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FOREWORD
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

"The Politics of Liberation" is divided into two major parts which I have called Political Activism and Political Science. Between them is the Interface the place where, according to dictionary definitions of that term, interaction occurs between two separate systems or processes. In some senses it is probably more accurate to say that the two parts of the thesis collide rather than interact and the whole thesis can read like two separate pieces of work. This was not deliberate but rather the logical consequence of allowing two quite distinct approaches to research to work themselves out not merely in the content of the thesis but in the form that the two parts took.

Feminist scholars in the social sciences have distinguished between two quite different approaches to research which rest on the concepts of agency and communion. The agentic approach, which they identify as masculine, separates, divides, categorizes, dissect, isolates, fragments, quantifies and manipulates—all toward controlling the subject under study, toward imposing a particular order on it. It is the dominant approach to research and a major part of what feminists have characterized as the patriarchal intellectual tradition. In contrast to this approach they speak of one which emphasizes communion. Manifesting itself in fusion, expression, acceptance, emphasizing naturalistic observation, investigator participation and qualitative patterning and above all insisting that what is being studied should be allowed to impose its own order on itself, it is identified with the feminine/feminist. The distinction between these two approaches, which does not correspond entirely with that commonly made between qualitative and quantitative research methods, and an elaboration of the concepts behind it is contained in pp 246–248 of Chapter 3.

In both parts of the thesis I have allowed the subject matter I was researching to determine the way in which it was presented and to that extent the thesis as a whole adopts a feminist approach. What makes the two parts of the thesis read so differently is that in allowing the social science models discussed in the second part to determine the way in which their content (and intent) is conveyed their strong masculine bias contrasts much more strongly with the first part of the thesis than if such an approach were adopted in presenting the data in the first part as well.

Political Activism contains a reconstruction of the activities of the Sydney Sexual Liberation Movements and their interactions with each other and the wider community during the period 1969–1973. It does not separate out the private from the public and treat only of the public. Both are included as equally important. In reality, the particular actions that participants in the movements undertook can only be understood by reference to what they were doing in those aspects of our lives that the dominant mode in the social sciences would label 'private' and hence irrelevant to the interests of social science. At times the material presented appears to repeat itself but necessarily so because single events in which all movements were involved played different roles in the development of those movements as well as of the individuals involved. The 1973 Women's Commission is a case in point: for the lesbians active in Sydney Women's Liberation it meant something quite different from what it did to the lesbians active in CAMP (NSW); it could not mean the same thing because individuals, and the groups in which they were involved, were at particular and different points of development. The same applies to the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium on which a good deal of the material in the first part of the thesis is centred. To go over the same event from different perspectives is part of the process of the qualitative patterning of phenomena that is emphasized by the feminist approach.

The first part is also detailed and for several reasons. The actions and motivations of individuals were important and the inclusion of them as relevant serves to stress the point that social change is not simply the result of anonymous historical forces which impose their will on hapless human beings. This is sufficient reason alone for the detail: the maintenance of the integrity of the data itself and of the actions of the individuals and groups involved. But since part of the exercise engaged in is an illustration of what three particular social science models do to a body of data when it is viewed through their own particular biases, then as much detail
as was necessary to reveal their exclusions and distortions had to be included. Finally, from the perspective of a political activist writing in 1979—1980 about the activities of the movements in 1969—1973 nothing, it seems to me, that has been included in that account is irrelevant to an understanding of those movements during that particular period nor indeed to an understanding of the dynamics of the surviving movements today. In trying to explain to women entering Sydney Women's Liberation today, for example, why the monthly general meeting has, from time to time disappeared, it is necessary to go back to the events and groups of 1970—1971 as a starting point, to the particular circumstances and women involved. Since 1970—1971 there has been a series of discussions on the role of the general meeting, fights over its powers, attempts to resurrect it (some of which have succeeded for short periods of time, some of which have failed) but all of which have been affected by and overlaid those very early fights about the general meeting's role. Unless accounts of the development of the movements err on the side of over—inclusiveness (if it is an error) we end up restricting both the freedom of thought and interpretation and freedom of action of future activists and scholars.

It is argued in the second part of the thesis that the social sciences, or at the very least the three models used, do require different things of the data, not merely from an account written for future activists but from each other. The second part of the thesis, Political Science, in content and in form typifies the agentic approach, the patriarchal intellectual tradition. In it the three models used are first presented. Each is delineated in terms of its basic unit of analysis, it major concepts, and the propositions (implicit and explicit) it claims are testable against a set of data. They are models which have been constructed by separating out, categorizing, abstracting from and manipulating other sets of data. They are the straps within which unruly data must be constrained, the means by which new sets of data are manipulated and controlled, or, if they cannot be controlled, excluded as irrelevant. And once they are excluded as irrelevant, for the social sciences they become non—existent. These three models are then imposed one by one on the data presented in Part One of the thesis and one of the main claims of the thesis is that this does involve an imposition on the data. Not surprisingly, the parts of the data which the models cannot handle, those which do not readily lend themselves to an agentic approach are those which are the messiest; the role of ideology in the movements, for example, and the attempts of the movements to change consciousness as well as clearly identifiable social and political structures and practices.

Thus what may appear to be a thesis at war with itself is a concrete demonstration of two approaches to the social sciences in collision and of the consequences of adopting an agentic approach, for an integral part of that approach is not merely the manipulation of sets of data drawn from the real world but the manipulation of the world from which the data are drawn. The interpretations of the Sexual Liberation Movements offered by the psychiatrists at the CIBA—GEIGY Symposium and their attempts to redefine as 'symptoms of adolescent identity crises' the behaviour of the movement activists who tried to disrupt its proceedings and hence to deny the legitimacy of their protests is a very good example of the reality manipulation that is characteristic of the agentic approach: in the case of the psychiatrists it is obvious, in that of the social science models discussed it is more subtle, but manipulation nonetheless.
PART ONE:
POLITICAL ACTIVISM
CHAPTER I
THE SYDNEY SEXUAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS 1969 -1972

The growth of the sexual liberation movements (1) in Sydney in the 1970s must be considered within a framework which acknowledges the influence that the socio-political climate of the preceding decade had on their emergence. The division of time into 'decades characterized by . . .' with the dividing line set arbitrarily at the points when the fifties become the sixties, and they the seventies, runs the risk of masking two facts: that each decade so delineated contains elements of both continuity with, and changes from, the preceding decade; and that whether the elements of continuity or those of change appear to dominate the move from one decade to the next is largely a matter of subjective interpretation. What I wish to do here is to outline five features of the sixties which appear to represent both changes from the fifties and elements of continuity for the seventies - in the context of an examination of the emergence of the sexual liberation movements. (2)

Firstly, there appear to have been changes in thinking and writing about the nature and loci of political power. As the distinctions between political, economic, and social, power became more and more difficult to maintain, political power, once seen to reside almost exclusively (and properly so) in the traditional political institutions of Australia, came to be seen to be both more diffused and more concentrated; it was in more places than had previously been suspected and in fewer hands. (3) University administrators, churches, pressure groups, governments of other countries, companies (whether under domestic or foreign control) and, particularly after the introduction of television in 1956, the mass media, all came to be seen as parts of the political system. They had, if not political power, then at least considerable influence, which they could exercise either directly, by applying pressure on the legitimate political decision makers, or indirectly, by trying to sway 'public opinion'. While Australian public opinion was polled and published nationally by only one company during the period 1941 to 1971, there is evidence to suggest that data collection and publication by market research firms, political parties, and academics, began to increase significantly during the 1960s. (4)

There thus came to be more point in attempting to sway public opinion; it was

(1) By sexual liberation movements I mean specifically Women's Liberation, Gay Liberation, CAMP (NSW), and the Thor group as they existed in Sydney. Thor is the name of a newspaper which started as Tharunka (the newspaper of students at the University of New South Wales), became Tharunka, and finally Thor. All of these groups will be discussed more fully in the text but it is worthwhile noting at this point the actual timing of their emergence: almost literally at the turn of the decade. The leaflet which announced the “inaugural” public meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation for 14 January 1970, was handed out at an anti-Vietnam War demonstration on 15 December, 1969. In July, 1970 CAMP (NSW) was established. In 1970, those who were to dramatically change the nature of the student newspaper Tharunka were elected to be its editors. Gay Liberation, formed, for the most part by people who were members of CAMP (NSW), did not establish itself as a separate group in Sydney until 1971. Additionally, Women's Liberation groups began meeting in other Australian state capitals in 1970. And in Melbourne, the Australasian Lesbian Movement had its inaugural meeting (initially as an Australian chapter of the 15 year old American lesbian organization, The Daughters of Bilitis) on 28 January, 1970.

(2) It is obvious that the five features discussed overlap and entail one another; their separation is an heuristic device to enable clearer presentation.


increasingly being measured and the measurements published. And the publication of the results of a public opinion poll is not a neutral information providing act, even if the questions are not intentionally worded to produce the desired results; to read that 90% of Australians think differently from the way you do can be an opinion influencing exercise, whether by design or not. In the 1960s 'getting the numbers' began to mean something else besides having a majority of votes in the backrooms of political party offices or on the floor of the House; it also came to mean the numbers you could get out onto the streets for a march or demonstration (to be filmed for television cameras) and having public opinion (the largest percentage of those surveyed in the latest poll) on your side. In a sense, those who were forced to play the new numbers game were those who could not win by playing the old one. Australia entered the 'mass age' in the second half of the 1960s: the age of mass production and mass consumption; the mass media; and entertainment (popular culture) (5) for the masses who were made to feel more important to the same degree that they were actually becoming more impotent. Those who so ungraciously felt the powerlessness that the benefits of mass society were meant to mask responded appropriately by trying to build mass movements for change; the 1960s were years of growth for the protest movements. (6) The youth movement, the peace movement, the student movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement, were all movements which, in many ways, reflected the character of the society that spawned them and that they sought to change: they could guarantee anonymity as far as most people were concerned because movements do not have members in the way that groups do, they have participants and supporters; one of the yardsticks of their effectiveness was the numbers of people who could be massed for demonstrations, marches and the like; and their power was both diffuse, in the sense that potential and actual participants were scattered throughout the society, and concentrated, in the sense that decisions about what direction a movement would move in were in the hands of a relatively small network of hyperactivists.

The second feature of the 1960s which appears to represent a significant change from the


(5) See for example, McGREGOR, Craig: People, Pop and Politics - Australia In the Sixties. Ure Smith. Sydney. 1968.

preceding decade is the focus of attention on the activities of youth. From whichever perspective you approached Australian society in the sixties the young (especially the student young) appeared to be a major concern, both to themselves and to an older generation which tried to analyze, survey, condemn, or join, them, or to explain away the problems they caused.

The generation gap of the sixties was thought to be a gap with a difference. Whether or not there actually was a generation gap with a difference in the 1960s, and there is some empirical evidence which suggests that on attitudes to a variety of issues there was not: the belief that there was such a gap and that it had to be bridged, by bringing youth into line with the older generation (rather than, for the most part, the other way around) by whatever means available served further to concentrate attention on youth. Of the two broad groups of youth who appeared to be causing so much concern to their elders, the ‘drop out - dope up - hippie - surfe- Beatlemaniacs’ and the ‘long haired - radical - lefty - student - activists’, it was the latter which was taken much more seriously, and for two reasons: they were challenging, rather than dropping out from, the society they found wanting; and they were seen not to be acting autonomously - especially with respect to campus unrest.

(7) Here again the overseas literature is enormous and some of it is mentioned above. The ‘problem’ of youth was sufficiently common to most western industrial countries for international academic conferences on the subject to be held such as that held under the auspices of the International Sociological Association in September, 1970. The theoretical papers presented at that conference were published in a special issue of the International Social Science Journal (UNESCO) Vol XXIV No.2. 1972 entitled “Youth: A Social Force?”. It was edited by Peter Lengyel who wrote in the editorial: “...the emergence of young people as a social and economic force in their own right and the weakening of the mediation process through which they were long kept in a subordinate and dependent position has rendered youth eminently visible: social scientists have reacted to this with considerable alacrity.” p 215.

(8) See for example, MORGAN, Patrick and OSMOND, Warren: “The State of Student Protest” Current Affairs Bulletin Vol 46 No.8. 7 September, 1970 pp 114-128 and [WALSH, Richard]: “The University Student ‘67”, Current Affairs Bulletin Vol 39 No.8. 13 March, 1967, pp 114-128. Morgan and Osmond were recent graduates from Melbourne. Walsh was one of the editors of the Sydney underground newspaper Or (in a verse a precursor to Thor) which was prosecuted under the Obscene and Indecent Publications Act in 1963. The two issues of the Current Affairs Bulletin encompass three very different perspectives on student activism. From 1965 onwards, Australian Public Opinion Polls began to include young people (aged 16-21 years) in their samples for surveys: GOOT, Murray and LIBERY, Jaki: op.cit. pi.

(9) See for example, BELL, Coral: “Oedipal Politics? An Interpretation of Student Insurgency and its Repercussions” Current Affairs Bulletin Vol 43 No.12, 5 May 1969, pp 178-191; ENCEL, Sol: “Sociology and Student Unrest” Presidential Address, Annual Meeting of the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand, Melbourne, August, 1969, published in The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology Vol 6 No.1. April, 1970 pp 3-9; BERRY, John: “ Who Are the Marchers?” Politics Vol III No.2, November, 1968 pp 163-175; GARDNER, Godfrey et al: “ Passive Politics: A Survey of Melbourne University Students.” Politics Vol V No.1. May, 1970 pp 30-37; CARROLL, Ian: “ The New Radicals” Arena No 21. May 1970 pp 65-71; LAQUEUR, Walter: “ Reflections on Youth Movements” Quadrant No 60. July-August, 1969 pp 11-12; LACOFIELD, Frank: “The Fourth World” Quadrant No 59. May - June 1969. pp 38-45. The clearest example of the condemnatory attitude toward student politics is from Sir Philip Baxter, Vice Chancellor of the University of New South Wales from 1955 to 1969, in an address he gave to the Australian - American Association in 1959 which was published in Quadrant No. 62. December, 1969 pp 35-40 as “Students, Universities and Society.” The best instance of the older generation joining the young but wishing it to be seen as the young finally catching up with them comes from Owen Webster’s introduction to the collection of essays, Disenchantment, where he wrote in November, 1969: “ Much of the student unrest around the world, undirected, incoherent, homing in on an Ignis fatuus in the hope that it might turn out to be a star, is motivated by a common disenchantment with the values of the modern world, the promise of the democracies, the directions in which they are leading. Though the protest may be directed at symptoms . . . the disenchantment lies deeper, but the young lack the experience to articulate and the wisdom to understand its root causes. Many older people . . . have been expressing a similar disenchantment for years, but their views have been unfashionable, too disturbing to a world bent on taking its course.” p ix in WEBSTER, Owen (ed): Disenchantment. Goldstar Publications. Melbourne. 1972.


(11) GOOT, Murray: “Beyond the Generation Gap” in MAYER, H. (ed): Australian Politics - A Second Reader. Cheshire, Melbourne. 1969 pp 153-175. Goott compared, using opinion poll results, the attitudes of student and non-student youth and the ‘older generation’ to a variety of questions; his conclusion was that, in fact, there was very little difference between the three groups.

(12) See especially BAXTER, Sir Philip: op. cit. and HOOK, Sidney: “The Cult of Revolution” Quadrant. No. 73.
The third distinguishing feature of the sixties was the development of a new style of politicking: these were the highly visible and expressive forms of demonstrations, rallies, marches, sit-ins, occupations, and attempts to make decisions at large open meetings; participation in politics of the new style became an end in itself rather than merely a means to an end, and confrontation was an important element in all forms of participation.

To build this [anti-capitalist revolt] requires risks which are not only necessary, but personally emotionally liberating. That liberation comes from the sense of having 'taken a stand' of having forged a breach in the cycle of bourgeois educational repression, through a nascent movement for control . . . (13)

The older generation of political leaders were seen to be a generation of Cassius' - they thought too much, and were therefore dangerous - (14) The political innocence of childhood was to be extended into adolescence and, if possible, beyond. It was an innocence which, characterized as it was by a preference for spontaneity of action over planning, for the sensory over the cerebral, for experience over theory, looked dangerously like Bakunin style nihilistic anarchism (or more accurately, the stereotype thereof) to many of its opponents. If we use Morse Peckham's concepts of Romantic Rebels and Enlightenment Revolutionaries, there were important elements in the new left which made it appear to be a group of Romantic Rebels in contrast to the more Enlightenment Revolutionary image that the old left took on, with the difference between the two being that the former conceive the possibility of an alternative without, however, formulating a particular alternative while the latter formulates an alternative and seek its implementation. (15)

The leaders of the new style politics were 'models', intellectual, almost spiritual, guides, gurus rather than leaders who demanded followers. And as gurus, their relationships with their adherents were rather ambivalent for both rejected the notion of old style leadership as appropriate to the new politics. As models, the imagery surrounding their deeds and words was very romantic: the swash-buckling image of Castro; the Eastern wisdom and patience of Mao and Ho; the suffering Guevera; and people such as Sartre, Marcuse, Szasz, Laing, Cohn-Bendit, Dutschke and others, quixotically tilting at the Establishment windmills of their own societies. (16)

The fourth feature of the sixties which is relevant to a consideration of the emergence of the liberation movements in the seventies, one which became more noticeable towards the end of the decade, was the broadening of the notion of what constituted a political issue. The political component of issues which had hitherto been regarded as social problems or as matters belonging in the domain of private morality was not merely highlighted but became the dominant aspect of those issues - the lens through which they were analysed, interpreted, and acted upon. Existing subjects of debate such as censorship, abortion, drugs, sexuality, and any

October, 1971. pp 51-64. For a somewhat lighter version of the communist bogey in the Australian universities in the sixties, see the novel, AITKIN, Don: The Second Chair. Angus and Robertson. Sydney. 1977.

(13) These are the words of student activist Warren Osmond quoted from the student newspaper Lot's Wife of 13 April, 1970 in MORGAN, Patrick and OSMOND, Warren : op. cit. p 117.


others which could be included under the heading of 'the permissive society' \(^{17}\) were politicized; an old (and, in the Australian context, bitterly divisive) issue, that of military conscription for overseas service, was revived \(^{18}\); and there were new issues, such as Australian involvement in the Vietnam War, the beginnings of a more serious campaign against racism with the Student Action for Aborigines (SAFA) freedom rides of 1965, and the turmoil in the universities, all of which were seen as political issues rather than social problems. \(^{19}\) The more frequent use of the word 'issue', with its connotations of conflict which may not be resolvable, rather than the word 'problem', which implies that a solution can be found by applying the same sort of reasoning that you would to a mathematical problem, is an indication of the type of change that was occurring in Australian thinking about politics.

If we can regard, as students of the sociology of literature tell us we can, changes in literature (albeit with time lags) as indicative of the changes in the society which produces that literature, then a glance through the tables of contents of successive editions of the first Australian 'reader' in political science is revealing. The readers were intended to supplement standard textbooks on Australian politics for first year university students; to add some life to the fairly arid institutional approach which those standard texts took. Texts are meant to be revised and updated relatively infrequently, that is what makes them standard texts; the readers, because they contained contemporary material, had to be revised regularly if they were to fulfil their functions of providing comprehension, informality, analysis and controversy, and novelty. \(^{20}\) Considered in their various editions, they therefore act as an interesting barometer of changes in the nature of what the proper study of Australian politics should encompass.


\(^{17}\) See for example FYVEL, T. R.: "We Permit... You Permit... They Permit." Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol 47 No. 2. 14 December, 1970 pp 18-32 or pick up any issue of The Australian Humanist from No. 1. (December 1966) onwards and there will be at least one article on some aspect of the permissive society.


pressure groups, parties, parliament and politicians, the bureaucracy, and the impact of foreign policy. In the 1967 revised edition of the First Reader (22) there were minor changes: the foreign policy readings disappeared and new readings appeared in the bureaucracy section. The first major changes appeared in the 1969 edition, Australian Politics - A Second Reader (23). In the preceding year Hughes' Readings in Australian Government (24) had been published. Mayer, in his introduction to the Second Reader, welcomed Hughes' "more even and dignified" (25) book and went on to point out that, in the Second Reader,

while a good deal of the material here is 'solid' in the usual sense, other selections are included which are ephemeral or which have no value if judged as intellectual contributions, but which, I hope, represent certain aspects of Australian politics in the raw. (26)

Mayer's Second Reader contained 11 sections comprised of 77 readings. Seven of the sections that were in the First Reader were retained although some of the individual readings were different. The eighth section of the First Reader, parliament and politicians, was split into two - politicians, and government and parliament. There were two entirely new sections: the first was headed 'the politics of youth' and contained readings on the generation gap, student protests, anti-Vietnam War marchers, and demonstrations; the second was headed 'aspects of freedom' and contained readings on ASIO, the Left and liberty, and human rights.

It was in the Third Reader (27) published in 1973, but prepared before that date, that a whole section entitled 'issues' appeared with 25 papers on topics such as the environment, urbanism, the media, education, racism, women's liberation, counter - culture, censorship, and permissiveness. (28)

The final distinguishing feature of the 1960s worthy of comment in the present context was the development of an Australian self-awareness and self-consciousness, prompted perhaps by the weakening of the traditional ties with Great Britain and the establishment of new links of a broad nature with the United States. There were two strands to this self-awareness: on the one hand there was the publication of a series of popular books about Australia, books which seem to have perpetuated ill-founded myths about the egalitarian, classless nature of Australian society; on the other hand, there was the establishment of academic departments of sociology (and the expansion of universities in general and social science departments in

(21) Ibid.
(23) MAYER, Henry (ed): Australian Politics - A Second Reader. op. cit.
(26) Ibid.
(28) It is of course possible that these changes in the contents of the Readers are measures of editorial idiosyncracy only, but this is highly unlikely. Changes occurred elsewhere as well. For example, in 1969 the South Australian Workers Education Association and the Department of Adult Education of the University of Adelaide (S.A.) changed the name of their quarterly publication, which had first appeared in 1960, from WEA Bulletin to Issue. In the editorial which announced the name change, Derek Whitelock wrote that the name change would be accompanied by new features such as political commentary, university comment, an arts review section, and a debate in print. The journal hoped "to become . . . a journal of social, political and cultural comment . . .". /Issue. Vol 4. No. 6. May 1969. p 1.
particular) equipped to gather data which could, if not destroy, then at least make large holes in, the notions that Australia was a homogeneous, egalitarian, and classless society.

Beginning in 1958, there have been two broad categories of popular (i.e., with a market larger than the educational market) books about Australia. The first, and by far the larger, was a series of books written by professional journalists and started with J. D. Pringle's *Australian Accent* (1958). This was followed by Donald Horne's *The Lucky Country* (1964), Craig McGregor's *Profile of Australia* (1966), and *People, Politics and Pop* (1968), and Horne's *The Next Australia* (1970), John Hallows' *The Dreamtime Society* (1970), the British journalist, Jonathan Aitken's *Land of Fortune* (1971) and Ian Moffitt's *The U·Jack Society* (1972). Ronald Conway's *The Great Australian Stupor* (1971) fits into this first category, not because the author was a journalist (he was a psychologist) but because the book's tone was journalistic. The second group of books was by Australian academic historians and included Russell Ward's *The Australian Legend* (1958), Geoffrey Blainey's *The Tyranny of Distance* (1966), and Ian Turner's collection *The Australian Dream* (1968). All of the books cited represent variations on a theme originally committed to paper in 1930 by the historian W. K. Hancock in his book *Australia* (30). Whether or not the images of egalitarianism and democracy in Australia that the books conveyed were empirically based, and Connell's 1968 critique (31) of them argues that they were not, large numbers of Australians bought the books to read about themselves: where they had come from, who they were, what they thought, and where they were headed. Horne's *The Lucky Country* had sold over 180,000 copies by 1970 which, for a nation of people who were supposed to suffer from a 'colonial cringe' with respect to Britain and a 'cultural cringe' with respect to everywhere else bar New Zealand, represented a significant change.

Alvin Gouldner (32) has described the 1960s in America as a time when sociology became part of popular culture, became accessible to everybody. In Australia in the sixties journalist authors were able to masquerade as sociologists and capture the market of popular culture because there was no academic discipline of sociology in Australian universities until 1959 when the first undergraduate department was established at the University of New South Wales. (33) The Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand (SAANZ) was not founded until 1963 and the first issue of its publication, *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, appeared two years later. Similarly, The Australasian Political Studies Association (APSA) established in 1956 (as the Australian Political Studies Association) began publication of its journal *Politics* in 1965. By contrast, The Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science (ANZAAS) was already in existence in 1912 when the then Challis Professor of Philosophy at the University of Sydney, addressing its annual meeting, made an impassioned but totally unheeded (for 47 years) plea for the introduction of sociology into Australian universities. (34)

---


The 1960s in Australia was a period dominated by the elements of change from, rather than continuity with, the fifties; change that was actively sought or resisted by a few, passively experienced by most. Those who sought to change their society, or those elements of it with which they were dissatisfied, used means (sometimes borrowed from overseas) which themselves represented departures from the past. Electoral politics had not only proved to be an unsuccessful and frustrating method of trying to bring about change, but also one which was becoming increasingly inappropriate to achieving the less concrete goals implied by the phrase 'human liberation' which were emerging toward the end of the decade. For the bulk of the Australian population, however, the changes of the sixties happened to and around them. The mass media told them about themselves and their children and whether they were horrified, delighted, concerned, or simply bored, by what they were told is probably less important than the increased exposure to the new range of possibilities that the decade brought.

Two of the issues that were to be of major concern to the sexual liberation movements in the early seventies, the legal status of abortion and male homosexuality, were two of the subjects (prostitution was the third) of a public opinion survey conducted in 1967 by Paul Wilson and Duncan Chappell (35); on both issues, it was the first time ever that Australians (sample - surveyed nation wide) had been asked for their opinions. When presented with the statement "Abortions should not be legal or allowed under any circumstances" and asked whether they agreed or not, 64% of the respondents disagreed, 27% agreed, 7% were unsure, and 2% declined to respond. When questioned about the circumstances under which they considered abortion should be legal or allowed, 66% said it should be legal if the mother's life were in danger, 60% if the mother had been raped, 53% where there was a danger that the child would be mentally or physically deformed, and 19% where the mother was financially unable to support the child(36). This last circumstance was the closest of the alternatives offered to any consideration of socio-economic reasons as legitimate grounds for legal abortions; but it was a long way off what was to become the Women's Liberation demand for 'Abortion on Demand'. When the sample was broken down by age and sex, Wilson and Chappell found that between the ages of 16 and 45 more women than men were in favour of legal abortions, but that, over the age of 45 more men than women favoured legal abortions. (37)
With respect to homosexuality, respondents were asked to consider the statement - "It should no longer be an offence for consenting males to engage in homosexual acts in private". The authors reported that 64% of their sample disagreed with the statement, 22% agreed, 12% were unsure, and 2% declined to answer. (38) In contrast to the statement about abortion, there were no correlations between age and sex and agreement/disagreement with this statement. With both statements, however, more liberal attitudes were associated with higher educational levels. (39)

The sexual liberation movements were thus to emerge in a climate of general public opinion that was substantially opposed to two of their less radical demands - changes in laws with respect to abortion and male homosexual behaviour.

ON THE USE OF SOME TERMS.

There is a group of words used throughout the literature on the sexual liberation movements which can be quite confusing because different authors use the same words in different ways. It is worthwhile at this point to clarify the senses in which I will be using these same terms in what follows.

When I use the phrases 'women's movement' and 'homosexual movement' I will be using the word 'movement' in a very general sense. It will be a major concern of subsequent chapters to examine whether or not these movements do in fact fit the social science model of a social movement. 'Women's movement' is a generic term covering, in Australia, the two groupings known as Women's Liberation and the Women's Electoral Lobby (WEL). There are, of course, innumerable other women's groups which could, depending on the criteria used, be classified as part of the women's movement. Some 143 of these are listed in the National Library of Australia's Select List of Women's Organizations in Australia as at 1975. (40) Many of these groups would themselves not like to be considered to be part of the women's movement, others would. They are excluded here on the grounds of their irrelevance to the subject matter. There is a second set of women's groups which often claim to be part of the women's movement, indeed the 'real' women's movement (without specifying whether the adjective 'real' is meant to qualify the word women or the word movement), the 'true heirs to the women's emancipation movement'. These are primarily women associated with The Festival of Light and the Community Standards Organization and The Right to Life Association and they will not be included as part of the women's movement either. The decision is not entirely arbitrary: for most of the time period covered by the thesis these organizations did not formally exist; they were in fact formed, and continue to justify their existence, as reactions to the changes being sought and at times wrought by the liberation movements; and their primary aim is not the liberation; nor even the emancipation, of women but rather the preservation of the family and standards of Christian morality and the prevention of the legalization (or ready availability) of abortion. (41)

(38) Ibid. p 13. In this case the authors are on safer ground with their interpretation of the results because the statement tells those respondents who did not already know that homosexual acts are an offence and agreement with the statement does imply support for (or at least non-opposition to) law change.

(39) Ibid. p 9 and p 13.

(40) NATIONAL LIBRARY OF AUSTRALIA: Select List of Women's Organizations in Australia. Canberra. February, 1975. It lists, with state branches given separately, 19 church organizations, 60 community organizations, 15 organizations concerned with the status of women, 16 professional organizations, 5 political organizations, 21 social organizations, and 7 sporting organizations.

(41) The initial aims of the Australian Festival of Light, adopted when FOL committees were formed in Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide in May, 1973, were based on the aims of the British FOL. These were changed at the first National Festival of Light Conference in Canberra in November, 1974, and much more specific emphasis placed in the Australian aims on the preservation of the family. Aims stated in THE AUSTRALIAN FESTIVAL OF LIGHT: Background Sheet. Undated, unauthorised leaflet. circa October, 1976. The Australian Right to Life Association first began to stir "in 1969 when legislation governing the existing laws on abortion were being discussed in South Australia". The first formal Right to Life Group was established in Queensland in September.
As with the term 'women's movement', when I use the term 'homosexual movement' it is in the general sense and covers the Campaign Against Moral Persecution (CAMP) and Gay Liberation.

There is then the important list of adjectives applied to groups, ideas, individuals, tactics, programmes for action, aims, and goals; words such as 'reformist', 'reformism', 'revolutionary', 'radical' and 'militant'. At times it seems as though the words are used more as instruments of intellectual abuse than as means of conveying any descriptive content - apart, perhaps, from the message that the user does not approve of the person, idea, or whatever, to which the adjective is being applied.

Using the Concise Oxford English Dictionary (42) as a starting point, it is relatively easy to clarify what is meant by militant - an adjective meaning engaged in warfare, combative. In politics, it is most commonly used to refer to tactics employed, or styles of action followed, and, in the Australian context, especially to trade union tactics. There is thus Alan Reid’s six part series entitled “The Militants” which discussed those Australian trade unions most likely to adopt confrontationist, uncompromising, and, at times, violent, means to achieve their goals. (43) Similarly, there is Ralph Summy’s distinction between militant and moderate tactics in the Australian peace movement, 1960-1967. (44) Militant tactics are characterized as: a reluctance to compromise in seeking to achieve a maximum set of demands (moderates seek incremental demands by bargaining); advocacy of direct confrontation with authority (moderates abide by the rules and utilize established intermediary institutions to make bargains with authority); aggressive proselytizing at the ‘grass roots’ in order to form a ‘popular’ power base which can challenge authority (moderates are more interested in persuading influential members of society of the worthiness of their claims). This then is the sense in which the word militant will be used: to denote a particular style of action or tactic, (not ideas, programmes, or goals)—combative, uncompromising, confrontationist.

The distinction between the words radical and revolutionary is at times very difficult to discern and in much of the literature the two words appear to be used interchangeably. (45) According to the Oxford English Dictionary, radical means of the root, affecting the foundations, going to the root. Thus, when applied to the noun change, as it quite commonly is, a radical change in society, for example, would be one which affected the foundations of society — what you consider to constitute the foundations of society is quite another matter. Revolution is defined as a complete change, a fundamental reconstruction, so that a revolutionary change in society would mean much the same thing as a radical change. Subtle differences in meaning enter because revolution as a noun also indicates a process whereby change is achieved. It has connotations of action, of violence, and, thanks to Marx and Engels, strong economic overtones. One feminist writer after another uses the adjectives radical and revolutionary almost, but not quite, interchangeably. There are some words with which one adjective seems to fit more comfortably than the other: you could have a ‘revolutionary analysis’ but a ‘radical analysis’

1970 and the NSW group in April, 1973. The stated aims of the organization mask their almost total preoccupation with opposition to abortion. See A Summary of the Origins, the Formation, the Aims, Objects and Achievements of the National Right to Life Association. Unauthorized, undated, roneoed, booklet. circa 1976.

(44) SUMMY, Ralph: op. cit. p 149.
(45) The only place I have seen it clearly specified by an author that they were going to use the words interchangeably is in OSMOND, Warren :“Towards Self-Awareness” in GORDON, Richard: op. cit. p 167. fn 1.
somehow sounds better, perhaps for no other reason than that it is more familiar. The American feminist writer Charlotte Bunch, for example,(46) without ever specifying whether she sees any difference between the two words (and no difference is discernible from the contexts in which they are used) writes of radical trends, radical analysis and radical rhetoric and of feminist revolutionary process, revolutionary ideology and revolutionary women’s goals. The Australian political scientist Thelma Hunter(47) uses radical to qualify the words restructuring, feminist, feminism, changes, programme, egalitarianism and women; she uses the word revolutionary with the words context, components, tenor, feminism, implications, theory, ferment, and nature - again, without ever specifying any difference which may exist between the two. Perhaps because of the long association of the word revolutionary with changes in the economic or class structure of a society, perhaps because the word also refers to the process of change while radical is used to refer more often to acts or types of change which are not necessarily of an obvious economic nature, the two words convey different images. Revolutionary conjures up images of theories which not only explain why conditions (usually economic) in existing societies are the way they are, but also include visions of a better society. Combined with this is an almost built-in moral imperative to action, to working toward creating this better society, complete with instructions on how to get from now to then. The images are of theories, blueprints, programmes, strategies, and plans; everything worked out in advance. What distinguishes the word radical is the absence of these images of theories, programmes, and the like, and in this sense it is a more neutral word. In what follows I will use both of these terms as sparingly as possible because of the confusion that their use engenders; when I do use them, it will be in the senses outlined immediately above.(48)

The distinction between the words reform and revolution is fairly easy to make; when difficulties do arise it is when people try to weigh up the likely consequences of a particular action in terms of its reformist or revolutionary potential. The Oxford English Dictionary definition of revolutionary has already been given and when compared with the definition of reform there would seem to be little reason for any confusion: reform means the removal of abuse(s) in politics, improvements made or suggested, it means to make better by the removal or abandonment of imperfections, faults, or errors. There is no mention of fundamental change or reconstruction. In politics, the implications are clear: to be a reformist implies an acceptance of the political system as basically sound but in need of some improvements, the removal of some imperfections; to be a revolutionary implies a belief that the political system is unsound and in need of basic reconstruction. Thus we have Hunter characterizing feminist reformists as “those who seek equality through existing social economic and political arrangements”(49); or Bunch stressing the importance of clearly distinguishing between a reform which is “any proposed change that alters the conditions of life in a particular area” (50) and reformism, which is the particular ideological position which claims that “women’s liberation can be achieved by a series of changes that brings us equality within the existing social, economic and political order” (51) or Mercer stating the position of the Women’s Electoral Lobby:

WEL is a reformist movement which accepts some of the present purposes and methods of the existing order but wishes to modify specific attitudes and institutions . . . The majority of middle-class women who formed WEL’s initial membership do not want revolution - they have too much to lose.(52)

(48) There is one point to be made about the differential use of the two terms in the titles of Women’s Liberation groups: radical is used much more frequently than revolutionary. There are groups known as Radical Feminists, Radical Lesbians, and so on and those groups which do use Radical as part of their name are more likely to focus their attention on patriarchy than on capitalism as the system most in need of change.
The difficulty really arises when an attempt is made to sort out whether particular demands or actions are, as Harding puts it, "merely reforms" or "truly revolutionary". (53) The simple answer has to be that you cannot know in advance whether or not a particular reform, such as abortion law repeal, sought from within the existing system will contribute to a fundamental reconstruction of that system which could take place at some future time. Harding, in her excellent paper on the futility of trying to maintain the reform/revolutionary dichotomy in feminist politics, argues that it is an artificial one. (54) Summers, in similar vein, is unwilling to underestimate the importance of some of the reforms demanded by feminists: she considers reforms such as the provision of child care facilities, or equal educational opportunities to be preconditions for female liberation. (55) In what follows I will use the term reform to mean a change within the framework of the existing political system and will avoid labelling actions or demands as either reformist or revolutionary. Where groups, individuals, demands and so on have been called reformist or revolutionary by others or themselves I will, of course, leave these as labelled because they are important indicators of perceived differences within and between parts of the movements.

There are four other terms which are in common use within the women's movement and which cause a great deal of confusion: these are sexism, patriarchy, male supremacy, and male chauvenism. The clearest definition of sexism is to be found in the newsletter of the Hobart Women's Action Group in 1974. Analogous to racism, sexism refers to a division made between people on genital/sexual grounds which goes beyond the simple biological classification and into the area of suppositions about personality, ability, equality etc. It is about a series of alleged differences extrapolated from one basic biological difference. (56)

The political system through which sexism expresses itself today is one of male dominance which is referred to as patriarchy. As Summers writes:

\[
\text{Men occupy dominant positions in all important political, economic and cultural institutions and are able to control the lives of some other men and all women.} \quad (57)
\]

Male supremacy refers to the institutional expression of sexism within a patriarchy; male chauvenism refers to the individual expression of sexism within a patriarchy.

---

(49) HUNTER, Thelma: *op. cit.* p 321.
(50) BUNCH, Charlotte: *op. cit.* p 38.
(51) Ibid.
(54) Ibid. pp 271-284.

There are many ways of approaching the subject of the origins of the Sydney Sexual Liberation Movements. One could, for example, ask why they emerged when they did and not five years earlier or two years later, or go on a search back through time looking for specific signs or causes of their imminent or distant emergence. Anne Summers, for example, writes

> it is impossible to say exactly when the new-wave feminist movement in Australia had its origins. Quite possibly it was during World War II when, for the first time, large numbers of women experienced a relative freedom in jobs and wages which they had to give up when the servicemen returned from the front. (58)

There is, implicit in Summers' suggestion about the origins of the new wave feminist movement, a hypothesis about the causes of social movements. It is one which is similar to that put forward by James Davies to explain when revolution occurs - "when a prolonged period of objective economic and social development is followed by a short period of sharp reversal". (59)

Some writers look on rising expectations alone as the cause of the emergence of the new feminist movement (60), others have looked for possible socio-economic sources of social strain. Ferris for example, in the United States, found this strain hypothesis unfruitful and was forced to conclude that "from the close perspective of 1970, events of the past decade provide evidence of no compelling cause of the rise of the new feminist movement." (61)

When, where, and how the search for the origins or causes of the emergence of the women's movement is conducted will be influenced by how it is seen, as a social movement, or pressure group, for example. Whether the content of its goals is of secondary importance to the eufunction it serves for the society as a whole, as David Lynn has suggested, is a question which will entail an entirely different type of search. (62) The search for causes, for 'roots', for origins, is one which will not be undertaken here; it is largely irrelevant to my present purpose.


(59) DAVIES, James, C.: "Towards a Theory of Revolution" American Sociological Review. Vol 27 No. 1. Feb. 1962. Davies means by revolution, "violent civil disturbances that cause the displacement of one ruling group by another that has a broader popular base for support." Fn 3 p 6. Davies claims that his theory of revolution is an attempt to synthesize and place in proper time sequence the theories of Marx, that progressive degradation leads to revolt, and of de Toqueville, that rising expectations based on some real improvements leads to revolt. See ALTMAN, Dennis: "Students in the Electric Age" 1970) in GORDON, Richard (ed): op. cit. pp 126-147 for three general views of the causes of student revolt: the conspiratorial which postulates the existence of a small group of manipulative leaders; the psychological which looks to Oedipal battles with authority figures and individual maladjustments; and the historical (in effect, only one variety of the historical, the rising expectations variety) which "views student revolt as a response to certain historical conditions, in particular, the apparent failure of the political system in a number of countries in the late sixties to respond to demands for change." p 127.

(60) See, for example, the testimony of women representing a variety of women's liberation groups to The New York City Commission on Human Rights of 21-25 September, 1970, published in the report of the Commission entitled Women's Role in Contemporary Society. Discus Books. New York. 1972. Betty Friedan, for example, cited rising expectations. Carol Vance of Columbia University cited the development of more effective contraceptives which enabled women more control over their reproductive role and hence a greater freedom to demand career roles, Corinne Coleman of Older Women's Liberation who cited the wider availability of education for women leading to rising expectations, and Diane Caruthers of the Radical Feminists who claimed that for many women working within the civil rights movement, there was a gradual recognition that they too were in need of a civil rights programme as women.


(62) "If the Women's Liberation movement did not exist, society would have to invent one to help awaken the nation to the necessity of undertaking the new adaptations demanded of it." LYN, David B.: "Determinants of Intellectual Growth" School Review. Vol 80 February, 1972 p 245 quoted in Jessie Bernard's Foreword (1973) to
I intend here to look at the beginnings, rather than the origins, of the sexual liberation movements, and to do this by seeking answers to a set of questions: who were the people who first started meeting together as, for example, Women's Liberation; when did they start meeting together; what did they do; where did they come from; and what did they bring with them.

Implicit in the questions posed above and, indeed, in many of the accounts of the beginnings of Women's Liberation in the United States, Great Britain, and in Canada, is the notion that the shape the new Women's Liberation movement took was greatly influenced by the past experiences that the women who 'founded' it brought to it. (63) Altbach, for example, writes of the American experience:

Although the women's movement is moving beyond the old constituencies of dissent, it still contains within itself almost the whole spectrum of ideology and strategy that the peace movement, the civil rights movement, the black power movement, the revolutionary youth movement, and the youth culture tried to, and to some extent, discarded in the 1960s. (64)

In the Australian case, to the range of experiences of the women who began Women's Liberation must be added the influence of the literature, ideas, and media images, of overseas Women's Liberation movements. (65)

It is extremely difficult to present a comprehensive picture of the early development of Sydney Women's Liberation. It involves, for purposes of clearer exposition, the artificial separation of the movement's growth into internal developments and external campaigns, which separation has the unfortunate consequence of masking the interplay between the two and the importance of each in the development of the other. It is much like trying to sort out the sexual politics of liberation from the politics of sexual liberation, the private from the public life, personal from political activity; to do so in some ways make writing about it easier, but what ends up being written about can only be a sum of the parts, never the whole.

In what follows the line between what is internal and what is external is at times drawn somewhat arbitrarily - on the basis of whichever of the two is the more relevant context in which to discuss the particular development. Conferences and Commissions are a case in point: they are open to the public, they are advertised, attract media coverage, occasionally produce public statements or sets of resolutions and demands to be made public, and usually result in an influx of new women to the movement; but, for the most part, they have been far more important for the internal development of the movement than as part of its external activities.


To claim, as some authors do, that Women's Liberation had its origins solely in the New Left (unless an extremely broad definition of New Left is used) not only denies the importance of the experiences women brought from their other involvements, but poses the interesting question of why the male dominated left which had absolutely nothing to say about women, did not want to know about the oppression of women, pelted those women who tried to raise the issue of women's oppression with the New Left with tomatoes, should be given credit for spawning Women's Liberation. Thus Marge Piercy wrote: "The Movement is supposed to be for human liberation: how come the condition of women inside it is no better than outside? We have been trying to educate and agitate around women's liberation for several years. How come things are getting worse?" PIERCY, Marge: "The Grand Coolie Damn." in MORGAN, Robin (ed): *Sisterhood is Powerful*. Vintage Books. New York. 1970. p 421.

(65) The same debt to the United States is acknowledged by both the Canadian and British women's movements: "The Canadian women's movement along with the Canadian left, has been guilty of the tendency to accept the American viewpoint" p 7; "The Women's Liberation movement in Canada generally continued to look to the writings of the American movement for the development of political analysis" p 11 both in CANADIAN WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL PRESS: *Women Unite! Canadian Women's Educational Press*. Toronto (1972) 1974. See ROWBOTHAM, Sheila: "The Beginnings of Women's Liberation in Britain" in WANDOR, Michele (Compiler): *The Body Politic - Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement in Britain, 1969-1972*. Stage 1. London. 1972. Rowbotham notes the vague rumours of the women's movement in America and Germany which had reached Great
By the end of 1972 Sydney Women's Liberation had engaged in several public campaigns over which it had attracted considerable media coverage; it had begun to produce its own periodicals; it had developed an autonomy from the male left of sufficient strength for parts of the left to feel concerned; (66) and it had had to contend with the emergence of the Women's Electoral Lobby. Internally, the growth of Sydney Women's Liberation in terms of both numbers and diversity meant that serious problems of structure, participation, organization and leadership had had to be faced, the same problems often taking different forms at different times.

Britain in 1968 and the very important Tufnell Park (London) group of predominantly American women. It is interesting to note, however, the acknowledgement, as an extremely important article for the beginnings of the American Women's Liberation movement, that American writers give to the British author Juliet Mitchell for her "Women: The Longest Revolution" which appeared originally in New Left Review No. 40, November-December 1966. Such an acknowledgement is given to Mitchell in, for example, CARDEN, Maren Lockwood: op. cit. p 69.

(66) The reaction of the left to the emergence of the women's movement in the United States was similar and interpreted by Altbach as follows: "The new left, fragmented and at least temporarily in disarray, gave up its initial resistance and embraced feminism as its last rallying cry. The women's movement offered women and men on the left one last cause, one last renewal of theory and action for their political and personal lives." ALTBACH, Edith Hoshino: op. cit. p 129.

1968

Unsuccessful attempt to start women's group.

1969

December

Mon 15 December

First ad hoc meetings of Women's Liberation held in Balmain. Balmain group. Anti-Vietnam War Demonstration at which Only the Chains Have Changed leaflets were handed out announcing the inaugural public meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation.

1970

Wed 14 January

Inaugural public meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation, 7:30 p.m. at 64A Druitt Street, Sydney.

February

Formation of campus Women's Liberation groups at the Universities of Sydney, New South Wales, and Macquarie University.

Mon 11 May

Heatherbrae abortion clinic raided by police. Staff arrested.

Sat 16 - Mon 18 May


Wed 27 May

First public meeting of coalition (later named Campaign for Legal Abortion) of groups formed to change abortion laws. University of Sydney.

Tues 2 June

First demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women’s Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial.

Sat 13 - Mon 15 June

NSW State ALP Conference outside which Sydney Women’s Liberationists hand out leaflets Women and the ALP.

Tues 23 June

First public meeting of group for Rights of the Unborn opposed to abortion law reform at which members of the coalition tried to intervene.

June

Beginnings of political fights for 'control' of the Glebe group.

Thurs 9 July

Public meeting of Campaign for Legal Abortion. University of Sydney.

Sun 12 July

Sydney Women’s Liberation organize public forum on abortion. University of Sydney.

July

First edition of Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter.

July

First (of only two) edition of Women's Liberation Movement National Newsletter.

Sun 12 July

First meeting of Working Women's Group. Fivedock.

Mon 17 August

Second demonstration of coalition and Sydney Women's Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial; and poster parade.

Thurs 20 August

Women's Liberation demonstration against Sexism in the Public Service.

Fri 4 September

Campaign for Legal Abortion Public Meeting. Teachers Federation Auditorium.

Mon 7 September

Third demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women’s Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial.

Fri 18 September

Front lawn Sydney University Vietnam Moratorium meeting at which Kate Jennings delivered speech attacking male left.
Fourth demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women's Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial.

Sydney Women's Liberationists paint slogans on windows of Waltons Department store.

Working Women's group meet at AIDC House.

Members of Working Women's Group raid Petersham Inn, Parramatta Road, Petersham to protest the hotel's refusal to serve women in the public bar.

Petersham Inn raided by Working Women's Group and other Sydney Women's Liberationists.

Motorcade and petition signature collection by Campaign for Legal Abortion.

Working Women's Group meet at Trade Union Club.

Fifth demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women's Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial.

Petersham Inn raided by Working Women's Group and other Sydney Women's Liberationists.

Abortion law reform leafletting in city during visit of Pope Paul.

Attempt to move General Meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation from 67 Glebe Point Road (where it had been meeting since February) to Trade Union Club.

General Meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation held at Trade Union Club.

Sixth demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women's Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial. Two leaflets: Abortion on Request and Abortion on Demand.

Working Women's Group leaflet outside staff entrance to Waltons Department store.

General meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation discusses proposals for organization of Sydney Women's Liberation.


End of fight for 'control' of Glebe group with announcement of formation of Bread and Roses group.

Formation of Art Workers for Liberation Group.

Formation of first Radical Therapy Group.

Formation of first Gay Liberation Group of Sydney Women's Liberation.

First meeting of Bread and Roses Group.

Sydney University Feminists Orientation Week activities include 'pub crawl' to those hotels refusing to serve women in their public bars.

Formation of North Sydney Group meeting at Mount St, North Sydney.
Friday 5 March
Working Women's Group protest at supermarket searches of shopping bags at Woolworths.

March
First edition of *Mejane* appears.

Tuesday 20 April
Abortion rallies on university campuses precede large demonstration outside Parliament House for presentation of petition with 9,000 signatures on abortion law repeal and free birth control centres. Parliament House invaded by demonstrators. Petition rejected.

April
SLUT Brigade retaliatory action against politicians who voted against acceptance of petition.

April
Glebe group plaster windows of Farmers Department store with posters and slogans asking *Who Makes the Most out of Mothers Day?*

April
Formation of Eastern suburbs group.

April
Formation of South Coast (Wollongong) group.

May
Sydney Women's Liberation contingent in May Day March.

Saturday 12 June
Sydney Women's Liberation demonstration for abortion law repeal outside NSW State ALP Conference at Sydney Town Hall.

Saturday 12 June
Working Women's Group demonstration at Flemmings Supermarket, Annandale in protest at searches of shoppers' bags.

Thursday 15 July
Formation of Liverpool Group of Sydney Women's Liberation.

Tuesday 27 July
Launching of Working Women's Group publication *What Every Woman Should Know.*

July
Formation of Sutherland (Caringbah) Group of Sydney Women's Liberation.

Saturday 28 - Sunday 29 August:

Mon 20 September
Seventh demonstration by coalition and Sydney Women's Liberation outside courts where Heatherbrae staff on trial.

October
Levine Ruling handed down and Heatherbrae staff acquitted.

October

October
Copies of *Mejane* seized from bookshops in Melbourne on grounds of alleged obscenity.

Sat 20 November
Abortion demonstration and march from Town Hall to Hyde Park where British actress Honor Blackman spoke in favour of abortion law repeal.

1972

Wed 19 January

Sat 29 - Sun 30 January
National Consultation of Women's Liberation in Sydney to discuss March Action Campaign.

Thurs 2 March
Public Debate on Abortion. Sydney Town Hall, Germaine Greer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues 7 March</td>
<td><em>MeJane</em> letters of protest to Colonel Sanders Kentucky Fried Chicken over offensive advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 11 March</td>
<td>First Sydney International Women’s Day March and rally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 23 March</td>
<td>Sydney Women’s Liberation demonstration outside ABC in protest at their refusal to screen film made of Town Hall Abortion Debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Sydney Women’s Liberation moves from 67 Glebe Point Road, Glebe to 25 Alberta Street, Surry Hills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 7 May</td>
<td>Sydney Women’s Liberation contingent in May Day March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 10 - Mon 12 June</td>
<td>National Women’s Liberation Conference. YWCA Liverpool Street, Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 15 – Sun 16 July</td>
<td>Child Care Seminar. Women’s Liberation House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 17 July</td>
<td>First ‘open’ meeting of Women’s Electoral Lobby in Sydney held at Women’s Liberation House. Alberta Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 24 July</td>
<td>“Public” birth of WEL (NSW) in Mosman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 26 July</td>
<td>Bread and Roses Group formally disbands itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Formation of Teachers Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Care Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Technical College Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Cove Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Pennant Hills Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manly Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Students Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Sydney Women’s Liberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td><em>MeJane</em> publishes first attack on Child Welfare System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 7 August</td>
<td>Women’s Abortion Action Campaign (WAAC) formed within Sydney Women’s Liberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 3 October</td>
<td>Demonstration outside NSW Parliament House as Cameron Motion for House to dissociate itself from those trying to legitimize abortion debated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 21 October</td>
<td>WAAC ‘Speak Out on Abortion’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 29 October</td>
<td>Sydney Women’s Liberation discussion on Women’s Liberation groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 31 October</td>
<td>Demonstration outside NSW Parliament House as Cameron Motion debated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Formation of Burwood Group of Sydney Women’s Liberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 4 November</td>
<td>Kids Lib Day at Women’s Liberation House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 9 November</td>
<td>First public screening of <em>Women’s Day - 20 Cents</em>. First Australian made Women’s Liberation film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 11 November</td>
<td>Equal Pay Demonstration - Ride the Buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>First issue of Women’s Studies Journal <em>Refractory Girl</em> appears.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During November-December 1969, ten to twelve women began to meet in Balmain, an inner city Sydney suburb. They discussed their position, the position of women in a male dominated society, particularly as that was reflected in sex role stereotyping and relationships within the family. They were mostly under 30, from middle class backgrounds, well educated, politically left of centre to varying degrees, and most had histories of political activism in one or other of the movements of the 1960s. What exactly it was that triggered an awareness in them that their roles as political activists were being circumscribed by the fact that they were women is difficult to say, but it was this awareness which drew them together. (67)

Two of the women who were involved in these early meetings (Margaret Greenland and Coonie Sandford) had recently returned from the United States; a third (Martha Kay) was an American herself, from a politically active family in Boston, and she had brought American Women's Liberation pamphlets with her when she came to Australia in 1969. (68) What was to become the first group of Sydney Women's Liberation met several times and drafted the leaflet Only the Chains Have Changed (69) which outlined their thoughts on Women's Liberation and called interested women to a public meeting to be held on January 14, 1970.

At those very early meetings concerned with the drafting of the leaflet, patterns of interaction and ways of doing things, which were to become characteristic of Women's Liberation small groups, were formed: a strong element of spontaneity; the admixture of personal experience and political ideas, not only independently important but also essentially inseparable; the lack of adherence to formal meeting procedures and structure, and the chaos, sometimes productive, sometimes not, in which that can end; the emphasis on working collectively and co-operatively within the group rather than in competition with one another, on having many women speak rather than a single spokeswoman; a personal enthusiasm and commitment that can come only from a sense of fighting for your own liberation, not somebody else's; (70) and a streak of evangelistic euphoria which produced a conviction that if other women were simply 'told', they too would experience a 'conversion'. (71)

Only the Chains Have Changed was handed out at an Anti-Vietnam War demonstration held on December 15, 1969. The leaflet posed the question "Why Women's Liberation?" and in the answers given are reflected the preoccupations of some of those who drew it up – the roots of women's oppression lay in capitalism. Indicative of the other political involvements of the authors, and of the need to make the leaflet relevant to the people to whom it was being distributed, was the linking of the struggle of women to the struggle of the Vietnamese people contained on the last page of the leaflet.


(70) See HANISCH, Carol: "Hard Knocks: Working for Women's Liberation in a Mixed (Male-Female) Movement Group" in FIRESTONE, Shulamith (ed): Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation. New York. 1970, pp59-63. "In other people's struggles you control your commitment - that is, you can get out when you want to. When you are fighting your own oppression, you can't get out. You can change from fighting as an individual to fighting with your group (and maybe back to fighting as an individual) but you can't stop struggling." p 60.

(71) See Martha Kay in TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light. op. cit. pp 1 - 3.
The public meeting which the leaflet announced was held at 7:30 p.m., on Wednesday 14 January, 1970 at 64A Druitt Street in the city of Sydney. The 90 or so women who attended that meeting heard several different women speak for a few minutes each on why they were involved in Women's Liberation. And from that meeting Sydney Women's Liberation began to grow. (72)

1 EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES.

In looking at the external activities of Sydney Women's Liberation during the period 1970-1972 it is possible to see the development of three broad types of approach to the issues with which the new movement concerned itself:

(1) There was a series of issues which Sydney Women's Liberation took up and with which it not only continued to concern itself but which were gradually broadened to incorporate related matters. Of this type of approach there were three major examples:

(a) the campaign to repeal the abortion laws which was begun in 1970 was broadened in 1971 to incorporate the demand for free contraceptive centres and the provision of adequate information and advice on contraception and in 1972 to begin to cover the much wider areas of women's sexuality and women's overall physical and mental health;

(b) the 1970 campaign for equal pay was broadened in 1971 and 1972 to include a wider discussion of the nature of women's work and the participation of women in trade unions;

(c) the very early agitation for adequate community child care facilities was broadened in 1971 and 1972 to incorporate a wider discussion on the needs of children, the attacks on the state system of child welfare and the beginnings of the fight against sexism in education.

(2) There was a series of 'protest action' campaigns directed at specific areas of complaint and of relatively short duration; they were confrontationist actions which were repeated rather than broadened. The 1970 raids on the Petersham Inn in protest at their refusal to serve women in the public bar, the 1971 protests at the supermarket practice of searching shoppers' bags, and the 1972 protests at the offensive advertising of Colonel Sanders Kentucky Fried Chicken are examples of this type of approach.

(3) There were a series of actions which were not directly aimed at changing the system but which were aimed, because of the inadequacies of the system, at establishing alternatives to it. To the end of 1972 the most important examples of this type of approach were in:

(a) the area of an 'alternative women's media': the establishment of the newspaper Mejane in 1971 and of the women's studies journal Refractory Girl in 1972; the publication of contraceptive information in What Every Woman Should Know in 1972; the production and reproduction of Women's Liberation literature by the Literature Committee/Words for Women Group; and the making of the first Australian Women's Liberation film, Women's Day - 20 Cents in 1971-1972. All of these provided women with the opportunity (born of necessity) not only to learn new skills but also to develop and share alternative analyses of reality - past and present;

(b) the area of alternative systems of support through the establishment of consciousness raising groups and more particularly the radical therapy groups;

(c) the beginnings of an alternative health care network with the setting up of Control, the abortion referral service.

(72) See Martha Kay in TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light, op. cit. pp 2-3. Ward's recollection, on the same programme, that the January 1970 meeting took place on a Sunday is inaccurate.
(1) Broadening Campaigns.

(a) Abortion Law Repeal:

On 11 May, 1970, the New South Wales Police raided the Heatherbrae Clinic, where abortions were being performed, in Bondi, Sydney, and arrested medical staff and patients; three doctors were charged. (73) The arrests and the subsequent court appearances of the doctors, which provided focal points for specific activities, gave Sydney Women's Liberation major political campaign issue for 1970—abortion law repeal. Throughout 1970, Sydney Women's Liberation worked (with increasing difficulty) both within a coalition of groups and in its own right on the campaign to repeal the laws. It produced and distributed its own leaflets and posters as well as distributing those of the coalition; its members participated in coalition organized public meetings and demonstrations, as well as organizing their own. The coalition, formed on 27 May 1970 with individuals from the Humanists, the Abortion Law Reform Association (ALRA), Women's Liberation, the Australian Labor Party (ALP), the Australia Party, the Liberal Party, and the Communist Party of Australia (CPA), could initially not agree on a name for the coalition nor on a specific aim beyond “the right of women to decide when and in what circumstances they would have children”. (74) During 1970 six major demonstrations and one motorcade and petition signature collecting exercise were organized. Most of the demonstrations were held outside the courts where the cases against the Heatherbrae doctors were being heard. Activities included demonstrations which varied from simply grouping outside the courts (2 June 1970), to poster parades (17 August 1970), to marches from the courts to the State Office Block to see state politicians (7 September 1970), to handing out leaflets attacking the Roman Catholic Church and Pope Paul during his visit to Sydney (10 November 1970) and finally, to invading the courts (15 December 1970). (75) Placards carried during the demonstrations read:

ABORTION LAWS PUT ALL WOMEN ON TRIAL!
A FOETAL LIFE IS NOT OF THE SAME VALUE AS A WOMAN'S DESIRE NOT TO GIVE BIRTH.
A WOMAN'S BODY IS NOT STATE OR CHURCH PROPERTY.
FREE WOMEN — FREE ABORTION.
REPEAL ALL ABORTION LAWS.
ENFORCE INHUMANE, OUTDATED, ABORTION LAWS?
NO! REPEAL THEM!
WOMEN DO NOT INCriminate YOURSELVES. DO NOT GIVE EVIDENCE.
YOUR WOMB IS YOURS. NOT THE STATE’S.

Leaflets distributed during 1970 attacked the state, the church, and the New South Wales Police Force. (76)

(73) In fact, in October 1971, all three doctors were acquitted by Judge Levine and since that time what is known the Levine Ruling has governed the conditions under which abortion in NSW is allowable—if one doctor has an honest belief, on reasonable economic, social or medical grounds, that the abortion is necessary. See SYNEP, Emmi: “Abortion Laws in Australia” Right to Choose. No. 10. March, 1976, p 6.


(75) The women who invaded the courts were wearing pinafores (designed by Julia Freebury of ALRA) with slogans painted on them over their clothes. The judge’s ultimatum that the women “either remove their apparatus or leave the court” caused some amusement.

(76) For example STEVENS, Joyce (Printer and Publisher): Morality and the Law. Undated leaflet. Sydney, Circa November 1970. Document No. 5; CAMPAIGN FOR THE ABOLITION OF ALL LAWS AGAINST ABORTION: Abortion is a Right, Not a Crime. Undated leaflet. Sydney, Circa August, 1970. Document No. 6 LUXEMBURG, R (Pseud. Authorizer): Police Terrorize Women. Undated leaflet. Sydney, Circa August, 1970. Document No. 7. This last document reports cases of women being picked up by police as they left abortion clinics after having had abortions and being interrogated by the police and examined by doctors at hospitals. It is worth noting at this point that many Women’s Liberation publications (especially the more libellous ones) were and are authorized by fictitious persons. Perhaps the busiest Women’s Liberationist in Sydney, in terms of the number of leaflets and publications she has authorized and the number of times she has been arrested is...
It was in September of 1970 that those members of Sydney Women's Liberation who had been participating in the coalition (which had eventually settled on the name Campaign for the Abolition of All Laws Against Abortion and shortened it to Campaign for Legal Abortion) withdrew. Tensions had arisen partly because of the way W.L. chose its speaker for the public meeting [of September 4] and the form of that speech, partly because money paid into W.L. for the campaign was not paid over, partly because W.L. members felt the Campaign was not sufficiently contacting and consulting them, and partly because Campaign meetings were poorly organized . . . (77)

There were differences over the stance which should be adopted both between the Campaign and Sydney Women's Liberation and within Sydney Women's Liberation itself. These differences were reflected, in part, in the argument over whether the demand should be for 'Abortion on Request' or 'Abortion on Demand'. The Campaign opted for the milder 'Abortion on Request' as did some women within Sydney Women's Liberation. Other Liberationists, angry that control of women's bodies was in the hands of male parliamentarians adopted the slogan 'Abortion on Demand' to emphasize that point.

On Tuesday 20 April 1971 there were large meetings of 500 people on the front lawn of Sydney University and at the University of New South Wales on the issue of abortion law repeal; people from both universities then moved down town to join the main body of demonstrators outside the NSW Parliament House. The occasion was the presentation of a petition demanding abortion on request and free birth control centres with 9,000 signatures on it to the Legislative Assembly of the NSW Parliament by the Labor MLA George Peterson. Women's Liberation and ALRA had combined forces both to collect the signatures and for the demonstration in support of Peterson. Some of the demonstrators had managed to get into the public gallery of the House and at the appropriate moment produced banners and demanded to know when abortion was going to be legalized. After they had been forcibly removed and order restored to the House, Peterson moved to present his petition. For the first time in 56 years a petition was rejected. With only 15 of Peterson's Labor Party colleagues voting for the petition's acceptance, the prospect for abortion law repeal was very slim. (78)

In August of the preceding year, the NSW Liberal State Premier Askin had declared that there would be no change to the abortion laws while ever he led the state government and the fairly strongly Catholic based Labor Party opposition was not very different in its attitude from the Liberals. On 8 September 1970 Peterson had been refused permission by the State ALP Parliamentary Caucus to introduce a private member's bill on the question of abortion law repeal. Federally, the Labor Party was in opposition too, but its leader, Gough Whitlam, had declared to a Labor Party Women's Conference on 1 September 1970, that he would support a 'free' or conscience vote on the repeal of the abortion laws. As far as Peterson was concerned, the matter did not end with the rejection of the petition: on April 20, the evening of its presentation to Parliament, a special meeting of the NSW Parliamentary Labor Party was called and the 15 Labor MLAs, especially Peterson, were reprimanded. (79)

Vera Figner. In real life, Vera Figner (1852-1943) cut a romantic figure as having been tried and sentenced to death, with 13 others in 1884, for having made and thrown the bomb which killed the Russian Czar, Alexander II; her death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. The use of the names of historical or literary women serves more than the one function of enabling people to avoid prosecution; it also provides a source of amusement to 'those in the know' who read in the newspapers that Doris Lessing, writer of Glebe, or Rosa Luxemburg, of Leichhardt, have been arrested yet again; and it is a subtle dig at men in general and the police in particular, their punishment for not knowing enough about women to detect deception.

(77) FREEBURY, Julia, DODDERIDGE, Pat and ROBERTSON, Mavis: op. cit. p 2
(79) Ibid.
Nor did the matter end there as far as Sydney Women's Liberation was concerned. The SLUT Brigade (Sisters in Liberation Union of Terrorists), a small group of the Glebe group, were spurred into retaliatory action. They visited the homes of the Labor MLAs who had voted against the petition's acceptance and the home of the state Labor leader, Pat Hills, was singled out for special attention. The walls outside his home were painted with signs which informed his neighbours of his 'particular crime'; the footpath and road outside his house were likewise lettered and at each end of the block, arrows pointing in the direction of his house and giving its number, were painted. The intention was to humiliate these men where they lived, not where they worked and could hide behind the mask of public office.

Another demonstration was held on Monday 20 September outside the courts where the Heatherbrae doctors were still on trial. In October 1971 they were finally acquitted by Judge Levine and the judgement he handed down widened considerably the grounds on which a woman could seek an abortion in NSW – but the laws remained on the statute books unchanged.\(^{(80)}\)

The campaign for the repeal of the abortion laws had already been broadened, as the demands of the Peterson petition indicated, to include free birth control centres, contraceptives, and contraceptive information. In 1971 it was illegal to advertise contraceptives and there was a (federally collected) luxury sales tax on oral contraceptives. Adequate information about the use of contraceptives was virtually non-existent. The demand for the Women's Liberation booklet on methods of contraception which the Working Women's Group produced and launched under the title *What Every Woman Should Know* on 27 July 1971, together with the commotion that followed its release, was indicative both of a tremendous area of need and of opposition to that need being met – at least by Women's Liberation.

Borrowing the idea from South Australia's Women's Liberation Movement, the Working Women's Group put together a booklet which would "explain in simple terms, how to prevent pregnancy, what to do about it and ... some of the other areas of women's health that are never talked about.\(^{(81)}\) It was produced for free distribution to female high school students and for sale.\(^{(82)}\) By November, 1971, the Working Women's Group had distributed 6,200 copies of the booklet and had ordered another 10,000 to be printed. The February 1972 edition of the group's newsletter, *Virago*, reported that they had received orders from Angus and Robertson (major booksellers) who wanted 500 copies, the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital which wanted 100 copies for their first year nursing students and from the Association of Justices of the Peace.\(^{(83)}\) Other reactions were less positive:

> What with police cars cruising around schools, police questioning us outside schools, and on one occasion, even searching a handbag, the abortion squad calling at some of our homes, TV cameras waiting at schools, being mentioned in State Parliament, the subject of several talk-back programmes, etc., we've raised quite a stir.\(^{(84)}\)

There was one quarter of the community from which the Working Women's Group received a response which was not entirely unpredictable. A letter from the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners commended the booklet in general but complained that it advised people to


\(^{(82)}\) For some of the positive feedback the group got see *Mejane* No. 5. November, 1971. p 3.


go to family planning clinics or specialists rather than to general practitioners; and they requested
a meeting to discuss the booklet. At that meeting, which was held on the evening of 23
November 1971 at Humanist House, there were some 70 people present, of whom about 9 were
doctors. The doctors came in for considerable criticism as women recounted their personal
experiences of seeking contraceptive advice from general practitioners who were both inexpert
and moralistic. The booklet had advised women to go to specialists because, while women
suffered at the hands of specialists too, they at least had had more training than the one lecture
on family planning given in 5th year medical school to general practitioners. The doctors were
told that they should accept responsibility for inadequate contraceptive advice — that is, be
prepared to terminate unwanted pregnancies which resulted from that advice.

The campaign was now being broadened to incorporate criticisms of the medical profession
in general and of medical education, criticisms which were published in Mejane along with
criticisms of the treatment of women by psychiatrists. It was also widening into a discussion
of the nature of female sexuality. The next booklet which the Working Women's Group planned
to produce was to be on female sexuality.

The campaign was continued on a variety of levels in 1972. On Saturday 20 December, 1971
there had been a march of about 200 people through the streets of Sydney in support of
demands for abortion law repeal and free contraceptive centres — in the rain. The march
was to end with a rally in Hyde Park. With the mixture of astuteness as to how to ensure media
coverage of a demonstration and the lack of organization which was not uncommon in the early
days of Sydney Women's Liberation, the rally in Hyde Park proceeded in the rain:

Joyce Stevens: I remember that demonstration. I arrived at the park with her
[British actress Honor Blackman], the speaker. I had nothing to do with the
organization of that thing, and when we got there everybody said, ‘we’ve for
nobody to chair the meeting... so would you do it?’... By the time anything
took place there weren’t many people left. If Honor Blackman hadn’t been
there, there wouldn’t have been anybody there.

Sue Bellamy: A couple of scrawny reporters stayed on for Honor Blackman.
It was in the news but she got more coverage when she arrived. That’s how
we got onto her, because she made some statement about having had an abortion.

(85) Ibid.
“Mother’s Little Helper” at p 6; “Beware of Doctors” at p 7 and [KELLY] GALE: “The Gentle

(88) Virago. No. 2. November 1971 p 4. The booklet never actually appeared. There were some tentative
explorations in Mejane of the subject matter of female sexuality. See GRAY, Colin: “Further Thoughts on
March, 1971 pp 12-13; [GARLICK] BEVERLEY: “Sex Outside the Laboratory” Mejane No. 4. September, 1971
p 9; [ROE] JILL: “Lesbian Love” Mejane No. 5. November, 1971 p 12. There were also two rather cautious
and ROE; JILL: “Lesbians are Women” pp 4-5 in Mejane No. 3. July, 1971. The irony of an article on lesbians
entitled “Greater Openness” and signed G.L. has not escaped the author herself who, in a footnote in an article
she published in 1974, acknowledged authorship. LYNCH, Lesley: “Myth Making in the Women’s Movement”,
Refractory Girl. No. 5. Summer 1974 pp 34-38, fn 6. Her use of G.L. is entirely understandable - she was a
school teacher at the time.

There was a similar march in Melbourne on the same day where the fine weather attracted more people. Both
Australian marches were timed to coincide with similar marches in the United States. See Sydney Women’s

Another ‘media personality’, Australian born author of The Female Eunuch,[91] Germaine Greer, was willing to lend her name to the abortion law repeal campaign on her return visit to Australia early in 1972. Her return and the publication of her book had attracted considerable media coverage of a sensationalist nature. [92] Greer raised the matter at her National Press Club luncheon in January 1972 and agreed to debate it at the Sydney Town Hall – provided Julia Freebury, whose idea it was, arrange everything. Freebury in fact found it very difficult to find anyone, especially from the Roman Catholic Church, which representative Greer had expressed particular interest in debating, to participate. On Thursday evening, 2 March, 1972, however, about 3,000 people packed into Sydney Town Hall to hear the debate which was filmed by an ABC television crew. I was among the other 2,000 or so people who had arrived too late (about half an hour before the debate was due to begin) and found themselves locked out and overflowing onto the footpath outside. Greer debated with Rev. Norman Webb, Bruce Smith, and Colin Clark the question of “Abortion - Right or Wrong?”. The film made by the ABC was to be shown in a special one hour fifteen minute edition of the ABC’s weekly current affairs programme, Four Corners, on Saturday 4 March, 1972. Suddenly, however, the ABC decided that Greer had been ‘over-exposed’, and that the film would not be shown after all. On Thursday 27 March, between 60 and 70 people demonstrated outside the ABC in protest at its refusal to screen the film. Coupons were placed in newspapers for people to cut out and send in to the ABC requesting that the film be shown. From NSW alone, 580 coupons and letters from 180 individuals were sent to the ABC – to no avail. [93] Julia Freebury herself wrote to the ABC asking permission to purchase the videotape of the debate, and was refused. [94]

In October 1972, Sydney Women’s Liberation was forced into taking defensive action with respect to abortion. On October 3, Jim Cameron, Liberal Party MLA for Northcott, was to move a motion:

That this House dissociates itself from the action of those seeking to legitimise abortions on demand and affirms its belief that such actions are unnecessary and repugnant to human dignity, the existing law in New South Wales being sufficiently flexible to deal with exceptional cases while defending the human rights of the foetus.[95]

The demonstration which centred around the theme of denying men, especially male politicians, the right to determine what rights women should or should not have, was attended by '150 women and some men', some on a float which drove through the city streets in the evening peak hour traffic. [96] Because the debate was adjourned, another demonstration was called for 31 October. In the meantime, members of the NSW Legislative Assembly were invited to discuss with women their views on “the questions of birth control and unwanted pregnancies” on the evening of Thursday 26 October and women were called to a day long “Women’s Speak Out for Abortion” on Saturday 21 October. [97] The demonstration on October 31 took the form of a “funeral

---

procession in memory of dead sisters who have been denied safe, legal abortion")(98) Cameron’s motion eventually lapsed without a vote being taken.

Throughout the entire period Women’s Liberationists helped women find doctors who would perform abortions: from the arrest of the Heatherbrae doctors in May, 1970 until they were acquitted in October, 1971, as individuals and in secret; and from late 1971 onwards, when Control, the Women’s Liberation abortion referral and contraceptive advice telephone service was started, as a group within Sydney Women’s Liberation.

(b) Women and Work:

Compared with the broadening of the campaign to repeal the abortion laws into related areas, the campaign which revolved around women in the workforce, equal pay, women in trade unions, and the nature of women’s work developed in a more haphazard fashion. Two factors probably account for this: first, the relatively good economic conditions into which the movement was born; and second, the absence of an event comparable to the arrest of the Heatherbrae doctors which could act as a pivot around which a campaign could be mounted and widened.

The fight for equal pay had, in fact, been going on in various parts of Australia long before Sydney Women’s Liberation was founded (99) but Women’s Liberation opened up a discussion on the wider aspects of women and work. The role of women in the workforce formed part of the first Sydney Women’s Liberation leaflet, Only the Chains Have Changed (100); one of the papers at the very first Women’s Liberation Conference, held in Melbourne in May, 1970 was Coonie Sandford’s “Women in the Workforce” which presented a fairly detailed analysis of the position of women in the workforce (101); the leaflet which was handed out to delegates to the NSW State ALP Conference in June 1970 explained why the concept of ‘equal pay for equal work’ was not going to get women anywhere, why the labour movement had to fight for ‘one rate for the job’ (102). But it was not until August, 1970 that Sydney Women’s Liberation was given something concrete against which to react publicly. The NSW State Public Service Board had advertised 60 vacancies in the daily newspapers and, by placing some positions under ‘Men and Boys’ and others under ‘Women and Girls’, had precluded women from applying for 30 of the 60 jobs and men from applying for 10. On Thursday morning, 20 August, 1970, a group of Women’s Liberationists marched through the city to the office of the NSW Public Service Board, handing out leaflets which protested about Sexism in Public Service (103) as

(97) Ibid. The Speak Out was organized by WAAC (Women’s Abortion Action Campaign) which had been formed in Sydney Women’s Liberation in August 1972. The date was chosen to coincide with the holding in New York of an International Tribunal on Abortion, Contraception and Forced Sterilization. Sydney adopted the whole range of discussion topics and this was the first time that the issue of abortion, broadened to cover contraception had been further widened to include forced sterilization. In the Australian context, however, forced sterilization, despite its importance to Aboriginal women, was not really integrated into the campaign over birth control.

(98) Ibid.


(100) WOMEN’S LIBERATION GROUP: Only the Chains Have Changed. op. cit.


they went. A delegation from the marchers sought to see the Chairman of the Public Service Board but had to accept a meeting with the Board’s Secretary instead. The Secretary informed them that the positions were not open to women because women did not want them. The delegation presented its demands and received an assurance that they would be passed on to the Board. (104) The action met with limited success – advertisements for Public Service vacancies reappeared in the newspapers excluding women from fewer occupations than they had done previously. (105)

The development of the area of women and work as a major area of concern was given a strong impetus in 1971. In each of the five issues of Mejane produced in that year an article on a particular type of women’s work was published. They were based on interviews with women who worked as housewives, nurses, machinists, secretaries, and cleaners: not the glamorous professions that are occasionally written up and glorified in the glossy women’s magazines, but those areas of work where most women are, in fact, employed. There were also news items and articles on women becoming members of the Builders Labourers Union, nurses superannuation schemes, how women were fired at Broken Hill because they were married, and women and work in industrial Wollongong. (106)

The Conference on Women at Work and Women in the Trade Unions which was held in Melbourne on the 28-29 August, 1971 was an important one not only because it represented the coming together of working women and women’s liberationists in a way that had not happened at the two previous conferences (107), and opened up a broader discussion, but also because it ended with a demonstration that highlighted, probably for the first time in a way that women wanted it to be, the rights of women to work in jobs that had traditionally been men’s and to get equal pay for the work that they were doing, given that those jobs might be equal to the jobs that men were doing. (108)

The Conference ranged over a wide spectrum of women’s work – housework, women in heavy industry, women on the production line, women in trade unions – with papers which presented a good deal of basic information in terms of detailed statistics on women in the labour force and women in trade unions. (109) The demonstration which followed the Conference was outside the ACTU Congress being held at the same time. Congress delegates were handed a leaflet which listed 17 items in an “Absolute minimum program” for unions to pursue with respect to women workers. (110)

(105) Ibid.
(106) Prior to the first edition of Mejane, reports on women and work had been published in the newsletter. For example M.L.[Gale] KELLY: “The Betrayal” on women working in the Qantas printing department, in Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter. August 1970. Apart from that, discussions of women and work had been restricted to within the movement such as at conferences and in group meetings and at different levels. Sandford’s paper op. cit., for example, was at a level of analysis much more abstract than the more experiential paper by BELLAMY, Sue: “Women in Factories” Paper delivered to Women’s Liberation Conference. 23-25 January 1971 and later published in the booklet Women at Work put out by Words for Women. Glebe. under the title of “Factory Work”. pp21-28.
(107) Zelda D’Aprano, a Melbourne woman who had, in October 1969, chained herself across the doors of the Commonwealth Building in Melbourne holding a placard demanding ‘One Rate Only’ of pay, had been a long time union activist and fighter for women’s rights, especially in the area of women and work. She considers this to have been the first national Women’s Liberation Conference, dismissing one of the previous ones (ignoring the other) on the grounds that it had been a “left wing women’s conference” and that the Women’s Action Committee which she, and several other Melbourne women, had founded in March 1970, had not been notified about it. The “left wing women’s conference” probably refers to the May 1970 Melbourne Conference as the January 1971 Sydney Conference was attended mainly by women from NSW. See D’APRANO, Zelda: op. cit. p 159.
(108) TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light op. cit. p 7.
Prior to the Conference and the demonstration, attempts by Sydney Women’s Liberation to make any headway, as far as women’s participation in trade unions and trade union concern for women was concerned, had been isolated and sporadic. It had also been restricted to ‘sympathetic’ unions such as the Builders Labourers which, on 8 March 1971, had joined up four Sydney women as members so that they could get the proper rate for the job. (111)

In 1972 the women and work campaign area focused more intensely on equal pay as a specific issue. After the June 1972 Conference in Sydney, amongst the plethora of new groups which appear after almost every conference or commission, was the Equal Pay Project Group. The overlap between it and the Working Women’s Group which was, for example, holding discussions around questions such as “Does arbitration help or hinder the case for equal pay?” (112) was so great that the two groups fused in November, 1972. Women from both groups held successful street meetings at various suburban shopping complexes where they handed out leaflets and spoke through loud hailing about equal pay.

In November 1972, the Australian wage fixing body, the Arbitration Commission, began sitting in Melbourne to hear, separately, two cases - a National Wage Case and an Equal Pay Case. At the time, only 18% of women workers received equal pay; the rest were being paid between 60% - 70% of the male wage. (113) On 3 November Melbourne Women’s Liberation made a submission to the Commission in the Equal Pay hearing and on Saturday 11 November Sydney Women’s Liberation organized a highly symbolic demonstration. After a rally outside the Sydney Town Hall, the demonstrators boarded buses and, because they only received 70% of the minimum male wage, they offered only 70% of the full bus fare - 7 cents instead of 10 cents.

Joyce Stevens: ..., we all got on the buses and absolutely flummoxed the bus conductresses and conductors ... Most of them refused to take our fares and so we rode around Sydney most of the morning not paying any fares and distributing our leaflets and talking to people about what we were doing and why we were doing it. (114)

The Arbitration Commission had not handed down its decision before the December 2, 1972 federal elections. That election saw a change in federal government and the new Labor Government sought to have the Equal Pay case re-opened and on December 13 the Commission agreed to their request. The new government’s brief was, rather appropriately, given to a woman, Mary Gaudron, who argued for equal pay for work of equal value. On December 15, 1972, the Commission handed down its decision: women were to be awarded the male rate of pay irrespective of the work they were doing; equal pay was to be phased in in three instalments and to be completely in effect by June, 1975.


(c) Children:

From the earliest days of Sydney Women's Liberation children have been an important reference group. In 1970 the emphasis centred on the need for the provision of adequate child care facilities; the point of view was that of the mother who needed to have her children cared for. (115) Alongside that point of view, 1971 saw Women's Liberation acknowledge that it had a complement - that of the children themselves. Again, Mejane acted both as an instrument for the exploration of an issue and as a mirror which reflected the concerns of the movement. In 1971, for example, it published articles on the difficulties of trying to find adequate child care, education of children in different types of school, and sexism in children's educational television. (116) It also published under the title of "Children and Liberation" a series of interviews with children talking about themselves and their liberation, introduced by the following words:

Perhaps some people will find it difficult to believe that these interviews are real, valid, honest - but maybe that's because our experience of children isn't real, valid or honest. Our reality isn't necessarily the reality of children -- and is one more important than the other? . . . (117)

After the June 1972 Women's Liberation Conference held in Sydney, those who had been acting within the numerous groups of the movement but whose main concern was with child care, joined together to form the Child Care Action Group. Their first newsheet, which appeared in July 1972, illustrated the way in which, prior to that time, they had been scattered in other groups:

... on July 15th about 20 women, and as many children, met in Women's Liberation House to discuss things ... Leanor reported on attempts by a Manly group to share child care. Megan told us about Leichhardt Council's plan to provide a centre for pre-school kids and a few babies ... Judy told us about the Maritime Services Board centre where children are fed and looked after for $3.50 each per week. . . . (118)

The plans of the group, as announced in the first newsheet, were very ambitious and worked on several levels: finding out what politicians, medical and psychiatric experts in the child welfare field thought about the provision of free child care and, if they were not sympathetic, to change their minds; distributing leaflets to women in factories and offices pointing out that they should be able to have their children cared for at work; looking for buildings suitable for use as child care centres; preparing a submission to the ALP on child care while they were formulating their electoral policies; finding out what different municipal councils were doing with respect to child care; and running an experimental over-night baby sitting service at Women's Liberation House. (119)

The August 1972 edition of Mejane contained the first shot in what was to become one of the most successful major fights of Sydney Women's Liberation: the closure, in its then form, of Parramatta Girls Training School (in 1974) and the Hay Home (in 1974), both parts of the NSW Government's Child Welfare System. (120) The initial impetus for the campaign came into Women's Liberation in the form of a 67 year old woman, Bessie Guthrie. A quiet but singularly determined woman, Guthrie brought her dossier on the Child Welfare Department to Mejane: newspaper clippings, parliamentary debates, correspondence, reports of commissions of inquiry, but most importantly, her own experience of trying to help the young girls who had been processed through the system -- all collected during a period of 20 years of involvement. She stayed in Women's Liberation using every opportunity to raise the issue until the movement took on her campaign as its own. The first article in a series, appeared in the August edition of Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter. July 1970 for the statement of aims of the movement which included child care and subsequent newsletters for the lists of aims of different groups.
Mejane. Entitled “You Can’t Run All the Time” it was undoubtedly the best article the newspaper published in 1972. (121) In retelling one young girl’s almost ‘natural progression’ into and through the girls’ homes, it detailed the sins of omission and commission of the state system of child welfare which equipped its charges for virtually only one type of work — prostitution — when they were old enough to escape its jurisdiction.

The beginnings of the examination and exposure of sexism in the education system which Mejane had made in publishing articles was taken up by Refractory Girl in its first (December 1972) issue with the publication of a detailed analysis of sex role stereotyping in children’s picture books. (122) And it was in a form, and a publication, which would be far more acceptable as ‘evidence’ of sexism to those in a position to do something about it — should they want to.

(2) Protest Actions.

The protest actions which members of Sydney Women’s Liberation initiated during 1971-1972 were often around matters which women found personally irritating, matters which an ‘outsider’ might see as trivial compared with the major campaigns. In the case of the raids on the Petersham Inn in 1970, the ‘decision’ to do something was reached in a manner fairly characteristic of the way in which groups worked. The women of the Working Women’s Group were talking about what annoyed them and one experience that they had in common and which was a source of profound irritation was that they were not allowed to drink in the public bar of hotels: if they went to a hotel they either had to go to the ladies lounge and pay more for their drinks or sit in the car outside and have drinks brought out to them by the men they went with. So they decided to do something about it. They picked a target hotel, the Petersham Inn, in Parramatta Road, Petersham, and raided it. They demanded to be served in the public bar, and handed out their leaflets which called for support from the drinkers in the bar. (123)

When their activities were publicised, they found themselves being called upon by other women to liberate pubs in their areas too, and to support other women prepared to do their own liberating. The protests had a large element of fun in them — on one occasion, several of the women dressed up as men; on another, a woman conducted a public meeting in the bar from a chair. But the protests were important:

many of which showed a strong concern for the provision of adequate child care facilities.


(119) Ibid.

(120) The temptation for other people to claim credit for the closure of the girls’ homes is perhaps indicative of the perceived enormity of the task. Peter Manning, a television journalist at the time, for example, oscillated between claiming virtual single handed victory over the child welfare system (by noting a perfect correlation between his production of a television segment condemning the Department and the closure of Hay and Parramatta) and acknowledging that Mejane had been campaigning for some time and that all that television did was “to promote the protest into the public spectacle of The Contest”. See MANNING, Peter: “The Political Role of Television” in LUCY, Richard (ed): The Pieces of Politics. Macmillan. Melbourne. 1975. pp 313-321.


Joyce Stevens: I think that the reason why such a seemingly trivial issue created such a stir was that it was a sort of oppression... of a large segment of the way women saw their lives; that, you know, there were these positions in society that were 'men only' which they couldn't impinge on. But again, it was a symbol of the difference that if you were a woman you either got lower pay or you paid a little bit more for the privilege of, you know, being pushed into this corner that you didn't want to occupy anyhow. So it was as much a symbol as it was a thing that irritated women. (124)

Similarly, the protests at the supermarket practice of searching shopping bags in 1971 were over a seemingly trivial matter but, as the leaflet (125) handed out made clear, it was symbolic of the lack of respect with which women in general were treated -- shoppers, after all, are mainly women.

The action taken against Colonel Sanders Kentucky Fried Chicken was in protest at their use of the advertising slogan “Kentucky Fried Chicken for Women's Lib” which appeared on the backs of Sydney buses and on billboards around the city. It was, like the other protests, a short campaign with a strong element of fun in it. The first step took the form of a letter to the management of Kentucky Fried Chicken from the Mejane collective in March, 1972. (126)

Tongue in cheek, the letter commended the management on its adoption of the aims of Women's Liberation which, of course, meant that women working for them received equal pay, and had free child care provided for them. It also meant, of course, that the management supported the other aims of Women's Liberation -- like free contraceptives and abortion on demand. The letter promised to reciprocate the gratuitous advertising: starting on International Women's Day (11 March) Women's Liberationists would carry placards announcing that Kentucky Fried Chicken supported free abortion on demand. All this was unless, of course, the management had not yet had time to introduce all the demands of Women's Liberation and were prepared to write a letter to the movement apologising for their hasty use of the name and promising not to do so in future. They received no such letter and, true to their word, carried the placards during the International Women's Day March. On Thursday 17 July, 1972, members of Women's Liberation put a 'curse' on the Colonel Sanders Empire. Dressed as witches, eight women descended on one of the Kentucky Fried Chicken outlets, handed out leaflets inside and outside the shop, pasted up posters on the store window which read WOMEN'S LIBERATION—ABORTION ON DEMAND and chanted curses. (127)

(3) Establishing Alternatives.

Some of the alternatives that Sydney Women's Liberation established during 1970-1972 either because existing services were inadequate or because they were non-existent have already been mentioned; the Control abortion referral service and the booklet What Every Woman Should Know, for example. To the end of 1972, the establishment of alternatives was mostly in the area of communications. The first (March 1971) edition of Mejane contained a statement of intent which gave the following reasons (amongst other) for its foundation:

The Women's Liberation movement in Sydney has grown to the point where an interested group decided to release (sic) the mass media from the very heavy burden seeking techniques preliminary to the real work of a movement which involves caucuses and coalitions. CLONINGER, Sally: "A Rhetorical Analysis of Feminist Agitation". The University of Michigan Papers in Women's Studies. Vol 1 No. 1. February, 1974 pp 44-50. Such an analysis underestimates the importance of such actions and, of course, assumes that caucuses and coalitions is the way to get the real work of the movement done.

(124) TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light. op. cit. p 10.
it has been carrying – that of providing propaganda publicity for the movement. Although they have done their best, their general ignorance of what Women's Liberation is all about has touched our conscience. The responsibility is ours. So comes MEJANE... We do not claim to represent the whole movement in Sydney, but we see it as involving political and economic change and a revolutionary change in consciousness as well.\(^{(128)}\)

While Mejane came in for severe criticism in later years for failing to reflect the developments that were occurring within Sydney Women's Liberation, and despite the disclaimer at the outset that they could not do so, throughout 1971 and even 1972 (although to a lesser degree) it did just that. It carried news items and articles on the major areas of concern to the movement. It also published reviews of films and books, articles on women writers and artists, and it began to look to Australia's early feminists for possible lessons.\(^{(129)}\) The style of the paper was personal, down to earth, and provocative; the lay out flexible and by 1972, 4,000 copies of each issue were being printed.

The Women's Studies Journal, Refractory Girl, which first appeared in December, 1972, was started for reasons similar to those which produced Mejane. Mejane's complaint was that the mass media distorted, trivialized, or ignored Women's Liberation; Refractory Girl's complaint was that academe wasn't interested in women at all.\(^{(130)}\)

In a sense, the emotional support that consciousness raising groups provided for their members was needed because of the changes individual women experienced as a result of participating in them. For many women who came to the movement, the growing awareness that the sexism that pervaded the society in which they lived and against which they were prepared to fight, was mirrored in their personal relationships had a devastating effect on those relationships. For some, while consciousness raising groups could provide emotional support, they could not provide the help they felt they needed to change the situations in which they were living. The traditional source of expert help in such a situation, psychiatry or other forms of counselling, had already come under attack from Women's Liberationists, not simply as inadequate for helping women to move beyond their conditioning but as one of the agencies through which women are conditioned. Late in 1972, therefore, several women established the Radical Therapy Group.

