radio spokesman each night on the Labor-owned radio station 3KZ in Melbourne, but would not speak against the referendum proposals although this was the ALP's official policy.
- 26 It was only Evatt's reference to *News Weekly* that connected his statement with the Movement. Accounts of preliminary discussions show that he took a lot of persuading to make the statement by people such as Senator Jim Ormonde, who commented that Dr Evatt was slow to realise the extent of the Movement's influence and was quite incredulous when he heard stories of Movement machinations. (See Paul Ormonde's *The Movement*, 58-9.)
- 27 In conversation with the author in 1952 Lovegrove asserted that the Movement would never be a serious problem to the ALP as it was, in his words, 'just another faction'.
- 28 Campion, 119 'The saddest moment in Mr. Santamaria's life seems to me the fortieth anniversary dinner of the Movement, in July 1981, where one of the speakers was Mr. Malcolm Fraser, Prime Minister of Australia. B.A. Santamaria, the man who, all those years ago, had set out with a great ache in his heart to remake the world so that the poor and rejected could find compassion and justice, was ending his days among the stone-faced men of the Right.'