As can be seen from even this necessarily abbreviated account of some of the external activities of Sydney Women's Liberation during 1970-1972, the tactics used were extremely varied. The movement was insistent on the need for radical change but in the meantime it recognised the importance of seeking some reforms within the system – abortion law repeal, free contraceptives, equal pay, equal employment opportunities, free child care centres and so on. To achieve these ends, it demonstrated, marched, rallied, petitioned, made submissions, lobbied, educated, painted politicians houses, hexed, leafletted, and, where necessary, set up its own services. At the same time as it was working on the two fronts of changing society and changing individual women, it was beginning to develop a coherent ideology; piecing together critiques of society and analyses of the position of women which could inform its actions.

II INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS

At the same time as Sydney Women's Liberation was developing its campaigns for change, its analyses of the position of women, its external face, it was trying to resolve a series of problems about its own structure, organization, and participation eligibility, and about what its relations with the left should be. To these three major problems - men, relations with the left, and organization - from mid-1972 onwards, a fourth was added; how should Women's Liberation relate to the newly formed reformist Women's Electoral Lobby.

These problems were related to one another but not in such a way that the resolution of one meant the automatic resolution of others; in fact, quite the contrary. By comparison with the other two, the problem of whether or not men should be allowed to participate in any of the meetings or activities of Women's Liberation groups was resolved relatively easily at the group level. (131) Because the men who wanted to participate in Women's Liberation meetings were from the left, the resolution of this problem exacerbated the difficulties associated with the question of the relationship between Women's Liberation and the left. Physically men were excluded, but whether or not their influence, in terms of their constituting what Marlene Dixon has called an 'invisible audience' (132) at meetings, could so easily be removed was another matter -- besides, how could you tell. To try to solve the problem by forbidding dual-membership would be practically impossible and ideologically unacceptable. But the very growth of Women's Liberation made it, more and more, an attractive movement whose direction it would be worthwhile trying to influence, if not control. It is undeniable that there was an element of competition within the movement between groups of women who also belonged to different left groupings; what is difficult, if not impossible, to sort out is the question of motives.

(1) Men.

Over the period 1970 - 1972 the problem of whether or not men should be allowed to participate in the activities of the movement and, if so, to what extent and on what terms, was raised in several different contexts and it is possible to discern a gradual strengthening of the determination to exclude men totally wherever it was possible.

In 1970, the question of men came up mainly at the level of the autonomous groups of Women's Liberation. Since each group was autonomous, each group had to decide for itself whether it would allow men to participate in its activities. In each case, the pattern of events which culminated in the exclusion of men appears to have been similar: a sense of obligation to try to include men in at least some group discussions; a division within the group with arguments for and against the exclusion of men being discussed; an agreement to try at least one mixed-sex meeting which inevitably turned out to be disastrous; and the resultant 'never again'.


(131) The Australian Women's Liberation Movements did not, in this respect, have the same advantage as their American sisters which was to learn from the experience they gained by being ejected, as whites, from the black movement: 'Had it not been for the pioneering role of the black movement, women would have had to fight much harder for the right to form their own groups, composed of women only. They would have been charged much more often with being 'man-haters', just as black nationalists were first charged with being simply 'anti-white'!" STONE, Betsy: Sisterhood Is Powerful. Pathfinder Press Inc. New York. (1970) 1972 p 3.

In Australia, a separatist black movement, much smaller than the movement in America, was itself only getting underway at the same time as the women's movement began.

reaction. (133) The most common argument used in favour of including men in some discussion groups was the argument about 'human liberation' - that men had to be liberated from their masculine roles too. (134) The fact that the men who most wanted to attend Women's Liberation meetings were from the left and were often in close personal relationships with the women at the meetings probably made the human liberation argument more cogent; and the particular meetings they did attend more difficult for the women concerned. The argument advanced against the inclusion of men was that men would dominate and divide the group of women, partly because women let them do so; that women needed 'free space' to develop their self confidence and to learn to like and respect each other; to learn how to take their freedom. (135)

The same method, of allowing each group of women to decide on the question of the participation of men when that question arose, was applied to Women's Liberation Conferences and Commissions. Either the collective responsible for organizing the Conference made the decision in advance (and made this known) or the matter was decided by the people present at the time. Thus, at the very first Women's Liberation Conference held in Melbourne on 16-18 May, 1970: 

The problem of having men at the conference was resolved after some debate - not as heated as it could have been - by having only the Saturday night session on Education open to men. (136)

While each of the autonomous groups had to make decisions about whether men should be allowed to participate in group meetings, and it may, in fact, have had to make that decision on more than one occasion as the composition of the group changed, the Mejane collective had an additional decision to make - what to do if men submitted articles for publication in the newspaper. The collective argued the matter out and decided to take each article as it came and several articles by men were published. Another problem arose when men submitted articles using female pseudonyms. (137)

Why men wanted to participate in Women's Liberation, even if it meant subterfuge, is not an easy question to answer. There were undoubtedly individual men whose concern and interest was genuine. There were also other men, particularly on the left, who regarded the emergent women's movement as an object of ridicule and contempt, as was evidenced by the reception that Kate Jennings received when she gave a highly charged anti-male/anti-left speech at a Moratorium rally on the front lawn of Sydney University on 18 September, 1970. (138) And there were accusations that Women's Liberation was draining energies away from the 'real struggle' - whether the real struggle be the anti-war movement or the class struggle. (139)

(133) See for example Martha Kay in TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light, op. cit., p.5. See also the report of the Balmain group's decision to exclude men contained in HOLLINGSWORTH, David (1971): op. cit., p.4.; and JANET: “Personal Account of Our Group” Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter, August, 1973 pp 7-8. Despite the fact that this report was written in 1973, the experience of the group with respect to male participation was the same.


(135) See [PRINGLE] ROSEMARY: op. cit. See also HEIN, Hilde: “On Reaction and the Women's Movement” The Philosophical Forum, Vol V Nos. 1-2, Fall-Winter, 1973-1974, p 256: “The liberation which women claim, whatever its by-products, must be achieved by women and for women, and not from men or by men, or as a boon to men. In a very profound sense, it has nothing whatsoever to do with men.”

(136) ANON: “Impressions of the Conference” op. cit.

(137) There was at least one such article: [LEAHY, Terry] NANCY AND KITTY, AMAZONS: “Re-Reading Seven Little Australians” Mejane, No. 4, September, 1971 p 9. Leahy, who was the brother of Women's Liberation activist Gill Leahy, had had an article submitted under his own name rejected prior to this. See also HOLLINGSWORTH, David (1971): op. cit., p 39.

(138) JENNINGS, Kate: “Watch Out!...” Text of speech delivered to front lawn meeting Sydney University
In 1971 Mejane published two short articles which indicated a shift in attitude of some men towards Women's Liberation and the reaction to that shift. In the first, Warren Osmond outlined his views of what Women's Liberation was about, acknowledging that women were oppressed at a personal level by men and at an institutional level by a society that was male dominated. He outlined what he saw as two different styles of Women's Liberation Movement which entailed different “potential roles for men vis-à-vis the movement.” (141) The first he was clearly not interested in because it led to female separatism; the second, he claimed, admitted that “many men reject the society’s stereotype ‘male’. This means that women’s lib implies a reciprocal ‘male liberation’ movement, a more mutual struggle.” (142) Men should set up their own consciousness raising groups, their own liberation group. The article ended by providing telephone numbers for men to ring if they were interested in discussing ideas about male liberation. (143) In her reply to Osmond’s article, Joyce Stevens pointed to the dangers of an overemphasis on consciousness raising, on finding the personal solution, at the expense of seeking societal change. She also sounded, by her choice of analogy, a note of skepticism — “some of these oppressors will welcome and give aid to women’s liberation just as some rare slave owners welcomed the slaves struggle for freedom” (144) and concluded by warning that “women better not wait for men to liberate them ... If oppressors can choose, the oppressed have no choice but to fight.” (145)

As was the case with Mejane, so those involved in the production of Refractory Girl were all women. But the Refractory Girl collective reached agreement without conflict on the subject of whether or not to accept for publication articles submitted by men — on rare occasions only. In fact, the problem hardly ever arose because men simply did not submit articles for publication. (146) The fact that the journal did not begin to plan for publication until mid 1972 undoubtedly had its advantages in this respect.

Groups and conferences can make decisions about who can participate in them and on what terms, marches through public streets are a rather different question. The first Sydney International Women's Day March, held on Saturday 11 March, 1972, illustrated the difficulties not only of trying to hold a women's march, but also of holding one which was different from those in which many of the women who came to Women's Liberation were used to participating. The 1972 IWD March is remembered not just as the first, but as one of the most difficult. During its progression there were strains and tensions about the 'purpose' of the march; at the end of it, at the Hyde Park Rally there were tensions over a male speaker and conflict between the Police, the male marchers, and a woman who had taken off her shirt because of the heat. Even before the march began, there was the problem caused by Julia Freebury's attempt to get University. 18 September, 1970. Document No. 18. See [KELLY] GALE: “a WOMAN on the front lawn” Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter. October-November, 1970 pp 3-4 for some of the male reactions to Jenning's speech.

(139) See Biff Ward's initial reactions to hearing about the existence of Women's Liberation: “my ...immediate reaction was that this was sort of self-indulgent twaddle; that there ... couldn't possibly be anything real in this and that these silly women should be back in the anti-war movement where we were so badly needed,” TRANSCRIPT: Mother I Can See a Light. op. cit. p 3. Ward changed her mind after attending the meeting.


(141) Ibid.

(142) Ibid.

(143) The phone numbers given were those of Warren Osmond and John Docker both of whom were in personal relationships with women on the Mejane collective.

(144) STEVENS, Joyce: “Male Liberation ?” op. cit.

(145) Ibid.

(146) In the first four issues which appeared 1972-73 there was only one short report written by a man which was
media coverage for the march by announcing to the press that it would be led by Germaine Greer and British comedian, Marty Feldman. (147) Many of the marchers on IWD 1972 had been participants in the Vietnam Moratorium marches and demonstrations and “people still had it in their heads that the main purpose of a march was to have a punch up with the Police” and they had to be restrained throughout the march from provoking just such a punch up. (148) In Hyde Park, at the end of the march, some of the men took off their shirts, an act which went unnoticed. When a women removed her shirt too, the Police moved in. The immediate response of the men in the vicinity was to rush to the women’s defence: the result - a brawl - “Male predators (i.e., the police) versus male protectors (i.e., male protectors?) over female victim (bare breast sister).” (149) There were two major complaints with respect to the behaviour of the men who participated in the march: first, that they had succeeded, in Hyde Park, in doing what they had been trying to do throughout the march - turn it into a confrontation with the Police; and secondly, that, by seeking to protect a woman from the Police, they were preventing women from fighting their own battles, developing “their own militancy” (150) The men who claimed to be showing their support for Women’s Liberation by marching, had not even begun to understand what the liberation of women entailed.

(2) Women’s Liberation and The Left.

As has been briefly noted earlier (151) some writers, without ever specifying what they mean by the words they use, claim that Women’s Liberation had its ‘roots’ or ‘origins’ in the New Left. The implication contained in such phraseology, that the New Left in some sense positively encouraged or fostered the development of Women’s Liberation, is totally misleading. The New Left was not only male dominated in terms of its ideologies, structures, and practices, with women being allowed to fill only the traditional female roles of typist and tea maker, but it was also initially implacably hostile to even considering the proposition that women were oppressed. The only sensible way to interpret such a claim about the New Left origins of Women’s Liberation groups is to say that many of the women who started Women’s Liberation had also been involved in one or other of the movements, groups, or factions that constituted what is broadly known as the New Left. But as far as Sydney Women’s Liberation is concerned even this interpretation of the claim is misleading because it ignores the fact that many of the women who were involved in the beginnings of the movement were also members of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) - the old left. (152)


(147) See TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy. op cit. p 2.

(148) Ibid.


(150) BELLAMY, Sue: "Must Men March – Minnie not Mickey" op. cit.

(151) See fn 64 and, for example ALTBACH, Edith Hoshino: Women in America op.cit. p126: "The new women's movement with its roots in the new left . . ." and KELLY, Gail Paradise: "Women's Liberation and the New Left" in ALTBACH, Edith Hoshino (ed): From Feminism to Liberation op. cit. p 39. "The past several years have seen the growth of a radical women's movement. It is widely accepted that this movement had its origins in the New Left."

(152) See later analysis of early 'Glebe lists' and note "Communist women were among the first in the emerging women's movement in Australia" MUNDEY, Judy: "Sexism in the Left" in Papers from the National Women's Conference on Feminism and Socialism. Melbourne, October, 1974 p 10. See MORTIMER, Rex: "The New Left" Arena. No. 13. Winter 1967 pp 16-28 for a discussion of the position of the Australian New Left half way between the poles of the more activist anti-ideological, diffusely organized American New Left and the more theoretical, Marxist, coherently organized British New Left. See also MELBOURNE REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS: The Call for the Revolutionary Regroupment of the Australian Left. Melbourne, September 1975 for a description of the various left groups in Australia and the relationships between them from the mid 1960s onwards.
The women who began those groups brought with them the experiences of both a positive (things worth keeping) and negative (things not to be repeated) nature to the new groups; but they also brought with them their differing allegiances and prejudices. A report of the first Women's Liberation Conference in May 1970, for example, shows a clear awareness of the existence of those differences and the problems they created:

Although some efforts were made from the beginning to communicate with other groups many people felt too shy or too aware of "factional" tensions to overcome the barriers between them... the conference lost a good deal of its potential because of the inability of people to break down their preconceptions about themselves and each other. (153)

A very early leaflet produced by the Sydney Women's Liberation Group, in about March or April, 1970 entitled 'Women's Liberation and the Left' stated that:

... Already the political orientation of women's liberation is clear; that is, the ideas and reasoning behind women's liberation reflect traditional themes of the radical socialist left. (154)

The leaflet went on to explain how the concepts of oppression and exploitation could be applied to an analysis of the position of women from which it followed that "women's liberation advocates solutions similar to the rest of the socialist movement." (155) Under a subheading 'Women's Liberation within the Left', the leaflet explained that women were organizing by themselves but that this would not weaken the left, nor were the groups initially closed to men a sign of anti-male sentiment; in fact, these actions were both necessary and ones from which the left would benefit. It would get stronger, more useful, existing women members and it would get new ones, women who came to the left via Women's Liberation: the "left movement as a whole will benefit from women's liberation since it helps it become a genuine movement for the liberation of all." (156) But the movement must look to itself as well: members should examine themselves and ask "(a) whether their organization is structured in such a way as to oppress or inhibit sections of it (b) whether their personal relations in fact embody the oppressive attitudes and assumptions we are trying to overcome." (157) As far as the first point was concerned, the women's liberation group in Sydney had avoided a hierarchical structure and found that the spirit of co-operation had flourished. "Within the left," the leaflet concluded, "women's liberation organize around the problems of women, and at the same time work for the reconstitution (sic) of the movement along the lines above -- so that no longer can the left be accused of repressing sections within its own ranks." (158)

The leaflet was a firm statement of intent -- women's liberation existed as part of the left and women would continue to meet separately from men. But there was also the need to quell fears -- women would meet separately from men initially; the left would gain by having stronger women; the left would gain new members; and no longer, if the movement looked to itself, would anybody be able to accuse it of oppressing some of its own.

On 4 June, 1970, women from Sydney Women's Liberation met with members of Resistance, a fairly broad-based youthful left movement. The women attending gave a brief summary of different aspects of women's liberation and a discussion ensued:

(153) ANON: "Impressions of the Conference" op. cit.
(155) Ibid. Emphasis added.
(156) Ibid.
(157) Ibid.
(158) Ibid. Emphasis added.
However, it was not until a direct question was asked of men of the organizational left about their approaches to W.L. that we realised how little they accepted the validity of our position. These people were willing to give lip-service to the ideas of women’s liberation, but didn’t see the importance of making a serious analysis of the relationship between the oppression of women and the structure of capitalist society. (159)

The political manoeuvring which took place within Sydney Women’s Liberation from mid-June 1970 onwards coincided with, and was part of, the organizational dilemmas caused by the growth of the movement. In 1967, within the left and the plethora of groups organized around opposition to the Vietnam War two groups grew in strength in Sydney: the Vietnam Action Committee and Resistance. (160) The headquarters of Resistance were located in the Third World Bookshop in the inner city. The bookshop was run by Bob Gould, Resistance’s ‘leader’. By 1969, Resistance had become dominant in the Sydney New Left. In February 1970, a new group, under the leadership of Percy, critical of Gould’s failure to implement his political guidelines, assumed leadership of the New Left; the new group was the Socialist Youth Alliance (SYA).

In February - March, 1970, the Glebe group of Sydney Women’s Liberation was formed and began meeting at 67 Glebe Point Road, in Glebe. 67, as it became known, was a small shop front with attached living quarters; the lessee of the property was Bob Gould. Gould sublet 67 to Sydney Women’s Liberation and the two women (both active in Sydney Women’s Liberation) who lived there. They were Kate Jennings, a Sydney University student, and Barbara Levy, also a Sydney University student who was involved in a personal relationship with Gould. As well as being the location of the Glebe group meetings, 67 served as the place where all the groups of the movement met for the general monthly meeting. Additionally, the Sydney University Labor Club, in which many of the early Women’s Liberationists were involved, used 67 as its centre. And it was one of the editorial addresses for the Sydney University based newspaper, The Old Mole, which appeared eight times between 1 June, 1970 and 8 March, 1971. The names of many of the women who were already, or later became, involved in Women’s Liberation appear on the Workers Council which produced The Old Mole. (161)

Beginning in June - July 1970, the meeting of the Glebe group suddenly grew larger as a group of women, members of the Percy-led SYA, started to attend:

Sue Bellamy: Because it was a fight between Gould and Percy and Barbara [Levy] still lived with Gould, Women’s Liberation was seen as a Gould front. We felt this was an enormous put down because women were being used against other women to fight male factional battles... In they came and pretty frightening too, 6 or 8 women, and one, Sylvia Hale, puts the line and the rest just scowl at us and then agree, and our meetings ground down. Those ideas of democratic centralism and high organization were stifling what had begun in Women’s Liberation, not just a free atmosphere but a different politics altogether based on collective responsibility, deep personal involvement and just being bloody.

(159) WOMEN’S LIBERATION MOVEMENT: National Newsletter. July, 1970. Document No. 20. This was the first of only two attempts at a National Newsletter. It is interesting to note the approximate numbers of women involved in the movement throughout Australia in July 1970. The National Newsletter lists the groups requiring copies of the newsletter for distribution and the numbers required: in NSW Sydney - 200, copies Newcastle - 25; in Victoria, Melbourne - 50, Parkville - 50; in South Australia, Adelaide - 100; in Queensland, Brisbane - 40; and in the ACT, Canberra - 50.

(160) See MELBOURNE REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS: op. cit.

(161) At least 6 of the 11 women on the Workers Council of 30 people who were responsible for the production of The Old Mole No. 2, of 15 June, 1970, for example, were involved in the beginnings of Sydney Women’s Liberation: Deidre Ferguson, Gillian Leahy, Liz Elliott, Jean Brick, Martha Kay, and Sue Bellamy.
nice to people who came in with ideas you didn't agree with. (162)

**Question:** You saw that as a combined Trot action, not as the actions of individuals who happened also to be Trots?

**Sue Bellamy:** ... We found out that what they were doing related to the men's attitudes because I used to meet some of those men ...  

**Joyce Stevens:** They used to caucus actually.  

**Sue Bellamy:** Yeah. It was really obvious what was happening and we were just powerless against it. And I remember on the final sort of occasion, Judy Keene just sort of sat there, practically in tears, saying 'Alright, if you want us, we haven't anything more to do, there's nothing else we can do, you can have us. Take us over'. (163)

Whether the SYA women were motivated to try to take over the Glebe group because they saw it as a Gould front or whether they wanted to establish control over the Glebe group because it was seen to be the most influential in Sydney Women's Liberation (164) at a time when the movement was going to have to make decisions about how it would organize itself is hard to say. But on the question of how the movement should organize itself, the Glebe group and the SYA were diametrically opposed, as was revealed at the January, 1971 Conference.

In July, 1970, shortly after the SYA women began to attend meetings of the Glebe group, those women who were also members of the CPA started up the Working Women's Group - which was seen as a CPA group. Whether the CPA initiative in starting up the group was in response to, or was totally independent of, the SYA action, these two major left groupings were seen to be in competition with one another, especially after the formation of the SYA Bread and Roses group in January, 1971:

**Joyce Stevens:** A lot of people I know just in conversation would say, you know, that's the SYA group and this is the Communist Party group. (165)

By early 1971, many of those women, active participants in both Women's Liberation and one or other of the left groupings who saw themselves as being faced with a choice about the commitment of their energies, had made that choice:

- **some dropped out of Women's Liberation and once again devoted their energies to the left;** (166)
- **some dropped out of the left and committed themselves totally to Women's Liberation;** (167)
- **some continued their involvement in both, simultaneously introducing women's liberation ideas into their particular group and expounding their group's beliefs within Women's**

(162) Quoted in HOLLINGSWORTH, David : (1971) op. cit. p 14.


(165) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy, op. cit. p. 9. It is difficult to assess claims that the Working Women's Group was or was not a Communist Party front. In terms of actual numbers, there may have been more non-party women than party members in the group, although when the group wrote a letter to the editor of The Daily Telegraph (published 15 November, 1970) complaining about inaccuracies in their report of the group's raid on the Petersham Inn (published 25 October, 1970) of the 13 women who signed the letter (although only one name was published - See Document No. 16), 9 of the women are known to me definitely to be members of the CPA and the other 4, I am unsure of. See Document No. 21. Even without a preponderance of numbers it is difficult to weigh relative influence and assess motivations. The CPA women have acquired, through years of experience within the party, definite organizational skills and considerable abilities of suasion. See ROBERTSON, Mavis: "A Necessary Reply" Mejane No. 4. August, 1972. p 5.

(166) Coonie Sandford for example, who was a member of Worker's Action, a Sydney study group which in 1971 formed itself into the Healyite group, the Socialist Labour League, in April, 1970, as one of the earliest
Towards the end of 1970, the Glebe group of Sydney Women's Liberation compiled two lists of names and addresses: one, a short list of 60 'activists'; the other, a longer list of 270 'supporters', people who had either made enquiries, sent donations of money, or subscribed to the newsletter. Other lists which were made by other groups appear to have been lost and it must be stressed that the Glebe list can only be considered indicative rather than definitive of the composition of Sydney Women's Liberation at the time. With the help of people involved at the time I have been able to find out a few details of 46 of the 60 people on the short list. Of the 60: all were women and because addresses were given, it was possible using Davis and Spearritt's *Social Atlas of Sydney* (169) (1971 Census) to check the socio-economic status (SES) rating of the addresses on the list. There is one major reservation about using the addresses on the short list and it is this: of the 46 identifiable women, 19 (41%) were university students of whom 16 lived in the immediate vicinity of Sydney University — Glebe, Balmain, Birchgrove, the traditional university suburbs. In other words, because university students are likely to move from the suburbs where they grew up, to university suburbs, stay for the duration of their university careers, and then move out again, the SES ratings of those activists who lived in Glebe, Balmain and the like, (intermediate SES rating) may not reflect accurately their SES 'origins' or 'futures'. With this reservation, it is worth noting that, of the 60 activists:

- 23% lived in suburbs with the highest SES rating
- 68% lived in suburbs with intermediate SES ratings
- 9% lived in suburbs with the lowest SES rating.

Of the 46 (77%) on the short list of activists who were known:

1. 41% (19) were university students, nearly all attending the University of Sydney. Other occupations included school counsellor, university lecturer, factory worker, journalist, secretary, librarian, and full time (CPA) political party functionary.

2. With respect to age, of the 46:
   - 71% were under 30 years of age
   - 14% were between 30 and 40 years of age
   - 15% were over 40 years of age.

3. In terms of party political alignments, of the 46:
   - 8.7% (4) were members of the CPA
   - 4.3% (2) were members of the SYA/SWP
   - 10.9% (5) were members of other left wing political groups.

Thus, a total of 24% (11) were actually members of some political party or group at this time.
But nearly all of the 46 had, in some way, been involved in some part of the organized or disorganized left. (170)

The Anti-War Conference held in Sydney in January 1971 provided another opportunity for women in Women's Liberation to try to exert some pressure on the male-dominated left. A letter signed by 55 Women's Liberationists and sent to the organizing committee of the Conference complained about the low level of female participation planned for the Conference:

We believe that all women have the capacity to discuss the experiences of, and the way forward for the movement, and it seems to us totally out of proportion that 31 or 32 lead speakers out of 33 should be men... It would be quite a step forward if men in the movement would reject the norm which claims that women have little or nothing to say. (171)

After the Conference, Martha Kay, who was one of the 55 signatories to the letter, had second thoughts on the points that the letter made and offered criticisms and suggestions for improvement which were much more specific than those contained in the 1970 leaflet “Women’s Liberation and the Left.” These were Women’s Liberation practices that the left could well afford to adopt:

- for conferences, a workshop format to facilitate real participation;
- ways of preventing the more articulate from dominating the rest;
- an end to the division of labour into a few (male) leaders and the many (some male and most female) shitworkers;
- and the provision of babysitting services. (172)

Within the movement itself, the formation of the Bread and Roses Group by the SYA women, which took them out of confrontation with the Glebe group, and the January 1971 Conference decisions of Women’s Liberation not to adopt the SYA proposals for the organization of the movement, did a lot to lessen the tensions that had developed during 1970. But they did not disappear entirely. The expression of fairly straightforward anti-communism (i.e., anti-CPA) had always been beneath the surface and broke through from time to time. Speaking of the Working Women’s Group:

Joyce Stevens: ... We produced What Every Woman Should Know and ... in a sense I think it enhanced our credibility. I mean that isn’t the reason why we did it, but for people who might have wondered what we were going to do in that group ... some of their worst fears weren’t there ... one of the problems is that anti-CP stuff seems to be worst when the movement is turned in on itself or when the CPA is involved in something that is successful ... because people think that’s the CPA strategy. (173)

The same sorts of fears that attended the splitting up of the Working Women’s Group into suburban groups when it became too large to work properly – that it was an exercise in CPA empire building – did not accompany the attempt to split up the Glebe group for the same reasons. In fact, quite the opposite – it was seen to be essential for the Glebe group to hive off suburban groups so that its influence in the movement would be weakened.


(170) For an analysis of the SES ratings of the long list see Appendix.


(173) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy. op. cit. p. 10.
There were some difficulties on Mejane about accepting for publication some of the material (seen as outright propaganda) on North Vietnam submitted by Martha Kay (174) and there were some on the collective who saw material submitted by other CPA women as straight out CPA propaganda:

Joyce Stevens: I went to Mejane . . . and I came across this stuff that Lesley [Gray/Lynch] had written all over, some material. I can't remember who had written it, whether it was Mavis [Robertson] or Stella [Nord] or somebody else from the CP and Lesley had written all this stuff all over it – 'Usual CP line. Communist bullshit' and stuff like that, and I thought . . . well, maybe it is and maybe it isn't but I couldn't be bothered having to cope with that sort of reaction to stuff (175)

The entire Mejane collective wasn't anti-communist and those who were appear to have brought their prejudices to the movement with them, rather than to have developed them later (176)

During 1971, the tensions within Sydney Women's Liberation about the role of party politically aligned women in the movement appears to have died down to this 'within group', almost individual level, but they flared up again on a wider level in 1972.

Throughout 1972 there was continuing concern amongst some Women's Liberationists in Sydney over the relationships that did, could, and should, exist between the movement and the left. And during 1972, the 'balance of criticism' shifted even further against the left. From the initial 1970 stance when the left led Women's Liberation to answer criticisms that it was draining energies off from the 'real' struggle, and to justify the exclusion of men from its meetings, the balance moved through more, and then less, tentative suggestions on how the left could, and then should, improve itself by adopting some of the Women's Liberation organizing principles and ways of conducting interpersonal relationships in 1971. The position Women's Liberation seemed to adopt in 1972 was one where elements of contempt were embedded in a general feeling that it was now up to the male left to start really doing something about the oppression of women; doing something more than simply acknowledging that Women's Liberation existed, paying lip service to its demands, and mouthing the right words at the right time.

The behaviour of men on the left, the way they chose to show their support for Women's Liberation during the IWD March in 1972, did much to solidify this further change in attitudes to the male left:

Anyway I would just like to ask some men why they came, and I might think I know some of the reasons, though few would agree. Maybe some male leftists are feeling a bit lonesome these Sydney days, what with the male left piddling along so ineffectually – though hopefully that might be because they've absorbed the radical feminist criticisms of their various authoritarian and sexist structures; or maybe so many women have withdrawn from those male groups that there's no one left to type those leaflets – and the men are all busy on their Pitman's typing lessons.

Maybe some men genuinely think women have grievances, but need to be helped to develop a more 'advanced' political analysis, where women's oppression is seen as only a part of a 'broader' struggle (a familiar and seductive bait!) Women's Liberation and Black Liberation certainly now appear on the programmes of most left organizations but cynics like me think that's tokenism and downright insulting. Certainly, blacks at the recent

(174) Ibid, p 9
(175) Ibid. pp 8-9. Stevens stresses that this was her 1972 response which would not necessarily prevail now.
(176) Ibid. pp 9-10.
Racism Conference in Brisbane went even further than that. It's a bit of a knock to the white ego to be told their politics and participation aren't wanted or relevant to the development of black consciousness. How will they feel if women tell them that too? (177)

Biff Ward's paper “Women and the Left” prepared for the June, 1972 Conference reiterated, in less antagonistic but no less definite terms, the belief that the male left was now lagging behind:

For those of us who were and/or are active in the traditional Left, this question of the relationship of the feminist and socialist movements is not easily dismissed. We are used to working with (for?) men who believe that we all could be freer human beings (in some vague way); men who believe in revolutionary change. Now that we feel “ahead” of them – believe that we have embarked on a deeper analysis – how are we to relate to them? (178)

Whilever Australian troops were fighting in Vietnam, whilever conscription for overseas military service was a reality and not simply an abstract issue to be argued over in principle, the ‘terms and conditions’ on which Women’s Liberation and the left dealt with each other was a matter of felt urgency. The election of the federal Labor Government in December, 1972, which was followed by an immediate amnesty for draft resisters, the end to conscription, and the withdrawal of Australian troops from Vietnam, removed most of that sense of urgency, just as it removed one of the most commonly used criticisms of the existence of Women’s Liberation – that it meant a diverting of energies from the anti-war movement.

Within Women’s Liberation, the suspicion in which politically aligned women had always been held, flared up again in 1972. Much of the discussion was triggered by the need to organize for the March 1972 Action Campaign. In November–December 1971, women had already begun to meet to discuss the organization of the activities to be undertaken in 1972. The first matter which had to be sorted out was the structure of the organizing body. At the meeting which was to decide on this question two proposals were to be put forward. One from Mavis Robertson (CPA) was that an organizing committee be set up from the general meeting of Women’s Liberation, a committee which would be open-ended and could set up various work groups formed around specific tasks; the committee’s role would be one of co-ordination rather than of direction. The second proposal to be put forward by Bread and Roses (SYA/SWP) which had caucused prior to the meeting, was for a closed committee with an executive which would direct the organization of the March Action Campaign. Sylvia Hale had not attended the caucus meeting and it is uncertain as to whether she had been informed about what she was expected to do. In a move for which she was later disciplined by the party, she seconded Robertson’s proposal for an open-ended committee. (179)

At the National Consultation held in Sydney on 29–30 January, 1972, some 30-40 women from Sydney, Wollongong, Newcastle, Melbourne, Brisbane, and Perth met to discuss the plans they had formulated and those outlined in letters from women in Adelaide and Canberra. The worry that the March Action Campaign, at least as far as Sydney women were concerned, was being dominated by “CPA/SYA heavies” was discussed - but not dispelled. (180) The belief that

(177) BELLAMY, Sue: “Must Men March . . .” op. cit. p 13.
(179) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy op. cit.
(180) WOMEN’S LIBERATION MOVEMENT: Minutes of National Consultation, Sydney, 29-30 January, 1972. Document No. 22. This formed the second of only two issues of an attempted National Women’s Liberation Newsletter. “On the question of whether March Action dominated by ‘CPA/SYA heavies’—movement needs to recognise that women who have belonged to political parties have often developed a range of skills, and of contacts, greater than those of many W.L. members. While these could be used to the advantage of the movement, the possibility still existed that things could be imposed on the movement without real consultation with all its
the Campaign was being dominated by the SY A, 'a Trot thing", was the reason for the Mejane collective's (many of whom had been in the Glebe group when the SY A tried to take them over in mid-1970) insistence that if a broadsheet about the aims and demands of the IWD March was to be inserted in the February edition of the paper, it would have to go in as a paid advertisement with a note pointing that out. (181)

While the June 1972 Conference in Sydney was organized around workshops which meant that very few papers were 'presented' to it, one of the few which was run off and distributed at the Conference was the Manifesto on the Rights of 'Political' Women in Women's Liberation. A slightly modified version of the paper was published in Mejane together with Mavis Robertson's "A Necessary Reply". (182) The Manifesto claimed that the average Women's Liberationist was a person who had "come to it from outside the pre-established left"; that Women's Liberation people "tended to be much less at ease with 'political' people and their outlook, who have formed a minority within Women's Liberation"; that it was ironic that women who initially fought within the left for women's rights now had "to demand their rights within the women's movement itself." The reason for their paper was that the "question of the role of 'political' women" had now become a "point of major dispute". Political women had "increasingly come under attack, being accused of 'manipulating', of using the movement for their own purposes, etc." (183) The Manifesto then went on to list eight 'principles' which should determine the place of 'political' women within Women's Liberation. The three most significant of these were that: all women who supported and worked for the aims of Women's Liberation had a right to exist within the movement regardless of their other political allegiances; that the only criterion on which women should be judged was on the politics they put forward in the movement; and that the Women's Liberation movement should be independent of all other political structures, "including the one to which we belong. We are prepared to stand on the strength of our ideas - to argue them out within the movement." (184) What this in effect meant was that politically aligned women have seen it as quite legitimate to compete with each other within the movement, to "show in practice the correctness or otherwise of their line" (185) "to strive to win the women's liberation to this [the need for a revolutionary socialist programme] realization and to support our program. " (186)

In her "Necessary Reply" Mavis Robertson acknowledged that the accusations of manipulation made against 'political' women may have a foundation in reality:

The very skills which political women have can be a source of manipulation... It is easy to give direction to a meeting if you know how to chair a meeting. It is so easy to determine the emphasis of a leaflet if you have the skill that leaves you the component parts. The suspicion that political women will put loyalty to party above loyalty to the movement could only be overcome by mutual trust and co-operation - and they should be held innocent of such charges until otherwise is proved. However, so long as W.L. remained an unstructured movement without headquarters or resources it was compelled often to rely on political groupings to provide these. The movement must recognise that unless it provides its own facilities it must continue to use those of outside groups, even though this may lead to resentment or unfair advantage for a particular group."

(181) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy. op. cit. p 8.
(182) Manifesto on the Rights of 'Political' Women in Women's Liberation. Unauthorised. Undated leaflet/paper prepared for distribution at June 1972 Women's Liberation Conference. Sydney Document. No. 23. The version which was published in Mejane No. 8. August, 1972 p 4 had a couple of paragraphs shifted around, left out references to attacks on political women most often taking the form of anti-communism, and left off the exhortations at the end of the paper. See also ROBERTSON, Mavis: "A Necessary Reply" op. cit.
(183) Ibid.
(184) Ibid. Points (1), (2), and (5).
Robertson went on to suggest that if the biggest fear of non-political women was that political women would caucus outside the movement and bring voting blocks into it to try to control the direction the movement's activities would take, then they need not fear such behaviour from the CPA women. CPA women did caucus but only to see how best to introduce Women's Liberation ideas and practices into their party -- not the other way around. Within Women's Liberation, CPA women acted as individuals.

The problem of the role of politically aligned women remained unresolved because it boiled down to a matter of trust. Feelings of mistrust, fear of manipulation and suspicion had been brought a good deal further out into the open; they had been raised, discussed, and written about, but they had not been dispelled because the only thing that politically aligned women could do, short of leaving their parties, was to say "trust us".

(3) The Organization of the Movement.

The structural organizational problems which Sydney Women's Liberation had to try to resolve centred on the relationship between the various small groups which were Women's Liberation. The importance of the small group as the basic unit of the movement was little questioned: it was essential for consciousness raising, for discussion in which everybody could participate, and for allowing women to develop self-confidence; if bureaucratization was to be avoided, again, large numbers had to be broken down into smaller ones; if women were to work collectively and in a spirit of co-operation with one another rather than competition, then again, small numbers were crucial, as they were if consensus rather than voting was to be the way decisions were to be reached and if actions based on those decisions were to involve all members.

Sue Bellamy: it was Martha [Kay/Ansara] who taught us how to work in collectives in theory; it was Martha who never could do it in practice. We all could ... In 1970 it was Martha who brought the idea about non-structure into the Glebe group; she was absolutely crucial. The thing was that we were ready for it; it fitted our style but she put words to it and brought some material from America ... (188)

Ideally, when small groups grew too large to function efficiently, they were to split into a number of smaller groups; in practice, this was difficult to do. Friendships were built up and bonds formed so that when the time came to split the group many were unwilling to move out and go their own way. There were three basic orientations of small groups within Sydney Women's Liberation:

(a) groups based on locality e.g., Balmain, Glebe, and other suburban groups as well as the university campus groups;
(b) groups based on interest or ongoing projects e.g., Working Women's Group, the Art Workers for Liberation Group, the Radical Therapy Group, and the collectives responsible for the production of Mejane and Refractory Girl;
(c) groups formed to organize specific activities which disappeared or transformed themselves after the event e.g., the collectives formed to organize conferences, demonstrations, marches and the like.

The activities, meeting times, and places, the ideas of all these groups had somehow to be co-ordinated and it was in this area of organization and structure of the movement that the

(188) TRANSCRIPT: Supplementary Interview with Sue Bellamy.
past experiences of a very negative nature which the women who began Women's Liberation brought with them played an important role:

All organizations we'd been in formerly, from school to revolutionary grouplet, had suffered from a hierarchy of strong men on the top, the weaker men along with exceptional women, and on the bottom the rest of us women doing all the shit work. We decided that that kind of organization was one of the things which had inhibited women's development and was not the thing for us. (189)

And

Many feel that the atmosphere among left wingers who develop intense hatreds of one another is destructive, that few real friendships develop and that even the strongest are liable to be broken by a political divergence. In other words, in the name of working for a desirable end Leftists employ as their means social relationships and manipulative styles which we see as having no part of their ideal society. If a revolution is not a quick seizure of power but a long social revolution with a political aspect, then the means are the ends. The immediate behaviour constitutes the revolution itself. (190)

From February-March 1970 onwards, as well as the regular meetings of the small groups, Sydney Women's Liberation held monthly 'business meetings' at 67 Glebe Point Road. At these meetings, information about group meetings was exchanged, correspondence attended to, decisions about who would speak to which group about Women's Liberation made, planned activities co-ordinated, and 'movement' activities, such as large demonstrations, organized. For some, these monthly general meetings were their only contact with Women's Liberation; for others, they were tedious affairs, to be avoided if at all possible.

At the centre of the turmoil over the organization of Women's Liberation, which began in June-July 1970, was the Glebe group; its importance at this time cannot be overestimated. There are undoubtedly innumerable interpretations of the struggles that went on, but two are worthwhile summarizing here -- one of what it all appeared to be about seen from inside the Glebe group, the other on how it looked from outside that group.

From the inside:

Women's Liberation had to try to find ways of organizing itself which were different from all those already in existence; ways which would preclude the possibility of power struggles, bureaucratic inertia, the division of labour into elites and shitworkers, hierarchical structures which stifled individual initiative and spontaneity, and the control of the many by the few. The principle of organizing on the basis of autonomous groups, each in control of its own destiny was of paramount importance. General meetings of individuals involved in groups should have no power over other groups and no decisions should be taken by voting not only because the will of the majority should not be foisted on any minority, but also because voting almost automatically implied many of the things that Women's Liberation was trying to break with -- block voting, caucusing, playing the numbers game etc. These convictions were painstakingly developed and firmly held by the Glebe group. When the group of SYA women began to attend the meetings of the Glebe group, to try to take them over, to 'convince' them of the need to vest the general meeting with powers, introduce voting, develop structures and programmes, to recruit women to build a mass movement, it succeeded in grinding down the group's meetings. The Glebe group felt beleaguered, not only at their own meetings, but also at


(190) CURTHOYS, Ann and RYAN, Lyndall: op. cit. pp 3-4.
general meetings which were also held at 67. To the Glebe group, the SYA moves looked remarkably like an attempt not merely to change the nature of the Glebe group, but also to gain control of the direction of Women's Liberation, and by the most economical means available. If the general meeting could be vested with powers over the activities of groups and decisions about those activities were to be reached by voting, then all that would be required in order to change the direction of the movement would be control of the general meeting. To get to that position, the most influential group in Women's Liberation at the time, the Glebe group, had to be 'won over'. The Glebe group fought hard to resist all attempts to give the general meeting any powers whatsoever; it was, in the short run, a fight to prevent the SYA controlling the movement; but in the long run, it was a fight to prevent any group of individuals, who would inevitably become bureaucratic centralists, controlling the movement. In this struggle against moves toward bureaucratic centralism the Glebe group felt isolated. (191)

From the outside:

Joyce Stevens: People had come together and the movement had grown out of certain ideas. And I think that some of the people in that initial group were frightened that the movement was going to become something that denied its origins. And in a certain way that's a reasonable fear. But the movement was growing anyway and there was no way you could contain it in the sort of organizational form that it had been in the beginning... if you were for growth then you had to let it grow and you had to cope with the problems as they arose. But, you know, it was a pretty young organization. There were lots of fears about the motives of different groups in the movement. And there were a lot of fears about what sort of organizational things people were trying to do with the movement, and why they wanted to do things, so a lot of things got messed up, sort of all mixed up. So that, exactly what people wanted wasn't clear. But I think that at a point it did become polarised around whether or not the movement as a movement was going to be able to establish a centre or whether the Glebe group was going to hang on to it as the sort of centre of the movement... There was a general meeting that used to take place in Glebe and it used to meet once a month and people who came to that felt that it was already sort of operating because there was a group of people [the Glebe group] who met there regularly. By the time you came to the general meeting, although there was no sort of theory about it, there was a sort of leadership in the movement, that dominated what happened at those meetings. And from my point of view, the struggle to establish some sort of co-ordinating committee, some sort of general meeting structure, was an effort in fact to involve more people in what at the time was being done by a very small group of people... And... in the main... I think the majority of people stood closer to your [the Glebe] position than they did to what the SYA were trying to do. (192)

The problem of the general meeting being held at 67 where the Glebe group also met was resolved in December, 1970 by moving it to the Trade Union Club, where the Working Women's Group had been meeting for several months. The issue of the general meeting and its powers and the relationships between the autonomous groups were temporarily resolved in January, 1971.

On 5 January, 1971, at a general meeting of the movement, the Glebe group did battle with the SYA over the issue of voting at general meetings. Sylvia Hale of the SYA had drafted a set of proposals on how the general meeting of Women's Liberation should operate; the set of

(191) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy. op. cit. pp 5-7.
(192) Ibid. pp 5-7. See also STEVENS, Joyce: "From There to Where" Scarlet Woman. No. 3. February, 1976 p 11.
rules was to be discussed and, hopefully, adopted at the meeting of January 5. The Glebe group, which found out about the proposals before they were circulated, hurriedly prepared a set of alternative proposals. At the meeting, with Joyce Stevens in the chair, Sylvia Hale handed out her set of proposals; Julie Gibson then handed out the Glebe set. Stevens, overriding Hales’s procedural point that her document should be considered first, ruled that both sets of proposals be considered simultaneously. The meeting never moved beyond discussion of the first point - that the general meeting of Sydney Women’s Liberation decide issues by voting. The Glebe group made it very clear that they would not vote - not even, or especially not, on whether the general meeting should vote or not. And no vote was taken.

Sue Bellamy: it was a great victory for the Glebe group. We saw it in those terms. I mean, that was just like the high point of what we thought we were doing. Now, whether we were really missing something, the point, we saw it as a real sort of anarchist battle(193)

The Sydney Women’s Liberation Conference on The Aims, Organization and Campaigns of Women’s Liberation was held in the Boilermakers Hall over the Australia Day long weekend, 23 - 25 January, 1971. Fifteen papers were discussed, not all of them on the theme of the conference, but the most heated discussions were about those papers which did raise questions about the aims, structure, and organization of the movement(194)

The two papers which presented diametrically opposed views on how Women’s Liberation should be organized were Debby Payne’s (SYA) "Women’s Liberation, Organization or Not ?" and Ann Curthoys and Lyndall Ryan’s (Glebe group) paper “Up from Radicalism: Problems of Organization in Sydney Women’s Liberation”(195) Payne’s paper argued for the creation of a mass movement, the adoption of a set of clearly defined aims, a programme, the creation of positions such as secretary, treasurer, and newspaper editor, that all power be vested in the general meeting to ensure that effective control of the organization be in the hands of all members, that decisions be arrived at by taking the position of the majority ascertained by a vote and that Women’s Liberation embark on a programme of recruitment. Curthoys and Ryan argued for the opposite on each of Payne’s points: no mass movement, no clearly and specifically defined aims, no positions, no power to the general meeting, no voting; that Women’s Liberation continue as a set of autonomous groups linked through a powerless general meeting.

The Conference reached a consensus decision that those women who wanted to become involved in the movement could join autonomous groups, each with its program, finances, discussion and activities, or project committees which deal with specific campaigns and aspects of work. The autonomous and project groups are co-ordinated by a general meeting which has no power over the structure or activities of the smaller groups, but which handles finance and campaigns in the name of the movement.(196)

(193) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy op. cit. p 7.


(195) CURTHOYS, Ann and RYAN, Lyndall: op. cit.; PAYNE, Debbie : op. cit.

For the Glebe group the consensus decision made at the Conference was a vindication of what they had been fighting for for the preceding six months:

*Sue Bellamy*: ... we won on that, we won on how it [the general meeting] could only be co-ordinating, mustn't vote, it doesn't have any policies or control over other groups, and we won that really firm argument about the women's movement could only thrive and grow if it had a series of autonomous groups, that it was based on the small group principle, and it wasn't a hierarchical or pyramidal organization, it was many interlocking bits and they were all independent and autonomous ... We won by default because those people who wanted us to have structure couldn't make us have it.\(^{(197)}\)

But it was not a decision that was made once and for all time; different groups of people at different times raised the same issues in different contexts:

*Sue Bellamy*: Every time there was anything stuck in the newsletter that smacked of centralism we'd just go along and argue about it. And so we just fought a little rearguard action all the time. And basically that kept them fairly ... see, the point was, in terms of real politik they couldn't do anything because of the strength of the Glebe group. If they could have got away with making all those structure things and policy they would have. It was just that they knew it was meaningless to do it when the biggest, sort of most thriving section of the movement was totally opposed. So they were hamstrung.\(^{(198)}\)

The composition of the Glebe group changed over time and many of those who had formed the core of the original group and who had fought the hardest against structures and bureaucratization within the movement transferred their energies to the production of Mejane in early 1971. What this meant was that Mejane now became the group within Sydney Women's Liberation to act as the 'guardian of the original spirit' of the movement.

Following the January 1971 Conference there were attempts to rationalize the organization of the movement without introducing rigid structures. One form of rationalization was the attempt by the Glebe group to reduce the numbers attending its meetings by encouraging other suburban groups to form. Indeed, the North Shore Group began meeting in February and the Eastern Suburbs Group in April, 1971.

The other part of the attempt to rationalize was the establishment in February 1971 of the Co-ordinating Committee:

> A committee is set up each month to co-ordinate events, to work out what has to be done between meetings and to try to involve as many people as possible to help us. The committee at the moment consists of 6 people.\(^{(199)}\)

The six people were representatives from six of the groups within Women's Liberation. March 1971 also saw the introduction of a $1.00 levy which was not a membership fee, but a fee to cover the cost of production and postage of the newsletter.

The September 1971, Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter contained a statement on the role of the Co-ordinating Committee (written by the committee) which provoked a flare-up of the fight over the organization of the movement again. In March, 1971, the Coordinating Committee had asked for the $1.00 levy to be forwarded to 67 Glebe Point Road. The June 1971 newsletter saw a change of address – mail for the Co-ordinating Committee was to go either to 67 Glebe Point Road or to a post office box number in Haymarket in the city. The September

\(^{(197)}\) TRANSCRIPT: Supplementary Interview with Sue Bellamy, op. cit.

\(^{(198)}\) Ibid.

Newsletter gave the Co-ordinating Committee's address for correspondence as Box K652, Post Office, Haymarket -- a different box number, and no alternative address. Despite the fact that the general meeting of Sydney Women's Liberation had been meeting at the Trade Union Club for some time, all the paraphenalia of the Co-ordinating Committee, the office equipment, was still housed at 67 Glebe Point Road. (200) The September Newsletter's statement on the Committee suggested, among other things, that:

- the Co-ordinating committee consist of 1 or 2 people from each group who would serve for a maximum of three, instead of the previously agreed to one, month;
- correspondence in general be addressed to the box number; that the contents of correspondence addressed to Women's Liberation be made known to all groups; that general enquiries receive a standard reply containing information about all groups; that the key to the post office box be held by the current co-ordinators; and that the Glebe group should indicate how they considered the general Women's Liberation mail, received at 67, should be answered and made available to the whole movement;
- a more congenial meeting place be found, one that was independent of all groups;
- that Mejane might like to consider a readers' discussion (soon) to help involve readers and sellers;
- that whenever the media approached any of the Women's Liberation groups for a story on the movement, they be told of the existence and location of all groups.

Prior to a discussion of these proposals at a general meeting, the Mejane collective sent a letter to the Co-ordinating Committee outlining its position:

We feel that the only need for a Co-ordinating Committee is to exchange information about activities and to distribute this information to members of Women's Liberation. . . The dangers of a centralist organization are many in our view. We do not feel that such a group should have a post office box number or a definite meeting place or become an information centre or have discussions as part of or prior to meetings. Once these things happen the meeting becomes a group . . . It is then prey to the dangers of feeling it is representative assuming it has a group consciousness feeling or what have you - we fear this sort of organization. . . If the co-ordinating committee confines itself to the mere exchange of factual information about W.L. events we would be pleased with its continued existence as a service to us all. Once it steps beyond this role to assume the nature of a group (perhaps a controlling centralizing group) we would prefer that it disband and if not we shall ignore its functions most probably . . . (201)

The discussion on the Co-ordinating Committee occurred on 23 September at a special general meeting and the change in the role of the Committee published in the October Newsletter was quite substantial: the Co-ordinating Committee, its very existence, and everything it did, was tied to the approval of the general meeting; correspondence was to be answered by the general meeting; the box number was no longer that of the Co-ordinating Committee - it was the Newsletter box number. Even the keys to the box underwent a change - they were no longer held by the Co-ordinating Committee, they were available from it. (202)

From its earliest days, Sydney Women's Liberation has always held large internal meetings or conferences around the theme of 'what have we been doing, where are we going, how are we

(200) See TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy, op. cit. p 4.
(201) This copy of the letter held by Sue Bellamy was in her handwriting and had the following names attached: Gill [Leahy], Lesley [Gray/Lynch], Sue [Bellamy], Cassandra [Pybus], Gale [Kelly], Gwen, Louise, Noralyn [Sullivan/Neumark], and Lyndall [Ryan] and Pam [Stein] in absentia, of the Mejane Collective. Document No. 26.
going to get there'. 1972 saw two such discussions: the first was the June Conference which was attended by women from interstate as well as from Sydney; the second was a Sydney Women's Liberation discussion held in October.

Out of the discussions of the January 1972 National Consultation, it was agreed that the June Conference be a "Conference on the women's liberation movement to discuss the perspectives and the problems confronting the movement, to which all women are invited". The three main areas for conference workshops to be organized around were to be:

1. composition of a Bill of Rights for Women;
2. politics and women's liberation, or the interaction of women's liberation and politics;
3. action.

The form which the conference took was an attempt to get around the problems that often accompany conferences which are structured into sessions with people giving papers, problems such as: the division of the conference into an elite of paper givers and a mass of paper receivers; having everybody sit through papers which are not of equal interest to everybody; being unable because of the size of the conference to discuss anything beyond a superficial level; and thus restricting discussion to the articulate few. In order to overcome these difficulties, the conference was to take the form of concurrent workshops discussing particular aspects of the three main areas outlined at the January National Consultation -- or topics which arose out of particular needs at the time. The result was fairly predictable: while the problems outlined above were avoided, others arose, and assessments of the conference varied tremendously -- "Depending on which work group you were in it was the 'best' or 'worst' conference ever held".

It was not long after this that Sydney Women's Liberation decided to hold an internal discussion on its own group workings. This decision was taken at the August 1972 general meeting, the same meeting where claims were made that Mejane was soliciting articles but not publishing them. At that meeting, which was held on Sunday 29 October, women from 17 of the groups within Sydney Women's Liberation outlined what their particular groups were doing and the difficulties they were experiencing. The most common problems within the groups were those associated with the absence of formal structures and roles: initial enthusiasm which was often difficult to sustain; informal leaders whose approval was sought; the work being left to one or two 'responsible' women; rapid turnover of membership leading to fragmentation and lack of continuity; difficulty in achieving a balance between action and discussion; and the problem of splitting groups which became too large when nobody wanted to.

The problem of the 'shitwork' being left to a few within groups became a problem for the movement as a whole after it moved from 67 Glebe Point Road, to 25 Alberta Street, Surry Hills in May 1972. But the move did solve more problems than it created. 67 was very much associated in people's minds with the Glebe group's dominance of the movement. It was also a place where people actually lived and to whom the cleaning up could always be left. In a sense, 67 was the Glebe group's meeting place; it was also the place from where the movement conducted its business -- in that order. 25 Alberta Street, had associations with no group. It was Women's House where the general meeting was held and from where the business of the movement was conducted; it was also the place where all the autonomous groups could hold their meetings -- in that order. It was not a place where anybody lived, which meant that there was

(203) WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT: Minutes of the National Consultation. op. cit.
(204) Ibid.
(207) Ibid.
nobody to whom the cleaning up 'could always be left.' The move to Alberta Street, against the best intentions to the contrary, coalesced into one group and virtually institutionalized one set of 'shit workers', the women to whom it fell to clean up the coffee cups after meetings, sort out the roster for keeping the house open as long as possible, to co-ordinate the meeting times and rooms available for groups to use, to sort out the mail, answer the telephone and worry about the rent.

The October 29 meeting saw the Mejane collective acknowledge their difficulties and raise the question of the content of the paper:

Can one paper talk to/for everyone, expressing theory, news of the movement, communicating with women outside. (208)

The discussion about the content of Mejane which ensued, instead of remaining at the level of discussion about the content became an argument over the status of the Mejane collective: was it an autonomous group like any other, or was it different because its finished product was a newspaper — so different that the general meeting of Women's Liberation should have some say over what that finished product should look like. Perhaps because many of those who worked on Mejane had come from the early Glebe group which had developed a clearly defined, and defensive, stance with respect to the autonomy of groups and the powerlessness of the general meeting, had lived through the attempts of the SYA women to take it over, and had always felt 'embattled', any attempt to offer suggestions about variations to the content of Mejane was seen as an attempt to give control of the functioning of one of the autonomous groups of the movement to the general meeting. (209) The difficulties over the content of Mejane were resolved by default. The collective, whose composition changed from issue to issue with some continuity of membership, continued to publish what they thought ought to be published until its last issue in April 1974 when it ended up "a voice for a very particular minority opinion in the women's movement". (210) What had been maintained was the principle of the total autonomy of the groups within Sydney Women's Liberation.

(4) Relations between Sydney Women's Liberation and the Women's Electoral Lobby.

Our choice is no longer whether or not to fight for 'reformist' goals, but what stance we are going to take in relation to WEL which is determinedly fighting for them. (211)

A question of 'stance' is very much the way in which relations between Sydney Women's Liberation and WEL took shape from the founding of WEL (Sydney) in June 1972 onwards. Much of the initial antagonism between Sydney Women's Liberation and WEL can be traced to the woman who founded WEL in Melbourne and then brought the idea to Sydney – Beatrice Faust. Faust's first public attack on Women's Liberation took the form of an article entitled "Crowing Hens" which was published in The Australian Humanist in June, 1970. (212) In it, Faust sifted out reports of the most sensationalist (media-wise) activities and utterances of overseas (mainly American) women's liberation movements and quoted these to argue for the inherent pathology of women's liberationists and hence the 'wrongness' of women's liberation ideology. She devoted the last few paragraphs of the article to an expression of her preference for the American group, the National Organization for Women (NOW), a group with which WEL, the organization which Faust was to found two years later, had much in common. (213)

(209) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy. op. cit. pp 7-8
(210) Ibid. Sue Bellamy p 8.
(211) SUMMERS, Anne: "Where's the Women's Movement Moving To?" op. cit. p 7.
Faust formed WEL in Melbourne in February, 1972 in order to put into practice an idea she borrowed from the American magazine Ms. Transplanted into Australian soil, the plan was to interview candidates for the federal election due in December 1972 to ascertain (and then publish) their views on ‘women’s issues’. In March 1972, Faust travelled to Sydney to try to start up a similar group. A member of ALRA in Melbourne, Faust worked through Sydney’s Julia Freebury of ALRA to set up a meeting of women who might be interested in the idea. To this first Sydney meeting were invited (by Freebury) Helen McCarthy, Wendy McCarthy, Joan Evatt, and Victoria Green, all members of ALRA, “Liz Fell, a sociologist; June Surtees, a teacher; Anne Summers and Caroline Graham, journalists; Faith Bandler, of FCAATSI; Mavis Robertson of Women’s Lib; Helen L’Orange, an alderman on Strathfield Council; and Helen Berrill, Independent candidate for Bradfield at the 1972 Federal elections” (214). At that meeting “the audience was only mildly enthusiastic and . . . Beatrice was rather critical of Germaine Greer and Women’s Lib., which upset some. Mavis Robertson thought that WEL tactics would only lead to significant reforms.” (215)

Despite the lack of enthusiasm, WEL did get off the ground in Sydney and three months later held its first meeting in Women’s Liberation House on 17 June, 1972. Forty people were present and the project to interview election candidates begun. After a short period of interaction Women’s Liberation and WEL in Sydney, by and large, went their separate ways. (216) The July issue of the Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter carried an item about WEL which considered itself “independent of, but connected to Women’s Liberation (quite a few of our members are active in it . . .).” (217) A sentence which read “contributed by Gloria at request of W.E.L.” (218) was appended to the news item. Very few items go into the Newsletter with ‘acknowledgements’ like this; it indicates a degree of dissociation similar to that seen with the insertion of the March Action Campaign Broadsheet in Mejane as a paid advertisement. The next two monthly Newsletters (219) contained reports on WEL’s activities - included under that section of the Newsletter reserved for reports from groups, as if WEL were one of the autonomous groups within Sydney Women’s Liberation.

(213) See FRIEDAN, Betty : It Changed My Life. Dell Publishing Co. New York, 1977 for her recollections, as founder of NOW, of its origins. See also HOLE, Judith and LEVINE, Ellen : Rebirth of Feminism. Quadrangle Books. New York. (1971) 1975 pp 401-428 for a chronology of the second wave of feminism in the U.S. from January 1961 to July 1972. It is interesting to note that in America NOW was formed a year or so before Women’s Liberation groups started meeting and that in Australia, Women’s Liberation groups had been meeting for about two years before WEL was formed.

(214) “WEL New South Wales – Report” The WEL Papers. Melbourne, 1973/74 p 75. Anne Summers (as well as Mavis Robertson) was a participant in Sydney Women’s Liberation. FCAATSI is the Federal Council for Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

(215) Ibid. Faust’s experience of Women’s Liberation appears to have been rather limited: “. . . Bea had attended local Women’s Lib. meetings and found them lacking in the political flavour she sought. . . She says there were obviously plenty of women around who, like herself, wanted to join a women’s group but found Women’s Lib unsatisfactory, ‘because they didn’t need their consciousnesses raised’.” LATREILLE, Anne: “Bea Faust – An Interview” The WEL Papers op. cit. p 8.

(216) In Melbourne WEL too there was some dissension in the ranks over the issue of a constitution for WEL: “Some members of the Women’s Liberation movement, always doubtful about the value of having a constitution because of the restraint it would impose on the possibility of joint decision making and the learning of skills. Though some of the more radical members of Women’s Liberation left WEL at this point, many remained and as time passed the relationship between WEL and Women’s Liberation has become closer . . .” in “WEL Victoria – Report” The WEL Papers. op. cit. p 79.


(218) Ibid.

(219) Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter. August, 1972 and September, 1972. Both group reports were on the progress WEL was making with its interviewing of candidates for the December, 1972 election.
In the November 1972 Newsletter which carried the precis of the points that had been raised at the October 29 discussion on groups, WEL was mentioned by several of the groups in the accounts of their activities and difficulties. Most significant were the North Shore Group and the Macquarie University Group — both had lost members to WEL, primarily because WEL appeared to be more action oriented than the groups they were in. The number of ‘defectors’ was small, smaller than the number who initially tried to participate in both and much smaller than the number who, from the start, had confined their activities to one or other.

Many of the accounts of the early development of WEL, written at the time, drew contrasts between Women’s Liberation and WEL which were misleading about the nature of Women’s Liberation, the Sydney movement at least. As if the only way to characterize WEL were to point out how different it was from a caricature of the already established Women’s Liberation, several writers gave the impression that women’s liberationists did not do anything; they talked a lot, raised their consciousnesses and waited for ‘the revolution’. WEL, on the other hand was formed to do something now. There were basic differences between WEL and Women’s Liberation and they were present from WEL’s inception in June 1972 — but they were not differences which could be dichotomized into an action/inaction distinction. Using the terms discussed at the beginning of this chapter, and in the senses there defined:

First, in terms of the ultimate goal orientation, WEL was a reformist feminist organization and Sydney Women’s Liberation was a radical/revolutionary feminist movement; Second, in terms of the methods and tactics used to work toward these goals, WEL showed an exclusive reliance on what Sum my called moderate tactics, while Sydney Women’s Liberation showed a preference for militant tactics (although it was not averse to the use of moderate tactics under certain circumstances) and for the development of alternatives; And, third, in terms of the internal structure of the two, WEL was convinced of the need for some degree of formal organizational structure while Sydney Women’s Liberation was opposed to any formal structure.

Stemming from these basic three differences between them came most of the others — differences in style, their media images, in the types of people attracted to them, and the types of activity each chose to concentrate on.

In November, 1972, as part of a Master of Psychology thesis Sandra Wortley surveyed women who subscribed to the Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter on their attitudes to several issues. The questionnaires were answered anonymously and demographic data about age and occupation were obtained from 88 respondents selected at random from the mailing list. Of the 88 respondents:

- 42% were 30 years of age or under;
- 30% were between 30 and 40 years of age;
- 28% were over 40 years of age.

In terms of occupation, the 1972 newsletter subscribers differed markedly from the Australian female population with respect, most particularly, to the proportion engaged in paid employment rather than in keeping house. Newsletter subscribers were far more likely to be in the labour force, to be in full rather than part time employment. As far as the actual jobs of respondents were

(223) Wortley’s contact in Sydney Women’s Liberation was Joyce Stevens. Her thesis supervisor, Robin Winkler.
were concerned, the overall picture of women being concentrated in 'female occupations' was repeated by subscribers. There were, however, major differences in terms of the particular female occupations in which the subscribers were concentrated — teachers and clerical workers were 'over-represented' and process workers, packers, domestic workers etc., were grossly 'under-represented' amongst subscribers. In other words, Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter subscribers were more likely to be employed in those female occupations which require some degree of certification, however minimal, than the female workforce as a whole.

By the end of 1972 the Sydney Women's Movement as I have defined it had formed and patterns of relationships between its constituent parts had been laid down. What all of the parts had in common was a dissatisfaction with the position of women in Australian society, a desire for change in that position, and a belief that change was possible. As a movement dedicated to a change in the position of all women it was, in a fairly limited sense, salvationist; but it was this, rather than other, worldly salvationist and women were to be both agents and the objects of that salvation. (224) Once we begin to look at more specific questions, questions such as the particular aspects of the position of women most in need of change, how change was to be brought about, what it would entail, and by whom it was to be effected, important differences in ideological perspective appear.

The women who established the first Women's Liberation groups in Sydney in 1969-1970 brought into the movement they founded their experiences of involvement in the new politics of the 1960s; experiences which led them to retain, reject, modify, or initiate particular practices and ideas, and to apply them to the question of how to go about changing the position of women. They also brought the prejudices, ambivalences, tensions, and contradictions of their own lives and their political involvements; involvements in the new left, the old left, the nascent Australian counter-culture, (225) the student, anti-war, and other protest movements. (226)

Within Sydney Women's Liberation two major orientations toward change and how it could be achieved had developed; they were what might be called the radical feminist and the revolutionary feminist perspective. Bearing in mind that both perspectives acknowledged that Women's Liberation had to concern itself with seeking change at two levels, the individual and the societal, and that neither was immune to the influence of the other, one major difference within the movement was the differing emphasis placed on each level of change.

The radical feminist perspective can be identified with the original Glebe group and when members of this group formed others, they took 'the spirit of Glebe' with them into Mejane, the Art Workers for Liberation, the SLUT Brigade, and the Radical Therapy Group. Because the Glebe group was so influential in the early years of Women's Liberation (227) and because the perspective was carried to other groups, it is of little significance that the original Glebe group disappeared. Some of the Glebe women had been involved in the Anti-Apartheid movement, nearly all had been involved in the campus based left (rather than the organized left) and when the time came to make the choice between leaving Women's Liberation, leaving the left, or trying to work in both, they chose to break with the left. (228)

---

(224) The women's movement is not salvationist in the same sense that millenarian movements of the middle ages were, although the word millenarian has sometimes been applied to it. On those movements see COHN, Norman: *The Pursuit of the Millenium*. Paladin, London. (1957) 1970 esp. p 13.


(226) See YOUNG, Nigel: *An Infantile Disorder? The Crisis and Decline of the New Left*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London. 1977 for coverage of the enormous number and variety of groupings that have been subsumed under the heading of the new left—with respect to G.B. and the U.S.A. See also GOLD, Alice Ross, CHRISTIE Richard and FRIEDMAN, Lucy Norman: *Fists and Flowers - A Social Psychological Interpretation of Student Dissent*. Academic Press, New York. 1976 for an interesting attempt to investigate student protest empirically.
What the Glebe group developed was an analysis of the oppression of women in which the basic unit of analysis was power and in which patriarchy, rather than capitalism, was the system given major emphasis. Their fights for the principles of autonomous groups, the powerlessness of the general meeting, the absence of structures reflected their stance on change. From the radical feminist perspective, changing the individual woman was more important; changing the structure of society without changing the conceptions, images and attitudes women had of themselves was pointless. But more than this, changing the individual woman was the best way to ensure that the society would be changed -- by those changed individuals. There was no point getting somebody to open the cage door if the canary refused to fly out because it believed it could not fly, or was afraid of life outside the cage. (229)

The radical feminist perspective with respect to the importance of changing the individual woman reached its clearest expression in the (second) Radical Therapy Group. Radical Therapy was the next step after consciousness raising: (230)

Josefa Sobsky: Consciousness raising . . . it’s political more than personal a lot of the time. And this is what happens, people get to a political, a very radical political position, you know, where they reach the zenith of consciousness [said with laughter], their raised consciousness. . . They are politically radical, but they’re personally, they will not make any decisions that radicalize their lives . . . You’re still very much a part of the whole male culture . . .

Robyn Lee: You’re still living with the same man, working at the same job and wearing the same clothes . . . [In radical therapy] you say things you never felt before . . . And it’s not as though we’re simply retreating into ourselves, or something, or some other appropriate term . . . self-indulgence is another. Really, I see it as just about the most political step I can take because we’ve just had too much of blaming everything on the system. In fact it is possible for you to get yourself out of your own situation in a very large number of ways. And until enough women have already been prepared to take that step any talk of revolution just seems to me absolutely fatuous. (231)

(227) It is difficult to account for the influence of the Glebe group without acknowledging the role of ‘powerful personalities’. Martha Kay writes: “. . . Although good attempts were made to develop responsibility to collective opinion -- for instance by not taking votes -- so that the majority didn’t rule over the minority -- often the reality behind our ‘consensus’ was that the stronger, more energetic, more socially acceptable women repeatedly did things their way”. [KAY/ANSARA,Martha] FIGNER, Vera: “A Personal View . . .” op. cit. p 48. Undoubtedly, the Glebe group had developed a good deal of internal cohesion which looked like exclusiveness from the outside. I was not active in Sydney Women’s Liberation at this early time but I was very much aware of the opinion of some activists that the Glebe group had set themselves up as the high priestesses and keepers of the only truth of Women’s Liberation. Sue Bellamy, one of the members of the original Glebe group responded to this impression as follows: “I can remember our perspective on that and it was only our way of reacting, that sort of inner sanctum thing . . . We never saw that as an elitist thing because we always felt embattled, right, so when you’re embattled you don’t feel like you’re the grand poohbah. It was obviously other people battling against that because they thought that. Full total miscommunication.” TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy op. cit. p 6. Similar sorts of criticisms were levelled at two of the other groups which some of the Glebe group women initiated: Mejane and the Radical Therapy Group, both of which were seen to be synonymous with the Glebe group despite the participation of non-Glebe women in both. There were, as well as the claims that Mejane was not publishing articles solicited, claims, the truth or otherwise of which is less important than their existence, that people who had tried to join the Mejane collective to work on the paper had been made to feel unwelcome. Again, with the Radical Therapy Group which was formed in mid 1972, “The gaps have widened between us and the rest of the movement which is a bit distressing . . .” Sue Bellamy talking in April 1973. TRANSCRIPT: Mejane Group Discussion. April, 1973 p 14. Document No. 27. (228) CURTHOYS, Ann and RYAN, Lyndall: op. cit. p 3.

(229) This is not an unfamiliar dilemma and crops up in a variety of contexts. For example, Evgeny Evtushenko the Russian poet wrote in his “Monologue of a Blue Fox on an Alaskan Animal Farm”

He who is conceived in a cage yearns for the cage
With horror I understand that I love
That cage where they hide me behind a fence.


(230) The June Conference (1972) Radical Therapy workshop discussion is reported on in part in Mejane No. 8.
Not only was individual change a prerequisite for societal change, it was the best way of creating revolutionaries:

*Sue Bellamy*: Some people endlessly talk about conditioning and it’s the most overused word in the movement now... And you can get to the point... in that process of saying that we are so conditioned, therefore we can never change, therefore why have a movement when everyone is so conditioned that they can’t escape it. Whereas if conditioning means that one is got at and moulded and one’s psyche and everything else is taken over by a pattern, then it seems to me the idealist position, which I think radical therapy takes, is to say that one can unlearn one’s conditioning, just as one learns it in the beginning... And if you can unlearn it what happens is... you can begin to untie the knots... And the more knots you untie... what happens is that you’ve untied so many that your life is intolerable... and therefore... you become totally at odds with your society and you must become a revolutionary or you cut your throat... Radical therapy to me is, you know, the greatest tool in creating revolutionaries that I can imagine.\(^{(232)}\)

The radical feminist stance on organization, that there be no structures, no decisions by the majority vote foisted on minorities, no general meeting with powers over the workings of the autonomous groups, that there be no binding lists of aims and programmes, is consistent with this emphasis on the importance on the individual in change. With the development of the inner freedom of the individual woman as a prerequisite for genuine social change, structures rules, blueprints, roles, majorities and the like would inhibit, and set limits to that individual development.

Not knowing what you want is the whole point of liberation if you know for sure that you don't want what you've got and you don't want what men have got either.\(^{(233)}\)

Change the individual and that changed individual (with others) will change the system to a form best suited (but unknowable now) to accommodate their needs.

The revolutionary feminist perspective can be most closely identified with those women who decided to maintain their involvement in both Women’s Liberation and the organized left groups to which they belonged: principally the CPA and the SWP/SYA but with a number of minor groupings that have come and gone also - the Communist League, the Spartacist League, and the International Socialists. Despite differences between these groups and their mutual antagonism to each other, they share a conception of their role within Women’s Liberation as being one where they can argue for the correctness of their “line”. They also share an analysis of the position of women in which the basic unit of analysis is class and where capitalism or patriarchy in capitalism is the system given major emphasis. Their willingness to accept, if not advocate, a greater degree of organization and structure than the radical feminists is consistent with the emphasis on the need for change on the societal level. To work for change on such a large scale requires organization, sets of aims, programmes, clear guidelines that can be followed. Such changes are a prerequisite for change on the individual level – spaces in which women can develop have to be created, structures changed.:
Yet it is not possible for either women or men to liberate themselves through a single process of changing attitudes. No one, no matter how liberated they might be in their personal attitudes and life styles can transcend the social conditions in which they find themselves. (234)

Not only was it pointless to try to be subjectively free while objectively in chains, the option to try was open only to a privileged few:

Consciousness raising will not necessarily lead all women in the direction of radical or revolutionary solutions. It may lead to a mistaken belief that women can liberate themselves through agreements in their personal lives and/or through the winning of wider job opportunities now. Whilst both of these issues are very important for all women they are options that are mainly open to women (and men) in the more privileged positions of society. For the overwhelming majority of women much more radical solutions are required to give them any sort of relief from their twofold oppression. (235)

The radical feminists feared that if the revolutionary feminists achieved the types of changes they wanted in the external conditions of society that the 'inner' woman would be no closer to being able to take control of her own life and psyche, or determine her own destiny than before because the revolutionary feminist approach to change looked very much like change imposed from the outside rather than change developed from within. This suspicion was exacerbated by (perhaps rooted in) the involvement of most revolutionary feminists in (male) political groupings and the fear that the revolutionary feminists were seeking to impose direction on the movement from outside it; an unspoken belief that the revolutionary feminist vision was somehow tainted by their continued participation in male political groupings.

To the revolutionary feminists, the only way to change the system was to stay within it and work on changing those structures which were most oppressive of women. To opt out either individually or en masse, which is what consciousness raising and radical therapy often appeared to lead to, was no solution. There was no point in being psychically free if the external conditions of society prevented you from obtaining the wherewithal to feed the body that housed your psyche.

The interaction of these two approaches to change within Sydney Women's Liberation created tensions which could only be productive if neither approach could be eclipsed entirely by the other; and the existence and strength of each did prevent the other from turning the movement as a whole in either one of the directions in which it was pulling. What had to be maintained between the two was not a balance of power nor an equilibrium but a balance of productive tension which revolved around sorting out the relationship between the personal and the political. In many ways Sydney Women's Liberation (as did other women's liberation movements) represented an attempt to achieve in practice what writers like Marcuse were trying to do on paper — to integrate the theories and programmes for change on the outer, external, societal (Marx) level and on the inner, internal, personal (Freud) level. Juliet Mitchell's two books Woman's Estate and Psychoanalysis and Feminism (236) are the clearest attempts to integrate the two approaches using Freud and Marx specifically, into an analysis of the oppression of women. Neither book succeeds entirely on its own; the former is more Marx than Freud and the latter more Freud than Marx. (237)

(235) Ibid.
(237) David Bazelon writes of the attractions and dangers of trying to amalgamate the theories of Marx (historical
It was with this seeming incoherence that these tensions in Women’s Liberation produced that people such as Beatrice Faust became impatient. Other women who had tried to participate in Women’s Liberation but had found that they could not likewise became impatient (238) and when WEL was formed, they welcomed it.

Whilst Women’s Liberationists of both the radical and revolutionary feminist perspective believed that the liberation of women would require and entail a total transformation of society, WEL saw itself, and was seen by others to be, a reformist organization. WEL saw the Australian socio-economic-political system as basically sound but in need of such improvements as would enable women to participate in it more fully at all levels. Whatever the consequences of the reforms they sought might be, their intention was not to radically transform the system. Their aims and methods were based on the assumption that the position of women could be improved from within the system using the methods of change regarded by the system as legitimate. Their very first foray into politics could not have been more accepting of the legitimacy of electoral politics as the ‘correct’ method of trying to achieve change; and it also indicated a belief in their own efficacy of being able to achieve change in this way. Their favourable media coverage (239) especially in contrast to that given to Women’s Liberation, the belief that the published results of their survey of politicians had influenced some voters (240) acted as positive reinforcement and ensured that for the immediate future at least, WEL would continue to press for limited demands using moderate tactics.

As far as changing the individual was concerned, WEL appeared to take two stances. Either it wasn’t necessary, as Faust, for example, claimed, or, if it was necessary for some women, then participation in WEL political activities was a far better method of consciousness raising than holding group discussions.

Beatrice Faust: Women’s Lib neglects the fact that women already know some of the problems, and have worked their way through them. Many of us can see the way in which oppression works, especially if we’ve done any psychology or learning theory. Take competition with male employees: to sit around and talk about this in fine detail is not satisfactory, you’ve got to get stuck into it and change it. People can get their consciousness raised by the school of hard knocks. . . . The WEL approach is to learn by doing, to undertake something rather than sitting talking.(241)

While this approach to consciousness raising may sound similar to the new left philosophy of (liberation) consciousness raising through ‘experiencing’ political involvement, it is, in fact, very different from it. The type of political activity that the new left regarded as valuable in itself and for consciousness raising was confrontation with the system, not participation in it. The WEL choice of moderate rather than militant tactics, its reformist nature, meant that what WEL members were likely to get out of political activity was not consciousness raising but competence raising — the more so if their tactics continued to be successful.

If Sydney Women's Liberation can be seen as having emerged from the traditions and perspectives of the new left in the sense outlined above, then CAMP (NSW) can be seen as having emerged from the traditions and perspectives of small-l-liberal-civil-libertarianism. Even if any influence that media coverage of the activities of Gay Liberation in the United States might have had could be ignored, there were signs, prior to the formation of CAMP that homosexuality and homosexuals were becoming issues for public debate in Australia. The focus of that debate was initially limited to homosexual law reform (and hence to male homosexuality) and it was being conducted by people who were not publicly known to be homosexuals; people who were urging law reform for a variety of reasons the least commonly voiced of which was that there was nothing wrong with, and hence should be no law against, homosexual behaviour.

There had not been in Australia stimuli to debate comparable to the British Wolfenden Report (Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution) released in September 1957, nor the passage of the Sexual Offences Act ten years later. There were occasional articles in magazines and newspapers (242) and the 1967 survey into Australian attitudes to homosexual law reform referred to earlier, (243) but serious and sustained debate was not opened up until the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government released its Draft Criminal Code for the Australian Territories 'for comment' early in 1969. In the Code, the commonly listed offence of buggery was replaced by the much wider offence of 'sexual connection against the order of nature' and it was to this wider, and much less specific, offence that many of those who concerned themselves with the draft objected. In Canberra, the Homosexual Law Reform Society formed in July 1969 to prepare a submission to the government about the code; (244) the Victorian Humanist Society formed a subcommittee to do likewise; (245) and the Convention of the Council of Australian Humanist Societies held in Brisbane in April 1970 adopted resolutions which not only urged all state governments to change their laws with respect to male homosexual behaviour, but also strongly urged their own member societies to form groups to pressure for reform of the laws. (246)

In May 1970, the then federal Attorney General, Tom Hughes, received considerable press coverage when he announced to the National Conference of the Australian Council of Social Services that the new criminal code might not outlaw "homosexual conduct in private between consenting adults" (247) Support for homosexual law reform came from the right quarters, right in terms of their respectability, but for reasons which would do very little to improve the positions of male homosexuals with respect to anything other than the law and which had nothing whatsoever to do with lesbians. As Lex Watson pointed out, advocacy ranged from the liberal gesture ("personally I find homosexuality disgusting but I defend their right to do it") to the need to reclassify homosexuals as sick rather than as criminal (sending a homosexual to gaol was like sending an alcoholic to a brewery), the need to relieve an

(243) WILSON, P. R., and CHAPPELL, D: op. cit.
(247) See for example, "Hughes has Doubts on Homosexual Law". The Age. (Melbourne) 25 May, 1970.
overworked police force of unnecessary and potentially corrupting work (police should be chasing burglars not buggers) (248) and seeing homosexuals, together with “celibate, deliberately childless and infertile couples” as “an ever growing asset” (249) in an overpopulated world. And those who most publicly supported homosexual law reform were also the keenest not to be seen, for the most part, to be homosexual nor even to condone homosexual behaviour per se. (250)

One reason for the absence of public debate on homosexuality was, undoubtedly, the absence of any groups of homosexuals, or even of sympathetic heterosexuals, who were prepared to take up the issue of homosexual law reform. In this respect the Australian experience differs markedly from that of countries such as Britain or the United States, but it is similar to the New Zealand and Canadian experience. In Britain and the United States gay liberation groups emerged in 1970 from a homosexual subculture which included, as well as the gay bars and the social clubs, one or more homosexual organizations which had, for periods of up to 20 years, been working (however timorously and apologetically) toward improving the public and self image of female and male homosexuals. (251)

New Zealand’s first public organization concerned with homosexuality was the eminently respectable, ostensibly heterosexual, New Zealand Homosexual Law Reform Society which had been formed in April 1967 to pressure for law reform. Canada’s first homosexual organization was the University of Toronto Homophile Association, formed in 1969. (252) And in Australia, when CAMP (NSW) was established in July 1970 there were only two groups in existence whose concern was with homosexuality and both were very very young: the ACT Homosexual Law Reform Society had been formed in July 1969 and the Daughters of Bilitis (Melbourne Chapter) was formed in January, 1970.

The ACT Homosexual Law Reform Society was formed in Canberra on 21 July 1969 by people “who for years had felt, without doing anything about it, that male homosexuals were victimized by the law”. (253) Two events acted as catalysts to the Society’s formation: the publication of the federal government’s draft criminal code and the imprisonment of a man on a charge of indecent assault upon another man. (254) As far as its public image was concerned, the Homosexual Law Reform Society was respectable – its President was Senior Lecturer in

---

(251) In Britain groups with names not designed to make their purposes obvious were formed in the 1950s and 1960s; groups such as The Albany Trust, the Minorities Research Group, Kenric. But these followed in a tradition of small sex reform groups and individuals such as Edward Carpenter, Peter Wildeblood, and Radclyffe Hall who had been prepared to take public stands on the issue of homosexuality, including their own. See for example, HYDE, H. Montgomery: The Other Love. Mayflower. London. (1970) 1972.; WEEKS, Jeffrey: Coming Out. Quartet Books. London. 1977.; WILDEBLOOD, Peter: Against the Law. Quality Book Club. London. 1955.; DICKSON, Lovat: Radclyffe Hall at the Well of Loneliness. Collins. London. 1975. In the United States, groups such as the Mattlechene Society, One Inc, and the Daughters of Bilitis had been in existence since the early 1950s. See, for example, KATZ, Jonathan: Gay American History. Thomas Y. Cromwell. New York. 1976.; MARTIN, Del and LYON, Phyllis: Lesbian/Woman. Bantam. New York. 1972.
Criminal Law at the Australian National University, Dr. Des O'Connor - and whether or not some or all of its members were homosexual was a matter of guesswork with hints dropped which would lead people to believe that they were not. (255) Its main concern in making comments on the draft criminal code was to convince the government that "men and women should be free to do what they like with their own bodies as long as they do not hurt, damage, or infringe the civil liberties of anyone else". (256) The Homosexual Law Reform Society must be considered, not as a forerunner to CAMP and Gay Liberation in Australia, but as the tail end of a tradition Australia never had, except vicariously through the British and American experience: if there were homosexuals amongst its members, they never said so; it was concerned solely with the reform of the law; and, very importantly, it appeared to accept as quite valid, psychiatric definitions of homosexuality as an illness and the value of psychiatric opinion. (257)

Their apologetic tone and the same acceptance of psychiatric definitions of homosexuality as disabling, place Australia's first publicly homosexual group in the same position as the ACT Homosexual Law Reform Society. Formed on 28 January, 1970, as a Melbourne Chapter of the 15 year old American lesbian organization, the Daughters of Bilitis, the group broke its link with America in July 1970 to become the Australasian Lesbian Movement (ALM). (258) At its inaugural meeting, the 15 women who attended decided that they would in future hold social gatherings, do some work for charity, and try to "create a better image of us within the community". (259) They adopted, with slight modification, the aims of the parent organization: aims which revolved around education - of the lesbian to enable her to "make her adjustment to society" (260) and of the public to help them understand and accept the lesbian, encouragement of responsible research dealing with homosexuality; and investigation of the penal code, "as it pertains to homosexuality". (261) The American organization welcomed all women, Melbourne thought that too risky (262) and so membership was restricted to "lesbians and female bisexuals 21 years and over". Married women had to have "the written consent of their husbands to join". (263) In an odd mix of courage and apology, members of the Melbourne group appeared on television, gave interviews to magazines and spoke to Lions Clubs; at the same time they tried to buy acceptance by doing charity work - they decided against adopting a war orphan and in favour of adopting a pensioner because with the latter, the money would stay in Australia; they broke their association with the parent organization because Daughters of Bilitis in America were giving them a bad name by participating in Gay Liberation protests wearing T-shirts with 'Dyke' and 'Butch' written across them; and, they, ALM, had as their publicity

(254) GRIEVE, James: op. cit.
(255) "If the intention of a Government in reforming the law is to allow homosexual men not solely the meagre right to have sex as they wish but also the same freedom to associate with their likes as is enjoyed by dogs, homosexual women and the rest of us..."Ibid. Emphasis added.
(256) Ibid.
(257) "Homosexuality may well be an illness as some maintain; but it is surely not a contagious disease"... and their recommendation to the Attorney General that "in all cases judges be compelled to seek psychiatric advice about an offender before passing sentence upon him".Ibid.
(261) Ibid. The major departure from the American aims (formulated in 1955) was the absence from the Melbourne set of a clause which said that D.O.B. would help the lesbian adjust "by advocating a mode of dress and
agent, a woman, Beatrice Faust, who regarded lesbianism as “anti-male adjustment”.

The newsletter, which appeared monthly, was a mixture of soppy poetry, announcements of meetings and publicity, and reports of dialogues which, using a different language and a much broader framework of analysis, CAMP and Gay Liberation were to take up later and call consciousness raising.

The ACT Homosexual Law Reform Society and the Melbourne Chapter of the Daughters of Bilitis were the only two public organizations concerned with homosexuality in existence when CAMP was formed. In May 1970 Christabel Poll and John Ware met with some of their homosexual friends, some people from the Council of Civil Liberties and the Humanists and some NSW “Leftist straights” to discuss the setting up of CAMP. The official launching of CAMP took place in July 1970 when Ware and Poll announced publicly that they, as homosexuals, were forming CAMP, an organization for homosexuals interested in fighting for their own rights. From the outset, public support for CAMP from groups such as the Council of Civil Liberties and the Humanist Society was much more visible than any support from the left. The only two letters to the editor which appeared in the first issue of Camp Ink (November 1970), for example, came from individuals representing those two groups. Likewise, when John Ware published an article “Rat Psychology and the Homosexual” in the Sydney University Union’s magazine, The Union Recorder in October 1970 and which was criticized in the next issue by a clinical psychologist, those who came to Ware’s defence in the following issue were civil libertarians, humanists and small-l liberals, rather than people from the left.

From the outset, there were two major features of Camp Inc which set it apart from its predecessors. First, in their public announcement of the formation of Camp Inc, Ware and Poll “came out” (i.e., declared themselves to be) as homosexuals and encouraged others to do likewise. “Coming out” served two functions: it helped other homosexuals begin to develop a positive self image of themselves; and it confronted the community with homosexuals who did not necessarily fit homosexual stereotypes and who were now prepared to fight for their rights themselves.

behaviour acceptable to society”. Cited in CORY, Donald Webster: op. cit. p 189.


FAUST, Beatrice: “Sexual Segregation” Letter to Editor. The Australian Humanist. No. 20. December, 1970. p 51. I was somewhat surprised when I attended an ALM meeting late in 1972 to see the 15-20 women present thank their invited guest speaker, a male clinical psychologist, for having talked to them -- he had spent almost an hour explaining, totally, unchallenged, their ‘abnormality’ to them.

Christabel Poll (32 years) was a double honours graduate from Keel University in England who was employed by the Commonwealth Public Service. John Ware (30 years) was a student at Sydney University completing an Arts Honours degree. Neither of their lovers were able to “come out” at the time for fear of job reprisals. Both later did, and became more marginally involved in the organization.


The article was WARE, John: “Rat Psychology and the Homosexual” The Union Recorder. Vol 50 No. 23 1 October, 1970 pp 3-5; the criticism was HAZEL, Brian: “Shocking Homosexuals” The Union Recorder. Vol 50 No. 25. 14 October 1970 p 4. The Defences of Ware appeared in The Union Recorder. Vol 50 No. 27. 2 November 1970. pp 4-6,8, and were FREEDMAN, Mark: “Behaviour Therapy for Homosexuals –An Attack” (Freedman was a lecturer in Psychology at Sydney University); BUCKLEY, Berenice: “Queer Psychologist” (Buckley was a member of the Executive of the Council for Civil Liberties); LOCKWOOD, W.H.: “Attack on Behaviourism” (Lockwood was a biochemist and close personal friend of Ware); CASS, Michael: “Erect Salami” (Cass was an honours student in Sociology at the University of NSW and Ware’s lover); POLL, Christabel: “Women’s Bad Habits” (Poll was Co-Founder of CAMP); ENCEL, Sol: “Science and Morals” (Encel was Professor of Sociology at the University of NSW); SIMONS, Dorothy: “Letter to Editor” (Simons was a member of the NSW Humanist Society). Again, in the first issue of the organization’s journal, the editors wrote: “We take this opportunity
The other major distinguishing feature of Camp Inc was that, despite the obviously male orientation of the organization, Ware and Poll were very keen to have both female and male homosexuals as members. (270)

The media coverage of the announcement of Camp Inc's formation was quite favourable and reasonably extensive (271) – undoubtedly partly a function of the novelty of having people publicly declare themselves to be homosexual. Those people who wrote to GPO Box 5074 Sydney, in response to the media coverage, were sent an invitation to join the organization and a copy of its aims:

1. To provide a forum for the exchange of ideas relating to homosexuality. Initially this will take the form of a magazine which will supply a means of communication between homosexuals as well as between homosexuals and the wider community. Eventually club rooms will be obtained.
2. To provide a number of services such as legal, medical and employment advice and information. A legal assistance fund will be established so that as many police prosecutions as possible can be challenged.
3. To agitate for law reform.
4. To entertain. The society is intended to be serious but not dreary. Many of our activities will be pure entertainment. (272)

to thank the N.S.W. Humanist Society; the Council for Civil Liberties; the Homosexual Law Reform Society of the A.C.T. These societies have been of great help in establishing CAMP Inc. "Camp Ink. Vol I No. 1. November, 1970 p 14.

(269) See for example, POLL, Christabel and WARE, John: "Editorial - Saving One's Neck" Camp Ink. Vol I No. 2. December, 1970 p 2. "It is time for us to come out of the shadows and loudly demand our rights as human beings." Ware was quoted as saying, in the newspaper interviews he gave in September, 1970, that "Half the hang-ups about homosexuality are caused by homosexuals themselves." See for example, SUNDAY TIMES REPORTER: "A Homosexual Club to End Secrecy." The Sunday Times. (Perth) 13 September, 1970 For his own motivations in founding Camp Inc see WARE, John: "Twelve Months Past" Camp Ink. Vol I No. 11. September, 1971 pp 4-7.

(270) See for example, [POLL, Christabel and WARE, John]: "Editorial - What's In It for Me? ..."Camp Ink Vol I No. 1. November, 1970 p 2 and the assumption that the readers would be male implied in: "will those homosexuals who claim there is NOTHING IN IT FOR THEM have us believe that they already enjoy these [civil] rights?.. Surely if such people bothered to look past the end of their noses, or that equally prominent protrusion on the lower half of their anatomy, they would realise that there is a good deal in it for them". Poll in particular was insistent on the importance of both sexes being members of Camp Inc which, she claimed, made it the only two sex homosexual organization in the world. See POLL, Christabel: "Gay Liberation" The Old Mole. No. 7. 26 September, 1970 p 5 and A SPECIAL REPORTER: "Gay Power on the Move" The Bulletin. 13 March, 1971.


1970

Wed 27 May
Federal Attorney General Tom Hughes suggests possibility of homosexual law reform for Australian Territories.

May
Meetings of interested individuals to form Camp Inc. begin in Sydney.

Fri 24 July
West Australian Labor Party (ALP) State Conference adopts policies of homosexual law reform.

July
Camp Inc formed in Sydney by John Ware and Christabel Poll.

Mon 31 August
Federal Opposition leader Whitlam publicly commits federal ALP to conscience vote on homosexual law reform.

Mon 7 September
National body of Presbyterian Church recommends homosexual law reform.

September
Extensive media coverage of public announcement of formation of Camp Inc. in Sydney.

Mon 21 September
Federal Attorney General Hughes discounts possibility of homosexual law reform for Australian Territories.

November
First issue of *Camp Ink* appears.

November
Church group formed within Camp Inc.

December

December
Camp Inc has approximately 300 members.

1971

February
Camp Inc letter of protest to Federal Minister for the Navy (Killen) over dismissal from the navy of 5 sailors for homosexual behaviour.

Sun 7 February
Melbourne Branch of Camp Inc formed – no member prepared to publicly declare their homosexuality.

Mon 22 February
Sydney University Campus Camp applies for recognition as registered university group.

February
Law Reform Committee formed within Camp Inc.

February
First General Meeting of Camp Inc at St. John’s Parish Hall, Balmain. 80-100 of the 400 members attending.

March
*Camp Ink* publicly supports Wendy Bacon on trial for publishing indecent material in *Thor*.

Mon 22 March
Ian Black of Camp Inc on Anne Deveson’s “The Newsmakers” commercial radio current affairs programme.

April
*Camp Ink* receives many letters of condemnation for its support of Wendy Bacon.

April
Sydney Camp Inc rents 393 Darling Street, Balmain as clubrooms.

May
Sydney University Campus Camp recognition as university club held up because of University fears about the legal status of homosexuality.

May
Married Members Group, Women’s Group, House Committee Group formed within Camp Inc.

June
Sydney University Campus Camp Group granted recognition as university club. 60 members.

July
Beginnings of struggles within Camp Inc over direction of organization its structure and ‘leadership’.

August
Anglican Church in Canberra and Goulburn announce support for homosexual law reform.

August
University of NSW Campus Camp Group formed.
CAMP (NSW) sends form letter to professional staff in Callan Park seeking their views on homosexuality. No replies received.

Advisory Committee formed within CAMP (NSW)

The Australian the only newspaper to carry news of forthcoming demonstration by CAMP.

CAMP demonstration outside Liberal Party Headquarters in Ash Street, Sydney where preselection contest being fought between Jim Cameron and Tom Hughes. First homosexual demonstration in Australia. Approximately 80 demonstrators.

Melbourne Anglican Synod declares itself in favour of homosexual law reform.

Church Group of CAMP sends out statement of Working Group on Religion to 700 clergy in all major denominations in Sydney asking for their views on homosexuality and christianity.

Gay Liberation departure from CAMP (NSW) begins.


University of NSW Campus Camp Forum on legalizing homosexuality. Speakers: Alex Carey, Anne Deveson, Rev Ted Noffs, John Webster.

Camp Ink Vol 2 No.1. produced in Brisbane. Four Brisbane CAMP members "come out" by having their photographs on the cover.

Camp Ink Vol 2 No. 2. produced in Sydney. 35 Sydney CAMP members "come out" by having their photographs on the cover.

Women's Group within CAMP collapses as women drift away.


CAMP and Gay Liberation members march under homosexual banners in International Women's Day March.

Assoc. Prof. Neil McConaghy interviewed on his aversion therapy for homosexuals for an article in Camp Ink.

Homosexual Guidance Service (HGS) group formed within CAMP.

Women's Group reconstituted within CAMP.

Morals Committee of Anglican Diocese of Sydney addressed by members of CAMP's Church Group.

Angus and Robertson launch Dennis Altman's Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation at Civil Liberties House, Glebe. Segment filmed by ABC.

Gay Liberation organizes demonstration outside ABC to protest at the ABC's refusal to screen segment filmed on 2 July.

Neil McConaghy and Robin Winkler debate aversion therapy. University of NSW as part of CAMP Sex Lib Week organized by CAMP.

CAMP organizes march through streets of Sydney. Australia's first homosexual march.

First edition of Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter.

Macquarie University Forum on Homosexuality. Speakers: Dennis Altman, Sue Wills, Father Jim McLaren and Dr. D. Martin.
Tuesday 8 August
Thurs 10 August
Monday 14 August
Thurs 7 September
Friday 13 October
20 October
27 October
Tuesday 31 October
Sunday 12 November
Sunday 12 November
Monday 20 November
Saturday 2 December

University of NSW Gay Liberation street theatre against aversion therapy.
CAMP sends letters to federal and state members of parliament on taxation laws as they affect homosexuals and on homosexual law reform.

*Sydney Morning Herald* visited by members of CAMP and Gay Liberation and handbills stuck up.

CAMP vacates 393 Darling Street, Balmain.

CAMP organized seminars with NSW Health Department on homosexuality - members of both CAMP and Gay Liberation participate.

ABC Television documentary on four members of CAMP screened.

CAMP organizes demonstration outside St. Clements Church of England, Mosman to protest sacking of Peter Bonsall-Boone, Church Secretary, who appeared in ABC documentary.

Meeting to organize campaign for CAMP's candidate (David Widdup) for federal elections.

Screening of Monday Conference programme on Aversion Therapy.

CAMP members staff polling booths in Lowe for David Widdup.
EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES - CAMP.

Like Sydney Women's Liberation, CAMP and later Gay Liberation saw that it was necessary to work for change on two levels. Just as individual women had to try to undo the damage done to their self-esteem, their self-confidence, and their images of self caused by sex role socialization, so individual homosexuals had to begin to throw off negative self-images, to transform self-doubt and self-hatred into self-acceptance -- and then into 'gay pride'. Simultaneously, changes to the environment in which homosexuals lived were also to be sought. Within a very broad campaign to 'change community attitudes' towards homosexuals and homosexuality, Camp Inc. (273) identified three major institutions -- the law, the church, and psychiatry -- as being both particularly oppressive of homosexuals and as having considerable influence in the formation of community attitudes. (274)

The Law.

Several factors contributed to the early emphasis amongst the activities of Camp Inc on homosexual law reform. First, and most obviously, the fact that in all states and territories in Australia (and the laws covering homosexual behaviour come under state rather than federal jurisdiction) homosexual acts between males constituted criminal offences to which were attached severe penalties. (275) Not only did the laws exist on the statute books but they were enforced (albeit selectively) and the kinds of activities that the state police forces pursued in making arrests were particularly unsavoury. (276) A second contributing factor was that the climate into which Camp Inc was born was one where the discussion of homosexuality was already set within the context of homosexual law reform. The publication of the federal government's Draft Criminal Code for the ACT and the Australian Territories, the statement by federal Attorney General Hughes on the possibility of homosexual law reform, the public statements by various churches, political parties, associations and politicians, were all about homosexual law reform. Law reform was something which public figures and groups could support without being seen necessarily to condone homosexual behaviour and this was something Camp Inc could capitalize on by emphasizing public support for law reform but playing down the varied and often unacceptable reasons given for that support. (277)

Thirdly, laws which criminalized
homosexual behaviour directly affected male homosexuals only and concern to change these laws reflected the interests of the predominantly male membership of Camp Inc. And finally, homosexual law reform had the appeal of being a very concrete goal to work towards. It was conceivably achievable and by for example, counting the number of politicians who supported it, progress toward it could be estimated along the way.

The ways in which Camp Inc and, in particular, its variously named law reform groups, pursued homosexual law reform were fairly limited. Almost as a prerequisite for any agitation to change the laws was the need to publicise what the existing laws and penalties were. Camp Ink, the monthly journal of the organization, which was sent to members and to the press, tried to fill the function by publishing resumes of the laws in the various Australian states. (278)

In similar information gathering and dissemination vein, CAMP had also to ascertain exactly where individual politicians stood on the issue. Neither major political party in NSW was prepared to make homosexual law reform party policy (279) so if a bill reforming the law were to be introduced into state parliament, it would have to be a private members bill. In this event both parties were likely to respond by making any vote on such a bill a conscience vote -- hence the importance of trying to find out how each politician stood. Nor was there much point in trying to find a politician who would introduce such a bill until there was a reasonable chance of it passing. Apart from the occasional newspaper report on individual politicians' stands on the matter (280) the only way to gather this kind of information was to write to parliamentarians and ask them for it. By the end of 1972 CAMP had undertaken two such letter writing exercises. The first was in late 1971 when letters were sent to all 185 federal members of parliament asking them for their attitudes to homosexual law reform and the Draft Criminal Code. (281) Only 32 of the recipients replied to the letter: 19 (all members of the ALP) said that they favoured homosexual law reform; 13 were non-committal. (282)

The second letter writing exercise was undertaken in August 1972 and on that occasion the recipients were NSW state parliamentarians. (283) The letter asked them for their views on two matters: the abolition of laws governing consensual sexual activity; and the passing of legislation outlawing discrimination in employment on the ground of sexual orientation. Between the two series of letter, on May 10, 1972, University of Adelaide (S.Australia) lecturer in law, George Duncan, was murdered. Duncan, a homosexual, had been beaten and his body thrown into the River Torrens from a point which was known to be a male homosexual beat. Although a special inquiry into the incident produced no results in terms of ascertaining the

2 March, 1971 on the Federal Labor Shadow Minister's (Hayden) recommendation for state homosexual law reform in an address to the Queensland Fabian Society: "It seemed the rational, responsible and enlightened way to deal with this behaviour problem was to withdraw penal sanctions against homosexual acts in private between consenting males, but to still regard them as acts of immorality."


(280) See for example, The Australian 13 February, 1971 which carried a report of Queensland State ALP Shadow Justice Minister Colin Bennett's statement that "We have more important things to do than waste our time with a pack of poofers".

(281) While male homosexual acts in NSW were covered by state and not federal laws, the attitudes of federal members of parliament were important because (a) the Draft Criminal Code for the Australian Territories could be used by state politicians as a model for state law change; (b) the attitudes of federal parliamentarians could indicate state parliamentarians' (of the same party) attitudes and be used to try to influence state parliamentarians.


identities of those responsible, police involvement in the murder was openly suggested. (284) The murder of Duncan, the fact that he was a university lecturer, and the allegations of police involvement, all contributed to the fairly rapid introduction into the South Australian parliament of Australia's first homosexual law reform bill. They also provided branches of CAMP and Gay Liberation groups in other states with further evidence to place before politicians; evidence of the need not simply for homosexual law reform but also for legislation outlawing discrimination against homosexuals. (285)

The only other weapon in the CAMP armory as far as homosexual law reform was concerned was to publicly support those politicians and groups who indicated their support for law reform and to publicly condemn those who opposed it. Such publicity was confined largely to the pages of Camp Ink (286) with one exception which was the occasion of the first demonstration organized by homosexuals in Australia. On October 6, 1971, about 80 demonstrators met outside the Liberal Party headquarters in Ash Street, Sydney, where the preselection for the federal seat of Berowra was to be contested by the sitting member, Federal Attorney General, Tom Hughes, and by Mr. Jim Cameron, state Liberal MLA for Northcott. Hughes, who had the support of the demonstrators, had publicly stated his belief that homosexual acts between consenting adults should not be the concern of the law; (287) Cameron had made it clear that he did not share Hughes' belief. (288) Demonstrators - members of CAMP, friends, and sympathetic heterosexuals - handed out leaflets explaining their presence (289), held up placards as the preselection committee walked to their meeting (290) and gave away helium filled balloons with slogans painted on them. (291) Hughes won the preselection.

While the early emphasis on the law reform activities of Camp Inc was on those sections of the criminal code which outlawed male homosexual acts, the organization soon became increasingly concerned with those laws which, by default rather than by intent, discriminated against female and male homosexuals. In May, 1971, for example, the Law Reform Committee invited (292) the membership of Camp Inc to comment on the three areas of law reform it had decided to tackle: reform of the criminal law; the status of adults which was relevant to the questions both of the age of consent (to sexual activity) and of the age of legal capacity (to enter contracts); and the "status of partners, especially 'de facto' and of the same sex - property ownership, inheritance, recognition of civil marriages, pensions etc." (293)


(288) For a discussion of Jim Cameron's stand see "Sydney Scene - If You Know What I Mean" Camp Ink Vol 1 No. 12, October, 1971 p 14. It was Cameron who was, in October 1972, to move that the NSW Parliament dissociate itself from the actions of those trying to legitimate abortions, discussed above.


(290) Placards carried slogans: "I am a Lesbian and Beautiful"; "Don't Let the Wowser Spoil the Party"; "Keep Cameron Out"; "Cameron Hates Homos but He'll B-g-r the Liberal Party"; "Advance Australian Fairies"; "The Government has no place in the Bedrooms of the Nation"; "Cameron is Lousy Sex Anyway".

The further broadening of the demands made upon the law which occurred during 1972 reflected, in part, the growth of the organization in terms of numbers and variety of membership interests and it also reflected the influence of the ideas and demands of the Women's Liberation movement, an unwillingness in CAMP to conform to the Gay Liberation characterization of it as 'only' concerned with homosexual law reform and the institutionalization of the two sex membership of CAMP – in April, 1972, when CAMP (NSW) adopted its constitution, one of the structural requisites was that the organization have "two Co-Presidents, who shall not be of the same sex". (294)

The May 1972 issue of Camp Ink contained a statement of intent by the recently elected Co-Presidents which reflected these organizational changes:

First and foremost it is increasingly necessary to reaffirm that CAMP is a political organization. Unlike all the previous and current social clubs, dances, bars, steam baths and beats that cater to homosexuals in Sydney – and mainly male homosexuals at that – we aim not to provide facilities within the present society and laws, but to change that society and its laws to the extent necessary to gain full equality and rights for homosexuals. Clearly we have been political to an extent. Most importantly, we have published this journal... We have also talked to the churches, and to the politicians, about their attitudes and the changes that we would like to see... And beyond that? Some attempt has been made, through Camp Ink, including this column and elsewhere, to see the position of ourselves in a wider context. The connection with Women's Lib in a wider Sexual Liberation movement has been raised... CAMP contains both women and men. In this we are both rare and fortunate... In the long term our interests are similar but in the short run they diverge – law reform and police activity are of far more direct relevance to the male than the female homosexual. But the women are faced with two sets of prejudices – the first, simply because they are women in a male dominated society, the second because they are homosexuals. Job discrimination, moral condemnation and social antipathy are common to both the men and women... (295)

CAMP's demands in the area of law reform increasingly emphasized the need for changes which would benefit homosexual women and men in their social and economic lives; concomitantly, the demand for reform of the criminal law became only one amongst many. (296) The dismissal of Peter Bonsall-Boone (Secretary of CAMP) from his position as Church Secretary to St. Clements Church in Mosman in November 1972 because he had publicly acknowledged his homosexuality on an ABC television documentary (297)

---


(293) Ibid.

(294) CAMPAIGN AGAINST MORAL PERSECUTION (NSW BRANCH): Constitution. Adopted 12 April, 1972. Document No. 31. See Clause 7 (1) (a). To claim, as Paul Foss does, that "It was not until the investiture of Sue Wills as Co-President of the N.S.W. C.A.M.P. that this long entrenched gender split [in the organization] disappeared" is misleading. FOSS, Paul: op. cit. p 9. It ignores the role played by Women's Liberation ideas and Women's Liberationists on some of the male membership of CAMP; it also implies that the investiture of a female Co-President did in fact heal the 'gender split' – which it did not.


(297) The television Chequerboard documentary entitled "This Just Happens to Be Part of Me" and which
ensured that for some time to come the call for legislation outlawing discrimination in employment on the grounds of sex or sexual orientation would take precedence over most others involving legislations.

Along with the change in emphasis of demands made upon the law from within CAMP went a change in tactics. The editorial of the January 1971 issue of Camp Ink, for example, sounded a rather pessimistic note:

> We do not advocate that homosexuals in Australia should immediately march down the street carrying Gay Liberation placards but we do feel that it should be recognized by all homosexuals that it is a necessary step to be taken eventually – maybe not for twenty years .. (298)

Similarly, in announcing the formation of the first law reform committee within CAMP in March 1971, Ian Black, its convenor wrote:

> The present Camp Inc. Law Reform Committee is opposed to militant demo-type tactics. Australians are an elderly people, even the young, and they don’t like anything upsetting. So we will go softly, softly. (299)

And yet, by October 1971, members of Camp Inc had demonstrated outside the Liberal Party headquarters in Sydney; by March 1972, had marched under Gay Liberation banners as a contingent in the first Sydney IWD march; by July 1972 had organized a march (the first in Australia) of homosexuals through the streets of Sydney during late night shopping; and by November, 1972 had organized the largest homosexual demonstration Sydney had seen. Changes in the people who were active in CAMP, the splitting of the Gay Liberation group off from CAMP, the election of office bearers within CAMP, and the success of Women’s Liberation demonstrations and marches are all factors which have to be taken into consideration in explaining this change.

On a more immediate level CAMP tried to provide a legal aid service: the difficulty with this was not in being unable to find lawyers and funds to fight cases, they were available whenever needed; it lay in the fact that men facing homosexual charges were either ignorant of the existence of CAMP or unwilling to risk the publicity which might surround availing themselves of its services. Some however did, and civil libertarian solicitors were able to successfully defend several cases. Even fewer victims of employment discrimination were willing to openly fight their former employers: the grounds on which any such action could be taken were slim and the risk to future employment enormous; and attempts by CAMP to get dismissed homosexual women and men to take a stand looked like invitations to instant martyrdom. All that could be done was to publicise any such cases as came to the attention of the organization. (302)


(299) BLACK, Ian: op. cit.
(300) See “W(h)ither Camp Inc ?” Camp Ink. Vol I No. 1. November, 1970 pp 7-8. “We have established a legal aid fund (to which donations are essential) so that as many police prosecutions as possible can be challenged. This may convince the police that homosexuals are not ‘easy prey.’”
The Churches.

As was the case with the law reform group of CAMP, the Church Group sought to work on several fronts:

... we have existed mainly on the strength of monthly meetings which have served both to assist us as christians to appreciate our role as homosexuals within the christian community, while at the same time we have prepared a letter and statement which have been sent out to some 700 clergy in the Sydney area outlining our ideas on the shortcomings of the theological basis currently so popular for use in opposition to homosexuality and homosexual acts ... For the past four weeks 5 or 6 members of the Church group have been meeting each week for prayer meditation with the thought that such activity would either lead to the formation of a specifically homosexual church, or would alternatively provide those of us who are members with sufficient spiritual strength to maintain our worshipping lives within the local congregation ...

One of our members, the Rev. John Hutchinson, who travels down regularly from Newcastle to be at our meetings, had had considerable experience of the Metropolitan Community Church in America and is in constant touch with them. He has suggested to us several times that a homosexual church may be the answer also in Australia. (303)

Again, like the law reform group, the church group had both to ascertain and then publicize the views of the various denominations on homosexuality and homosexuals. In addition to newspaper reports on statements of church bodies on their stances on the issue (304) which Camp Ink reported, individual members of CAMP wrote articles for the journal which not only attacked the church stands but also attempted non-traditional interpretations of the Bible. (305)

In the last resort, however, the only way to systematically canvass church opinion was to write to individual clergy soliciting their opinions.

In August 1971, 700 clergy in Sydney were sent a copy of the Statement by the Working Group on Religion, with a covering letter outlining what the group wanted from them (306): comments on the Statement; their understanding; and help in furthering the aims of the group. The letter provided an important point of contact between the Church Group of CAMP and the Morals Committee for the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Sydney. On April, 17, 1972, Peter Bonsall-Boone, Convenor of the Church Group wrote to the Rev Bruce Smith, Convenor of the Morals Committee and Principal of Moore Theological College at Newtown in Sydney. He noted that two clergy from the College had already commented on the Statement and had passed the material on to Smith, and asked if Smith himself would care to comment. (307)

(303) Letter from Peter Bonsall·Boone, Secretary of CAMP (NSW) and Convenor of the Church Group within CAMP (NSW) in response to enquiry from man in Como NSW. Letter dated 17 April, 1972. Bonsall·Boone had been Convenor of the Church Group from its inception in November, 1970. In the letter, held by Bonsall·Boone, he went on to state his view that any such separate homosexual church would be an interim measure to accommodate the needs of homosexual christians; he saw it as disbanding when the established churches accepted homosexuality and homosexuals.


(305) See for example, HUMPHREYS, Laud: "Jesus Christ – A Sexual Person" Camp Ink Vol I. No. 4. February 1971 pp 9-11; DEAN, Roger: "Homosexuals are Sinners" Camp Ink Vol I. No. 5. March, 1971 pp 8-9; PERRY,
in his capacity as Convenor of the Morals Committee replied on 5 May, 1972, making no comment on the Statement but inviting Bonsall-Boone to present evidence on homosexuality to the Committee. Bonsall-Boone accepted the invitation and on 7 June, 1972, he and Peter de Vaal gave evidence as homosexuals to the Committee. The Report of the Committee which was not released until November, 1973, strongly condemned homosexuals and homosexuality. (308)

Like other groups within CAMP, the Church Group provided speakers on homosexuality and on CAMP to any group in the community which issued an invitation; it also offered support to individual homosexuals who had difficulties resolving their personal conflicts about being homosexual christians whose churches condemned their homosexuality; and it tried to get individual clergy to modify their views on homosexuality.

The dismissal of Peter Bonsall-Boone from his position of Secretary to St. Clements Church of England at Mosman was an event which affected not just those concerned with legislation to outlaw discrimination in employment; it had a profound effect on the Church Group. Reluctant to take a stand against St. Clements because of the loyalty he felt for the church which had employed him for four years, and the members of the church congregation with whom he had become friendly, Bonsall-Boone was initially willing to resign his position when the Rector of St. Clements requested him to. Several members of the CAMP Executive and other friends convinced him that he should not resign but force the church to dismiss him if they no longer wished to employ him. On Wednesday 8 November, 1972, he was dismissed.

The demonstration which was organized by the CAMP Executive outside St. Clements, Mosman on Sunday 12 November, 1972 was large, noisy, but orderly, and well covered by the mass media. It was attended by members of CAMP, Gay Liberation, the NSW Humanist Society, and the staff of the ABC who had filmed the Chequerboard Programme which had resulted in Bonsall-Boone's dismissal. Parishioners were forced to 'run the gauntlet' through rows of chanting demonstrators to attend the morning service and leave it. (309)

Bonsall-Boone's dismissal contained several lessons for CAMP activists. Firstly, that it was not so much the homosexuality of an employee as the public acknowledgement of that homosexuality that was likely to lead to her or his dismissal. The Rector of St. Clements had known of Bonsall-Boone's homosexuality for some years. It was not until after the screening


(307) Correspondence between Smith and Bonsall-Boone held by Bonsall-Boone.


(309) The leaflet issued by the Church Group which announced the proposed demonstration reflected the ambivalence of the group about demonstrating as an appropriate tactic to use against the church: "The demonstration is intended to be QUIET, ORDERLY and DIGNIFIED and all demonstrators are requested to attend the church service." See CAMPAIGN AGAINST MORAL PERSECUTION: Demonstration. Undated Leaflet. Sydney, November, 1972 Document No. 40. It should be compared with that issued by the Co-Presidents of CAMP: *Why We Are Here op. cit.* and that issued by THE SYDNEY GAY LIBERATION PUBLICATIONS GROUP: *Blatant Oppression*. Undated leaflet. Sydney, November, 1972. Document No. 41. Bonsall-Boone did not participate in the demonstration himself: he did not want to further embarrass the Rector of St. Clements, the congregation, or the Church of England. For further coverage of the demonstration see BONSAII-BOONE, Peter: "Editorial" op. cit.; "When the Shouting is Over" op. cit.; LEE, John: "Peter Bonsall-Boone: Coming Out in Mosman" op. cit.; TUCKER, Robert: "Gay Brothers Off Anglican Hardhats"
of the programme in which he had said he was Secretary for a church in Sydney that the
Rector, faced with criticism from some of his parishioners and with pressure from church
authorities, could not afford to be seen to condone homosexuality by continuing to employ an
unrepentant homosexual. The same sorts of factors appeared to have been working on Rev.
Bruce Smith, Convenor of the Morals Committee for the Anglican Diocese of Sydney and
spokesman on matters of morality for the church in Sydney who, in June 1972 had invited
Bonsall-Boone to give evidence to his committee on homosexuality. Smith knew both that
Bonsall-Boone was a homosexual and that he was Secretary to St. Clements. And yet, on
the commercial television programme A Current Affair on November 9, he expressed
surprise that the Rector of St. Clements had not done anything about it ‘until the thing
became public’. (310) The second lesson we learned was that no amount of righteous
indignation, demonstrating, chanting and media coverage could get Bonsall-Boone reinstated –
anti-discrimination legislation was essential for that. Such legislation would also stiffen the
spines of those employers who were willing to employ homosexuals but not willing to be
seen to do so. Thirdly, for those of us who lived in what has often been called the ‘homosexual
ghetto’, amongst other homosexuals and tolerant, accepting, sympathetic straights, it was a
shock to experience the depths of intolerance and disgust mixed with fear expressed by some
of suburban Mosman’s churchgoers. To watch, for example, a mother cover the eyes of her
child so that it would not have to look upon ‘those disgusting perverts’ and to realise that she
was deadly serious, was very disturbing and an indicator of what little impact the two year old
homosexual movement had had on community attitudes. (311) The fourth lesson was
about tactics: we learned that it was relatively easy to rally a fairly large (by 1972 standards)
number (about 200) of people prepared to participate in a homosexual demonstration and to
attract extensive television and newspaper coverage when the issue was very clear cut, and
the demonstration called for a Sunday.

Psychiatry.

Perhaps the most pervasive influence that Camp Inc had to try to combat was that of
psychiatry. Not only was there a fairly broad public acceptance (if not entirely accurate
interpretation) of psychiatric definitions of which kinds of behaviour were ‘sick’ and which
were not, and of psychiatric treatment as some sort of ‘miracle wonder drug’, but supporters
and opponents of homosexual law reform alike, and churchmen, fell back on the findings of
psychiatry to support their arguments. The opinions of those who were in favour of homosexual
law reform or of those who disagreed with church condemnation of homosexuals were often
double edged: many who were prepared to support law reform did so on the grounds that
homosexuals would benefit more from psychiatric treatment than from imprisonment; many
who considered church condemnation of homosexuals to be mediaeval did so because they
believed it more appropriate to regard homosexuality as an illness than as a sin. Moreover,
as a moulder of community attitudes and ‘judge’ of homosexuals (312) psychiatry appeared
to have a lot more to offer than either the church or the law: it was more up to date, more
scientific; its practitioners had a much higher professional status; it appeared to be more
humane; and, probably most importantly, it claimed to be able to cure homosexuality.

The Digger, No. 8, 2-16 December, 1972; COUGHLIN, George: "Christians Should Help, Not Condemn
Seekers after Love." The National Times, November 20-25, 1972; "Homosexuals Protest Church Action"

(310) See TRANSCRIPT: Interview – Mike Wllsessee and Rev Bruce Smith. A Current Affair. OTEN.

(311) A similar sort of attitude was expressed by a St. Clements parishioner on radio on 9 November 1972.
9 November, 1972. Document No. 44.
It was the perception of psychiatric theories which considered homosexuality to be a disorder as a threat to homosexuals which prompted John Ware to first start thinking of forming an organization of homosexuals. He was particularly incensed by the behaviourist model of homosexuality and the treatment that it offered – aversion therapy. (313) In his article, "Rat Psychology and the Homosexual" which was published in the Sydney University student Union's Union Recorder in October, 1970 and again in the first issue of Camp Ink in November, 1970, (314) Ware argued that aversion therapy was a crude and a cruel method of treatment which was being used by behaviour therapists to impose their own middle class values on people who sought treatment for illnesses which had been 'created' by therapists themselves through their definitions of what constituted an illness. Claims that people 'voluntarily' sought treatment for their homosexuality were false because such people sought treatment only because of the internalized and external social pressures placed upon them to do so. Aversion therapy moreover, could not cure homosexuality in the sense of being able to turn an unhappy homosexual into a happy heterosexual; all it could do was to discourage homosexuals from engaging in homosexual acts. But, more importantly than all of these things, there was the danger that students of psychology would become obsessed with techniques and experiments and ignore the moral and ethical implications of what they were doing; and if this happened there was a real danger that more refined and sophisticated techniques of behaviour modification would be developed and used for purposes of moral manipulation.

While there were numerous other psychiatric treatment methods being used on homosexuals, aversion therapy was the one on which Camp Inc concentrated its attack. Several factors contributed to this almost exclusive concern: firstly, it was the treatment method which received the most mass media coverage (315) which meant that not only were we more aware of it but that the general public was more familiar with it too; second, of all psychiatric treatment methods, it was clearly one of the most distasteful because it involved inflicting physical pain and was thus more likely to attract public condemnation than any of the talk therapies; and finally, there was already quite strong opposition to it from within the profession, opposition which could be exploited because it went beyond simple treatment preference rivalry. Although one of John Ware's preoccupations was with aversion therapy and, more broadly, the influence of psychology and psychiatry on community attitudes toward homosexuals, with the exception of an article by Mark Freedman entitled


(313) See WARE, John: "Twelve Months Past" op. cit.

(314) op. cit.

(315) Several reasons may be advanced to explain why the mass media reported on aversion therapy more often than other treatment methods: first, two of its leading proponents in Sydney, Prof. Sid Lovibond (Psychology, University of NSW) and Assoc. Prof. Neil McConaghy (Psychiatry, University of NSW) were academics and hence bound less by professional bodies' rules about advertising than psychiatrists and psychologists in private practice who used other treatment methods. The Sun Herald, 28 September, 1969 for example, carried a report on Lovibond's use of aversion therapy with alcoholics which ended with Lovibond quoted as saying:"I'm a natural enthusiast, but I really believe that this experiment is succeeding far beyond my hopes . . . What we need now are more subjects. If people with drinking problems care to give me a phone call at the university I can assure them of our discretion." A second reason might be that it is much easier to translate into everyday language how and why aversion therapy is supposed to work than it is to do so with other forms of therapy --"If the dog craps on the carpet you punish it and before long the dog will stop crapping on the carpet," WARE, John: "Twelve Months Past" op. cit. Third, with the exception of perhaps psychosurgery, aversion therapy treatment methods (electric shocks for the most part) are more spectacular to report on than those of the talk therapies and they are used on problems which newspapers delight in reporting on in any context – sex, alcohol and violence. Fourth, the time it takes to conduct a treatment programme using aversion therapy is relatively short and hence success or failure can be claimed more quickly. And finally, the release, in mid-1972, of Stanley Kubrick's film A Clockwork Orange with its dramatic and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NEWSPAPER COVERAGE</th>
<th>INTERVIEW-ARTICLE</th>
<th>HOMOSEXUAL GUIDANCE SERVICE</th>
<th>AVERTION THERAPY FORUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 1</td>
<td>Baxter article in <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 5</td>
<td>Sunday Telegraph article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 8</td>
<td>Altman on Bob Rogers TV programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 14</td>
<td>Brett letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 20</td>
<td>Day letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 21</td>
<td>Halford letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 23</td>
<td>Lee letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 28</td>
<td>Gill letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HGS Leaflet drafted by Ware, Wills, Lyons**

**HGS accepted as special group in CAMP LIB WEEK**

**CAMP Executive discusses CAMP SEX LIB WEEK**

---

**Brett letter to *The Australian***

**Day letter to *The Australian***

**Halford letter to *The Australian***

**Lee letter to *The Australian***

**Gill letter to *The Australian***

**Conway letter to *The Australian***

**Aversion therapy article in Nation***

**Wills interviews McConaghy**

**Wills agrees to send HGS leaflets to McConaghy**

**HGS meeting attended by Broughton Hall psychiatrists**

---

**Wills discussion with Ware of *Camp Ink* article***

**McConaghy request to Altman refused**

**Altman accepts McConaghy articles**

**Altman informs Wills of McConaghy telephone conversation**

**Wills letter to McConaghy asking for interview**

**McConaghy articles sent to Altman**

**McConaghy to Wills agreeing to interview**

**Wills sees Price about McConaghy**

---

**HGS to Wills agreeing to participate in aversion therapy forum**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NEUWSPAPER COVERAGE</th>
<th>INTERVIEW-ARTICLE</th>
<th>HOMOSEXUAL GUIDANCE SERVICE</th>
<th>AVERSION THERAPY FORUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td>Brett letter to <em>The Australian</em></td>
<td>Wills letter to Barclay of NSW Health Department</td>
<td>Wills letter to Brett and Conway inviting them to oppose McConaghy at forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wills sends HGS leaflets to McConaghy</td>
<td>Brett to Wills declining invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wills sends HGS leaflets to Broughton Hall Superintendent</td>
<td>Conway to Wills declining invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wills sees McConaghy at Fell Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wills sends interview transcript to McConaghy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2</td>
<td>Altman's <em>Homosexual</em> launched</td>
<td>McConaghy returns corrected transcript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td>Altman on Monday Conference</td>
<td>McConaghy to Wills sending photograph of aversion therapy equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Australian* and *The Bulletin*
**NEWSPAPER COVERAGE**

Altman letter to *The Australian*

Wills letter to *The Australian*

Charles letter to *The Australian*

*MD* carries item on HGS

Wills letter to Australian and NZ College of Psychiatrists

McConaghy agrees to inclusion of part previously excluded from article

College of Psychiatrists letter to Wills

*Camp Ink* article on McConaghy and aversion therapy published and copies sent to McConaghy

**INTERVIEW-ARTICLE**

Wills sees Webb of Ed'n Section of NSW Health Department

1st seminar to NSW Health Department

2nd seminar to NSW Health Department

3rd seminar to NSW Health Department

4th seminar to NSW Health Department

**HOMOSEXUAL GUIDANCE SERVICE**

1st seminar to NSW Health Department

2nd seminar to NSW Health Department

3rd seminar to NSW Health Department

4th seminar to NSW Health Department

Monday Conference on aversion therapy

Monday Conference reviewed in *The Australian*
"Homosexuality and Psychological Functioning" which was reprinted from an overseas journal (316) and a few reviews of books which dealt with psychiatric pronouncements on homosexuality (317) neither the organization nor the journal made much reference to these concerns between July 1970 and early 1972.

Until 1972 Ware had been almost the only person within Camp Inc who had any knowledge of psychology in general and aversion therapy in particular. Some, like Dennis Altman, who were concerned about it had left the organization late in 1971 to form the first Australian Gay Liberation group (318) but early in 1972, several people, myself included, who had both a knowledge of and an interest in aversion therapy joined CAMP. On Wednesday 1 March, 1972 The Australian published a report by Cliff Baxter under the lead of "Dirty Books Cure Sex Haters" which acted as a trigger to three related sets of activities, related by the issues involved and the people concerned. These sets of activities were: the formation within CAMP of the Homosexual Guidance Service (HGS); the writing of an article intended to discredit (and ultimately stop) the use of aversion therapy on homosexuals; and the setting up of a public debate between a proponent and an opponent of aversion therapy, again intended to discredit its use.

Baxter's article reported on the use of pornography supplied by the Commonwealth Customs Department to Dr. Ron Farmer of the Psychology Department of the University of NSW in treating "frigid women with a deep seated fear of sex". The main emphasis in the report was on pornography from Denmark being made officially available to certain individuals while being denied to the general public, and Farmer was the man with whom the report was primarily concerned. The other person mentioned was Professor Nathaniel McConaghy from the Department of Psychiatry at the University of NSW who was also using the pornographic material in "a bid to change homosexuals who want to become heterosexual". Although the report mentioned that "Professor McConaghy has treated homosexuals referred from prisons and courts but usually he prefers them to attend of their own free will", the main emphasis was still on the supply of pornography and its usefulness in helping people to enjoy (heterosexual) sex. When the same information was reported in The Sunday Telegraph several days later (319) the emphasis in reporting was again on the pornography aspects of the story and its supply to Farmer and, secondarily, to McConaghy.

While the newspaper emphasis on the 'supply of pornography' aspects of the report is understandable in the light of the changing climate of opinion with respect to Australia's rigid censorship laws, the reaction to the report, as indicated by letters to the editor of The Australian, was to the mention of aversion therapy for homosexuals. (320) Over a relatively long time span – 14 March to 11 May – a total of seven letters to the editor about aversion therapy for homosexuals were published in The Australian. The first, which appeared on rather crude portrayal of aversion therapy ensured continued publicity for aversion therapy in Sydney.

(316) FREEDMAN, Mark: "Homosexuality and Psychological Functioning" Camp Ink Vol I No. 7. May, 1971 pp 4-8. reprinted from Germinal Summer, 1971. Perhaps the most important aspect of Freedman's article was the stance it adopted toward any psychological problems homosexual might exhibit – "Current evidence suggests that if homosexuality is more often associated with psychological disturbance in a person this is caused by society pressure rather than individual psycho-pathology. Many homosexually-oriented individuals function well despite these pervasive pressures against their sexual interests, pressures which are, moreover, indefensible." p 8.


(318) This split will be discussed later. Altman, whose Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation. Angus and Robertson, Sydney (1971) 1972, had been published in America in 1971 (but not released in Australia until July 1972) announced the birth of Gay Liberation in Sydney at the Forum on Sexual Liberation on Jan 19, 1972 where he also referred to "more sophisticated form of poofter bashing practised by psychiatrists and called aversion therapy" "Forum on Sexual Liberation" Camp Ink. Vol 2 No. 4, February, 1972 p 9.

(319) "Customs Porno in Research" The Sunday Telegraph. 5 March, 1972.
Tuesday 14 March, 1972 was from Peter Brett, Professor of Jurisprudence at Melbourne University. He likened aversion therapy to torture and punishment and questioned the ethics of the medical profession in assisting the state to carry out “practices of this kind” and the kind of legal authority which courts and prisons used to refer offenders for ‘treatment’. He also found it strange that universities should ally themselves with those carrying out these activities. Another two letters were published on Monday 20 March: one from Graeme Halford, Senior Lecturer in Psychology at Newcastle University, attacked Brett’s point of view and argued that “if it is ethical to gaol a man for certain behaviour, surely it is ethical to apply a punishment which changes that behaviour as effectively and humanely as possible”; the second, from Brian Day in Queensland, applauded the publication of Brett’s letter and asked “by what temerity are homosexuals considered to be sick, and therefore in need of a cure?”

Another three letters to the editor were published a week later. On Tuesday 28 March, John Lee, writing on behalf of Sydney Gay Liberation supported Brett and pointed out the limited (genital rather than emotional) concept of sexuality (as measured by penile erections) on which McConaghy work was based. On Wednesday 29, the Rev Neil Gill wrote attacking Graeme Halford’s letter on the grounds that from the letter, it appeared that George Orwell’s 1984 was indeed rapidly approaching “where any person who did not fit into the set stereotyped mould which society demanded, was remoulded to fit, irrespective of their right to be an individual personality”. And Ronald Conway, author of The Great Australian Stupor, and Senior Psychologist at St. Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne, wrote, on Monday 3 April, that he was heartened to see such a well known jurist as Prof Peter Brett leaping into the fray over aversion therapy and its use on homosexuals compulsorily referred from the NSW prisons and courts. In his letter, Conway made several points about aversion therapy: that it is and has been, controversial; that it works only at symptom removal; that its results are possibly being juggled to ignore failures; and that it is grounded in assumptions which reflect an authoritarian view of social conduct. He concluded by worrying that there was “nothing to prevent the extension of the practice into other areas of non approved behaviour which happen to correspond to the social or political prejudices dominant in the community at a given time”. A final letter on the matter was published in The Australian of 11 May, 1972. It came again from Brett who expressed great concern that his questions about the ethics of aversion therapy had not been answered by either the medical profession or the universities.

Baxter’s article in The Australian gave John Ware something concrete around which to revive his campaign against aversion therapy; the name, position and location of at least one person in Sydney who was using aversion therapy on homosexuals and did not appear to be averse to publicity -- Professor Neil McConaghy. On Monday 6 March, 1972, I met with John Ware to discuss his ideas for an article on aversion therapy for Camp Ink; the primary source was to be an interview with McConaghy, provided he would agree. Baxter’s article in The Australian gave John Ware something concrete around which to revive his campaign against aversion therapy; the name, position and location of at least one person in Sydney who was using aversion therapy on homosexuals and did not appear to be averse to publicity -- Professor Neil McConaghy. On Monday 6 March, 1972, I met with John Ware to discuss his ideas for an article on aversion therapy for Camp Ink; the primary source was to be an interview with McConaghy, provided he would agree. (323) It was fortuitous that at this time one of my colleagues in the Department of Government at the University of

(320) It would be more correct to say the letters that the editor of The Australian chose to publish were those concerned with aversion therapy because we do not know how many, if any, other letters dealing with other aspects of the report were sent to the paper but not published.

(321) Day, although this was not stated in his letter to the editor, we knew to be a homosexual activist in CAMP in Queensland.

(322) For Baxter’s original report and the letters to the editor referred to see Document Nos 45 - 51

(323) Ware thought there were several advantages to me interviewing McConaghy: I was a woman which he thought McConaghy would find less threatening; I had studied Psychology at Sydney University and was familiar with the behaviourist model and with the literature on aversion therapy; I was not worried about McConaghy knowing that I was homosexual; and I had some experience in interviewing psychiatrists.
Sydney was Dennis Altman. On Tuesday 21 March, 1972 I told Altman I intended to write to McConaghy to ask for an interview and enlisted his aid in trying to find out as much about McConaghy as I could before meeting him. Altman told me that on the preceding day McConaghy had telephoned him to ask if he knew of any male homosexuals who would be willing to look at the pornography from the Customs Department which he would be using in his aversion therapy programmes and tell him which they found most erotic; before he could use the material effectively, McConaghy had first to ascertain which slides ‘turned male homosexuals on’. (324) Altman refused to supply McConaghy with any names but agreed to accept copies of McConaghy’s published reports on his use of aversion therapy on homosexuals. Altman was struck by McConaghy’s apparent inability to grasp the extent and intensity of the opposition of homosexuals in the gay movement to what he was doing; that McConaghy would even make the request of Altman was very difficult to understand in the light of information that Altman had acquired from his American friends -- that at the 123rd Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in San Francisco in May 1970 McConaghy had presented his paper “Aversive Therapy of Homosexuality: Measures of Efficacy” (325) and had had tomatoes thrown at him by members of Gay Liberation.

On 22 March I wrote to McConaghy (326) referring to the newspaper reports and the letters to the editor they had provoked and to the willingness he had expressed to Altman to make his publications available and to discuss them. I informed him that I intended to prepare an article on aversion therapy for Camp Ink and that I felt it would be better to get a first hand account of his research rather than rely on newspaper reports which may have misrepresented some aspects of his work and neglected others which he felt were important. And I requested an interview. McConaghy replied on April 6 (327) suggesting that if I still wanted to talk to him after I had read the articles he had already sent to Altman, he would be pleased to do so. He continued:

> It would be subject to the condition that any material that you quote me as saying you give me the opportunity of reading before it appears in print. This doesn’t apply naturally to any comment which you may wish to make on this but: any actual statements that you attribute to me. This is a customary stipulation that I think all professional people request of journalists.

I telephoned McConaghy and arranged to interview him at his place of work, Prince Henry Hospital at Little Bay, on 20 April. In the interim I endeavoured to find out what I could about him, first by reading the two articles he had sent Altman on 23 March (328) and others referred to in their bibliographies, and then by talking to people who knew him personally. (329)
By the time I met with him on Thursday 20 April, the picture I had of McConaghy was a confused one of seemingly contradictory images: he practised aversion therapy, regarded by many as a sophisticated form of torture, but considered himself to be enlightened and progressive; he used aversion therapy primarily on homosexuals but did not seem to realize the extent of homosexual hostility toward him; he had been pelted with tomatoes by Gay Liberationists in America but asked a Sydney Gay Liberationist, who had just written a book from inside the American gay movement, to provide him with people to rate his pornography for use on homosexuals; and finally, there was the suspicion in the minds of some in the movement that he was himself a homosexual, punishing himself through punishing others. In many ways I expected McConaghy to be as domineering and self assured as I had seen Prof. Sid Lovibond, Sydney’s other academic aversion therapist, to be. So, I was surprised, when I did meet McConaghy to find him slightly built, rather timid, and extremely nervous. (330) After a while spent in reassuring him that it would make for greater accuracy, McConaghy agreed to the use of a tape recorder on condition that, once transcribed, the tape would be wiped and a copy of the transcript sent to him for verification. The interview was conducted in two parts because McConaghy had a teaching commitment to carry out. Excluding the time he was teaching, the interview took slightly over two hours. We covered his academic and research background, his main interest in the use of aversion therapy, the psychological theories of human behaviour he operated from, his current work and the values underlying it and finally, his answers to the most frequently expressed criticisms of aversion therapy. (331) In some ways I was surprised that McConaghy did not conform to the expectations I realised I had of him – that he would be fairly openly condemnatory of homosexuality and homosexuals. The longer we talked, the more clearly emerged a picture of McConaghy as a detached, clinically distant scientist whose primary interest was the pursuit of knowledge.

After the interview had been concluded, I asked McConaghy if he would participate in a forum that we, in CAMP, were organizing as part of a proposed week of activities in July 1972, to ‘celebrate’ the passing five years before in Britain of the Sexual Offences Act which granted limited sexual freedom to male homosexuals, and the birth two years before of CAMP. (332) The forum would be on aversion therapy and he could present his case for the use of it and be opposed by someone who disagreed with its use. He was hesitant at first, claiming that no good purpose could be achieved by confrontations between himself (and other psychiatrists) and homosexuals because they usually resulted in a widening, rather than a bridging, of the gap between the two groups. He expressed fears of militancy such as he had experienced at San Francisco. I assured him that the forum was being organized by CAMP and suggested that it was more likely that homosexuals (and others) would resort to violence if psychiatrists refused to meet with us. He finally agreed to participate, provided he was in Sydney at the time. McConaghy also admitted that he feared that homosexuals would actually damage his property.

part of the Sydney Push – the information was conveyed via Altman. It was also confirmed in part by the end of the Baxter newspaper article where McConaghy was quoted as having said that "he was afraid the Australian research results would be 'howled down'. ‘The permissive society is not so permissive’, he said. ‘You had better say it makes frigid women better mothers. Society cannot stand the idea of people enjoying sex.’" BAXTER, Cliff: op. cit.

(330) Whether or not McConaghy had any preconceived expectations of me, I don’t know. I was, as I had intended to be, polite and eager to learn. The only intimation I ever had that the strategy to ‘disarm’ had paid off came several years later when I was told that McConaghy considered that he had made a big mistake in underestimating me. This he allegedly said to psychoanalyst Win Childs when she taxed him about the statements he had made and agreed to have published in the *Camp Ink* article.

(331) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Nell McConaghy. Corrected. 20 April, 1972 Document No. 55.

(332) The Executive meeting of CAMP at which the activities which we called CAMP SEX LIB WEEK were discussed was held on 19 April, 1972. As well as the debate between McConaghy and an opponent of aversion therapy, there was to be a debate between a well known proponent and an opponent of homosexual law reform
I asked if our CAMP photographer could come to the Hospital to photograph the equipment he used in his therapy. He agreed, but later, by telephone, said that he would prefer to have a photograph taken himself and send it to me; if we sent a photographer, we would know exactly where his equipment was. I also told McConaghy, in the context of alternatives to aversion therapy for homosexuals, of the establishment within CAMP of the Homosexual Guidance Service (HGS).

On Wednesday 5 April, John Ware and I met with Bob Lyons, a senior year medical student at Sydney University, to discuss the setting up within CAMP of a group which would concern itself with the way that homosexuals and homosexuality were dealt with by psychiatry and we drafted a leaflet setting out our long and short term aims. One of our long term aims was to "To encourage people in the helping professions to use their standing in the community to attack the oppression of homosexuals by openly denouncing this oppression wherever and in whatever form it exists, and by publicly dissociating themselves from outmoded [psychiatric] classifications and the idea that homosexuals should be cured". Our short term aims involved meeting "the immediate needs of troubled homosexuals and their families" by providing various counselling services. After the initial meeting of HGS, the group expanded to include several 'sympathetic straights': Sue Rawlinson was a clinical psychologist who offered help in running discussion groups; and Andrea Russell was eager to run assertiveness training groups for homosexuals. The individual counselling was done by Ware, Lyons, and myself, often over the telephone, and at far from convenient times.

Once the leaflets had been printed we were able to try to have the existence of HGS publicised by a variety of means. We invited two psychiatrists from Broughton Hall, Drs. Harry Freeman and Ian Curtis, to one of our meetings and asked that they help, both by acting as 'respectable' psychiatrists to whom we could refer anybody who insisted on seeing a psychiatrist but who would not attempt to 'cure' anybody of their homosexuality, and by spreading the word of our existence within Broughton Hall. After considerable negotiation, we managed to have an item about HGS published in MD Australia, a magazine which was distributed to every general practitioner in Australia and copies of the brochure were sent to columnists who wrote the personal advice columns in three Sydney daily newspapers. The best media coverage HGS received was a very sympathetic news story, which also publicised CAMP SEX LIB WEEK, in The Bulletin of 15 July, 1972.

(to be organized by Lex Watson) and a debate between a minister of religion who thought that homosexuality was sinful and one who was more progressive in his views (to be organized by Bonsall-Boone). Neither of the latter debates eventuated.


Ibid.

Ibid. The intention, as outlined in the leaflet, to charge a small fee for the individual assistance and small group discussions was included because John Ware in particular believed that people were more likely to take the service seriously if they thought they would have to pay for it. As it turned out we did not collect any money: we rarely remembered to ask for money and when we did remember, we did not ask because the people who needed the most help were those who could least afford it.

In at least one case that I know of Freeman was most helpful. It concerned a young woman who was perfectly happy with her own lesbianism but whose parents were not. She wrote asking if we could refer her to a psychiatrist who would write to her parents and say that she was alright and that a cure for her lesbianism was never possible nor desirable. Freeman, after seeing her, wrote her parents just such a letter.

Freeman also spoke to the Superintendent of Broughton Hall Psychiatric Hospital and contacted me to say that he, Dr. McLean, was willing to include a notice about HGS in the Hospital Staff Newsheet. This notice was forwarded on 26 May, 1972. See Document Nos. 57 and 58.

The approach to MD Australia was made late in May 1972 and the item appeared in the August 1972 edition of the journal. See Document No. 59.

These were the 'Dear Suzy' in The Daily Mirror (June 1972); the 'Dear Del' in The Sun (July, 1972) and the 'What to do if...' part of the Look Section of the Sydney Morning Herald. (August, 1972). Only the first two columns mentioned referred to the service after receiving the leaflet.
As our approach to Broughton Hall psychiatrists had met with such rapid success, we decided to try to short circuit the process of approaching each NSW Health Department Psychiatric Hospital individually by going directly to the Health Department and working our way down from the top. As I had already met the Director-General of State Psychiatric Services, Dr. Bill Barclay (341) I was delegated to write to him and request an interview on behalf of HGS. On 15 May 1972 I wrote to Barclay, reminding him of the circumstances under which we had met before and of how, at that time, he had expressed his concern to keep out of the state's psychiatric hospitals those people who could be better helped by community groups. I was writing now as a member of one of those community groups, willing and able to offer assistance and would like to talk to him about the possibility of HGS working in with the Health Department. On 2 June, the Assistant to the Director, Dr. W. E. McSwiggen replied to my request suggesting that because Barclay was too busy to see me, I ring for an appointment with him. (342) I saw McSwiggen on July 3 and we discussed the contents of the HGS brochure and the types of services we offered. What we wanted from the Health Department was for them to make our brochures available to people who presented themselves to the state's psychiatric hospitals because they were troubled by their homosexuality. At this point in the discussion Barclay joined us and in three minutes of plain talking told me what McSwiggen had not been able to make me understand during the preceding half hour of cryptic communication. If, argued Barclay, the Health Department were to officially sanction the distribution of our HGS brochures in the hospitals, this would be taken as Health Department agreement with the contents of it. While some, even most, Health Department psychiatrists might agree with our statements about the non-abnormal nature of homosexuality, there was no way that a Minister for Health in a Liberal Party State Government, led by Askin, could be seen to agree with such a statement. If, however, we approached individual psychiatrists or hospital administrators with our brochures and those administrators did not think the matter of sufficient note to request permission from Head Office, he would not be in a position to say no. Barclay also suggested that we see the Mental Health and Drug Education section of the Health Department to see if we could contribute anything to their mental health education programmes. This, on behalf of HGS, I did (344) and it was through this contact that we ran four seminars for health educators of the Health Department for four consecutive weeks, beginning on Friday 13 October.

Before I actually managed to finish transcribing the tape, I met McConaghy again. This was on the night of Monday 29 May, at the home of sociologist Liz Fell whose custom it was to conduct her University of NSW tutorials at her home and to invite guest speakers. On this particular evening she had invited Farmer and McConaghy. She had also invited members of Sydney Gay Liberation in the hope of provoking some sort of confrontation between McConaghy and the Gay Liberationists. (345) This she succeeded in doing but one of the most interesting things that occurred that night was McConaghy's attempt to use one part of the homosexual movement against the other. In reply to an accusation from a Gay Liberationist that he did not offer his patients an alternative to aversion therapy, McConaghy retorted that at least CAMP

(341) I had met Barclay at a Government Department (Sydney University) seminar in 1969 and interviewed him for my research into the reorganization of NSW psychiatric services. An additional reason for my nomination was that Freeman had told us that Barclay had been 'very impressed' by the published version of that research and put it on his list of recommended reading for hospital administrators. See WILLS, S.E.: "Re-Organization of Psychiatric Services in the Sydney Metropolitan Area" Australian Journal of Social Issues. Vol 6 No.1. 1971.
(343) McSwiggen to Wills. 2 June, 1972 Document No. 62.
(344) Again, the main reason I was delegated to contact the section was that I had met the Programme Director, Dick Webb, in the course of my earlier research in 1969, when he was Psychiatrist in Charge of Preventive Psychiatry at Gladesville Psychiatric Hospital.
had set up the Homosexual Guidance Service to which he could refer homosexuals -- what did Gay Lib have that was equivalent! The Gay Liberationist replied that they too referred people to HGS. At that meeting both McConaghy and Farmer asked me to send them HGS brochures; this was done on the following day. I only ever met one person whom McConaghy had actually referred to CAMP. This was a young woman who had actually undergone a programme of aversion therapy with him and after it had failed he had sent her to us. She told me that all he had been able to accomplish with his therapy was to help her get over a broken love affair -- he had used photographs of her ex-lover during the therapy. She was not entirely happy about the use of the photographs but, after she became involved in the social activities of CAMP, was delighted that he had been unable to change her lesbianism.

On 2 June I forwarded a copy of the transcript of our interview to McConaghy with a covering letter (346) which suggested that if he disagreed with any part of my transcription we should listen to the tape together. And I reminded him that he had agreed to participate in our forum on aversion therapy on 22 or 23 July. At this stage, I had been unable to find anybody to publicly debate McConaghy. From their willingness to oppose him in their letters to the editor of The Australian, I had thought that either or both of Brett or Conway would have been interested in doing so in public. On 15 May I had written almost identical letters to them both (347) referring to their letters to the editor, and explaining the nature of the forum we were inviting them to participate in. I also invited them to set down their views on McConaghy's position and offered to send them a copy of the interview I had done if they were willing to do so. So that they would be clear about our position on attempted cures for homosexuality, I enclosed HGS brochures with each of their letters. Brett was the first to emphatically decline our invitation. In a letter dated 18 May (348) he suggested that my letter to him had been written under a misapprehension about what he had been writing about in his letter to the editor. He was concerned with the use of aversion therapy on patients who may not be completely free in choosing to submit to it -- he was not really concerned whether these people were homosexual or not. For that reason he would not participate in our forum, besides which, he would not be available on the dates proposed. He warned me against trying to draw any conclusions about his views on homosexuality from what he had written -- he did have views on these matters but their nature he did "not propose at the present time to make public" (349) Conway's letter declining the invitation was dated 23 May (350) and in one sense was more straightforward; he would not be able to travel to NSW at that time. His reply was much longer than Brett's and set out his position on aversion therapy to which he was opposed, and on homosexuality which he was prepared to treat under certain circumstances -- but by 'psychodynamic procedures'. He offered to comment on the interview with McConaghy and to help the Melbourne Branch of CAMP in any way he could.

On June 7, McConaghy returned the transcript of our interview which he had corrected. All of his corrections were minor with one exception: there was a section in the interview which, as he put it in his covering letter, he would prefer me not to print -- "It's the kind of comment I'd rather make in speaking than in writing". (351) McConaghy did not deny having made the Corrections.

---

(345) Fell, whom I had not met before this night had asked Lex Watson, the other Co-President of CAMP. Watson had been unable to attend, and thinking the encounter might be of use to my proposed article passed the invitation on to me.


(348) Brett to Wills. 18 May, 1972 Document No. 66.

(349) Ibid.


(351) McConaghy to Wills. 7 June, 1972 Document No. 68.
statements; all he asked was that they not be printed. The first was his answer to the question of whether, if asked, he would agree to try to change a heterosexual into a homosexual. This, with a slight alteration to the wording, he agreed, on September 8, to allow to be printed. The second statement was a remark which I assumed he would not change his mind about and so did not press the matter: this was his comment that as far as his research was concerned, he was glad that Gay Liberationists were only a minority amongst homosexuals. His covering letter also noted that he would soon forward the photograph of his laboratory equipment and that he was still willing to participate in the forum in July.

On 2 June, 1972, I wrote to Robin Winkler, a lecturer in the School of Applied Psychology at the University of NSW whom a friend had told John Ware might be willing to publicly debate McConaghy. The letter (352) I sent him was similar in form and content to those I had sent Brett and Conway, and on 21 June, Winkler replied (253) saying that he “would love to” present his criticisms of aversion therapy at such a forum and would await further details.

On 29 June McConaghy forwarded the photograph of his equipment with a covering letter (354) which offered further assistance if I had any queries about the photograph. And on 12 July I was able to write to McConaghy (355) thanking him for the photograph and informing him that we had organized the other speaker for the forum - but not at this stage telling him who it was.

Immediately prior to the forum, two media ‘events’ ensured that homosexuality and aversion therapy were brought to public attention. The first was the launching on Sunday 2 July of Dennis Altman’s Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation, his appearance on the hour long television programme, Monday Conference, on 3 July and the Sydney Gay Liberation organized demonstration outside the ABC Offices in Elizabeth Street, Sydney, on 11 July, to protest the refusal to screen a segment on the book launching filmed for the ABC current affairs programme, This Day Tonight. The second was an article in The Australian of Saturday 15 July by Ann Beveridge entitled “Aversion Therapy”. The article, while it made passing reference to McConaghy’s use of aversion therapy on homosexuals, concentrated on the work of Prof. Sid Lovibond, Head of the School of Applied Psychology at the University of NSW and drew parallels between it and Stanley Kubrick’s film A Clockwork Orange which was then showing in Sydney. The article brought out several points:

that despite the fact that the treatment (used for “some of society’s most objectionable and distressing sex and anti-social behavioural problems”) was extremely painful, the patients undergoing it were grateful that it was available because it appeared to be the only thing that was being successful for them;

that Lovibond’s work was still experimental, indeed, he referred to a patient as being “used as a human guinea pig in aversion therapy”;

that aversion therapy could be used on people against their will - “Accusations have been made in NSW that courts and prisons have referred prisoners for aversion therapy with an offer that their prison sentences might be reduced as a result”;

“A criticism often levelled at those practising aversion therapy is that through this technique they have the power to control human behaviour; that they could use a set of inhuman, mechanical

(353) Winkler to Wills. 21 June, 1972 Document No. 70.
procedures for manipulating people”. Three letters to the editor, all attacking the use of aversion therapy, appeared after the CAMP forum on aversion therapy, and were from three people who openly identified themselves as part of the homosexual movement. (356)

On Wednesday 19 July, I telephoned McConaghy suggesting that the debate for Saturday 22 July be advertised in that day's Sydney Morning Herald in the public lectures section under the title “Aversion Therapy for Homosexuals: Ethics and Efficacy” – Prof. Neil McConaghy versus Dr. Robin Winkler”. McConaghy agreed to the advertisement on condition that we alter the ‘versus’ to ‘and’ – he did not want the advertisement to create the impression that there was to be a confrontation. On that day, the advertisement was placed with the paper which, somewhat to our surprise, in view of its past refusal to take our advertisements, accepted it. However, by telephone, on Friday 21 July, the Herald offices insisted that the signatures of the participants be obtained to indicate their agreement with the wording of the advertisement. Consequently, I had to obtain McConaghy’s signature from him at Prince Henry Hospital and take it to the Herald; Winkler’s signature was forged, with his permission, as we were unable to get it from him in time. The advertisement did appear.

The forum of 22 July began at 10:30 a.m., in the John Clark Debating Chambers at the University of NSW. The use of the Chambers had been obtained free of charge through the Cultural Affairs Officer of the University’s Student Union. It was attended by about 50-60 people, most of whom were either activists in the homosexual movement or colleagues of Robin Winkler, from the School of Applied Psychology. (357) McConaghy and Winkler had agreed beforehand between themselves on the format of the forum. (358) Both distributed to the audience notes presenting some aspects of the cases they would put. (359) McConaghy spoke very briefly to the notes he handed out which, in one page, summarised the results of his 1970 follow up study – of the 35 acceptable follow up reports on male homosexual subjects who had undergone aversion therapy 10 showed marked, 15 some, and 10 no, improvement. Winkler handed out two sheets which contained short accounts of some work done using the drug scoline in aversion therapy on alcoholics and homosexuals; the accounts were, in fact, detailed horror stories. Winkler read a much longer paper which, in essence, represented a Thomas Szasz type ‘anti-Psychiatry’ (360) attack on psychotherapy as an agent of social control and used aversion therapy on homosexuals as a particularly barbarous example of that attempt at social control. The discussion which followed was very orderly. McConaghy was questioned mostly by homosexuals, Winkler, mostly by his colleagues. Winkler later prepared his paper in a form suitable for publication as a monograph and offered it to both CAMP and Gay Liberation. (361)

After the forum, two groups of people retired to lunch at a nearby hotel – The Decline and Fall – McConaghy and some people who sat with him, and a group of homosexuals. Interaction between the two groups was minimal except between McConaghy and myself. Even that was restricted to his expression of admiration for a pendant I was wearing. It did not matter to him that it represented the symbol for homosexual; in fact, he asked if a similar

---

(357) We tape recorded the proceedings on very impressive looking equipment but when we tried to play the tapes back we found that the microphones had been faulty. There is thus no record of the debate.
(358) I acted as chairperson but the debate was so orderly that my only task was to direct the attention of the speakers to any questions from the audience.
(360) See the references to Szasz's work cited in Fn 312.
The pendant could be made for him to wear. I took this as an attempt on his part to reassure us that he really did have our 'best interests' at heart and would wear our symbol to show us that he really did not think that there was anything wrong in being homosexuals. He never received the pendant.

McConaghy had been co-operative on another matter. In our interview in April, he had spoken of a motion (for which he himself had voted) passed by The Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists which stated that the College did not think that homosexual acts between consenting adults in private should be a criminal offence. In July, 1972 I had written letters to several people within the College in an attempt to get the correct wording of that motion and to check up on a rumour that members of the College had participated in a survey on their attitudes to homosexuality. Having received no replies to my enquiries, on August 16 I telephoned McConaghy to see if he had a copy of the motion. He did not have it but gave me the correct name and address of the person to whom I should write. The Executive Secretary of the College replied to my letter on September, 14 with the wording of the motion—"that the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists strongly condemns community attitudes and laws which discriminate against homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private"—but did not refer to my request for information about the survey. The letter was published in the same edition of Camp Ink as the article based on the McConaghy interview.

I met McConaghy once more before the article was published. This was on the evening of Friday 8 September when he was the guest speaker at a gathering of Humanists at Humanist House. There, his audience was interested but not hostile, except for a few homosexuals in the hall who failed to get him to answer their questions about the values implicit in his offers to treat homosexuals. It was at this meeting that McConaghy agreed to have published one part of the interview he had previously said he would prefer not to see in print.

In early November 1972, I sent McConaghy several copies of the Camp Ink with the article based on the interview with him in it. He never replied nor commented to me at all on it. The article was entitled "Intellectual Poofter Bashers" and was divided into four parts: a discussion of the general idea of forcing people to conform to social norms by the use of techniques administered by people not generally regarded as legitimate agents of social control; a discussion of the theory behind aversion therapy, how it is supposed to work, the mechanics of administering it, and some of the major problems associated with its use; a discussion of the use of homosexuals as human guinea pigs in experimental research designed to further scientific knowledge; and the transcript of an interview I had done with a young man who had unsuccessfully undergone a course of aversion therapy for his homosexuality with McConaghy. Throughout the article were juxtaposed sets of quotations—usually one from McConaghy talking or writing about what he was doing and why and one from an author who took a different view and implicitly called what McConaghy was doing by another (usually less flattering) name. (365)

(363) As it turned out, the survey into psychiatrists' attitudes to homosexuality was only then being undertaken as part of the research being done by Sandra Wortley. She was, at the time I was writing to the College, writing to me to request access to the CAMP membership names to get her sample of homosexuals. Her research was used later as evidence in support of a clinical memorandum (passed by the College on 13 October, 1973) to support the motion the College had already passed. See BARR, R.F., GREENBERG, H.P. and DALTON, M.S.: "Homosexuality and Psychological Adjustment" Medical Journal of Australia, 1974, No. 1. pp 187-189.
I had no direct contact with McConaghy until early 1973 but was informed of two occurrences involving him which were of interest. On 6 November, Dennis Altman had met McConaghy at a party and during the course of the conversation, Altman had lost his temper and abused McConaghy about his use of aversion therapy. And on Wednesday 15 November, I was contacted by Lorna Martin, the production assistant for Monday Conference. My name had been mentioned to her as someone who would be able to provide her with some background material and lines of attack on aversion therapy about which they were planning to do a programme. (366) I forwarded her a copy of “Intellectual Poofter Bashers” and on November 17, Martin telephoned me again and asked if I would participate in the programme. McConaghy, she informed me, had been invited to participate in the debate but had declined and so they had got Prof Sid Lovibond instead. There would be a second aversion therapist, Dr. Eric Wright Short, who was in private practice at North Sydney. The major opponent of aversion therapy in the debate was to be Ronald Conway. He was to be supported in his opposition by Prof. Peter Brett, and a psychiatrist who opposed aversion therapy as a treatment method, preferring another form of psychotherapy. I was to be billed as ‘a social scientist who had written on aversion therapy with particular reference to homosexuals’. (367) The programme was to be filmed in the ABC television studios on Sunday 19 November and screened the following night.

Technical problems with some of the camera equipment on the afternoon of Sunday 19 meant that all the participants had to wait for almost an hour before the filming could begin. During this time the producers of the programme kept the ‘two opposing teams’ apart so that, I was told, we would do everything before the cameras: if we were going to argue we would do it on camera; if we were going to concede points to each other, we would do that on camera too. What I found surprising while we were waiting was the ferocity with which Brett expressed his determination ‘to get them’, the aversion therapists. His blustering hostility (368) during the debate interfered with this determination and was ridiculed by Lovibond during a replay of the film at which neither Brett nor Conway were present. The actual debate bogged down on fairly narrow side issues and went over and over the same ground – whether aversion therapy widened or narrowed a patient’s area of choice; whether aversion therapy worked only at symptom removal and was therefore inferior to psychotherapy; whether judges or aversion therapists inflicted more pain. I found it very difficult to break into the debate first, because Moore had structured the programme beforehand in terms of a speaking order in which I was at the bottom (369) and secondly, because it was very difficult to cut into the discussion before Brett did. (370)

A few days after the programme was screened, I was told that Robin Winkler had been asked to participate in the debate and had agreed. The invitation had been withdrawn, however, when Lovibond threatened to withdraw if Winkler appeared. Winkler was a lecturer in the School of Applied Psychology of which Lovibond was the Head and Lovibond did not wish to be seen on television being attacked by a very articulate and junior member of his own staff.


(366) The format of Monday Conference varied but essentially it consisted of a person presenting their views on a particular subject and being questioned either by a specially selected studio audience, or a panel of journalists and ‘experts’ or being opposed with other speakers with or without a participating studio audience. When Altman appeared on Monday Conference, for example, he was interviewed by a panel.

(367) Neither of the two doctors – Wright Short and the psychotherapist – in private practice were actually named on the programme.

(368) One television critic reviewed Brett’s performance as follows: “And two of the opposition side, Peter
Community Education.

As well as the three major areas - the law, the churches, and psychiatry - CAMP members spoke to interested groups wherever and whenever requested. Because so few members of the organization were in a position, with respect to their jobs and their families, to publicly declare their homosexuality and because CAMP stressed the importance of homosexuals speaking about homosexuality and demanding homosexual rights, the burden of talking to community and professional groups rested with a few individuals. Requests for speakers came from some unlikely places but each was treated as importantly as the others: talks to the Hunter Valley Branch of the Women Graduates Association in Newcastle (371), B'Nai B'Rith Young Adults, the Society of Greek Students and Philhellenes and the Canterbury Apex Club (372) were all treated very seriously. Other groups, which were of considerably more value in terms of their roles as parts of the helping professions included university medical, social work and psychology students and the professional associations of such groups. (373) And, in August, 1972, with the reluctant permission of the Headmistress, I was invited to talk to the senior class of Moorfield Girls High School, an event which marked, unbeknowns to either the Headmistress or myself at the time, the first time in Sydney that a known homosexual had been invited into a school to present a positive image of homosexuality to school children. (373)

Marches and demonstrations were also a form of community education. They presented the public with homosexuals who did not fit stereotyped images and who were unashamed of their homosexuality. Perhaps the most significant of these was the march through the streets of Sydney through the crowds of late night shoppers on Thursday evening 27 July, 1972, as part of the activities of CAMP SEX LIB WEEK. This was the first march of homosexuals Sydney had seen. (375) About 150 people, carrying helium filled balloons, handed out leaflets (376), and chanting, marched through the crowded city streets with a small police escort which behaved more like a protection squad for the marchers than as a control on us. (377)

Brett, Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Melbourne and another unnamed consulting psychiatrist, made themselves expendable with meandering questions and emotional rhetoric about torture tactics. "DAWSON, Sandra: "Stumping with a Stifled Yawn" The Australian. 25 November, 1972.

(369) The order was to be: Lovibond - Conway - Lovibond - Conway - Wright Short - psychotherapist - Brett - Wills.

(370) The television camera must have picked up my frustration: "So Ronald Conway... made most of the running, and Sue Wills... made the most potent and concise arguments whenever she could cut through the over-heated waffle surrounding her". DAWSON, Sandra: op. cit.

(371) John Ware spoke to this group in July 1971. See WARE, John: "Twelve Months Past". op. cit.


(373) Ibid.

(374) A teacher at Moorfield Girls High School, Lesley Lynch/Grey, who was also a member of CAMP and active in Sydney Women's Liberation, ran the Discussion Club which the students attended after school hours. It was Lynch who invited me to speak at the school. The Headmistress agreed, provided two conditions were met: first, that students wishing to attend this particular discussion bring written notes from their parents giving them permission; and second, that Lynch arrange to have the students presented with a view of homosexuality which was opposed to the one I would present. As far as the first condition was concerned, all attending students presented signed permission notes, even if some of the signatures were forged. Lynch genuinely attempted to fill the second condition by inviting Rev Roger Bush, a minister who ran a radio programme and a newspaper column, to speak. As it turned out, Bush was unable to attend and sent two male replacements who were fairly obviously homosexual and who presented views on homosexuality not very different from those I had presented. On the Monday Conference of 2 July, 1972, on which Altrnan appeared, Roger Bush was one of the interviewing panel and on that programme he referred to the two homosexual men who worked for him. "Sydney Scene - Forces of Darkness" Camp Ink. Vol 2 Nos 8-9, June-July, 1972.p 19.

(375) CAMP and Gay Liberation members participated as a Gay Liberation contingent in the IWD March of 1972 and there had been the Berowra preselection demonstration in October, 1971.

(376) WATSON, Lex and WILLS, Sue: End Oppression of Homosexual Men and Women Now. op. cit.
In a sense David Widdup's candidacy for the seat of Lowe in the federal elections of December, 1972 as a CAMP candidate was more an act of community education than a serious attempt to win a seat. Somewhat surprisingly, most of the mass media took Widdup's campaign seriously (378) and gave it reasonable coverage although he was one of nine candidates for Lowe, the then Prime Minister William McMahon's seat. (379) The fact that Widdup was the candidate for Lowe and Evans whom the Women's Electoral Lobby had decided was the best (on women's issues) candidate standing and that they were prepared to declare this on their form guide (380) undoubtedly helped. Widdup's candidacy gave CAMP the opportunity to publicly, and in the context of electoral politics, state the case for a series of changes which homosexuals were seeking. It also provided an opportunity for a number of members of CAMP to become personally involved in something very concrete. And the simple act of handing out how to vote cards for a homosexual candidate was for some a means of coming out in a way over which they had some control. (381)


(381) Widdup in fact polled 218 primary votes.
EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES - SYDNEY GAY LIBERATION

After the Gay Liberation Cell split off from Camp Inc in October-November 1971 (to be discussed later) there was a period of mutual antagonism and suspicion between some members of both groups. Even after some of the hostility had been lessened by the entry into both groups of people who had not been involved in the 1971 split, the communications between CAMP and Gay Liberation were very unreliable and on an informal level - between individuals who were friends rather than on a more formal inter-organizational level.

During 1972, most of the external activities of Gay Liberation, beginning with its public launching at the Sexual Liberation Forum of 19 January, 1972 by Dennis Altman (382) were of a very public and demonstrative nature. The refusal of the ABC to show a film made at the launching of Altman's book on 2 July occasioned the first Sydney Gay Liberation organized demonstration. This was held outside the offices of the ABC in Elizabeth Street during the lunch hour on Tuesday 11 July. Between 80 and 90 people gathered on the footpath with Gay Liberation banners and balloons to hand out leaflets (383) flowers, and apples to passers by. Three members of Gay Liberation were allowed into the building to present their case to the ABC. Unable to see Clement Semmler, the acting head of the ABC who had banned the screening of the segment on This Day Tonight, they had to be content with a brief discussion with a few people further down the ABC hierarchy, but to no avail; the segment was never shown. The demonstration itself, which saw one man arrested for offensive behaviour, received coverage on three of the four Sydney television news programmes that evening - including the ABC news. (384)

On August 8, thirty members of the University of NSW Gay Liberation Group demonstrated on the campus of the university against Neil McConaghy's use of aversion therapy on homosexuals. The demonstration, which took the form of street theatre, was performed twice during the lunch hour - once in the Roundhouse, the student union building, and once on the lawn outside the University’s Library. The performance consisted of a young woman and man seating themselves quietly amongst the crowd. Then their parents arrived calling them 'filthy poofers'. They were joined by characters representing the police and the church who surrounded the two, shrieking that homosexuality was wrong and demanding that they seek a cure. Succumbing to the pressure, the two homosexuals agreed to seek help, whereupon the chant went up for 'McConaghy, McConghy'. A character dressed in academic gowns and labeled 'The Man from McConaghy' appeared and proceeded to administer aversion therapy to the two. After a while they began to call for the therapy to be stopped and to cry out for help. At this point the 'Good Gay Lib Fairy' appeared and banished McConaghy. After each performance a member of the group explained their objections to McConaghy's use of aversion therapy and talked about the oppression of homosexuals on campus. (385) A similar public protest was the leafletting on 14 October of the audience attending the screening at the Mosman Classic of the film Some of My Best Friends Are ..., a film which portrayed homosexuals in an oppressively stereotypic manner. (386)


(384) See [TAYLOR, Frank] F.T.:“An Impression of the Gay Demo” Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter. Vol I No. 1. July, 1972 and “Sydney Scene - Forces of Darkness” op. cit. As this latter article pointed out, several Gay Liberationists who had been filmed for the segment at the launching of Altman’s book were extremely drunk. If this was Semmler’s reason for not screening the segment, it would have been far better had he said so - at least to Gay Liberation.
As was the case with CAMP, members of Gay Liberation spoke to groups, both professional and community, whenever the opportunity arose. In July, 1972, Sydney Gay Liberation began to produce its monthly newsletter. It was roneoed and usually ran to about sixteen foolscap pages and, to a far greater extent than Camp Ink, was inward looking, carrying articles of a personal experiential nature (387) and criticisms of various parts of the broader movement (388) as well as reports of the activities of the Gay Liberation Groups.

In November 1972 Sydney Gay Liberation produced A Gay Liberation Manifesto (389) which was adapted from the 1971 London Gay Liberation Manifesto. It was a poorly produced 13 page roneoed document which was aimed primarily at other homosexuals. (390) It was divided into five sections: 'How we’re oppressed’ by the family, school, church, media, words, employment, law, physical violence, psychiatry, and self-oppression; 'Why we’re oppressed' which argued that legal reform was necessary but not sufficient because at the root of homosexual oppression was the structure of society and its basic unit, the patriarchal nuclear family; 'We Can Do It', which called for an alliance with the women’s movement to fight for the abolition of the family and “the cultural distinctions between men and women” (391); 'A New Life Style' which called for the building of a new liberated life style which would first have to get rid of some undesirable aspects of gay life – the emphasis on youth, butch/bitch role playing, and compulsive monogamy; and 'The Way Forward’ which involved the long term aim of ridding society of “the gender-role system which is at the root of our oppression” (392) the removal of self-oppression and the development of gay pride and a list of immediate demands for an end to discrimination against gay people by the law, employers and society, an end to exclusively heterosexual sex education, an end to the psychiatric treatment of homosexuality, a call for the age of consent for gay males to be made the same as for straights, and for gays to have the same freedom to hold hands in public and kiss, as heterosexuals have. The Manifesto ended with a call to work in close alliance with CAMP and noted that “Sydney Gay Liberation and C.A.M.P. have already co-operated in a number of such activities during 1972 and we must work to find ways to improve this relationship in the future.” (393)


(390) Its introductory paragraphs illustrate this:“To you, our gay sisters and brothers, we say that you are oppressed; we intend to show you examples of the hatred and fear . . . We will show you how we can use our righteous anger . . . “Ibid.

(391) Ibid.

(392) Ibid.

(393) Ibid.
Internally CAMP went through major changes between July 1970 and December 1972. In many ways, these changes were produced by the same factors at work on Sydney Women's Liberation during its early years, but in the case of CAMP, the pressure of growing numbers and the realization that it was a viable organization provoked a very different response. And CAMP had some quite different problems about which its membership disagreed both with its leadership groups and amongst themselves.

(1) **The Structuring of CAMP.**

The initial meetings in May 1970 of the group of people who were to form Camp Inc were gatherings of friends in private homes. When the organization was publicly launched in September, 1972, it had the names of John Ware and Christabel Poll attached to a box number in the Sydney GPO and for some time theirs were the only two names publicly associated with the organization, and more often than not, it was Ware alone who was presented as the founder of Camp Inc. Even after the journal of Camp Inc began to appear in November, 1970, it was some time before real names other than theirs were published: initials, pseudonyms, Christian names only, predominated whenever people wrote as homosexuals.

In some respects it was almost inevitable that the people who joined Camp Inc would look for leadership to those who had been prepared to come out publicly when they themselves could not. In editorial after editorial Poll and Ware exhorted homosexuals to come out, to fight for their own rights and gradually, a few did, if initially only in the pages of the journal. As far as the development of the organization was concerned, the reliance, the virtual dependence, on Ware was unfortunate. Influenced strongly by Women's Liberation literature, Ware had envisaged Camp Inc as a leaderless, structureless collection of autonomous groups each pursuing its own aims and coming together at general meetings for the exchange of information and ideas.

The early tendency to rely on Ware, to always seek his approval, was exacerbated by the acquisition of clubrooms at 393 Darling Street, Balmain in April 1971 into which Ware and his lover, Michael Cass, moved. Always on call, always in demand, the co-founder of Camp Inc, against his will, became de facto leader surrounded by an informal clique of activist friends. Once the clubrooms had been acquired the almost inevitable split in the growing membership between those whose primary interest was in 'political activity' of some sort and those who wanted only to be involved in the social activities of the organization further pushed Ware into the leadership role as he tried to prevent the organization from becoming one giant closet in which homosexuals could enjoy themselves in a safer environment without ever changing anything. (396)
It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the acquisition of 393 Darling Street, as clubrooms. For some it provided an alternative to the exploitative commercial bar scene; for others, who for one reason or another could not go to the gay bars, it was the only oasis of relief in their lives of deception:

_Gaby Antolovich:_ The thing that we realized was that in any of the homosexual stereotyping at first it was far worse than anywhere else because for the first time people felt free to be screaming queens and heavy dykes ... that happened because they felt it was OK to be homosexual and let their hair down, or cut it off, and go into a role into which they thought they should fit. Because we were only just beginning to talk about role playing and because of the social pressures which meant that most homosexuals didn't express their homosexual stereotypes openly in their dress and manners except in certain places, CAMP became one of those places. It was really interesting that. As soon as they walked through the door a lot of women were instantly tougher and a lot of the men were instant queens and brought out their silk scarves. And in lots of ways, it was fun at first, that whole release that was really important to all of us.(397)

_Ware tried to guide the early euphoria, produced by having somewhere to go to relax to sit around drinking coffee and talking freely about being homosexual, to borrow a book from a library full of books about homosexuality; he tried to guide it into activity of one sort or another. As one of the early members put it:"

_Judy Paul:_ He was steering people into a political consciousness we didn't know we had and his whole manner of doing that was to con you into believing that there were things that had to be done and so we did them. And I thought, if I was being conned by this man, what the hell, he was right.(398)

And to some extent, Ware was successful: the church group, the women's group, the law reform committee, and the married members group, all formed between November 1970 and May 1971, were all pursuing their own goals; but the bulk of the membership remained closetted and politically inactive.

By July 1971 Camp Inc was in much the same position as Sydney Women's Liberation had been a year earlier. There was a core group which acted as an informal leadership group as far as the bulk of the membership was concerned. Consisting of Ware and his friends they were fearful that the organization would lose sight of its initial political aims and become just one more segment of the gay social ghetto. Ware in particular became increasingly disillusioned with the apparent inability or unwillingness of other members of Camp Inc to initiate their own political activities; or to take their discussions of their lives as homosexuals one step further into consciousness raising. From the point of view of those who were not part of the core group it appeared to be a clique of the founder plus friends who would not let go control of the organization so that it could grow and diversify and represent all the membership.

Some part of this was personal resentment of Ware and the power he was believed to wield, resentment from other men in the organization who saw themselves as being deprived of legitimate influence. For some, the solution lay in providing the organization with a degree of structure so that channels of participation could be both broadened and formalized; if people did not feel strongly enough or able enough to become involved in Camp Inc activities without the aid of specified roles and structures, then those structures would have to be provided. And opinions. If we have comfortable club rooms and we have fun at our social functions, well and good. But if we let our clubs develop into bigger better ghettos then we have defeated our original purpose."(397) TRANSCRIPT: _Interview with Gaby Antolovich._ Document No. 83.

In July 1971 the general meeting of Camp Inc settled on the Advisory Committee as a minimum structural requirement. (399) It was to consist of:

(a) individuals who were concerned with the formation of C.A.M.P. and the consequent stating of objectives, aims, etc.;
(b) activists who since we were formed have indicated their willingness to work and shoulder responsibility by initiating discussion and work groups within the deliberately flexible structure. (400)

In other words, the Advisory Committee was to consist of Ware, Poll, their friends plus representatives from the various groups within CAMP. In an endeavour to retain as much flexibility as possible it was emphasized that "the Advisory Committee is not a formal and rigid structural group ... Thus we are not an organization so much as a movement. There are no bosses, and no restrictions on doing your own thing except insofar as it costs money." (401)

That the structuring of CAMP did not end with the establishment of the Advisory Committee is partly explained by the departure from the organization of what was to become Sydney Gay Liberation; a group of women and men who, by comparison with the rest of the CAMP membership, was younger, more prepared to adopt militant tactics, and readier to adopt women's liberation concepts and ways of organizing. In many ways they were closer to Ware's position on a variety of issues than the rest of CAMP was, but as far as Ware's supporters were concerned, the Gay Liberation group was seen to be in competition with Ware, and even had their own 'leader' in Dennis Altman. (402) Altman who had been involved in CAMP for some time had recently returned from America where his book Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation had just been released. At a Sex Lib Forum at Sydney University in October 1971, organized by Campus Camp, the university branch of CAMP, Altman had come out. (403) A lecturer in the Department of Government at the University, Altman, in November, 1971, came out to his colleagues at a staff colloquium on Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation. (404)

To Ware and others who had been present at an earlier meeting of Camp Inc where Altman had presented himself as an 'interested sociologist', the timing of Altman's coming out - after he had had a book published - was opportunist. Rather than granting him the right to control the timing of his own coming out that they took for themselves and gave to other members of CAMP, they were mistrustful of his motives: others who were far less secure in far less rewarding jobs than Altman had risked those jobs by coming out; Altman, who they saw in a position of relative safety and influence, had not. In addition, Altman, whose book was primarily about the American gay movement, was 'leading' the Gay Liberation group toward simply aping the American experience. Ware, in a mix of national chauvinism and sound political judgement, had always argued that no simple transplant of American gay liberation ideas would take root firmly enough in Australian soil to sustain the growth of a homosexual movement.

(400) Ibid.
(401) Ibid.
(402) See ALTMAN, Dennis: Letter to the Editor. Camp Ink. Vol I No. 10. August, 1971 p 16: "There appears to be a widespread impression that I am leading a movement to 'get' John Ware, and the present 'leadership' of Camp Inc. Nothing could be further from the truth. I greatly admire and respect John ... But this does not mean I feel any obligation to disguise criticisms I may have of Camp Inc, and I regret the attitude of some who see questioning the organization's progress as somehow inimical to its welfare ... if we listened to John more and lauded him less, I suspect Camp Inc would be moving in the sort of direction I have suggested."
(403) FOSS, Paul: "Gay Liberation in Australia" op. cit.
(404) Uninvolved in either group at the time, I remember the colloquium very clearly. It represented a turning point for me personally because it was after this that I made a conscious decision to become involved in one or other part of the homosexual movement and came out myself. The Department contained 'representatives' of both parts of the movement - Lex Watson was involved in CAMP and Altman in Gay Liberation. Prior to the
When a Gay Lib Cell began to meet as one of the groups within CAMP, to hold consciousness raising sessions, the differences in style between the more youthful and ‘scruffy’ cell members and the older more cautious members of CAMP became more noticeable. Ware became increasingly impatient of what he called the ‘excessive navel contemplating’ of the ‘young men in the grey flannel singlets’, and his supporters became more and more convinced that it was an attempt if not inspired, then at least encouraged by Altman, to ‘take over’ the organization. The final crunch came when the cell was refused permission to hold a dance at 393 on 30 January, 1972; the reason given was that the cell was the messiest group in CAMP and could not be relied upon to clean up after their meetings let alone after a dance. To the differences in style between the cell and some of the older men who were members of CAMP must be added the element of fear not only that the cell would do things that would dent the respectable image they thought that CAMP had thusfar successfully projected, but also that it could ‘blow their cover’ with all its talk of coming out. (405)

What CAMP was left with after the Gay Lib cell departed was a largely inactive, more cautious, and predominantly male membership, few of whom were ever likely to become more involved, even fewer of whom were ever likely to come out. When Ware and Cass moved out of 393, partly because the burden of living at the clubrooms had begun to place strains on their relationship and partly because Ware had become totally disillusioned with the organization, CAMP was left without even de facto leadership. And the move was to even more structure. Even Ware, opposed as he was to the idea of a structured organization, supported the move for CAMP to adopt a constitution and to elect office bearers as necessary if CAMP was to continue to exist as more than just a social club.

A constitution was drawn up by Ian Black and adopted at the general meeting of CAMP held on Thursday evening, 12 April, 1972. All office bearers - one male and one female Co-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and NSW Editor of Camp Ink - were elected unopposed. (406)

Although there had been some lobbying prior to the elections for the position of male Co-President a fairly strong statement at the meeting that both Co-Presidents would be expected to appear in the media in those roles quashed the aspirations of those who had been lobbying; as far as the female Co-President’s position was concerned, the problem had been in finding somebody to stand. (408)

colloquium I had not known that Altman was homosexual, but because I knew him a little better, I was aware that Watson was involved in CAMP.

(405) I was somewhat surprised when, immediately after I had been elected Co-President of CAMP, a man whom I had never met, but who I later found out had a long involvement with CAMP and had been financially generous to the organization, approached me with some sound advice: do not, he suggested, try to lead the organization in any radical direction like the gay lib people had tried to do; most of the members of CAMP really needed the organization as a haven and would be frightened off if it started becoming publicly involved in activities that weren’t quite respectable.

(406) Co-Presidents: Lex Watson, Sue Wills; Secretary: Peter Bonsall-Boone; Treasurer: Frank Paysen; NSW Editor of Camp Ink: Robin Tapp. Those elections represented my introduction to the sexual politics of liberation: Tapp whom I had met only once before April 12 had stood for election in order, as she later put it, to attract my attention. Once she had succeeded in doing this, she stopped coming to Executive meetings of CAMP; and when my attention no longer attracted her, resigned her position.

(407) Other rumoured contenders were Brian Woodward and Peter Bonsall-Boone.

(409) In many respects my election was quite extraordinary. I had never belonged to any organization before joining CAMP in March 1972 let alone stood for office. In talking with Ware and Watson and Altman about the election of office bearers their concern had been to find a woman to stand. The names they mentioned were Chris Pol who Ware knew would not stand and Gaby Antolovich, who nobody could find. Any other woman who would have been suitable, I was told, had become fed up with the maleness of the organization and left. At the suggestion of Ware and Watson I agreed to attend a meeting of those women which had been called for Saturday 8 April at the home of Margaret Jones and to tell them that CAMP was going to adopt a constitution that there was to be a female Co-President who would be able to ensure that they were not driven away again. I also agreed to encourage some of them to nominate for the Co-Presidency and as many other offices as possible. What I did not know at the time was that Jones had called the meeting to set up a Sydney branch
In our first statement to the membership after the election, Watson and I, as Co-Presidents of CAMP, tried to stress the co-ordinating role of the Executive:

Now that the N.S.W. Branch has a formal constitution, it is important to stress that CAMP is more of a movement than a society, that it is a formalized collection of Groups who set their own various aims and go about achieving them. The executive should provide a co-ordinating point only for the various groups and for special activities which involve the total membership. (409)

It was, however, very difficult to prevent part of the membership feeling a gap between themselves and the Executive; the simple fact that it met behind closed doors and that membership of the Executive was restricted to the Branch's elected office bearers plus one representative chosen from each of the groups (by the group) made this almost inevitable. Not that Executive meetings were power packed and filled with momentous decisions; quite the contrary, they were tedious affairs where decisions about paying gas bills, organizing working bees to clean up the garden, and whether or not to raise the membership fees, took up most of our time. That some people soon realised just how unexciting the meetings were is indicated by the relatively rapid turnover of group representatives to the Executive.

As Co-Presidents, Watson and I acted as virtually the only contacts the Branch had with the media and this was not so much a function of our roles as of the fact that we were the only two members of the Executive who had come out – at least until October 1972 when the Chequerboard programme was screened. Group convenors, under a decision made by the Executive on 9 May 1972, had the right to correspond with the media on their groups' behalves and the Co-Presidents on behalf of the Branch:

*Provided that any person writing on behalf of the Branch or part thereof discuss with, and show letter to, other members of the group or Executive.* (410)

Just how much of the Executive's time was taken up with the administration of the clubrooms is shown by the fact that between 7 September 1972 when CAMP had to vacate 393 Darling Street, and 10 February 1973, when it acquired the lease on new clubrooms at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge, only one formal Executive meeting was held; most of the energies of the Executive in the interim were expended on looking for new clubrooms. (411)

(2) Major Issues in CAMP

There were three major issues, some of which have been touched on earlier, which, until the end of 1972 were problematic for the membership of CAMP: the allying of the organization with other causes; the split between social and political activity; and the disappearance and re-emergence of the women's group. of the Australasian Lesbian Movement. Totally unknown to all but one woman there I went to the meeting and put the case for their return to CAMP. When I asked that they be prepared to attend the election meeting on April 12 and nominate for positions, Jones angrily (and justifiably in the context) retorted that if I thought that CAMP was so bloody wonderful why didn't I nominate. When I explained that I was unknown and very new to CAMP, others at the meeting said that it did not matter because they would come to the meeting and provide the necessary votes. When I told Watson that I had been forced into agreeing to stand, he simply smiled and said he'd hoped that was what would happen - but he would get Chris Poll to nominate me just in case. This she did five minutes after we'd met for the first time at the meeting of 12 April. To overstate the extent of my political naivety and social ineptitude especially as far as the subtleties of sexual politics was concerned at this time would be[night on] impossible.

(409) WATSON, Lex and WILLS, Sue: "Sydney Scene: Where Are We Going?" op. cit. p 13.
(410) CAMP (NSW Branch) :Minutes of Meeting of Executive Held at 393 Darling Street, Balmain on Tuesday 9 May, 1972.
(411) The fight over Bonsall-Boone's dismissal in November and the running of Widdup's election campaign without formal executive meetings is, again, indicative of the executive's primary concern, at this stage, with clubroom administration.
(a) Organizational Alliances:

That there was a rift between some of the members of CAMP and its founders was clearly evidenced by the furore which surrounded the support that Ware gave, through Camp Ink, to Wendy Bacon and her involvement in the publication of pornography in the newspapers, variously named Throrout, Tharunka, Thorunka, and Thor. Ware sent out, with the March 1971, (412) edition of Camp Ink, two leaflets: one calling for financial support to help Bacon fight the charges laid against her; the other, a copy of the poem considered obscene by the authorities -- "Cunt is a Christian Word". To Ware's surprise, he received twenty letters in two weeks from members all protesting at the inclusion of the poem with their journal. The next edition of the journal contained a sternly worded editorial from Ware who pointed out that some of the charges laid against Bacon were the result of her having published homosexual material. It continued:

It appears that all the catch cries and all the slogans used to put down homosexuals are being used by homosexuals to put down Wendy Bacon... Camp Inc. is an abbreviation of Campaign Against Moral Persecution. We are being hypocritical if we attack the moral persecution of homosexuals but support the moral persecution of Wendy Bacon! The same public attitudes which are used to destroy Wendy Bacon are those which are used to destroy homosexuals. Those people who would like to keep 'cunt' off the printing presses are the very people who would keep homosexuals in the closets. (413)

The letters of protest to the Editor were framed in terms of the damage Camp Inc could sustain by associating itself with Wendy Bacon:

This girl and her stand which I find personally degrading have nothing to do with our organization and its concerns. How can we hope to obtain law reform if we are going to link our selves with protests of this kind. (414)

The letters in response to these criticisms reacted to the 'non-alliance' arguments by placing Camp Inc in the context of a broader social movement for liberation:

I feel that we are right to link ourselves with any person or organization that is out to end moral persecution, after all, we are the 'Campaign Against Moral Persecution' aren't we? (415)

When CAMP again lent its support to Wendy Bacon and John Cox in February and March 1972 by devoting some part of the March 1972 edition of Camp Ink to the court cases (416) and by making 393 Darling Street available for a fete to raise money for legal expenses, Ware was able to note a dramatic change in attitude on the part of the membership of CAMP. Reprinting a paragraph from his April 1971 editorial, he went on:

The reaction of CAMP this time was MAGNIFICENT. A number of CAMP members sat through the court case lending moral support to Wendy... A sizeable contingent turned up at the demonstration at Martin Place with their protests written on placards. (417)
To refer to Ware’s support of Bacon as “an essentially tactical move over a non-homosexual issue” as Paul Foss does (418) is quite wrong. Ware’s lead in support of Bacon was part of his view of the place of CAMP within a much broader context of liberation movements. As Editor of the journal, he continually published material of a non-homosexual nature – on transvestites, and transsexuals, on attitudes to abortion and prostitution, and Camp Ink was the first journal to publish the Manifesto of the Adelaide Women’s Liberation Movement. Likewise, he began a series of columns in the journal where he intended to “inform Camp Ink readers of the aims and objectives of groups and organizations within Australia”. Called “Other Voices”, it is significant that the only two groups to ever provide anything for it were the Council for Civil Liberties and the Humanists. And, in his editorials he sought to broaden the approach of the membership to the issue of homosexuality by stressing its context amongst other movements.

What the membership objected to was not the alliance of the organization with other causes – there were no objections to the inclusion of material on transvestism not the CCL nor Women’s Liberation – but with non-respectability as they defined it. Most saw CAMP as best pursuing its aims by pursuing respectability: the letters to the editor which complained about the language of the journal, its cartoons or photographs reflected this as did the suggestion, periodically raised, that CAMP should publicly donate some of its funds to ‘worthy causes’.

There was another side to the problem of allying the organization to other causes or organizations and this was the attempt by some members of CAMP to tie it more closely to the commercial gay (male) world. This attempt was made mainly through some of its publications. That the gay bars were exploitative of homosexuals through their cover charges and marked up prices for drinks was widely condemned by homosexuals and that they were run by criminals who paid the police protection money so that they could stay open till all hours was widely believed. One of the social functions of Camp Inc was to provide an alternative to this scene. Ideally, Camp Inc would have drawn off some of the gay bar clientele not into its social, but its political, activities. But its chances of actually doing this were non-existent.

[417] POLL, Christabel and WARE, John: “Editorial” Camp Ink. Vol 2 No. 5. March, 1972. There was only one letter of protest this time and Ware published it because of the irony of the last line: “Upholding people that deliberately break the law is in my opinion not right” T.P.N.G.: Letter to Editor. Camp Ink Vol I No. 6, April, 1972 p 17.


[421] POLL, Christabel and WARE, John: Editorial” Camp Ink Vol I No. 10, August, 1971. This was directed specifically at an article contained in the same issue where the author argued that the issues of abortion, prostitution and homosexuality should be kept separate. See CONNELL, R.W.: “The Commercial Boys of Sydney” Camp Ink. Vol I No. 10 August 1971 pp 4-6.

[422] See for example: “Letter to Editor” Camp Ink Vol 2 No. 4, February, 1972 p 15. “Personally I cannot but feel that it is deplorable that an association and magazine with such high aims, seeking to obtain social justice
The commercial publications presented somewhat of a dilemma: it was obvious that they were run to make a profit rather than a revolution but if CAMP advertised in them perhaps some of those it was not reaching by other means could be reached. The problem with this was that by advertising in them, writing for them, or simply agreeing to accept their paid advertisements in Camp Ink or sell them at the clubrooms, CAMP would be seen to tacitly approve of their contents and the whole exploitative commercial scene of which they were an integral part. The ambivalence of the CAMP Executive and the divisions on it over this is exemplified by the two motions passed at the meeting of 9 May 1972: one that CAMP was agreeable to selling William and John from the clubrooms for $1.00 per copy, having paid the publishers 67cents per copy; the other which read:

That on the grounds that an article by Dennis Altman appears in William and John Vol I No 3 that a letter be sent to Dennis asking him, in view of his previously expressed antipathy towards the commercial exploitation of homosexuality, whether he be willing to donate any proceeds accruing from his article in William and John Vol I No 3 to the homosexual cause in Australia.

The exploitative nature of William and John was revealed most clearly in an article by Lex Watson (using the pseudonym Trevor Hughes) in Camp Ink of June-July 1972. He detailed the price discrepancies for pornographic books purchased from ordinary bookshops, sex bookshops, and mail order from William and John. In some instances it was as high as $3.00 per book. His criticism was pointed:

Particularly it is important to strip from some of these commercial operations their thin veneer of alleged altruism. To claim to be political, or educational, the inference that we are homosexuals like all our readers so how could we exploit you, you are our brothers, our interests are the same – thank you, that will be $1.00... But a final word about the other side of the coin. These commercial rip offs of camps could not survive if camps did not support them.

In a double barrelled attack first on William and John and secondly on Sydney Gay Liberation, some of whose number had written their opposition to Widdup’s candidacy for the 1972 federal election in their newsletter, Ware, in his editorial in Camp Ink of November, 1972, pointed out the inconsistency he saw in Gay Liberationists refusing to support Widdup but at the same time supporting William and John by writing for it. Weren’t Gay Liberationists aware not only of the commercial rip offs involved in the magazine’s book sales and that some of the books being sold were degrading of lesbians, but also that William and John was published and partly owned by Bertram Horne. Horne, Ware reminded them, had been written up in the and acceptance for a persecuted minority of the community should allow even one simple word or illustration to be published which could be considered not acceptable by even one member of the Heterosexual community. See also CONNELL, R.W.: op. cit. on the bad name that gay male prostitutes were giving ‘good’ homosexuals.

This was raised at Executive meetings after April 1972 most often by members of the church groups which, when Watson and I argued strongly against donating funds in the name of CAMP because we saw that as an unacceptable attempt to buy acceptance, often ended up doing so in the name of the church group.

[POLL, Christabel and WARE, John:] “Editorial” Camp Ink. Vol 2 No. 4, February, 1972, “There is a pattern to this opposition [to CAMP]. In all states it is loudly voiced by those who appear to be pre-occupied with their obscure security in the gay-bar subculture”. One possible reason for this opposition was made very clear to me when, in July 1972 Lex Watson and I visited Cappriccio’s. We were told that all the publicity we had sought for CAMP SEX LIB WEEK with our march had made life very uncomfortable. By drawing attention to the fact that there were large numbers of homosexuals in Sydney, most of whom were closetted, we were drawing attention to male homosexuals who had hitherto been able to ‘pass for straight’. Don’t rock the boat was the very clear message.

[CAMP (NSW BRANCH): Minutes of Meeting of Executive Held at 393 Darling Street, Balmain on 9 May 1972. The first motion was put forward by Brian Woodward who continually sought to establish links between CAMP and the commercial world. The second, regarding Altman, was put forward, half in jest, by Watson and myself. Because Altman was overseas, it was never actually acted upon.

newspaper Nation Review as having been seen at the Springbok tours in 1971 rubbing shoulders with the Nazis and carrying a placard which read 'Bash a Demonstrator'. What Ware neglected to mention was the use of William and John by David Widdup in his election campaign.

(b) Social Club or Political Organization.

The problems associated with the major emphasis of the organization began as soon as Camp Inc acquired clubrooms in May 1971. Those who were more concerned with the political activities of the first three aims of Camp Inc, rather than its fourth aim - to entertain - were always a minority. Ware had hoped to encourage those homosexuals who came to Camp Inc's social gatherings - the parties and barbeques - to become more involved, but with the odd individual exception, he failed. The first general meeting of Camp Inc in February 1971 was attended by only 70 out of the 370 members.

Appeals to conscience and outright abuse through the pages of Camp Ink achieved nothing:

All these lovely, well-dressed queens we've seen trissing about the Balmain club rooms pissed out of their minds - ONLY because THEY become BORED with the gay bars etc. Needless to say, they have joined EVENTUALLY - because it boister their social calendar with a few extra gatherings required to occupy the week end... CAMP INC IS NOT JUST A SOCIAL CLUB. IT IS A BODY AGITATING FOR LAW REFORM. The social obligations SHOULD REVOLVE AROUND THIS... CAMP INC is faced with the lethargy and bigotry of its OWN MEMBERSHIP... (431)

These attacks were met with letters arguing about the value of the fund raising activities for the organization and how important the social functions were for many homosexuals.

The structuring of CAMP which it was hoped would provide increased avenues for participation and channels of social into political activity was unproductive because those who wanted to participate were as few in number after the structuring as before it. Those who Ware thought would become involved in CAMP's activities if it became structured were the people who were already involved. Those who were uninvolved remained so and structuring the organization had the reverse of the effect intended: now that they had elected office bearers whose 'job' it was to look after the aims of the organization, they no longer had reason even to feel guilty when appeals were made in terms of 'its YOUR organization so...'.

(c) Women's Groups in CAMP.

Camp Inc was founded by a woman and a man both of whom stressed the importance of having both sexes active in the organization. And yet, few women joined and those who did were less involved in Camp Inc's political activities than the men. To answer the question of why so few lesbians joined or became involved would entail, amongst other things, an analysis of the socialization of women. While this is not the place to undertake such an analysis, a discussion of what happened to those women who did join, in part, reflects the effects of that socialization. The biggest problem that faced the lesbians who joined Camp Inc...
was to work out what they wanted from the organization. Apart from the opportunity to meet other homosexuals – both male and female – in a more relaxed atmosphere at the social gatherings, there was anything that lesbians, as distinct from male homosexuals, wanted. As Marion Norman wrote after attending the first general meeting of Camp Inc in February 1971:

> We kept asking each other – what does Camp Inc offer the lesbian? Then we started asking what do we WANT Camp Inc to offer . . . It is not the chance to make supper for the boys. We don’t need homosexual law reform, although we’ll fight for it . . . Most of our specific needs arise because we are women therefore if we want actively to be involved in the fight for equal job opportunity abortion law reform etc., etc., we should look to Women’s Lib. What is left to ask of Camp Inc.

After much discussion, it occurred to us that one very important issue, concerning ALL homosexual couples, is the one of recognition of the relationships as a very real thing . . .

Chris Poll, who had co-founded Camp Inc with John Ware, dropped out of active involvement fairly early on; she did not, for example, attend meetings of the women’s group which formed in May 1971. And her active participation in the production of the journal dwindled. She spoke on behalf of the organization to outside groups and occasionally attended general meetings and gatherings as part of the informal leadership group until mid-1971.

The women who joined Camp Inc fell roughly into three groups: those who were somewhat older and tried to become politically involved, women such as Margaret Jones and Rosalind Foxcroft who acted as convenors of the first women’s groups and who became part of the law reform committees and Joy Blunt who was the only female member of the married members group; those who became involved in the group of friends and supporters of John Ware, women such as Judy Paul, Jo Beaumont, and Gaby Antolovich; and those who attended only the parties and social functions of Camp Inc or whose contribution was restricted to the house committee’s work. The women who joined Camp Inc and were active to some extent did not, in any way, form a cohesive group nor was there any attempt to weld them into one. And in some ways, men such as John Ware and Dennis Altman were more familiar with Women’s Liberation ideas and literature and more interested in them, than many of the women. That the women’s group experienced difficulties was not simply because the women did not know what they as women wanted from Camp Inc – many of the male homosexuals involved were quite obviously misogynists:

> Gaby Antolovich: There were really bad jokes. Like the one about the blind man walking past the fish shop and saying ‘Hi girls’. And we used to laugh at them. And the men used to say awful things like, ugh, I’m glad I don’t have to fuck women because they stink . . . There was a real pressure to be sort of female to be left alone or to fight like a male to be noticed . . . And that sort of thing was there all the time, there was a real aggressiveness against us. But it was also made worse by the fact that there weren’t too many of us and also a lot of women felt that some of us were being too aggressive and the men used that: see, even so and so thinks you’re too tough, in the wrong way . . . It’s alright to go and beat up your girlfriend but it’s not alright to stand up to a man and tell him he’s a shit.

Women who were active on some committees were made, by one means or another, to feel unwelcome by the men. Margaret Jones for example, I was told late in 1972, was a pain in the neck on the law reform committee and so to get rid of her they had simply not informed.

(433) NORMAN, Marion: op. cit.

(434) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Gaby Antolovich. op. cit.
her of meeting times; Rosalind Foxcroft was seen by some as a ratbag and was constantly ridiculed until she was driven away from meetings.

The women's group which met on a Saturday afternoon was very informal and until June 1971 was open to all members of the organization. The calendar of events which went out with the May 1971 edition of the journal listed the next women's group meeting for 19 June and noting how low female participation had been in Camp Inc called a women's only meeting to discuss this and give women a chance to talk to each other. (435) That meeting was attended not only by many of the women in Camp Inc, but also Michael Cass who refused to leave until the women justify to his satisfaction their desire to exclude men. Cass, who lived at 393, the women found intolerable.

When I invited myself to the meeting of the women of CAMP at Margaret Jones' home on 8 April 1972 to ask them to return to CAMP some of the criticisms of the organization they expressed were that Chris Poll was no longer involved and had hardly ever concerned herself with the women in CAMP anyway; that CAMP wasn't really concerned about lesbianism; that the men expected the women to clean up after them and little else besides; and that a lot of the men and Cass in particular, did not really want women there at all. At the time I was firmly convinced that it was essential for lesbians to become involved in CAMP, not for the benefit of CAMP, but because without the framework of a political organization within which to work, the lesbians would become exclusively socially oriented. Neither did I accept that CAMP was hopelessly anti-woman; if lesbians did assert their presence, work out what they wanted, then I saw no reason why CAMP should not become the genuine two-sex organization that it had been set up to be. It was a naive optimism that made me believe that if all the women at that meeting came back to CAMP and we started 'trying harder together' we could overcome the male bias of the organization.

The first meeting of the re-activated women's group was held at 393 on the afternoon of Saturday 6 May, 1972. The twenty or so women present decided that "it was of great importance not only to keep the Women's Group going within C.A.M.P., but also to work out some programme of activities within which all women members of C.A.M.P. could participate in some way or other." (346) At that meeting nine fairly specific activities that the group could work at were set down: to produce a women's group newsletter containing reports of meetings; to plan some specifically female oriented activity for CAMP SEX LIB WEEK; to go as a group to the Women's Liberation Conference to be held in June 1972; to prepare a pamphlet on the group's aims and activities similar to the HGS pamphlet; to prepare a pamphlet which exploded the myths and misconceptions of female homosexuality; to prepare criticisms of the books about female homosexuality that were being sold as thinly disguised pornography and insert those criticisms in the copies of books of booksellers who would let us; to provide female oriented material for Camp Ink; to collect information about employment and housing discrimination against women; and to provide social activities for the women members of CAMP. (437) By the end of 1972, all that the group had done with respect to these aims was to produce the newsletter regularly, prepare the pamphlet about the group (438) and provide social activities for group members and name itself the Camp Women's Association - CWA. (439)

(437) Ibid. One bookseller, Bob Gould who operated the Third World Bookshop, had already agreed to provide us with the copies of the books concerned and to insert criticisms in other copies he sold.
(438) The CWA leaflet was, in fact, written by myself. See Document No. 84.
(439) The name was decided upon on 15 July 1972. That the initials would correspond with those of the
In terms of my own role in trying to encourage political activity, or at least political awareness, in the women's group, I was torn between two extremes and usually ended up fluctuating between them: on the one hand, I wanted to participate minimally and let the group develop its own political consciousness and commitment to activity at its own pace and I was sufficiently influenced by the anti-authoritarian ideals of Women's Liberation small groups to want not to dominate the groups; but I was insufficiently involved in its actual groups to know that full and equal participation of all members was a Women's Liberation ideal rather than a reality. (440) At the other extreme I was constantly tempted to try to control the group and direct its activities because I believed it was degenerating into a group solely concerned with social activities and steering itself into the position of a traditional women's auxiliary - fund raising for a male dominated organization. (441)

What was happening throughout 1972 was an almost imperceptible development of a Women's Liberation consciousness in many CWA members. Several factors can be seen at work in this: Women's Liberation was becoming more visible throughout 1972; women who were active in both Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation groups attended CWA meetings fairly regularly; and there was a deliberate fostering of increased contact between Women's Liberation and the CWA which proceeded from some women in both groups. The CWA meetings of Saturday 15 July, 1972, for example, was intended to be the first of a series where members of the CWA and Sydney Women's Liberation could meet to discuss lesbianism and feminism. It was organized by Caroline Bensel, a lesbian within Women's Liberation who was finding it difficult to raise the issue of lesbianism there and by myself and others within the CWA who were finding it difficult to initiate discussion on Women's Liberation within the CWA. That meeting was only marginally short of disastrous in the short term and the Gay Women's Liberation Group which flowed from it and met regularly at Women's House in Alberta Street, and which was intended to be a consciousness raising group consisting of lesbians from the CWA and Women's Liberation, had only two Women's Liberation activists amongst the twenty or so CWA members. (442) The Gay Women's Liberation group failed as a consciousness raising group and it failed to provide the link between Women's Liberation and CAMP. What it did do was to make "the lesbians more isolated from the men in CAMP". (443) But this time it was on the basis of lesbian separatism chosen rather than a segregation imposed by the male members of CAMP.

respectable and long standing Country Women's Association was one of the major factors in the decision of most of the women to accept CWA rather than any of the other suggestions. Most thought it an amusing dig at one of the most sacred organizations of Australian women; some said that they would find it useful to be able to tell friends that they were only going to a CWA meeting.

(440) That I was seen in fact as dominating the group no matter the level of participation I adopted was made clear to me by the references to me in the newsheet which were a mild sort of send up, and from feedback from group members about how others saw me: some were frightened of me, others wanted my approval, others thought that I did not mix enough socially and so on; and from the request to write anonymously my objections to a commercial lesbian matchmaking organization. The woman (Robin Tapp) who was writing in support of the club asked that I not use my name because people would agree with me because it was me who was writing rather than because of the merits of any of the arguments. See [TAPP, Robin (Pro) and WILLS, Sue (Con)): "Therese - Pro or Con" Camp Ink. Vol 3 No. 5, [June] 1973 p 9.

(441) The changes in style and emphasis of the newsheet, the authorship of which was rotated on an informal basis, is indicative of the varying roles that members saw for the group. See CWA Newsheets Nos 1 - 10 Documents Nos 85 - 94.

(442) I did not participate in the Gay Women's Liberation Group at all. This was for three main reasons: first, I feared that if I did become involved in it, this new group which was primarily CWA members would simply transpose CWA relations of leader-follower roles in to the new group; second, the woman with whom I was closely involved (Gaby Antolovich) was having a difficult time being seen as a person independent of me and my role as Co-President of CAMP and this new group provided her with an opportunity to become involved in something with which I had nothing to do; and finally, sheer lack of time on my part, coupled with a distrust of the ability of most of the group members to maintain the confidences of everybody else, which was essential if the group was to function properly as a consciousness raising group, led me to believe that my time would be better spent on other activities.
By the end of 1972 John Ware and Christabel Poll who had founded Camp Inc two and a half years earlier, full of enthusiasm and optimism that other homosexuals would commit themselves to the organization's aims as fully as they initially had, had very little to do with it. Poll had dropped out of all involvement fairly early on and Ware remained marginally involved with CAMP through HGS, reserving his energies for the production of Camp Ink which he continued to edit until the end of 1973. CAMP's membership appeared to have triumphed over the early ideals of its founders and to a large extent there were two CAMPs: a small group of political activists and a larger group of politically inactive, but financially supportive, party goers. A leadership, at first informal, and then formally elected, failed to drag a reluctant membership into active participation. And yet, by the end of 1972, as far as its public image was concerned, CAMP was more active and receiving better media coverage than ever before since its foundation. The wounded egos sustained by both sides in the CAMP - Gay Liberation split had partially healed and there was better (i.e., some) communication and co-operation between the two groups. Ideological differences within CAMP had remained at a fairly low level with the biggest disagreements revolving around tactics rather than goals. The reformism - revolutionary debate had not even got off the ground in CAMP by the end of 1972: the bulk of the membership was wholeheartedly reformist without even acknowledging the existence of any alternative to it. Those who saw a radical restructuring of society as ultimately necessary had either left with Gay Liberation or were in such a minority within CAMP that they were powerless to move against membership inertia. The idea of homosexual liberation requiring a socialist revolution was not alien to the CAMP membership, it was literally inconceivable.

Some demographic information about the CAMP membership is available from two sources: the Wortley thesis referred to above which provided information about Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter subscribers (444); and the correspondence of the Secretary of CAMP for 1972. (445) Wortley took a random sample from the CAMP membership files and of the 84 members who responded to her questionnaire, 82% were men and 18% women. A similar breakdown of 79% male and 21% female enquiries to CAMP in 1972 was found in the Secretary's correspondence. Not only were there fewer women than men in CAMP but they were much younger than the men whose ages were more evenly distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE DISTRIBUTION OF MEMBERS OF CAMP 1972</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40 years</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the occupations of the CAMP members were concerned, the women were predominantly students and apart from the five men who were nurses, stereotypes of 'typical male homosexual occupations' were not met. The image held by Gay Liberationists of the men of CAMP as 'dull public service types' was, however, quite accurate, with most of the men being clerks, accountants, public servants, and teachers. (447) As far as socio-economic status rating were concerned the

(443) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Gaby Antolovich op. cit.
(444) WORTLEY, Sandra: op. cit. She collected demographic material in her survey of attitudes using members of CAMP and Sydney Women's Liberation as part of her sample.
(445) In 1972, the Secretary of CAMP wrote 247 letters on behalf of CAMP. These cover answers to enquiries, renewals of membership, and new memberships. This correspondence is held by Peter Bonsall-Boone.
(446) Source of information, WORTLEY, Sandra: op. cit.
CAMP membership was spread fairly evenly over highest, intermediate, and lowest ratings with

- 30% living in highest SES rating suburbs
- 38% living in intermediate SES rating suburbs
- 32% living in lowest SES rating suburbs. (448)

(447) See Appendix for details of occupations of CAMP members.
(448) See Appendix for details of SES rating of CAMP and CWA members.
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS -- SYDNEY GAY LIBERATION.

Internally, Sydney Gay Liberation went through similar difficulties in 1972 to those experienced by CAMP. Additionally, the publicity surrounding the release of Altman's book presented problems for both him and for his relations with the group.

When the group of 10-12 predominantly male Gay Liberationists left CAMP in January 1972, one of the main goals was 'not to be like CAMP' -- in style, structure or, most importantly, image. They saw themselves as anti-authoritarian, radical, and totally opposed to the leadership roles they saw people assume in CAMP (448) and yet their difficulties with people seen to be leaders were far more pronounced than those CAMP experienced because they had a leader imposed on them by the media. While Sydney Women's Liberation experienced difficulties because the media appointed Germaine Greer the 'high priestess' of Women's Liberation in Australia, Greer was not actually involved in Women's Liberation and she was here on a visit only. Altman, on the other hand, was a participant in Gay Liberation, and he was permanently resident in Sydney. The differences that already existed between Altman, a comparatively well-off, securely employed, university lecturer and the younger student/semi-skilled worker group of Gay Liberationists became more pronounced with the pre-and post-release publicity that surrounded the launching of his book. Appearances on a popular evening television programme Monday Conference (451) and interviews in magazines such as Vogue Australia (452) made Altman a (not entirely reluctant) media personality throughout 1972. Personal friendships between Altman and Gay Liberation members coupled with an anti-leadership, anti-star ideal within the group and a mass media that tended to create stars and seek individual spokespeople made Altman's position within the group very difficult. (453) So, for the most part, he remained involved at as low a level as possible, occasionally writing for the newsletter (454) and taking part with others in consciousness raising groups. For the group too Altman posed a dilemma -- they were opposed to the idea of leadership and yet Altman's book and his public acceptance were the surest, almost the only, way in 1972 that Gay Liberation gained some media coverage of its existence.

There were other leadership problems within Sydney Gay Liberation and these were in terms of workers and initiators rather than media created stars. In essence, they were the same problems that CAMP had: a few individuals shouldered responsibility for the activities of the group and once they had taken this on themselves they were left with that work and with the job of trying to encourage greater participation from the other members of the group. As John Lee wrote in August 1972:

But the problem is that virtually all the developments of recent months, which ever come to fruition, were initiated, fostered, followed up by Robert Tucker and myself ... For Sydney Gay Liberation has always depended on a few people to meet any agreed ends ... The perpetuation of this system of de facto leaders will only lead to continuing major problems for the growth

(449) LEE, John: "Where Are We At...?" op. cit.
(453) Altman was, for example, very hurt by demands from people he considered his friends that he donate a large portion of the royalties they believed he had already received from his book; it was more the way in which the demand was made and the people who made it than the actual demand which hurt him.
(454) In 1972 he wrote only one item for it: ALTMAN, Dennis: "Law Reform - Again" op. cit.
of the group — on any level. I came to Gay Lib, assuming, like everybody else, that we were by our very nature anti-authoritarian, we didn’t want appointed leaders (cf. C.A.M.P.) that our developments would arise "spontaneously". Concomitant with this belief was my assumption that most people in the group were responsible for where they were consciously at . . . oh, what naive idealism on my part . . . After a while, it became obvious that when things were "getting done" . . . it was because a few of us initiated and took responsibility. I’m not denying that others didn’t work on various projects, but they relied on direction, assuming someone else was looking after it all . . . Having fallen into the role of a defacto leader or initiator, (and insidiously, no one opposed constructively any new proposals), I began to relate to the "non-initiators" in veiled authoritarian terms (sometimes, not too veiled either) . . . Through all this, the group and myself are still repeating, all our avowed anti-authoritarian values, while acting out all the contrary roles, and their attendant expectations. A real double-bind situation . . . (455)

Lee and Tucker attempted to solve the problem of the group by leaving it for a while but they succeeded only in resolving the conflicts they themselves were experiencing. Once they had left, others filled the roles that they had vacated. In November 1972, for example, only three months later, a special Gay Caucus was called to discuss a series of problems, central to all of which was the leadership dilemma:

Many of the people who have been in gay lib a fair while and who have developed a radical gay consciousness are currently not relating to the newer members; the people who look after the Centre have little contact with each other and those who are publicly activists for Gay Lib are tending to become an unchanging (in size) elite.(456)

All the attempts to overcome the problems that the continual emergence of leaders constituted — by caucuses, appeals in the newsletter, consciousness raising — resulted merely in the rotation of people who filled the roles rather than an abandonment of the roles themselves.

The other major problem that confronted Sydney Gay Liberation in 1972 was the position of women in the group and, as with CAMP, the perception of that position as a problem was restricted to a few. Like CAMP, one of the major problems was that there were fewer women and that they were less involved than the men and, like the women in CAMP, in September 1972, the Gay Liberation women wanted a genuine two sex organization:

Gay Lib has been functioning in Sydney for about one year now, and even though a small number of women have been aware of the fact, women, due to a variety of reasons, have not been drawn to Gay Lib as active participants . . . Most women remain quiet and unparticipatory without even realising it. Lesbians come along to meetings, find them to be male dominated/oriented and consequently feel their experience to be invalid. There is a far greater turnover of women at our meetings for just this reason . . . I personally would like to see Gay Lib here remain unified with both men and women as active participants . . . It is just as much the men’s responsibility as the women’s to see that women "get a go". Too often a spokesman for Gay Lib has turned out to be a man; we can no longer avoid the fact that even within the Gay Lib movement women are secondary.(457)

The major difference between the position of women within Gay Liberation and CAMP was that far more Gay Liberation lesbians had developed a Women’s Liberation consciousness of the oppression of women than CAMP lesbians had and that more of the Gay Liberation men had too. In other words, many more Gay Liberation men knew that they should not be sexist

(455) LEE, John: "Where Are We At . . ?" op. cit.
(and what that meant) than did CAMP men—even if they were unwilling or unable to act on that knowledge. But relations deteriorated rather than improved. At the end of a long article on the oppression of women published in the Newsletter of December, 1972, Pam Stein issued an ultimatum:

Men, after reading this article you may realise our oppression as women a little more . . . you may also realise why the women in Gay Lib feel threatened and fucking mad or even more to the point disappointed when the men in Gay Liberation put us down by ignoring us, by saying we are aggressive, when we are being assertive, when they refuse for the reason of masculine arrogance to participate in our movement, and also when they are [too] bloody lazy to look for themselves and come to the women to lean on and ask us what they do . . . Brothers, if you can't see for yourselves why the women are angry . . . then Gay Liberation is worth nothing in our eyes and particularly with me !!!!

By the end of 1972, Sydney Gay Liberation had been in existence for one year. Externally, its activities had consisted of reactions to events rather than internally generated initiatives. Internally, it had faced, but been unable to resolve, the leadership dilemma and its women had, like their counterparts in CAMP, begun to move from a position of trying to make a two sex movement ideal a reality towards the angry beginnings of a separatist stance.

(457) LOFTUS, Mim: “Women in Gay Liberation” Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter. Vol I No 3. September, 1972. The item was followed by a note to the effect that since it had been written more women had become active in the movement.

Equally as important as the developments of each of the Sydney groups in their own terms is the perceptions, the images, each had of the others. For my purposes whether or not these images were accurate or even justifiable is less relevant than what they were and how they affected relations between the groups. It would be impossible to collect and present the views of all members of each group and the following information is deficient in this respect; it consists primarily of the views of activists, expressed usually in relation to specific incidents.

(1) Sydney Women’s Liberation and CAMP.

Sydney Women’s Liberation had been in existence for almost a year when Camp Inc was formed and the internal dynamic of its own development was already underway. By September 1970, when Camp Inc was publicly launched, the Glebe group had already assumed dominance of the movement, and it was to the Glebe group that Christabel Poll and several other women from Camp Inc went to talk on 25 November, 1970, and with unfortunate consequences:

Gale Kelly: And they came with hostility to 67 and they challenged us on our own ground, and we, we were ready for a discussion with them and wanted a discussion . . . And Christabel Poll came, they came in with a chip on their shoulder and told us they thought we were stupid; what have we got these closed meetings for anyway, closing men out. And in the end, at the end of that night there were, you know, one or two girls who actually seemed to want to discuss and talk, you know, come to some sort of understanding with one another. But it was never repeated. (459)

On another occasion, one of the lesbians from CAMP dropped into a Glebe group meeting and did nothing to improve the impression the official visit had created:

Gale Kelly: We had one come to Glebe once, remember that girl . . . she’d been in the army, a sergeant in the army . . . It was like allowing a man to come to the meeting [talking] of how she despised women, they gave her the shits, couldn’t live with ‘em . . . you can only fuck them, and it was just like a man. And it was terribly difficult because immediately, just like a man, your defences go up, you know, you stop thinking in terms of whether she’s a woman or a man, she’s just saying certain things. (460)

When the formal invitation was reciprocated in August 1971 and some Women’s Liberationists went to Camp Inc to talk to them about Women’s Liberation, both men and women were present. According to one of the Women’s Liberationists there was an audience of about 20 who listened politely and asked questions politely; but the enquiries all came from the men. After the meeting had formally closed a few Camp Inc women approached them to ask questions. Asked why they had not spoken up during the meeting, they replied that they were too embarrassed to do so. (461)

When the first issue of Mejane appeared in March 1971, it carried a very straightforward announcement of the formation of Camp Inc and its university branches. (462) A more revealing indicator comes from the notes scribbled on a leaflet passed around at a Mejane meeting in October 1971. With reference to the demonstration Camp Inc had planned for outside the Liberal Party Headquarters on 8 October, 1971 was written, in three separate hands:

- There’s a Camp Inc demo on Fri night outside Liberal Perty in town
- PISS WEAK
- Come now Sisters we must exercise empathy with our underdeveloped bourgeois brothers. (463)
In July 1972 when the Gay Women’s Liberation group, comprised mainly of CWA members, began to meet at Alberta Street, the meeting time coincided with that of the Mejane group who nicknamed them ‘the leather set’. The images of the CAMP women, despite the complete change in the personnel of the group, remained the same:

*Sue Bellamy:* When you’re told that at Camp Women’s Association meetings people go through, you know, big time progressions and get butcher and butcher every meeting and hold their cigarettes this way instead of that way and how isn’t that great and, there’s this whole perpetuation of the butch and the femme traditional sort of exhibitionism and stuff. But I don’t think that’s any further away from the male culture than the woman who trots behind her husband and says nothing.

What in essence some of the Women’s Liberationists were accusing the CAMP lesbians of was not having developed a Women’s Liberation consciousness and basically, that was a justifiable accusation – even if they overestimated the extent of role playing that went on in the relationships of group members.

One of the other differences between the groups was in terms of the importance attached to coming out:

*Sue Bellamy:* The thing that I get so furious about is that you get half a dozen people jumping up and down saying first of all, ‘coming out’, this sort of melodramatic form of sexual identification in front of other people which I find ridiculous now. Like, you know, I’m a lesbian, haaaaaa, kind of thing. I hate that.

As far as CAMP as a whole was concerned, the organization was seen as reformist (while Women’s Liberation was revolutionary) and its men sexist – the banners and placards they had carried in the International Women’s Day March in 1972 as well as their general behaviour had been offensive. Some indication of the attitudes of Sydney Women’s Liberation newsletter subscribers towards homosexuals in general is available from the Wortley thesis. Broadly speaking, out of the four groups she surveyed – Women’s Liberationists, members of CAMP, psychotherapists and a control group – the CAMP group was the most ‘progressive’ in its attitudes toward homosexuality, followed by Women’s Liberationists with the control and therapist groups holding similar ‘non-progressive’ views.

The questionnaire provided respondents with an opportunity to make comments on the issues of women’s role and homosexuality and some of the Women’s Liberationists revealed a good deal of ignorance and some prejudice. For example:

> Firstly on the questionnaire on homosexuals. I found this very difficult because each homosexual would be different . . . When the homosexual is . . . a “Female within a male body” or vice versa, then he/she would have to find satisfaction in his/her homosexual role. BUT when homosexuality is due to a hang up in the phallic stage of development, or due to inhuman repressions by the mother/father figure during childhood, then it would be kinder to assist the homosexual through to his/her full adult development, which would PROBABLY be as a heterosexual.

(460) *Ibid*

(461) Personal communication Dimity Fletcher.


(464) *TRANSCRIPT*: Mejane Discussion Group, op. cit. There were two other women (Josefa SobSky and Robyn Lee) in that discussion group who did not think that the CAMP lesbians role played to the extent that Bellamy and Kelly claimed.

(465) *Ibid.* Bellamy herself was a lesbian and her attack on coming out is partly attributable to an unwillingness...
To me homosexuality is a regrettable state of affairs. I am not "appalled", "Shocked" or "disgusted" by it, but if "freely expressed" means homosexuals being affectionate in front of children i.e., in parks etc., then I would be upset by it, mainly for the reason that it may put ideas into boys minds which may swing them towards it... I wish we could find an answer to this problem, mainly for the homosexuals for they appear to be living in a "No man's land" and I think many of them must be very miserable inside.(469)

Poll's inability to understand why Women's Liberation needed groups which excluded men is quite comprehensible in terms of her commitment to a two sex organization such as Camp Inc was intended to be and she was indeed quite critical of what she saw as the 'inner sanctum' atmosphere that the Glebe group seemed to exude.

The CWA Newsletter which announced the 15 July 1972 meeting with Women's Liberationists did not simply represent an unfortunate choice of words; it reflected an attitude quite common among CWA members:

... it was finally decided that women's lib needs liberating and who better to do it than the CAMP women's group. A group of lovely ladies have therefore been invited to attend our next meeting and indulge in some social intercourse.(470)

The wording of the report of that meeting contained in the next CWA Newsletter was a little less provocative:

One the negative side, it was obvious that for some C.A.M.P. women, the lib. views were far too radical to swallow in one go (if at all); others evinced a bored "I've heard it all before" reaction-(471)

When the Gay Women's Liberation group began to meet at Women's House in July 1972, for some of them Women's Liberationists reacted unacceptingly:

Goby Antolovich: People were curious about us and fairly hostile to us generally. Hostile because they didn't know much about lesbians and they didn't know what we were doing. They probably thought we were fucking or something. There was that sort of reaction. Every time we'd say something about lesbians, they started seeing us as people who can only talk about lesbians but they put us in the position of always talking about lesbians because they left us out of everything else.(472)

Women's Liberationists saw CAMP lesbians as lacking in a Women's Liberationist consciousness and CAMP women saw them as unaccepting of lesbians, and both were justifiable impressions. When it came to the lesbians within Women's Liberation, they may have had a feminist awareness but they lacked, as we saw it, a consciousness of their lesbianism. What was particularly difficult to understand was their stance on coming out: that some women found it difficult for a variety of reasons to come out was perfectly understandable; what was difficult to accept was that the self-styled radical Women's Liberationists refused to come out on the grounds that it was unnecessary.

on the part of the woman with whom she was involved (Kelly) to come out.

(466) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy op. cit.

(467) See Appendix for Wortley's summary of her findings.

(468) Part Time Welfare Officer. Aged 24. WORTLEY, Sandra: op. cit. These comments come from the actual questionnaires which were not submitted with the thesis. Wortley gave me these pages, together with copies of her worksheets.


(472) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Goby Antolovich, op. cit.
Just as the Women’s Liberation respondents to Wortley’s thesis survey as a group were a little more progressive in their attitudes to homosexuality, so the CAMP respondents were more progressive in their attitudes to the role of women. But, once again, some of the open-ended responses were revealing:

I fail to see where being a woman can in itself be such a problem, unless, of course, she is a homosexual. (473)

I know I’d hate to be tied to the sink every day of my life so if a woman feels that she needs ‘something else’ to keep her active then why shouldn’t she do it – providing it makes her happy! Anyway a nice face in the office does help to pass the day. (474)

(2) Sydney Women’s Liberation and Sydney Gay Liberation.

There were far more Gay Liberation women involved in the activities of Women’s Liberation than there were CAMP women and in many respects their relations with that movement were much better.

The June 1972 Women’s Liberation Conference where Gay Liberation was given a session reinforced all the assumptions that Sydney Women’s Liberationists had made that the men of Gay Liberation (like all men) were sexist. All of that Conference was held at the YWCA Head Headquarters in Sydney except for the Sunday evening session on Gay Liberation which was held at Women’s House. Two Gay Liberation men and one woman presented papers to a packed Women’s House. Barry Prothero spoke briefly on “Why Homosexual Liberation?” followed by Jim Wafer talking about homosexual images in ancient Persia under the rather misleading title of “Towards a Strategy of Psycho-Sexual Revolution” and Susanne Hollis spoke about ‘potential bisexuality’ under the title of “Lesbians in Women’s Lib and Women in Gay Lib”. After the papers had been presented a rather drunken Christabel Poll launched a double-barrelled attack on both Women’s Liberation and Gay Liberation by asking the male speakers if they did not find it peculiar, even offensive, that they as homosexuals, were the only men who were not only allowed to speak at the Conference which was closed to men, but also to step inside Women’s House which, as a general rule, excluded men. The reactions to her question from the men, who became more and more chauvenist as they tried to defend themselves, and from other women who then proceeded to attack them, produced a shouting match which ended up only when a large number of women left the session to hold small group discussions elsewhere in the building. (475)

For Gay Liberation men the situation was more complex. Because a lot of Gay Liberation ideology and practice was based on material borrowed from Women’s Liberation and even if they could not actually manage to treat the women in their own groups in a non-sexist fashion, they could not afford, for the sake of their own self-image as part of a radical sexual liberation movement, to be seen to by anything other than totally admiring of Women’s Liberation.

(3) CAMP and Sydney Gay Liberation

Some of the ways in which CAMP and Sydney Gay Liberation perceived each other have already been touched on. Despite better communication between some individuals in

(473) Sheet Metal Worker. Aged 29. WORTLEY, Sandra: op. cit.
(474) Credit Control Supervisor. Aged 30. Ibid.
(475) For a non-Sydney person’s view of the session see [DANIELS] KAY: “Women’s Liberation National Conference” op. cit.
both groups which had begun to develop by the end of 1972, there was still the continual
sniping in print between them, the basic theme of which was that Gay Liberationists saw
themselves as radical and CAMP as reformist and that CAMP members, unable to play
the "more radical than thou" game and win it, had to be content with trying to show Gay
Liberationists that they were not quite as radical as they thought they were.

From the Gay Liberation side, there was Des Krause

It will be a pleasure to break away from the bourgeois confines of
Camp Inc. (476)

and Robert Tucker

Gay Lib is different from Camp Inc because we don't sexually
objectify each other and because law reform won't really help
homosexuals much cause while queens hate each other we'll get
nowhere. (477)

and the anonymous note tacked on to the end of David Widdup's election advertisement

Doubtless, gay liberationists will not be very enamoured with this approach
to social change... we don't want to become censors in refusing it even if
we feel that the terms he is working within are too limited for effective
change. (478)

or Susanne Hollis

Gay Lib is a radical group, dedicated to establishing a new social
structure. Homosexuals aren't sick: our capitalistic self-destructive
society is. Camp Inc is a more conservative organization... (479)

Additionally, other well known homosexuals contributed to the fight from outside the groups.
Jim Anderson, for example, on his visit to Australia gave an interview to William and John in
which he slated CAMP as reformist and powerless and named Gay Liberation as the only answer. (480)

From CAMP members came defensive reactions and counter-attacks. In response to
Susanne Hollis' criticisms, Brian Woodward, then NSW Editor of Camp Ink, wrote:

You... say that CAMP is a 'more conservative organization' - more
conservative than what? If you mean 'than S.G.L.' in what way,
and on what, do you base this judgement?
What has Gay Lib ever done that CAMP hasn't done, or at least been
the instigator of?... Do you feel that the radical/ratbag/demonstrator
image that S.G.L. had could be due to the few more vocal members
of S.G.L. giving the whole group a weird image? (481)

From John Ware came the attack on Gay Liberationists for writing for William and John
referred to earlier. (482) and from Lex Watson, using the pseudonym Trevor Hughes again,
the following:

Since returning to Australia, I have heard a number of people expounding
the Gay Liberation ideology, or their version of it... Everyone seems to
be stressing bisexuality in Australia - we are all bi, they say... I thought
Gay Lib were the revolutionaries of the homophile movement, that they

(477) TUCKER, Robert: "Gay Liberation: Doubts and Fears" op. cit.
were proclaiming the right to be camp without apology ...
I think this big emphasis on bisexuality is revisionist nonsense, it is
counter revolutionary it is middle class liberalism and it will lead
to a new oppression, a new moral authoritarianism." (483)

Alongside these exchanges were the genuine attempts to bridge the gap between the two
organizations. The Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter frequently printed a call for greater
co-operation between the two organizations. (484) That need was made very clear to them
over a demonstration they had planned against the NSW Health Department on behalf, oddly
enough because we were never told about it, of HGS. They were planning to demonstrate
because of

the refusal of the State Department of Health to recognize the
Homosexual Guidance Service, a counselling service organized by
CAMP. Apparently the reason lay in the Parliamentary Act from
which the Health Dept takes its terms of reference. -- That Act
describes homosexuality as a “disease”. (485)

The demonstration was called off, according to the report, when

Sue Wills, co-president of CAMP was approached by the organisers
of the Health Department’s training school for counsellors regarding
the possibility of members of CAMP and Gay Lib taking part in a
series of talk-ins with the counsellors. (486)

The report was inaccurate in two respects: first, the refusal of the Health Department to
recognize HGS had nothing to do with any Act of Parliament; and secondly, the Health
Department never mentioned Gay Liberation in its approach to me – I simply invited them
to participate in the seminars in an attempt to foster better relations between the two groups.
Similarly, I had moved at the first Executive Meeting of CAMP in April 1972 that Gay Liberation
be granted the status of a Special Purpose Group within CAMP and asked to provide a (487)
representative for the Executive (an offer never taken up); Special Purpose Status meant that
the group could exclude whomsoever it chose from its meetings. And, it was I who moved at
the Executive meeting of 18 June 1972 that Gay Liberation be allowed to hold a fund raising
party at the CAMP clubrooms. (488) In a way, the fact that I had not been a member of
CAMP when the Gay Liberation cell split off and that I was a woman, undoubtedly made
it easier for me to make moves to bridge the gap between the two groups. These factors were
probably also at work in approaches from Gay Liberation men such as Dennis Altman, Barry
Prothero, and John Lee for me to speak publicly with them at groups or public debates on
homosexuality.

On the Gay Liberation side, moves to bridge the gap came from a few individuals too.

Bob Haywood, for example, wrote in response to the note attached to Widdup’s election

(484) See for example: “Relations with C.A.M.P.” Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter. Vol I No. 2. August,
October, 1972.
(486) Ibid.
(487) CAMP (NSW BRANCH): Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Held at 393 Darling Street, Balmain on
19 April, 1972.
(488) CAMP (NSW BRANCH): Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Held at 393 Darling Street, Balmain on
18 June 1972. The arrangement was that both groups would advertise the party and that CAMP would get $45
or 25% of the proceeds from the party, whichever was greater.
As a Sydney Gay Liberationist, I reject as petty and energy draining for the whole homosexual movement this anonymous attack on a gay brother from C.A.M.P. on his coming out. (489)

Altman in interviews tried to defuse hostilities by praising the work of CAMP (490) and in an article in the Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter (491) gave his support to homosexual law reform activities – one of the issues which divided CAMP and Gay Liberation.


(491) ALTMAN, Dennis: “Law Reform – Again” op. cit.
The discussion of the Tharunka - Thorunka - Thor (hereafter simply called Thor) group which follows will be much more abbreviated than those of the other groups for several reasons: only two individuals from that group, Wendy Bacon and Liz Fell, were involved in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium on Psychiatry and Liberation which will be the focus of the following chapter; only Bacon was involved in that Conference on the basis of her experience with the Thor group – she was invited to speak about pornography; Fell was invited to speak in the anti-psychiatry session and in some respects Fell is most significant in terms of her relationship with Bacon, a relationship which was forged in the Sydney Push. A brief discussion of the Thor group is necessary insofar as it was in the context of that group and its activities that Bacon had become known to members of the other groups. Fell had become known to us as a Sydney Push woman and it was the Sydney Push/Libertarians who provided both the personnel for and the philosophy underlying the publication of the newspapers.

The University of NSW student newspaper Tharunka had already faced one court case for the publication of obscene material (1965) (492) when three people, strongly influenced by the Sydney Libertarians, took over its editorship. Wendy Bacon, Val Hodgson, and Alan Rees had already produced two issues of a newspaper called Thorout to show the student union of the university that it could be done without all the structures of a body like the union. Their intention, according to Bacon, was not to fight an anti-censorship battle nor to concentrate on pornography; their involvement “was essentially with each publication as it was being prepared”. (493) While Tharunka also published material on drugs, the anti-Vietnam War Moratoriums, and satirical pieces on contemporary political figures, it was for the erotic material that the three editors were charged on 33 counts for their 1970 activities. Print runs of the student newspaper increased from 13,000 to 17,000 as demand from outside the campus increased and mid-way in 1970, Liz Fell, employed at the University of NSW in the Department of Sociology, joined the production team. In 1971, Tharunka returned to its more usual student format and Bacon, Fell, and others who had become involved were joined by a number of the downtown Sydney Push who wanted to continue the production of the paper, now named Thorunka, and, after a few issues, simply Thor. Sales of the paper reached 20,000 and publishers, distributors, and editors alike were charged (and in most cases found not guilty) with the publication of obscene material.

What is more important here than a detailed description of the court cases is a brief discussion of the philosophy of those who produced the papers. The people who were involved in Thor were part of the Sydney Libertarians/Sydney Push, (494) a loosely bound but cliquey libertarian/anarchist - discussion/drinking group. They were anti-authoritarian, anti-reformist, direct action oriented and individualist. Bacon summarised the influence that they had on her in terms of her involvement in the papers:

Like the anarchists, the Libertarians are thorough-going opponents of authority seeing the state and other authoritarian institutions as forces to be fought against in their own right... But unlike anarchists, Libertarians...


(494) While a complete history of that group has yet to be written, some information is available from DOCKER, John : Australian Cultural Elites. Angus and Robertson. Sydney. 1974 and Broadsheet, the newssheet of the Sydney Libertarians. See especially, BAKER, A.J.: “Sydney Libertarianism and the Push” Broadsheet. No. 81. March, 1975 pp 5-10 for the differences between the two groups.
do not set their sights ahead and argue that the main thing to work for is a future free society. Instead of being something that can be settled for all time, freedom is something to be fought for here and now. If anarchist-like activities... are worth doing it is for their own sake, not for any future ends... Arguing that there are connections between various forms of repression, economic, political and social, the Libertarians believe that sexual repression maintained through the authoritarian family and monogamous marriage in a capitalist society, has a central place in the development of the servile, conformist personality found in any repressive system. While recognising that neuroses are deeply implanted in childhood, again the accent is on combatting compulsiveness and guilt in their own lives, on exposing illusions about sex, rather than on progress for sexual reform.

Despite the obvious areas of overlap between Women’s Liberation and homosexual liberation analyses and those of the Libertarians, especially in terms of the repressive role of the family and marriage, and the merit of adopting militant, direct action, tactics, and despite the publication in Thor of material supportive of both groups and the support that Camp Ink gave Wendy Bacon, there was very little actual interaction, except on a very individual basis between the groups.

When Women’s Lib began to have exclusive meetings in Sydney a number of Push and Libertarian women registered uninterest on the grounds that, in effect, they were “already liberated” as well as objecting to the exclusive aspect of the membership and the notion that they were “bourgeois” because Women’s Lib was becoming fashionable among suburban housewives.

It was not until the end of 1972 that some Push women began to express their dissatisfaction with the status of women in the Push: they prepared a paper on “Male Chauvenism in the Push” to present at the Minto Libertarian Conference in December, 1972.

To Sydney Women’s Liberation, the Push women were kidding themselves if they thought they were already liberated: how could they be when leading Push men like Darcy Waters reputedly made annual trips to Sydney University during Orientation Week to “cull” the best looking new female students; how could they be when the only new people to ever gain acceptance within the Push “were women, if they happened to put together the proper sequence of political fucks”: Moreover, Thor sexually objectified women in the particular type of erotica it published.

As far as the homosexual movement was concerned, the Push was, if not openly anti-gay so overwhelmingly heterosexually oriented that it was, in effect, oppressive of homosexuals. There were one or two people within the Push who were homosexual and who, according to some, were always produced to prove that the Push was not anti-gay but to say that the Push was, by the end of 1972, even familiar with the tenets of homosexual liberation ideology would be a gross overstatement.

(495) BACON, Wendy : op. cit.
(496) Altman, for example, was a friend of Fell’s and some Women’s Liberationists such as Anne Summers and Gill Leahy had had personal involvements with Push men.
(498) Ibid.
(500) Fell, who jokingly said that she would never become a lesbian until it became unfashionable again, was alleged by one Gay Liberation lesbian to have put her down by calling her a ‘cunt sucker’.
(501) Jenny Coopes and John Cardenzano were the two people known to most until 1972 when Sasha Soldatow became involved in the Push and it was he who had these names produced for him as proof.
CHAPTER 2
THE SYDNEY SEXUAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AND THE CIBA-GEIGY SYMPOSIUM

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

How to structure this chapter presented two major problems. While the focus of my attention is on the invitations to participate in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium on Psychiatry and Liberation Movements issued by McConaghy and on the reactions to those invitations, I do not want to blow out of proportion their importance amongst the ongoing activities of the Liberation Movements. I wish merely to bring those reactions into relief, to make them stand out against a background of continuing concern with other issues. Neither do I wish to create the impression that decisions about whether or not people should participate in the Symposium (and if so, under what conditions) were of equal importance to each of the movements, let alone to different individuals within those movements; very simply, they were not. So, the data will be presented in fairly straightforward chronological order, taking each of the movements separately and discussing McConaghy’s invitations in the context of activities in which they were received. Then, in order to highlight the reactions and interactions the invitations produced, I will try to draw out from their movement backgrounds, and to draw together, those individuals and parts of the movements which were most closely involved with the Symposium.

SYDNEY WOMEN’S LIBERATION

1973 was an important year in the development of Sydney Women’s Liberation. In that year external events forced the movement to face two issues which would be of major importance to it for years to come. The first was the question of the type of relationship that should/could be established between a self-proclaimed revolutionary-radical movement of social change and a government in power which was more willing to listen sympathetically to some of its demands than any previous government had even come close to doing. And, right from the beginning of its term in office, the Whitlam Labor Government showed that, in some areas at least, it was prepared not only to concede the legitimacy of some of the women’s movement’s demands, but also to act on them. In the two week period (5 - 17 December 1972) of the Whitlam-Barnard Duumvirate which immediately followed the federal elections, some decisions were announced. And some of these affected, or were of particular interest to, women: the application to re-open the equal pay case; the immediate removal of the 27% sales tax on contraceptives; the lifting of the ban on the public advertisement of contraceptives in the ACT; and the appointment of the first female presidential member (Elizabeth Evatt) to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. (1) But the honeymoon period between the movement and the government was very brief. The responses of some parts of Sydney Women’s Liberation to the establishment of the position of Women’s Advisor to the Prime Minister in January 1973, and to the filling of that position during March - April, 1973, gave the new government an early indication that not all of its decisions affecting women would be met with uncritical acclaim from the women’s movement. Those responses also indicated the lines along which new divisions would be thrown up in the women’s movement; divisions which would become more important as government funds became available for movement initiated projects. (2)


The second new issue for Sydney Women’s Liberation was that of the place of lesbians within the movement and of the relationship between lesbianism and feminism. 1973 saw that question raised forcefully and publicly in Sydney Women’s Liberation for the first time and by lesbians who were considered to have come from outside the movement. While the initial response to the public lesbian presence was unveiled hostility, the impact was such that the issue could no longer be ignored.

1973 also saw for the first time women from Sydney Women’s Liberation arrested, as it were, 'in the course of their revolutionary duties' and the introduction, after a fight which involved both staff and students, of the first Women's Studies Course to be taught in an Australian university. In the midst of all these activities, and others, McConaghy's attempts to get somebody from Sydney Women’s Liberation to present a paper at his conference in the name of the movement were met and dealt with.
1972
December
Tues 5 - Sun 17
First Whitlam Ministry in new Labor Government

MCCONNAGHY DISCUSSES PROPOSED LIBERATION AND PSYCHIATRY
CONFERENCE WITH LIZ FELL

1973
January
Sat 20
TUES 23
Four Sydney Women's Liberationists arrested in Manly

MCCONNAGHY SENDS LETTER TO SYDNEY WOMEN'S LIBERATION
INVITING THEM TO PROVIDE A SPEAKER FOR HIS CONFERENCE

Sat 27 - Mon 29
February
Mount Beauty Women's Liberation Theory Conference.

MCCONNAGHY DISCUSSES MCCONNAGHY'S INVITATION

March
SUN 11
JOINT MEETING OF THOSE CONCERNED WITH MCCONNAGHY'S
INVITATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS CONFERENCE

Sat 17-Sun 18
Sydney Women's Commission held in Teachers Federation Auditorium

Sat 24-Sun 25
Final interviews of women shortlisted for position of Women's Advisor
to Prime Minister, Canberra.

Mon 26
Mejane collective send letter to selection committee for position of
Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister.

April
Sun 1
Post mortem on Sydney Women's Commission. Distribution of Selection =
Rejection leaflet and copies of Mejane letter to Post Mortem meeting.

May
Sun 6
Handing out of pro-abortion leaflets outside St. Mary's Cathedral.

Thurs 10
Lamb-McKenzie (Medical Practices Clarification) Bill defeated in Federal
Parliament.

Sun 12
Mother's Day March,

MCCONNAGHY CONTACTS LIZ FELL TO ASK FOR NAMES OF INDIVIDUAL
WOMEN'S LIBERATIONISTS WHO MIGHT GIVE PAPERS

MCCONNAGHY CONTACTS MADGE DAWSON WHO DECLINES INVITATION

MCCONNAGHY CONTACTS JOYCE STEVENS WHO DECLINES INVITATION
BUT SUGGESTS JUDY MUNDEY

MCCONNAGHY CONTACTS JUDY MUNDEY WHO ACCEPTS INVITATION

June
Wed 20
Start of strike in General Philosophy Department at Sydney University
over Women's Studies Course.

Sat 30
WAAC Organized march for repeal of abortion laws.
Meeting at Alberta Street to discuss establishment of Women's Liberation
birth control clinic.

August
MON 6 - TUES 7
CIBA-GEIGY SYMPOSIUM ON LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AND
PSYCHIATRY
Long before Neil McConaghy actually sent out his official invitations to Sydney Women's Liberation and Sydney Gay Liberation asking them to provide speakers for his Conference on Liberation and Psychiatry, several individuals, friends of Liz Fell in the main, knew that such a conference was being planned. In December 1972 McConaghy had had a series of telephone conversations with Fell about the Conference:

*Liz Fell*: He rang me up. He discussed at length the disadvantages of having it at the university . . . having it in a lecture theatre; how many people would be there; whether everyone could participate; how are we going to get a big lecture theatre; we'll have to get video; it's not going to work; whether he was going to restrict the numbers. We talked about the themes: we talked about who else might do the anti-psychiatry section; who else might take on censorship. Then he raised the women thing and I only said I thought it would be really beaut to do something on it. The gay thing I didn't discuss with him at all because he'd obviously made up his mind about that; it was something he was going to have. . . . He didn't in any way understand what Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation was except that he couldn't select someone out for himself; he thought they had to do the selecting and so he then wrote to them asking them to do the selecting . . . In some senses he was attempting to be more democratic in the way in which he saw it by going to the organizations without even understanding the nature of them.'

That McConaghy had, as Fell put it, no understanding of the nature of Women's Liberation is clear from the way in which he addressed his invitation. Dated 23 January 1973, he wrote to ‘The Secretary, Women’s Liberation’. On University of NSW letterhead, he continued:

*Dear Madame,*

The School of Psychiatry in the University of New South Wales is considering the possibility of sponsoring a two day symposium in the period June to August, 1973 on the topic “Liberation and Psychiatry”.

Would your organization be interested in sending a speaker to such a symposium? The approximate format considered at present is that on the first day the theory of liberation movements and radical therapy would be examined; on the second, sexual liberation movements, particularly in relation to their relevance to psychiatry. The major issues I think relevant are Women's Liberation, Gay Liberation and censorship. If your organization is interested could you suggest a speaker and indicate whether she would be free at any time over the period from June until August.

A copy of the paper to be read would be required one month before the date of the symposium.

Yours sincerely,

N. McConaghy
Associate Professor of Psychiatry.

That letter, like many addressed to Women’s Liberation rather than specifically to one of the groups within it, lay about Women’s House for some time waiting for somebody to volunteer to do something about it. That it did not immediately assume importance within Sydney Women’s Liberation is perfectly understandable: it was January, a time of year when many people are away and the movement’s activities are always relatively quiescent; some Sydney women were preparing for, then attending, and recovering from, the Mount Beauty Theory Conference;

---

(3) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Liz Fell and Wendy Bacon. Fell had originally met McConaghy in 1968 at a party held by a mutual friend, Caroline Graham (one of the founding members of WEL in Sydney). There, Fell and McConaghy had argued over the relative merits of Freud (Fell) and Skinner (McConaghy).

and for those women still in Sydney, there were the preparations for the Women's Commission to be held in March. It is also understandable that it was the Glebe group which decided to take up McConaghy's invitation and at least discuss it: it was within the Glebe group which still met at 67 Glebe Point Road (despite the availability of Alberta Street) that there was the biggest overlap of Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation; (5) and it was to homosexual women and men that McConaghy's name was an anathema.

The Glebe group which, describing itself as "consisting of mainly radical gay women but not exclusively" and involved in "anti-pornography laws, anti-psychiatry, against aversion therapists and into zaps" (6) had developed a group cohesiveness which comes most quickly from shared experience of action within a hostile environment; it was the group from which most of the seventeen women who tried to 'liberate' two Hotels in Manly on January 20 had come.

While the Working Women's Group raids on the Petersham Inn late in 1972 had been carried out and taken with a sense of fun, the same sort of action taken by the Glebe Group in Manly provoked an entirely different reaction. There were differences between the two groups which may go part way to explaining the different results of the raids: the Working Women's Group was composed of women who were older and 'more presentable' in their appearance; the Glebe Group women were younger and 'scruffier looking' and one had worn a Gay Liberation singlet.

Two Hotels were raided, the North Steyne, and the Hotel Manly. According to pre-arranged strategy two women entered the Steyne and ordered beers. When they were refused service the other 14 women who had been waiting outside the hotel joined them. Arguments with barmaids and customers ensued and the bar manager was called to try to stop the beer throwing and glass smashing. Told that they would not leave until they had had a beer the manager called the police - and ordered free beers for all the women for which they insisted on paying. Having achieved their purpose - to be served in the public bar - the women left as the police arrived, leaving the manager to explain to the police that they were not really needed after all. Joined by a woman who was passing by, the group, buoyed up with its success, decided to apply the same tactics to the Hotel Manly. This time, however, the proprietor was not at all interested in maintaining the peace of his bar by accommodating the demands of the women; he called the Manly police immediately. The result was considerable violence and four arrests: one woman was charged with using unseemly words and resisting arrest; another with offensive behaviour and resisting arrest; and the other two with inciting a prisoner to resist arrest. (7)

In February 1973, the Glebe Group (8) discussed what they should do about the invitation from McConaghy. Afraid that unless they took the initiative no discussion would be held at all, the group wanted Women's Liberation to adopt a policy of non-participation in the conference.

Gillian Leahy: We decided that we wouldn't participate and we didn't think Women's Lib should participate but there was no way in which we could prevent other people, women, who wanted to, or even people who said that they wanted to do it on behalf of Women's Lib. (9)

Unable to make decisions which could bind either the movement or individuals within it, the Glebe Group decided to call a meeting of interested people to try to work out a Women's

(5) Only two of the women, out of a total of 10-12 in the Glebe group considered themselves to be heterosexual at this time.
(8) Gillian Leahy, Pam Stein, Penny Short, Theresa Jack, Mim Loftus, Trudy Lipwood, Shane Kelly, Sue Hollis, Christine O'Sullivan, Katie O'Rourke, Robyn Lee, and Josefa Sobski constituted the core of the Glebe Group,
Liberation response, a response which might also be adopted by Gay Liberation, CAMP and the people - Liz Fell, Wendy Bacon, and Dennis Altman - whom McConaghy had approached individually. Gillean Leahy took responsibility for setting a date and place for the meeting, for putting up a notice about it at Women's House and for starting the chain of contacting people who would in turn contact others. Given the structure of Women's Liberation there was little else the Glebe group could have done.

The meeting, which will be discussed in detail later, was held on Saturday 11 March 1973 at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale. Some of those present, after considerable discussion, drafted and signed a letter to McConaghy which was sent by registered mail on Monday 12 March. Because he knew nothing of the nature of Women's Liberation, when he received the letter which demanded that he restructure the Conference as a prerequisite for any consideration of the request to participate, and which was signed by several women who claimed to be from Women's Liberation McConaghy could only assume that Women's Liberation as an organization had refused to participate in his Conference unless he met the demands outlined in the letter.

Of far greater concern to many Sydney Women's Liberationists than whether or not to participate in McConaghy's Conference - if they even knew of its planned existence - were the preparations for the Women's Commission to be held over the weekend of 17-18 March, the weekend following that on which the joint meeting of 11 March was held. Planning for the Commission had begun in November 1972 and had originated as a response to an election promise by the then Prime Minister, William McMahon, that if re-elected, he would set up a Royal Commission to enquire into the status of women. Press releases and leaflets directed to women's groups, dated 18 December, 1972, announced the proposed Women's Commission:

On March 10 and 11 (sic), we propose that a Women's Commission be convened in Sydney, open to all women who wish to testify about the conditions of women in Australia. As you know, the recent elections saw various vague promises from the former Prime Minister about a 'Royal Commission'. It was suggested that if/when a Commission was convened, it would not consider such questions as abortion, birth control or equal pay, but a Commission organized by women, for women, will discuss the questions which women consider important, and can raise the consciousness of all who participate.

The leaflet went on to list the areas the Commission would cover - women as mothers, women as workers, women as sex objects, and why marriages break down. It continued:

Each topic could be introduced by women who would testify to their actual experiences and situation. Women who have specialized knowledge could be called upon to elaborate the actual alternatives available to women in our society, and the potential solutions which women work for . . .

In our view, such a Women's Commission could provide a new impetus for women to understand more deeply their oppression, and to take action accordingly. It is not our intention that this Commission should be a decision making conference, but one where women are free to articulate their needs and their solutions.

(9) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Gillian Leahy.


(11) McConaghy to Mr. Paul Soss (sic) and Colleagues, 19 March 1973. Document No 98. McConaghy's opening paragraph in fact makes this assumption: "Thank you for your registered letter of 11th March, 1973 which I presume is in answer to my communications of 19th and 23rd January 1973 to Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation. I am somewhat puzzled by your response as I am aware that members of your movements talk at meetings organized by academic and other bodies without suggesting that you organize the meeting." After explaining the nature of the Conference, he opens his last paragraph with: "I hope in the light of this
The actual planning for the Commission was not without its difficulties. To begin with, there was disagreement over the degree of structure the Commission should take on. The original committee of six (14) had decided on a structure which would not only divide the two day Commission into thematic sessions but would also have particular women "to speak at the beginning of sessions in order to help break down inhibitions, and set a mood which would induce other women to speak and share their experiences". (15) But there were some who opposed this plan

Sue Bellamy: ... we turned up every week and every time they talked about having noted speakers and stuff, we kept saying, ah, but wouldn't it be better to, soft peddling backwards all the way ... If one is to choose to criticize the structure of the Commission and the division of women into productive and reproductive organs as they relate to the means of production in this society, you know, it reflected an old style political line anyway, all those divisions anyway ... Everyone was being super polite at Commission meetings. There was no real debate about it all ... I think the few of us who sort of saw that, kept hoping that we could cut the structure down as much as possible, keep cutting it back every time they thought of a new horrific thing to do, so that it would explode on the day; and so that the Commission would take over itself. (16)

While some individuals were attending the pre-Commission planning meetings to try to prevent the Commission from taking on too much formal structure, another was attending to protest the exclusion of lesbianism from the Commission agenda. Gaby Antolovich, a member of CAMP, had read the advertising leaflet (17) about the Commission and had noticed that no provision had been made in any of the sessions for lesbians to testify to their oppression. Early in February 1973 she went to a meeting of the Glebe Group:

Josefa Sobski: We were meeting at Glebe, Gaby came to us and complained about the fact that we had been deliberately, we as lesbians, as a group, had been deliberately excluded from the Commission agenda, right. This is what she said, right. So, of course, everybody sort of sat down and ummed and ahhed and eventually became quite furious ... I felt we had no right to make this claim, having taken no part in the pre-commission meetings or formulating any of the discussions that were supposed to be sort of taking place, and so on. So, why cry now (18)

Having failed to get the support of the Glebe Group, Antolovich began to attend the Commission planning meetings which were being held weekly at Women's House.

Robyn Lee: ... Their resentment certainly continued because every week that I was there the fight came up again ... You didn't know how to defend yourself. You'd sort of sit saying 'Are you accusing me of discriminating against lesbians'. And it didn't mean anything to me but it seemed to me that that was what I was being accused of ... they felt there was some kind of implicit chauvenism in the organization. (19)

clarification your organisation will be prepared to send speakers ..." (Emphasis added).
(13) Ibid.
(14) Nola Cooper, Sylvia Hale, Nita Keig, Mavis Robertson, Diana Caine and Shirley Woodland.
(16) TRANSCRIPT: Mejane Group Discussion, op. cit. Sue Bellamy and Gale Kelly formed the main opposition to the structuring of the Commission.
(18) TRANSCRIPT: Mejane Group Discussion. op. cit.
Sue Bellamy: I did suggest at the first publicity meeting that there be at least some questions dealing with homosexuality. And that was pruned down and pruned down and the, you know, all smiles all around the room when they finally popped in the question on 'can you sexually love a woman', you know, as though that had solved the problem... Can you imagine the level of debate, given that a woman was in that meeting who said, 'this smells of lesbianism'. I mean, that was the level that everyone was holding themselves to. (20)

The Commission was held in the Auditorium of the Teachers Federation in Sussex Street, Sydney on Saturday 17 and Sunday 18 March, 1973. When the first women arrived just before 10 a.m., on the Saturday morning they were confronted by an unexpected would-be participant. John Ware, Co-Founder of Camp Inc, and then editor of its journal Camp Ink, had chained himself to one of the rows of seats half way up the tiered auditorium. The chain was light weight, bought especially for the occasion, as was the small padlock; beside him was his rather tatty briefcase containing papers and a thermos flask. As more and more women arrived, individually asked him to leave (which he declined to do), and the talk turned to bolt cutters and forcible ejection, his trembling became more pronounced. Amidst the initial disorganized discussion Ware shouted that he was protesting the exclusion of males from the Commission because that was as sexist as the exclusion of women by men from their gatherings; he was accused of being a plant of the Camp Women's Association, of hiding behind the skirts of the CWA or of some other group expressing their dissatisfaction with the way the Commission was organized; and some argued that he should leave because his presence would inhibit women who wanted to testify about their personal relationships with men. Ware agreed to leave if a majority of women present wished him to do so. Further heated argument followed during which an Aboriginal woman protested against his exclusion:

I'm a black, an oppressed black. I was asked to come here and speak about the oppression of black women and I can't talk about the oppression of black women without black men because they are just as oppressed as me and the other black women. I walked in late and I hear you pissing on about some guy who's sitting up there. As far as I'm concerned you're going on like a bloody lot of fuckwits. (applause) I don't know what that guy's all about, who he is or where he's from. Somebody said he's from Camp Inc, whatever that is, but obviously he's from some oppressed group within our community. And as far as I'm concerned, oppressed people, if he can come here and just sit and maybe later on be allowed to have a say, I think that's fair enough... I think that too much time has been wasted already and I think that my time will be wasted because we're on completely different levels. If you're not prepared to listen to what I've got to say about blacks, oppressed blacks, both men and women, well, I think I'll leave because I cannot talk about oppressed women and leave out the men. (applause) (21)

Immediately after that statement was made, Joyce Stevens, who was trying to chair the discussion, put the question to a vote. On a show of hands and voiced, the Commission decided, by a large majority that it wanted Ware to leave. He unchained himself and, together with

(19) Ibid.  
(20) Ibid. The final Commission leaflet advertised a session on Women as Sex Objects where the questions: “Do you feel it is difficult to relate to women? Can you sexually love a woman?” were placed 9th and 10th in a list of 20 questions. AL YSEN, Barbara (Authoriser): Women’s Commission 1973: Are You Happy as a Woman? Undated leaflet, Sydney March 1973. Document No. 100.  
(21) TRANSCRIPT: Women's Commission Proceedings. Most of the Commission proceedings were taped but all save a few of the tapes have been lost. Approximately 4 hours of tapes remain intact.
Christabel Poll who had arrived midway during the discussion and joined him, he left. Two Aboriginal women, amidst pleas that they reconsider, also left the Commission. (22)

Ware gone, the Commission settled down quickly. The first session on women as mothers in fact focused on children, childcare requirements and the inadequacies of existing facilities. The Saturday afternoon session followed the ‘women as workers’ theme and testimonies ranged over the experiences of women working in offices, factories, universities, and the professions; and they were not without their humour. Joan Bielski, a member of WEL recounted what she did whenever she saw a newspaper advertisement for an ‘attractive young woman, 19 to 25, well groomed, and with a pleasant speaking voice’:

Joan Bielski: I ring up immediately and ask to speak to the employer.
Having assured him that I have the required qualifications and measurements
I then ask him if he meets my requirements: does he have a beer gut, is he bald, does he have halitosis? Is he athletic because I like a good run around
the office. If I find out he’s 45 I let him know he’s too old for me, that he
doesn’t fit my requirements and that I’m no longer interested in the job. (23)

The Sunday morning session of the theme of ‘women as sex objects’ was that into which the second publicity leaflet for the Commission had slipped the only, somewhat cryptic, reference to lesbianism - “Can you sexually love a woman?”. On a large table outside the auditorium the Commission organizers had laid out piles of these leaflets into which other material had been inserted by various people: 15 pages of roneoed material detailing the case of Therese, one of the young women victims of the Child Welfare system; (24) a single sheet entitled How Do Women See the Church, prepared by Christian Women Concerned; (25) a short paper on The Older Woman and Divorce; (26) Questions to the Women's Commission, a series of questions implicitly criticizing the way in which the organizers of the Commission had decided, unilaterally, to allow only one ‘authorized’ taperecording of the proceedings to be made, and to set up a format of the sessions which started with a lead testimonial, to be followed by “three ‘spontaneously’ prearranged testimonials and, in the time left, ‘genuinely’ spontaneous testimonial”; (27) and a leaflet advertising a public meeting to be held in the same auditorium on the Sunday evening (18 March) following the Commission, a meeting of those who were opposed to the Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill which had been introduced into the NSW Parliament on 6 March, 1973. (28) It was into this bundle of leaflets that Camp Women's Association members had inserted copies of their brochure on the group's aims (29) and leaflets entitled Can You Sexually Love a Woman?

(23) [WINDSCHUTTLE,Liz] L.W.: “Women's Commission” Women's Electoral Lobby Newsletter. No. 8. April, 1973 p 21. Windschuttle estimates that 400 women attended the Commission and that 138 of these gave testimony. Coverage of the Commission by the 'straight' press was reasonable though not entirely uncritical. See, for example, VARGA, Susan and BUCKLEY, Jean: “At the Crutch of the Matter” Nation Review. 23-29 March, 1973; JONES, Margaret: “Paranoia: The New Bar to Liberation” The National Times. 26-31 March, 1973; KEAVNEY, Kay: “For Women Only” The Australian Women’s Weekly. 18 April, 1973. All three articles mentioned that a man had chained himself to a chair at the opening of the Commission but only the Keavney article failed to mention that he was from the homosexual movement. This was not surprising for the magazine nor inconsistent: Keavney’s article alone of all three totally ignored the testimony of lesbians given at the Commission.
(25) [CHRISTIAN WOMEN CONCERNED]: How Do Women See the Church. Undated, unauthorized leaflet. Sydney March 1973. Document No. 102. Christian Women Concerned, formed during lent of 1968, consisted of women of various denominations concerned to play their role in the established churches. Their attendance at the Commission marked their first group contact with Women's Liberation and was followed in May 1973 by the first edition of their journal Magdalene.
It began:

The Women's Commission has chosen to ignore LESBIANS -
the title of this handout is the tokenism given to US in the
Commission's leaflet. (We were totally ignored in the first).
LESBIANS DO EXIST.
LESBIANS ARE PERSECUTED.
WE WILL NOT DISAPPEAR SIMPLY BECAUSE WE ARE IGNORED.
WE ARE THE C.W.A.
CAMP
WOMEN'S
ASSOCIATION (30)

It went on to list some of the activities of the CWA and ended with the taunt:

The 6th Annual Meeting of the U.S. National Organization for
Women voted on 19th February, 1973, to fight for lesbian causes
as a top priority.

What is Women's Liberation in Australia doing ??? (31)

Within the auditorium the CAMP lesbians sat in two groups, one on either side of the stage
where the chairpersons for that session, Gale Kelly and Sue Bellamy, were located. The first
speaker for the session was Gaby Antolovich who said that she would like to open up a
discussion "by asking why lesbians weren't given either a separate session and why lesbians
weren't mentioned very much". (32) She asked for an answer from someone in Women's
Liberation. Her question was answered immediately from the chair:

Gale Kelly: Could I answer it. I think you'd probably have to ask every
member who was at the Commission meetings their own personal view
on that. My own is that lesbians were not included in any way, that they
weren't given a separate group because we don't consider them
separate people. I think, you know, that they're women, their problems
are their own, just as every woman's problems are her own, whatever
they may be. We didn't give a separate thing to women who are
bus conductresses either. (applause). (33)

The opening challenge and response was suspended for several speakers (34) and then taken
up again by Jill Roe:

Jill Roe: I asked for permission to speak twice yesterday so if you'll forgive
me I'll return to the general question which has been, if not swept under the
carpet, then skated around during this Commission, that is to say, the whole
question of female sexuality, of lesbianism, and what attitude the women's
movement is going to take to it. If I turn back over the things that have
previously been said about sex objects this morning you have heard about the
oppression of girl children, the oppression in sexist porn and we've heard
that there is no special question about lesbians. I think that enough evidence
has come up this morning, and I don't want to go over what's already been
said, enough evidence has come up this morning to suggest that the question
of lesbianism is far more central than you or I might like to think. Of course,

No. 104. This was obviously the basis for the accusation that Ware was a plant from a group of people dissatisfied
with the organization of the Commission.


(29) CAMP (NSW): Camp Women's Association. op. cit.


(31) Ibid.
it's not a question of what I might like to think. I am in that position
and with the help of the Women's Liberation Movement, I must say,
I have been able to come to terms with my own sexuality. It's taken
me a very long time to get to the position where I can stand up and say,
as I have, here I am, lesbian, and this is what I've got to say. I've got
to say to you that the whole question of women as sex objects sits
more firmly on the shoulders of lesbians than any other women. . .
Contrary to what seems to be a fairly repressively tolerant attitude here,
lesbians are women and due to the Women's Liberation analyses of the
condition of women it is very clear to me and very clear to increasing
numbers of lesbians that their position ought to be in the movement
and that the movement has got to wake up to this whole question of
sex objects which sits so firmly on the lesbians' shoulders. . . I put it
to you that we've got to come out, certainly lesbians have got to
come out, but the women's movement has got to come out for
lesbians too because we're women. . .

There was, during the session, only one acknowledgement from a woman active in Sydney
Women's Liberation, of ambivalence, if not hostility, to the lesbian presence:

I want to ask my sisters if they feel they've ever discriminated against
lesbians, if they've ever been out on a Camp Inc march, because I've been
out on a Gay Lib march and I've never had special feelings about the
word lesbian until by-standers started using it as a term of abuse and I
felt like hell. And to my great shame I felt I just wished I'd had a
placard saying "I've been married for 18 years and I'm the mother
of two children and I'm not a lesbian". And I just suddenly realised
what an awful thing I'd done; by wanting to defame being a lesbian
I discriminated against my sisters. And I just would like all the
women in the movement to examine their own feelings if somebody
calls them that word, do they get cross, because if they get cross,
they're discriminating against their lesbian sisters.

Several other lesbians spoke of their experiences outside of the movement but their
testimonies were separated from each other by those of women speaking about women's health
and about women as (heterosexual) sex objects. The morning session ended full of tensions,
unresolved conflicts and unanswered charges on the lesbian issue. As I walked out of the
auditorium at the end of that session Gillian Leahy said to me: "You fucking lesbians have
taken over the whole bloody Commission" - an accusation which reflected more the hostility
that existed to the subject being raised within the movement in the way that it was than any
accurate assessment of the time taken up by lesbian speakers.

(32) TRANSCRIPT: Women's Commission Proceedings. op. cit.
(33) Ibid.
(34) Bessie Guthrie spoke to the written material on Therese; Robyn Lee spoke of a lesbian relationship she
had been involved in which she considered as sexist as any she'd experienced with a man; Wendy Bacon spoke
of lesbianism within Silverwater Women's Prison where she'd spent some time for publishing indecent and
obscene material; a woman from Mudgee spoke of the difficulties of living in a country area; and Pat Miller
spoke about the May Day Queen Competition - all before Roe could get to the microphone.

(35) TRANSCRIPT: Women's Commission Proceedings. op. cit. This account, based on the Commission tapes
which survive is at variance with that of LYNCH, Lesley: "Myth Making in the Women's Movement" Refractory
Girl. No. 5. Summer, 1974 pp 34-38. Lynch, without the benefit of the tapes, attributes to Gale Kelly, as
well as her now famous remark about lesbians being no different from bus conductresses, the statement, which
Lynch claims was "just credible", that lesbians had not been given a separate session because "it was simply a
matter of priorities" p 37. Kelly did not mention priorities at all which leaves her bus conductress statement
to stand alone. The other discrepancy is that Lynch claims that Jill Roe prefaced her Sunday morning testimony
with "I am a lesbian" to which a woman (Sue Bellamy) retorted "So what". p 37. If this exchange did take
place, it did not, according to the tapes, occur on the Sunday morning. It could have taken place on the
Saturday afternoon when Roe also spoke but the tapes of that session which do survive are incomplete. I feel
sure that Lynch who was able to see the irony in writing an article on lesbianism entitled "Greater Openness"
op. cit. and signing it G.L., will also see some irony in writing an article intended to destroy myths about
Sydney Women's Liberation hostility to lesbianism entitled "Myth Making . . ." which in fact created myths.
In contrast to the morning session, the Sunday afternoon session on the theme of women in marriage produced a strong feeling of solidarity due largely to the testimony of Aboriginal woman, Pat Miller who spoke of her encounters with psychiatrists. Concretely, one of the first things to come out of the Commission was a black list of medical practitioners and on that list, amongst the gynaecologists and general practitioners, were the names of psychosurgeon Harry Bailey and aversion therapist, Neil McConaghy.

The usual spate of group formation that follows any Women’s Liberation Conference or Commission developed after the 1973 Women’s Commission: suburban groups in Newtown, Mosman, and Epping-Carlingford began to meet; the Eastern suburbs group was revamped; and the work groups which later established the abortion service, Control, and the Leichhardt Women’s Health Centre, and the Elsie Women’s Refuge all grew out of the Commission. (37)

The issue of lesbianism had been raised in Sydney Women’s Liberation, but it remained unresolved; it had been raised by ‘outsiders’ to the movement and in a confrontationist style. To some women within the movement this was perfectly understandable, almost inevitable because Sydney Women’s Liberation had not been able to handle the issue being raised from within. Out of the Commission had come the realization that:

Robyn Lee: . . . despite all the discussion about lesbianism, it still hasn’t been talked about in the movement, and you’ve got to see the way women behave at meetings, the way they, you know, the fear of touching each other, all that kind of thing. Women you’re supposed to be really fond of and know really well and it’s still taboo . . . we know people who very obviously have hang-ups about saying anything at all about the subject and it’s really distressing that there are all these binds which we can never get through in order to talk honestly about how we feel; about how people feel about lesbianism; about whatever their sexual preferences are . . . I think the debate is going on all the time even though nobody’s saying a word - it’s acted out . . . How the hell do you get through this kind of thing so there can be, within the movement, some kind of honest discussion, so that sisterhood brings out what it obviously should, which is loving women and surely, loving women must always contain at least the possibility of sexual love. Because we’re really stopped until we can get through that. (38)

For another Women’s Liberationist, the way in which lesbianism had been raised at the Commission and by whom it had been raised, confirmed the worst impressions different CAMP women had made years before:

Gale Kelly: . . . the thing that came up for me with some of the lesbian women at the Commission and particularly that last one who spoke, that girl from Newcastle, somehow what I was hearing them say was ‘We want to be loved by you people because we feel ugly and rejected’. So they were being dishonest in all their lesbian stuff and carrying on with ‘we’re proud of it’ and all that sort of stuff. You know, that’s a cover up of what they really feel like: ‘pride’ and we’re going to live up to it and all this jazz, coming in in their singlets and all that stuff. Alright, if they feel they’ve got to do that, OK. But what they’re really saying

(36) TRANSCRIPT: Women’s Commission Proceedings. op. cit.

(37) See STEVENS, Joyce: “From There to Where?” op. cit. Anne Summers and Jennifer Dakers had, at least since December 1972, been proposing some sort of women’s refuge but had been unsuccessful in locating suitable premises.

(38) TRANSCRIPT: Melanie Group Discussion. op. cit.
is other than that so why can't they be honest if they want other people to be honest and open. I felt sorry for some of those girls, I really did. I thought, you poor buggers. (39)

And there was some concern about the effect on other women at the Commission:

*Sue Bellamy:* What I see when I hear the word lesbian and the argument about the lesbian subculture and that the movement is sexist, etc., now is a group of women who I think are full of incredible hostility and anger and have no way to get it out except by creating false arguments against people that they have to consider to be straight regardless of what they are or who they are . . . The thing I get so furious about is that you get half a dozen people jumping up and down . . . 'coming out' . . . Like, you know, I'm a lesbian, haaa, kind of thing. I hate that. And I get furious because I know that a hell of a lot of people who are listening to this barrage of violence relate sexually to other women and don't identify with the heavy leather set at all. I know it happened at Mount Beauty and I know bloody well it happened at the Commission. That there were a hell of a lot of women in that room who really can love women in every possible way but they don't identify with that kind of old camp structure. As far as I'm concerned they're reactionary as fucking hell, these people who identify with that old lesbian movement. It's a very narrow political position and it's based incredibly on a sense of rejection from a culture that they insist on validating by insisting on defining other women as straight and maintaining that straightness for ever because the image they present would turn women off any idea of relating to women, would fill them with so much fear of relating sexually to women that they'll rush back to their husbands like buggery. (40)

The references to 'the movement being sexist' and to Mount Beauty were to a paper given at the National Women's Liberation Theory Conference which was held 27-29 January, 1973 at Mount Beauty. (41) The Conference was organized by Canberra Women's Liberation and in all, twelve papers were prepared for it. (42) Undoubtedly, the most controversial was that presented by the Hobart Women's Action Group entitled "Sexism in Women's Liberation or . . . Why Do Straight Sisters Sometimes Cry When They Are Called Lesbians?" (43) In an attempt to demonstrate that the position of lesbians within Women's Liberation was a symptom of the failure of the movement to come to grips with sexism inside the movement itself and hence within the society as a whole, the paper gave a list of personal experiences which implied that two of the foundation stones on which Women's Liberation movements world wide are built - sisterhood and consciousness raising - excluded lesbians. (44) Conference reactions to the paper had been very strong, nobody denies that, but there was some dispute as to why it was so strong:

(39) Ibid.
(40) Ibid.
(44) Some of these experiences were: 'having one's consciousness 'raised' by a discussion of how to cope with being called 'that horrible name' at our first women's lib. meeting'; 'being told to keep out of the movement because 'some women won't come if lesbians are there, and those women shouldn't be put off because W.L. is for all women' '; 'standing on the edge of the dance floor at a W.L. party knowing that sisterhood is only
One accepted line is that the W.L. gathering was so stung by the unanswerable charges of sexism that they blindly and indignantly hit out at the authors to avoid examination of their own sexist behaviour. Alternatively it is argued that the charges in the paper were of little relevance to the explosion, and that what had excited peoples' irritation was the apparent arrogant, elitist and exclusionist behaviour of the four H.W.A.G. women over the two days before the paper was discussed. (45)

The Mount Beauty Conference and the Sydney Women's Commission two months later were the first real attempts to initiate discussion on lesbianism within Sydney Women's Liberation, or parts thereof. Separated by only two months, the two occasions share common features: first, the issue was raised by women who could be defined as 'outside' the movement: very few people at Mount Beauty knew the Hobart women personally before the Conference; and in Sydney, the lesbians came from CAMP rather than from inside Women's Liberation;

secondly, the introduction of the subject took the form of accusations which hit at the movement members' images of themselves: the Hobart women accused Women's Liberation of sexism and the CAMP women accused it of discrimination against lesbians and of being more conservative than the American equivalent of WEL, the National Organization for Women;

thirdly, reaction to those accusations consisted of denial of their validity followed by attacks on the women who had made them;

and finally, probably because of the preceding sequences of events, the issue was shelved rather than thrashed out and the actions, reactions, and motives of all those involved became the focus of heated argument both during and long after the events took place.

Towards the end of March 1973 another issue arose which divided Sydney Women's Liberation along different lines -- the position of Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister which the new Whitlam Labor Government had created. Applications for the position were invited early in 1973 and from over 400 people (including some 150 men) who applied, a short list of 17 women was drawn up. Over the weekend of 24-25 March, all 17 candidates were called to Canberra for final interviews for the position. Newspaper reports criticized the expense to the public of such a procedure and even before the appointment had been made, the position had been dubbed 'Gough's Supergirl' by the press. (46)
On Sunday 25 March, 15 of the 17 candidates issued a joint press release from their motel rooms affirming their “whole hearted support for the successful applicant” whomever she be and recommending that a committee of inquiry into the status of women in Australia be established immediately. (47) On Monday 26 March the Mejane collective sent a registered letter to the committee involved in selecting the woman for the position. It was addressed to “Messrs Whitlam, Wilenski, Hall . . . and any other male ‘selectors’.” (48) In the letter they requested information (for publication in Mejane) on how the short list of women was selected from the vast number of applications received:

Why the selection was made?
How the selection was made?
On what basis the selection was made?
By whom was the selection made?
Were any women involved in the selection?
If so, how many?
What women’s organizations did they represent, if any?
What qualifications were involved for application?
How were the original applicants screened? (49)

The letter continued:

We wish to advise you that no woman chosen by men to advise us will be acceptable to us. We believe that it is not your right to choose for us our spokeswoman, any more than it is any woman’s right to act as the single spokeswoman for the rest of us . . .

. . . we can, as writers, and publishers, promise you the maximum in positive non-co-operation, and we can only hope that the woman finally “selected” is soon able to expose for all women, the mechanics and the rationale of the selection from her own point of view. (50)

Copies of this letter, together with a more detailed criticism of the selection process which was contained in a leaflet entitled Selection = Rejection: Some Facts Discovered about the Selection of the PMs Woman Advisor (51) were distributed to the press and, amongst other gatherings of Sydney Women’s Liberation, at the Women’s Commission post mortem meeting held at Women’s House on Sunday 1 April 1973. (52)

The tone of the Selection = Rejection leaflet was sharp and the focus of criticism had shifted from the selection committee to the 17 applicants for the position. And, from the information contained in the leaflet, it was obvious that one of the applicants had provided the material for the leaflet; (53) how else could it have reported on a conversation that took place during the drafting of the joint press release. Applicants were criticized for a variety of
reasons:

none of the 17 women . . . challenged the obvious male dominance of the selection board . . . few, if any, of the women who applied seem to have asked what restrictions would apply to the job . . . The Prime Minister has already stated that the first duty of his advisors is loyalty to him. Given that none of the 17 women had their names taken from the list, one can only assume that they accept this . . . At an informal party on Saturday night . . . it was obvious . . . that at least one of the 17 was prepared to use “traditional female methods” to get the job . . . it was rather late for those 17 women to have asked solidarity from one another, when they themselves showed very little to the rest of their sisters, movement and otherwise . . . (54)

And the Para-Noids, as the leaflet was signed, wanted to know from the applicants:

* If they disapproved of particular actions, would they observe Public Service secrecy? If “yes”, who would they then be serving, the P.M., or women?
* If they have considered this, why did they apply?
* Did movement women who applied consult their sisters before doing so?
* If not, on what basis can they assume that they represent all women? . . . (55)

The leaflet concluded:

Under present circumstances, no woman chosen could expect total movement support, at least until the above questions are answered. (56)

The April 1973 Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter published a letter from Margaret Greenland who was very critical of the Selection = Rejection leaflet. She pointed out that nobody had made any attempt to initiate discussion of the job within the movement and yet here was a leaflet

pointing fingers of accusing scorn at the women who did apply - a leaflet that seems to me to accuse them of all sorts of treachery and backwardness, in a very moralistic “holier than thou” way, making them into sorts of pariahs or outcasts. It reminds me very unpleasantly of scenes witnessed in left political groups of the pillorying and humiliation of some “backward” individual who, knowingly or otherwise, has strayed “off the line” and is to be suspect thereafter. (57)

Greenland also felt it unfair that the leaflets had been distributed at a meeting where they could not really be discussed because the meeting had been called specifically to discuss something else - the Women’s Commission - and that criticism by leaflet allowed those criticized no right of reply. It ran, she claimed, “counter to some of the most valuable and revolutionary attitudes and ways of acting in the W.L. movement”. (58)

An unsigned note printed immediately after Greenland’s letter in the Newsletter (59) began by defending the Selection = Rejection leaflet: those criticized had at their disposal the same means of replying to the attacks in the leaflet as those who had drawn it up - a typewriter and a gestetner. Then, in several rather confusing points about whether or not the applicants for the Women’s Advisor position would have felt better or worse had there been discussion within the

(53) Sue Bellamy who drew up the leaflet claims that Anne Summers, when she talked to her about what had happened in Canberra over the 24-25 March weekend, ‘must have known’ that the information she conveyed would be used.
(54) Selection = Rejection op. cit. Emphasis in original.
(55) Ibid.
(56) Ibid.
(58) Ibid.
movement before they applied, whether such discussions would in any way have affected their decisions to apply, and what constituted ‘the movement’ (how many women and which women) for the purposes of being able to say that discussions had been held, the author(s) of the response to Greenland virtually invalidated the criticisms and demands made in the Selection = Rejection leaflet.

Another attack on the leaflet came from Mavis Robertson writing for Tribune.(60) Robertson pointed out that the leaflet was somewhat lacking in a sense of reality - “why be shocked that the real world exists?” (61) That the job, she argued, was never discussed in the movement was a problem, not for the women who applied, but of the movement - “the fact is that Women’s Liberation, in Sydney, has no place where such a dialogue could have taken place. Worse still, attitudes and assumptions may have prevented women from feeling free to seek advice ... often a de facto policy operates which impedes discussion”. (62) Of course, she acknowledged, there were dangers associated with positions of power but

We cannot assume that a woman in power will sell out; all we can assume is that she may have no choice but to sell out if she is not backed by a strong and independent movement. (63)

Did non-co-operation with the Woman Advisor mean, she asked, a refusal to participate in any of the reforms she might be able to initiate:

If we are really concerned about the woman who slaves for $34 a week we will press harder for reforms of genuine equal pay, child-care facilities etc. Women relate to these issues far more than to any government advisor (male or female) on any salary. The point is not that we settle for them but that we accept them as a down-payment and use them to further the aim of liberation ... The movement, like the woman advisor, might be bought off by a few reforms, but it is more likely that each gain can raise our expectations ... (64)

One part of the straight press responded to the Selection = Rejection leaflet in similar vein. Lindsay Connors in The National Times of April 30 - May 5, 1973 (65) considered the reaction of the Mejane collective to be "perverse" and "the most disappointing thing about the recent appointment" and wondered whether it was provoked by a "fear that this success will cool the fervour which is necessary to the total upheaval they seek". (66) While criticisms of the selection process may be "basic and meaningful" to the mainly highly educated members of the women’s movement, it was probably "inconsequential piffle to the women who most stand to benefit from any immediate reform especially in the area of social services". (67)

The Mejane letter to the selection committee and the Selection = Rejection leaflet and the reactions they provoked were important for several reasons:

as the first public Sydney Women’s Liberation response (even though both came from the same group within the movement) to one of the new Labor Government’s initiatives, one which was seen by many movement and non-movement women as an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of their claims for special consideration, the leaflets set the widest possible terms of reference for any debate about the relations between the movement and the government - and those terms were no holds barred. (68)

(60) ROBERTSON, Mavis: “Whitlam’s Woman Advisor” Tribune. No 1799. 10-16 April, 1973. Tribune of April 3 had published the leaflet and, according to Joyce Stevens, Robertson had been instrumental in ensuring that the leaflet got into the paper.
(61) Ibid.
(62) Ibid.
(63) Ibid.
secondly, they made it both necessary and possible for the hitherto 'theoretical' discussions about the place of reform-seeking within a revolutionary movement to be concretized;

third, they began the discussion within the movement of the dilemmas associated with trying to distinguish between co-operation, compromise and co-optation, a discussion which was to become more crucial when government funds began to flow more generously in International Women's Year;

and finally, the leaflets marked an end to the public facade of an all-embracing sisterhood and gave fair warning that 'sisters' were no longer immune to what was tantamount to public denunciation.

Speaking later of how she saw the new Labor Government, one of the authors of both leaflets:

*Sue Bellamy:* That government came to power as a reformist government that really didn't have any perspectives on anything. And they, I think, were parasitic on all sorts of organizations like Women's Liberation who did have some sort of workings out of a social welfare programme. Now, what did they offer us? They offered us money... But we were confronted with an enormous crisis it seems to me: that up until 1972 we were in a position of being embattled - but right, if you like, but we were about the business of romantic politics. And romanticism and a government in power of a certain sympathy toward you doesn't mix. I felt that it had a certain role to play in raising people's consciousness but I wasn't prepared to give away my politics for its money. And basically, that's what it offered.(69)

McConaghy in the meantime, still had his conference to organize. The letter (dated 11 March) he had received from the joint meeting of people from Women's Liberation, Gay Liberation, and CAMP had said that:

we would only participate under the following conditions:
1. That a committee be set up that would be open to the various liberation groups and the invited individuals to jointly decide on the structure and direction of the Conference;
2. And with the automatic proviso that the Conference itself be open to all people to attend e.g., psychiatric patients etc. (70)

The letter was signed by 24 people, some of whose signatures were barely legible, but it was clear that at least 8 of the signatories had identified themselves as Women's Liberationists.(71)

So far as McConaghy was concerned, both Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation, as organizations, had officially refused to participate in his conference unless he met the conditions outlined. The two letters (to be discussed later) that he wrote in reply to that of 11 March, the second agreeing to discuss demands for some say in the structure and direction of the conference, both went unanswered.

---

(64) Ibid.
(66) Ibid.
(67) Ibid.
(68) Since the resignation of Elizabeth Reid (the successful applicant) in 1976 there has been considerable speculation that the 'no holds barred' approach was reciprocated, at least by one of the selection committee, Peter Wilenski, whom it is alleged chose the woman he thought least likely to survive in the job.
(69) TRANSCRIPT: Go Forth and Multiply, op. cit.
(71) These were Miriam Loftus, G[ail] Shehan, Pam Stein, Josefa Sobski, Penny Short, Susanne Hollis, all
Having failed to obtain a speaker from Women's Liberation by working through the movement, McConaghy then approached individual women whose names had been suggested to him. In May, 1973 he telephoned Liz Fell again and asked her to suggest the names of some women who might be willing to speak at his conference as Women's Liberationists. Amongst others (72) Fell suggested Joyce Stevens and she herself spoke to Stevens on his behalf. (73) McConaghy contacted Stevens several times towards the end of May to ask her to present a paper at the conference which was now to be held on August 6 and 7. Stevens was unwilling to do it herself, not because of any ideological or personal objections to the conference, but simply because she was 'fed up with' talking to groups of people about Women's Liberation and she asked Judy Mundey to do it. Mundey, despite initial reservations, agreed because she thought that however objectionable McConaghy and his practice of aversion therapy were, she might be able to reach one or two women at the Conference with the ideas of the movement.

By early June 1973 then, McConaghy had secured the participation of 'a Women's Liberationist' in his conference. His original letter of invitation had not gone to a general meeting, nor had the participation of Women's Liberationists been discussed in any but a small section of the movement, amongst a group of women who were predominantly also Gay Liberationists. Even if a general meeting had discussed the invitation and vetoed participation there was nothing anybody could have done to stop any woman giving a paper in the name of Women's Liberation: the general meeting had no power over any of the groups within the movement, let alone over any individual. That nobody took the invitation to a general meeting for discussion is not at all surprising, invitations to speak rarely were. Besides, for most Women's Liberationists there was movement activity to involve them which was more important than McConaghy's invitation. And in May, there was, to begin with, the annual hassle over the May Day March.

The Sydney Women's Liberation general meeting of Sunday 25 March had decided that Women's Liberation would not march as a contingent but that:

this does not prevent women from marching in individual group contingents or whatever . . . and some women's liberation groups are planning to march . . . but W.L. as a whole will not be marching . . . we will, instead, hand out leaflets explaining why we are abstaining from the long march . . . "Should we miss may day because of ms may day" leaflets will be produced for distribution on the day.(75)

The May Day Committee (the group responsible for organizing the march) had repeatedly been approached by Women's Liberation and asked to do away with the beauty contest which had gone under the names of 'Miss May' and 'May Day Queen' competition. The movement had threatened to withdraw from the march if the beauty contest was not discontinued and it had not been.

On Sunday 6 May 1973, the May Day March proceeded without a Women's Liberation contingent but with individual women distributing leaflets as they marched. Trouble erupted at the Domain where the march ended in a rally and a platform with microphones had been set up for the usual line up of speakers. When a May Day official began to congratulate Miss May and thank 'the girls' for their tremendous efforts, the Women's Liberationists who had been leafletting the gathering asked for permission to address the rally. When permission was

of whom identified themselves as Gay Liberationists as well; Meaghan Morris, also signing as Campus Camp; and Gill Leahy.

(72) Madge Dawson, for example, telephoned me on 21 May 1973 to say that McConaghy had asked her to speak at the conference as a Women's Liberationist. She wanted my advice on whether she should accept his invitation and I advised her not to.

(73) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Liz Fell and Wendy Bacon, op. cit.
refused, several women crowded onto the platform and after a scuffle secured the microphone and began to read from their leaflet which outlined the reasons for the official non-participation in the March. (76) A May Day official grabbed the microphone back and called over the police; a tactical error for at that point the crowd began to chant for the women to be allowed to speak. And they did speak: Gillian Leahy explained why Women’s Liberation had refused to march; an Aboriginal complained about his union; a Gay Liberationist, Craig Johnston, spoke of how he found the Miss May competition offensive; and Janne Reed spoke of how she and three other women had gone in, disguised as men, to work a shift at BHP’s Wollongong steel plant in April 1973 to protest the company’s refusal to hire women workers. (77) Half way through the line-up of impromptu speeches the march officials dismantled the amplifying system, took down their flags and tried to regain control of the rally by setting up the microphone on top of a van nearby. The rally ended in a verbal brawl between men from different sections of the left: the officials of the march from the SPA alleging that the women speakers had been set up by the CPA to disrupt the rally (78) and members of the CPA seizing the opportunity to demand that SPA bureaucratic control of the march be dismantled. (79)

Again in May, there arose another issue which was of vital concern to Women’s Liberationists. The April edition of The Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter contained a report that on May 10, 1973 two members of the Commonwealth House of Representatives (David McKenzie and Tony Lamb) would introduce into the parliament a private members’ bill which would, if passed, make abortions much easier to obtain in the ACT. The newsletter report pointed out that there were probably some inadequacies in the Bill but that the real fight would have to be against the campaign that the Right to Life was organizing against the bill. The Victorian state branch of the Right to Life was holding huge public rallies, using highly emotive publicity, disrupting meetings of supporters of the bill, and had initiated a massive letter writing campaign, inundating members of parliament with letters urging them to vote against the Bill. (80)

Most Australian newspapers had reported on the ruling by the United States Supreme Court on 22 January 1973 which declared that laws against abortion violated the right to privacy provision of the United States Constitution and the controversy that surrounded that decision (81) and in the week leading up to the May 10 debate, devoted considerable space to the views of church leaders, politicians, and others on the merits or otherwise of the Lamb-McKenzie Medical Practices Clarification Bill. (82) There was little that Sydney Women’s Liberation could do in Sydney and the one attempt at some form of protest was a dismal failure: the general meeting of 26 April 1973 had planned to hold demonstrations outside some

(74) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Pam Stein.
(78) At the time, Janne Reed was still a member of the CPA.
(79) See also Statement of Women’s Liberation Working Women’s Group and Equal Pay Group in Response to a Statement of the Executive of the Sydney May Day Committee, May 1973. Document No 111. This would undoubtedly have been seen as another CPA attack by the Committee because of the widespread belief that the Working Women’s Group within Sydney Women’s Liberation was a ‘CPA front’. See also RUTHERFORD, Mervyn: “The Sexist Symbol at May Day” Nation Review. May 11-17, 1973 p 911.
of Sydney's largest catholic churches on Sunday 6 May and hand out pro-abortion leaflets to those attending the services; but come Sunday 6, only four women (and two reporters) turned up to hand out their leaflets outside St. Mary's Cathedral in the city. (83)

On May 10, 1973 the Lamb-McKinzie Bill was debated inside the Federal Parliament while outside large numbers of anti-abortion and pro-abortion demonstrators (some of whom had travelled from Sydney) kept a noisy vigil. The Bill was resoundingly defeated with only 23 members (all from the ALP) voting for it and 98 opposing it. (84)

The defeat of the Bill by such a large majority was demoralizing for the women's movement as a whole: it revealed how much the movement had underestimated the ability of the right to organize and how small an impact it had had on the Catholic wing of the Labor Party; and it sparked a division within Sydney Women's Liberation over what to do next. On May 12, 1973 Sydney Women's Liberation held a 'Mothers Day March for All Women'. There had been no International Women's Day March in 1973, the Women's Commission having taken its place. The Mothers Day March, at which mock Mother's Day cards and leaflets (85) had been handed out, was small and to many, disappointing. (86) During the march members of WAAC had handed out leaflets which announced a march for June 30, to call for the repeal of all existing abortion laws and for safe contraceptives to be made freely available.

The proposed WAAC March provoked Lyndall Ryan to write to Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter:

... it must be obvious after the defeat of the abortion bill in federal parliament on 10 May that no Australian parliament will repeal abortion laws now or in the near future. Secondly, it is now obvious that women must establish their own birth control clinics that carry out abortions and thus go under the existing laws. Rather than asking parliamentarians to help us, I think we have reached a stage where we must demonstrate that man-made laws are irrelevant to our objectives...

So, on Saturday 30 June 1973, rather than marching for a futile objective there will be a meeting at the Women's House, 25 Alberta Street, at 3 pm to discuss the establishment of a women's liberation birth control clinic. (87)

WAAC replied to Ryan's letter in the same edition of the Newsletter and opened up with a statement of how they saw the issue:

In taking up the points raised by Lyndall Ryan in her letter we are taking up what we consider to be a fundamental issue for our movement – how can we fight our oppression most effectively? (88)

Certainly, they admitted, the defeat of the Lamb-McKenzie Bill was demoralizing, certainly, the strength and success of the Right to Life campaign against the Bill was disarming, but that did not mean that the movement should not try to change the laws. The defeat of the Bill revealed


the strength of the Right to Life, that parliamentarians can be subjected to mass pressure, and
the unpreparedness of the women’s movement: “Had a strong movement of women been built
around this issue prior to May 10 then the outcome of the debate may have been somewhat
different”. (89) Seeking to have the laws relating to abortion changed was not a matter of
asking parliamentarians to help us, it was a demand “that they respond to our needs”. (90)
Laws would not go away by being ignored

We do not believe that the struggle to change the existing laws and the
struggle to set up alternative birth control clinics are mutually exclusive. (91)

but

such projects can only hope to cater for a very limited number of women,
those who happen to know of its existence. (92)

and

there would still be inadequate resources to cope with all the women
requiring assistance. (93)

What Ryan’s letter revealed, they argued, was “a basic lack of confidence in the ability and desire
of many, many women to collectively struggle to change the existing laws”. (94) The defeat
of the Lamb-McKenzie Bill had, because of the interest it had generated
laid down the conditions for a successful campaign in defence of one of
our most elementary rights . . . As the most conscious women so far (in
our recognition of our oppression) we have a duty to all other women in
fighting actively for our rights and in disseminating our ideas and immediate
aims to as many women as possible. (95)

On June 30, the march went ahead but was relatively small

Joyce Stevens: there was only about 800 people in it and I’ll
guarantee 400 were men. And all these fucking men marching
down the street saying “Women unite, abortion is your right”. And
every time one of them came near me I said “Stop fucking—well
saying that”. That really shat me off more than anything else I’ve
ever seen in a march with those bloody WAAC, SYA men organized
into this “Women unite, abortion is YOUR right”. (96)

On the afternoon of June 30, the meeting called by Ryan went ahead too, attended by about

health group had already formed out of the March 1973 Women’s Commission and held its first meeting on
(88) KLINN. Wendy, KEIG, Nita, GULLIVER, Penny, AUJARD, Doreen, MCHUGH, Margaret, LEITH,
Rodie, HARSANYI, Tina, WEAVER, Helen, ECCLESTON, Joy, BRADFORD, Margaret, ROOKE, Debra,
march had actually been made well before the Lamb-McKenzie Bill was even debated.
(89) Ibid.
(90) Ibid.
(91) Ibid.
(92) Ibid.
(93) Ibid.
(94) Ibid.
(95) Ibid. cf KEIG, Nita: “The Crisis in Women’s Liberation: The Need for a Socialist Perspective”. Socialist
Worker - Theoretical Journal of the Fourth International in Australia. No. 1. March, 1977 p 7: “A large part of
trying to provide the correct leadership and perspective for the women’s liberation struggle is to recognise and
select those issues that will start to involve and mobilise wider layers of women in struggle at any particular
point in time and will push the movement ahead.”
(96) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Joyce Stevens and Sue Bellamy op. cit. WAAC estimated the march size
to be only 400. See “Successful Marches Held on June 30” Right to Choose. No. 1. 1973 p 3. The march
in Sydney ended in a rally which was addressed by George Peterson (Labor MLA), Brigit Gilling (Vice President
of ALRA), Lynne Smith of Macquarie University WAAC, and Nita Keig of Sydney WAAC.
30 women, and out of that, and the earlier meetings of the Self Help Health Group, grew Control (the Sydney Women's Liberation telephone abortion referral service) and the Leichhardt Women's Health Centre which opened its doors in March 1974. (97)

The calls for 'mass mobilization to change the laws relating to abortion' and 'ignore the laws and do it yourself' represented two approaches which have always been present in Sydney Women's Liberation and adopted by different groups and individuals who have a long record of mutual antagonism. The papers presented to the January 1971 Women's Liberation Conference in Sydney by Ann Curthoys and Lyndall Ryan (98) on the one hand and by Nita Keig and Debbie Payne (99) (both signatories to WAAC's reply to Ryan's letter) which were discussed in the preceding chapter spelt out those differences most clearly. They had not been resolved in the intervening 2/2 year period; all that had happened was that nothing had occurred to provoke their reiteration in the interval, and that the major proponents of each view had moved into new activity groups within the movement. While neither side of the debate was prepared to claim that the approaches were mutually exclusive, they were more than just differences which could rest easily alongside each other within the movement; there was too much mutual hostility (originally political, but now personal as well) for that to be possible.

Set in the context of the developments that were occurring within Sydney Women's Liberation during the first half of 1973, McConaghy's invitation to participate in his conference was of minor concern to all but a small group within Women's Liberation who, ultimately, were powerless to prevent any woman, whether she was from Women's Liberation or not, from speaking at the conference as a Women's Liberationist; powerless and, by the time the conference was held in August, uninterested.

(98) CURTHOYS, Ann and RYAN, Lyndall: Up from Radicalism. op. cit.
(99) KEIG, Juanita: Building a Mass Movement for Women's Liberation. op. cit. and PAYNE, Debbie: Women's Liberation: Organization or Not. op. cit.
1973 was as important a year for CAMP as it had been for Sydney Women’s Liberation, but for very different reasons. Nobody expected the new Labor Government to create a position for a ‘Prime Minister’s Advisor on Homosexual (Female and Male) Affairs’ or to develop policies specifically designed to alleviate the oppression of homosexuals. But there was a feeling that if the Australian electorate was prepared to accept that it was ‘Time for a Change’ of government (the slogan on which the ALP had successfully campaigned) then they might also be prepared to accept that it was time for a change in attitudes towards homosexuals. Indeed, an ANOP opinion poll commissioned by The Nation Review in May 1973 found that most people surveyed were prepared to tolerate, if not accept, male homosexuals. Asked to “suppose you learned that two young men were living together in a homosexual relationship” and given several options of response, 74.4% stated that they would feel it was none of their business, 13.7% would disapprove but do nothing, 5.0% would inform the police, and 3.6% would consult the appropriate authorities other than the police and 1.2% would go and see the people and warn them strongly. (100)

The impression that community attitudes towards homosexuals were becoming less hostile was supported not only by the series of events that occurred in 1973 but also by the quite extensive and fair coverage of those events given by the mass media: CAMP’s fight with Life Line; the call by various ALP conferences for homosexual law reform; the performance of homosexual ‘marriages’ by a Perth Baptist minister; the motion by federal parliamentarians Moss Cass and John Gorton that the House of Representatives did not think that homosexual acts between consenting adults should be subject to criminal prosecution; the expulsion of a homosexual student from a university college and the subsequent protests; and finally, on suggestions for a homosexual church. (101)

Perhaps because the environment in which CAMP was operating appeared to be less hostile in 1973, the organization seemed to be taken up much more with changes that were occurring within itself than in previous years. 1973 saw the organization begin to change in ways that would become clear to the participants only half way through the year and not reach crisis point until early in 1974. There were two major components of that change. The first was the beginning of a major re-orientation of the organization’s activities, the associated emergence of a new leadership group, and a corresponding change in style. The shift was away from the overtly political activities of 1970-1972 when the organization took on politicians, church leaders, and psychiatrists in a publicly confrontationist style. And it was toward a ‘behind the scenes’ social welfare type of activity which was epitomised by the emergence of Phone-A-Friend (PAF), CAMP’s answer to Life Line. To those of us who had expended considerable energy in trying to pull, cajole, or bludgeon a lethargic membership into greater involvement in the organization’s activities it was an object lesson in unintended consequences that we really could not appreciate at the time. We had sought greater membership involvement and we got it — but we got it before we had had time to realise that we were unable to influence the direction it would take or to estimate accurately its strength. The second element to the change (100) HASELTON, Simon: "We’re Growing Up on Homosexuality and Abortion" Nation Review. 1·7 June, 1973. (101) See for example “Hayden Calls for More Tolerance” The Australian. 29 January, 1973; “Immoral Teacher Re-Instated” Sydney Morning Herald. 3 February 1973; “Life Line Part Two” The Australian. 20 February, 1973; “Careers Up in the Air” The Australian. 6 March, 1973; “Labour Women Oppose Foreign Bases” The Australian. 2 April, 1973; “Man to Man” The Australian. 11 April, 1973; “Lesbians Wed in Perth Ceremony” The Australian. 8 May, 1973; “Men Only at this ‘Marriage’” The Australian. 9 May, 1973; “CAMP Bill faces Tough Fight” The Australian. 17 May, 1973; “Ease Homosexual Law, says Primate” The Australian. 22 May, 1973; “Ban on Student in Hostel Brings Reaction” Sydney Morning Herald. 19 June, 1973; “Campus Capers” Nation Review. 13-19 June, 1973; “Trouble at Macquarie” Sydney Morning Herald. 14 July 1973; “Melbourne’s Gay Society Looks for a Minister for its Own Church” The National Times. 6-11 August, 1973.
was the rapid development during 1973 of a feminist consciousness amongst many of the women involved in CAMP. The corollary of the lesbian issue being raised within Women’s Liberation was that the issue of sexism was raised within CAMP. For those women who had been working actively in CAMP for some time, 1973 marked the start of the move away from working with men and eventually out of the organization altogether and into far greater involvement with Women’s Liberation. For those whose previous activities had centred on the social life of the organization the self-confidence developed by exposure to the ideas of the women’s movement encouraged them to become more involved in some of the other activities of CAMP - most notably PAF. Taken in longer time perspective, 1973 represents one part of a cycle which the involvement of women in CAMP appears to have repeated several times since 1970. Those initially politically active try to encourage other women to become more involved. At the same time, they become, through their own participation, more and more conscious of the difficulties of working within a male dominated organization. Eventually, a point is reached where it is no longer worth while fighting the men within the organization as well as outside it, and they leave, either to form women only groups or join existing ones – just at the point where those women they had been trying to encourage to become more active begin to respond. And so the gaps caused by the departure of the original activists are filled, and the cycle begins again. The departure of women such as Margaret Jones late in 1971 to set up their own women only group represents one complete cycle; the departure of Gaby Antolovich, myself and other in 1974 to become more active in Women’s Liberation represents another. 1973 was that part of the cycle when women became more and more conscious of the difficulties of working within CAMP, a consciousness that was fed by the much closer and more frequent contact with Women’s Liberation that had begun to develop.
Informal meeting of some of executive of CAMP (NSW) with some from Victoria and S. Australia to discuss possibility of CAMP National Conference.

Beginnings of interstate feud between *Camp Ink* and CAMP (SA) later to involve also CAMP (NSW)

CAMP officially at new clubrooms, 10 David Street, Forest Lodge.

*The Australian* reports on CAMP's difficulties with Life Line.

HGS re-evaluates its role and functions.

CWA meetings evidence growing awareness of male dominance of CAMP

John MacKay delivers his criticisms of McConaghy to *The Medical Journal of Australia*

**JOINT MEETING OF THOSE CONCERNED WITH MCCONAGHY'S INVITATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS CONFERENCE**

CWA members attend Sydney Women's Liberation Women's Commission

**MCCONAGHY FORWARDS COPIES OF CONFERENCE CORRESPONDENCE TO WILLS**

**MCCONAGHY OFFICIALLY INVITES CAMP TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS CONFERENCE**

Phone-A-Friend officially commences operations

**CAMP EXECUTIVE MEETING OFFICIALLY DECLINES MCCONAGHY'S INVITATION**

New women's groups representatives accepted on CAMP Executive.

**CAMP LETTER TO MCCONAGHY OFFICIALLY DECLINING HIS INVITATION**

CWA granted Special Purpose Group Status by Executive

First newspaper reports of proposed Cass move on legalizing male homosexual behaviour.

Executive meeting moves to rescind Special Purpose Group Status of CWA suspended.

Life Line agrees to co-operate with CAMP

CAMP moves out of David Street, Forest Lodge.

Last CAMP Executive meeting until 5 September

**CIBA-GEIGY CONFERENCE ON LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AND PSYCHIATRY**
In January 1973 several members of CAMP (South Australia) and Society Five (CAMP, Victoria) were in Sydney and met informally with those Executive members of CAMP (NSW) who were still in Sydney over the holiday period and with John Ware, Editor of Camp Ink. Discussions focused on two major issues: the theme of a CAMP National Conference, proposed for May 1973, and the relationship of the journal to the interstate branches of CAMP.

Dissatisfaction with this relationship was long standing and mutual. Ware, who had co-founded the organization and started the journal, saw Camp Ink as the national journal of CAMP, and as the national journal, he believed it should be financially supported by all state branches. In NSW members of CAMP automatically received the journal. The membership fee included a subscription fee which was collected by the branch on behalf of the journal and periodically transferred to it. Queensland and Western Australia CAMP had adopted the same scheme. Only in Victoria and South Australia was subscription to Camp Ink optional for members of CAMP and not all members did subscribe.

Camp Ink, which had always barely survived from issue to issue, had been in such bad financial shape in September 1972 that a special fund raising party had been organized for it by the NSW Branch. By January 1973, those funds had been spent and Ware proposed that Victoria and South Australia adopt the NSW scheme or, failing that, that they directly subsidize the journal from branch funds. Ware's other complaint was the difficulty he had in persuading anybody from the other state branches to write for the journal: news of interstate branch activities was either not forthcoming or when it was, it was out of date; articles rarely appeared or when they did, they were unpublishable. Ware had a very clear idea of the politicizing role that he thought the journal could and should play, an idea that was somewhat at odds with what many of the branch members - NSW and interstate - wanted from it. He not only saw it as a journal which spoke to the membership of CAMP, radicalizing it, keeping it informed and involved, it was also to be a journal which spoke for the membership of CAMP - or more correctly, perhaps, for what he would have liked the membership of CAMP to be. The journal was sent to the mass media and to non-members of the organization as well as to members and Ware was unwilling to publish articles which were poorly written or which advanced a line at variance with the aims of CAMP; and he was definitely not about to cater to what he suspected were the tastes of the predominantly male membership of CAMP. The real difficulty with Ware's views on the role the journal should play was that they were shared by very few others and those few were concentrated in the NSW Branch.

The main interstate opposition to Ware's view of the relationship that should prevail between the journal and the branches came from South Australia. There had always been complaints from individuals about the journal - on particular issues or articles, that it did not always come out on time, or that subscriptions appeared to go astray - but it was not until January 1973 and the South Australian attack that the complaints were all put together and aired publicly.

Jon Ruwoldt, activist member of CAMP (SA) and Co-Editor of its magazine, Canary, took Ware's proposals for interstate subsidization of Camp Ink back to South Australia and discussed them in an article in the January issue of Canary. Ware's scheme, he calculated would cost CAMP (SA) $45 a month, which, while it could be raised in a variety of ways, begged

---

the question of whether it should be raised:

Well, what purpose does CAMP INK serve for us? I think it is undeniable that we need a national publication, for a variety of reasons. We need a publication that tells us what's going on in the other states, to give us stories of interest, to provide a forum for members nationally, and most importantly, to print good commentary on the news that affects us. CAMP INK does, in fact, print state news if it gets it, though it does not encourage it; but it never prints international news...

... the editor [Ware] says, firstly, that it is not his job to summarize overseas news for reprinting in CAMP INK, and secondly, that it is his policy only to print original material... John Ware insists that he should not write a single word in the magazine. He just publishes what is sent in. He is on the end of a pipeline from each state. Trouble is, it seems that only Sydney people are prepared to stuff original material down the open end of the pipeline to John Ware at Coogee.

I think the editor should take a much more active role than this... No one in Adelaide, for instance, was encouraged to write about our attempts at law reform in detail. Indeed, no one thought to! But such an article was published, by a Sydney writer [Lex Watson]. Obviously the editor asked him to write instead of getting on the blower to S.A., and asking one of us to write! John Ware conceives of his job as arranging and laying out a feature article type magazine. How good is he at it? Well, first criticism I've heard is that there are not enough pictures... Secondly, the critics say the pictures that are printed are not interesting enough... Then, more technical perhaps, but critics say the layout could be more imaginative... Finally, the editor can't just sit and wait for articles to drop into his lap. He must go and get them in, and not rely on the sympathy of his friends in Sydney. CAMP INK must be a national magazine, with articles from all over Australia, and not just from Sydney... In conclusion, I know John Ware will be angry that I have taken space in Canary for this article instead of sending it to CAMP INK in Sydney. Maybe I should also write to him, but this article is definitely what Canary should be publishing, and I'm not prepared to wait 6 or 8 weeks for my article to appear—if it is printed straight away—with a bitchy editorial comment stuck on directly underneath it: these criticisms cannot be answered by an obstinate refusal to compromise on the part of the editor. It can be answered in part if other people decide to have their say too, and if at the Gay Convention, or whatever it is in May, John Ware allows all the state branches some say in the running and style of their magazine. (103)

By the time that Ruwoldt did write to Camp Ink, relations between CAMP (SA) and the journal had deteriorated even further and Ruwoldt saw CAMP (NSW) as having entered the feud too. The cause of the deterioration was the reviews the journal published of Homosexuality in South Australia (104) a collection of articles written during 1972 and published by CAMP (SA). About half of the articles were papers given at a seminar on Homosexual Oppression and Liberation held at the University of Adelaide in July 1972; the rest were either reprints from various sources or had been written especially for the publication. The first review was published in the January edition of Camp Ink. (105) Lex Watson, writing under the pseudonym of Trevor Hughes, criticized the publication for three major shortcomings: first, that as far as

(103) Ibid.
the reading public was concerned only one of the 16 articles had been written by a homosexual - "If an oppressed minority group are going to organize a political pressure group to ask (demand?) equality and full acceptance then they are not going to be taken very seriously if the best they can do is hide behind the coat-tails of liberal do-gooders". (106) Secondly, that CAMP (SA) had published the views of people who were far from sympathetic to the homosexual cause, one psychologist and two psychiatrists (one of whom was practising aversion therapy on homosexuals) and several religious pieces, for example. And finally, that, despite the fact that two of the authors were women, there was no discussion about lesbianism - "the male oriented outlook of this volume, while claiming to about 'homosexuality', not 'male homosexuality' is as much a denial of the existence of lesbianism as the better known heterosexual denial of the existence of lesbians". (107)

The February 1973 edition of Camp Ink published a reply by Jon Ruwoldt (108) which was prefaced by a report on the state of relations between CAMP (SA), Camp Ink, and now, CAMP (NSW) - "the open hostility to S.A. CAMP and its committee in Sydney must be answered soon or there will be an open rift between S.A. and Sydney CAMP and Camp Ink". (109) The trouble, according to Ruwoldt, was that it seems we have run foul of those ideological Sydney heavies John Ware and Lex Watson. You know, it seems we are actually not constituted along the lines which John Ware wanted; also our branch's committee, now a year old, generally have not come out to the degree that Lex and John have; again the latter criticize our ideology, aims and achievements. (110)

In defence of Homosexuality in South Australia, he argued:

It is written by respected S.A. authorities, and an interstate reviewer could scarcely realize the standing these authors have here, let alone the impact of their views on the close-knit S.A. public... At $1.50, the book is the first reasonably priced authoritative Australian publication of its kind ever to hit the S.A. reading public...

If the book was meant for Sydney heavies we would have asked John Ware, David Widdup, Lex Watson et al to author it surely. But then who'd buy and read it. (111)

He closed by referring to David Widdup's 1972 political campaign and issuing a challenge:

Sucks to the critics: you've got your homosexual candidates, we've got a book into the hands of the reading public. Now which is more likely to change public attitudes? (112)

An answer to Ruwoldt from Lex Watson (again as Trevor Hughes) was published immediately under Ruwoldt's reply. (113) He reiterated, in summary, the major points of his first review of the publication. Its sins of commission were: psychiatrists and psychologists who were not prepared to condemn the use of aversion therapy but rather held out "totally illusory prospects of 'cure'"); one churchman who was not very sympathetic; and a piece on Gay Lib that was inaccurate. Its sins of omission were: "women, camps speaking for themselves... sociological perspectives, hard data on law enforcement in S.A, and job discrimination". (115)
Three more exchanges on Homosexuality in South Australia were published in Camp Ink. The first was from Jill Matthews, one of the two women who had had articles in the CAMP (SA) publication. Hughes had criticized her article saying that she had mentioned lesbians at the start of it and then gone on to talk about the oppression of women in a largely heterosexual context; he had wondered why her article had been included at all as she showed no comprehension of the position of lesbians. Matthews defended herself by attacking Hughes:

"Mister Hughes, of course, knows all about the position and experience of lesbians. Or at least knows what lesbians "ought" to be saying . . . Do we need to say it again and again, Mr. Hughes, Lesbians are multidimensional people too. And we will not conform to society’s demands and stereotypes, nor yours. We will not be told who we ought to be nor what we ought to do."

The second, from Heather Walsh in Victoria, (a pseudonym I used) took up the gauntlet Ruwoldt had thrown down in asking whether the SA publication or Widdup’s campaign was more likely to change community attitudes — and plumped for the latter. The book, I argued, was dangerous because it looked as though CAMP (SA) was endorsing the views expressed in it (because there was no editorial comment to the contrary); because only one of the contributors of those who were homosexual was prepared to say so; because lesbians were virtually non-existent as far as the publication was concerned; and because it seemed as though CAMP (SA) was supporting “the view that homosexuals ought not to be tarred and feathered, rather they should be pitied and offered treatment for their maladjustment”. By contrast, during the campaign “Widdup stood for election openly as a homosexual, and his polling booths were staffed by homosexual men and women who openly admitted that they too were homosexual and that they were tired of do-gooders using the homosexual cause to salve their consciences and qualify them for the label ‘tolerant’”. Not that a political campaign was necessarily more effective than a book — it depended on what type of campaign and what type of book:

If Widdup had conducted a campaign based on the premise that homosexuality is a sickness and deserves pity and if CAMP S.A., had produced a book by homosexuals arguing for homosexuality as a viable alternative life style, then the situation would be reversed.

The final letter on the subject published in Camp Ink came from Watson (still as Hughes) and was a defence of his criticism of Matthews. Basically, he argued, they agreed: he had not suggested that he knew what lesbians ought to be doing or saying, simply that what was missing from the publication were lesbians speaking as lesbians on the position of lesbians.

It was not, however, to be the last word written on the subject. In the April edition of Canary Jon Ruwoldt widened the group of Sydney heavies to be resisted, accurately guessing the Lex Watson was Trevor Hughes but incorrectly assuming that he was also Heather Walsh. At a committee meeting (20 March, 1973) the SA branch of CAMP had decided that it could no
longer afford to buy copies of Camp Ink in bulk for resale through the branch. He acknowledged that the journal had been very important in raising the consciousness of homosexuals and in the formation of the South Australian branch, but:

I must however speak out against the conservative and authoritarian stance of the co-editor of Camp Ink and of Lex Watson. These two have consistently, under various pseudonyms (Trevor Hughes, and lately a Victorian Woman), denigrated the actions of SA CAMP, using as objects for their scorn, our recent publication HOMOSEXUALITY IN S.A. . . . Basically it seems to me that they resent another CAMP group entering the field of publication. This is understandable only if all must be sacrificed to keep Camp Ink afloat. Unfortunately, I do not think that our branch members consider that it is worth keeping afloat. Thus John Ware, Lex, David, Sue and Gaby see their pet little paper perishing for lack of support (not only in SA, but also in Victoria and Qld) and so are driven into their present state of bitchiness and paranoia.

If Lex Watson (alias Trevor Hughes, Vic woman, etc) thinks that we are really all that bad, why stoop so low as to label SA C.A.M.P. as a bunch of heterosexual do-gooders. He, of all people, should know that at least I am very homosexual: it seems that he has allowed his fury at being scorned to distort his priorities. Surely the Aust. C.A.M.P. movement is more important to us than all the small-mindedness of a bitchy elite that happen to run Camp Ink.

We all have work to do, and Mss Watson, Ware, Widdup, Wills et al should realize this. They should roll up their sleeves, forget their pettiness and help, or allow Camp Ink to become as empty as their priorities and emotions seem to have become. (124)

The feud between CAMP (SA) and Camp Ink and some members of the NSW CAMP Executive was about financing the journal, about differences in political style and priorities, all exacerbated by the sexual politics of two of the protagonists; but it also represented the first concerted effort by a state branch to stand up to the ideological domination of the organization by Ware and those in the NSW branch who shared his views. In 1971 the Gay Liberation cell within CAMP had tried to do so but found it easier to leave the organization altogether. (125) The stand taken by the South Australian Branch, the fact that the issues involved had been aired publicly, that the branch neither weakened in its fight nor withdrew, were all important indicators that times had changed. And, most importantly, for those in NSW (both on the executive and amongst the general membership) who were unhappy with the organization but unwilling to challenge its leadership, Ruwoldt's healthy disrespect for the aura of reverence that had attached itself to Ware, as co-founder of the organization and editor of its journal, and his willingness to take on the 'ideological heavies' of Sydney showed them that it could be done.

Ruwoldt's stand was able to influence not only by example; his friendship links to CAMP in Sydney were with the Church Group (renamed Cross Section early in 1973). A Lutheran by upbringing, one of his main areas of interest was homosexuality and the churches (126) an interest which both he and the Church Group knew was not shared by Ware or the 'Sydney heavies'. And it was from the Church Group that the emergent Phone-A-Friend drew a lot of its support both moral and numerical — Phone-A-Friend, the group to which most of the opposition to the dominance of 'Mss Ware, Watson, Widdup Wills et al' would steadily gravitate during 1973.


(124) Ibid. Ruwoldt pointed out that he had opposed the decision to no longer take copies of the journal for resale.

(125) The other factors in this move out of the organization have been discussed in the preceding chapter.

The issues of Camp Ink which appeared during the first half of 1973 probably published more articles and letters with pseudonyms attached than real names. Besides Lex Watson and I masquerading as Trevor Hughes and Heather Walsh, there was David Widdup who, in various guises, opened up the more public of the two concurrently running, but totally separate, debates about the position of women in CAMP.

At one of the informal meetings (2 January 1973) between interstate members of CAMP discussion centred on the merits of a National Conference of all CAMP Branches which South Australia was planning to organize for 13-18 May in Adelaide. (127) At the meeting of 2 January John Ware suggested:

that the convention should be used to tackle the question of why women were not involved in the homosexual movement to the extent men are.

This he claimed was the greatest problem facing the homosexual movement throughout the world and one that has to be solved before the movement could advance.

The suggestion was enthusiastically supported by Liz, the only woman present, and also by Peter de Waal.

Some thought a five day conference biased towards lesbians would be boring while others thought that women would be incapable of organizing the conference.

It was finally agreed that there will be a National Conference of CAMP as a radical feminist movement. The conference will be organized by women and will probably take place in Adelaide, if the women and branches not represented agree. (128)

The contradictions involved in a small group of men deciding that the homosexual movement, composed mainly of men should become a radical feminist movement, and hold a conference on the subject, and that that conference should be organized by women, did not seem to occur to the men at the meeting; nor, initially were they apparent to the women (myself included) who were later informed about the decision. (129) The suggestion for a National Conference of CAMP as a radical feminist movement was the first move in what looked like a continuing debate about the role of women in, and the relevance of feminism to, the homosexual movement. Conducted in successive issues of Camp Ink (from January to September) it was, however, primarily a dialogue between David Widdup and his other selves, Marjorie Carrington and Joan Morrison, the pseudonyms under which he sometimes wrote for Camp Ink and for Liberaction, the newsletter of the Hobart Women's Action Group. Widdup, in fact, provoked only two genuine responses, both from interstate women; Jill Matthews in S. Australia, and Leslie Rogers in Victoria. (130) That no members of the CWA joined in the debate by writing letters to the editor either in support of, or opposition to, Widdup is not very difficult to understand. Most CWA members would not have written to the journal about anything; indeed, the attempt that Ware made in mid-1972 to hand over an issue of the journal to women failed dismally. (131) Gaby Antolovich and I, the only two women who wrote for the journal on anything even approaching an occasional basis, both knew that Widdup was talking to himself and saw little point in interrupting his monologue.

(127) It was at this Conference that relationships between the branches and the journal were to be sorted out.


(129) Neither Gaby Antolovich nor I had been present at the meeting. We were both on a scuba diving excursion on the north coast of NSW. It was an excursion which cost the women's movement one of its lesbian activists. Carolyn Bensell who had tried unsuccessfully to get a discussion on lesbianism going in Women's Liberation and who had been instrumental in setting up the Gay Women's Liberation Groups which had met mid-1972 at Women's House died in a diving accident on 4 January 1973. Two days later, on 6 January, her lover, Lexi Nettleship, who had been actively involved in Campus Camp (Sydney University) committed suicide.

(130) In order of appearance, the articles and letters were: WIDDUP, David: "In the Category of Women and Other Trivia" Camp Ink. Vol 3 No. 1. [January] 1973 pp 6-7; [WIDDUP, David] CARRINGTON, Marjorie: "A Male
The CWA had begun its own debate about the position of women within CAMP but in early 1973 it was roughly at the same stage of development as was the debate about the position of lesbians within Women’s Liberation — “going on all the time even though nobody’s saying a word, acted out”. (132) Widdup’s articles, together with Ware’s support for their sentiments, highly intellectualized by comparison and discussing sex roles and sexism in an abstract way, were thus somewhat irrelevant to what was happening in the CWA. The two debates began separately and remained quite distinct because, ultimately, they were pointing the women in CAMP in opposite directions: the CWA was heading towards Women’s Liberation and separatism from men; Widdup and Ware were trying to hold the women to CAMP — or, failing that, as it sometimes seemed, were willing to try to follow them into Women’s Liberation.

The CWA which had not met on a regular basis for several months was one of the first groups to use the new clubrooms at Forest Lodge in February 1973. What was most noticeably different about the reports of CWA members was a sudden awareness of the men in CAMP and the dominant role they played in the organization. No CWA newsletter prior to 1973 had even mentioned men, and now they cropped up in every second or third item in the report:

1. ATTENDANCE
First, the good news: mostly new-new and old-new ... faces turned up at the meeting — AND two men ...

2. WOMEN’S REPRESENTATIVE
... CWA will be represented at every executive meeting. Even so, women are far outnumbered by men on the executive, a situation which could be remedied by A. more women’s groups being formed within CAMP (a group membership of 10 people entitles you to a representative on the executive); ... B. by women attending existing groups and making their voices heard ...

4. PHONE - A - FRIEND
... Here is another area where women are needed ...

5. CATHOLIC GROUP
Gary Pye wants women at the Cross Section Catholic Group — so far membership is all men (another male rep. for the executive girls). Women interested in discussion and action on homosexuality - male and FEMALE - and the Catholic Church, go to meetings ...

One meeting later:

The meeting closed with Monika (’the muscle’) Hauber breaking into little bits three unfortunate males who happened to be present, and eating them for pre-dinner snacks. (134)

Both of these editions of the CWA Newsheet carried notices of the Women’s Commission and urged CWA members to attend as a group:

Because of the rather dubious position of lesbians within Women’s Lib., it is important for the CWA to go as a group ...

DON’T FORGET TO COME TO THE WOMEN’S COMMISSION AND WEAR YOUR CAMP T-SHIRTS

LESBIANS WILL BE IGNORED IF WE DON’T GO. (135)
By the time both of these newsletters had appeared Gaby Antolovich had already been to two meetings of the Women's Liberation group which was organizing the Women's Commission and had reported back to the CWA on how resistant they had been to the suggestion that there be a separate session on/for lesbians:

Gaby Antolovich: ... The things that were thrown at me [by the Women's Commission organizing group] about that was that, 'well, where have you been with all the organizing of it'. 'What right have you to say anything now'. 'Who are you!' type of attitude. 'Lesbianism isn't important'. 'What are you trying to do to us - there are other more important issues like working women and abortion.' And I got a bit upset... And in the last lot of meetings they produced the literature with "can you sexually love a woman". And I objected to that not only because of the tokenism but because it sounded like an ability to fuck, like 'can you type', rather than some sort of political stance... It just seemed so irrelevant to what I was trying to get at and also it was just stuck in the middle of sexuality somewhere, buried. They just bunged in a question and I wanted a whole session on it. (136)

As to why it was so important to her that there be a separate session on lesbians and lesbianism at the Commission:

Gaby Antolovich: I knew there was a lot of closet lesbians in Women's Liberation and... I'd had some vague experience of Women's Liberation and there were these negative attitudes to lesbians even from the lesbians in Women's Liberation. I just couldn't understand how you could work toward alternatives and still sort of either hide your lesbianism or hate lesbians. It was just that vague idea that I didn't think it was right that there be hostility or ignorance in the sense that lesbians were ignored in Women's Liberation. It made sense to me that lesbianism was an important aspect of Women's Liberation because sexual oppression is a fundamental part of our oppression, so lesbian oppression obviously is too. Also, there was a great deal of fear of man hating and man hatred at the time... people were closet man haters in Women's Liberation. And I think there was a connection between not being seen to be man haters and lesbians being more automatically man haters than heterosexual women and we can't give a bad impression of Women's Liberation - there was a real sort of thing that we've got to look good to the public. You see, we in CAMP had worked through that problem, at least in our heads, about respectability because that's a fundamental part of homosexual oppression. You are pressured into being really fantastic in all ways except your sexuality and hopefully you'll get away with being homosexual if you're brilliant in your job and look neat and tidy and all that sort of garbage... We'd done a lot of talking about it, about how we're pressured into being respectable citizens and that the homosexual movement has got that pressure on it too, to be respectable and not to have radical ratbags giving it a bad name. And that sort of thing was happening in Women's Liberation too. And one way to keep your respectability is to hide your lesbian scum section and tone down the man hating and look like nice ladies who are trying to do nice things. I think that was much more the level at which I was fighting and lesbianism was the example. (137)
Participation in the Women's Commission, which for most meant simply attending it, represented the first 'political' activity that the CWA had undertaken as a group; and for most of the women in it, it represented their first 'political' act as individuals. It was very difficult to arouse their interest in the activities of any of the other groups within CAMP or in any of the broader issues, such as opposition to psychiatric treatment of homosexuals, despite the fact, or perhaps because of it, that many of them worked as psychiatric nurses.

On some issues the active participation of all members of CAMP was sought, on others it was not. The latter was the case with the meeting of those people from the movements concerned with McConaghy's conference. The 'invitation list' for that meeting was, in fact, quite short, and deliberately so. The meeting was to consist of only those individuals (Altman, Bacon, Fell) and people from those groups (Women's and Gay Liberation) who (by 11 March) had been asked to speak at the Conference. Watson, Antolovich and I (from CAMP) were not there simply by courtesy of the others (at that stage CAMP had not been contacted by McConaghy) but for two major reasons: first, to lend weight to the argument that nobody should participate in the conference; and secondly, to try to bind CAMP in advance to policy of non-participation because we suspected that if Gay Liberation refused, McConaghy would then approach CAMP.

As far as CAMP was concerned, we were well aware by early February, not only that McConaghy was planning a conference and had invited Altman, Bacon, Fell, Women's and Gay Liberation to participate but also that he had not invited CAMP to provide a speaker. Altman, Watson and I (who all worked together) had discussed the conference, the invitations and the possible courses of action open to the movements on several occasions early in February. What had emerged from those informal discussions was a consensus that we did not think that anybody connected with the movements should participate in the conference. We were worried that McConaghy could and would use the participation of homosexuals from the movement to convince those of his colleagues who were critical of his use of aversion therapy on homosexuals that he was accepted by the homosexual movement; participation, from our point of view, would imply condonation. We had three other objections. First, that some non-movement homosexuals might see our participation as tacit approval of aversion therapy and undertake a course of treatment. Secondly, movement participation would enable McCaonghy to parade as a 'trendy' psychiatrist, in touch with society's radicals, an image we felt he had of himself and which we were not willing to help him cultivate. And finally, if we really did see McConaghy as 'the enemy' there would be something very odd about a movement which claimed to be serious about radical change but was prepared to agree to a one-sided let up in the revolution (he was not about to suspend treatment of his homosexual patients for the duration of the conference) in order to participate in a polite intellectual exchange of ideas with the enemy – in his arena, on his terms, and in front of an audience he had selected.

Our mistrust of McConaghy was fed by an article of his which was published in The Medical Journal of Australia in January 1973. Given the status of a "Special Article", it was entitled "The Doctor and Homosexuality". Before I actually saw the article John MacKay, a homosexual medical practitioner who was active in HGS, had told me that 'at last' McConaghy had revealed his anti-homosexual attitudes in print. He thought that the article should be answered and that he, as a doctor, would have a much better chance of getting something

(139) This conversation occurred at an HGS meeting on 21 February, 1973.
published by the Journal than anybody else in HGS. On 5 March MacKay and I went through a draft of his reply to the article, typed it and then he delivered it personally to the Journal's office so that there could be no unverifiable claims that it had not been published because it had never been received -- a possibility that occurred to us.

In his article, McConaghy did not actually state that he considered homosexuality to be an illness; his condemnation was far more subtle. His article was a discussion of what a doctor should do if confronted by somebody - male - who thought they were homosexual. The topics he covered and the language - 'diagnosis', 'homosexual problems', the possibility that worries about being homosexual may be 'part of an obsessive condition', 'controllable but not dangerous impulses', which 'threaten', that 'successful results' have been reported with both psychotherapeutic and aversion therapy treatment, whether homosexuality was genetically or environmentally determined, and homosexuals (female and male) having distant and rejecting fathers -- all by implication pointed to his view that homosexuality was an illness in need of treatment. He acknowledged that treatment to help homosexuals overcome their homosexuality when they really did not want it was likely to fail but he also advised doctors who saw people whose homosexuality was being held in check by strong feelings of guilt and shame not to break down those defences. He ended one paragraph by noting that "homosexual organizations have objected to all treatment of homosexuality on the grounds that such treatment militates against the public acceptance of homosexuality as an alternative mode of sexual behaviour" (140) and opened the next with "At present there is no substantial evidence as to whether psychotherapy or aversion therapy is more effective in the treatment of homosexuality". (141) He acknowledged that some doctors may have no moral or ethical objections to homosexual behaviour and that they may feel that people should have freedom of choice in this aspect of their lives, but he reminded such doctors of "the guilt and misery produced in people with homosexual problems by current legal and social sanctions". (142) And then, speaking of the research into the causes of homosexuality, which is weighted towards the view that the father's role is a crucial factor, he showed he was in touch with the liberation movements:

In view of the strong social disapproval of homosexuality, the failure of child psychiatrists to educate the public concerning the importance of the father's role contrasts strangely with the continued emphasis they have placed on the importance of the child having a single mother or substitute mother figure . . . when the evidence for this is far more dubious. Perhaps the alliance with Gay Liberation has prevented Women's Liberation movements from stressing this manifestation of male chauvenism" (143)

Men with "some homosexual component" he continued, may be anxious not to pass it on to their children. Such men, he advised, could be "reassured that this is unlikely, but at the same time the importance of their role as fathers should be emphasized. It seems rare for Lesbian women to show this concern about their children. Of course, overt homosexual behaviour is much less common in women. When it does occur, it is rare for Lesbian women to be exclusively homosexual". (144)

MacKay's letter (145) was intended to be provocative because he hoped that one of the medical reporters for the daily newspapers would pick it up and give it broader circulation. To this end, he asked "what proportion of Australia's 1,500 homosexual registered Medical Practitioners"

(140) MCCONAGHY, N: "The Doctor and Homosexuality", op. cit.
(141) Ibid.
(142) Ibid.
(143) Ibid.
(144) Ibid. In view of his admission in 1972 that he found it difficult to attract women as patients his choice of "seems rare" rather than "is rare" was wise.
(145) See MacKay's photocopy of McConaghy's article, Document No 114, for the parts he indicated he thought
regarded McConaghy as an expert on homosexual problems:

Are 1,500 registered medicos spending hours washing non-existent blood off their hands subjecting themselves to courses of electro-convulsive therapy . . .

Are 1,500 doctors giving themselves up to 'uncontrollable and dangerous impulses' which the Professor implies is a possible corollary of this condition?

Has Professor McConaghy ever attempted to communicate with this body of his colleagues . . . Even if these gentlemen were prepared to agree with Dr. McConaghy (a rather unlikely occurrence) about the possible 'pathological' reasons for their sexual orientation, it is highly unlikely that they would agree with a diagnosable malady - lumped in with kleptomania, whooping cough, and gout - - - . . .

It is interesting that Professor McConaghy made no mention at all of H.G.S., as a valid technique of managing homosexuals. Perhaps he practices a "do as I say, not as I do" philosophy, since he has referred patients to H.G.S. How come H.G.S. has no place in his article? . . .

The College of Psychiatrists may acquiesce with Professor McConaghy's ideas and endorse his 'expert' stance on the topic of homosexuality, thus reinforcing their own prejudices and coloured preconceptions. Yet, both the College of Psychiatrists and their whiz-boy Professor claim that their attitude towards homosexuality is sympathetic and understanding. To which I can only remark, if the Psychiatrists are the homosexuals' friends, who needs enemies. ? (146)

The letter was signed John W. Mackay, M.B.,B.S. Mackay's strategy paid off: not only did the Journal publish the letter but it was picked up by one of the daily newspapers. On 22 May, Geoff Griffiths, the medical writer for The Mirror telephoned to ask the basis for MacKay's assertion that there were 1,500 homosexual medical practitioners in Australia. (147) He was a little disappointed when I told him that the figure was based on the Kinsey calculations that around 10% of the general population could be assumed to be homosexual and that we had no evidence to suggest that doctors, as an occupation group, should be any different from the general population in respect of their sexual orientation; 1,500 represented 10% of registered practitioners. He did however, agree, that the letter and the existence of HGS was worth reporting on. (148)

By early 1973 HGS was useful more in terms of this role of publicly providing McConaghy and other psychiatrists with an alternative to their attempts to treat homosexuality than it was in terms of the numbers of homosexuals who sought help from it. After the initial rush of 'troubled homosexuals' whom we realized were infrequently in need of individual counselling, HGS had very few clients. Most could be, and were, redirected to other groups in CAMP or to friendship and social groups within the organization and this, in fact, was the way that most of them had found HGS helpful - as a point of entry into CAMP. (149) When HGS was reconvened in February 1973 our first activity was to re-evaluate its role in the light of the previous year's experience and our own changed perceptions of that role. (150) We decided that if there was going to be any kind of 'therapy' it would be conducted in groups of six people
who would meet weekly in the knowledge that, once filled, the group would be closed and that it would be expected to have reached its self set goal by the end of six weeks. Only those in ‘most desperate need’ would be accepted into this kind of group; as many as possible would be redirected to other groups within CAMP or assisted to set up more flexible discussion groups. We also discussed the desirability of a name change. When we first set up the group we had thought that ‘Guidance Service’ was as value free a name as we could think of but we became increasingly self conscious about the connotations of the word ‘Guidance’. Both the name and the offer of intensive work groups presented us with the dilemma of trying to offer help to people who were finding it difficult to come to terms with their own homosexuality without putting ourselves into the position of experts with power over those people and correspondingly fostering attitudes of deference and dependence in them. There was also the worry that they would, because they were coming to a ‘Guidance Service’ stigmatize themselves and be stigmatized by others within CAMP. (151) We were never able to resolve that dilemma and eventually (at the end of 1973) disbanded the group.

After the meeting of 11 March at which Watson, Antolovich and I had signed the letter to McConaghy making consideration of participation in his conference conditional on his meeting certain demands which we suspected he would find totally unacceptable, we turned our attention to more pressing matters. One of these was the public meeting which had been called for Sunday evening 18 March to protest the NSW Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill; another at least as far as the women were concerned, was the Women’s Commission.

Preparations for CWA participation in the Women’s Commission were made, in the main by Gaby Antolovich and Jill Roe. My own participation was minimal for several reasons. In some respects because of my involvement in Refractory Girl, I felt much more a part of Women’s Liberation than either Roe or Antolovich who were the two women most concerned to push in public the issue of exclusion of lesbians and lesbian issues from Women’s Liberation. A second factor was that of time pressure. During the week leading up to the Commission I was helping to publicize the meeting of March 18. This involved arranging for leaflets (152) to be distributed at Sydney University, arranging for Dr. Win Childs (153) a psychoanalyst, to appear on day time television questioning the need for censorship (154) and being marginally involved in finding a chairperson for the meeting itself. (155) A third factor was my desire not to leap on to the tail end -- at the most public moment -- of a campaign for which Antolovich, and to a lesser extent Roe had done all the spadework. (156) She and Roe met several times in

John MacKay, Sue Rawlinson, Andrea Russell, and myself.

(151) Our awareness of this dilemma later made us, John Ware and I in particular, very critical of Phone-A-Friend which did not seem prepared to even acknowledge that there were any problems associated with offering help to people who we wanted to regard themselves as our equals i.e., equally as capable as anybody else to become active in the organization.

(152) See Document Nos 105 and 106.

(153) I had interviewed Win Childs on 18 October 1972 with a view to doing a follow up article to that based on the interview with McConaghy. As a psychoanalyst she was critical of the use of aversion therapy in general; in addition she was not interested in trying to treat homosexuals in the sense of trying to change them into heterosexuals. By the time we got around to reaching an agreement on what parts of the interview could be used in print without jeopardizing the anonymity of herself and the patients she referred to as examples (March, 1973) there seemed little point in publishing what was left of the article. It was Childs who told me (on 14 March 1973) that McConaghy had been upset by my article.


(155) Liz Fell chaired the meeting.

(156) Antolovich spoke of her resentment at being treated as an appendage to me at the Commission itself when she opened up her testimony with: “I’d like to start off with a personal oppression within CAMP, the Campaign Against Moral Persecution. Now, the person I’m on with is Sue Wills, a very well known personality
the week prior to the Commission to plan what they would say. Roe had felt excluded from Sydney Women’s Liberation in its early days and had learnt of the experience of others: the reception that Christabel Poll had been given by the Glebe group in 1970 and the hostile defensiveness that the Hobart Women’s Action Group had provoked at Mount Beauty in January 1973. Antolovich was so angered by the refusal of the organizers of the Commission to plan for a separate session on lesbians and so worried that any attempts to raise the issue during the Commission would be blocked that she was prepared to disrupt it. At the General Meeting of CAMP held at Balmain Town Hall on Friday 9 March she had called for some of the men there to come to the Commission in drag (i.e., dressed in women’s clothing) but her request was ignored. She had discussed with John Ware his plan to attend the Commission (not in drag) to protest what he saw as sexism—the exclusion of men from the Commission. To the extent that Antolovich, Roe, Poll and I had been told by Ware that he intended to go to the Commission and chain himself to the seats and did not warn the Commission organizers, we could be accused of complicity in his act. The two protests—Ware’s against the exclusion of males from the Commission and the CWA’s against the perceived exclusion of lesbians and lesbian issues from Women’s Liberation—were unrelated except insofar as they were made on the same occasion and by people who were linked through their participation in CAMP. (157) The accusation that Ware was a CWA plant was simply inaccurate and his protest was linked, if to anything, to Widdup’s desire to see the homosexual movement as a radical feminist movement. The shift in identification from homosexual-first-woman-second to woman-first-homosexual-second that already appeared to be underway as far as many CWA members were concerned was probably given a push by Ware’s brief attendance at the Commission. I certainly had felt ambivalent about his declared intention to go to the Commission and had done nothing, such as warn the organizers, out of a loyalty to Ware personally rather than in support of his stand. And at the Commission itself my discomfort became acute: I could not not say hello to Ware when I arrived to find him chained to the row of seats, but neither could I sit with him; and when the motion that he be asked to leave was put to the vote, I could not bring myself to vote at all. No other CWA women sat with him either, and when he did leave, of the women there from CAMP, only Christabel Poll left with him. The CWA women stayed for the first day’s session on ‘Women as Mothers’ and ‘Women as Workers’ and returned on Sunday for the session on ‘Women as Sex Objects’ when Antolovich and Roe gave their testimonies discussed above.

During the week following the Commission McConaghy contacted me several times about his conference. The details of his manoeuvres will be discussed later but, for the moment, he sought: first, my own participation in the conference (which I refused); then, to know how to answer the letter we had sent him in a way that would ensure our participation (which I refused to tell him); and finally, permission to send me copies of all the correspondence to date between the movements and himself (which I gave). (158) Two days later he wanted to know within CAMP (audience laughter). The oppression I feel is that my individuality is being crushed by her great personality in the movement. (audience laughter). Now I feel that women are suffering this sort of oppression with their men and this is the reason why I wanted to go to Women’s Lib, because the oppression I felt, the lack of individuality, being an appendage of Sue, is the sort of oppression women have felt: that they are only some man’s fuck, or some man’s wife, and not an individual in their own right”. TRANSCRIPT: Proceedings of Women’s Commission, op. cit. This statement prefaced her question to the Commission as to why lesbians were not given a separate session.

(157) George Devereux’s study of the variety of motives which prompted people to participate in the 1956 Hungarian uprising which led him to postulate that “a large number of differently motivated persons may come to perceive a given historical moment or event as suitable for the gratification of their various subjective needs” p 29 is worth bearing in mind here. DEVEREUX, George: “Two Types of Modal Personality Models” (1961) in SMELSER, N.J. and SMELSER, W.T. (eds): Personality and Social Systems. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 1963. pp 22 - 32.

(158) This conversation occurred on 19 March, 1973. See McConaghy to Wills, covering note, 20 March 1973. Document No. 116. This was accompanied by a copy of the letter he had sent to Women’s Liberation on
if I thought the signatories to the letter would be satisfied with organizing one quarter of the conference – on pornography and drugs – still unorganized. Such an offer, I told him, was likely to be seen as tokenism and totally unacceptable. I was able to disavow him of the impression he had that all the signatories to the letter wanted to participate in organizing his conference and indicated that I saw no reason why he should not write a reply offering to consult with a lesser number of people. (159) Unbeknowns to both McConaghy and myself, the letters he did send were received, but ignored. (160)

After that brief period of intensive contact, McConaghy and his conference were pushed into the background by other developments within CAMP, the most time consuming of which was the spur to assertiveness that the Women’s Commission seemed to have given the CWA. The CWA Newsheet No 14 of 5 April was a strongly worded document. It reported on the CWA meeting of 31 March where a letter to Jon Ruwoldt, drafted by Robin Tapp, was approved for sending off. The letter queried the apparent change in theme of the CAMP Conference planned for May in Adelaide:

There is some confusion, and a few questions being asked, here at Sydney C.A.M.P. We quite honestly believed that the theme of this activity week was radical feminism: about women, run by women and for women. Your news sheet that we have received here indicates that you have either changed the original theme or have forgotten/ignored the original plan. Why is this so? We were, to say the least, disappointed when we read your news sheet and found that the emphasis was not only on social functions (drag balls are not really an interest for women) but on heavily male-oriented and male run activities...

The CWA Newsheet also complained about the behaviour of CAMP member Brian Woodward:

Maybe it’s wrong to expect camp men NOT to be male chauvenist pigs. The latest prime example was Brian Woodward who had the gall to invite speakers on “skin care” on Thursday the 22nd of March - a lesbian coffee night. No - one was asked or informed of this patronizing, male, authoritarian decision - so on Thursday, the 22nd of March, the women were forced to bear with what a male thought we women needed:

WHAT A FUCKING PUT DOWN
1. How long before camp men realize they are more oppressive than most heterosexual men?
2. And how long are the men in C.A.M.P. going to allow deadshits like Brian Woodward to give them a bad name. (161)


(161) See Tapp to Ruwoldt. Undated. 31 March 1973 Document No. 118. In a personal letter to me and posted before the CWA letter went off, Jill Matthews explained that “the gay - camp started out concentrating on the relation of women to the movement – but we soon realized that the more general issue of sexism was more important – covering not only women, but effeminates, drag queens, transvestites/trans-sexuals etc., and that what we needed to begin working on was the nature and structure of sexism” and asked if I would present a paper to the conference. Matthews to Wills. 26 March 1973. Document No. 119. My reply was rather abrasive and referred to the CWA letter which was still unanswered at the time of my writing: “I am very concerned that what started out to be a ‘radical feminist’ conference appears to have turned into a series of orthodox discussion sessions with a few token women co-opted to the organizing committee to silence any cries of ‘male chauvenism.’” I refused to write a paper for the conference until my own and the CWA’s queries about who had made the decision to change the conference and why they had not bothered to consult with anybody else, were answered. Wills to Matthews. 7 April, 1973. Document No 120.
(162) [REPIN] YVE: CWA Newsheet. No. 14. 5 April, 1973. That particular item was written by Antolovich. At the CAMP Executive Meeting of 17 April 1973, which neither Antolovich nor I attended, a motion was
CWA disgruntlement with particular men and the more general male orientation of the organization made it very sensitive to anything which looked like an attempt to interfere with CWA activities. At a CAMP Executive Meeting of 10 February, in a motion that was aimed primarily at Phone-A-Friend which had collected some money, it was decided that “CAMP should have only one account and that individual groups within CAMP should pay all monies into the account” and receive monies from it. Although the CWA had had a savings bank account since mid-1972 with an unchanging balance of only $10, to have to hand over the money to CAMP was irksome but it was done on 17 February. And to illustrate the meaninglessness of the exercise, at the next Executive meeting the CWA representative (Yve Repin) moved that the CWA be voted $10 for advertising expenses and the $10 was handed back.

CWA meetings in February 1973 had discussed the need for more women to sit on the Executive, for women to be involved in other groups. It was not as though there were particular issues we felt the CWA wanted to push, and there was nothing in particular that the CWA or any of its members specifically wanted from CAMP. It was one possible course of action that might alleviate the growing sense of dissatisfaction, the cause of which could not even be articulated. The strategy of ‘creating’ groups of ten or more women so that individual women could be ‘elected’ to the Executive was discussed at the CWA meeting of 14 April and several women volunteered to act as group representatives. This decision was still in the process of being acted upon when a second solution occurred to others – CWA secession from CAMP. And for several weeks both courses were simultaneously being acted out. The CWA Newsheet No. 15. dated 16 April, 1973 came as somewhat of a surprise to those of us who were busily fabricating women’s groups with names and aims sufficiently different from one another to make separate representation on the Executive, if not convincing, then at least plausible. Written by Yve Repin, the newsletter opened:

1. WOMEN WANT OUT.
C.A.M.P. launched itself over 2 years ago, and I’ve been associated with it for almost a year.

For individual lesbians - including myself - it’s been great; it’s enabled us to “come out”, accept ourselves, meet other lesbians, etc., etc...

But that’s about as far as it goes. How about the development of C.W.A. as a group? . . . These days, C.W.A. functions and meetings are usually attended by about 20-30 women, and the interest is almost exclusively social. Women come to C.W.A., find a mate and drift off again. That’s all C.A.M.P. has to offer them, and that’s all they’re prepared to offer C.A.M.P. . . .

The social aspect is of course tremendously important, but it seemed to me that there could and should be greater involvement for members of a Lesbian group. So -- I asked some of you why there is this lack of involvement. The answer was immediate, spontaneous, and unanimous: we want a women only organization. Given that, we will throw in all our energies and resources . . .

We undoubtedly have the enthusiasm, the resources, the media contacts (through Sue) and the business expertise to establish and run a very successful club for lesbians, catering exclusively for the needs of women.

Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) held at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge, 17 April, 1973. At the next meeting, a neat point of clarification was made by Antolovich: “No one was called a “fucking deadshit”; “fucking” appeared quite separately from “deadshit” in the CWA No. 14 Newsheet.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive of CAMP (NSW) held at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge, 14 April, 1973.


Repin went on to outline proposals for the new club’s activities: it would rent premises, it would “appoint a full time manager, who generates her own (modest) salary out of revenue” (166); it would have various facilities – rooms for dancing and parties, for children, for meetings and discussions, for producing a journal and brochures; it would provide a counselling service and a limited catering service; and “of course, special functions will be arranged, from barbecues and dances through to discussions, seminars, and consciousness-raising groups”. (167) Aware of the suspicion that a full time manager generating her own salary out of revenue would arouse, Repin stressed:

This is NOT an exploitative venture; the manager’s salary will be in the form of a percentage of revenue (with a top limit) and everything else will be ploughed back into the club to improve premises and facilities. (168)

What CWA members had to do “right now” was to

- fill in the attached membership form for the new C.W.A. (Camp Women of Australia) and send it in urgently with your cheque for $10. This will enable us to move fast into our new clubrooms,
- come to the Annual General Meeting 8 p.m. on 30/4 at Balmain Town Hall, when Sue will announce and explain the women’s withdrawal from C.A.M.P. (169)

Four women - Danny Sampson, Monika Hauber, Gaby Antolovich, and I – got in touch with each other as soon as we had received our newsletters. We met to discuss our mutual concern and to try to work out what we could do to take the process of secession back a few steps. There was much in the newsletter which concerned us: the secession had not been discussed at a CWA meeting at all; I had not been consulted about the announcement I was supposed to make at the Annual General Meeting; all cheques for $10 were to be sent, not to the CWA, but to Repin at her private address; there seemed to be an unnecessary degree of urgency; and most importantly, the emphasis seemed to be on the social facilities of the new organization, with discussions, seminars and consciousness-raising described as “special functions”. In addition, there was the suspicion that Repin, whose entrepreneurial skills none of us doubted (170) envisaged herself as the manager generating her own modest salary out of revenue. None of us was worried that she would exploit club members in a financial rip-off scheme (she was more likely to have put her own money into the venture); quite the contrary, we were afraid that she might be able to create a financially viable women only organization. And financial viability would have to be based on successfully organized social functions which, we feared, would simply mean that more women would have easier access to a more comfortable community closet – one that would not be conducive to political activity.

On 20 April we discussed with Repin our desire to allow a full meeting of the CWA to discuss the secession option, along with others, and produced the CWA Newsheet No. 16:

The last newsheet mentioned secession from CAMP. We feel that this should be discussed by the CWA group as a whole, before any irrevocable action is taken. Therefore, we would like to call a meeting on Saturday, April 28, at 3 pm to discuss:

a) Should we break away from CAMP?

b) Why do people feel we should take such action?

c) What do we want to do that we can’t already do within CAMP?

d) Can we form a viable alternative group which would warrant getting our own premises?

e) If the group decided to leave, what do we want the statement of secession to say? (171)

(166) Ibid.
(167) Ibid.
(168) Ibid.
At the CAMP Executive meeting of Tuesday 24 April, as well as the group representative for the CWA who on that occasion was Monika Hauber, two new women's groups were represented and it was:

Resolved: That Radical Lesbians and Gay Women's Liberation be accepted as special purpose groups within CAMP. Radical Lesbians concentrate on making homosexual women accept themselves. Gay Women's Liberation activist group within Women's Liberation making heterosexual women accept homosexual women. (172)

Special purpose status meant that the groups could exclude whomsoever they chose to (in this case the target was men) and could operate separate bank accounts. At the CWA meeting of 28 April, 30-40 women (173) discussed the position of the CWA. After outlining what I saw as the options available to the CWA the meeting was thrown open to discussion in which I participated very little. The options were:

- total secession from CAMP;
- seeking the status of a special purpose groups within CAMP;
- maintaining the status quo;
- forming a separate group, but one which was affiliated to CAMP.

Two options, maintaining the status quo and forming a separate but affiliated group, provoked very little discussion, being dismissed (until it came to voting) as unacceptable and conferring no benefits, respectively. Danny Sampson argued that the CWA should remain within CAMP as a special purpose group: this would enable the CWA to get its own premises, to operate a separate bank account, and to close group meetings. Remaining within CAMP did have its advantages, she argued: there was Camp Ink which all members of CAMP received; CAMP could provide external support; and it already provided a guiding framework of aims within which much could be done. Additionally, special purpose status within CAMP could be used as a trial run for a totally separate group; with its separate bank account, its right to exclude people and the right to meet wherever it chose, a special purpose CWA could test its ability to survive apart from CAMP. (174) The case for total secession from CAMP was, by comparison, rather weak, not the least of all because Yve Repin was initially not present to put it and had sent word that the meeting should start without her. Those who did support secession spoke of their dissatisfaction with the CWA as presently constituted and operating because it seemed to lack direction; and that CAMP as a whole did not address itself to the problems of women nor did women have the power to achieve anything within the organization. This was countered by the argument that women in CAMP did have a power resource -- the ability to withdraw support from Phone-A-Friend should it be necessary. Repin's absence during those discussions was unfortunate because it meant that secession was not fully developed as an option. In the face of a challenge she appeared to have backed off and, without her future vision of a separate women's group, secession began to look like an empty and self-destructive nose-thumbing gesture.

(169) Ibid.
(170) She had run a financially successful market research firm with Peter Kenny for several years.
(171) ANTOLOVICH, Gaby, HAUBER, Monika, SAMPSON, Danny, and WILLS, Sue: CWA Newsheet No. 16 20 April, 1973.
(173) The range is wide because women arrived late and others had to leave before the meeting was over.
(174) In the middle of our discussions one of the men who lived in the upstairs rooms of 10 David Street, wandered down to find out what all the animated conversation was about and was told politely but firmly to leave which, after we had refused to even discuss the matter with him, he reluctantly did. It was a meaningful coincidence which illustrated to any who may have doubted it that the CWA had the ability to exclude men.
Three separate motions were put to the meeting: total secession was defeated soundly; seeking special purpose status within CAMP was opposed by only three women; and a motion that the status quo be maintained could not even find a seconder.

The election of a CWA representative was delayed until Yve Repin arrived but when she did come, she declined nomination and Margaret McMann was elected to the position. Three related matters were decided upon at the meeting: that CWA membership would not oblige anyone to join CAMP (175); that special purpose group status would be sought for the CWA at the next Executive meeting; and that men would be excluded from CWA meetings unless specifically invited to attend.

The Annual General Meeting of CAMP fell between the CWA meeting and the next Executive meeting. Held on 30 April at Balmain Town Hall it was relatively uneventful with all office bearers being elected to their positions unopposed. Watson and I were returned as Co-Presidents but the other positions were all filled by new officers: Gaby Antolovich as NSW Editor of Camp Ink (replacing Brian Woodward); Richard Hollamby as Treasurer (replacing a series of acting Treasurers); and Peter de Waal as Secretary (replacing Peter Bonsall-Boone).

By contrast, the Executive meeting of May 8 saw emergent conflicts being kept from direct expression by a series of formalized motions. Before we even got to the point of moving for special purpose status for the CWA, decisions had to be made about whether the Branch should pay the fares of an official NSW Branch representative to Adelaide for the National Conference, and then, who that representative should be. Additionally, it was felt that John Ware, as editor of Camp Ink, should be present at the Conference to try to sort out the financial and other difficulties the journal was experiencing in its relations with other state branches. After several interstate telephone calls we secured the agreement of other state branches that we would all contribute $20 towards Ware’s return air fare to Adelaide. The matter of the NSW Branch representative was much more contentious. Watson had been lobbying me gently for several days before the Executive meeting. Originally opposed to the idea that an official representative be sent, two days before the meeting he had changed his mind and, more than that, he would not be averse to any suggestion that he should be the Branch representative: his feud with Adelaide, and Ruwoldt in particular, was, as far as he was concerned, on going. At the Executive meeting of April 17, for example, prompted by Watson, the Executive had moved:

That this executive condemns the vilification of our two Co-Presidents in CANARY. The unjustified comments seem to stem from a book review published in Camp Ink, which is the national journal of the Campaign Against Moral Persecution and not the journal of CAMP (NSW Branch).

and that a copy of the motion be sent to the Editor of Canary with a request that it be published in the next issue. (176) At the Executive meeting of May 8, a motion “that a representative be sent from the NSW Branch and that fares be paid by the Branch” (177) was carried by 4 votes to 3 with one abstention. That all those opposed and the abstainer were women was noticeable. (178) There were two nominations for the role of Branch representative: Bonsall-Boone and Watson; and Bonsall-Boone was chosen by 4 votes to 2. (179) Watson's obvious displeasure at not having

(175) Membership fees were set at $5 p.a., ($2 for students and pensioners) with $2 of that being taken up with the cost of producing and posting out the newsletter 12 times a year.

(176) Copies of the letter, containing the text of the motion, were sent to Watson and myself and to CAMP (SA). Bonsall-Boone to The Editor, Canary. 23 April, 1973. Document No 121. The motion was moved by John Ware second, Peter Bonsall-Boone.

(177) Moved Richard Hollamby: second Chris Stahl. Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain on 17 April, 1973.

(178) In favour: Peter Bonsall-Boone, Chris Stahl, Lex Watson, Jan Davis. Opposed: Gaby Antolovich, Monika

(179) Watson’s obvious displeasure at not having
been chosen because of the way the women voted (180) was expressed when it came to the granting of special purpose group status to the CWA. It was granted the status it sought but with Watson expressing "the gravest reservations" that this was possibly the thin edge of a widening wedge being driven between the women and the men in CAMP (181). Watson's observation was perspicacious and his own actions over the next few weeks almost made his prophecy a self-fulfilling one.

At the next Executive meeting (19 May 1973) Watson moved to recind the status of special purpose group from the CWA on the grounds that, by excluding men from its meetings, the CWA was contravening the Constitution of CAMP (NSW) which, he claimed, outlawed discrimination on the basis of sex. The motion was withdrawn

on condition that the CWA meeting to be held on 9 June 1973 be open for discussion with the general membership of CAMP, Sue Wills to put this before the next CWA meeting. (182)

The fact that the CWA and the Executive met on alternative Saturday afternoons meant that it took replies to questions and requests two weeks to arrive back at their source. The request from the Executive meeting of Saturday 19 May was discussed at the CWA meeting of 26 May and the reply to the Executive did not get there until 2 June. That reply was that the CWA was not prepared to give up one of its regular fortnightly meeting times to meet with other (i.e. male) members of CAMP but was prepared to attend an open meeting on Saturday 16 June. (183) The reply embodied a subtle but important shift. Rather than have a regular CWA meeting invaded by men demanding an explanation for their exclusion and putting the CWA on the defensive, the CWA expressed a willingness to attend an open meeting where complaints from men that they were not allowed to attend CWA meetings without special invitation could be made to look ridiculously petty. Come June 16, however, CAMP had lost its clubroom (184) and the proposed meeting was postponed until new clubrooms could be obtained. The decision to postpone a discussion of CWA exclusion of men was somewhat of an anti-climax to a looming confrontation which could have resulted in the CWA secession that had been rejected a month earlier. From June onwards, when the CWA met, it did so at Women's House, to which all men were denied entry. (185)

It was in the middle of all this wrangling over the position of the CWA that I received a telephone call from McConaghy. On 9 April he rang wanting to know if I was sure that I did not want to present a paper at his Conference; I assured him that I did not. In reply to his query as to

Hauber, Sue Wills, Abstention: Margaret McMann.

(179) I refused to vote on the question of who should be sent to Adelaide at the Branch's expense on the grounds that I had voted against anybody being sent at all. Had I voted for Watson, he still would not have won; his margin of defeat would have been reduced, no more.

(180) For Bonsall-Boone: Chris Stahl, Gaby Antolovich, Lance Gowland, Margaret McMann. For Watson: Monika Hauber, Jan Davis.

(181) The motion for special purpose group status for the CWA was moved Margaret McMann: second Sue Wills. Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) 8 May, 1973 op. cit. Watson's "gravest reservations" were not actually recorded in the minutes.


(183) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge. 2 June, 1973.

(184) The Leichhardt Municipal Council meeting of 12 June had decided to "authorise prosecution proceedings if there is a recurrence of any illegal use of premises known as No.10 David Street, Forest Lodge". Quoted in Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain, 16 June, 1973. The illegal use was that of a 'commercial' club operating in a residentially zoned area. Complaints from neighbours about the noise from the juke box had been lodged with the Council.

(185) The Executive of CAMP held no meetings between 16 June and 5 September, 1973.
whether there was anybody else in CAMP who might be interested in doing so, I suggested that he
write to CAMP, through me, officially inviting CAMP to provide a speaker; I would present his
request to the Executive of CAMP which had the authority to make such decisions. (186)
McConaghy's letter (187) was presented to the Executive meeting of 17 April (which I was unable
to attend) and the meeting decided that "Under the structure provided, CAMP is not willing to
participate, in line with other organizations". (188) Any chance McConaghy did have to secure a
speaker from CAMP, he destroyed by the reference he made to CAMP as having (by implication of
context) less militant aims than Gay Liberation. As I pointed out to him in my reply on behalf
of CAMP

If our stance on this matter somewhat belies your assumption that CAMP
is a conservative homosexual organization, so much the better. (189)

The emergence of the new leadership coterie and the gradual change of style in CAMP both of
which were associated with the development of Phone-A-Friend is much harder to document
than the changes in the CWA. There are no decisive events, no isolable incidents, which can be
used as marking posts: instead there was the most subtle rechanneling of energies into PAF; of
people who had been members of CAMP for some time but not been very actively involved in
anything before; of people such as Bonsall-Boone, de Waal, and Woodward, who had been active
but became much more interested in PAF; and of people who were new to the organization and
found it an attractive group to join.

Phone-A-Friend grew out of the conjunction of two events in November, 1972. The first
was CAMP's attempt to set up a meeting with Rev Alan Walker, Director of the Central Methodist
Mission which ran the telephone counselling service, Life Line. We had been told by several people,
some from interstate, that when they had telephoned Life Line asking for information about
homosexual organizations in Sydney, they had been told by the counsellors that they knew of no
such organizations. To check the accuracy of these reports several CWA members had rung
Life Line and asked for telephone numbers and addresses of homosexual groups in Sydney. In
every case we were first told that there were no such groups and then offered counselling for
our 'problem' — either then and there over the telephone or by appointment with one of their
face-to-face counsellors. Armed with this information, on 6 November, 1972, I wrote to Alan
Walker asking him to meet with representatives from CAMP and Gay Liberation. I reminded him
that in both Canberra and Melbourne Life Line was only too willing to refer callers to homosexual
organizations in those cities, enclosed an HGS brochure, and asked that he contact CAMP to set
up a meeting to discuss how Life Line, CAMP and Gay Liberation could work together to help
homosexuals "for ultimately it is the individual homosexual — not Life Line, CAMP, or Gay
Liberation — who looses out if he or she cannot contact other homosexuals for reassurance that
they are not alone in a world which is hostile to homosexuals". (190) My letter went unanswered.

The second event which acted as a spur to the formation of PAF was Chris Stahl's joining
of CAMP. A Swede who had been involved in a homosexual telephone referral service in Sweden,
Stahl brought the idea, the know-how, and the energy to start setting up a similar service in Sydney.

(186) The route that his invitation was to reach CAMP was deliberately structured to go through me because,
in fact, if somebody who was a member of CAMP did decide that they wanted to give a paper to his Conference,
there was absolutely nothing that the Executive (or anybody else) could have done to prevent them. In addition,
given the shift in the balance of power that was going on in CAMP, neither Watson nor I were at all sure that
somebody would not accept the invitation.


(188) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain. 17 April, 1973.


Stahl's point of entry into CAMP, as for many newcomers at that time, was through people associated with the church group and he also formed strong friendship ties with these people. At the time, CAMP had no clubrooms and the church group as well as the executive held meetings at 16 Terry Street, Balmain. This was the home of Bonsall-Boone and de Waal. Bonsall-Boone, as Secretary of CAMP collected the mail from CAMP's post office box and answered the general enquiries and their was the telephone number given out for general branch and membership business.

PAF's association with HGS, the group with which it might be thought to have most in common, was initially weak and then defensive. At first, I was marginally involved with PAF at their request; in part because of my involvement with HGS but for other reasons as well. PAF's initial approach was undoubtedly sparked by my pursuit of Life Line's apparent unwillingness to talk to CAMP. On 9 February 1973 The Australian's Perspective column had run a news item on Life Line's refusal to accept a Jewish man's application to become a telephone counsellor on the grounds that Life Line was a Christian organization. I took the opportunity to contact an acquaintance who was working for The Australian and asked whether he would like to follow up that story with another on Life Line - it didn't want to know about homosexuals either. The item appeared on 20 February and the ABC evening current affairs programme PM picked up the story and interviewed Alan Walker. Walker stated that he felt that there was a basic contradiction between being a practising homosexual and a practising christian; he also denied ever having received my letter and suggested that CAMP write to him again. On radio I spoke of the experiences of many who had telephoned Life Line and not been given the information they sought, and stated that CAMP would indeed write to him again - and send the letter by registered mail this time.

It was undoubtedly this media exposure that prompted the PAF meeting two days later to decide to approach me to become the group's Press Officer. I declined the invitation for two sets of reasons: first, it would take up too much of my time for it would involve keeping myself informed of the group's activities, compiling lists of persons to be contacted, and attending PAF committee meetings; and secondly, I was becoming uneasy about the way people in PAF seemed to be approaching the idea of a telephone answering service. As part of HGS, I was, with the others in that group, working towards a clear recognition of the dilemmas of offering people 'help', of the power relationships involved in such situations, and that most of the people who contacted HGS were best served by redirecting them to other groups within CAMP. I was now being asked to join a group of people who were unwilling to acknowledge that any such difficulties existed and who seemed intent on setting up barriers not only between callers and telephone operators but between members of the group itself.

The within-group distinction was between supervisors and operators. Initially, there were only three supervisors - Bonsall-Boone, myself, and Barry Sherlock - although the grounds that were used to distinguish us from other members of the group were difficult to fathom. I agreed to act in the capacity of supervisor for a short period because it seemed, at first, to mean very little beyond being available by telephone for a block of several hours a weekend in case any

(191) "Pray it again, Sam" The Australian. 9 February, 1973.
(193) "The position [of Press Officer] was discussed at some length. The meeting decided that it was necessary for the Press Officer to be available by phone both day and night. Sue Wills, not present at the meeting, is to be approached about the position of Press Officer." Minutes of Meeting of Phone-A-Friend. 22 February, 1973.
of the operators needed advice on what to do about a particular caller. Given that most of the PAF operators I knew seemed to possess what I thought were the basic qualifications—commonsense and patience—I did not envisage being called upon to act in a supervisory capacity much at all; indeed, I never was. Early in March, however, I learned that supervisors were expected to perform another task which I found both unpleasant and presumptuous; this was the 'screening' of potential PAF operators. I agreed only once to perform this duty. On 15 March Bonsall-Boone and I 'screened' three people: the first was the third supervisor whom I informed that the Wayside Chapel's Crisis Centre (whom he had claimed to have worked for) had never heard of him and who Bonsall-Boone informed that other PAF members were antagonistic toward him and that perhaps he should look to becoming involved in another group in CAMP; the second was a woman who was told by Bonsall-Boone and Stahl that she was unacceptable because other group members had reported that she could not 'keep her cool'; and the third was the man who would be elected Treasurer of CAMP in April, Richard Hollamby, who was found acceptable.

What was most disturbing was the way in which the personal likes and dislikes of other group members seemed to count for so much in the screening process. While they may be important in group meetings they seemed totally irrelevant to determining the suitability or otherwise of people whose main involvement in PAF would require them to sit in a room by themselves (or with one other person) for hours on end waiting for the telephone to ring. And if they were important in group meetings then it was equally important that they be faced and dealt with at that level rather than through a process by which personal likes and dislikes were relabelled 'professional unsuitability'.

What I, and others such as Ware and Watson, found unpalatable about PAF and the way it appeared to be developing, others found very attractive and PAF did draw a lot of people to it. Its attractiveness was understandable because it offered members of CAMP many things that other groups did not. It offered them clear directives on what to do, when, and how to do it; compared with other groups in CAMP, PAF offered orderly, almost regimented, participation. For those who feared that involvement in CAMP would entail coming out, PAF offered participation which was totally anonymous as far as the outside world was concerned and which provided instant feedback—thanks from a grateful caller—on the value of their contribution. And it offered them somebody, the supervisor, to fall back on if they were in doubt. In addition, Stahl offered PAF members something which was equally important—a sense of themselves as a special group of dedicated people. PAF operators were chosen from amongst applicants; they had to be approved and found suitable for what was portrayed as a position of responsibility requiring a special type of person. (194) Those chosen were then trained and given special knowledge, even though some of it was unlikely to be called on very often—their first training session was aimed at helping them deal with any necrophiliacs who rang up (195); their second discussed the legal aspects of callers who wanted to masturbate whilst on the telephone to PAF operators. (196) Additionally, all PAF operators were required to sign a 'secrecy agreement' drawn up by a solicitor which forbade them to discuss with anyone outside of PAF "Any details of telephone conversations or meetings". (197) But there was another side to these inducements to join PAF and that was the 'punishment' threatened for failure to take the responsibility seriously:

(194) In giving the reason for interviews Stahl wrote: "It is unfair to have someone on the training program as we more or less think will not be suitable for the service." Minutes of Meeting of Phone-A-Friend. 8 March, 1973.
The Warning System.
This system means that if a person will not turn up for a shift he/she is rostered on for he will get a warning, if it happens (sic) again within one year the person will have to give a reason, if not the reason is good enough the person will be told to leave. Why is this so? We are all working voluntary and it is so little as are required to do if you can't do a shift, it is just to make a phone call to a supervisor and let him/her know. It is irresponsible to other Friends to not turn up. (198)

There were obvious advantages for the PAF committee members as well. Being involved in the establishment of the group put them in the position of being able to set the rules of participation in the group and determine the criteria, unspecified as they were, of suitability. There was another attraction too and this was that none of the 'Sydney heavies' was at all interested in PAF. For people like Brian Woodward, Peter Bonsall-Boone, Peter de Waal, and members of Cross Section, all of whom at one time or another had been criticized, not taken seriously, or found ideologically unsound, by 'the heavies', PAF became a separate power base with its own resources – the ability to attract members and donations, and an air of actually doing something which could be 'measured' by the number of phone calls it received. What it could not do, however, was to attract media interest. The press release which announced PAF's commencement of operations on Friday 13 April 1973 (199) was sent out to 40 media people and the only coverage it received was two radio broadcasts. (200)

The number of PAF operators fluctuated. Stahl wanted to have one male and one female operator on duty at all times the service was working – 6 pm Friday to 6 am Monday. He encouraged people to join by constantly publishing comparative figures:

8 March: 11 males and 7 females (201)
25 March: 14 males and 15 females (202)
April: 30 members both male and female (203)

And then in May, in the aftermath of the CWA struggles, but not as a strategic manoeuvre, a large number of women operators left PAF. (204)

Despite the difficulties of poor media coverage and fluctuating numbers of operators, PAF gradually became more well known: over its first weekend of operations it received 20 phone calls; (205) by the end of the second weekend, 48 (206) and by August, PAF had received 600 calls. (207) Part of the increase may be attributable to the fact that Life Line eventually did agree to refer homosexual callers to PAF.

Following the invitation Walker issued over radio on 20 February, I wrote to him on 5 March, enclosing a copy of my original letter and requesting an appointment. (208) Walker replied on 29 March asking that we make an appointment to see the Director of Life Line, Rev Mal Leask, and himself. (209)

(200) These were Macquarie Network 2GB and the ABC. See CAMP Newsletter. Vol 2 No. 1. 11 May, 1973.
(203) Papers for Annual General Meeting of CAMP (NSW) 30 April, 1973.
(204) "As you know that we have been rostering male-female on the same shift. As we now have very few female friends in our group it is at present impossible to roster two friends at the same shift." Phone-A-Friend Newsletter. No. 5. 5 May, 1973.
(206) Papers for Annual General meeting... op. cit.
both Leask and Walker could be present and it was not until May 1973 that this was possible. In the meantime CWA members rang Life Line to test the range of responses of their telephone operators to a variety of fabricated stories: some sought information about lesbian or male homosexual organizations, others made up tales of trouble with parents, doubts about whether they were lesbian or not, broken love affairs and being runaway school children. In all but one instance, the responses were the same: no information, advice to 'give it up' because it was not normal, and the suggestion that the callers come in for counselling; the one exception was a male counsellor who became very eager to learn what lesbians 'actually did together'.

I met with Walker, Leask, and the General Secretary of Life Line, 'Henderson, for almost two hours on the afternoon of Tuesday 29 May, 1973. Walker was adamant that there was a fundamental conflict between being Christian and being homosexual and was totally impervious to any suggestion that homosexual women and men should not be offered counselling to 'give it up'. He listened woodenly as I outlined the nature of CAMP and the services it offered to homosexuals. The only thing I said which provoked some response of concern in him was that at least one of his counsellors was using the service for somewhat voyeuristic ends. Leask, on the other hand, was far more receptive to the idea that Life Line counsellors be allowed to refer homosexual callers to Phone-A-Friend and that the next training session for Life Line counsellors should include some discussion of CAMP, provided by people from CAMP. In the face of the obvious differences between Walker and Leask it was fortunate that Walker did not appear to want to interfere in the day to day running of Life Line; and once outside Walker's office, Leask asked me to send him information about CAMP and its activities. (210) A subsequent telephone conversation with Leask confirmed our agreement, the main point of which was that PAF's telephone number would be displayed on the wall of the telephone counsellors' room at Life Line and that counsellors would be allowed to refer people to CAMP through PAF. (211) Periodic spot checks carried out by CAMP confirmed that Life Line counsellors were indeed referring people to PAF.

Until the end of 1973 the status of PAF was ambiguous. The very things that made it attractive to its members made it appear unacceptable, even threatening, to non-members. There was some questioning of its need for what was seen as excessive secrecy and a ridiculing of the extremes to which this was taken; and the motives of the volunteer operators were sometimes regarded with suspicion -- it was often referred to as Phone-A-Fuck, and not entirely in jest. PAF's seemingly constant (compared with other groups) requests for money were seen as an attempt at empire building and blocked wherever possible: PAF could operate a separate bank account only insofar as that was necessary for it to be registered as a charity(212); PAF operators were not to accept reverse charge phone calls (213); discussions of an allocation of $25 for PAF to purchase a filing cabinet were deferred (214); discussions of PAF finances referring to telephone installations were deferred (215); a PAF operator was not to be reimbursed

(210) This I did. Wills to Leask. 21 July, 1973 Document No. 129.
(211) For other details of the agreement see WILLS, Sue: Report to CAMP (NSW Branch) Executive on Sue Wills and Life Line. 2 June, 1973. Document No. 130.
(212) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge on 3 March, 1973.
(213) Ibid.
(214) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain on 24 April, 1973.
(215) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain on 8 May, 1973.
$2 for transport to an emergency case (216); and PAF was to be allowed a $20 petty cash float which was not to be used for wages or petrol. (217) But PAF, through determination and dedication, did establish itself and it slowly began to expand its hours of operation. More importantly perhaps, the image of PAF, 'the friendly voice offering help and information over the telephone', began to compete with the image of CAMP as an organization dedicated to political action, as the image of the entire organization.

Set in the context of the two major internal changes that were being acted out within CAMP during 1973, McConaghy’s Conference was not of major significance to CAMP as a whole. To some individuals within the organization ensuring that CAMP would officially refuse to participate, in solidarity with the other liberation movements, was important but it was not difficult to achieve.

(216) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 10 David Street, Forest Lodge on 19 May, 1973.
(217) Ibid.
SYDNEY GAY LIBERATION

In 1973 Sydney Gay Liberation experienced pressures for change similar to those felt by CAMP: the emergence of a new group of leaders and the disaffection of the women members of the movement. The way that these pressures were handled in Gay Liberation was affected not only by the less structured form the movement took but also by the order in which they had to be dealt with. In CAMP the struggles of the women's group with the sexism of the male members of the organization came to a head with clearly defined positions while the new leadership group associated with PAF was still in its emergent stage. In Gay Liberation, the struggle between old and new leadership groups came first, with many of the women remaining involved in Gay Liberation only until some of their male contemporaries left, making the sexism of the new leadership stand out more starkly. Again, there were differences between CAMP and Gay Liberation in terms of which group of leaders took the initiative in new areas of activity. In CAMP it had been the new leaders who started PAF; in Gay Liberation it was the old group of leaders who took the initiative and formed themselves into the 'pissed off activists' to plan (even if they were unable to carry all their plans to fruition), a series of terrorist activities, and, by comparison, the new leaders looked as if they had become stuck at the initial consciousness raising stage.

While CAMP had been much more active in attacking psychiatrists in general and McConaghy in particular, throughout 1972, in 1973 this role was taken over by Gay Liberation, and especially by the pissed off activists, some of whom were also involved in the anti-psychiatry discussions organized by people like Liz Fell and in Robin Winkler's pseudo-patient research work.

The leadership changes, or more properly, the failure of the new leadership group to acquire a following, had their effect relatively quickly in Gay Liberation. Sydney Gay Liberation formally ceased to exist on 20 October 1973. It was to be replaced by the Gay Liberation Front, a loose coalition of totally autonomous groups which would meet together as the GLF once a month. But April 1974 saw the last edition of the Gay Liberation Newsletter and the disappearance of the Front, its totally autonomous groups left to function without their umbrella organization, and then to disintegrate.
MCCONAGHY SENDS INVITATION TO GAY LIBERATION ASKING THEM TO PROVIDE A SPEAKER FOR HIS CONFERENCE

Zap Action: Open affection between Gay Liberation men in city and at Manly surf carnival.

Combined Sydney-Melbourne edition of Gay Liberation Newsletter

"Return to Minto" Gay Liberation Week.

Orientation Week activities by Sydney and NSW Universities Gay Liberation groups.

ALTMAN DECLINES MCCONAGHY'S INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS CONFERENCE

Zap actions: Rex Hotel, Kings Cross; Cock and Bull Bar, Bondi Junction.

Pissed off activists begin to meet at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale.

"Return to Minto" Gay Liberation Week.

Orientation Week activities by Sydney and NSW Universities Gay Liberation groups.

Zap actions: Rex Hotel, Kings Cross; Cock and Bull Bar, Bondi Junction.

Pissed off activists begin to meet at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale.

Pissed off activists discuss McConaghy Plan.

John Lee and Rod Byatt on reconnaissance mission to Prince Henry Hospital

JOINT MEETING OF THOSE CONCERNED WITH MCCONAGHY'S INVITATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS CONFERENCE

Pissed off activists shift meeting place to 4 Wigram Road, Glebe.

Zap Action: leafletting the Sydney University Union Theatre screening The Gay Deceivers.

Senator Lionel Murphy "raids" ASIO Headquarters in Melbourne

MCCONAGHY WRITES TO JOINT MEETING CLARIFYING NATURE OF CONFERENCE

Jugoslav Premier Bijedic in Australia on official visit.

Pam Stein's correspondence returned by Commonwealth Police

Pissed off activists call off McConaghy Plan

Planning commences for production of national newspaper Radical Homosexual

Gay Liberation informed that they have to vacate 67 Glebe Point Rd., Glebe

Are You A Poofter? leaflet distributed to school children

Anton Veenstra attends CAMP Executive meeting as first Gay Liberation representative.

Gay Liberation reassessment meeting

Special anti-psychiatry edition of National U

Gay Liberation begins to meet at 10 'David Street, Forest Lodge.

Gay Liberation Fund Raising Dance for Radical Homosexual

Sydney Gay Liberation 'heavies' leave for Melbourne for newspaper

CAMP Executive approves wording for joint CAMP - Gay Liberation sticker

Zap Action: Leafletting the Domain

CAMP and Gay Liberation move out of 10 David Street, Forest Lodge.

Press release about expulsion of student Jeremy Fisher from Menzies College, Macquarie University issued by Gay Liberation.

Demonstration at Macquarie University in support of Jeremy Fisher.

Pissed off activists begin to meet at 14 Australia Street, Camperdown.
The way that most Gay Liberationists found out that McConaghy had sent an invitation to Sydney Gay Liberation asking them to provide a speaker for his conference was to see it published in the joint Sydney-Melbourne edition of the Gay Liberation Newsletter of January, 1973. Handwritten across the top of the published version were the words "INVITATION FROM A FRIEND!" and at the bottom, a very rough sketch of a terrified looking head emitted the cry "ARRGH!". And typed across the bottom of the page was:

"Obviously, whether or not Gay Lib sends a speaker will have to be decided at a Caucus. This is an issue on which it would be valuable to have a common attitude with Women's Lib. (218)"

And there, for a while, the matter rested.

January 1973 in Sydney was no more conducive to political activity for Gay Liberation than it was for Women's Liberation or CAMP. The only activity that was organized in January reflected the fact that it was the holiday season: three male members of the Gay Liberation Zap Group spent the morning of Saturday, 17th riding around on the city circle train openly expressing affection with each other and talking to people about Gay Liberation and then repeated the same performance at a Surf Carnival at Manly in the afternoon. (219) Plans were underway, however, to try to repeat the success of the Gay Liberation Weekend of 16-17 December, 1972 at Minto (220) with a "Return to Minto" Week to be held Friday 16 - Friday 23 February, 1973. (221)

Reports of how successful the December 1972 weekend had been had prompted many people to join Gay Liberation and go to Minto in February with very high expectations. But by the end of the first weekend of the proposed week, the enormous gaps that separated women from men and the old members from the new, turned the "Return to Minto" into a very divisive event. After exercising what they saw as considerable restraint and patience, the women present, all of them long time members of Gay Liberation, could contain themselves no longer. The particular provocation was the prospect of having to sit through a long and

tedious analysis from a newer member of Gay Liberation as to why he was a homosexual.

*Pam Stein:* It was a result of some guy getting up and giving a paper on 'why I am a homosexual'... and it was the typical sort of Freudian analysis... and it was long and it was boring and we just didn't want to hear it. We knew we were all poofers and we wanted to get on to more important things... There was this fellow, who I think must have been his boyfriend, who kept protecting him all the time... he was terribly queenie and also kept putting us down, putting the women down all the time... And this guy was desperate to do his paper... and we just didn't want to list to it cause... What was more important to us was the guys and the women getting together who had some sort of common interest.

We ended up reading out the SCUM Manifesto and leaving. One guy came up to us and said "That is fantastic", you know, and he just didn't realize the implications of it...

And from the point of view of one of the men who had been involved in organizing the week:

*Rod Byott:* At that weekend the women got up and disrupted the whole thing... said their piece and just left the whole thing in complete chaos.

Even before the February week, however, tensions had already begun to build up between those who had been active in Gay Liberation for a long time and those who were new to the movement.

*John Lee:* ... everybody stopped going to those mass meetings where people used to start of on "what is sexism", the hard core people got absolutely fed up.

Gay Liberation, Women's Liberation and to some extent CAMP had always found it difficult to integrate new people into the existing groups. The process of consciousness raising cannot be short circuited by new people being told how to leap a few steps and catch up with those who have already gone through it; nor can those who have been through a year of development be expected to mark time waiting for them to do so. And it is not simply a problem created by consciousness raising. Strong friendship networks of people who have not merely known each other for years, but have lived and worked together, come out together, demonstrated and marched together, set up their own, for the most part, not consciously constructed, barriers to entry.

In January 1973, the problem was not new to Gay Liberation; what made it unbearable was the size of the influx of new people. The initial response of the older members was to stay away from the meetings held at the centre, 67 Glebe Point Road. The Minto fiasco acted like a 'last straw' and prompted them to form a distinct group which decided that it would not meet at the centre nor officially call itself Gay Liberation. And 'the pissed off

---

(222) TRANSCRIPT: *Interview with Pam Stein.* The SCUM Manifesto (Society for Cutting Up Men) was written by American feminist Valerie Solanas and, given its contents, Stein was justified in believing that he had not realized its implications. It begins: “Life in this society, being, at best, an utter bore and no aspect of society being at all relevant to women, there remains to civic minded, responsible thrill seeking females only to overthrow the government, eliminate the money system, institute complete automation and destroy the male sex... The male is a biological accident: the Y (male) gene is an incomplete X (female) gene... In other words, the male is an incomplete female, a walking abortion, aborted at the gene stage. To be male is to be deficient and emotionally limited... He is a half dead, unresponsive lump... he is at best an utter bore, an inoffensive blob... Although completely physical, the male is unfit even for stud service..." The Manifesto continues in this vein for another 10,000 words. SOLANAS, Valerie: S.C.U.M. society. *for.cutting.up.men. MANIFESTO.* (1967) Reprinted by herstory press. Wellington, N.Z. 1977. pp 3-4.

(223) TRANSCRIPT: *Interview with Rod Byatt.* Of the Gay Liberationists interviewed Byatt was the only one whose perceptions of his position amongst the pissed off activists was markedly at variance with how that position was seen by others. He saw himself as part of the core group of radicals, none of the others did.

(224) TRANSCRIPT: *Interview with John Lee.*
activists', as they called themselves, (225) began to meet in private homes toward the end of February, 1973.

The 'official' Gay Liberation was holding its regular consciousness raising meetings at the centre, into which four Gay Liberationists had moved to live at the end of January (226) As well as the consciousness raising groups, a series of actions were organized by the Zap group in February. Orientation weeks at the Universities of Sydney and NSW provided an opportunity for some of the newer people to acquire some leafleting experience in a relatively non-threatening atmosphere. (227) Further, there were two zap actions, both of which were directed at Hotels: the Cock and Bull Bar at Bondi Junction was zapped because "a barman was (believed) sacked for not refusing to serve homosexuals" (228); and the Rex Hotel at Kings Cross was zapped after Aborigines had been bashed at the Hotel. (229)

While the 'official' Gay Liberation was meeting weekly at the centre, the pissed off activists, meeting first at Pam Stein's home at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale, were experiencing difficulties of their own. In the first place, they were unable to control just how far the word of mouth system of inviting people to be part of the group would extend:

Rod Byatt: The whole thing was that it was supposed to be a secret, that no one who was presently going to Gay Lib meetings was supposed to know about it. So it was all by word of mouth and that what mustn't happen, what shouldn't happen was that people who were going to the [Gay Lib] meetings this sort of half, shouldn't know about it. (230)

Byatt was not even sure that he would be welcome:

Rod Byatt: I was going to meetings because I was living there ... And John Lee told Richard [Wilson] and Richard told me. Richard and I were very sort of close at that time because we were organizing things at Sydney University ... I don't know whether Pam [Stein], for instance, would have approved of my going or Richard going because we were obviously sort of involved at that [Minto] Conference and I was [living] at the centre. ... (231)

Discussions with some of those involved put the number of pissed off activists at between 10 and 15 people. The five members of the group I interviewed in 1974, during the course of their interviews named various other participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names Given</th>
<th>Rod Byatt</th>
<th>Paul Foss</th>
<th>John Lee</th>
<th>Barry Prothero</th>
<th>Pam Stein</th>
<th>Number of People Named By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Byatt</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Foss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Gowland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Kelly</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Lippman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Loftus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McDiamid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy O'Rourke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine O'Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Prothero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Stein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Names Given | 9         | 12        | 11        | 14        | 12        | (232)
Invitations had been issued, initially by Pam Stein and John Lee, and the process had snowballed, against their original intentions:

Pam Stein: It was the last ditched effort, you know, to make the thing, the goals of Gay Liberation work, somehow. And we thought we were being very elitist but we thought it was time we had to and other people could go to Gay Liberation meetings and carry on the same there, and maybe, one day they could get to where we were, sort of thing... (233)

As to what the pissed off activists would do:

Pam Stein: We had lots of different thoughts on whether we should put out a newspaper and things like that and it was always in the air. But it was mainly sort of discussions about terrorist activities, you know. You could say they were terrorist activities... I think it was mainly the women who wanted to do some terrorist activities and let people know there was a group that had actually done it and that it wasn't just some sort of vandals. (234)

Paul Foss: ... there was at that period, general consensus that we were sort of self styled anarchists and we were going to disrupt the system as much as possible and provoke some sort of conflict. (235)

Barry Prothero: ... we did see the action thing as a consciousness raising thing as well. Most of the discussion was about the political implications of the actions that we were considering and through planning action we were trying to develop a fuller understanding of what the situation was that we were in and what was going on politically and socially. I suppose that's a kind of consciousness raising as well. (236)

Given the nature of the type of activity that was being contemplated, some means of sifting out those people who had doubts had to be worked out:

Barry Prothero: There were people who were at the first meeting and when they heard the kinds of things being discussed there, found that they didn't agree with them; they didn't think they should be done and they really didn't want to be involved in those actions. (237)

Pam Stein: I tried to keep Frank Taylor out because... I thought that he was incredibly wishy-washy like, as a person and that he didn't want any terrorist activities and I thought, shit, that's the reason we're here anyway... When Frank came he always said, "No, I don't want to do it". And everybody, of course, trying to be very brotherly and sisterly would say, "Alright Frank, say what you've got to say" and we'd listen and the whole meeting would sort of turn into a "but Frank, don't you think..." (238)
Frank Taylor was only one of several who were 'discouraged' from attending future meetings:

Paul Foss: ... they were pushed out, quite deliberately pushed out ... made to feel they weren't radical enough or that they didn't have similar sorts of beliefs and, you know, "what are you doing here, you know, if you're not interested in this? Why come?" (239)

Rod Byatt: ... we just developed that technique of just alienating people by talking above their heads. (240)

Ultimately, because of the difficulties involved, and the time that was felt to be being wasted, there was only one solution

Pam Stein: ... we could sway people one week and then during the week they'd start thinking about it and then they'd come back and people's minds would, sort of, be changed on the matter ... and we decided that because there was quite a few people coming and going into the group and they wouldn't come back next week and things like that, we decided to split into groups and we wouldn't even tell each other what we were going to do until it was finished. (241)

Sparked by the invitation Gay Liberation had received in January, 1973, one of the first plans the pissed off activists discussed was to destroy McConaghy's aversion therapy equipment. Altman, they knew, had been contacted on 28 February by McConaghy (242) and asked to present a paper, not as a representative of any organization, but as an individual – one who happened to have written *Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation*. And he had, they knew, flatly refused:

Dennls Altman: I always thought I shouldn't go as an individual because I was very uneasy that it might be used in some way to justify or legitimate McConaghy. (243)

The plan to destroy McConaghy's equipment (the McConaghy Plan) was discussed over the period late February - mid March. The groups had not formed with the specific aim of destroying his equipment: rather, it had formed to carry out terrorist activities and McConaghy's Conference gave them an idea for one of the terrorist activities they could carry out.

Rod Byatt: Well, the idea that came up was that well, the discussion went from the letter [invitation] to I think, your work, details of people's sort of experiences and how they'd sort of come up against a brick wall every time they went to see him. He just couldn't sort of be approached. There was this idea of some sort of sabotage, that we actually go out there and more or less break, smash up his equipment. I think someone mentioned at the time that most of his stuff was imported so that it, the idea was that it would take three or four months before he could get back into action again. (244)
And the actual break in and smash up would be timed to coincide with the Conference. The McConaghy Plan, however, turned out to be a very good example of how not to plan terrorist activities. For a start, the necessary secrecy was totally absent:

John Lee: The whole thing was sort of farcical anyway because no one could sort of keep their mouths shut, certain people couldn’t. I mean, within a week of that McConaghy thing starting, it was all over Sydney. (245)

And then the respect for the private property of others that 20 or more years of socialization had inculcated had to be overcome:

Pam Stein: ... he [Frank Taylor] didn’t want to hurt anybody. We weren’t going to hurt anybody. He even thought that destroying McConaghy’s things was hurting him ... we shouldn’t destroy private property and stuff like that. (246)

But the plan did get beyond the mere talking stage - just. John Lee and Rod Byatt went to Prince Henry Hospital on Wednesday afternoon 7 March on a reconnaissance mission:

Rod Byatt: We just caught a bus out there. I had no idea where it was ... We wandered in. We found a map of the place as soon as we got there. We spent quite a while just hunting around buildings just trying to find out where he was. We eventually found where the block where his office was. And having established that we went around and I think back towards the fence ... more or less trying to find out where we could get away; the get-away, more or less. There was a road running along the back and it seemed perfect. We'd just sort of walk into the place and just sneak out the back over the fence ... It seemed quite feasible. See the thing was we didn't have a camera at the time and I think I even suggested we come back with a camera just to sort of prove to the others that it could be done. I think at one stage we actually went up into the building and as far as the receptionist's office ... The whole thing was that we'd go in there and leave notes ... And we were trying to visualize how it was going to be written up in the papers. It was going to be this secret vengeance type thing, you know. It seemed perfectly feasible to me ... (247)

John Lee's version of the afternoon's activities contradicts Byatt's on minor points only:

John Lee: we actually sort of went out there to Prince Henry and sort of stalked around in the bushes. It was all very romantic ... Jeff [Hill] drew us a complex sort of map of where it was and posted it up [from Melbourne]. So we went out there and checked it up. We didn’t get into the building to actually sort of look at the equipment we just went out there and hid in the bushes and waited all afternoon ... We just lay there in those funny bushes, you know, that funny sort of scrub, until it got dark, just to see what kind of people were hanging around. We had various things worked out. We knew some people who were in that Clinical Sciences Building and we were going to find out what sort of hours the cleaners had. We checked all the windows out and that they were sort of very easy to break but that’s as far as it got. We had a map and notes ... and we had a sort of press release all sort of worked out. (248)

see if it was possible to get some information out of the files for publication". TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.

(245) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with John Lee.
(246) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
(247) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
(248) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit. The discrepancies between the two accounts are minor, the most noticeable being the existence or otherwise of a map provided by Jeff Hill who had undergone a course of aversion therapy with McConaghy. See [HILL] JEFF: “Aversion Therapy” Gay Rays. December, 1972 pp 6-7. As an interviewee Lee admitted that his memory for details and times was appalling. Byatt, on the other hand had an accurate memory for details which was in no way affected by the differences between how he and others assessed his importance to the group. Additionally, none of the other interviewees knew of the map. As Paul Foss remarked, “Maybe John thought he’d ask him for that”. TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
On the Sunday (11 March) after the reconnaissance mission, the joint meeting of those invited to participate in the McConaghy Conference was held. Both 'official' Gay Liberation and pissed off activist representatives were present at the meeting and signed the letter to be sent registered mail to McConaghy on 12 March. And once the meeting was over, and the letter sent, it was pushed into the background by other events.

The McConaghy Plan itself seemed to lose momentum after refusal to participate in his Conference had been decided upon. Nothing further was done until it was officially called off. And the end of March, 1973, Pam Stein, who taught school at Doonside, received a telephone call at the school:

Pam Stein: ... some little man said, "Your letters will be forwarded to you from Canberra, we've been withholding them". And I said, "Oh yeah, who said?" And they said, "The Commonwealth Police have been withholding your letters". And the only letters I'd been getting were from my mother ... And I got a whole pile of letters all of a sudden, from the Women's Movement ... Apparently it happened to lots of people, a lot of people who were members of various things to do with left wing movements. It was very strange ... And I talked to Judy MacKinlofty whose husband is a lecturer in Law at Sydney Uni and I said, "You know, what the hell can I do about this?" And she contacted her husband to see what we could do and he said, "Nothing" ... I didn't really mind, actually, I got all my letters back. (249)

Stein had written letters to a teacher friend away at a National Fitness Camp week and she had written of the progress made in the McConaghy Plan. The woman to whom she had written had also had her mail intercepted. Although no reason was ever given as to why the Commonwealth Police had intercepted their mail, the most likely reason, and the only one which Stein herself could think of, was that it was part of the excessive security which surrounded the two day visit to Australia of the Jugoslav Premier Bijedic on March 20-22, 1973. The visit occurred at a time when fears that Ustasha Croatian terrorist organizations existed in Australia were widespread and had prompted Labor Attorney General Lionel Murphey to 'raid' the headquarters of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization (ASIO) in Melbourne; he was, as Minister in charge of ASIO, dissatisfied with the information the organization was passing on to him.

It is not unlikely that the news of the Commonwealth Police's seizure of Stein's mail was received with some relief by those who felt that they had their reputations as real radicals staked on going through with the McConaghy Plan, a plan which was ill researched and too widely known.

Pam Stein: I don't think anybody really wanted to go through with the plans ... to bash up McConaghy's equipment ... It seemed to me that there were lots of excuses ... There was a guy who'd been in there himself and they said they were still going to do it afterwards, you know ... we'll go away in a group and just do it - but nothing happened. (250)

John Lee: There was Terry [Rolfe], Paul [Foss], Christine [O'Sullivan], me - about five of us who could have pulled it off really ... The trouble was that it got extended into this fairly ragged edged kind of group with 12 or 15 people and we weren't really sure who was in it ... He [Rod Byatt] freaked out completely ... he just completely freaked out at the idea, when it looked as if it might actually become a reality - when we'd actually gone this far, of actually checking out the windows. (251)
Paul Foss: I might be sort of self-indulging, but I don’t really think so, but I think the reason why the whole thing ended was because John [Lee] and I and the two Davids [Martin and McDiamid] went to Melbourne and we were all in the group . . . I think he [Rod Byatt] was certainly disturbed about what was going on. There were other plans . . . We also started to go out on a number of occasions to go out and do some spray painting but we never did any of that. We never did anything really . . . I think that the main function of the groups may have been, I don’t know how to explain it, to promote some sort of invariance principle. You know, that we all have the same visions of the world, that was the main purpose . . . All those people in that meeting hadn’t been doing anything reasonably violent except Trudy [Lippman] . . . David Martin and myself . . . I know myself, I was perfectly willing to do any of those things. I don’t think anybody else was. I don’t think John [Lee] was. I really don’t think John was. And I think David McDiamid was fairly unquiescent. (252)

Rod Byatt: . . . if anyone was going to do anything it was probably going to be John [Lee] and the women, Pam Stein.

Q: Why not you?

Rod Byatt: Well, I mean, I was terribly enthusiastic. I would, you know, have done it. It upset quite a few people at the meeting. The idea of going out there and smashing up his equipment. I think the women approved of it but most of the men didn’t. But I didn’t mind doing it. (253)

Pam Stein: I didn’t want to go through with the terrorist activities because I didn’t trust the guys anyway . . . The first meeting, you know, there was a core of people, the second meeting, somebody else would come in and they’d already know about it and I thought, shit, you know. And it was actually me that spilled the beans too. But I could trust the women and I really didn’t want to go on any raid with any guys because I didn’t want to be copped and in a way I felt at that stage I wanted some terrorist activities against some other guys, even those guys that were with us, cause all of them were still sexist in the extreme. (254)

Each of the men was sure that they themselves would have gone through with it, and they were convinced that the women would have gone through with it – but they weren’t too sure about any of the other men. The women, on the other hand, were not at all sure of the men and they were not entirely convinced that the target of their terrorist activities should not be a little closer to home. (255)

In contrast to the McConaghy Plan, the action that was taken against Macquarie Street psychosurgeon Harry Bailey (256) was successful, even though it was not quite of the same order of the McConaghy Plan. It was planned in secret and executed with precision. The McConaghy Plan had been an unqualified failure and for such obvious reasons, that when it came to planning some form of action to be taken against Bailey the idea was taken up by a small group of pissed off activists, almost all of whom lived in the one household at Australia Street, Camperdown and kept secret from all but the group until after it had been carried out. One week day early in April 1973, a small group of pissed off activists went to

(252) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
(253) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
(254) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
(255) The women did in fact carry out some acts of property destruction in women-only groups.
187 Macquarie Street in the city and distributed leaflets to offices on all floors of the building where Bailey's office was located:

PSYCHOBUTCHERY OF GAYS

Perhaps you are amused by what you see going on here today. Perhaps you are disgusted, or perhaps just bored.

Well, the subject about which we are protesting is not at all amusing. We are concerned about the horrors of PSYCHOSURGERY and our aim is to bring attention to one of the men who perpetuate it - Harry R. Bailey, 187 Macquarie Street, 4th floor.

Psychosurgery is a glamorous term used to describe the process whereby the parts of a person's brain thought to be concerned with personality, sexual drive, etc. are chopped up, sliced out or destroyed by one means or another - thus changing the basic personality of that person.

Bailey's speciality is cingulo-trachotomy, an operation which he employs to 'cure' sexually 'immature' persons, and which, being a psychiatrist who decides who is sexually 'immature', means HOMOSEXUALS.

At present he is working at full production and does THREE SLICE-UPS PER WEEK...

Gay Liberation then, objects violently to brain slicers such as Bailey and his ilk. The use of homosexual patients for this kind of research, whether they be 'voluntary' or whether they are forced to undergo surgery by court referral, cannot be allowed to continue. How can anyone voluntarily apply to have their brains removed? Shrinks like Bailey define homosexuality as an illness and then propose the cure. Homosexuality is not an illness but only so by their definition...

PUT an end to HOMOSEXUAL MUTILATION!

Having distributed the leaflets, the group then dumped a bucket of brains in Bailey's waiting room and made a hasty exit.

McConaghy, meanwhile, was trying to get in touch with the people who had written to him demanding, as a condition of their participation in his conferences, that he change its structure and allow them some say in its organization. His two letters of 19 and 21 March to "Paul Soss and Colleagues" had been sent to Stein's address at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale. Stein, however, had begun to spend more time out of Sydney, the pissed off activists had transferred their meetings to 4 Wigram Road, Glebe, and Foss, as Editor of the Australian Union of Students (AUS) newspaper, National U, was spending most of his time in Melbourne, so that:

Paul Foss: When he wrote back his reply making us an offer, I remember seeing the letter at Pam Stein's place and I said, look, there's nobody here, let's just ignore it. We never replied to that letter did we, just totally ignored it. (258)

At this stage Sydney Gay Liberation was becoming increasingly fragmented. There was a distinct division between the old hands who rarely went to the centre at 67 Glebe Point Road, and those who, like Terry Bell, were relatively new to Gay Liberation and were trying to make the centre work. The Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter was not produced at all during the

(257) [ROLFE, Terry]: Psychobutchery of Gays. Unauthorized Undated leaflet. Sydney April 1973
Document No. 134.

(258) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
period February to April, and only a few zap actions were undertaken - the patrons of Sydney University's Union Theatre, for example, were leafleted, on Thursday March 15 as they arrived to see The Gay Deceivers by only three Gay Liberationists. The old hands themselves were beginning to split into smaller groups of those who saw themselves as hard core radical pissed off activists and those who were too wishy-washy to be trusted. Groups began to be known by the name of the street in which they met for any length of time - Wigram Road, Australia Street - and it was virtually only on this basis that anything was actually planned and carried out. Interaction between the various fragments was restricted almost to an individual level and there is only one example of any planned activity that involved people from more than one fragment.

One evening early in April 1973 Paul Foss was at the centre for a meeting to which hardly anybody had turned up so he and Terry Bell wrote and typed up a leaflet which they intended should be handed out to school children outside schools:

**ARE YOU A POOFTER?**

If so, you are not going to be told anything about it at school. Homosexuality that is if you are a girl and like other girls, or if you are a boy and like other boys, is considered by the State, the Church, the school authorities and by most of your parents to be a moral crime. But if you are a poofter, nothing will make it disappear!

It is stupid to believe that any form of love between people is a sin . . .

There are many hundreds of thousands of poofters in Australia - you are not alone in your feelings. Be proud, you are no less a person for your homosexuality . . .

Gay Liberation is made up of homosexuals - people like yourselves. We are here to make a stand against a society which says our sexuality is wrong. Dicks and cunts are not dirty! If you feel lonely, or need someone to talk to, DON'T ring up 'Lifeline' talk to your parents or see a minister of a church. They will betray you! Come instead to the Gay Liberation Centre, 67 Glebe Point Road, Glebe, or ring 660 - 4687. We will never betray you, brothers and sisters. (259)

About 100 of the leaflets were handed out, outside one school and produced a fairly predictable response - one parent called the Education Department, the police and the media and Foss was given an opportunity to explain the reasoning behind the leaflet on ABC current affairs programme This Day Tonight. (260) It was a short lived controversy and the other 900 leaflets which had been run off for later distribution remained in a pile at the centre, undistributed.

At the end of March 1973 John Lee, Paul Foss, David McDiamid and David Martin began to discuss the possibility of putting out a national homosexual newspaper to be called Radical Homosexual. Production was to be set up in Melbourne there appearing to be a number of practical advantages in doing so (the relatively lower rents of large houses suitable for the production of a paper being one) and to maximize the involvement of the people there who professed interest in being members of a collective. (261)


(260) See "Paul Foss Comments on the Schools Leaflet" (It was actually written by Terry Bell and wrongly attributed to Foss) *Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter*. No 9, July, 1973. The newsletter was wrongly dated July - it was in fact the June newsletter. Lex Watson was also asked to comment on the leaflet on a day time television current affairs programme, ATN 7 *The Today Show*. The interviewer concentrated on the part of the leaflet which warned children not to trust their parents because they would be betrayed and Watson tried to shift the discussion to one about the need for adequate sex education (including fair treatment of homosexuality) for school children.

(261)LEE, John:*"The Gay Liberation Newspaper that Wasn't to Be ..."* *Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter*. No. 11. August, 1973. It was to be modelled on the very successful Canadian Gay newspaper, *The Body Politic*. 
To ensure sufficient starting capital, Gay Liberation held a fund raising dance at Paddington Town Hall on 5 May 1973 at which leaflets were handed out explaining that it would begin production in July 1973, provided a minimum of $800 had been raised by the end of June. The dance, in fact raised $700 for the newspaper and in early June, Foss, Lee, McDiamid and Martin left for Melbourne. Their departure left a rather large hole in Sydney Gay Liberation because they constituted most of the male core of the 'heavies' of the movement, the men with whom the female 'heavies', if they were going to work with any men, (which was becoming increasingly unlikely) would work.

The official Gay Liberation which operated out of the centre was also in disarray. On April 4 they had received notice to quit the premises but even before that it had become increasingly obvious that Gay Liberation was not functioning properly:

Over the last two months Sydney Gay Lib once again faced a crisis which has arisen with predictable frequency: a lack of interest and active participation in the organization. The first indication of this was the failure of the newsletter which has not been produced since Feb. Also during this period attendance at SGL meetings and activities fell drastically. The zap group was no longer functioning except on one occasion when leaflets were distributed at a Sydney school. Thrus meetings dwindled to 4 or 5 people; and it was felt SGL was dormant, if not dead, and would not be in action for some time.

This pessimism was partly dispelled at a Thurs meeting on April 26, when the future of SGL was discussed. Those present realised that SGL had overreached itself, and that certain of its commitments should be reconsidered. Firstly, the centre came under scrutiny. On a social level it was successful. It thus facilitated communication between gays, but in other areas it failed badly. The roster system did not work, and although people were there most nights this placed an unfair strain on the household living there. As a result and particularly because of the uncertain tenancy (the church is selling its holdings in the area) the centre has been vacated. For Thurs meetings it was decided that SGL and CAMP while remaining separate and distinct organizations and without placing restrictions on each others activities, would share premises for financial reasons and to establish a more viable centre for homosexual communication. The arrangement has yet to be fully worked out between SGL and CAMP executive – it is by no means irrevocable and has still to face the test of practice. If in the future either or both groups feel the need for separate premises, this arrangement will not prevent such a thing happening . . .

Well, that SGL still exists is a fact. And a few people are making efforts to ensure that it remains a reality. However, as in the past, if a few continually work to keep SGL going, without your assistance, we can expect another crisis in six months time. And each backslide negates any personal and collective achievement that may have been made, and the whole process has to start again. So come back to the meeting if possible, or give us some feedback.

On Tuesday 24 April, 1973, the official Gay Liberation representative, Anton Veenstra, attended his first CAMP Executive meeting and Gay Liberation, part of it at least, held


(263) The newspaper never actually appeared and by August 1973 the collective had acknowledged that it was not likely to: "If it is possible to put certain interpersonal complications aside, I would offer the "objective" view that a large part of our inability to get it together was our own oppressed heads or worse, the inability of most of us to recognise that this was so", LEE, John: "The Gay Liberation Newspaper that Wasn’t To Be .."op. cit.

(264) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.


(266) Minutes of Meeting of Executive of CAMP (NSW) Held at 16 Terry Street, Balmain. 24 April 1973.
its first meeting at 10 David Street, on 4 May. (267) But what looked like a successful salvage job for Gay Liberation and the re-establishment of ties between the two groups which had been sought by some people for a long time, in fact, represented a further fragmentation of Gay Liberation. For as soon as Veenstra, and then Lance Gowland, began to act as Gay Liberation representatives on the CAMP Executive they were no longer seen as Gay Liberationists but as having ‘gone over’ to CAMP. (268) As it turned out, CAMP too was forced to vacate its clubrooms in June 1973. Only one joint CAMP-Gay Liberation venture was undertaken between May and June and that was the co-funding of a sticker which was to be small enough for people to carry around and stick up wherever they went. At the CAMP Executive meeting of 19 May Veenstra had suggested the following wording:

HOMOSEXUALITY IS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE – 824023 (269)

The wording of the sticker was to be discussed by representatives of both organizations and at the meeting of 2 June, the Executive of CAMP gave approval for the stickers to be produced with the wording:

HOMOSEXUALS DEMAND EQUALITY
CAMP/GAY LIB

The approval was given with opposition from Gaby Antolovich and I noted in the minutes at our request. (270) Our objections were twofold: first, that ‘homosexual’ would be taken by most people to mean male homosexuals only; and secondly, that really, we were not demanding equality (with heterosexuals) because, like the feminist in the Women’s Liberation cartoon, actually, we had something better in mind. Unable to have the “DEMAND EQUALITY” changed, however, we were not really interested in having “AND LESBIANS” added.

By the end of June, Sydney Gay Liberation consisted of small groups of individuals working, in the main, out of communal households and barely in communication with each other. Some of the long time male activists had gone to Melbourne and some of those who had stayed in Sydney had to all intents and purposes dropped out. Of the newer people, those who had been meeting at David Street, had lost touch with those who preferred, because it was CAMP’s clubrooms, not to. And almost all of the women had left:

Pam Stein: The terrorist secret group meetings thing was good in lots of ways for the women because as a result of our frustrations at not being able to do a thing, we went away and sort of did what we could. And then I sort of dropped out, and lots of other people dropped out, of the movement completely and we had a big think about the thing and about whether or not we should compromise our principles... and whether we should work with men. And we decided we shouldn’t work with men, ever, but we should work with women regardless of consciousness levels and radicalness... but we compromised and went to the McConaghy thing. (271)
At the end of July when Gay Liberation decided that it could not let the McConaghy Conference proceed without some action it was a particular fragment of Sydney Gay Liberation, the Australia Street household, which began to make plans. The details of the plans will be discussed later, for the moment it is necessary only to put them in context. On Wednesday 1 August, Barry Prothero telephoned me to ask if I could attend a meeting at Australia Street, of a small group of people who had been thinking of disrupting the homosexual section of the Conference which was less than a week away. I did so that evening and while the people there had not decided exactly what they were going to do, they were going to attend and asked if I could get extra copies of the issue of Camp Ink which contained the article on McConaghy. I returned the next night with 100 copies of the journal and became involved in an argument with Gary Schleeman who was trying to nip any plans for disrupting the Conference in the bud on the grounds that he had heard that McConaghy was going to make a public statement at the Conference to the effect that he was no longer going to offer aversion therapy to homosexuals because he did not think that it worked. Schleeman left everybody totally unconvinced.

On Sunday 4 August, John Lee who had been up from Melbourne visiting friends in Newcastle returned to Sydney for a brief stay. He went to Australia Street and between Sunday night and Tuesday morning organized for a Gay Liberation leaflet explaining their boycott of the Conference to be written, typed up and run off and for a group of the old pissed off activists to be at Australia Street, first thing on Tuesday morning, to go out to Prince Henry Hospital to the Conference.

Throughout 1973 the major thrust of Sydney Gay Liberation's external activities had been an attack on psychiatry. Several individuals had had horrific experiences with psychiatry long before they had ever become involved in Gay Liberation, some because of their homosexuality; and others had become interested in psychiatry after joining Gay Liberation. As a group, Gay Liberation attacked Bailey and McConaghy as public advocates of particularly unpleasant treatment methods; as individuals many had participated in anti-psychiatry and patient rights discussion groups organized by Liz Fell. In addition several had acted as pseudo-patients in Robin Winkler's research into psychiatric hospitals' treatment of patients. Winkler had mentioned his intention to do this kind of research at the forum CAMP had organized in July 1972 when he had confronted McConaghy. At that forum, those of his colleagues from the University of NSW who were there condemned his proposal as unethical. He went ahead with it nonetheless and between November 1972 and April 1973 some 20 people, almost half of them associated with Gay Liberation 'presented' with fake symptoms at psychiatric hospitals in Sydney. On Tuesday 17 April The Australian carried the first report of the research in a brief news item entitled "Mentally Ill 'Mistreated'". Other reports followed: the entire 30 April edition of National U was devoted to pseudo-patient reports and advice on how to beat psychiatrists at their own game: The Digger of May 1973.
also carried major reports of the research as did Tribune of 22-28 May. (276) Criticism of traditional psychiatry was not restricted to the underground press in 1973 and neither did it come only from minority groups -- the establishment press also began to question, if not attack, the value and values of psychiatry in 1973. (277)

Internally, Gay Liberation fragmented into a series of small groups in 1973. The old leadership group had left and the new leaders found it difficult to hold Gay Liberation together:

Pam Stein: My frustrations really weren't against McConaghy but that was just what came up at the time and I thought, shit, I'd go along with it ... And it was sort of a last ditch effort to sort of get a movement going, even though it was only that sort of five or six that would start it again, cause that's the way groups work anyway, you know, from what we'd seen in the past ... Cause what happened with groups anyway was that a group formed, got huge, big, there'd be a split and there's be another group formed, get large, big, and there'd be a split off again. There'd always be tensions in groups and that's what kept things going. Gay Liberation was at the point where it was sort of a giant fizzle and ... the guys didn't realize that this was the way groups worked at all the women did, and still hoped to get things going. (278)

In October 1973, after a successful Gay Pride Week in (8-16) September, Gay Liberation formally disbanded itself, dropping all pretense that it was what it could not be and developed a structure which reflected what it was. Gay Liberation was replaced by the Gay Liberation Front which was to act as a contact point for the activities of independent groups, “independent in every sense of the word. Making their own statements to the media, funding and determining their own actions and whatever structures they felt were necessary for the type of activity they were involved in”. (279)

For the Sydney homosexual movement as a whole 1973 seemed to mark the last year of a very important establishment and early growth period. Both CAMP and Gay Liberation seemed to expend the major part of their energies during that year on internal wrangles, which, by early 1974, had been resolved by the departure of most of the original ‘heavies’ - in dismay, disillusionment, disgust, protest, or from sheer exhaustion. Camp Ink, under John Ware’s editorship did not appear at all after 1973 and the last Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter was produced in April 1974. While CAMP (NSW) continued to operate ‘under new management’ Sydney Gay Liberation and the Front disappeared altogether.

(278) TRANSCRIPT: op. cit.
THE THOR GROUP

In the first part of 1973 the major activity of this loose knit group of people was to work towards the defeat of the NSW Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill. On 4 April 1973 that Bill failed to secure passage through the NSW Legislative Council and was allowed to lapse when Parliament was prorogued in May 1973. After the Bill had been defeated, the battle over censorship of pornography in NSW was, by and large, over for the time being. After the defeat of the Bill, many of those who had been associated with the production of Thor in 1972 and with the campaign against the Bill became involved in the fight to save Victoria Street, Kings Cross from the developers and in the production of Scrounge, a newsletter which was produced from Victoria Street, and intended as "an information service and a communication link for political and social action groups in Sydney" (280) which appeared sixteen times between June 1973 and August 1974.

Despite the fears of some of the anti-censorship people that media coverage of the proposed Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill was poor and would allow the Bill to slip through while nobody was watching, by comparison with campaigns mounted by the women's movement and the gay movement, the anti-censorship campaign was very well covered by the media. The attempt to censor pornography, because it allows of a mention of, if not emphasis on, pornography, sells more newspapers than does, for example, an equal-pay or homosexual anti-discrimination campaign.

The stage for the campaign was set in September - October 1972: the Victorian Chief Secretary, Ray Meagher, announced plans in September 1972 to introduce tough new legislation aimed at "preventing filthy publications being indiscriminantly placed in the hands of children" (281); in Brisbane, the Vice Squad seized 5,000 copies of the student newspaper National U because it contained a short story by Frank Moorehouse which was allegedly pornographic (282); and in Sydney, Wendy Bacon and some of her Thor colleagues, were still being reported in the media because of their appeals against convictions handed down in February 1972. (283) Then in October 1972 most Australian newspapers carried reports (almost all of them with a strong element of ridicule) of the release in Britain of The Longford Report on Pornography. (284) And finally, in December 1972, the new federal Labor Government announced that it intended to ease federal censorship regulations to expand the freedom of the individual "to read and view what he pleases and also the freedom to be protected from exposure to unsolicited material" by transferring the censorship section of the Department of Customs and Excise to the Attorney General's Department and setting up a judicial tribunal to hold public hearings and publish reasons for any censorship of imported material. (285) State governments, however, would still be able to impose their own censorship laws and in January 1973, the NSW Liberal Party Government announced its intention to tighten up NSW laws.

(280) Scrounge. No. 1. ([June] 1973. The first issue of the newsheet had the names of Wendy Bacon, Darcy Waters, Inez Sooz, Sasha Soldatow, and Susan Varga listed as contacts. The last, No. 16 of 14 August 1974, the names of Chris Sharp, Teresa Brennan, Wendy Bacon, Darcy Waters, Liz Fell, Jenny Coopes, Jane Arms, Graham Pitts, Dave Morrissey, and Jennie and Rennie Tomato - indicating its very strong association with the Push.


(282) PEACOCK, Matt: "Tabloid Story Seized by Vice Boys" Nation Review. 28 October - 3 November 1972.


January and February 1973 saw the NSW Chief Secretary preparing the ground for the introduction of the Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill into state parliament in March. He and the Victorian Chief Secretary met on January 19 to discuss their campaign to stop “the flow of filth” over the NSW border into Victoria. Newspaper reports of the “all out drive to halt hard-core pornography” (286) did not appear, however, to take the threat that pornography posed quite as seriously as the Chief Secretary did. Griffiths was usually photographed pouring over a pile of pornographic newspapers and magazines, with a smile on his face as he described their contents to reporters - “sordid acts”, “animal orgies”, “filth” - and explained that his objections to personal notices in newspapers were very strong because they “encouraged deviants, perverts and prostitutes to get together”; and repeating proudly “They call me the Gestapo. That’s good. It gives me the impression I’m winning.” (287) Nor was the seriousness of the campaign really helped much by the seizure in Melbourne of poster sized photographs of Michelangelo’s statue of David and in Sydney of Beardsley line drawings, as pornographic. The other side of Griffith’s campaign was the wholesale seizure of tons of magazines and newspapers and the laying of charges against publishers and sellers, including the publishers of the Sydney based homosexual magazine William and John. (288)

It was in the midst of the early part of the campaign that McConaghy, through Liz Fell, contacted Wendy Bacon in February and secured her agreement to present a paper on censorship and pornography at his conference:

Wendy Bacon: I think he rang me up and I at some stage rang and agreed to do it. (289)

As far as those who were opposed to censorship were concerned, it was not really until Griffith had attached some substance to his campaign - in the form of the provisions of the new Bill - that it was taken seriously. The day before the Bill was introduced into the NSW Legislative Assembly, The Australian published an editorial which was general in its condemnation:

It is a little hard to understand the wave of concern over pornography which seems to be sweeping State politicians, if no one else in the country . . . No one would imagine that Australian society is really in danger of being depraved and corrupted by a rash of smudgy picture magazines and advertisements which could only appeal to a lunatic fringe who have always been the oldest profession’s crudest customers anyway. In Australia today infinitely more people read about pornography than actually read it. Surely State politicians could find something better to do with their valuable time. (290)

Griffith introduced the Bill into the lower house on 6 March and outlined its provisions. There would be no reference to obscene material in the new legislation, it would all be covered by the word indecent which would be used to refer to:

(288) BACON, Wendy: “Porn for Droogs” Nation Review. 9-15 February 1973; and FOSS, Paul: “Obscenity Trial - The Prosecution of William and John - a Homosexual Publication” National U 19 February 1973. The publishers of William and John were faced with 64 charges relating to “printing an obscene publication, publishing an obscene publication, printing indecent printed matter, and publishing indecent printed material”.
(289) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Liz Fell and Wendy Bacon.
matters of sex, drug addiction, horror, crime or violence being dealt with in a manner or to an extent that departs from contemporary community standards of decency, regard being had to the nature of the article, any merit it might have in the field of literature, art, medicine or science, and the circumstances of its publication. Further, the provisions will be extended to apply to articles other than books, magazines and periodicals — for example, records and films. (291)

Probably the most provocative provision of the Bill was the decision to substitute trial by stipendiary magistrate for the old system of trial by jury. The second reading stage of the Bill was set for 21 March, which gave two weeks for some sort of public campaign to be mounted.

The campaign to have the Bill defeated put many people, especially those in the women’s and homosexual movements, in an awkward position. Pornography, heterosexual and homosexual, was produced by and for men. Its relevance to women was all negative—heterosexual pornography was sexist and sometimes violent, it treated women as sex objects and was degrading. So called ‘lesbian porn’ was produced to titillate men, not lesbians. Some male homosexuals in the gay movement were well aware that heterosexual pornography was sexist and did not want to be seen to be supporting its proliferation. They were also wary of being seen to approve of male homosexual porn: sex objectification, heterosexual or homosexual, was ideologically unsound. The difficulty with such a position was that it put the liberation movements on the same side as the most conservative, right wing opponents of pornography. Differences between the right and the movements in terms of why they opposed pornography would be lost in any public expression of that opposition. The dilemma was sidestepped rather than confronted and resolved and that sidestepping took two forms: first, by and large, the liberation movements remained silent on the issue, especially when the stand that CAMP took in early 1972 over the arrest of Wendy Bacon is used as a standard; secondly, the emphasis in the campaign was shifted, not only by the liberation movements but also by others who seemed to be facing the same sorts of ideological difficulties — shifted away from a debate about pornography per se and on to an attack on those provisions of the Bill which gave Police wide powers of seizure, which did away with trial by jury, and which allowed maximum fines of $2,000 to be imposed.

The major public demonstration of opposition to the Bill was organized for Sunday 18 March, three days before the second reading of the Bill in the Assembly and on the evening at the end of the two day Sydney Women’s Commission at the Teachers Federation Auditorium. Organization was already underway for that public meeting when Wendy Bacon attended the joint meeting on 11 March of people invited to participate in McConaghy’s Conference. At that meeting, Bacon, who had already agreed by telephone to present a paper to the Conference, signed the letter to McConaghy which demanded consultation over the Conference structure as a prerequisite for participation in it.

During the week leading up the the meeting on 18 March, leaflets (292) advertising it were distributed, Bacon was interviewed and quoted in newspapers as threatening to “invade the public gallery then shower the floor of the House with pornographic leaflets” and “have 100 people in Martin Place next week handing out pornographic publications” (293) and

(292) See Document Nos 105 and 106.
arrangements were made for psychoanalyst Win Childs to appear on a day time television programme debating the Bill with Chief Secretary Ian Griffiths and Richard Neville, a publisher of *Oz*.

The meeting on Sunday 18 March was attended by some 300 people, "a curious collection of Newcastle libertarians, sex shop proprietors, sex magazine publishers, gay liberationists, and representatives of the underground press" (294) and a few Women's Liberationists who had returned to the Auditorium after the Women's Commission. Liz Fell chaired the meeting and the emphasis of the speakers was not on pornography, its merits or otherwise, but on the unacceptable provisions of the Bill and on speculation about why it had been introduced. Before Wendy Bacon spoke on the dangers inherent in the abolition of trial by jury, Jimmy Staples provided yet another justification for opposition to the Bill:

He postulated that the rapid growth of magazines like Ribald, Searchlight, and Sexy have cut into the circulation of established magazines and pressure has been brought on Askin by the press magnates to stem their growth (monopoly Capitalism once again). (295)

That theme was elaborated on by Terry Blake (editor of *The Kings Cross Whisper*) and George Munster (editor of *Nation Review*), the latter naming K.G.Murray Pty. Ltd (publishers of *Man and Man Jnr*) and Gordon and Gotch (distributors of Playboy) and pointing out that neither Murray, recently absorbed into the Packer empire, nor Gordon and Gotch, were without influence in the Liberal Party machine. (296) Gillian Leahy was put in the difficult position of having to speak in opposition to the Bill, wearing two hats — that of a Women's Liberationist and that of an employee of Bob Gould's Third World Bookshop which sold a good deal of very sexist pornography. Lex Watson, as Co-President of CAMP, tried to widen the discussion by arguing that the censorship of magazines like *William and John*, which did publish articles on the politics of homosexual liberation, was political censorship and that Camp Ink could be next.

On Monday 19 March, *The National Times* published an Editorial critical of the Bill. Under the headline "Corruption is more than Smutty Books" it attacked the NSW Government's sense of priorities:

The critical fact is that whatever the problems caused by smutty publications, they do not amount to anything like the unsatisfactory situation which exists surrounding organized crime and poker machines in NSW . . .

The NSW legislation on smut threatens the liberties of residents of the State . . .

The bill in its present state also gives police far more powers than they should reasonably have to seize a suspect publication, not in the small numbers necessary for evidence, but in the substantial numbers which could prove financially punitive to a defendant regardless of whether he ultimately proves his innocence.

There are powers of entry and search totally unnecessary given the gravity of the offence.

There is a power to restrict a publication once it offends good taste . . . This means that if "The National Times" should offend the Chief Secretary of NSW and his State Advisory Committee on Publications, not only the offending issue but all subsequent issues could be ordered to be restricted in their


(296) WALSH, Richard: *op. cit.*
advertising and sale ...
The fact is that Government should be concerned far more with realities of society than with what it considers desirable. And some of the nastier realities are to be found in the licensed clubs of NSW. (297)

And on the 20 March The Australian carried an article based on an interview with Dr. Win Childs which opened with her statement that erotic material, commonly referred to as pornography, was not harmful to children and which then went on to turn the psychoanalytic tables on those who wished to censor:

The people who worry Dr. Childs are the “clamorous crusaders who consistently use words like dirt or smut or filth which: means they link sex with excrement.”

“This link doesn’t exist in the mature mind — but it does exist in a small child’s” she said. “They have not outgrown their infantile attitude toward sexuality”. The crusaders, said Dr. Childs, have often had a puritanical upbringing which means they are uneasy or frightened about sex. And the crusade enables them to do two things: “You have to read a lot of erotic material if you’re conducting a campaign, but they can do it ‘for the good of others’ without a conflict of conscience”, she said.

“And in seeking the punishment of others they are satisfying their own needs to be punished for their very strong but disguised interest in erotic material”. (298)

If the battle over the Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill could have been decided, as well as fought, in the media the Bill would probably have been defeated at its second reading stage. Griffiths, who was fighting on the grounds that pornography was dangerous, especially to children, was made to look ridiculous and his Bill a bulldozer brought in to knock over a sandcastle. The opposition to the Bill was multifaceted with everything except a discussion of pornography itself being brought into the campaign: that the Bill was designed to protect the establishment’s monopoly on soft-core porn; that it represented a distorted ordering of Government priorities; that it gave the police unnecessary powers; that it abolished trial by jury; that its penalties were excessive; and finally, that those who would censor were basically more depraved than those whose reading they wanted to censor. The fate of the Bill was not, however, to be decided in the media but in the NSW Parliament where the Liberals had the numbers and where the Labor Party opposition was divided:

The debate in the NSW ALP caucus on the issue was extremely bitter: the small centre and left group in the party were adamant that the Bill must be opposed in its entirety; Hills and the controlling right group were equally determined that they would support the Bill.

When it came to the crunch the right won the vote 19 to 14 — 11 of the people’s champions found the whole issue much too perplexing and simply abSENTed themselves from the meeting altogether. (299)

The second reading stage of the Bill began on 21 March 1973 and heard some interesting, not to say, colourful, turns of phrase. Jim Cameron, Liberal MLA referred to the Bill as “the most recent positive step taken up by the Government to erect and maintain some working machinery to filter and screen out destructive and low quality ideas which foul the social nest” and dismissed criticisms of the Bill as coming from “large numbers of academics,

social long hairs, and intellectuals:” who had their feet planted firmly in the air. (300) When the debate resumed on 22 March, George Peterson, sympathetic to the aims of the women’s movement, put himself in the difficult position of condemning the poem Eskimo Nell but supporting its publication:

This poem has been enjoyed by three generations of males at smoke socials but when it is published in black and white and one sees this reference to pregnant widowhood, one sees it as an incitement to rape and murder. After Mexican Pete has been sexually destroyed by Eskimo Nell, he puts a revolver up her vagina and fires six shots into it. Anyone who finds that funny has got a peculiar sense of humour. I think the publishers of Tharunka did the right thing in publishing this poem because after seeing it there in black and white, nobody could ever pretend to a group of soldiers around a keg of beer that Eskimo Nell is a funny poem. One advantage in the publication of pornography is that, as has happened on occasion, something that has been hidden behind corners can be brought out into the open and revealed for the rubbish it is. (301)

Peter Coleman, Liberal MLA, quite accurately pointed out in his speech that “the key issue has not yet been confronted by Speakers from the Opposition side. The key issue is pornography and the nature of it” (302) and then spent the rest of his speech in support of the Bill trying to make honourable members aware of the dangers of the new breed of pornographers -- Wendy Bacon and her associates -- who were not “fly-by-night operators looking for a quick buck” but “porno-political operators concerned with building a new political civilization” (303)

It is these people ... who have changed to a great extent the publishing climate in New South Wales and made possible the pornographic revolution that we have today. It seems to me to be clear and must be accepted that this attack on what they regard as the falsity of all authorities and their espousal of the new liberated morality and their belief in the value of pornography as a revolutionary technique should be taken seriously, and the political element must be seen as a significant part of the whole picture ... We are dealing not with a liberal revival or movement, or something that should not be taken seriously, but with something quite deliberate in its political attack upon our institutions. It must be taken seriously and not dismissed as boring. (304)

All told, eleven members spoke at the second reading stage of the Bill before the Legislative Assembly passed it on 28 March and sent it on to the Legislative Council. The passage of the Bill through the Assembly was demoralizing to those who had been campaigning for its defeat. Student bodies at Macquarie, Sydney and NSW Universities agreed to support the publication of a newspaper called Act I and a “Festival of Indecency” was held on the front lawn of Sydney University on the evening of Thursday 30 March during which people read out ‘indecent’ prose and poetry and undressed - until it began to rain. (305)

Ultimately, the fate of the Bill lay with the undemocratically appointed NSW Legislative Council where the Bill reached its second reading stage on April 4. At that point, the Leader of the Opposition in the Council, Neville Wran, moved an amendment to have the Bill referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report. The Legislative Assembly had already heard
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of the objections to the Bill that had been expressed by the Printing and Kindred Industries Union in NSW and the Australian Journalists Association. To those names Wran added:

The State Council of the Liberal Party of New South Wales, the Women's Conference of the Australian Labor Party, the Victorian Young Liberals, the New South Wales Young Liberals, the Community Standards Organization of New South Wales ... the Literature Board of the Australian Council of the Arts, the Council of the Arts, the Council of Civil Liberties and the Bar Council of New South Wales ... (306)

to which, Mr. R. C. Packer, (publisher of Forum - The Australian Journal of Interpersonal Relations, one which stood the chance of being classified as an indecent publication) added when he spoke in the debate:

The New South Wales Library Association ... academics from various universities, various newspapers ... the Australian Publishers Association ... students of the University of New South Wales and students of East Sydney Technical College. (307)

Wran's amendment was voted on and won by 28 votes to 27 with R.C.Packer (Liberal) and W.G.Keighly (Country Party) crossing the floor to vote with Independent Labor's C.A.F.Cahill and H.Gardiner and the Opposition. The Indecent and Restricted Publication Bill had been referred to a Select Committee which meant that when Parliament was prorogued in May 1973 the Bill lapsed, and no new legislation was brought in.

After the Bill's defeat the police stopped their wholesale seizure of pornography and market forces killed off many of the publications that would probably have been kept alive much longer had they been classified as indecent. The people who had been associated with Tharunka - Thorunka - Thor sank back into the larger Push from where most of them had originally come. In June, many of them stepped out again to become involved in the squatting that was an attempt to save Victoria Street from the developers and, illustrative of their constant belief that the printed word is as important to the process of social change as direct action, began to produce Scrounge.

---
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McConaghy discusses his proposed Liberation and Psychiatry Conference with Liz Fell and asks her to present a paper to it on anti-psychiatry and she agrees.

McConaghy sends invitation to Sydney Gay Liberation asking them to provide a speaker on Gay Liberation for his Liberation and Psychiatry Conference.

McConaghy sends invitation to Sydney Women's Liberation asking them to provide a speaker on Women's Liberation for his Liberation and Psychiatry Conference.


Glebe group of Sydney Women's Liberation discusses McConaghy's invitation.

McConaghy asks Wendy Bacon to present a paper on censorship and pornography to his Liberation and Psychiatry Conference and she agrees.

National U publishes item on McConaghy's proposed Conference.

McConaghy asks Dennis Altman to present a paper on homosexual liberation to his Liberation and Psychiatry Conference and Altman refuses.

Joint meeting of those concerned with McConaghy's invitations to participate in his Conference

Letter from joint meeting sent registered mail to McConaghy

McConaghy writes to joint meeting clarifying the nature of the Conference - renamed Liberation Movements and Psychiatry.

National U publishes item on Conference and on joint meeting and copies of McConaghy's invitation and the joint meeting's response to the invitation.

McConaghy forwards copies of correspondence between himself and liberation movements to Wills.

McConaghy writes to joint meeting agreeing to consult with representatives of the liberation movements.

McConaghy asks Wills to present a paper at his Conference and she refuses. Asks "permission" to send formal invitation to CAMP to provide a speaker.

Altman writes to McConaghy explaining his refusal to participate in the Conference and distributes copies of the letter as a leaflet.

McConaghy sends formal invitation to CAMP to provide a speaker to his Liberation Movements and Psychiatry Conference.

CAMP Executive formally declines McConaghy's invitation to participate in his Conference.

Wills (on behalf of CAMP) writes to McConaghy informing him of CAMP's decision to decline his invitation.

McConaghy contacts Liz Fell to ask for names of individual Women's Liberationists who might be willing to participate in his Conference.

McConaghy contacts Madge Dawson who declines to participate in Conference.

McConaghy contacts Joyce Stevens who declines to participate but suggests he contact Judy Mundey.

McConaghy contacts Judy Mundey who agrees to participate in his Conference as a Women's Liberationist.
July
Last week

August
Thurs 2
Sun 5
Mon 6
Tues 7

Australia Street Gay Liberation household begin to plan disruption of McConaghy's Conference.

100 copies of *Camp Ink* delivered to Australia Street for distribution at McConaghy's Conference

John Lee returns to Sydney and begins to organize conference disruption

Conference on Liberation Movements and Psychiatry begins at Prince Henry Hospital

Production of Gay Liberation leaflet for distribution at following day's Conference session on homosexuality.

Liberation Movements and Psychiatry Conference session on homosexuality disrupted.
Although McConaghy was planning for our participation in his Conference on Liberation Movements and Psychiatry over a period of eight months, from December 1972 to August 1973, there were only two periods during which the Conference became a major concern of the sexual liberation movements – March 1973 and August 1973.

We first heard of McConaghy’s intention to organize the second CIBA-GEIGY Conference around the theme of psychiatry and liberation from Liz Fell in December 1972. Fell probably knew McConaghy better than any of us and her relationship with him was of a very different nature from ours. She had met him in the first instance socially through a mutual friend, Caroline Graham. Their differences over the respective merits of psychoanalytic and behaviourist approaches (Freud versus Skinner) overlay a similar interest in, and basic acceptance of, the value of psychiatry – although for which people and under what circumstances psychiatry was of value they disagreed strongly as they did over the role that psychiatry and psychiatrists played in the power structure of society. Altman’s first contact with McConaghy had been by telephone early in 1972 when he had sought Altman’s help in contacting male homosexuals who would look at the slides he used in his aversion therapy treatment of homosexuals and tell him which they found most erotic. Before that they knew of each other by reputation: McConaghy as an aversion therapist who had been pelted with tomatoes by American Gay Liberationists when he presented a paper on his treatment of homosexuals to a Conference in San Francisco; and Altman as the author of Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation which had been published in America in 1971 and as a Sydney Gay Liberation activist. In 1972 Altman and McConaghy had met occasionally at parties held by mutual friends, such as Fell, and more than once, Altman had been pointedly rude to him. While McConaghy and Fell could disagree over a variety of issues within a basic framework of the acceptance of psychiatry, McConaghy and Altman were diametrically opposed on the basic question of the acceptance of homosexuality as normal. McConaghy’s other possible contact with the liberation movements was through me. In some ways our relationship was a mutually exploitative one. I had interviewed him, arranged for him to participate in the CAMP Forum and written an article condemning him. Our contact prior to March 1973 had been solely around these matters and at that point, unless he had gained some advantage or satisfaction from being able to say he was on speaking terms with the Co-President of a homosexual organization, I had made much more use of him than he of me. Our rare encounters at other gatherings could be characterized as civil whereas Altman’s were hostile and Fell’s friendly. So it was understandable that McConaghy would contact Fell for advice about his conference rather than Altman or I.

In December 1972 McConaghy did contact Fell and had a series of telephone conversations with her about the structure of the Conference and what themes he wanted to develop. At that time neither Fell herself nor the liberation movements saw her as part of the movements; she was still very much associated with the Push which was seen to be both sexist and heterosexist. Some movement individuals knew her personally but it was friendship on the basis of people who held similar views on matters other than sexual liberation. It was at that stage that Fell herself agreed to present a paper to the Conference on anti-psychiatry.

Liz Fell: . . . he said he was going to get Women’s Lib to talk and I just I mean, I couldn’t offer because I wasn’t part of the women’s movement at that stage. And he suggested I tell him who and I said I didn’t know. (308)
The fact that McConaghy had asked her to give a paper to his Conference and that she had agreed to do it and also that she had had a series of discussions with him about the Conference – its structure and content – meant that, as far as Fell was concerned, she had been a participant in its organization from the beginning.

Liz Fell: I actually remember that I had a chance to participate in the structure of it because right at the beginning Neil had rung me up about where it was going to be ... how many people were going ... what things were to be discussed, he discussed hundreds of things with me ... I was very much part and parcel of the organizing of that Conference. (309)

McConaghy then wrote identical letters to Gay Liberation on 19 January and Women's Liberation on 23 January 1973 (310) inviting them to send speakers to his Symposium on Liberation and Psychiatry which would be held some time between June and August 1973. The friendship links between women active in Women’s and Gay Liberation and their own dual membership ensured that parts of both movements knew that the other had received an invitation from McConaghy. The Glebe group of Sydney Women’s Liberation was still meeting at 67 Glebe Point Road which, in January was in transition: Gill Leahy and other Women’s Liberationists were in the process of moving out of residence there and Rod Byatt and other Gay Liberationists were in the process of moving in but until April 1973 both Gay Liberation and the Glebe group were meeting at 67. When Barry Prothero and Robert Tucker published McConaghy’s invitation to Gay Liberation in the January edition of the Gay Liberation Newsletter informal discussions between the pissed off activist section of Gay Liberation and the Glebe group had already canvassed the possibility, even the desirability, of the adoption of a common stance to the Conference. By early February 1973 Gay Liberation had published the invitation and then let the matter drop and the Glebe group had discussed the invitation and also let it drop. Both agreed that it should be discussed further but at that stage there was no reason for haste and there were other things to do.

In February 1973 McConaghy issued two further invitations: first, through Fell to Wendy Bacon; and secondly, independently of Fell, to Altman. When first asked to present a paper on censorship and pornography to the Conference Bacon felt no hesitation about doing so and simply agreed.

Wendy Bacon: You see I’ve talked on censorship in a hell of a lot of places and basically I disagree with those places a hell of a lot ... On the one hand I can see that by participating in that sort of thing you’re simply keeping it going, on the other hand I’ve always felt that what you write to some extent stands on its own and therefore I’ve been prepared to write in things like Nation Review and The Australian ... I think my objections to Nation Review as a journal and the idea that it sets up and the illusions it sets up are just as big as the Geigy thing and yet you do participate ... The same thing with the gaols. On the one hand you’re opposed to the gaols and yet on the other you go and work in them. (311)

At that stage Bacon’s response to the invitation was to treat it in the same way she would treat any other which asked her to talk or write on censorship – do it, despite any reservations about the context. From the outset Altman’s position was much more complicated. While
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Fell and Bacon could respond to McConaghy’s invitation on the basis of the invitation itself and feel few or no pressures operating on them not to participate, Altman was subject to pressures which pushed him in different directions. For a start Altman was an academic and, when it suited his purposes, McConaghy was billing the Conference as an academic one. Secondly, although this was known probably only to Barry Prothero at the time:

*Dennis Altman:* I always wasn’t at all convinced that it might not be a good idea to actually participate and talk to psychiatrists. (312)

But against his position as an academic and his uncertainty about not participating other pressures were operating:

*Dennis Altman:* I probably felt it necessary to establish my Gay Lib identity by taking hard line positions on these sorts of symbolic issues... I was very aware of the fact that I was very estranged on one level from... the people in Gay Lib and I'd been attacked. That must have been after the Gerald Stone interview, I’m sure it was... I was sort of very conscious of people saying that I was selling out so this was a good issue to prove I wasn't selling out... I really was on the defensive about what I did and so really, I refused to participate because I didn't want people to attack me for it. (313)

More publicly,

*Dennis Altman:* I always had this feeling that McConaghy was doing this so that he could claim in self defence, ‘but after all, I do this in conjunction with Gay Liberation’... I was very uneasy that it might be used in some way to justify or legitimate McConaghy. (314)

There was also the question of his personal relationships with members of Gay Liberation. He had always had “a lot more money and a lot higher status quite independently of the book. That had always been a problem and of course, the book reinforced it, obviously”. (315) Such differences had meant that he had not been invited to participate in the meetings of the pissed off activists:

*Dennis Altman:* You see there were all sorts of hassles going on. There were hassles between me and Barry [Prothero], there were hassles between me and other people and I felt very offended because they were having these secret meetings and I’d been kept out of it.

Q: Were you deliberately kept out?

*Dennis Altman:* Oh yes... Don’t forget this was sort of... less than six months after my book had come out and all that PR stuff... There were all these divisions building up and there was the great argument I had... about the royalties from my book... I think it was quite obvious that... they didn’t want me along and Barry obviously didn’t want me along because he felt that the whole PR thing had overshadowed him and, of course, the point is, I didn’t really want to go. I’m like that: I want to be asked even when people know I don’t want to because then I could have said no. (316)

When McConaghy asked him on 28 February, to present a paper to the Conference, Altman refused. The pressures operating against his participating in the Conference were much stronger than those which were urging him to accept the invitation to present a paper at the Conference.
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The Glebe group of Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation were made up of individuals whose reactions, as individuals, to McConaghy's invitation were probably no less complex than Altman's. In addition they were parts of groups which had been asked to make a group response to the invitation either by selecting one of their number to present a paper or by working out some other course of action. Gill Leahy was one of the few women in the Glebe group who was not also part of Gay Liberation and, as far as she personally was concerned:

Gill Leahy: I believed in non-participation and that was that. (317)

But the Glebe group, as only one of the autonomous groups of Sydney Women's Liberation, did not feel that it could make a unilateral decision on behalf of the movement without prior discussion with other Women's Liberation groups. The desire to adopt a common stance toward the conference came from the Glebe group and Gay Liberation but not necessarily for the most obvious reason.

Pam Stein: I really couldn't have cared less about the McConaghy Conference. I was just hoping that there'd be some sort of solidarity between the groups. I mean, not just between the women's movement and the Gay Liberation movement but other groups as well, anti-psychiatry and the Push. (318)

The responses of the male Gay Liberationists varied:

Barry Prothero: I said very early that what I thought should be done at the Conference was that brains should be thrown and that the whole place should just be disrupted. (319)

Paul Foss and John Lee were in favour of a simple boycott; both had been involved to differing degrees in the anti-psychiatry group and in Robin Winkler's pseudo-patient research work and both were aware that McConaghy could use Gay Liberation participation to legitimate himself in the eyes of his colleagues.

Over the weekend of 3 - 4 March, informal discussions between Gay Liberationists and Glebe group Women's Liberationists fixed a time and date for a meeting for all those who had been invited to participate in McConaghy's Conference: Sunday 11 March at 2 pm, at Pam Stein's home, 104 Johnston Street, Annandale. Gill Leahy took responsibility for contacting Liz Fell and Wendy Bacon and for putting up a notice in Women's House about the meeting. Others agreed to spread the message by telephoning around.

On Monday 5 March, Altman informed Lex Watson and I about the meeting. Two things were important about the discussion I had with Altman on that day: first, that he did not express the doubts he had about there being some value in homosexuals talking to psychiatrists at the Conference; and second, that what we were discussing was not a joint meeting on March 11 for all concerned to work out a response to McConaghy's invitations but how to ensure a united front of non-participation. Altman was particularly concerned that Fell may not agree to boycott the Conference because she could not possibly understand McConaghy's significance to homosexuals; we were both concerned that individual homosexuals, even after some sort of 'official' boycott of the Conference was publicly announced, could agree to speak at it claiming to be members of Gay Liberation or CAMP and that there was nothing anybody could do to stop them so doing. It was for this reason that the number of people in the homosexual
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movement told about the meeting on March 11 was relatively small. Only three people - Watson, Antolovich and myself - from CAMP were told and we told no others; and the circulation of the message amongst the Gay Liberationists was restricted mainly to the pissed off activists. While there was no deliberate attempt to 'forget' to let Women's Liberationists know about the meeting, neither was any special effort made to get a representative sample of the various groups to attend the meeting and ultimately those Women's Liberationists who did attend were primarily from the Glebe group.

Before anybody turned up to the meeting many of those who would go would do so with their minds already made up that nobody should participate in the Conference and be prepared to argue with anybody who thought that we should. This applied to Watson, Lee, Foss, Leahy, Stein, Antolovich, and myself. Altman appears to have worked out in advance a much more complicated set of plans:

Barry Prothero: Dennis was arguing for participation with me privately and arguing very strongly for it. He thought that plans to disrupt the Conference would be counterproductive. He thought that there were so many shrinks going to be gathered there that it was too valuable an opportunity to miss to talk to them. He didn't agree that they would be inaccessible to rational argument. ... He had a strategy that he was going to argue for non-participation but that was non-participation in the sense of nobody participating, Women's or Gay Liberation or CAMP or individuals. And he thought that if there wasn't going to be that united front then the position would have to be rethought out ... That was going to be his first stand: that he was going to argue for a united front of non-participation. If it was broken then I think he was tempted to say that he would give a paper. (320)

On Sunday 11 March between 30 and 40 people crowded into one of the larger rooms at 104 Johnston Street, Annandale. Liz Fell was unable to come and Wendy Bacon arrived shortly after the meeting began. The meeting was opened with a brief explanation of why it had been called and a piecing together of all the information we had about the Conference. Foss and Lee told the meeting that the Conference was to be about sexual liberation and psychiatry and that Altman, Bacon, Fell, Women's and Gay Liberation had been asked to speak at it. The Conference was to be two days long and held at Prince Henry Hospital where McConaghy conducted his aversion therapy on homosexuals and that it was to be sponsored by Geigy, a drug company. The audience would be made up of psychiatrists. Gill Leahy said that people in Women's Liberation did not want to send a speaker to the Conference and were interested in co-operating with a united front of opposition to it. The drugs produced by Geigy were probably harmful to women and there was no way that psychiatrists at that sort of Conference could be reached. Altman argued that he thought that nobody should participate in the Conference for three reasons: first, that McConaghy considers homosexuals to be sick and had said so in a recent article in The Medical Journal of Australia; second, that McConaghy could use liberation movement participation in his conference to legitimize himself overseas; and thirdly, that homosexual participation in his Conference could lead other homosexuals to think that we approved of McConaghy. Stein, Foss, Lee, Watson, and I all expressed similar opposition to any participation in the Conference. Wendy Bacon pointed out that John Court was just as damaging a psychiatrist as McConaghy was and that because we, as radical groups, were very much misunderstood by various institutions, she thought that we should be directly represented at the Conference. Some
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time was then devoted to a discussion of the impossibility of direct representation of Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation at the Conference because the Conference was to be open only to those who had been specifically invited and because Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation had been asked to send one speaker each. In addition, the whole Conference was to be structured into time limited sessions that would really not allow us to participate on any terms other than McConaghy's. There was, for example, no suggestion that the receivers of psychiatric treatment, the patients, were going to be invited to present their side of the picture of what psychiatry was all about. It was at this point that a list of demands to be made of McConaghy were discussed and the only two which were ever clearly articulated were that we be allowed some say in the organization and direction of the Conference and that the Conference be open to anybody who wished to attend. It was decided that a letter making these demands be typed up at the meeting and signed by as many present as wanted to and sent to McConaghy by registered mail. Some people drifted away during the time it took for a couple of people to drive to the home of somebody who had a typewriter and bring it back. When the typewriter arrived Paul Foss typed the following letter which was dictated by those remaining at the meeting:

Prof N. McConaghy
School of Psychiatry
University of New South Wales
Dear Sir,

At a meeting at the above address on 11 - 3 - 73 the invitations to participate in the “Psychiatry and Liberation” Conference were discussed and it was agreed that we would only participate under the following conditions:

1. That a committee be set up that would be open to the various liberation groups and the invited individuals to jointly decide on the structure and direction of the Conference,

2. and with the automatic proviso that the Conference itself be open to all peoples to attend e.g., psychiatric patients etc.

Yours,

There followed 25 signatures, one of which is illegible. They were:

P. Stuart Foss (AUS)  Wendy Bacon
Sue Wills (CAMP)    Dennis Altman
David McDiamid (Gay Lib)  Susanne Hollis (Gay Lib, W.L.)
A. Veenstra (Gay Lib)    Frank Taylor
A. Watson (CAMP)    David Martin (Gay Lib)
Trudy Lippman (Gay Lib)    Gaby Antolovich (CAMP)
John Lee (Gay Lib)    Meagan Morris (Gay Lib, Campus Camp, Women's Lib)
Theresa A. Jack    Gill Leahy (Women's Lib)
Miriam Loftus (Women's Lib, Gay Lib)    Trevor Johnston (Gay Lib)
G. Sheehan (Women's Lib, Gay Lib)    (321)
The people who spoke at the meeting and most of those who signed the letter would have to be classified as the 'heavies' of the homosexual movement and they all spoke against participation in the Conference unless certain conditions were fulfilled by McConaghy.

Paul Foss: I remember Dennis Altman giving quite a pointed speech at the meeting which quite clinched it. (322)

Dennis Altman: I don't know of anybody whose mind I changed. Paul might be right, but they mightn't have been people who, they wouldn't have counted for very much quite frankly. They weren't very vocal, given that despite all the rhetoric all the movements obviously had leaders. (323)

After the meeting Paul Foss, John Lee and David Martin drove around to Liz Fell's home at Paddington and asked her to sign the letter too before they sent it to McConaghy:

Paul Foss: We went straight around to her place, John, myself and David Martin to Liz's place and she signed it and then she went through this enormous rave about how I can't in all conscience, because of the whole Libertarian open society thing, I can't censor, I can't be involved in censorship of this sort and so she finally crossed her name out. (324)

Liz Fell: I intended to go to that meeting but for some reason, there were some other things going on here, I didn't go. And when they came back with this I read it and agreed to sign it. They continued talking, I think for a couple of hours and they suddenly got very heavy. It was very very difficult. They wanted to tell them what to do... The feeling I had was terribly oppressive, very dominating and wanting equal power and grabbing it... it was awful and I felt, God, I don't want to be part of this. (325)

While Foss, Lee and Martin were at Fell's, she telephoned Bacon to find out what had happened at the meeting and why she had signed the letter:

Liz Fell: ... I rang Wendy up. They said Wendy had signed it and I said, how extraordinary. And Wendy said she felt ambivalent about it. And it was a group pressure thing in part. (326)

Wendy Bacon: ... at the meeting they raised the issue about the fact that it was going to be very difficult for the homosexuality issue to be raised in the context of the thing. I agreed to that as an objective. However, the same sort of thing didn't apply to the censorship debate and there were a lot of psychiatrists who are not pro-censorship so it wasn't affecting what I had to say, but I supported, I had some solidarity with the homosexual objections to it... I know I felt a lot of pressure from Gay Lib and Women's Lib on the censorship issue because I felt there's a lot of puritanism in it and somehow the fact that I hadn't reacted in the same way in some situations I felt there was a real attack for being sort of elitist which I don't think was justified. And when I went along to that meeting I was certainly feeling that I was wanting to back them up. I did feel I was in a difficult position and that I didn't agree with all their ideas. I know that's something I quite often do which is a result of a confusion. I read the letter and then thought I don't really agree and decided to sign it nonetheless... I was having a lot of conflict first of all wanting to agree with those people then when Liz reacted I probably felt yes, I really do agree with her, I'd better back her up too. And you sort of go both ways. (327)
I did write a note on the letter, on the back, saying I agreed with it being open but I didn’t want to be part of the decision making about the structure and direction, particularly the direction. God, I didn’t want to be directing the Conference . . . I had been part of it so I really had to look at it and I decided it would be most unfair to Neil to gang up when in fact I had been involved in it. (328)

On the Sunday evening after the meeting, after Foss had told Altman that Fell had signed the letter and then crossed out her name and written an individual note on the back demanding only that the Conference be open, Altman telephoned Fell to chastise her first for not signing it and then for, as he had heard it, trying to get Bacon to change her mind:

Dennis Altman: I thought that it was right that we were boycotting and I also thought that it was right that people go and talk rationally to the psychiatrists.

Q: In that case why were you angry with Liz and Wendy?

Dennis Altman: Oh, that was a different sort of thing. That was a sort of solidarity thing. I just don’t like that Libertarian business of unrestrained individualism, I suppose. (330)

Fell telephoned me that evening to explain her position. She had participated in the decision making about the Conference from the start and if he was prepared to open it then all sorts of things could be done which would be far more effective than boycotting the Conference: some of his ex-patients could be brought in to testify against him, for example, and the ex-patients of other psychiatrists.

On Monday 12 March, the letter of the joint meeting was sent registered mail to McConaghy. On Monday 19 March, McConaghy telephoned me to discuss the letter we had sent him. He began his conversation by trying to assure me that all along he had wanted me to present a paper to his Conference as an individual on the same basis as he had asked Bacon, Fell and Altman to do but that he had delayed asking me because I had signed the letter of 11 March. His attempt at flattery failed dismally. In fact I was insulted by his assumption that I did not know that the others had been asked well before March 11 to present papers to his Conference and that I would not realize that I was second choice to Altman. I declined his invitation. He then asked if I would tell him how to answer the letter we had sent to him — what did we ‘really’ want, so that he could say the right things in his reply and ensure our participation. I refused to tell him what to say. He then tried to convince me that I should feel obliged to present a paper to his Conference. First, he had spoken at the forum I had organized on behalf of CAMP in July 1972 and secondly, he stressed that his was a Conference of academics and, as a fellow academic, I had a responsibility to participate. Of all his ploys, these last two came closest, not to making me decide to present a paper to his Conference, but to making me feel guilty about refusing to do so. But there was simply no way that the kinds of pressures he could exert on me to participate in his Conference could match that I already felt — having jointly signed a letter of liberation movement solidarity — not to participate. After he accepted that I was going neither to give a paper to his Conference nor to tell him what to write in reply to our letter, he said he thought that our demands were unreasonable, that his Conference was an academic one and that he had not made demands concerning the CAMP conference. He asked if I had seen the original letters that he had sent to Women’s Liberation and Gay Liberation, they were perfectly reasonable letters. Forgetting the Gay Liberation Newsletter had published his letter to them I answered that I had not, and agreed that he could send me copies of them. He ended our conversation by suggesting that if we wanted to have our conditions met, we should organize our own Conference.
McConaghy was perfectly correct. Our demands were unreasonable; they were meant to be. For most of us, but not for Fell or Bacon, the demands were to publicly legitimate our predetermined non-participation.

Gill Leahy. We weren't interested in participation... And we decided that we should put demands to change the structure that would be so great that they wouldn't agree to it. (331)

Having failed to solicit any information from me as to how he should reply to our letter, McConaghy contacted Robin Winkler who, when speaking to me next day, said that McConaghy had asked if he could read out to Winkler a draft of the letter he had written in reply. Winkler told me that he had suggested a few changes to the draft and that McConaghy intended to send it off straight away.

McConaghy's reply, addressed incorrectly to Mr. Paul Soss and Colleagues was dated 19 March and in part read:

Dear Mr. Soss,

Thank you for your registered letter of 11 March 1973 which I presume is in answer to my communications of 19th and 23rd January to Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation. I am somewhat puzzled by your response as I am aware that members of your movements talk at meetings organized by academics and other bodies without suggesting that you organize the meeting.

I wonder if when considering my invitation to participate in the symposium now called "Liberation Movements and Psychiatry" your members were under some misapprehension as to the nature of the proposed symposium... It is... primarily a meeting of psychiatrists talking to psychiatrists, though it has been customary to invite speakers from outside this discipline when it was felt that they could aid the discussion.

Though this is the nature of the meetings, they have always been open in the sense that any members of the public could attend provided there was room and to my knowledge there always has been... I would anticipate that there would be at least 40 seats for non-psychiatrists if not more...

There may well be a place for a public meeting of the type your letter indicates and of course this could be organized by any groups such as yourselves. The symposium we are organizing clearly has a different role, being primarily an academic meeting of psychiatrists. It would be of value to us to have the participation of a speaker from each of your movements to give us first hand interpretation of your views. However as this will also give you an opportunity to address psychiatrists and psychiatrists in training it could be useful to your movements also.

I hope in the light of this clarification your organizations will be prepared to send speakers... (332)

He concluded by announcing that the Conference was now to be held on 6-7 August and asked for a reply within ten days as he wanted to finalize the list of speakers by the end of the month.

On the same day as he wrote this first reply, National U appeared publicly acknowledging the role that the meeting of March 11 had played for the liberation movements:

... a meeting was held at Annandale last Sunday 11 March to work out some united policy... We all felt that the basic incongruity of psychiatry with
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the liberation movements - it is used as a powerful weapon to prevent revolutionary changes in the personality - made the conference blatantly ludicrous and that a consensus of tactics be employed to present a united front.

A general suspicion of the motives of McConaghy whose whole reputation rests on averting homosexuals, the involvement of Geigy, not our favourite institution, was enough to make most of us want to piss the whole thing off. It is fairly obvious from the dictates of McConaghy's letters that no real dialogue could ever occur under his terms of participation. Also it was considered presumptuous on McConaghy's and Geigy's part to organize a conference that excluded any prior discussion with the participants on the way that they felt that their interests were best preserved. Particularly affected was Gay Liberation, who hardly wants to collude with one of the world's leading oppressors of homosexuals...

The subsequent reply to McConaghy... was penned in such a way that the terms of participation would be seen by him as untenable. The exclusive nature of the conference... and the feeling that the individuals and groups concerned would be restricted to present material in a structured way, a structure that best protects the vulnerability of psychiatrists... convinced all of us that attended the meeting that unless a radical change occurred in the presentation of the conference, we did not want to be involved. (333)

In the same edition of National U, Foss, its Editor, had published McConaghy's invitation to Gay Liberation and a copy of the reply the meeting of 11 March had sent him. (334)

Before McConaghy could have received a reply to his letter to Soss and Colleagues on 19 March (had one ever been written) he telephoned me again, on 21 March. He wanted to know if the liberation movements would be satisfied with a say in the organizing of the quarter of the two day Conference that had not yet been organized. When I asked what the theme of that quarter was, he told me it was the session relating to drugs and pornography. I pointed out to him that while these themes might be of some interest to some members of the movements they would hardly be seen as relevant to them as the sessions on Women's and Gay Liberation. Any offer of consultation on the sessions of the Conference on drugs and pornography would possibly be seen by others in the way I did - a tokenistic gesture. He then complained that it would be impossible for all the people who signed the letter to form a committee with the organizers and have discussions about the Conference; 25 or more people was just too many. I informed him that I really did not think that that was what we had had in mind when we wrote the letter, that three or four people chosen from amongst the signatories and other interested parties was what we had meant when we spoke of representatives in our letter. He asked if he should write another letter to the joint meeting. I replied that I saw no harm in such a move; I did not tell him that I saw no point in it either.

So, on 21 March, McConaghy wrote again to Paul Soss and Colleagues

Dear Mr Soss,

Further to my letter of 19th March 1973, I have realised that certain aspects of the programme for the Geigy Psychiatric Symposium are still not fixed so that it might be possible to reach some agreement about the structure and direction of the Conference. This being the case would three or four of your members be able to meet me to discuss your requirements in this respect. (335)

(334) See Document No. 97.
McConaghy failed to mention in his letter that the certain aspects of the programme that were still not fixed and about which he was willing to negotiate did not relate to the women’s and homosexual sessions.

At the time I had no way of knowing whether McConaghy actually was writing the letters he spoke of. There was certainly no indication from 104 Johnston Street, Annandale, that they had received them. This was the result of several factors not the least important of which was the decision by Foss and Stein to ignore them. In a way, I could have saved McConaghy a lot of trouble by telling him that I didn’t think there was any point in his writing letters to the joint meeting because as far as I was aware we had no intention of participating in his Conference under any circumstances. I did not do so for two major reasons: first, I did not feel that I could speak with any confidence about the wishes of the other signatories to the letter; and secondly, I was not particularly interested in making life easy for him.

McConaghy also had to reconfirm that Bacon and Fell would still participate in his Conference. Given that Bacon had signed the letter of March 11 demanding that the Conference be open and that there be consultation on the structure and direction of the Conference and that Fell had demanded that it be open, McConaghy could no longer be sure that they would present the papers they had originally agreed to do. Bacon was in a more difficult position than Fell. She had attended the meeting of March 11 and signed the letter of March 11 demanding consultation and that the Conference be open. And, as far as others at the meeting were concerned, Bacon had agreed to be bound by the letter:

Dennis Altman: I’m sure Wendy said she wouldn’t participate in the Conference and she would try to persuade Liz and she agreed she ought to be bound by that meeting. (336)

Paul Foss: Wendy said at that meeting that she wouldn’t talk at the thing. She said, ‘Alright, if you’re not going to do it, I won’t either’ . . . She did say at that meeting that she wouldn’t . . . (337)

Wendy Bacon: I would never have gone to that meeting if I felt I had to be bound by it . . . But finally what happened was that McConaghy finally contacted me . . . and I directly spoke to him then I was told it was definitely going to be open and then I decided that that was the essential thing as far as I was concerned, that it should be open. (338)

Although, to the best of my own recollection of the meeting, as well as Bacon’s, it was never clearly articulated at the meeting of March 11 that people would attend it and be bound by the decisions of the meeting, and given the past histories of refusals to be so bound by any meeting, Bacon did acknowledge that “I suppose by signing the letter it is assumed that you will be bound.” (339)

Fell’s position, because she had demanded only that the Conference be open, was much simpler:

Liz Fell: He rang up and said was I or wasn’t I going to speak at the Conference. I said if it was going to be open. And he said it was going to be open . . . And I explained to him that I didn’t feel I could
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take part in the direction of the Conference and that he had actually consulted me. (340)

So, by the end of March, McConaghy was back in the same position he was in in February: he had confirmed the participation of Fell and of Bacon but he still did not have a Women’s or a Gay Liberationists willing to participate in his Conference and Altman had flatly refused.

On Monday 9 April, McConaghy telephoned me again. Making no reference to the fact that his letters to Paul Soss and Colleagues had gone unanswered, he asked once again that I reconsider my decision not to present a paper to his Conference. And again I assured him that I would not. He then asked if there was anybody else in CAMP who might be willing to present a paper. I suggested that he send an official invitation to CAMP, through me, and that I would present it to a meeting of the Executive of CAMP, which could make a decision about whether or not CAMP, as an organization, would authorize somebody to speak at his Conference. As mentioned earlier, neither Watson nor I could be sure that somebody from the emerging Phone-A-Friend group would not be willing to present a paper to the Conference. Had the invitation been sent to the post box, even though addressed to me, it could have been opened by somebody else and a participant found before we could do anything about it. Sent to me, at my home, the timing and manner of its presentation to the Executive could be decided by Watson and I to ensure that the chances of a refusal could be, if not guaranteed, then at least maximized. As it turned out, however, the letter itself made it extremely unlikely that anyone would have volunteered or that the Executive would agree to authorize an official CAMP participant:


Dear Ms. Wills,

Further to our telephone conversation of Monday, 9th April, I would like to extend an invitation to your branch of C.A.M.P. to provide a speaker at the forthcoming Geigy Psychiatric Symposium to be held on 6th & 7th August this year, on the topic “Liberation movements and Psychiatry”. The attached documents on the Symposium and the copy of my letter to Mr Soss (actually Mr. Foss, I misread the signature) will give the members of your executive the details of the Symposium.

The background to the letter is that I sent an invitation to provide a speaker to Gay Liberation on 19th January this year. A letter apparently in response to this invitation was received from Mr. Foss and members of Gay Liberation and Women’s Liberation to which my letter is a reply. I subsequently read in an article in National U of 10th March by Mr. Foss that their reply “to McConaghy was penned in such a way that the terms of participation would be seen by him as untenable”.

There is some attempt within the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists for this body to add to its recent statement condemning legal and social discrimination against homosexuals a further statement, possibly dealing with the compatibility of homosexuality with psychological health. I realise that some of your members may regard legal reform and gradual change in public opinion brought about in this way, of no use, or may actively oppose it as not conducive to some form of confrontation which they consider will ultimately be more effective. However, I think equally that some of your colleagues may not share this viewpoint.

My reasons for organizing this particular topic for the Symposium to be held in our School this year are that I feel psychiatrists and psychiatrists-in-training would benefit from being exposed to as wide a range of views as possible both on the issue of homosexuality and the other issues to be dealt with. This
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was my reason for originally approaching Gay Lib. to send a speaker. It would appear from Mr. Foss's letter that this is incompatible with their more militant aims. As your organization is the other well known homosexual organization in Sydney and I believe contains some members who feel that they can work within existing social institutions to change society's attitude to homosexuality, I am therefore extending this invitation to you to provide a speaker. I certainly believe it will make easier the task of those of us who are working within the College towards obtaining a statement from this body of as liberal a nature as possible.

For those of your members who are of the opinion that there is a contradiction between my being both active in the treatment of homosexuality and yet considering this condition may be compatible with psychological health, I would like to explain my attitude. As I elaborated at the meeting organized by your association last year at which I was invited to speak, I believe that this is no more contradictory than for a doctor to carry out an abortion on an unmarried mother who is distressed at the possibility of having to carry her pregnancy to termination. This does not mean that the doctor regards pregnancy as unhealthy but rather that due to society's attitude to pregnancy in unmarried women her condition warrants this form of medical treatment. I feel that those homosexuals who, in the light of current social attitudes, are so distressed by their homosexuality that they wish help to weaken or change this, equally require medical help. Many of these people are not capable of changing their attitudes to homosexuality and under these conditions I feel that treatment to weaken this is justified.

In view of the need to finalize these arrangements for the Symposium in the near future, I would appreciate your reply to this letter as rapidly as is convenient.

Yours sincerely,

N. McConaghy,
A/Professor of Psychiatry.

There were several points which McConaghy would perhaps have been wiser not to stress: first, the obvious implication that CAMP had been invited only after Gay Liberation had refused; second, the suggestion that CAMP was less militant in its aims than Gay Liberation; and finally, his confirmation that he was still willing to treat homosexuals with aversion therapy. His letter was not presented to the CAMP Executive meeting until 17 April.

In the meantime Altman, who had been told of McConaghy's first reply to Soss and Colleagues, and that nothing was to be done about it decided to make his own reply to McConaghy:

*Dennis Altman:* You see, I was always uneasy and in fact the letter I wrote to him, which was a terrible letter, says, I think, that a conference with psychiatrists where we could talk to psychiatrists would be a good idea, but I don't want you to organize it. And you see, some of the other people in fact felt that there was really no point talking to psychiatrists, whereas I never thought that. So I had a more complicated position. I could say that the whole thing was bad because McConaghy was organizing it but that the concept itself was a good one. I wrote him a letter because I'd signed the original letter to him... I thought there should be some answer and that I'd answer for myself seeing that I was an individual signatory and not an organizational signatory. (342)
Altman not only wrote to McConaghy but had copies of the letter run off as a leaflet and distributed to those he felt should be made aware of his stance. In part, his letter read:

I do not view this conference as an academic meeting such as, for example, last year's ANZAAS where I did give a paper. First, it is impossible for me to detach myself from my connection with Gay Liberation in considering the conference. And second, the organiser of the conference is publicly associated with a view of homosexuality as a "problem" for which "treatment" should be sought. (I refer to your article in The Medical Journal of Australia, January 1973) As you are both the sole organiser and associated with a view that must be offensive to me as a homosexual, I can only see your invitation as a political one to be judged on political grounds, namely should I participate in a conference over whose ground rules I have no control and which are laid down by someone whose position I consider oppressive.

... For me to participate in a seminar organised by you would at least create the possibility of my being seen as legitimising your position and this I cannot do. I am not unwilling to meet with psychiatrists as my visits to Prince Henry Hospital demonstrated. I would, in fact, welcome a conference which enabled a genuine interchange of views with psychiatrists, but this would need to be organised by both psychiatrists and those of us on whom you presume to make judgements — or at least by someone not so closely associated with your position. (343)

McConaghy replied to Altman four days later, on 13 April, 1973. In part, he wrote:

... Naturally I regret your decision and I am very doubtful that there will be any other opportunity, at least in the near future, for you or other persons holding similar views concerning homosexuality to discuss these with a sizeable body of psychiatrists, particularly those who are in a position to influence the policy of psychiatrists as a whole within the next ten years or so.

Though I can understand your objecting to my position in relation to homosexuality I am also doubtful that any members of the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists have a viewpoint closer to that of your movement. For example, I and my colleagues involved in the Behaviour Therapy Unit at Prince Henry Hospital have been active in attempting to have the College make a statement that homosexuality is compatible (sic) with psychological health. We are finding it very difficult to gain the support of a few more members in this attempt.

I am not saying this with any expectation that you will consider such a statement desirable, or that you will change your mind in regard to speaking at the Symposium. I can see the political significance this has for you. However I suggest that it would at least not be harmful to the interests of your movement if other homosexuals participate who would be prepared to put forward a viewpoint opposed to the treatment of homosexuality but whose alignment is not as "militant" as your own. (344)

The reference in McConaghy's letters both to CAMP and to Altman to the activities of the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists as an incentive had no effect. Similarly, if McConaghy had hoped that Altman would try to encourage CAMP (the letters were written only three days apart) to participate in his Conference, it was a vain hope — even given Altman’s uncertainty — because Altman did not discuss McConaghy’s letter to him with CAMP at all.

McConaghy's invitation to CAMP was presented to the Executive meeting of 17 April, a meeting I was unable to attend. Watson, by virtue of the other things that had to be discussed at the meeting, and their importance, (including the condemnation of South Australia's Canary for vilifying the NSW Branch's Co-Presidents) was able to present McConaghy's invitation together

---
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with a statement of reasons why CAMP should not break solidarity with Gay Liberation and have a motion refusing to participate passed with no opposition. On May 5, I wrote, on behalf of CAMP, to McConaghy of the CAMP Executive’s decision to decline his invitation. In part, my letter read:

... the meeting unanimously decided that CAMP would not be willing to participate in your forum under its proposed structure for the reasons outlined in the letter to you signed by myself and other members of CAMP, Gay Lib and Women’s Lib.

The Executive of CAMP consists of office bearers elected at an Annual General Meeting of all members and others elected by the various groups within CAMP to represent them on the Executive and hence does have authority to speak and act for CAMP as a whole.

If our stance on this matter somewhat belies your assumption that CAMP is a conservative organization, so much the better ... (345)

McConaghy had been refused by Altman, Gay Liberation and CAMP and, as far as he could ascertain, Women’s Liberation. In May 1973 he contacted Fell again by telephone to ask for the names of individual women who might be willing to speak at his Conference. Fell was aware that the decision of the Glebe group of Women’s Liberation not to participate in McConaghy’s Conference was just that — a decision of the Glebe group.

Liz Fell: I actually carried on at length with Gill [Leahy] that they should have, if Women’s Lib is an open structure, that they should have taken that letter and put it in Mejane or the Newsletter and given everybody the opportunity to participate if they wanted to. (346)

Fell suggested that Madge Dawson might be willing to present a paper to the Conference. Dawson, who did not consider herself a Women’s Liberationist and who did not participate in any of its groups, telephoned me and asked whether I thought she should accept the invitation. After I told her of the decision to boycott the Conference by Gay Liberation, CAMP and parts of Women’s Liberation, she decided not to participate. Joyce Stevens was another person whom Fell had suggested and, while she was unwilling to do it herself, suggested Judy Mundey. Neither Stevens nor Mundey were aware that there had been any discussion of a joint boycott of the Conference and Mundey agreed to present a paper, as a Women’s Liberationist, to the Conference.

It had taken McConaghy five months to secure the participation of a Women’s Liberationist in his Conference.

It was not until the last week of July that any more was done by any part of the homosexual movement about McConaghy’s Conference. During that week Terry Rolfe discussed with Barry Prothero and others the possibility of making some form of protest at the Conference. Unless something was done, the psychiatrists gathered there would not even know that the homosexual movement had boycotted the Conference let alone why. By this stage too, it was clear that only Altman and the homosexual movement had stuck by the original agreement, however fragile its binding power, not to participate in the Conference.

On Wednesday 1 August Barry Prothero telephoned me to ask if I could come to Australia Street that evening for a meeting with people who were intending to ‘do something’ about the Conference. My stay at that meeting was very brief because they were very unclear about exactly what they were going to do and what they really wanted from me was 100 copies
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of the edition of Camp Ink which contained my article "Intellectual Poofter Bashers". I delivered
the journals the next night and while I was there became involved, with Prothero, in an argument
with Gary Schleeman, a Gay Liberationist I had not met before. Schleeman was a psychiatric
nurse who had not found discussions about psychiatry in Gay Liberation very easy:

Gary Schleeman: There was much talk about psychiatry in general being a
monstrous evil and I had mixed, you know, I accepted much of the stuff
about categorization and criticisms about the medical model but I didn't
think it was impossible to have any kind of dialogue with psychiatrists. I'd
had the psychiatric put down used on me. (347)

When Schleeman saw the copies of Camp Ink arrive he became aware that the talk about disrupting
the Conference was moving much closer to being translated into action and he tried to convince
Prothero and I that McConaghy was going to recant at the Conference. He claimed that he had
been told by a colleague of McConaghy's, Ron Farmer, that McConaghy was going to make a
speech at the Conference acknowledging that his success rates for treatment of homosexuals with
aversion therapy were so poor that he was no longer going to treat homosexuals. Neither Prothero
nor I accepted that it was remotely possible that McConaghy, who had based a large part of his
career on the use of aversion therapy for homosexuals, was suddenly about to publicly declare,
at a gathering of his peers, that he had seen the error of his ways.

On Sunday night 5 August, the day before the Conference was due to start, John Lee,
who had been visiting friends in Newcastle returned to Sydney. He was to stay the night with
Prothero and Altman but before he went there he visited Australia Street and discussed the
plans to disrupt the Conference with Terry Rolfe. He had written a draft of a leaflet that was
to be distributed, together with the copies of Camp Ink, to the psychiatrists at the Conference.
Lee spent the best part of Monday 6 August visiting those of the pissed off activists who had
not already been contacted, talking to them and asking that they go to the Conference next
morning when the homosexual session of the Conference was to occur. They knew that McConaghy
was to present a paper during that session and that Andrew Jakubowicz, a lecturer in Sociology
at the University of NSW, whom some of them knew, would be speaking about homosexuality
but not as a homosexual.

There was only one thing that might interfere with their plans to disrupt the Conference. We had been told that if a large number of people attended the Conference some of them may
have to be accommodated in a separate room, away from the main auditorium, and have the
proceedings of the Conference relayed to them by video. They would, however, by a link up,
be able to ask questions of the speakers. If there were indeed too many people to all be
accommodated in the main auditorium then it was highly likely that any Gay Liberationists who
arrived on the second day of the Conference would be directed to the second room. Lee asked
me if I would telephone McConaghy on the Monday night after the first day's sessions to find
out if all those who had attended had been able to fit into the main auditorium.

On the Monday, John Lee who had gone out on his rounds of contacting pissed off
activists telephoned Prothero:

Dennis Altman: ... and he asked Barry if he would take the car and pick him
up and take him around to do some things for the McConaghy thing ... and I
had a fit . . . because I thought it was terribly dishonest of John to ring up and
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not tell me but ask Barry ... I mean I don't think it's a question of morality, I'm not trying to judge but ... I was very angry and I went too ... We went around to the centre and John was typing out that screed and I thought it was absolutely awful and I in fact typed out a bit of it on the typewriter and I was rewriting it but I kept on mistyping it, so it had to be done again.(348)

And it was done again on the Monday evening:

Terry Bell: [John Lee] was there sitting on the arm chair writing it out as Terry Rolfe was typing it out on the typewriter and I was waiting to run it off on the machine ... and there was a big frantic rush to get things done finally and ... somebody bought balloons ... We ran off quite a few because we intended to publish the leaflet in the newsletter that was being got together at the time but ... we forgot to collate them into the newsletter ... There weren't many of us though. Gary [Schleeman] would have been there for sure. At that stage I don't think he was complaining too loudly because he knew that regardless of what he said something was going to happen. So there wasn't much sense protesting. (349)

On the Monday evening I did telephone McConaghy to ask whether there would be enough room in the main auditorium for anybody who might like to attend tomorrow's sessions to participate without having to do so via closed circuit television from the separate room. He assured me that there was plenty of room for everybody to fit in. He did not ask why I wanted to know or whether I intended to attend. I then telephoned John Lee at the Centre:

John Lee: I talked to you on the Monday night because you said no worries, you'll probably be able to get into the back of the auditorium because there weren't enough people to go into the second auditorium ... That's when we really kind of stepped up our plans for disruption and that kind of thing. (350)

On the Monday morning the Conference had been opened by McConaghy who referred to his attempts to get the liberation movements to participate in the conference:

I had thought for some time that insufficient attention was being paid to the significance of various liberation movements for psychiatry. This opportunity to choose the topic for a psychiatric symposium was therefore most welcome. A few months later, when I was attempting to obtain the participation of members of the various liberation movements, in particular that of Gay Liberation and Camp Inc, my enthusiasm had waned somewhat. (351)

The first session on Theories of Liberation Movements consisted of three papers: Sid Lovibond (Head of the School of Psychology at the University of NSW) spoke on "Liberation and the New and Old Left"; H.M. Bower (Director of Postgraduate Studies at the Mental Health Authority of Victoria) on "Liberation and Psychiatry - Towards a Reconciliation" and Terry Irving (Senior Lecturer in the Department of Government at Sydney University) on "The History of the Study of Social Movements". A few minutes was allowed for questions at the end of each
paper, and at the end of the session time was set aside for a discussion of all three. At the end of this first session there were very few questions which related to the theme of the session - social movements. Once Bridget Gilling had asked a question on the importance of the doctor/patient relationship and suggested that it had to be changed from one where all workers in the helping professions assumed their own superiority in their relationships with patients, the focus of discussion centred on that relationship. Lovibond's solution to this problem was the development of community health centres where the relationship between professional and patient would have a better chance of avoiding a superior/inferior nature; Bower's was through a change in the way helping professionals are educated. Both tacitly accepted Gilling's characterization of the nature of the relationship, both acknowledged the need for change.

The second morning session was on Abortion and again there were three papers: Bridget Gilling (Community Social Worker) on "Abortion - The Reality"; H. Carey (Head of the School of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at the University of NSW) on "Therapeutic Abortion"; and Tony Adams (Director of the Division of Health Services Research of the Health Commission of NSW) on "Liberating Women with Unwanted Pregnancies from the Moralizing Attitudes and Behaviour of the Male Dominated Medical Profession". Gilling stated the premises from which she would argue at the beginning of her paper: that women should have control of their own fertility and that every child has a right to be wanted. Throughout the paper she referred to the difficulties that women had in procuring safe abortions, difficulties set up by the medical profession. In the question time at the end of her paper she was asked by Professor Kiloh (Professor of Psychiatry at the University of NSW) who was chairing the session, to spell out the types of barriers the medical profession sets up and Gilling did so: psychiatrists made women seeking abortions jump through hoops; they lectured women on their stupidity for not having used contraceptives properly; they condemned the morality of women who were not married; and in general acted as though they had the God given right to lecture patients on their moral behaviour.

Carey too made his stance on the issue very clear:

Patients are often referred to Obstetricians and Gynaecologists for termination of pregnancy with little consideration having been given to the risks involved in this procedure.

These risks are related to the stage of the pregnancy at the time of termination. After 10 weeks amenorrhoea (8 weeks from fertilization) the risks are so serious that termination is justified only on the strongest of indications, i.e., there must be a very genuine risk to the mother. Stress due to social, economic or personal factors does not balance out the physical risks to the mother from a procedure to destroy a foetus that has been growing for more than two months.

He followed this opening statement with a series of statistics on the 'dangers' of terminating pregnancies, statistics in which were embedded his fairly obvious opposition to abortion, therapeutic or otherwise. He illustrated Gilling's point about the medical profession's assumed right to lecture women on their stupidity very clearly when he stated that "The majority of pregnancies [for which terminations are sought] result from taking risks by women who are irresponsible or follow emotional reactions without considering the consequences". His stance was very quickly picked up by two Women's Liberationists in the audience:

Joyce Stevens: Dr. Carey gave us some facts from his point of view but that's not really what I want to ask him a question about. He's very concerned about

discussion session references are to the taped version. Most papers as published vary very little from the way they were delivered - in content at least. Some asides have been cut out and in one, an analysis of some of the events at the Conference have not been published.
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the risks involved in abortion and he says that one needs to weigh
up very carefully the risks that are involved. I'd like to suggest
actually that sex for most women is very risky under any circumstances
and that once any woman is going to participate in sex at all she has to
weigh up all sorts of risks even up to what contraceptives she is going to
use and that there are considerable risks in all of these things. Why is it
that Dr. Carey thinks that a woman is not capable when it comes to whether
she'll proceed with a pregnancy. Why is everything else left to the woman
to decide in respect to what she will do with her body but this is the one
case where somebody else has got to weigh up the risks and make the decision
for her?

Carey: The problem is that many women try to make that decision without the
facts. It is the doctor's job to provide her with the data, if she is emotionally
capable at the time of understanding it. Before she makes a decision she
needs the facts and she may be misled by some enthusiasts who say that
termination is a benign condition which can be entered into without any risk
of complication. (355)

While there was no opportunity to pick Carey up on the question of who would make the decision
about whether a woman was “emotionally capable” at the time, the more important point was
raised by another Women’s Liberationist present at the Conference:

Barbara Allysen: I would question your facts because it seems to me that you
can choose any hospital or any state or any country and find precisely what you
want but, given those statistics, what are you and what is your school doing
to minimize the risks other than telling women they should not have abortions? (356)

Carey’s reply, that he was “here today for that reason” did not really address itself to the
characterization that Allysen had made of his stance – that there are risks associated with abortion,
therefore we should not do abortions rather than there are risks associated with abortion, therefore
we should work out medical procedures to minimize those risks.

Tony Adams prefaced his paper by saying that when he had told his wife that he was to
give a paper on Women’s Liberation and Abortion she had said: “How dare you get up and talk
about Women’s Liberation, you don’t know a damned thing about it”. (357) With obvious
reference to Carey, Adams noted that “Usually it is those doctors with moral objections to
abortion who pound the complications argument in an attempt to deter women from obtaining
abortions”. (358) The main thrust of his paper was that women have a right to safe early
terminations if they decide that that is what they want and that the medical profession should
not impose its moral hang-ups on women who seek terminations and for two reasons: first, it
is not doctors who have to suffer the consequences of the decision they make of not to terminate
a pregnancy; and secondly, that such moral argumentation and the requirement of psychiatric
approval for termination only cause delays which increase the risks to the woman’s health.

The questions addressed to the entire panel at the end of the session were varied. The first
from a woman who asked that, given that the technical difficulties can be minimized
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if the termination is carried out early in the pregnancy, should not women be educated to seek terminations early, provided Carey with the opportunity to reciprocate Adams' gibe at him. The last speaker, he said, was out of touch with reality because every endeavour was made to minimize the delay in carrying out terminations. This, however, created other problems because the trend he saw of a tremendous increase in the number of women seeking abortions meant that there were not enough hospital beds available for ordinary usage. Gilling, in reply, asked that, given that terminations took up less hospital bed time than births did, what was happening to all the bed space that was being made available by the births that were not occurring. Carey's reply was that births were better distributed over all hospitals than were terminations which tended to be concentrated in particular hospitals. A woman doctor from the audience noted that "one must not deny the fact that abortion is a destructive act upon the body" (359) and then raised the question of the guilt that abortion produces in women, citing the case of a woman who had had six abortions. Gilling replied that the woman was probably better off than if she had had six full term pregnancies. Following up this line of discussion, there was the question of how anyone could assess which women of all those who sought terminations were likely to suffer from depression and guilt after an abortion. There were three replies to that: Gilling suggested that there was a real need to look at the results of a study which had been carried out in Britain on the children who had been born against the wishes of their mothers (i.e., women who had been refused abortions) because the results of that study had revealed appalling consequences for the children: Kiloh, from the chair, pointed out that a causal relationship between abortion and depression should not be assumed because depression was a wide-spread phenomenon and could have many causes including pregnancy and birth; and Dr. Susan Owen pointed to studies that had been carried out in London which showed that where abortions were easily obtainable post-abortion depression rates were very low. Several doctors in the audience took the opportunity to make statements of their position rather than raise questions. Dr. John McCarthy of Broughton Hall stated that "Any woman who wants an abortion should be allowed to have one quickly and with dignity; this should be a general rule". (360) And Dr. Beverley Raphael stated that "A woman should be allowed to have an abortion if she wants one, what we need is an emphasis on prevention". (361) Professor Whitlock from the University of Queensland had the final question and asked the panel if they regarded abortion as a moral issue and if not, why not. Carey brushed aside the question by answering that "some people are amoral these days" but Gilling took it seriously and replied that sexual morality was the least important component of moral behaviour and that anything which avoided bringing a child into the world which would not be loved was moral. Adams, to whom very few remarks had been addressed during the entire discussion time, did not answer at all.

The afternoon session was entirely given over to Women's Liberation and there were six papers (three on each side of a tea break) in the session chaired by Dr. Susan Owen from the School of Psychiatry at the University of NSW: Ivor Jones (First Assistant in the Department of Psychiatry at Royal Melbourne Hospital) on "Biological Limitations on the Women's Liberation Movement"; Helen Molony (Family Psychiatrist of Sydney) on "How Psychiatry Puts Women Down"; Beverley Raphael (Lecturer in Psychiatry at the University of Sydney) on "The 'Non-Liberation' of the 'Liberated' Woman"; Judy Mundey (Sydney Women's Liberation) on "Sexism
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and Psychiatry"; Neville Parker (Consulting Psychiatrist and Visiting Lecturer in Psychiatry at the University of Queensland) on "A Psychiatrist's Viewpoint of Women's Liberation"; and Bettina Cass (Lecturer in Sociology at the University of NSW) on "Testosterone -- The Basis of Social Power? Or The Politics of Biological Determinism".

Ivor Jones, as the title of his paper suggested, outlined what he saw as the biological limitations to women's liberation. Basing his paper almost exclusively on Corinne Hutt's Males and Females (1972) he cited evidence drawn from studies of chromosomes, genes, chimps, baboons, primitive hunter/gatherer tribes, tribal Aboriginals, and women prisoners in present day society to show that men and women were biologically different and that women's liberation was limited by these differences. All this without any indication that he was aware of the criticisms that have been raised about the difficulties inherent in producing evidence from the animal kingdom to prove a point about contemporary human behaviour. There were no questions to Jones at this point and the session proceeded to Helen Molony who was introduced by Owen as a member of Women's Electoral Lobby, a psychiatrist whose bias was feminist and whose husband was Neil McConaghy. Molony opened her paper:

I had given this talk the rather more sober and less challenging title of "Psychiatric Concepts which May Have Contributed to Female Oppression" — but this was altered (without my knowledge or consent, I may say) by my current Male Oppressor, Professor McConaghy, Organizer of this Symposium, who demanded a more trendy and punchy headline.

In the West of Ireland, the country I hail from, the birth of an infant is invariably greeted with the query "Is it a boy or a child?"

Add to this the fact that having migrated to Australia, I found myself in a society which I declare would flush out the latent feminist in the most acquiescent of females, and you may have sufficient data to account for the bias from which I speak — that is a feminist one. A liberal rather than a radical feminist who would argue that the liberation of women involves the liberation of men and that social equality can be achieved without a revolution. (362)

She went on to describe the anti-woman bias in Freudian psychiatry, the weaknesses of psychiatric theories of maternal deprivation, the anti-feminism of descriptive psychology, and the way in which psychosomatic medicine is implicitly condemnatory of women. She concluded:

It is probably inevitable that psychiatry in the treatment of women should have focused on individual psychopathology and largely ignored the possibility that some of their difficulties may be the product of social forces. Physical medicine did not accept responsibility for changing those aspects of society which caused infections and malnutrition until late in its development. Psychiatry has now reached a similar stage in its development — when it can no longer focus on adjusting the individual female (or male) to society and ignore its responsibility to change those aspects of society which are producing unnecessary mental suffering and ill health. Certainly it must rid itself of unproven theories about female psychology which may add to these. (363)

There was only one question of Molony at this point: she was asked to comment on the proposition that women tend to have hysteria problems and men to have sociopathic problems; she agreed that it was possible to characterize the sociopathic personality as the extreme form that masculinity takes.
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Molony was followed by Dr. Beverley Raphael, the aim of whose paper was expressed as:

I would like to say that one needs to be aware, to have insights into the origins of one's involvement or avoidance of involvement in contemporary social issues, and in this case one's individual cathexis or anticathexis of the Women's Liberation Movement. There are many motives for involvement as there are for negating involvement. And extremes at either end of this continuum of social interest may be areas of pathology. I do not take issue with the cause itself, but only ask those who espouse it to consider carefully their reasons for so doing, so that they may operate from a foundation of mature self-knowledge rather than the repetition compulsion of unconscious neurotic conflict. (364)

Raphael's argument, which produced the most comment during the discussion session, should have been dismissed on methodological grounds. She used three pieces of evidence in the explanation for her plea to Women's Liberationists to examine the motives for their involvement lest they be pathological in origin: one was a study done in America by Cherniss; the second, a series of cartoons; and the third, a 'member' of Women's Liberation. Arguing from the Freudian position that jokes are a "valid and important reflection of significant unconscious processes" (365) and that they "make possible the satisfaction of an instinct (whether lustful or hostile) in the face of an obstacle that stands in its way" (366) Raphael used twelve cartoons which she claimed showed that Women's Liberationists may be motivated by, amongst other pathologies, pathological anger towards men, penis envy, pathological denial of sexuality, and negation of all child-bearing, child-rearing, and mothering functions. What she failed to mention was that not only was none of the cartoons drawn by a Women's Liberationist but that none was drawn by a woman. In other words, if her cartoons reflected any pathology, they reflected the pathological fear that these male cartoonists had of the liberation of women. The third piece of evidence was produced to support her contention that Women's Liberationists cannot cope with, and so deny, sexuality itself. The evidence consisted of the case of Elayne K, aged 26, a "very active and outspoken supporter of Women's Liberation, frequently demonstrating and taking a heated stand on issues of sexual discrimination". (367) The fact that, as she herself pointed out, Elayne K was a male who wanted a sex change operation did not seem to worry her in terms of its worth as a piece of evidence to support her case that women who become involved in Women's Liberation needed to question their motives for signs of pathology. She concluded:

I would like to say that I think such a movement as this has many valuable contributions to make to the whole social framework. But those who are committed to it, or are considering commitment, would be well to remember the vital issues of relevance.
Why is one doing this?
What does this extreme view signify? It may be pathology. (368)

The first question of Raphael came from a woman who asked that, given that everybody knows that some of the women involved in Women's Liberation might be pathological, what was the point of her paper. Check your motivation was Raphael's reply. Margaret Clancy, who had been involved in some of the anti-psychiatry discussion groups Fell had organized asked Raphael the source of the cartoons. Raphael replied that she had taken them from women's magazines over the last 12 months. Clancy made the point which was taken no further that the cartoons were drawn by men and that she thought it unfortunate that Raphael had based her "attack on
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Women's Liberation on the usual trivializing caricatures". (369) Raphael chose to answer only one part of Clancy’s criticism; she was sorry that Clancy felt it was an attack on Women’s Liberation. This was greeted with disbelieving laughter from the audience and a question from anti-psychiatrist psychiatrist Harry Freeman:

*Harry Freeman:* It was seen as an attack and you questioned their motivation. Can I ask you your motivation in questioning their motivation? (370)

When the applause died down Raphael answered that she was questioning both why she was not herself involved and why other people were. Sasha Soldatow who was there to cover the Conference for Scrounge (371) asked Raphael whether the personal pathology applied only when there was extremism to which she replied that perhaps it was with over-involvement that pathology occurred. A woman psychiatrist from the audience made the final point of that session by noting that the motivation of the other speakers had not been questioned, only Raphael’s.

Judy Mundey was the first speaker after the afternoon tea break and was introduced by Dr. Susan Owen:

*Susan Owen:* When I rang Judy Mundey up and asked her how she would like to be introduced, I asked, well, what are the things that I can tell about you. And she said you can say I’m a bit frightened but she said I wasn’t to mention who her husband is. (372)

Having had her request explicitly denied, Mundey, who knew nothing about the partial boycott of the Conference, stated the aim of her paper as showing that “the answer is not trying to fit women back into the model, one which has already proven so unsatisfactory, to cure them of their frustrations, depressions, anxieties. If the model is wrong, the answer is to change it”. (373) She spoke of the socialization of girls into very restricted sex-stereotyped roles — those of wife and mother and of the problems this creates for women, especially those who reject those roles as the be-all and end-all of life. She used the experiences of other women and herself to illustrate her points.

Mundey, who was pressed for time to finish her paper, was followed by Neville Parker whose paper was to be devoted to an examination of “why a few women give up so much of their time and energy to a cause, often to the neglect of their family or their occupation . . . the psychology of these people has to be considered”. (374) He stressed that

> I am not going to discuss the moderate and sensible people who quietly and persistently contribute to progress in this area by their everyday lives and their commitment. Rather I have in mind a very small group who are collectively identified as the Women’s Liberationists; they are an offshoot of the feminist movement and have blossomed in an atmosphere where there is increasing acceptance of woman’s role in society. (375)

After giving an example of a woman who was characterized as being a good housewife and mother before an accident which confined her to a wheelchair and as neurotic afterwards because she continued to try to do her housework from the wheelchair, he made the point that:

> It is not so much the character trait or behaviour which determines the consequences but the social, political or religious attitudes towards it. My patient if not a changed woman following the accident, she is basically the
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same disturbed compulsive person who has replaced her socially acceptable
behaviour with neurotic symptoms when the former avenue for expression
was blocked.

It is my belief that the campaigners for women's liberation have features in
common with this patient and that their activities are but a substitute for
what would otherwise be regarded as neurotic illness. (376)

He reported that on going through his records of over 5,000 consecutive private patients only two
had become active in Women's Liberation. Both of them had "classical textbook symptoms of
neurosis with predominantly obsessional features". (377) After they became active in Women's
Liberation the women improved but "then their husbands attended me because they had become
impotent". (378) The women needed no further treatment because "Woman's (sic) Liberation
had become for them a neurotic equivalent, socially acceptable and certainly more productive". (379)

As to why different people become involved in different social movements, he could understand
people becoming active in CAMP or Gay Liberation for "their own sexual orientation has resulted
in experiences which cry out for reform" (380) but whites who became involved in the fight
against discrimination against Aborigines did so because "in spite of their normal appearance, they
have felt since childhood that they are inferior second-class citizens and can ally themselves with
this minority group and act out their resentments in a disguised way". (381) As for Women's
Liberation:

- the evidence strongly indicates that these women have sexual hang-ups; their
- literature and their speeches are filled with sexual themes; it has been so from its
- beginnings. One has the feeling that if only they used their sexuality rather
- than denounce or deny it there would be much less noise from this vocal
- minority group. (382)

After citing another case study, he went on:

- It is interesting how these ladies castigate members of their own sex; they
- rubbish the prostitutes, they decry the sensuous woman, they scorn the
- "cabbages", in fact the only ones they admire are the bra-less Amazons who
- gird their loins - and with clitoris rampant flaunt all about them, male and
- female, with intellectual rhetoric . . .
- I agree with the historians who assert that women who are actively involved in
- women's liberation are protesting against their lack of femininity; they are not
- women and yet cannot compete with men on equal terms. Furthermore one has
- the distinct impression that there is no compassion for the really underprivileged
- women - the workers' wives tied by their brood of children, with husbands who
drink too much; they do not have the talent to do a University course and cannot
find an outlet other than the companionship of fellow sufferers working with
- them in the factory. (383)
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He concluded his paper:

In concluding that Women's Liberation campaigners are using this alternative means of adaptation I hope I am in no way looking down on them or making a value judgment of the principles which they uphold. If this is a neurotic equivalent then fair enough; it is more productive than lying in bed with a tension headache. Let us have people acting out their problems as long as they do not infringe on the personal liberties of others (and they sometimes do) and as long as they do not disparage the rest of us who complacently sit back and tolerate an imperfect world. (384)

A very angry sounding woman doctor reached the microphone first to “ask the last speaker if such neurotic symptoms are never found in idealized men” to which Parker replied: “My brief was to talk about the psychopathology of Women's Liberationists. I'd very much like to talk about the psychopathology of psychiatrists which would make a more interesting paper”. (385)

Bettina Cass was the last speaker in the Women's Liberation session and stated her biases at the outset—a feminist and an academic sociologist. In a detailed and well argued paper she managed, whether by premeditated design or by coincidence, to undermine Ivor Jones' paper on biological limitations to women's liberation. Jones had based his entire paper on Corinne Hutt's Males and Females; Cass criticized, in detail, Hutt's evidence and arguments and concluded that Hutt, as a researcher, falls into the category of women described by Oakley: "Women tend to be even more prejudiced than men about the potentiality they have as a sex for full and equal participation in social, economic and political life." (Oakley 1972) Corinne Hutt's thesis is a scientific attempt to keep men and women "in their place": to preclude both from participation in the sphere of the other. Her book is a construction, using the rhetoric of science, which asserts the unequal potential of men and women and attempts to validate that construction in terms of biological necessity. It is the latest contribution to the mythology of sex roles. (386)

Cass's paper, while much sounder than those of the other speakers, was also much less provocative and during the discussion period very few questions or remarks were directed to her; understandably most were directed to Parker and Raphael. Dr. Zilliarchis, a male psychiatrist, asked Parker whether he did not believe that people with overvalued ideals were important, to which Parker replied: "All great contributions have been made by disturbed people and I'm all for it". (387) Joyce Stevens, from Women's Liberation, was quick to direct a statement-cum-question to Parker too:

Joyce Stevens: This is the first time I've ever been to a psychiatrist and after this experience I must say I'm rather glad because I hadn't realised until I came here that I was neurotic, pathological and that I was sexually hung up and that was the reason why I was a confirmed Women's Liberationist. But I must say that after having listened to Dr. Parker I just wonder who isn't neurotic. He says that if a woman identifies with Women's Liberation because of the things that have happened to her own life she's neurotic. If somebody identifies with the Black Movement because they're not black, that is, because it hasn't happened to them, they're neurotic. So that you've got it both ways. That is, you're neurotic if you do things that derive from your own experience but you've got to be neurotic if you do them because it doesn't derive from your own experience...

Owen from Chair: Would you come to your question?

Stevens: What is normal? (388)
Parker's reply was that he wished people would use the word 'normal' as he did, in its statistical sense rather than in the sense of being acceptable. And, used statistically, Women's Liberationists fall outside the normal range. A male medical student asked Mundey whether, if we were being asked to 'forgive' failed women, women who could not live up to the role expectations imposed upon them, we were allowed to forgive failed men too. And Mundey, acknowledged that men also missed out in the conditioning process. Ailsa Burns asked the panel whether they thought that psychiatry had anything to offer women who were unhappy with their roles. Molony replied that she thought that psychiatrists were too hung up and until they could see what was happening to them, no; Owen replied that psychiatrists did have a role to play, just as they did with men's liberation; and Raphael replied that psychiatrists may have quite a lot to offer but that their main problem was that they viewed themselves as omnipotent.

A male member of the audience claimed that he found the reaction to Raphael indicated that the women present were treating her as a traitor to the cause. But, as far as he was concerned, she had struck a blow for liberation because she had argued for moderation. He asked whether the other women panelists supported moderation. At first, Mundey said that she did not want to make a comment. But after Molony had said that she was a moderate and timid and Cass had stated that she was a moderate and often labelled reformist and conservative, Mundey changed her mind. She used the example of the fight for equal pay for women to argue that the demand had been put forward moderately for a long time and nothing had happened. The only real result came with firmer action and so she did believe in direct action and direct confrontation. The case of the stand that the Builders Labourers had made against the demolition of historic buildings was a further example of the need, on occasion, for immoderate action. Her answer was applauded. There were more comments about Raphael's paper – that she had not really urged moderation, that she had asked people to question their motives and that she had failed to point out the psychopathology of those who were prepared to tolerate injustice – before the first day of the Conference closed. What is interesting to note is that from the tapes of the Conference, the second room had in fact been used on the Monday. McConaghy, during my telephone conversation with him on the Monday night had led me to believe that not only would it not be needed on the Tuesday but that it had not been used on the Monday. In the cat and mouse game we were playing, it was difficult to work out who was misleading whom more.

On the Tuesday morning some of the pissed off activists – Barry Prothero, John Lee, Terry Rolfe, Trudy Lippman, Mim Loftus, Christine O'Sullivan, Shane Kelly, Susanne Hollis – met at Australia Street at around 9 o'clock. At Australia Street were 100 copies of Camp Ink, copies of the Gay Liberation leaflet, whistles and balloons and eggs.

Barry Prothero: I'd suggested to a couple of people that we get brains but they were too expensive and they would have needed thawing out, so we just got eggs.

They took two taxis out to Prince Henry Hospital, one taxi stopping on the way to get more eggs. By the time they arrived at the lecture theatre the first session of the second day of the Conference was almost over. Chaired by Associate Professor Andrews from the School of Psychiatry at the University of NSW it was on pornography and there were three papers: Ron Farmer (Lecturer in Psychology at the University of NSW) on "The Effects of Sex Censorship in the Home"; John
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Court (School of Social Sciences, Flinders University) on "Pornography — Personal and Societal Effects"; and Wendy Bacon on "Psychological and Social Possibilities".

Farmer’s paper argued that “the focus on public censorship distracts attention from the major determiner of sexual deviance and inadequacy; that of sex censorship in the home”. While he was opposed to censorship to adults for reasons concerning individual liberty, his main concern in the paper was to illustrate by a series of case studies that people who presented to him as adults with sexual problems had been shielded from exposure to sexual material and sexual discussion as children. He concluded by arguing that:

> Sex education should be directed towards the parents, as it is they who are the most powerful censoring agents during the period in child development where the foundations of sexual attitudes, fears, aversions, and beliefs are established. (392)

Farmer’s paper, at this point, provoked only a couple of questions and these were of a technical nature. One questioner, for example, wanted to know whether he tried to get husbands to come in to joint therapy with their wives to which Farmer replied that about one-third of husbands were extremely reluctant to do so. John Court’s paper, on the other hand, was very provocative. A South Australian campaigner for stricter censorship laws, his main argument was that:

> it is scientifically legitimate to assert that there are effects of sexually explicit material which most would be prepared to label harmful, while taking it for granted that it has effects in behaviour therapy which could be labelled beneficial. (393)

Using every sort of evidence — opinions of experts and statistical studies — Court, who was very careful not to claim causal relationships, nonetheless reported on the high positive correlations found between increased dissemination of sexually explicit material and increased figures of reported rape and increases in the incidence of VD. Professor Whitlock from Queensland asked why, if as Court suggested, there was a rise in the incidence of rape and attempted rape which Court seemed to think was due to the greater availability of pornography, Court singled out pornography as the cause when the incidence of all crimes of violence had increased. Sex and violence, Court answered, were linked in pornography. John McCarthy of Broughton Hall asked whether there were any figures for countries where the increased availability of pornography had not produced changes in the incidence of sex related crimes. Court replied that while in some countries there had been an initial decrease in sex related crimes after censorship laws had been relaxed, and there did appear to have been a decrease in sexual hang-ups, after a very short period of time that decrease disappeared and turned into an increase.

Court was followed by Wendy Bacon who was introduced as “a courageous and rather creative person in Sydney”. Bacon shifted the focus of the discussion:

> The whole trouble with this discussion about effects of pornography is that it goes on in a vacuum. To me personally it is pretty much a non-issue. People have been arguing for years that pornography doesn’t have any harmful effects and finally many people seem to be convinced that it doesn’t have any drastically harmful effects. Yet that is not really the issue, nor has it ever been the issue. You can take someone who is pro-censorship and argue all day with them about the harmful effects. They may well in the end be convinced that there is no empirical evidence. Yet this is not the issue to them. This became quite clear in the U.S. Commission on Pornography and Obscenity. In the minority report, three of the
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Commissioners wrote this: "The Commission has deliberately and carefully
avoided coming to grips with the basic and underlying issue. The Government's
interest in regulating pornography is always related primarily to the prevention
of moral corruption and not to the prevention of overt criminal acts and
conduct." That is, they don't give a damn whether or not any of this empirical
evidence came out on one side or the other, they still wanted to retain the
censorship laws because the law is relating to upholding a particular moral
order. (395)

Pornography, she argued, was very much a 'superstructural thing', it gave you a picture of what
the sexual structure of society was really like. Bacon concluded her paper by distinguishing
between different types of pornography. While she was totally opposed to censorship she felt
quite free to criticize the mass produced depersonalized pornography that was becoming increasingly
available, criticize it because it objectified women.

So however much of this type of pornography is available I really can't
see that it will have much to do at all with changing sexual attitudes in
this society. It is an aspect of the consumer society and that is all you
can say about it. On the other hand, I do think some of the things that
have been attempted by what they call the sexual libertarians to
demystified (sic) sexuality and promote more open sexual discussion are
part of a whole trend which could change sexuality. It is time to make
distinctions and stop just talking about pornography or sexually explicit
material. (396)

It was at the end of Bacon's paper that the Gay Liberationists arrived:

_John Lee_: So we got there and we all stood at the back of the auditorium
... we didn't make an attempt to try to fit into the seating arrangements
at all. There were spare seats but we all just stood along the back. (397)

_The chairperson of the session noticed them:_

_Professor Andrews_: There are quite a few people standing. I wonder if
people could consolidate to make seats available at the end of rows. I
wonder if you'd move in so that there is seating available for the people
at the back. (398)

They remained unmoved as questions were directed to Bacon. Norman Rose, a Melbourne
psychiatrist, noted that two types of pornography seemed to be available in Europe: one was
the standard glossy picture magazine and the other was represented by magazines such as _Suck_
and _Oz_ which seemed to have a political liberation type message. He asked her to comment on
the relationship between magazines like _Oz_ and liberation. Bacon acknowledged that there was
a revolutionary connection which reflected the influence of Reich and the connection was the
belief that there cannot be an economic revolution without a social and sexual revolution. This
was followed by a question to Bacon about rape:

_Marie McIwain_: Do you see rape more as a symptom of a fascist attitude
toward females rather than as a product of sexual excitement?
_Wendy Bacon_: Rape. It's both a product of sexual excitement – I mean that
must be the initial thing. But the fact that it is rape must relate to the sexual
structure of the sorts of people that feel inclined to rape. And also, certainly,
to the relations between men and women in this society. I don't think I'd
call it fascist. That wouldn't be a word that I'd apply to it but it's certainly,
it's certainly a product of the situation of usually young men who are unable
to relate to women in any other way but a sexual way, except perhaps some
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older women. But they see women as sex objects, and they also feel obviously inadequate to confront them one to one very often... Just recently there was a case in Sydney where five Aboriginal boys were up for raping a white girl. Now, they got off and they did no doubt forcibly fuck her. But, on the other hand, they'd done so in the past and there were several times there'd been a group of them and the jury let them off. Now I think that what that indicates is some change in the thinking of people. If all it means is that a woman who's fucked around is going to be treated worse than those that don't it will be an unfortunate thing but if it's an indication of the fact that people are beginning to see it more than as an isolated incident and more as a product of social situations then I think it'll be a fortunate development. (399)

Before questions were invited of the entire panel, the chairperson called again for the Gay Liberationists to join the Conference:

Professor Andrews: Why don't you come and join us and be part of some general discussion.

Wendy Bacon: Yes, that would be much better. (400)

Gay Liberationists: See, the impression I got was that they'd been invited to join in, to come and sit down and not to feel apart, right, and they refused. They were having no part of it and they were making it very much an us/Them situation and rejecting the overture that had been made to them. (401)

They remained standing up the back of the auditorium as the three speakers on pornography answered questions from the audience. McConaghy asked Court why he did not campaign against cars, tobacco, and alcohol given that they too had harmful social effects, why single out pornography. Court's reply was to argue that the other issues would involve complex political matters and that in the case of the motor car, for example, the benefits of its widespread usage outweighed its harmful effects. A woman from the audience asked for clarification as to whether Court was actually claiming a cause and effect relationship between pornography and the types of social effects he had talked about. Court answered that he was not claiming a cause and effect relationship but that pornography was a "potentiating factor" in the social effects. Farmer added that in view of some of the results he had obtained with therapy there may indeed be some sort of relationship and Bacon argued that if there was a relationship then pornography was the effect rather than the cause. One final question from a male member of the audience asked Court to distinguish between pornography and erotica. Court admitted that there was some difficulty but if one looked at the effects then it could be argued that erotica aroused a "normal well adjusted male" (to which there were groans from the audience) and that normal people found pornography distasteful, it turned them off rather than on.

During the morning tea break, while the auditorium was cleared, the Gay Liberationists went around and placed a copy of Camp Ink and a copy of their leaflet on each of the seats and retired to the back of the auditorium again to await the return of the participants who, while they were waiting for the session to start, had time to read the leaflet.

A STATEMENT FROM GAY LIBERATION

The point may not have come over clearly: that the homosexual liberation movement has boycotted this conference.

We were invited to speak -- by Professor McConaghy himself -- but we regard the idea of HIS setting up a conference that is (unbelievably) styled "Psychiatry and Liberation" as utterly farcical.
You see we're just not prepared to come along and “rationally” debate our position with our oppressors. No, we're fed up with that. We're sick of being reasonable anymore when the oppressive horrors of aversion therapy, psychosurgery and neo-Freudian bullshit psychotherapy continue to fuck us over.

Last year, however, being less aware than we are now, we did engage in reasonable debate with McConaghy. We argued that people came to him to be "cured" of their homosexuality because they were oppressed. That is, they are victims of this society's sexist, anti-homosexual values. They have internalised the sort of ideological bullshit that claims heterosexuality is a basic prerequisite for a happy life. Time and again the brick wall descended: "People come of their own free will . . . " "My work is value free, . . . " are among the stock replies.

We are not going to debate our position quietly and rationally in the context of a conference of shrinks who virtually all accept some of the assumptions that allow sexist torturers, like McConaghy, and sexist butchers like Harry Baily (with his psychosurgery) to exist at all. For ALL the theories you work within fit, to one degree or another, the prevailing sexist ideology of this society. Blatantly, as in the case of aversion therapy and psychosurgery, and more subtly and insideously in the case of the non-Behaviourist therapies.

The acceptance of these values was amply illustrated in ABC-TV's Monday Conference debate on aversion therapy last year. On the one hand we had the no-nonsense behaviourist hard-liners, in the form of Prof. Lovibond and Dr. Wright-Short, and on the other the nice liberal humanists. When the question of "curing" homosexuals came up, the only thing the behaviourists and "humanists" argued about was the inhumanity of aversion therapy, per se. The co-president of CAMP, Sue Wills, tried desperately to steer the discussion towards the question of motivation in seeking "cure" i.e., why the fuck were homosexuals going to shrinks anyway. But that vital point was ignored. (The two sides preferring to push for the one thousandth time the merits of their approach to the "problem").

At a discussion last year between gay liberatinists (sic) and counsellors from the Dept. of Health, a psychiatrist Dr. Harry Freeman, said: "I'm accused in the profession of being ridiculously sympathetic towards homosexuals and yet I couldn't honestly advocate that homosexuals come and see me because . . . . as a heterosexual . . . I'd give off all the wrong vibes". We entirely agree.

For you are all guilty as oppressors -- even if you disapprove/feel repugnance for aversion therapy or psychosurgery -- you have to accept the charge. We know, for example, from the kind of information that came (sic) in when CAMP was looking for professional supporters for the homosexual guidance service that there is barely one shrink in this city who doesn't work to some degree with sexist assumptions.

Your profession INVENTED the idea that homosexuality is a form of mental illness and there is nothing to suggest that that idea is radically challenged within your profession.

So FUCK YOU ALL.

We say GAY IS GOOD

And we will work to subvert you as active agents of an oppressive social system.

This statement was produced by a group of gay liberationists who are actively concerned with exposing psychiatry as an oppressive force. More information can be obtained from:

SYDNEY GAY LIBERATION
P.O. Box A 76
Sydney South, 2000

(402)

Sasha Soldatow: I was completely unaware of any planned activity until I came back into the hall and saw those leaflets at which time I grabbed a leaflet and read it through . . . . And then what happened was that I met Dr. John . . . and he sat next to me . . . (403)

John Lee: We headed back to the back of the hall just as if nothing had happened. And some people sat in the centre aisle, quite close to the stage . . . . Shane, Christine, Trudy . . . . We all had eggs at that stage . . . . We tried to work out some sort of tactics. Trudy wanted to sort of get as close as she could to sort of get a dead hit on. And the more timid of us queens stayed up the back. (404)
Once the participants had settled down, the chairperson for the session on homosexuality Andrews, opened it by asking Dr. John Cade of Melbourne to deliver his paper “An Eclectic Psychiatrist Looks at Homosexuality”. Cade, a psychiatrist superintendent of the Mental Health Authority of Victoria, began his paper by talking about some of the difficulties associated with trying to define homosexuality and, after mentioning some of the ways that different sections of the community regarded homosexual behaviour, argued for the adoption of the Kinsey 7-point continuum of heterosexual - homosexual behaviour.

Sasha Soldatow: I was taking notes right the way through because of Scrounge. But ... there was a point at which I changed my tactic in taking notes ... half way through the Cade thing I began to take down notes for things that were beginning to involve me. (405)

Cade went on to talk about his attitudes to homosexuality from the perspective of his two roles as psychiatrist with clinical and administrative responsibilities. From the point of view of the clinical psychiatrist his view was that:

*John Cade:* ... a stable homosexual relationship is certainly no more psychiatrically abnormal than nail biting or cigarette smoking ... It appears to be a matter of social acceptability ... So, what is acceptable varies from generation to generation and I think it's presumptuous to label socially unacceptable behaviour as *ipso facto* necessarily deviant or abnormal. However, there is some behaviour that is so deviant or so socially disruptive that the individuals concerned are almost inevitably regarded as abnormal – either very bad or very sick. For example, the paedophiliac who solicits prepubertal boys or the transvestite who is delusional about his sexual identity, or, to give a heterosexual example, the ruthlessly incestuous father. Whether or not homosexuality is regarded as an illness, there's no doubt that homosexuals, like heterosexuals, may develop a psychiatric illness which requires treatment. (406)

*John Lee:* We were a bit confused about our tactics ... Trudy began letting balloons go, you know, hanging on to the end to make a large farting noise at appropriate moments during Cade's talk. (407)

The appropriate moments presented themselves when Cade began to discuss his attitude to homosexuality from the perspective of his role as hospital administrator:

*John Cade:* Amongst either patients or staff it's an unmitigated nuisance simply because it leads to disruption, turmoil, or scandal mongering. Amongst male nursing staff it's relatively uncommon, contrary to what some people might think. Whether or not the homosexual male nurse is a nuisance, is a menace, depends on whether he divorces his sex life from his professional duties. If he does he's often a very competent and sensitive nurse who gives a high measure of devotion to his patients. I remember one young man many years ago who was a pest when nursing in wards where there were numbers of young men who aroused him but became an absolute treasure when he was re-posted to a male geriatric ward. (408)

At those words a large section of the audience either groaned or burst into disbelieving laughter. From then on his speech was interrupted by shrill whistles (from police-type whistles), whenever he made what was considered to be either a sexist or a heterosexist comment.
John Cade: It's been my experience that lesbian pairs or groups among nursing staff who live in hospital nurses homes breed tension or disruption sooner or later. Of course, it might be argued that this is not the fault of the lesbians but of their jealous and moralistic heterosexual colleagues. This may be so at times but most times a crisis seems to be precipitated by a threatened or actual disruption of a homosexual relationship rather than external pressure. (409)

This was greeted by a burst on the whistles as were his remarks about Gay Liberation:

John Cade: Having said all this I think you'll agree that Gay Lib, I think, has been most unjust to psychiatrists. I've seen some of their propaganda and they seem quite paranoid -WHISTLE - to put it quite bluntly - AUDIENCE LAUGHTER - about the aims and attitudes of psychiatrists toward them as individuals and as a group. I agree with them, with the reservations I've mentioned, that homosexuality is not necessarily psychiatrically abnormal... Anyhow, neither I nor any psychiatrist that I know, am burning with evangelical zeal to go out into the highways and byways searching for happy homosexuals to brainwash them into semi-impotent heterosexuality and so-called social conformity. (410)

Cade concluded with a quotation from Kinsey, part of which was:

John Cade: ... In short, there's an abundance of evidence that most human sexual activities would become comprehensible to most individuals if they could know the background of each other individual's behaviour. (411)

The audience response to Cade's paper was a mixture of applause, boos, and whistles. There were two questions of Cade in the short time allowed for them to be directed to him as an individual speaker:

Gary Schleeman: Dr. Cade, you mentioned an instance where a homosexual male nurse was an absolute treasure when transferred out of a situation when apparently you regarded him as likely to be a difficulty with the patients. Can you tell me why is a homosexual nurse more likely to allow his sexuality to interfere with his professional role than a heterosexual nurse? Do you hold that this is necessarily so?

John Cade: Ah well, this happens to be a homosexual community this particular ward, you see. I think that a heterosexual nurse, a male nurse, or nurse working in a ward with patients of the opposite sex would, could be at equal risk, depending on their prudence and control.

Gary Schleeman: I wonder why you raised the issue?

John Cade: Do you think it is irrelevant?

Gary Schleeman: I think it's something that applies equally to heterosexual nurses. I don't think it should be any kind of issue.

John Cade: Uhah, alright, I take your point, but it's an issue for an administrator. An administrator as I've said in that this particular person was a nuisance sexually that is, with young male patients, and we, that has to be prevented in the same way as you have to prevent heterosexual behaviour.

Gary Schleeman: Certainly, that's just an instance of a particular person's sexuality getting out of hand, not his homosexuality. It may equally occur with heterosexual nurses.

John Cade: I quite agree, oh yes. Yes, sure.

Chairperson: Any further questions?

Female member of audience: If you'd been talking about heterosexuals you wouldn't have even mentioned it.

John Cade: Well, I was talking about homosexuals.

LAUGHTER FROM AUDIENCE

Bob Ives: Bob Ives from Melbourne. Dr. Cade, if a patient presented to a

(409) Ibid.
(410) Ibid.
psychiatrist and this patient was relatively heavily homosexually oriented, but had some heterosexual orientation as well, a much lesser orientation, and was disturbed by his or her heterosexual impulses, and requested treatment designed to alter their sexual orientation in a homosexual direction, that is, to make them more completely homosexual, and remove their relatively small amount of heterosexuality impulse, would you regard it as acceptable to attempt such treatment.

John Cade: Well, I've never been faced with that particular problem. I think it's, er, and I don't know how I would approach it. I'm sure I'd hand over the problem to someone else like Neil McConaghy. (412)

Cade was followed by Andrew Jakubowicz, a lecturer in Sociology at the University of NSW:

Barry Prothero: There were a few things said during Cade's paper but generally quiet. Well, relatively quiet, put it that way, just whistles. Andrew J's paper was well received, I'd say, by the Gay Lib people. (413)

Sasha Soldatow: ... by the end of Cade's thing I was beginning, I was by then sort of personally involved so that by the time Andrew stood up, which I couldn't believe ... I mean, as soon as he got up I thought, right, this is it. And that's probably the point at which I decided to get, you know, really involved. See Andrew and I have had a number of discussions, fights, attacks on each other ... about the resident action stuff. And I'd accused him before then of sort of, you know, making an academic career out of resident action and pretending to be very nice and helpful but still sort of doing all the right things as far as the academy goes. And this to me was just a perfect example of it ... In the other attacks that I'd had they'd all been about, sort of, him doing things for migrants and saying we must go around and do things for migrants and stuff like that and so the attacks were more theoretical but this one was, this was an actual point at which I felt that he was really treading on my feet. So at that point I became totally un-Scrounge reporter and became me. ... The thing that annoyed me which, in a way quite pleased me that I wasn't with the Gay Lib people in the body of the hall, was that there was a real silence throughout Andrew's paper ... that was the feeling I was getting quite strongly from the Gay Lib people in the back, that they were quite happy about Andrew ... which annoyed me cause again I saw that as tokenism ... So there was that intense silence ... and I think what particularly annoyed me was that, you know, the personal level stuff with Andrew annoyed me, but also the fact that the psychiatrists remained silent so therefore they were actually learning or thought they were listening to something they should consider important. It was given on a level which they could understand, you know, another professional standing up and giving a professional paper. (414)

Jakubowicz, who was heard in silence and with the 'approval' of the Gay Liberationists, opened his paper which was entitled "Psychiatry and Homosexuality: Individual Repression or Personal Liberation" with

Andrew Jakubowicz: Well, the reason I'm here today is the reason in part for that blue sheet in front of you. Neither Gay Lib nor CAMP were going to talk to you today. Dennis Altman said inviting a Gay Libber or even your normal conservative homosexual to talk at a meeting like this would be very much like
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inviting a Jew to talk at a Nazi Party rally. And I think that analogy isn't far off. But given that Gay Lib refused because you don't take up battle with the enemy on his own ground according to his rules, and CAMP didn't particularly like coming in as second fiddle, someone, I thought, ought to at least appear and take on the stimulus-organism-response behaviourists as Dr. McConaghy described himself recently... Well, the aim of this paper is to take on the assumptions of the behaviourists, the assumptions of the aversion therapists and, in a sense, the assumptions and ideology of individual psychotherapy and what it does to people who happen to be homosexual. I'm going to look at sexual behaviour as a social phenomenon rather than an individual psychological one or as a biological one. And I also want to look at the process in our sort of society whereby people learn that their behaviours are sick behaviours and they learn guilt, they learn anxiety about their feelings and possibly I want to toss up some alternatives, some of which are being acted out by people here today.(415)

Jakubowicz then went on to outline a sociological perspective on homosexuality relating it to the societal pressures which push homosexuals toward treatment for behaviour that has been labelled socially unacceptable because it constitutes a threat to the dominant pattern of socio-economic relations. He concluded with several points:

Andrew Jakubowicz: Aversion therapists have defined homosexuality as an individual problem of maladjustment rather than the internalization of stigma by a member of a minority group. Secondly, I think society as a whole must learn to understand more about why square society reacts in the way it does to gays—very little research has gone into that. Thirdly, I think we should realize that sexual preferences are learnt from one's individual experiences of the world. Homosexuality has as much or as little natural validity as heterosexuality. For most homosexuals who approach a psychiatrist the most useful thing he can do is to refer them to a homosexual counselling service... Perhaps if Geigy was committed to the future of the human race instead of the future of its own company profits it would give the money that goes into a conference like this towards the establishment of such Gay Community Counselling Centres rather than masturbating its own ego.(416)

The end of Jakubowicz's paper was met with applause and cries of 'right on'. The first question of him came from a woman psychiatrist who asked about the existence of counselling for lesbians. He referred her to the people from Gay Liberation, some of whom were female, who were there in the auditorium and who would give her the telephone numbers of some of the groups to which she could refer women. She was followed by Harry Freeman:

Harry Freeman: Andrew, as I understand it then you are asking for two things today. You're not only asking for a change in consciousness in we who are psychiatrists, it's not just a conscience issue, but action, action that you would, for operational purposes, call political action.

Andrew Jakubowicz: Right... I would argue that any situation in which someone is attempting to manipulate the reality of someone else is a political situation. Right, so that every relationship between a therapist and a patient is a political one. (417)

Freeman was followed by Soldatow:

Sasha Soldatow: Andrew, you seem to have put yourself into a very funny double bind. .

Andrew Jakubowicz: Undoubtedly.

Sasha Soldatow:... by speaking today. From my point of view I can see your
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speech today as a product of the same society that produces aversion therapy and the whole psychiatric profession. And I say this because you talk about - I presume you don’t fuck men?

Andrew Jakubowicz: You’re right.

Sasha Soldatow: Now, this assumption means that you must talk about homosexuals in terms of ‘them’ which means that you have a particular internalized stereotype already in operation. .......

Andrew Jakubowicz: No, I think .......

Sasha Soldatow: .... now, an internalized stereotype of a homosexual.

Now, what I wish to suggest is this, and it has come from my own personal experience. I fuck men, I fuck women also. Predominantly I fuck men. I notice when I say these things at meetings like this there is a dead silence comes over the room as it has now come over ......

APPLAUSE

Andrew Jakubowicz: Right.

Sasha Soldatow: But I don’t see myself as a homosexual. I don’t see myself as a heterosexual. I think the problem has been made for me by people saying that there are distinctions between homosexuality and heterosexuality. Now, I don’t see myself as either homosexual or heterosexual. I certainly don’t see myself as bisexual because I think that there is an unfortunate thing about bisexuality that it is a concept and it does not refer to any specific fucking situation. So, there’s no experiential basis for bisexuality. Now, the point that I’m trying to make is that because I don’t see myself as either gay or straight, perhaps I’ve got a problem that psychiatry hasn’t discovered yet.

LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE

Andrew Jakubowicz: Sasha, can I just make one comment that applies to that. I think you’re dead right - whatever you said - LAUGHTER - I made the point very early on and I want to stress it, that for me, human beings are sexual beings. That is the only label I’m prepared to put on us. But in the reality game that goes on in situations like this, it may well be useful at first to start off with, to play with the labels people use to define themselves.

Sasha Soldatow: It is the objectifying that’s the unfortunate thing at conferences like this.

Andrew Jakubowicz: Right, there’s a problem in communicating when you’re dealing with ideological concepts anyway. I don’t think we can get over that.

Sasha Soldatow: If they can’t get through that then psychiatrists can get fucked quite frankly.

Andrew Jakubowicz: Right, well ....... (418)

At last it was McConaghy’s turn to present his paper to the Conference. Entitled “Should Psychiatry Treat the Person or Society” he opened it with a point of clarification:

Nell McConaghy: Firstly, may I make some points about the difficulty of communication even with one’s friends. I have met Andrew on a friendly basis and I have announced to all and sundry, I think, over and over again, that I am not a behaviourist -WHISTLE- as such. (419)

If anybody had gone to the Conference even half expecting McConaghy to recant, as Schleeman had told us he intended to do, it would not have taken much of McConaghy’s paper to convince them it was not going to happen. But it was not simply that he did not recant, it was what his paper actually said which stunned many liberationists. Had we all sat around before the Conference and tried to work out what he was most likely to say most of us would probably have said that he would give a paper similar to those he had already published and like that given to the CAMP

(418) Ibid.
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forum in mid-1972 -- statistical results of his treatments of male homosexuals. None of us could have guessed, even in our wildest imaginings, that he would present a paper in which he likened himself to Galileo fighting for the principles of truth and enlightenment and imprisoned for his heresies by the forces of ignorance and evil -- the liberation movements, amongst others.

Sasha Soldatow: Now, I was stunned a bit by McConaghy's paper because I hadn't expected it. Right ... for a while I actually tried to follow the arguments through and tried to put it into some sort of tradition ... which I gave up half way through. (420)

Gary Schleeman: ... he set himself up as a bit of a martyr for the cause of science, and that was pretty funny. But I suppose he's just missing the point ... (421)

Wendy Bacon: That whole Galileo paper really meant something to him. (422)

He began his paper:

Nell McConaghy: In 1597 in a letter travelling from Padua to Graz was to be found the following passage: "I have written many direct and indirect arguments for the Copernican view but until now I have not dared to publish them, alarmed by the fate of Copernicus himself, our master. He has won for himself undying fame in the eyes of a few, but he has been mocked and hooted at by an infinite multitude, for so large is the number of fools". WHISTLE - Thirty five years later - WHISTLE -- the author, Galileo, was a prisoner of the Italian Inquisition, forced to renounce the Copernican view he had further developed, that the earth is not fixed in a mobile at the centre of God's universe but is merely a minor planet rotating about a minor star in one of the innumerable galaxies. (423)

From Galileo's struggle, came scientific humanism:

Nell McConaghy: With its acceptance, no longer was religious dogma automatically believed. No longer would medieval man occupy his ordained place in the social and religious hierarchy paralleling the earth's place in the hierarchy of the heavenly bodies. Divine authority was overthrown and all ideas were freed to the enquiry of man's mind, their truth to be established by scientific investigation. All ideas? Or did scientific humanism carry within it another set of dogmas which would in their turn limit the growth of scientific enquiry? (424)

From scientific humanism's acceptance of

Nell McConaghy: ... the essential worth and dignity of each human being the liberal concept of a society which provided everyone with individual freedom and equal opportunity seemed an inevitable development. An attractive extension of this concept is that all men are in fact equal. (425)

Making passing reference to the physical assault on Eysenck at an academic conference he went on:

Nell McConaghy: What is becoming apparent is that a set of liberal humanist dogmas are being established which if people question they will do so at the threat of loss of academic respectability and advancement if not actual physical harm. The basis for these dogmas is certainly one which is extremely appealing to our sympathies. Disadvantaged groups exist in our society. At the moment attention is being focused on those associated with the liberation movements -- women, blacks, homosexuals and psychiatric patients. The disadvantages they suffer clearly limit their ability to fully achieve their potential in terms of creativity and happiness. To suggest that these disadvantages are to some extent due to these groups inherently lacking qualities
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which our society admires and rewards could certainly support their continued
disadvantage or at least, to do nothing to reduce this. To a humanist, such a
view borders on the ethically unacceptable just as did the views of Galileo to the
Catholic Church. Yet, what if there are, in fact, inherent differences between
the mental capacities of the black and white man, between men and women,
between homosexual and heterosexual, and between psychotics and non-psychotics.(426)

It was at this point in his paper that the disruptions which had hitherto been limited to occasional
blasts on the whistle, began to increase:

John Lee: We were all probably nervous, at least I was, and as soon as McConaghy
started talking there was kind of an instant sort of barrage which sort of irritated
me because I kind of thought we should let him have his little say. The others
were away by this stage and there was no holding them back. There was this
constant cat-calling. He’d say some sort of amazing statement and everybody
would scream out. So that from the beginning of his paper the whole audience
was worked up. Everybody was turning around and they didn’t know what hit
them. McConaghy actually had to stop speaking at several points cause the noise
was so loud. There were long pauses and some of the people in the audience were
telling us to shut up . . . there were the balloons floating all over the place. The
audience was full of people who thought it was very exciting. There was a fair
sprinkling of radicals among them and they sort of kept hitting them on.
They were hitting noted dignitaries on the head and so generally the place became
chaotic and McConaghy’s voice was getting a bit shrill at that stage because he
was trying to give his speech and keep going.(427)

McConaghy did proceed, with increasing difficulty.

Neil McConaghy: Are scientists not to be allowed to consider this possibility
and seek evidence to support or refute it. In fact, they will not be stopped.
Just as Galileo, despite his fears, continued his researches - WHISTLE -
contemporary scientists will continue to seek evidence -WHISTLE - for or
- WHISTLE - against - WHISTLE - the existence - WHISTLE - of innate
-WHISTLE - differences - WHISTLE - between -WHISTLE - groups of
people.

From audience: Why bother to ask the question in the first place?
Neil McConaghy: Why did Galileo ask the question?

From audience: . . . values already operating . . .
Neil McConaghy: We will be discussing that at the end of about 15 minutes.
Those scientists who produce evidence supporting the existence of such differences
between men and women are likely to be labelled sexist . . . As a majority of opinion
forming people in our society tend to share basically liberal humanist values there will
be considerable support, covert or overt, for such labelling and relative indifference to
the persecution these investigators suffer as a result. Similar considerations of course
apply . . . .

From audience: How much care is there for what I suffered?
Neil McConaghy: We can discuss that later.

From audience: We don’t want to discuss it anymore.
Neil McConaghy: Well then, leave.

From audience: Go away! Go away!
Neil McConaghy: Similar considerations -WHISTLE - Similar considerations
- WHISTLE - of course apply -WHISTLE - to research concerning -WHISTLE -
other disadvantaged groups associated -WHISTLE - with other -WHISTLE -
liberation movements. Psychiatrists who are treating patients where such issues are
relevant face similar problems. (428)
He continued, with intermittent interruptions from whistles and catcalling, to argue that psychiatrists should treat homosexuals who are troubled by their homosexuality—not, as the movements had always suggested to reduce their anxiety and accept their homosexuality, a possibility he did not think applied to all patients. Psychiatrists, in answer to the question in the title of his paper, should treat the person and not society. (429) He concluded his paper:

_Neil McConaghy:_ Hence, more than ever it is vital that the progress of the behavioural sciences be stimulated so that we can control the threatening aspects of human behaviour . . . .

_From audience:_ Like homosexuality!

_Neil McConaghy:_ . . . with the surrender of humanism to the irrational pessimistic view of man the world is awaiting the emergence of a new ideology which will provide an optimistic basis for the development of the physical sciences, for the behavioural sciences just as the earlier humanistic ideology did for the physical sciences. What this new ideology will prove to be we can as little predict as could man caught up in the conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism in the 16th century. However, as psychiatrists, primarily involved in applying scientific knowledge to controlling human behaviour, we can be sure that we will in the meantime be subjected to considerable hostility from those people who see science as menacing the future of mankind. We will be instructed to administer to our patients not those treatments shown in scientific trials to be effective but those which accord with the philosophies of various pressure groups. Throughout this time I consider we should firmly put first the interests of our patients as we see this . . . .

_From audience:_ What a lie! What a lie!

_Neil McConaghy:_ . . . consistent with the ethics of the medical profession throughout its history. Our other major concern should be consistent with the ideology of the future, to encourage against all opposition, the fullest and freest progress of the study of human behaviour. (430)

It was at this point that the Gay Liberationists let fly with their eggs—the women from down the front, the men from up the back.

_Gary Schleeman:_ All of the egg throwing, it seemed, was coming right over my head from away up the back . . . It was a very steep theatre and eggs were hurtling over my head and some were smashing on the roof and dripping down on the audience and not disrupting things at all. Getting across lots of anger.

_Q:_ Did an egg hit you?

_Gary Schleeman:_ Some of it dripped down my back. I wasn't aware of it at the time but I was aware that it was dripping on the head of the man in front who appeared to be a very gentle soul. (431)

_Sosha Soldatow:_ . . . I think it was somebody around me said: “The police should be called”, whereupon I stood up and said “Give me an egg, quick” . . . I really wanted to have an egg to throw because I was annoyed that all the eggs kept missing . . . (432)

In response to a request from the chair for questions, came a shouted statement:

_Male member of audience:_ If you had your brains drilled out and if you were fucking-well electrocuted you wouldn't be so bloody rational sitting down there. Can you wonder how we derived this wonderful new arrogant consciousness and developed as a pressure group. We were electrocuted by you. We were subjected to this ideological bullshit which just gave us the

(429) It is interesting to note that McConaghy’s argument that psychiatrists should not treat society but rather the individual, was diametrically opposed to that of Molony (his wife) who argued that they should. Indeed, as Fell remarked: “When I got there Helen [Molony] came up to me and said ‘I gave a terrible paper’! I was so nervous”, because as far as she was concerned it was an experience of sort of defying Neil.” TRANSCRIPT:
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realization of what you're up to.
Chair: Is there a question?
Neil McConaghy: Are there any people here who have actually been treated with aversion therapy?
Male member of audience: Just because no one's here doesn't necessarily mean no one's been treated.
Neil McConaghy: No one is denying that. I have treated over 200 homosexuals in this city but it's surprising that none of them feels as strongly as you do.
Female member of audience: That's because they can't feel anything!
Female member of audience: It's surprising that they feel at all! (433)

While a few of the questions from the audience were directed to Jakubowicz, mainly about the availability of gay counselling services, and some to the panel so that Cade could pass a few remarks, most of the pressure of questioning and criticism was directed at McConaghy.

Harry Freeman: This is a question to Professor McConaghy. One of the points that you made is that at this stage, I guess because of the profession and the ethics and those sorts of things, we should treat the homosexual because he has pain and he wants to be treated, although we recognise the social determinants of this particular situation and we hope to change them and perhaps we should indulge in some sort of political activity to see that that comes about. What I'm wondering is why you feel that say intervention with the homosexual in pain is perhaps indicated; why you're sort of prepared to sort of pick that particular instance, that individual in pain out and say, yes, my professional ethics demand that I have some sort of responsibility toward this patient and exercise it. Why would you pick out the homosexual in pain rather than say the girl who wants an abortion in pain, or say the conscientious objector in pain. What would it be in your ideas that makes you see this as a suitable medical intervention despite the sort of social consciousness that you have.
Neil McConaghy: I don't completely follow your question Harry. You're saying if a conscientious objector came along to see me as a patient, would I not help him if I thought it was correct.
Harry Freeman: Yes. Said that he wanted you to help him politically. Said that he was in strife, he was going to have to go to court or something. Would you sort of take up a cudgel and help that guy the way you are saying you have a responsibility to go up and take up your various machineries to help the homosexual in pain.
Neil McConaghy: I would be treating him as a patient as a psychiatrist. What I did for him politically, I would respect as an entirely separate issue.
Harry Freeman: So you can divorce the two?
Male member of audience: That's it!
Female member of audience: That's it in a nutshell!
Neil McConaghy: I would certainly support this person politically and if he were asking for psychiatric help I would give him psychiatric help. But it seems to me that . . . .
Harry Freeman: No. What I am getting at is when a homosexual comes along to you what he's sort of asking for sort of transcends politics and transcends those sort of things, it's just there, he's a patient asking to have his sexual orientation interfered with for one reason or another. And you answer the call because you're a doctor. Now, I'm wondering whether, why it is that that particular individual in pain, that his call you answer because you're a doctor and that another individual's you mightn't answer.
Neil McConaghy: I don't think that's true. I think that any patient where I have treatment expertise that I think will help the patient, I will give it.
Male member of audience: That's the level of discussion at New South Wales. (434)

(432) Transcript: Interview, op. cit.
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More and more people became drawn into the argument with McConaghy. After Jakubowicz had given the telephone number of the Homosexual Guidance Service, Soldatow commented on the implications of what he saw in that kind of request from psychiatrists:

Sasha Soldatow: Can I just comment on that counselling service bit. What seems to be happening in this situation is that psychiatrists that have patients are not adequately dealing with their patients. That is, there is some breakdown in the relationship between the psychiatrist and the patient and they are looking for an alternative referral service for their patients. Now, I want to suggest that probably the best referral service a patient can have is another patient. Which means you’re back into the ordinary everyday reality of life, that is, relationships as they happen in everyday life. Now, this brings us back to looking at the whole profession of psychiatry and the whole existence of experts. And I think that one of the nasty things that is happening in this Conference is that Gay Lib and CAMP Inc are in some way becoming a referral service for the patients that the psychiatrists cannot handle adequately. Now, I think this is bad because the whole relationship responsibility between the psychiatrist and the patient is not being questioned at all. Now don’t make Gay Lib and don’t make CAMP Inc into a referral service where you can send patients.

Chair: Sasha, would you like to frame that as a question for the panel?
Sasha Soldatow: No, I don’t want to ask the panel any questions.

Wendy Bacon: See, as long as you keep saying as you just implied a little while ago that there’s no connection, that you see your political role as separate from your doctor role, well, you’re not coming anywhere near to understanding what people are upset about. And you’re not coming anywhere near to understanding anything Andrew said about us. What we’re saying is that psychiatry does have a political role. You ended up the whole thing with this pretty grandiose thing about progress and again I think that you’re just missing the whole point because so long as you use your science by pain, maybe reduce some pain so that people become better adjusted to this set up and so long as the same thing is done to women — I don’t know how many homosexuals you’ve treated but, you know, thousands of women have been given brain surgery for that reason — so long as you identify that with progress well, you’re not even coming anywhere near to understanding us. What we’re saying is we don’t accept your notions of politics and we don’t accept your notions of progress. And until you’re prepared to rethink some of these things I don’t know, really, if there’s much possibility of there being a discussion.

Neil McConaghy: I think the discussion is valuable to us. I think I do understand your position. I don’t agree with it but by discussing it I do get a clearer notion of what it is. And I do like to know it because it does help me to understand some of the things that are going on in this society. But why you should feel that until you’ve brainwashed everyone into accepting your ideology that they must be punished, or attacked or vilified in some way is what I do not sympathize with and I will oppose consistently.

Sasha Soldatow: The point is yours is a powerful ideology, don’t you see that. You’ve got the machinery and the expertise and the power that goes with it. You can organize a conference like this because you’ve got the money.

Neil McConaghy: You don’t need money to organize a conference. You’d have no trouble organizing a conference at all if you could get an audience who would listen to your rather disturbed ideas.

SCREAMS, MOANS, and WHISTLES FROM AUDIENCE

Chair: Are there any further questions.
Sasha Soldatow: That’s exactly the sort of expertise that I’m talking about. By calling us disturbed you are, that’s how bloody progress works.

Chair to Panel: Do you want to go on?

Neil McConaghy: Why has one side got the right to use any vilifying language they like and the other can’t use even any mildly one.

Harry Freeman: What I want you to say is that when you make a comment like “you’re all very disturbed” is that you are saying it in a way that it is meant to be nothing more than an insult, not a statement about the objective situation.

Neil McConaghy: Well, I think their ideas are irrational and I have said this. This means
Harry Freeman: ‘Disturbed’ is a bit of a connotative word to use.

Neil McConaghy: What about my being a power figure, this doesn’t have any connotations? Can I accept this as just an insult too and doesn’t it have any connotations? What you say is true, what I say is an insult.

Harry Freeman: I just think that instead of using ‘disturbed’ you should use ‘pack of bastards’ or something. (435)

The tension remained at a high level despite the occasional breaks by people other than critics of McConaghy asking questions. For Soldatow, it was exhilarating:

Sasha Soldatow: I can remember alternating in what I said between being really sort of peaceful and quiet and calm and making a point and then yelling and then peaceful and quiet and making a point and then yelling. I remember that sort of up-down, up-down thing with me very strongly and that’s partly the way I work anyway. . . . I had a big yell at one point, and somebody was sitting behind me who had earlier told me not to smoke, so I quickly lit up two cigarettes, he jabbed me in the back with a pencil when he said “don’t smoke”. But the same guy tapped me on the shoulder in the middle of when I sat down and he said to me: “Look, why don’t you be calm and rational because you make your points so much better if you calmly and rationally say them”. And I think, the next one I calmly and rationally said and then, bang, flew into that sort of routine again . . . John was also strange cause, I don’t know what was happening in his head but in a way it was quite good sitting next to him. I was getting a certain amount of comfortableness about what I was doing so I wasn’t in a totally hostile environment, there was at least one person. . . . From an outsider’s point of view he was just sort of sitting next to me, but there was a certain amount of calmness, I suppose. And I managed in the middle of all that chaos to write down on a pad of paper ‘Do you want to have a fuck’ . . . It’s surprising how your mind just works so quickly at those points . . . I felt a separation between the Gay Lib people and myself and . . . I think I quite liked that cause it meant that if something happened that they got cut off with I felt I could carry it through. But equally I felt they were carrying through certain things that I did. And then I was really glad when, and it turned out to be Harry Freeman, whom I didn’t know at that stage, took up the point about McConaghy calling me, not deranged, disturbed. (436)

He returned to the discussion in answer to a question from a female psychiatrist in the audience:

Female psychiatrist in audience: I’d like to ask the panel and maybe some of the audience too, their opinion on this issue. It seems to me that the longer this conference goes on, the longer it becomes clear that the relationship between the psychiatrist acting as a therapist in any area and his attitudes and the fact that he is a political person, whether or not he should desire to be so, produces all sorts of difficulties that we don’t seem to be able to get over, not very easily anyway. I wonder whether the Gay Liberation Front would suggest that all psychiatrists ought to accept their own political, in the sense that I’m using it, stand, or whether psychiatrists ought in fact to be given political education in this sense, as part of their course. What is the solution if it’s something which keeps coming up like this?

Sasha Soldatow: I think psychiatrists should be disbanded.

Questioner: Apart from that.

Sasha Soldatow: I really think that is the only solution I can see. Because you are still using the distinction that I talked about and you are in fact talking about a relationship where no relationship exists . . . there is a pretence in the psychiatric profession that there is some sort of real relationship established. If you want to do studies, I would really like to see studies of how many psychiatrists become friends with their patients.

Harry Freeman: On the point made that there seems to be no communication. There’s
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an awful lot of evidence that, for instance, psychiatrists can only help people
who think the way they do, who are from the same social class and share the
same ideology and whether a psychiatrist likes to say he’s divorcing his ideology
from his therapeutic armamentarium is one thing, but there’s an awful lot of
data to suggest that if he attempts to, not only isn’t he, but he won’t be able to
do any good anyway. (437)

The session look as though it was going to end on a much calmer note than it had begun on as
the questions pattered out. But Trudy Lippman had saved one last egg.

Gary Schleeman: Then as we broke up McConaghy was sitting back at the table,
at the panel table, and Trudy came and threw one at him point blank and it just
hit his stomach. And I was just about to leave and I just felt so uptight about the
attitude of physically attacking people that I... physically attacked Trudy, yes. I
raced up the stairs and said “Did you throw that egg” and slapped her. And Trudy
started yelling and trying to knee me in the balls, at which point everyone started
restraining us and my hair was being pulled and we were just dragged apart. And
people were saying: “You dare call yourself a Gay Liberationist”... I lost my
temper. You know, I was just holding on. I was pretty uptight about the whole scene... it was very important to me that the whole thing hadn’t been disrupted... And I
just lost my temper when a very direct person to person attack was made... we were
all hustled and somehow or other ended up outside, out through the door adjacent to us.

And I was wandering around and feeling generally pretty ill and irked and pretty
upset and Terry Rolfe and I think John Lee were saying “You’d better clear out” or
something like that. (438)

There was another scuffle:

John Lee: A whole lot of people came out of the audience and instead of heading off
for the lunch room they wanted to talk to us and ask questions and that sort of
stuff. The thing with Gary was going on and then two med students came along. We
kind of broke it up and then these med students came along and started supporting
Gary. And of all things, picking Mim and Trudy, as sort of trouble makers and
offering smart-arsed comments like “I think you’ll need a lot of understanding” and
“I’m glad you came along today to be reasonable” and stuff like that. And so either
Mim or Trudy started kicking one of the guys and they got into a headlock too.

It was all kind of like a football scrum with one med student sort of being kicked
and sort of rabbit-killed at the same time. (439)

After Prothero, Lee, Christine O’Sullivan had wandered around some of the rooms at Prince
Henry and asked the contents of some of the filing cabinets they saw, they joined the other Gay
Liberationists and went down to Maroubra to have lunch with Bacon, Soldatow, and others.
And after lunch:

John Lee: We all went back and sort of sat amongst the sort of respectable ones.
What was incredibly curious about the whole thing — you’re probably aware of
how liberalism works — we were allowed to go back into the place without being
sort of manhandled or anything. We’d just smashed eggs all over the guy, committing
some act of minor violence and yet we went back into the place quite calmly with
all these people sort of talking to us quite calmly. (440)

The characterization of liberalism at work has to apply in both directions — the Gay Liberationists
calmly and quietly joined the psychiatrists whom they had earlier characterized as oppressors.
If the ructions of the morning did nothing else, they provided the afternoon speakers with
ample material for instant analyses — both of the behaviour of the egg throwers and of the
behaviour of those who analysed the behaviour of egg throwers and so on, in an infinite progression
of psychiatric put down.
There were three papers presented to the first part of the afternoon session, the theme of which was anti-psychiatry: F. A. Whitlock (Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Queensland) on “Drugs, Morality and the Law”; Robin Winkler (Senior Lecturer in Psychology at the University of NSW) on “Psychology as Social Action”; and C.G.Barrow (Senior Lecturer in Psychiatry at the University of Adelaide) on “Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry”. Whitlock’s paper excited little comment. He argued that the real problem lay not with drugs whose use attracted legal sanctions but those people suffering from “Excessive consumption of sedatives and hypnotics and alcohol” and concluded with the suggestion that:

One might not unreasonably demand that we should try and be consistent in our ways of coping with drug use in society, stop being hypocritical, avoid the use of the psychiatric label for behaviour that is condemned by current social standards and try to avoid the disastrous errors that have attended the United States’ attitude to drugs. (441)

Winkler’s paper on “Psychology as Social Action” reported on more of his work using pseudo-patients. Wisely perhaps, given the nature of the gathering and what had happened, it reported on the work of university students — clinical psychologists in training — rather than on the Gay Liberationists as pseudo-patients. He introduced his paper with the proposition that:

Being a psychiatric patient not only leads to different perceptions than those of staff but carries with it a loss of credibility. The upshot is a different point of view from staff members that is less likely to be believed than what the staff member sees from his point of view . . . The further the perceptions of the patient differ from those of the staff, the more they are likely to be disregarded or judged as pathological, since the staff are the arbiters of reality and rationality. (442)

Pseudo-patient research, he argued, helped validate the experience and observations of patients in their own and others eyes, especially the eyes of mental health professionals and enabled criticism to be taken more seriously; it helped alleviate the pressures on patients which militated against them speaking out; it helped train clinical psychologists and it provided a valuable means of gathering information which could and should be disseminated to the general public. He then reported on the experiences of four of his eight students who had spent between two and nine days in psychiatric hospitals emphasizing the reports of boredom, powerlessness and dehumanization (through insufficient staff explanation) staff reactions to patient complaints and having to wear pyjamas. In response to a question at the end of his paper as to whether pseudo-patients were not more likely to find fault with psychiatric institutions because they went in looking for it, Winkler replied that he had found that his graduate students were not nearly as critical as he himself was.

Barrow’s paper on “Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry” as presented to the Conference differed from the published version of it to the extent that he had updated it to incorporate an analysis of the events of the morning session. He opened his presentation by saying

Barrow: It’s a rather dull title “Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry” so I would like to subtitle it “Why the Eggs Missed Nell McConaghy” (443)

Barrow characterized the sources of the anti-psychiatry movement as being from within the ranks of psychiatry itself, especially Laing, and from outside the ranks of the medical profession — student
groups, psychologists and sociologists. In passing he characterized his reactions to the anti-psychiatry edition of National U as similar to those he would experience if he were attacked by a patient during a psychotherapy session — to stand back from his feelings "and try to appreciate their origins, always bearing in mind the possibility that the attack might in a particular situation be quite justifiable anyway, depending on one's competence or lack of it." (444) He gave his interpretation of the development of Laing's thought, the early stages of which he thought were sound, the later, when he "aligned himself with radical Marxists, anarchists, black power leaders and others of the New Left" (445) which were not so sound. He then went on, using the psychiatric concept of projection — "the attributions to other persons of unwanted aspects of the self" to analyse the "forces within the anti-psychiatry movement".

Most of the writings of the student body concerned with the anti-psychiatry movement for example, emphasize the power which society has invested in psychiatrists and it is to this that they object most strongly. The use of the term "head shrinker" in itself indicates an attribution of power which damages ... The anti-psychiatrists accuse psychiatrists of violence and hostility to their patients, and while this may conceivably be true in some cases, the intensity with which it is stated leads one to the deduction that the accusers are attributing to the psychiatrists qualities which they do not wish to acknowledge in themselves ... Under the guise of apparent concern for the handicapped, and identification with the underdog, comes frustration and rage that a person should need to be dependent on and attached to another helping person. This is particularly crucial for the adolescent who is trying to separate himself from dependency on his parent and therefore attachment behaviour in other people however necessary it may be for them. There is magical thinking in it too — if you can denigrate the helpers enough, then the need for help may somehow seem to disappear ... Returning to Laing's formulation, I think that the attribution of pathogenicity to the family rather than to the patient, then to society rather than individual family, is in a sense another attempt to empty the self of unacceptable aspects and identify them externally. This happens in paranoid delusions, as we all know, and I think it is happening again in the formulations of Laing. (447)

By fairly obvious implication, supporters of anti-psychiatry were adolescents still acting out their separation from their parents, paranoid, and whatever they accused psychiatry of, they acknowledged (but were unable to accept) as parts of their own make-up. As to why the eggs missed McConaghy, he diverged from his written paper:

_Barrow:_ I think the eggs were actually designed to miss Professor McConaghy because the attackers wanted to see him survive, wanted to see him define what he is up to and, once again, I think this is an adolescent phenomenon ...

_Female member of audience:_ We don't want to see him survive!

_Male member of audience:_ We're sorry we missed.

_Barrow:_ I think it's the same testing out of a person's capacity to tolerate aggression which is an extremely reassuring factor in individual psychotherapy, in group psychotherapy, in families with normal adolescents and, I suggest, in anti-psychiatry. (448)

His replies to questions continued in similar vein:

_Female member of audience:_ Why is rational the only way. And it seems to be that anyone who allows feelings into their discussions is immediately characterized as being psychopathological. I'm getting tired of it.

_Barrow:_ If you're talking about the particular comment of "being disturbed"
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earlier on, I was thinking about that too. I noticed that once that comment
was made there was an immediate extreme reaction of recognition . . .

SHRIEKS FROM AUDIENCE

. . . of recognition by members of the Gay Liberation group as if that was what
people were wanting to hear, that the disturbance was actually recognized. I
think Professor McConaghy and any other speaker is tested out and tested out
and tested out until there is an attribution like that which I think is a recognition
of the actual disturbance. I thought that was a very striking event this morning. (449)

Before the afternoon tea break there was discussion with all members of the panel but most
questions were directed to Winkler, partly because he would be unable to return after the break.
Most questions seemed, in fact, to miss the point that Winkler had been trying to make in his
paper:

\[McConaghy:\] Why is there so much surprise that they were kept in for 20 days.
Psychiatrists are bound to help people and so should keep them in if they said
they were suicidal when they presented.

\[Winkler:\] I'm not interested in that question but what happens afterwards, that
people don't recognise that you're normal even if you start behaving normally.\] (450)

And again

\[Male member of audience: As one of the people who has interviewed a pseudo-
patient, whose name incidentally appears amongst the editorial staff of \textit{Camp Ink}
that was distributed around the members today, he came to the hospital and put
a rather convincing story of depression, to the extent that
\] it
\[was impossible not
\][\[Male member of audience: As one of the people who has interviewed a pseudo-
patient, whose name incidentally appears amongst the editorial staff of \textit{Camp Ink}
that was distributed around the members today, he came to the hospital and put
a rather convincing story of depression, to the extent that
\] it
\[was impossible not
\]

\[to admit him. He managed to act in quite an effective depressed way by isolating
himself from the rest of the community and then left within 48 hours.

\[Winkler: I think you entirely miss the point. The point is that if people act
according to textbook definitions then you should have committed them. What
you are saying is that the person acted extremely well.

\[Questioner: I'm saying he acted depressed.

\[Winkler: I'm saying that once you're inside and you no longer
\]behave
\[as if you
\]

\[are depressed, nobody notices. It indicates that there is no independent check
other than the initial history, no extra check.\] (451)

After the tea break, the final three papers to the Conference, continuing the theme of anti-
psychiatry were presented by Liz Fell on “Psychiatry and Ideology”, W. Ironside (Professor of
Psychological Medicine at Monash University) on “Aspects of Anti-Psychiatry” and finally,
Harry Freeman ( Psychiatrist at Broughton Hall) on “Revisionist Anti-Psychiatry”. Fell’s paper
contrasted two extreme positions on psychiatry: Sir Martin Roth as representing establishment
psychiatry and the Socialist Patient Collective (SPK) from Heidelberg University (1970-71) as
representing anti-psychiatry.

S.P.K. is committed to radical anti-psychiatry using a Marxist dialectical
methodology, somewhat similar to the approach of Sartre, Cooper and
Esterson. Roth is committed to psychiatry as a scientific activity —
scientific in the 'natural science' sense of the term. (452)

Both had very different views on what constituted psychiatric illness, what caused it and how it
should be treated:

I would argue that even though both views of the world have philosophical
problems and are based on untestable assumptions, nevertheless they are
both potentially fruitful and powerful modes of understanding social
reality . . . neither view (or philosophy) is right or wrong. Our knowledge
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of reality, in so far as we are aware of it, is knowledge of socially constructed or conceptualised reality.

However, I want to suggest that the conflict I have described is not just a conflict arising from differing views of reality i.e., it is not just a conflict of ideas. If this were the case, then it would probably be resolved. In the long run, I believe it is a question of which view serves each group best in terms of understanding and shaping reality for their purposes and in their interests. It is a conflict arising out of the social and economic position of contending parties. This is where I suggest I differ from Harry Freeman. (453)

Fell spent a few minutes analysing the relationship between psychiatrist and patient as an authoritarian one which the SPK had challenged. Such a challenge and the inevitable conflict it would entail was just beginning in Australia. She concluded by suggesting that:

when Professor McConaghy entitles his paper at this Symposium “Should Psychiatry Treat the Person or Society” he indicates the position of power that psychiatrists are in. Certainly my own position is one of sympathy with the anti-psychiatry stance and I note the black-banning of this Conference by members of gay liberation and some members of women’s liberation who saw no point in engaging in dialogue under conditions set up by psychiatrists and their allies the pharmaceutical industry. (454)

The only remark directed to Fell at that point was a comment from a male psychiatrist who suggested that she had been too hard on Roth who was more open-minded than she had characterized him as.

Ironside’s paper on “Aspects of Anti-Psychiatry” made several points: first, that anti-psychiatry, or more correctly, opposition to psychiatric interpretation and treatment of illnesses is not a new phenomenon; second, that “psychosurgery, as practised today can be rated as the apotheosis of medical antipsychiatry affording the anti-psychiatry movement some of its cogency”; (455) and third, that the criticisms of psychiatry as ineffective are partly the fault of claims by some psychiatrists for successful treatments which are unrealistic and unjustifiable. The movement against psychiatry, he concluded, was basically a movement against the medical profession.

Harry Freeman ended the two day Conference on a note which had been sounded throughout — opposing sets of values which produced opposing and mutually antagonistic stances (involving highly sensitive egos) on a range of issues. He responded to Barrow’s charges that the anti-psychiatry movement was composed of people motivated by all manner of individual psychopathology rather than genuine concern.

Dr. Barrow asserted that the anti-psychiatry movement could be seen as resulting from the projective identification of feelings of helplessness in the activist. But when we admit that everything that happens results from the same process (projective identification) then I wonder where such an explanation gets us and why we do it. It is possible to analyze the movement in this way. But maybe the reason for the growth of the movement is that psychiatrists simply do not do very well with people. When we examine the “causes” of anti-psychiatry we rarely look at outcome studies, the data. The fact that neurosis probably gets better without our Intervention: that has not been talked about. The fact that a good many people with neurosis are damaged by psychiatry:
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that hasn’t been looked at. But we haven’t mentioned that people in the anti-psychiatry movement may have adolescent identity problems, and that people who throw eggs have problems with aggression. Which are the most important things to look at; or should we look at them all?...

Moving now to Dr. Barrow’s “interpretation”; That people in the anti-psychiatry movement are projecting their feelings of omnipotence and aggression onto psychiatrists. He made the interpretation. It got a response; people “felt better” afterwards. This was supposed to prove that his behaviour (the interpretation) had some special validity (i.e., that it uncovered a difficulty that was making people’s behaviour mystifying for him and themselves). The validity attached to it by Dr. Barrow was not however that it represented a “power” situation, that it manipulated other people (i.e., it made somebody do something). Someone noticed that Dr. Barrow smiled. Now if he made the appropriate interpretation, moved the appropriate people in the correct way and he “felt better” maybe it is THIS that we should be talking about when discussing the origins and causes of anti-psychiatry.

If
(a) this psychiatrist “feels better” by “putting somebody down” and
(b) he doesn’t do very well with a majority of the patients he treats, then
(c) is it that psychiatry is about making psychiatrists feel better, rather than making patients better.

Is it perhaps that the medical model allows us to ensure that we’ll always be better and that the patients will rarely be better. If somebody is sick, we make an intervention, and they get better, then that was because of our intervention. If they get worse, it was because they were too sick. (456)

He went on to outline what he called “revisionist anti-psychiatry”, the central focus of which he believed was on the sick role which robbed people of agency. Agency “refers to the experience or feeling that you really are the person who has something to do with your own existence”. (457) Most anti-psychiatry writings, he claimed, either ignored the question of agency or treated it as peripheral to their central concern.

My experience leads me to believe that there are “sick” people, no matter how you think about it. Given this, then the best approach to “caring” for these people is to set up a service... where the whole emphasis is on people exercising agency. (458)

Before discussion was opened to all three panelists several questions were directed to Freeman alone. Most of these were about the concept of agency which many of those present found difficult to concretize – how could you force patients out of their sick role and into a role in which they exercised agency. When questions of the entire panel were invited, again, most questions and comments were directed to Freeman. Some did not like his characterization of psychiatrists claiming credit for patient recovery and absolving themselves of any responsibility if the patient’s condition worsened. But most questions returned to the concept of agency.

The two day Conference ended on a civil note. Those of us who had not gone received garbled accounts, second or third hand, of what had happened:

Dennis Altman: I heard from Terry [Irving] what had happened... And Terry thought it was quite good. And suddenly I decided it was quite right then, throwing eggs at him and that it was a good thing to do...because... You see, I’m always divided. One sort of argument is the rational argument things and the other is that if you really confront people it forces them to take note of what you’re saying, even if their immediate reaction is anger, they can’t forget about it. And I think there is always this danger that if you get co-opted and play their game they don’t listen to what you’re saying and they can just brush off any criticism within their framework. I think that it was sort of Terry’s reaction that
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Influenced me on, the fact that he approved of it, having been there and he wasn’t a Gay Lib person and he wasn’t as far as I know, emotionally hostile to psychiatry.(459)

In the end, after all the invitations and discussions and meetings and correspondence, Bacon and Fell and some parts of Women’s Liberation participated in the Conference on McConaghy’s terms, trying to argue with the psychiatrists; Altman, CAMP and other parts of Women’s Liberation boycotted the Conference; and Gay Liberation participated, but on their own terms. And the carrot that McConaghy had tried to dangle, the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrist's motion on homosexuality was passed on 17 October, 1973 — despite, because, or totally independently, of the nature of the Gay Liberation participation?

(458) Ibid.
(459) TRANSCRIPT: Interview, op. cit.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Three methods were used to collect the data for analysis. These were: participant observation, interviewing, and document analysis. These three are all qualitative rather than quantitative research methods and all three were used in order to achieve what Denzin calls “across-method triangulation”. (1) Method triangulation is one form of multiple triangulation which is said to exist when “researchers combine in one investigation multiple observers, theoretical perspectives, sources of data and methodologies”. (2) Oscar Lewis in La Vida, for example, used several methods of collecting data to produce what he thought was necessary for a “well rounded family study”. (3)

Multiple triangulation is one of the ways in which qualitative researchers have attempted to counter accusations of ‘bias’, ‘subjectivity’, ‘unscientific’, ‘case study specific’, ‘soft’, and so on, levelled at them by their quantitative counterparts. Another response, which like triangulation, implicitly acknowledges both the validity and the relevance of the criticisms, has been the search for ways in which any particular qualitative method can be “methodologically refined, to give it the dignity of a social science procedure”. (4) One result of such a search is Friedrichs and Lüdtke’s list of “prerequisites of standardised participant observation” which, they admit, would, if fulfilled, severely limit its applications. (5) The other major response to criticisms has been to counterattack those who insist on the use of quantitative methods. This counterattack has developed two lines of argument. The first is that the obsession with quantification restricts the social sciences to the production of studies which are trivial and irrelevant (6) and may indeed reflect a desire to have “an excuse for sweeping dangerous and unpleasant issues under the carpet”. (7)

Hugh Stretton, commenting on what happened to American sociology with the post war ascendency of behaviouralism writes:

Theory grew more ambitious, empirical research more theory oriented. There were appropriate substitutions of subject matter. The more pressing any social problem became, the less notice it could now expect from sociologists. There was rising racial conflict and less research into it. As delinquency and crime increased, criminology and courses in social disorganization dwindled. When overpopulation was identified as a world problem, America trained fewer demographers. Research went instead to markets that had few real “problems” at all: to opinion and market research, and to medical, industrial and military sociology. (8)

(2) Ibid. p 310.
(3) LEWIS, Oscar: La Vida. Panther. London. (1967) 1968. Lewis started by gathering census type data on a large number of families from which he selected a small group of families for intensive study which involved the taking of life histories, intensive interviews and participant observation. See pp 25 - 27.
(5) Ibid. p 20. These conditions are: (1) a plurality of observation objects and/or observers; (2) that the researcher should no longer also be one of the observers; (3) that the observation field as well as its dimensional analysis be limited; (4) that each observer be provided with an exact plan indicating not only what must be observed but for how long; (5) strict definition of the observers’ role. pp 20-22.
The second line of argument in the counter attack made a different point. Qualitative researchers argued that if the advocates of quantitative research cared to examine their methods a little more closely, they would find that they too were, at base, qualitative. For example, people who count the number of suicides in a community are making subjective evaluations of the intentions of those they claim have committed such an act. (9)

The debate over research methods, often characterized as qualitative versus quantitative methods, is an integral part of the debate which has been carried on with varying degrees of acrimony (10) throughout the social sciences over their ‘scientific’ status. (11) The debate is ongoing, and has been for some time, in psychology (12) sociology (13) and political science. (14)

A new dimension has been added to the debate with the emergence of feminist critiques of the social sciences which characterize quantitative research methods as essentially ‘masculine’ and qualitative research methods as ‘feminine’. Using David Bakan’s concepts of ‘agency’ and ‘communion’ (15) Rae Carlson, writing about methodology in psychology argues:

Agency is manifested in separations, in repression, in conquest, in contract; communion is manifested in fusion, expression, acceptance, in non-contractual co-operation... agency is identified with a masculine principle, with the Protestant ethic, with a Faustian pursuit of knowledge... as with all forces toward mastery, separation, and ego-enhancement... current scientific operations (separating, ordering, quantifying, manipulating, controlling)... are “agentic” features which research has also identified as distinctively masculine. In contrast, more communal kinds of scientific inquiry... involve naturalistic observation, qualitative patterning of phenomena studies, and greater personal participation of the investigator. (16)

Jessie Bernard, who says that she has watched one or other version of this polarity debate express itself in sociology for fifty years (17) argues that what is new about this version of it is

---

(11) See ENGLER, Robert: “Social Science Consciousness” in ROSZAK, Theodore (ed): op. cit. p 178: “Political science has also devoted considerable energy to the quest for a methodology which would establish the objectivity and hence the ‘scientific’ quality of the discipline. Perhaps the clearest accomplishments of this concern has been the essentially apolitical nature of the field and its teaching.”
its machismo element. (18) Further, she suggests, it may help to explain why the agentic approach which yields 'hard' data has more prestige than the communal which yields 'soft' — because what men do in societies is always more highly valued than what women do and because the agentic approach is more attractive (and appropriate?) to males trying to 'solve' the problems of a society which is dominated by males. (19)

If, as Dreitzel suggests, "social changes are mirrored by shifts in sociological interest" (20) and if research methods are differentially appropriate to different fields of inquiry, (21) then, the increasing recognition especially by academic women (and some men) that women have been and are oppressed, and should no longer be expected to accept that state of affairs, will undoubtedly, through studies aimed at finding out how, by whom or what, in what ways and why, women have been and are being oppressed, add impetus to the move already present within the social sciences (22) toward raising the status of the qualitative methods of research.

Colin Fletcher argues that:

Some situations suit quantitative sociology ... Wherever there is a pressure for conformity, for uniformity, for mediocrity, for concealment in the grey mass, there is an opportunity for good quantitative sociology. And then it works. (23)

What made the particular qualitative research methods used in this study the most appropriate to the area under study will be spelled out in greater detail in what follows.

(17) BERNARD, Jessie: "My Four Revolutions: An Autobiographical History of the ASA" in HUBER, Joan (ed): Changing Women in a Changing World. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 1973. pp 11-29. In a footnote, p 23, she gives as examples of other versions of the polarity — "statistical vs case method, quantitative vs qualitative, knowledge vs understanding or verstehen, tough minded vs tender minded and so on. These poles as related to methods have been paralleled by such conceptual polarities as Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, expressive and instrumental, status and cash nexus, and so on."
(18) Ibid. p 23. "The specific processes involved in agentic research are typically male preoccupations ... The scientist using this approach creates his own controlled reality. He can manipulate it. He is master. He has power. He can add or subtract or combine variables. He can play with a simulated reality like an Olympian god. He can remain at a distance, safely invisible behind his shield, uninvolved. The communal approach is much humbler. It disavowes control, for control spoils the results. Its value rests precisely on the absence of controls ..."
(19) Ibid. p 23.
(20) DREITZEL, Hans Peter (ed): Recent Sociology. No. 2. Patterns of Communicative Behaviour. Macmillan. New York (1940) 1972 p viii. Similarly, with respect to history: "History is a selective view of the past whose scope is limited more by the realities of the present than through a clear understanding of the past. As historians perceive shifts in the present power structure they consciously or unconsciously alter their views of who was important in the past. When entrepreneurs became powerful during the latter part of the 19th century, historians came to interpret the actions of the 17th century gentry and merchants more in terms of the development of an entrepreneurial spirit ... and ... an interest in black history has been intricately connected with the impetus of the civil rights movement ... When a group of people come to think of themselves as significant beings or as pushing for such recognition from society, and further, when historians recognise or experience such pressure, then an interest in that group's past is enhanced. SMITH, Hilda: "Feminism and the Methodology of Women's History" in CARROLL, Berenice (ed): Liberating Women's History. University of Illinois Press. Urbana, Illinois. 1976 pp 368-369.
(21) CARLSON, Rae: op. cit. argues that "one need not accept, much less defend, the status quo in order to
1. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

The literature on participant observation covers three major areas:

(a) definitions of, and the assumptions underlying, participant observation as a research method;

(b) the actual mechanics involved in participant observation including how the researcher gains entrée into the field, stays there and leaves it, the roles the participant observer can take, and observation and data recording techniques;

(c) the advantages and disadvantages of using participant observation as a means of gathering information.

In what follows I shall consider each of these areas, first as they are covered in the literature and then in terms of their application to the present work.

(a) Definitions and Assumptions:

While some definitions include interviewing and document analysis under the term participant observation (24) it is more usual to reserve the term for the more specific form of research method which is “characterized by a period of intense social interaction between the researcher and the subjects in the milieu of the latter” during which time “data are unobtrusively and systematically collected”. (25) It implies, according to Denzin, a commitment—conscious or unconscious—to a symbolic interactionist perspective (26) and its purpose is “to prevent imposing alien meanings upon the actions of subjects”. (27) Participant observation assumes, not only that by sharing in the experiences of those being studied, the researcher has a greater chance of avoiding the substitution of her or his own perspective for those of the subjects, but that this, in itself is desirable; that any understanding of the behaviour of a group of people must at least include (or at the other extreme, entirely consist of) a consideration of what the behaviour means to those people, to look at it from their point of view. Thus, for example, Erving Goffman, in wanting to “learn about the social world of the hospital inmate as this world is subjectively experienced by him” used participant observation as a research method...
It was then and still is my belief that any group of persons — prisoners, primitives, pilots or patients — develop a life of their own that becomes meaningful, reasonable, and normal once you get close to it — and that a good way to learn about any of these worlds is to submit oneself in the company of the members to the daily round of petty contingencies to which they are subject. (28)

The nature of what I was trying to research — the interactions of the liberation movements over a period of time — made participant observation (together with interviewing and document analysis) the most appropriate method of research to use. The fact that I was a participant in the activities of these groupings before I began the research determined the type of participant-observer role I would have to negotiate.

From their inception, women’s liberation movements have been dubious about the ability of any man to fully appreciate, let alone be trusted to work with women toward the elimination of the oppression of women. Likewise, the homosexual movement’s suspicion of heterosexuals. Men cannot ‘experience’ being oppressed as a woman, nor heterosexuals being oppressed as a homosexual, because a good deal of that oppression is self-oppression. (29) Because one of the aims of both movements has involved the creation of new self-images — based on actual experience rather than abstract theoretical constructs — men have been excluded from participating in the Women’s Liberation Movement.

We are often asked, “Why do you not allow men to join your groups?” and “Given that women’s liberation cannot be achieved without a radical restructuring of society, would it not be better to involve yourselves with groups devoted to that total purpose?” The two questions may be answered together.

First of all it should be noted that Women’s Liberation grew out of a dissatisfaction with other radical groups which regarded the status of women as peripheral to their critique of capitalist society and expected women to play the traditional auxiliary role. Even where men were sympathetic it was seen that women were so conditioned to accept male leadership that they found it difficult to participate on an equal basis. In addition, women have had such a low self-value that they have despised each other, desperately needing the attention of men as the only assurance of their value. The formation of separate women’s groups is the only way they can get over their various hang-ups. Women must become more conscious of themselves, and establish a solidarity and learn to like and respect each other. They have to express themselves fluently, develop independent plans of action and accept responsibility without fear — in other words, come out of their gilded cages and take their freedom. Men cannot make us free — this would mean nothing but an extension of male supremacy. They can help, but they cannot do it for us — in fact a lot of confusion comes in at this point between support, which is desirable, and protection, which defeats the whole purpose. (30)


(29) This type of argument has led to positioning the movements and their claims at the forefront of the revival of the old debate in the sociology of knowledge. Merton characterizes this as “insider access to” versus “outsider exclusion from” particular kinds of knowledge. See MERTON, R.K.: “Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter on the Sociology of Knowledge” in Varieties of Political Expression in Sociology. An American Journal of Sociology Publication. University of Chicago Press. 1972 pp 9-47. The claim to “insider access” to particular kinds of knowledge is not restricted to the women’s gay and black movements — for example: “I do not feel that any person, in the general public, can truly know what it is like to be incarcerated, to be completely cut off from society, unless he himself has spent ‘time’ behind the walls of a prison.” PARKER, Robert: “Subjective Conclusions” Iconoclast Behind Bars. July 1971. School of Sociology. University of NSW. p 35.

(30) [PRINGLE] ROSEMARY: “Men and Other Movements: Allies or Foes?” Liberation. No 2. May 1972. This exclusion has been seen by some as a short term necessity only. For example: “It follows that the common
Heterosexuals, although harder to detect, have likewise been excluded from participation in the Gay Liberation movement.

We argue that the large number of heterosexuals, non-sexuals or simply sexually confused people, here in Melbourne is impeding the progress towards a radical Gay consciousness of those who are Gay. To be Gay is something only a Gay person knows about. There is a unique homosexual experience, a subtle psychological thing, almost intangible to the understanding of any but the most sensitive and empathetic straights. Yet even though they may understand they cannot "feel" what it is like to be camp; to live 24 hours a day as a homosexual. Outsiders, non-homosexuals, we suggest, may actually delay the development of Gay Awareness, a new Gay consciousness, that is proud and non-apologetic. In Consciousness Raising Groups, what feelings can a heterosexual offer in the airing of distinctly homosexual experiences... Before Gay Liberation can engage in a dialogue with straights it must first come to understand its own oppression in all its deepness and subtlety. The goal has not been achieved yet. Straights will make it that much harder by diverting Gays from the exploration of the uniqueness of themselves and their experience in this society and instead into a general problem and personality sorting-out.(31)

Even the most ostensibly sympathetic and 'ideologically sound' heterosexual is suspect. Sasha Soldatow's questioning of Andrew Jakubowicz's sexuality and the effect that had on his perceptions of homosexuals as "them" is clear illustration of this.

There has also developed a strong resistance in the movements to being the 'subjects' of academic research. (32) stemming not only from a realization that academic researchers have been largely responsible for the creation of the old stereotypes of women and homosexuals which have been so negative, but also from a growing reluctance, especially on the part of women, to help male (and the few females in academe) academics further their own careers (34) and reap financial and status gains by writing and/or teaching about women. (35)

Of patterns of male-female dominance-submission can only be temporary; liberation comes with the development of universalizing relationships including men, women and children. CAMPBELL, Leonie: "Women's Liberation" Arena. No 27. 1971 p 35.

(31) THE PUBLICATIONS GROUP, MELBOURNE GAY LIBERATION: Heterosexuals in Gay Lib — Queens and Dykes Want Gay Lib Back. Melbourne. 1972. That this was a problem which at the time was peculiar to Melbourne is indicated by the opening paragraph: "M.U. [Melbourne University] Gay Lib is faced with a peculiar problem: non-homosexuals within its ranks. Nowhere in any of the overseas Gay literature is there any mention of the problems that might arise from large numbers of non-homosexuals within the movement. We know for certain that none of the three Gay Lib groups in Sydney are faced with this problem; they are all exclusively homosexual". For CAMP (NSW) the problem of heterosexuals wishing to become members appears never to have arisen. In other groups such as the Gay Society in Armidale (NSW) heterosexuals appear to have participated in the group without causing any problems. In fact the Armidale Gay Society in 1972 found it advantageous to have as its spokesperson a woman who considered herself to be asexual — at least she was able to act in public for the group. None of the other members of the group felt secure enough on their university scholarships, to admit to even membership of the group.


(33) See my "The Psychologist and the Lesbian" Refractory Girl. No. 9. Winter. 1975 pp 41-45, for some of the effects of these stereotypes. For the effects of males doing research on women and the resultant stereotypes or total neglect of women see MILLMAN, Marcia and KANTER, Rosabeth Moss (eds): Another Voice — Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science. Doubleday Anchor. New York. 1975. Similarly in anthropology women have realized that "our most male colleagues generally have been content to describe women's behaviour as men would like it to be. A lot of essential questions have never been asked — the result of male anthropologists chowing the fat with male informants has been a view of women that proceeds almost directly from male norms."
During September—October 1972 (36) both CAMP (NSW) and Sydney Women's Liberation were willing to co-operate in the distribution of a questionnaire to some of their members for an academic researcher initially unknown to both groups. Recipients of the questionnaire were free to answer it or not and to return it to the researcher (postage prepaid) or not. Provision was made in the questionnaire for respondents to make comments and many did. (37) The LEWIN, Ellen et al: “Power Strategies and Sex Roles”. Paper presented to the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New York, November 1971 pp 1-2.

(34) The Editorial of the first issue of the Australian Women's Studies Journal Refractory Girl No 1. Summer 1972-1973 for example states that people writing about women should be encouraged to do so “not to advantage their personal careers but to contribute to our knowledge and our understanding” p 4.

(35) Female academics who had never been part of the women's movement, who once regarded women's liberation as irrelevant or were openly hostile to its existence, but who later came to teach women's studies courses are also suspect—they are seen as bandwagoners, as women who have waited until 'women' became academically more respectable before being prepared to commit themselves. Compare, for example, the following two quotations from works separated by four years: “The more you 'make it' in this world the more you detach yourself from those who have not. Academic women, generally, do not see the need for W.L. because they don't think women are oppressed. The psychology behind this is not surprisingly male. To succeed in a man's world you have to become a man i.e., never admit that the rules are wrong, just blame the people who play. Women in male terms are stupid, dumb, lack drive and initiative, are lazy and apathetic. The success of this woman however feels proud that although born a woman didn't stay one for long.” KING, Louise E: Untitled paper on Canberra Women's Liberation delivered at Women's Liberation National Conference, Sydney 10-12 June, 1972. And: “Women's Studies are flourishing throughout a whole range of academic institutions, but particularly within universities. This newly acquired popularity is of course tremulously based, courses being offered for reasons unrelated to any solid respect for women's role in society. As such, many Women's Studies courses will be vulnerable to the next academic fad. But what concerns us most is the nature of some existing women's studies courses. Taught by academics (male and female) without any feminist or radical perspective, they are conservative in methodology and reactionary in content” The occasion was the changing of Refractory Girl's self classification from 'Women's Studies Journal' to 'Journal of Radical Feminist Thought', Editorial. Refractory Girl. No. 10. March, 1976 p 2.

(36) Prior to 1972, there were two instances of co-operation with academic researchers in Sydney. In 1971, Professor Sol Encel from the Department of Sociology at the University of NSW took a tape recorder to the CAMP (NSW) clubrooms in Sydney and conducted a series of interviews some of which were published in: ENCEL, S., MACKENZIE, N and TEBBUFT, M: Women and Society — An Australian Study, Cheshire, Melbourne. 1974 pp 44-45. One of the members of CAMP (NSW) who was interviewed by Encel says that she participated in the interview because she, and some of the others involved, felt flattered by having their opinions sought by a university professor. She also claims to have been misquoted in the published version of the interview extracts. Also in 1971, members of the Glebe group of Sydney Women's Liberation agreed to be interviewed for the writing of HOLLINGSWORTH, David: Sydney Women's Liberation and the Problems of Revolutionary Praxis. Unpublished BA (Hons) Thesis, Department of Government, University of Sydney, 1971. In both instances, access to the groups was through one individual who was closely associated with those who could grant it.

(37) WORTLEY, Sandra: Attitudes and Therapeutic Goals. Unpublished Master of Psychology Thesis, School of Psychology, University of NSW. February 1973. The questionnaire had a final page which asked for comments on it. Most of the respondents from CAMP (NSW) and Sydney Women's Liberation who answered the questionnaire and returned it made comments within the context of the questionnaire. For example, from the CAMP (NSW) group came: “I hope you spend more energy on political work and less on drawing up pointless questionnaires” 29 year old male homosexual; “The fact that you believe that some of your choices offer alternatives when one of them entails the other, reveals an inability to understand what is offensive to homosexuals” 27 year old male homosexual. And from amongst those who received the questionnaire because they were subscribers to the Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter: “Yes, I dislike having this pap fed into me to be processed the same way whichever answers I give. Also resent, my name and address being bandied about without my permission.” "You have missed a vital point. A person is a human being not a mixture of labels. Your classifications or statements tend to reflect a fixed socially acceptable viewpoint — which is met with tiring sameness from a boring mal-informed ignorant narrow-minded great bronzed Australian public. How about a situation in the here-and-now instead of a hazy few statements, which will give you the result you have calculated to receive" 26 year old nurse. One non-responsive did not answer the questionnaire at all, but wrote a letter to Wortley dated 4 December, 1972, giving her reasons for refusing to fill out the questionnaire. “I see no point in answering a questionnaire if one has to give answers which one does not agree with. Secondly, I disagree with the assumption inherent in the questionnaire of treating homosexuals and housewives as objects of psychological disputation. Thirdly, I disagree with the implied conclusions — the underlying subjectivity of the questionnaire that with tolerance and understanding by "us" — these unfortunately can learn to "assimilate"... I do not think that anyone should have to answer questions that are closest to one’s own viewpoint. This implies firstly that your own viewpoint is not good enough, and secondly that if you answer one point which could be near your viewpoint — then logically one must agree with another answer which is certainly not one's viewpoint at all. I am sorry, I disagree strongly with all that you are trying to do".
Executive of CAMP (NSW) in a covering letter sent with each questionnaire made very clear its reasons for co-operation:

We feel that, from our point of view, the survey is very important for two major reasons:

1. it will reveal how therapists feel about homosexuality, something which the therapists themselves are reluctant to discuss;
2. the results of the survey will be given to CAMP to use as we want—and to be published in CAMP INK;

We want to make it very clear to you that the person conducting the survey did not at any stage have access to the membership flies.

The resistance to academic research on the movements has been strengthened over the years by the inaccuracies and distortions in some ‘academic’ accounts of the women’s movement. Consider the following example:

A remarkable incident occurred at a Women’s Liberation meeting in Sydney in 1973 when a man endeavoured to attend. The man in question was a leading figure in the homosexual organization, CAMP Inc, who argued that women and homosexuals had common interests. Refused permission to stay, he chained himself to his chair, but was forcibly ejected. A group of black women attending the meeting then left, declaring that oppressed groups should maintain solidarity.

Taken in the order in which they occur in the paragraph, the following errors were committed (leaving aside errors of omission)—

1. It was a Women’s Commission organized by Sydney Women’s Liberation not a Women’s Liberation meeting;
2. The man who endeavoured to attend was the editor of Camp INK and had been a leading figure in the establishment of the organization—he was no longer actively involved in the organization;
3. The name of the organization was CAMP, no longer CAMP Inc;
4. He did not argue that homosexuals and women had interests in common, but rather that to exclude him from the Commission was as sexist as men excluding women from their gatherings;
5. He was chained to a row of seats before anybody arrived—he did not chain himself to his chair after he was refused permission to stay;
6. He was not forcibly ejected—he left under his own steam after he had got those present to vote on whether he should be allowed to stay or not and the vote had gone against him;
7. Two black women left (and one later returned) — to say that a group left is misleading.

Not only is there distrust of outsider academics, but those members of the movements who are also academics encounter a good deal of suspicion, for a variety of reasons. For example:

A more dangerous problem than the co-optability of certain Women’s Liberation demands is the tendency of some university trained women to see themselves as experts, thus creating a false division between the ‘theoreticians’ and other women. False, because where all women share and discuss their particular experiences, a body of common experience results which is the opposite from abstract theory lacking concrete content... Any tendency to separate out the
theoretical and non-theoretical women moves against the trust we share. No woman wants to shed one group of oppressors to take on another group, particularly when they are her own sex and when they use the direct experience of women to analyse and digest and develop the classical style of intellectuality which precludes process, but creates followers. Much of this expert knowledge then becomes theory far removed from direct experience, or is based on book knowledge already existing with assumptions unquestioned. (41)

Jo Freeman, for example, discusses the difficulties she, as a member, encountered in trying to gather information on the American Women's Liberation Movement. After experiencing hostility from other members she discovered that "two women from a Left faction were circulating the rumour that" her "study would be used by the University of Chicago to help them eliminate potential feminists applying for admission". (42)

The Sydney Branch of the Women's Electoral Lobby (WEL) formalized its distrust of members who were also potential researchers in the following motions:

That all WEL material, completed surveys, experiments, should be published under copyright. Individuals may apply for permission to use WEL material in part or in full to a General Meeting. In an emergency application to the Co-Ordinating Committee would suffice. (43)

That no member of WEL shall make use of any information acquired by use of her position as a member of WEL to gain an improper advantage to herself or to cause detriment to WEL, or to benefit a political party. (44)

From some of the quotations given above, it is clear that, as far as the liberation movement groups are concerned, any person trying to gather information on their activities would have to (as a minimum requirement) adopt a 'symbolic interactionist perspective' so as not to impose alien meanings on their activities, if that information gathering were going to need any kind of co-operation from the groups. Had I not been a participant long before I became a systematic observer, had I not already, as it were, 'established my credentials' as a genuine participant first and a researcher second, it seems to me that I would have found it much more difficult, if not impossible, to gain access to the kinds of information I sought than I did.

(b) Mechanics of Participant Observation:

Here, the ways of gaining entrée and the roles of participant observation adoptable will be discussed together because in many instances, one determines the other. Two of the four roles most commonly dealt with in the literature will be treated only nominally because their relevance to the present work is minimal.

Schwartz and Schwartz distinguish two modes of participation which take place simultaneously. The first is "affective participation" in which the investigator's emotional responses are evoked in the situation. (45) This, quite obviously, can occur whether the investigator wants it to or not. It can also be put to good use to obtain more meaningful and valid data. The observer, who, upon being asked to notice just how disturbed a psychiatric patient was by the way he jumped back when prodded, thought to herself, 'My God, how would I react if I were prodded by a total stranger for no apparent reason' was participating affectively in the life experiences of the psychiatric patient. The second mode of participation is "participation

as a role activity" under which Schwartz and Schwartz consider only two roles — passive and active participation. (46) It is, however, more common to see listed four roles which the participant observer can adopt in the field. (47)

The two roles which are of less relevance here are the ‘observer-as-participant’ and the ‘complete observer’. (48) The ‘observer-as-participant’ is the role adopted, for example, in the interview situation, where the identity of the investigator and the purposes of the research are known to the subject and where interaction is fairly restricted and of short duration. Tony Parker, for example, adopted this role to conduct the interviews for his three books, The Twisting Lane, The Frying Pan, and In No Man’s Land. (49) The editing out from the published work, of the interview questions, makes it impossible to see to what extent Parker did interact with the interviewees. The example, often cited, of the ‘complete observer’ role is that where the observer sits behind a two-way mirror and observes subjects who are totally unaware of being observed. Here, the investigator is insulated from any social interaction with the subjects.

The other two roles adoptable, each with its own advantages and disadvantages, are the ‘complete participant’ and the ‘participant as observer’. (50) The true identity and purposes of the researcher as ‘complete participant’ are unknown to those being investigated. Here the researcher infiltrates the group under study and pretends to be a genuine participant. Several studies in which this role was adopted illustrate some of the problems involved. Festinger, Reicken and Schachter’s When Prophecy Fails (51) was a study, using the complete participant role of a group in America which predicted the imminent end of the world. Their observers posed as ordinary group members because the researchers knew access would be denied if their real identities and purposes were to be explained. Stories which indicated a sharing of the group’s belief system were concocted for four observers to enable entrée into the group. The fabricated stories were essential, but the arrival of the four “new people to a fairly small group within ten days had an effect on the state of conviction among the existing members, especially since the four seem to have appeared when public apathy to the belief system was great”. (52) Once accepted by the group, the observers had to maintain their roles whilst trying to avoid actual participation which they found very difficult. The authors describe an incident which “strikingly highlights the utter impossibility of avoiding influence on the believers short of absolute refusal to participate in an activity”. (53)


(47) A fifth type, which is far less common is that of the “participant interventionist” whose role is “to assist the community to develop itself and to study that process while it is taking place”. See HOLMBERG, Allan R.: “The Research-and-Development Approach to Change: Participant Intervention in the Field” in ADAMS, Richard and PREISS, Jack J (eds): Human Organization Research. Dorsey Press. Illinois. 1960 p 84.


(50) See JUNKER, Buford: op. cit. pp 35-37; and GOLD, Raymond: op. cit. pp 33-35.


(52) FESTINGER, Leon et al: op. cit. p 240.
At the end of the December 3-4 meeting, Bertha sat for “private consultations” between the individual members and “the Creator” who spoke through her. All the observers dutifully asked a question or two of the Creator and accepted the answers passively, quitting the situation as soon as they politely could. The last observer to go through this ritual was not allowed to be merely passive and non-directive, however. The voice of the medium droned on for a few minutes and then said: “I am the Creator”. Next the voice asked our observer: “What do you see when I say ‘I am the Creator’?” To this the observer replied, “Nothing,” whereupon the medium’s voice explained: “That’s not nothing; that’s the void.” The medium then pressed further: “Do you see a light in the void?” Our observer struggled with this impasse by answering, “A light in the void?” and got, as a reply, a fuller explanation of the “light that expands and covers the void” together with an increasing flood of elaboration that terminated when the medium called other members into the room and asserted that the observer had just been allowed to “witness the Creation”. The medium further stated that this “event” was validation of her speaking with the Creator’s voice, since every time her voice said “I am the Creator” our observer saw the vision of the Creation. Against this sort of runaway invention even the most polished technique of nondirective response is powerless. (54)

When Prophecy Fails illustrates the practical problems of role-pretence, entrée, maintaining that pretence, having to record observations in secret and trying to avoid participation. It also raises the question of the ethics of such an invasion of the privacy of the group and its individual members. (55) John de Hoog’s Skid Row Dossier illustrates the difficulty of trying to see life from another point of view — in this case, from that of the tramp in Sydney. Describing the occasion of his arrest de Hoog writes:

Mentally I still lived in a world cluttered with cliches such as civil rights, legal rights, innocence, etc., so that while the outward trappings popularly associated with police abounded, the meaning of the process made no sense. (56)

Erving Goffman is more specific about the limitations his own position placed on his ability to see life from the point of view of the psychiatric patient:

My view is probably too much that of a middle class male; perhaps I suffered vicariously about conditions that lower class patients handled with little pain. Finally, unlike some patients, I came to the hospital with no great respect for the discipline of psychiatry nor for agencies content with its current practice. (57)

Laud Humphreys’ Tearoom Trade (58) illustrates nicely some of the ethical problems associated with adopting the ‘complete participant’ role. Posing as a homosexual, Humphreys made detailed and systematic observations of homosexual acts between men in ‘tearooms’ (public lavatories). Noting down the registration numbers of the cars that these men drove he was able to trace them to their homes where he later interviewed them. Humphreys was the subject of a debate over the ethics of collecting information on people without their knowledge or consent, information which could be used for blackmail purposes. (59)

---

(53) Ibid. p 242.
(54) Ibid. pp 242-243
(55) Ibid. p 247. They discuss the difficulties of observers having to use the bathroom in relays to record notes.
(57) GOFFMAN, Erving: op. cit. p x.
Humphreys appears to have been able, by posing as a particular type of homosexual frequenter of the 'tearooms', (the 'watchqueen' or lookout) to avoid being drawn into participation. This, however, may not always be possible and Ned Polsky's advice to researchers in criminology not to pose as criminals is equally applicable to researchers posing as homosexuals — particularly movement homosexuals —

You damned well better not pretend to be 'one of them', because they will test this claim out and one of two things will happen: either you will ... get sucked into 'participant' observation of the sort you would rather not undertake, or you will be exposed ... (60)

Posing as a homosexual (even with the type of 'affective participation' discussed by Schwartz and Schwartz) like posing as a tramp will leave the 'complete participant' with an incomplete picture of life from the point of view of the homosexual. To masquerade as a homosexual, knowing that you are not, is very different from being a homosexual:

Like most gay people, I know myself to be part of a minority feared, disliked and persecuted by the majority, and this gives my life a complexity and dimension unknown to straights. (61)

Fundamental to all answers is an understanding that the dominant factor in my life, towering in importance above all others, is a consciousness that I am different. In one all important respect, I am unlike the great mass of people always around me, and the knowledge of that fact is with me at all times, influencing profoundly my every thought, every minute activity, and all my aspirations. It is inescapable, not only this being different, but the constant awareness of a dissimilarity ... (62)

When the role of 'participant-as-observer' is adopted, the investigator's real identity (as investigator) is known to the group being observed as is their purpose. The researcher rather than infiltrating the group, enlists its co-operation. The problems of adopting this type of role centre on gaining the trust of those being observed so that the presence of the observer does not distort the behaviour of the group members. Rose Giallombardo, in her Society of Women — A Study of a Women's Prison writes that

The inmates raised no objections when they were asked if I might join them, but they were extremely suspicious of my presence in the prison. Everyone's presence in the prison structure must be justified — one is either part of the staff or part of the inmate body. And the researcher in the prison setting is neither fish nor fowl. (63)

Initially suspected of being either a reporter or a FBI agent, it took Giallombardo considerable time and effort to convince the inmates that she was in fact a researcher — and only then was co-operation forthcoming.

Evelyn Hooker is perhaps the most famous and accepted (by homosexuals) non-homosexual researcher on homosexuality in America today. She has built up a considerable amount of trust within the homosexual community — but it took her thirty five years to do so. Homosexual novelist Christopher Isherwood explains her acceptance in these terms

What was wonderful about her was that she never condescended to us, never treated us like some strange tribe, so that we told her things we had never told anyone. (64)

(61) ALTMAN, Dennis: op. cit. p 1.
In her 1965 study, "The Homosexual Community", Hooker explains the methods she used, how she gained entree into the group and what was required of her by the group (65).

My objective is to see the homosexual world through the eyes of research subjects as the only way in which to know what is really going on; to look with the subject at his world as he knows it. Only if I can achieve and maintain an attitude such that non-evaluation is constant, and that whatsoever I hear or see is simply a matter of sheer interest, will I be able to establish the necessary conditions of trust for complete frankness. The homosexual mask in the presence of a representative from the dominant culture is so firmly set, the expectation of moral disapproval so constant, that the distrust and suspicion of motives so ready-to-be-alerted, that the researcher must prove his trustworthiness again and again. Only if the genuineness of the researcher’s interest is simply understanding what he sees and hears is conveyed by his total attitudes of feelings and behaviour, is it possible to enlist the full co-operation of the subjects. They must become, in effect, research assistants in the enterprise, seeking to learn as much for themselves about the community in which they live as for the researcher, and to enlist others as well.

My original access to the community was not deliberately sought for research purposes, but developed quite accidentally in the course of normal processes of social interaction with a group of friends to whom I had been introduced by a former student — a fully successful businessman. After a period of testing my capacity to accept their behaviour in a non-judgemental way, while divesting themselves of their protective masks, they made an urgent request that I conduct a scientific investigation of ‘people like them’. By ‘people like them’ they meant homosexuals who did not seek psychiatric help, and who led relatively stable, occupationally successful lives (66).

Hooker’s acceptance by the homosexual community and the fact that her work has continued over a very long period of time has meant that she has not had to resort to (nor would she have been able to if she wished to maintain the trust she had built up) the ethically questionable practices Giallombardo used in talking with her prison inmate subjects. Where some refused to have their statements recorded, Giallombardo put her notebook away for the duration of the interview session and afterwards rushed to the ladies room to write up the statement from memory (67). One wonders whether it was the inmate status of her subjects or the pursuit of the ‘higher’ goal of knowledge which enabled Giallombardo to see this as perfectly legitimate.

A more recent study of homosexuals, but one which was conducted along lines similar to Hooker’s is Carol Warren’s Identity and Community in the Gay World. Using an approximation to the role of ‘participant-as-observer’, she studied American non-movement homosexuals as they interacted in the gay culture. Discussing the literature on participant observation and the rules laid down for carrying out field work leads her to question their relevance.

Almost inevitably, the researcher is exhorted to decide on a particular role to play in the setting – covert or overt – and play it. This abstract type of rule, however, ignores the situational and interpretive nature of social interaction ... Rules about choosing and playing a role ignore interactional contingencies as well as general differences between settings. In general, the role chosen and played emerges from the interaction and not vice versa. What is more, roles are negotiated, not chosen by the sociologist ... (68)


(65) Her first study conducted in 1954 was with members of the Mattachine Society, One Inc, or friends of members of those groups which are considered conservative by current Gay Liberation standards. CHANCE, Paul and HOOKER, Evelyn: “Facts that Liberated the Gay Community” Psychology Today, Vol 9 No 7, December 1975, pp 52-55, 101.
It is worth noting that Warren makes a point of stating that her research findings "cannot be generalized to the new generation of stigma confronting gay liberation activists". (69)

Studies on liberation movement homosexuals are rare. Studies of the homosexual liberation movements are growing in number and are being written by movement homosexuals themselves. They are predominantly about the American movement as are most of the studies of Women's Liberation thus far produced. (70)

Pointing to the problems and limitations of those studies conducted by researchers adopting either the 'complete participant' or the 'participant-as-observer' role in no way totally invalidates the contributions those studies have made, nor does it mean that my approach was problem free: it was different, and so its limitations will be different.

The participant-observer role that I negotiated in gathering the data does not fit any of the categories outlined in the literature. I was a genuine participant in CAMP (NSW), Gay Liberation and Women's Liberation and an observer of their activities before I became a participant-observer with more emphasis on systematic observation. At no time in the name of 'detachment' or 'objectivity' did I stand back from participating. Thus, the fact that I continued as a genuine participant in the activities of the groups means that my presence and behaviour as participant obviously affected — however minimally — the behaviour of others in our interactions. The effect of my presence and behaviour as an observer, I feel did not. Had I withdrawn from the role of genuine participant and adopted that of 'participant-as-observer' the effects would have been more noticeable simply because I would have drawn attention to my observer role, which, while known to those with whom I interacted was, as far as I can ascertain, 'forgotten' during those interactions. The 'complete participant' role I find ethically unacceptable.

My entree as a genuine participant into the activities of the groups occurred during 1972. I came to join CAMP (NSW) through friendship with two male homosexual work colleagues in the Department of Government at Sydney University. Both were already members of CAMP (NSW) but one, Dennis Altman, was a member of the Gay Liberation group which had formed within CAMP and split off from the organization late in 1971; the other was Lex Watson, whose primary loyalties had remained with CAMP. As far as CAMP (NSW) was concerned, I joined as an ordinary member early in March 1972 and began to attend the organization's social gatherings and meetings. As a new member, I committed faux pas which, had I been a ‘participant-as-observer’ would have resulted in the ‘anxieties’ which Schwartz and Schwartz discuss. (71)

As it was, what resulted was not anxiety but mere embarrassment. For example, late one Sunday afternoon in March 1972, I was present at the Balmain CAMP clubrooms with three male members of the organization whom I had met on several previous occasions. Two male non-members whom none of us knew, entered and we began talking with them. During the conversation one of the visitors made reference to ‘her’ and ‘she’. As I was the only female present, I asked him who he was talking about. His answer took the form of a tirade of abuse, rapidly approaching physical assault, for my ‘refusal’ to acknowledge that his male companion was his ‘wife’ and hence the ‘she’ and ‘her’ of his conversation.

(67) GIALLOMBARDO, Rose: op. cit. pp 199-200.
(69) Ibid. p viii.
That Ned Polsky's advice against posing as a criminal applies also to posing as a homosexual, is well illustrated by my own experience. I learned, shortly after I had been elected to the position of Co-President of CAMP (NSW) that 'some people had their doubts' about me. Probably because I was not only relatively unknown to all but a few of the members of CAMP and because I was reticent about discussing my private life, a rumour had sprung up that I was really a heterosexually married woman with several children. Only after another female member of the organization 'vouched for' my lesbianism, was the rumour quashed and the doubt removed.

The fact that I was seen to have come to CAMP (NSW) through friendship with men who were considered 'heavies' and that I was from Sydney University, probably affected the attitudes of other members towards me (and in this sense I was not an 'ordinary' member); as undoubtedly did the fact that I was female in a predominantly male organization, and that the directions in which my interests lay within the organization were in re-constituting a viable women's group, in helping to form the Homosexual Guidance Service as an alternative (opposition) to psychiatric treatment of homosexuals, and in re-educating the public — publicly. In pursuing these interests actively I was atypical of the membership in general and the female membership in particular.

Several factors seem to have contributed to the relative ease with which I was able to gain some measure of acceptance within Sydney Gay Liberation. The acceptance was not total because I was, after all, associated with CAMP, but it was greater than that experienced by many other members of CAMP. These factors were: that I was female; that I had joined CAMP after the Gay Liberation group had split off and hence had not been involved in the acrimony that accompanied that split; that I was involved in the fight against psychiatry, as were many Gay Liberationists; that I was seen to have the approval of Dennis Altman; (72) that I spoke at various public forums and debates with male Gay Liberationists at a time when it was thought desirable to have both a male and a female homosexual appear together and there were few other lesbians who were willing to do so; (73) and that I had come out publicly as a lesbian while most members of CAMP (and not a few Gay Liberationists) had not.

My initial contact with participants in Sydney Women's Liberation came via my attempt to re-establish a women's group within CAMP. Some of the women who came to those early meetings were from Gay Liberation — women who were also involved in Women's Liberation. Some women who were not involved in Gay Liberation but whose energies were directed toward Women's Liberation also attended those meetings on a semi-regular basis in addition to the times when groups of women from Women's Liberation were specifically invited to try to start up a dialogue between the two groups. This was during the period when there was some ambivalence about the position of lesbians within Sydney Women's Liberation.

San Francisco, 1973. These are all American and mostly male. Studies of the American women's movement abound, especially in the innumerable anthologies as well as, for example, FREEMAN, Jo: op. cit. and the works cited in the preceding chapters.

(71) SCHWARTZ, Morris and SCHWARTZ, Charlotte Green: op. cit. p 100.
(72) In an interview with Mike Delaney, for example, Altman is quoted as saying "There are also people within the various branches of C.A.M.P. who are in a sense gay liberationists" "Dennis Altman — An Interview with Mike Delaney" WILLIAM AND JOHN. Vol 1 No. 6. p 11.
(73) One of the earliest public debates in which I took part was at Macquarie University on 3 August 1972. Dennis Altman and I opposed Father Jim McLaren and Dr. Martin, Professor of Psychology in an "Open Forum on Homosexuality". The write up of that debate in the Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter Vol 1 No 2. August 1972, by Sue and Kerry (which also appeared in the Macquarie University student paper ARENA Vol 5 No. 10, October 1972) placed myself and Altman together in opposition to the other speakers. There was no mention of my position in CAMP nor any comment to indicate hostility. Such hostility did appear, however, with reference to other members of CAMP (members of long standing, and male in particular) — the hostile comments about David Widdup's decision to stand in Lowe in the 1972 federal elections for example which appeared in the Sydney Gay Liberation Newsletter. Vol 1 No 4. October, 1972.
Contacts with other groups of people more marginally involved in the CIBA-GEIGY Conference were established in 1972 through friendship networks — groups such as the Sydney Push and some of the psychiatrists and psychologists who were opposed to psychiatric treatment of homosexuals in general and aversion therapy in particular.

During this period I made notes of events and activities involving the groups in which I participated. This felt need to take notes and keep some sort of record of events may be idiosyncratic but it is fed by academic training, a feeling of irritation which arises whenever I try to find records of past homosexual and women's groups in Australia and cannot, and an anxiety that unless those of us who are involved in the liberation movements do keep records, our history will either not be written at all or will be written by people who have never been involved in them.

The point at which I began to make ‘more systematic’ notes thus represented a minor re-orientation. It did not stand out as a major change in my behaviour, nor was it noticeably different from the behaviour of other ‘note-takers’, who shared my obsession. I made no ‘grand announcement’ of the added purpose of my ‘more systematic’ note taking. At the joint meeting of 11 March 1973, called to plan a co-ordinated response from the liberation groups to McConaghy’s invitations to participate in his conference, several people remarked to me on the ideal nature of this meeting for my thesis. This to me was an indication of two things— that they knew, and that they did not object. This was reinforced by the fact that all those I sought to interview about their participation in the events surrounding the Conference agreed willingly, knew why I wanted to interview them, and talked openly about their participation not only in those events, but in other events about which I initially knew nothing but which they thought would be relevant; the clearest example of this is the plan of the pissed off activists to destroy McConaghy’s aversion therapy equipment.

The literature on how participant observers should ‘leave’ the field of observation is irrelevant in the present context because as a genuine participant, I did not leave the field. (c) Advantages and Disadvantages of Participant Observation as a Research Method: Here the literature on the subject will be dealt with rather more briefly as many of the matters raised therein, such as the problems associated with adopting various roles, have already been discussed.

If, as Denzin argues, “an irreducible conflict will always exist between the sociological perspective and the perspective of everyday life” (74) then participant observation tries to minimize this conflict by urging the researcher to share in the everyday life of those being studied. Variously phrased (75) this is the main advantage claimed for participant observation as a method of research. That it is simultaneously the main disadvantage attributed to


(75) For example — “Taking the role of the acting other permits the sociologist to escape the fallacy of objectivism; that is, the substitution of his own perspective for that of those he is studying”. Ibid. p 8; “Participant observation enables the research worker to secure his data within the mediums, symbols and experiential worlds which have meaning to his respondents. Its intent is to prevent imposing alien meanings upon the actions of the subjects” VIDICH, Arthur J: op. cit. p 79; “Qualitative methods allow us to know people personally ... We experience what they experience. Qualitative methods enable us to explore concepts whose essence is lost in other research methods. Such concepts as beauty, pain ... hope and love can be studied as they are defined and experienced by real people in their everyday lives” BOGDAN, Robert and TAYLOR, Steven J: op. cit. pp 4-5; “Participant observation is conscious and systematic sharing, in so far as circumstances permit, in the life-activities and, on occasion, in the interests and affects of a group of persons. Its purpose is to obtain data about behaviour through direct contact and in terms of specific situations in which the distortion that results from the investigator’s being an outside agent is reduced to a minimum” KLUCKHOHN, Florence R.: “The Participant-Observer Technique in Small Communities” American Journal of Sociology. Vol XLVI No 3, November, 1940 p 331.
participant observation is illustrated very clearly by Denzin in his book The Research Act in Sociology. Here, within the space of three pages, he exhorts sociologists to do and not to do, exactly the same thing:

Participant observation is a commitment to adopt the perspective of those being studied by sharing in their day-to-day experience... the intent is to record the ongoing experience of those being observed through their symbolic world... To comprehend scientifically the world of social man, sociologists must adopt the perspective of those being studied. (76)

Learning and sharing the meanings inherent in another person's symbolic world poses problems for the participant observer, for he may cease to think entirely as a sociologist (or anthropologist) and, instead begin to adopt the perspective of those he is studying. This "going native" can inhibit the development of hypotheses, for the observer finds himself defending the values of those studied, rather than actually studying them. (77)

Related to this problem of subjectivity and biases, which is part of the debate over the relative merits of qualitative and quantitative research methods raised earlier, is the question of "going native", the effects of the researcher on the data, and the difficulty of making generalizations from studies using participant observation as a research method. Other alleged disadvantages are related to, or result from, this central question of subjectivity.

The advantages claimed for participant observation, in addition to those already mentioned include its allowance for flexibility that it is not "restricted to static cross sectional data" but enables the "real" study of social processes; and that participant observation does not rely on the verbal capacities of participants and allows some choice on how closely verbal behaviour approximates real behaviour. S. M. Miller discusses the problem of 'over-rapport' by which he means that "the researcher may be so closely related to the observed that his investigations are impeded". In his own study of union leadership, Miller became too closely associated with the leadership of the union and found it difficult to investigate rank and file members both because of the members' views of that close association and because he himself began to think too much in the set of the leaders. In my own case, my primary identification with CAMP meant that attendance at meetings of CAMP took precedence over attendance at other meetings—simply because I was unable to be in more than one place at one time. It also

(77) Ibid. p 188. Emphasis added.
(78) For example, see GOLD, Raymond L.: op. cit. p 34.; MCCALL, George: "Data Quality Control in Participant Observation" in MCCALL George and SIMMONS, J. L.: op. cit. p 132 where he defines "going native" as "overidentification with the participants' viewpoint, or more likely, with the viewpoint of some particular faction among these participants". The difficulty which seems likely to arise for any researcher is to distinguish between "going native" and "participating affectively".
(81) For example, that the participant observer cannot see everything either because of the sheer physical impossibility of being in more than one place or because of the role defined for the self. See MCCALL, George: "Data Quality Control in Participant Observation" op. cit. p 128; ZELDITCH, Morris L: "Some Methodological Problems of Field Studies" in MCCALL, George and SIMMONS, J. L.: op. cit. p 13; MILLER, S. M.: "The Participant Observer and 'Over-Rapport'." in MCCALL, George and SIMMONS, J. L.:op. cit. pp 87-89.
meant that once CAMP had decided to boycott the CIBA-GEIGY Conference, I felt bound not to attend it—even as an observer. Similarly, my association with CAMP meant that I was not privy to the secret meetings of the pissed off activists and learned of those activities from interviews. These interviews also allowed a matching between other participant's observations of events both with each other and with my own.

The problem of 'going native' associated particularly with the 'complete participant' role is one that receives considerable attention in the literature. The treatment accorded the problem is for the most part as ambiguous as the quotations from Denzin cited above would indicate. Researchers, it would appear, are to go so far— but no further in trying to learn to share the 'symbolic meanings inherent in another person's symbolic world'. In one sense, going native did not present itself as a possibility, let alone a problem to me, because I already was native. I did not have to learn the meanings inherent in the world of the liberation groups—as part of the groups, they were already mine. Denzin suggests that one of the dangers in going native is that the observer may end up defending the values of those being studied rather than actually studying them. The genuine participant in me obviously defends (some of) the values studied because they are my own, but that does not prevent the observer (and indeed the participant) from studying them. How many observers are going to be able to find a group none of whose values are already their own to study and what effects would that have on their work. What being native meant is that there is greater pressure on me to be aware of, to bring to consciousness, and state what being native means in terms of shared values. Would that the same pressures were felt by all participant observers.

(85) MILLER, S. M.: op. cit. p 87.
2. INTERVIEWING

The literature on interviewing is far more varied than that on participant observation. The latter is treated solely as a research method; the uses of the former range from assessing job applicants through social work and psychiatric counselling to gaining information for research purposes. Here, the literature on the interview as a research method will be dealt with under two broad heads:

(a) categorizations into types of interview;
(b) the problems associated with using data obtained from interviews.

(a) Types of Interview:

As has already been mentioned, the interview is sometimes considered to come under the broader definition of or to be that particular type of participant observation where the researcher adopts the role of 'observer-as-participant'. As a research method it is also seen as one of the qualitative methods which can yield more or less (depending on the particular type of interview used) quantifiable data — data which can be subjected to statistical manipulation.

At the most general level, the interview is seen as a particular form of commonly occurring social interaction — the conversation. The distinguishing criterion sometimes used, as for example by John Madge, (86) that it is different from ordinary conversation because it is purposive, is inadequate. What is more important is that it has a particular purpose — the eliciting of information. Thus, Maccoby and Maccoby write:

For our purposes, an interview will refer to a face-to-face verbal interchange in which one person, the interviewer, attempts to elicit information or expressions of opinion or belief from another person or persons. (87)

This would still include a good many conversations. What distinguishes the interview from other forms of social interaction subsumed under the category of conversation more than anything else is the formalization of the interaction: one person assumes the role of seeker of information and/or opinion, the other, that of provider; the presence of equipment, be it tape recorder or pen and paper for the purposes of preserving a record of that conversation and the information obtained; and the awareness that that record is to be 'used' in some way (more or less unknown to and beyond the control of the interviewee) by the interviewer.

Where writers have attempted to classify interviews into different types, they have used several criteria such as the 'type' (or, as it turns out, the status) of person being interviewed, the purposes of the interviewer, and the degree of structuring of the interview situation. In most cases, some mix of these criteria is used. Madge, for example, distinguishes between interviews of potentates, experts and 'people'. He then suggests three purposes of interviewing — gathering facts and/or opinion, enlisting or retaining co-operation for a course of action, and instilling confidence in interviewees to help them make appropriate decisions. The last two purposes clearly indicate the manipulative possibilities of the interview situation. Madge ends up with nine categories and lists what he considers to be the three most important forms as appealing to potentates for permission, to experts for technical information, and to ordinary people for ordinary feelings and facts. (88)

(88) MADGE, John: op. cit. p 145.
L. A. Dexter, writing seventeen years later and with a good deal more sophistication, uses the criteria of the type of person interviewed and the degree of structure of the interview situation to distinguish between elite, non-elite, and informant interviewing. Elite interviewing is an interview with any interviewee who

in terms of the current purposes of the interviewer is given special, non-standardized treatment. By non-standardized treatment I mean (1) stressing the interviewee's definition of the situation, (2) encouraging the interviewee to structure the account of the situation, (3) letting the interviewee introduce to a considerable extent... his notions of what he regards as relevant, instead of relying upon the investigator's notions of relevance... In standardized interviewing... the investigator defines the question and the problem; he is looking for answers within the bounds set by his presuppositions. In elite interviewing... the investigator is willing, and often eager, to let the interviewee teach him what the problem, the question, the situation, is... (89)

An informant, on the other hand, is

distinguished from an elite interviewee by two factors: participation and time. The informant is regarded to some, often to a considerable extent, as a subprofessional colleague or co-worker of the research investigator. (90)

In a more restricted definition of informant interviewing, Zelditch argues that an informant be called an informant only when he is reporting information presumed factually correct about others rather than himself; and his information about events is about events in their absence. Interviewing during the event itself is considered part of participant observation. (91)

Zelditch then goes on to distinguish between the uses to which informants can be put — the informant as surrogate census taker, as a representative respondent, and as the observer's observer. (92)

Within the category of informant, Dean, Eichhorn and Dean list 'fruitful' informant types under four headings. First, those who are especially sensitive to the area of concern — the outsider, the rookie, the nouveau statused, and the naturally reflective and objective person; second, there are the 'more-willing-to-reveal-informants' — the naive informant, the frustrated person, the 'outs' who have lost power, the habitue or old hand, the needy person who craves attention, and the subordinate who must adapt to superiors; third there are the 'critical cases' — informants with similar psychological and social characteristics placed in different sociological environments; and finally, the trained person in the field, such as the social worker. (93)

By far the most common way of classifying interviews is in terms of the degree of their structuring or standardization. Thus Maccoby and Maccoby distinguish between the standardized and the unstandardized interview (94) and Denzin refines the distinction into schedule standardized, non schedule standardized and nonstandardized. (95) The more standardized and scheduled the interview, the greater the yield of quantifiable data which can be treated statistically.

(90) Ibid. pp 7-8.
(91) ZELDITCH, Morris: op. cit. p 9.
(93) DEAN, John P, EICHHORN, Robert L and DEAN, Lois R: "Fruitful Informants for Interviewing" in MCCALL, George and SIMMONS, J. L. (eds) op. cit. pp 143-144.
In the schedule standardized interview the same information is sought from each interviewee by presenting each with the same wordings of the same questions in the same order and under the same conditions — Colin Fletcher's "pressure for conformity, for uniformity, for mediocrity, for concealment in the grey mass". (96) The assumptions underlying the use of this form of interview are that the same words will mean the same thing to different people, that the same question will be 'heard' in the same way and that the same order of questions will maintain the same level of interest and co-operation in different people — all highly dubious assumptions. In the nonschedule standardized version, which Denzin suggests most closely resembles Merton and Kendall's 'focused interview' (97) the same information is sought from each interviewee but the particular wording and ordering of questions may be changed to suit each particular respondent. This version of the interview is based on a partial denial of the validity of the assumptions underlying the schedule variety and the substitution of another assumption — that it is possible, by special selection of respondents and special training of interviewers, that skills can be developed in the interviewers to enable them to present an 'equivalence of meaning' to all respondents. (98)

Finally, in the nonstandardized interview, no predetermined set of questions is employed, nor are questions asked in a prespecified order — at its least standardized, it is Dexteo's elite interview, where the interviewer encourages interviewees to set the definition of, and structure the account of the situation and to introduce what they regard as relevant.

In the present research, the type of information I sought from interviewees made it most desirable to use a nonstandardized form of interview where the interviewee was treated as an 'elite'. I wanted the interviewees to fill in some of the gaps in the information I had collected by participant observation; I wanted them to provide me with interpretations and meanings of events other than my own, and to provide me with information about things which they considered relevant and I either had not, or had no knowledge of whatsoever. As they were all either friends or acquaintances, and all fellow participants in the liberation movements, and I related to each of them in a different way, each interview is highly individual. It would have been impossible for me to put on some mask of 'impersonal interviewer' to each of them and ask them to forget every impression and experience of me that they had accumulated; neither could I forget my experiences of them. What resulted was that undoubtedly (and unconsciously) our responses to each other were influenced by these factors; we interacted with each other more in terms of being friends and fellow participants than in the more commonly discussed terms of research interviewer and interviewee.

All interviews were conducted when and where it was convenient for the interviewee so that they would feel at ease, be encouraged to define the situation in their own terms and raise what they felt was relevant. Thus, all but two were conducted at the homes of the interviewees and those two were conducted, at the request of the interviewees, in my room at the university. All interviews were taped, transcribed verbatim and the transcripts sent to the interviewees. They were asked to correct any errors that appeared, and add anything else they wanted to. Most of

(95) DENZIN, Norman K: The Research Act ... op. cit. pp 124-128.
(96) FLETCHER, Colin: op. cit. pp 67-68.
(97) DENZIN, Norman K: loc. cit. p 125.
the interviewees added nothing, a few corrected minor details and some added details to, elaborated upon, or clarified things that they had said. Sometimes it was necessary to ask interviewees general questions about specific events — to lead them on to talking about those events — at other times merely to probe a little and once, to provoke a response by playing devil's advocate. In one of the early interviews, a respondent introduced a piece of information — the formation and activities of the pissed off activists — which was totally unknown to me. This made it possible for me to check his version against those of others who were involved. Versions of actual events differed very little from one another. In most cases pieces of information of minor significance were either added or left off. What did vary were the interpretations the interviewees put on their own and other participants' behaviour and the motivations they attributed to themselves and to others.

(b) Problems Associated with Using Data Obtained from Interviews:

There are three sources to which 'errors' in the data obtained from interviews can be traced. These are the interview situation, the interviewer and the interviewee.

The interview situation, because of the formalized nature of the interaction between seeker and provider of information outlined above, because interviewees are aware of the possibility that what they say may, quite frankly, be 'taken down and used against them', because interviewers are aware that, to some extent at least, they are providing cues which will influence the way the interviewees respond, the situation itself, cannot but influence what is said (and not said) and how it is said.

Very little of the literature on the problems associated with interviewing is devoted to those errors which arise from the limitations of the interviewer. While most writers warn of the dangers of interviewees who say what they think interviewers want to hear (99) few mention (even for the benefit of potential interviewers) the dangers of interviewers who hear what they want to hear (for whatever reason) rather than what is said, or who lead interviewees to say what they want to hear by so framing the questions and structuring the situation that the responses given are the only ones that could be given under the circumstances. It is similar to the classic dilemma of the witness in the box confronted by the lawyer's question "Have you stopped beating your wife? Answer yes or no." On either answer, the witness who has never beaten his wife loses. The only cognizance some authors give to this possibility is by specifying difficulties associated with the interviewer and interviewee speaking 'different' languages and having different 'symbolic' worlds (100) and the interviewer not knowing enough to know what to ask. (101)

In the literature, it is to the interviewee, the provider of information, that the majority of errors are traced. These errors relate to the interviewee's ability to possess knowledge of past or current events, and to pass that information on verbally, distortion free, and in a manner intelligible to the interviewer. Problems arise when interviewees consciously or unconsciously distort 'the truth'; possess as part of their general knowledge information which, to the interviewee, is specialized, and hence are not aware that it should be passed on; use language and concepts which

(99) For example: "Some interviewees want so much to be helpful that they strain to give the researcher the kind of answers they think he wants ..." MCCALL, George: op. cit. p 134. See also VIDICH, Arthur and BENS MAN, Joseph: "The Validity of Field Data" in ADAMS, Richard and PREISS, Jack (eds): op. cit p 191.

have meanings particular to their subculture; and agree to participate in interviews for what the literature refers to as 'ulterior motives'. (102)

The list of 'fruitful informants' given by Dean, Eichhorn and Dean above gives some indication of the range of 'ulterior motives' that interviewees could have for participating in interviews. It is precisely because of their ulterior motives, it would seem, that they are fruitful informants—to be sought out rather than avoided. In conducting my own interviews I was made aware in two cases, by remarks made by interviewees, of the possible existence of 'ulterior motives'. One respondent, while I was setting up the tape recorder, remarked that he thought that I would have very little trouble getting people to talk to me because they would be flattered to think their views were being sought for something 'as important as a Ph.D. thesis'. Did this say more about his own motives for agreeing to be interviewed than the motives of others? Did it affect what he told me? How can I know whether it did or not, and if it did, how can I know how it did? And would it really matter anyway? A second interviewee, after we had finished tape recording suggested that we lunch together and continue talking at a more conversational level. He had, he said, welcomed the opportunity of being interviewed because up until that time he had been 'terrified' of me. The interview had given him the chance, as he saw it, to develop a social relationship. Had this led him to say what he thought I wanted to hear? Did he do so consciously or unconsciously?

If 'ulterior motives' are suspected, the literature advises that care be taken in the use of the information obtained from those individuals. This somehow seems to miss the point that all individuals are motivated by 'something' to participate in interviews, or as Gusfield points out, the interview confers "certain rewards on both parties". (103) Implicit in the discussion of motives listed as 'ulterior' and the warning that care be taken in the use of information obtained from the interviews where they are suspected, is the assumption that the information obtained from people who participate for the 'correct' reasons such as a belief in the value of research and that researchers should be aided in their pursuits, is likely to be of greater value in terms of being less 'distorted', and so on. What is really being said in the literature is that some motives—ulterior or otherwise—have been and are more acceptable to researchers than others—without any consideration of why they should be.

(101) BECKER, Howard S and GREER, Blanche: op. cit. p 30. It is interesting to note that they consider the problem of the interviewer not having enough information to enquire into a particular matter under the heading of 'Matters Interviewees are unable or unwilling to talk about'.


(103) GUSFIELD, Joseph R: op. cit. p 29.
3. DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Document analysis was the third method used to collect the data for analysis. It was less important as a method for obtaining information about the actual events surrounding the CIBA-GEIGY Conference (except for the correspondence exchanged between the participants) than as an aid in building up a picture of the development of the liberation movements and the context within which the Conference must be placed.

In his "The Historian and the Historical Document" Louis Gottschalk distinguishes between primary and secondary sources in terms of the former being the testimony of an eyewitness or somebody (or mechanical recording device) who was present at the events being recounted and the latter being the testimony of somebody who was not there, and for Gottschalk document is synonymous with source. (104) The sources used here were mainly primary.

Because the documents analysed constitute the 'literature'—papers presented at conferences, leaflets, newsletters, newspapers and so on—of Sydney Women's Liberation, Sydney Gay Liberation and CAMP (NSW), they are virtually all what Robert Angell calls 'personal documents'. A 'personal document' is

one which reveals a participant's view of experiences in which he has been involved. It is not absolutely essential that the individual whose conception of a situation is set forth should have written the document himself. A careful transcription of an interview may be regarded as a personal document... Nor is it requisite that the individual himself be the focus of the experiences related in the document. That focus may be a group with whose activities he is thoroughly familiar. (105)

My interest in the use of personal documents coincides with the first of three that Angell lists

the investigator who wants to understand the development of a particular person, group or institution or class of them. The primary aim... [is to] grasp the nature of the particular social units or types of study of their past and present tendencies. (106)

The documents analysed also possess what Gottschalk calls a high 'degree of subjectivity' which enhances rather than detracts from their value because it is a reflection of the nature of the liberation movements themselves. In part, this 'subjectivity' is a concrete expression of 'the personal is political' adopted by the liberation movements, in part, a reaction to what is known as 'the patriarchal intellectual tradition' and, in part, an expression of the anti-intellectualism of some women in the movement.

One of the basic tenets of the liberation movements is the concept of 'the personal is political' which, among other things means that it is legitimate, even necessary, to discuss one's personal experiences and problems with others because only by so doing does it become clear that individuals' problems are not the 'fault' of individuals personally, but the result of the existing structures of society. (107) This concept was not discovered by, nor is it the sole


(106) Ibid. p 185. The other two types of investigation of personal documents are those interested in improving the theoretical system and those interested in the method itself.

(107) BOALS, Kay: "Review Essay: Political Science" Signs. Vol I No. 1. Autumn 1975 pp 161-174. writes: "the personal is political, that is, that the problems individuals encounter are not the result of unique personal weakness, but rather are caused by the structure of the societal institutions, and in particular by the sex-role system." p 172. She goes on: "all human relationships are inherently political. Thus, ' politicize' cannot mean 'to
property of the Women's Liberation Movement. In 1959, for example, C. Wright Mills wrote

Know that many personal troubles cannot be solved merely as troubles, but must be understood in terms of public issues — and in terms of the problems of history-making. Know that the human meaning of public issues must be revealed by relating them to personal troubles — and to the problems of the individual life. (108)

Juliet Mitchell describes the revolutionary Chinese 'speaking bitterness' sessions:

a personal incident that was condemned to the oblivion of privacy is examined as a manifestation of the oppressed conditions women experience: the personal is seen to be a crucial aspect of the political . . . by "speaking bitterness" the Chinese peasants, subdued by violent coercion and abject poverty took a step out of thinking their fate was natural by articulating it. (109)

The strong reaction amongst liberationists who have had or are still in contact with universities is against what is broadly labelled 'the patriarchal intellectual tradition'. (110) Similar criticisms have also been voiced by Gay Liberationists with respect to the heterosexist nature of that tradition. Elements attributed to that tradition and against which feminists have reacted include:

(a) an objection to the university system itself and the institutionalization of intellect, as a male dominated institution with its old boy network of jobs and promotions from patrons for disciples, with its power structures and traditions of truths being handed down to docile students from god professors, and so on; (111)

(b) an objection to the narrow confinement of subject areas within traditional disciplines whose boundaries are so rigidly defined and jealously guarded that bitter border disputes leading to internecine wars are commonplace and take place at the expense of both scholarship and subject areas. The aim of most Women's Studies Courses to be 'truly inter-disciplinary' is the clearest expression of this objection; (112)

(c) the fact that university courses and texts ignore the existence of women totally or grant women only token acknowledgement; (113)

make political'. What it means instead is 'to bring to conscious awareness the political (i.e., contingent rather than inevitable) nature of existing social arrangements'. In this usage, then, 'politicization' is equivalent to 'consciousness-raising' and consciousness-raising becomes the crucial political act — crucial because it opens the way to transformation of hitherto taken-for-granted ideologies and institutions". p 173. More explicitly, in the condemnation of the tendency of some university women to see themselves as experts, Leonie Campbell writes of the false division created thereby between 'theoreticians' and other women. "False, because where all women share and discuss their particular experience, a body of common experience results which is the opposite from abstract theory lacking concrete content". CAMPBELL, Leonie: "Process of Liberation" op. cit. p 10.


(111) For example: CURTHOYS, Ann: "Women's Studies, the University and the Women's Movement" Unpublished paper circulated in lieu of attendance at the Women's Studies Conference, 28-29 June, 1975. Adelaide. Written Canberra, 1975. "The Universities in Australia have always been essentially conservative institutions demanding intellectual conformity and have always dealt harshly with intellectual or political dissidents . . ." ROE, Jill: "HHR Restored" Refractory Girl. No. 6. June 1974: "In April 1973, at the Sydney Women's Commission, a large gathering of women reacted in very mixed ways to the impassioned view that it was pointless to attempt radical feminist scholarship in today's male-bound institutions. It was all very understandable: and justifiable." p 5.

(112) For example: Editorial. Refractory Girl. No 1. op. cit. "This journal will be truly inter-disciplinary in the sense that we feel free to move from one area of knowledge to another . . . Our impression is that these divisions [between disciplines] were unnecessarily drawn have been confirmed . . . We each work in different disciplines but this has been less important than the perception that the same male standard of reality permeates them all, and unlike the empire-building academics, we wish to stress our common interests, not accentuate our difference." p 4.

(113) Editorial. Refractory Girl. No. 1. op. cit. "The ultimate purpose of Refractory Girl is to force an awareness in all those who presume to write about society that the world is not composed entirely of men. It is difficult
(d) the belief that traditional academic methodologies, reflecting as they do traditional male interests, are inadequate and inappropriate for looking at the experience of women in particular and dehumanizing in their approach to all people. Inadequate and inappropriate because trying to look for female reality and experience with tools, and trying to interpret female reality and experience with constructs, which were designed and developed by males to look for and interpret male reality and experience (on the false assumption that they were looking at human reality and experience) results in a picture of female reality and experience as either non-existent or as a deviant case of male reality and experience. It is the machismo element, the agentic approach to research referred to above that is being criticized as inappropriate and dehumanizing. (114)

The documents of the movements do not reflect the entire range of opinions on various issues that exist within them. They are representative of the opinions of those articulate enough to write them down in the first place and have access to the resources to reproduce them, just as the transcripts of tapes represent the opinions of those who are sufficiently articulate to verbalize their feelings and experiences. The documents I used were those leaflets, papers, newsletters, letters, published and unpublished accounts of events, which I had collected over the years and which others had collected and granted me access to. The scrutiny applied to them was of a kind appropriate to their nature rather than as laid down by Gottschalk as a condition for accepting any single detail of a document as good evidence. Two of his tests, for example, ask whether the witness was both able and willing to tell “the truth”. (115)

Wherever possible, documents used as evidence were scrutinized with the following sorts of questions in mind —

(a) the context in which the document was produced: what was happening at the time; where, when and under what conditions was it produced; was it a reaction to anything, if so, what; how many people were involved and who were they; for what purposes was it produced;

(b) what was the intention of the author(s);

(c) what sorts of corroborative evidence exist.

If these sorts of questions could not be answered from the document itself, the author(s) were asked.

to discover a simple example of a comprehensive piece of writing in literary criticism, history or the social sciences which is not apparently based on this assumption. The majority of scholarly books ignore women, or where their existence is acknowledged, it is most often in a token fashion, a few pages tacked onto the general scheme. At most, there is a single chapter which presumes to encompass a disparate heterogeneous group of human beings by reducing them to their basic common denominator, their sex.” p 3.

(114) For example, BELLAMY, Sue: “The Heroine as Myth, or Male Cultural Baggage We’ve Been Forced to Carry” Refractory Girl. No. 1. Summer 1972/73 calls for some questioning of the historian’s acceptance of “the cultural cleavage that divides society into recorded male national reality and sanctioned privatized female pseudo-reality and unfulfilment”. p 30. And SMITH, Dorothy: “Women’s Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology” Sociological Inquiry. Vol 44 No. 1. 1974 pp 7-13 argues how important it is to study the personal feelings omitted as a rule from sociological research.

(115) GÖTTSCHALK, Louis : op. cit. p 38.
B. DATA PRESENTATION TECHNIQUES

The data have been presented in two separate chapters, the first covering the movements from their births up until the end of 1972, the second, covering 1973 and the CIBA-GEIGY Conference. Some of the difficulties encountered in trying to do that in a way which minimized violation of the integrity of that data have already been discussed in the introductory notes to those chapters. These were, in particular, the difficulties associated with splitting the account of the growth of the sexual liberation movements into external activities and internal developments and those associated with simultaneously setting the CIBA-GEIGY Conference in the context of the ongoing activities of the movements and highlighting it as a specific incident which involved parts of all movements in interaction with each other.

A subset of difficulties revolved around differing interpretations of the motivations of individual actors. As has already been pointed out, there were no disagreements between the various sources of information as to what actually happened during 1972-1973. What there was some disagreement about was the importance different individuals attached to the particular events, their own participation in those events, and the intentions and motives they imputed to their own behaviour and that of others. Rod Byatt, for example, one of those who called themselves the pissed off activists, when asked why he thought the plans of that group to destroy McConaghy’s aversion therapy equipment had fallen through, gave the following reasons:

(a) Pam Stein had written of those plans and the people involved in a letter to a friend. That letter, amongst others she had written, had been seized by the Commonwealth Police who, if the plan had actually been carried out, would have known who had been involved and, presumably taken action to ensure that those responsible would be arrested;

(b) there were some in the group who, while initially enthusiastic, came to see the planned action as too extreme and became fearful, while he himself saw the plan as feasible and would have gone through with it.

Paul Foss, when asked the same question, gave these reasons:

(a) He and several others who had been going to participate in the McConaghy plan, had left Sydney and gone to Melbourne to set up the new gay newspaper;

(b) there were some in the group, such as, and especially Rod Byatt, who, while initially enthusiastic, ‘freaked out’ when the time for putting the plan into action drew nearer— while he himself would definitely have gone through with the plan.

Byatt and Foss gave their ‘reasons’ and in so doing impute intentions and motives for their own behaviour and that of others. My task in this and a few other instances, has been to decide upon which of these (in some respects competing, in others complementary) ‘explanations’ and any others that I myself might have, is more plausible — i.e., more reasonable, probable, likely (116) In this task I have been aided by some of the findings of the attribution theorists. Attribution theory “deals with the rules the average individual uses in attempting to infer the causes of observed behaviour”. (117) Those findings which I found helpful to bear in mind, can be summarized as follows:

(a) in their evaluations, people, are, generally negatively biased. That is, people are cost rather than reward oriented, and tend to weight the negative aspects of an object (or person) more heavily than the positive aspects; (118)

(116) KELLEY, Harold H: “Attribution in Social Interaction” in JONES, Edward et al: Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behaviour. General Learning Press. Morristown. New Jersey. (1971) 1972 p 10 defines a plausible cause as “one that any member of the same culture and time period as the experimenter would be likely to mention as a probable cause for the behaviour if we set it in its setting and ask, “why did it occur?”.

(117) JONES, Edward et al: op. cit. p x.
(b) avoidance behaviour is more likely to be attributed to external causes (the external situation rather than the actor) and approach behaviour to internal causes (the actor rather than the situation) i.e., “more responsibility is attributed to the person for his actions taken for gain than for similar actions to prevent loss or to avoid punishment”; (119)

(c) “Those actions of another person that are in conflict with the attributor’s interests tend to be attributed, more than they should be, to the person”; (120)

(d) “In interdependent interaction with another person, the person tends to attribute to himself those actions of the other person that are consistent with the attributor’s own interests”

(e) whether or not one person’s behaviour is reciprocated by another depends heavily on the causes attributed to that behaviour (122) and, as far as hostile behaviour is concerned, people respond to the hostile intention of the act rather than the amount of pain or injury caused; (123)

(f) finally, and probably most importantly, “there is a pervasive tendency for actors to attribute their actions to situational requirements, whereas observers tend to attribute the same actions to stable personal dispositions” (124) As to who, actor or observer, is ‘right’, the authors Jones and Nisbett, aware of the difficulties involved in trying to make any such assessment, come down very cautiously on the side of the actor by suggesting that there are (from experimental evidence) “many occasions on which the observer [makes] dispositional inference when the data do not allow it”. (125)

In some instances, the data obtained from interviews fairly clearly fell within what Scott and Lyman call “accounts” rather than “explanations” of their behaviour (126) By an account they mean “a statement made by a social actor to explain unanticipated or untoward behaviour — whether that behaviour is his own or that of others, and whether the proximate cause for that statement arises from the actor himself or from someone else” (127) This, they distinguish from an explanation by claiming that the latter involves statements where untoward behaviour is not an issue. (128) They distinguish two types of accounts — justifications where “one accepts responsibility for the act in question, but denies the pejorative quality associated with it” (129)

(120) Ibid. p 19.
(121) Ibid. p
(122) Ibid. p 14.
(123) Ibid. p 15.
(125) Ibid. p 88. This finding has interesting implications for verstehen. Brodbeck writes: “How then do we know the thoughts and purposes of others? We can only know them, according to the proponents of verstehen, by an imaginative projection of our own states of mind. When we behave in certain ways, we know directly our own motives and we attribute these to others when we see them behaving in similar ways”. BRODTECK, May (ed): Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. Macmillian. New York. 1968 p 14. If, in fact, we tend not to attribute our own motives to others then it would seem that verstehen would call for an extra effort of will to overcome the tendency toward attributing our own actions to situational requirements and those of others to personal dispositions.
(127) Ibid. p 46.
(128) Ibid. p 47.
(129) Ibid.
and excuses which are “socially approved vocabularies for mitigating or relieving responsibility when conduct is questioned”. (130)

Over the issue of whether, having signed the letter addressed to McConaghy refusing to participate in his conference unless certain conditions were met, she felt bound by that letter not to participate, Wendy Bacon, who actually did give a paper to the Conference, felt a need to justify her action. As far as some people, Dennis Altman for example, were concerned, Bacon’s behaviour was untoward. When I asked her whether she felt bound by the decision of the meeting that wrote the letter to McConaghy, she answered:

I suppose by signing the letter it’s assumed that you will . . . I know I felt a lot of pressure from Gay Lib and Women’s Lib on the censorship issue because I feel there’s a lot of puritanism in it . . . I felt there was a real attack for being sort of elitist which I didn’t think was justified and when I went along to that meeting I certainly did feel I wanted to back them up . . . I did feel I was in a difficult position and that I didn’t agree with all their ideas . . . I know that’s something I quite often do which is a result of a confusion that I read the letter and then thought I don’t really agree and . . . decided to do it nevertheless. (131)

At various other points during the interview she came back, of her own accord, to the question of why she had not felt bound by the meeting:

See, Sasha wouldn’t have been bound by the meeting . . .
I really think that according to the amount of pressure that goes on and the interests you’ve got in sort of backing someone up, you’re sort of making a decision — it’s terribly hard to be consistent about it . . .
I was having a lot of conflict first of all wanting to agree with these people, then when Liz reacted I probably felt yes, I really do agree with her, I’d better back her up to . . . and you sort of go both ways. (132)

Again, the task was to sort out some kind of weighting of each of these justificatory reasons, either to ‘honour’ or ‘not honour’ her accounts.

(130) Ibid.
(131) TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Wendy Bacon and Liz Fell.
(132) Ibid.
(133) SCOTT, Marvin and LYMAN, Stanford: op. cit. p 52.
In his *Essence of Decision* (134) Graham Allison takes the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962 and looks at the data through three different 'conceptual lenses' or models — the rational actor model, the organizational process model, and the governmental politics model. It is more, Des Ball argues, than an attempt to explain the crisis, "it is intended to be a blueprint for examining evidence". (135) It represents the application of the rather commonplace notion — that what you see depends on how you look at it — to a noncommonplace series of events — the Cuban missile crisis.

The application of this notion is done rather more frequently in the social sciences than is at first apparent and for different reasons, in areas which use both qualitative and quantitative research methods, and at varying levels of abstraction. Every time, for example, raw data such as straight frequency counts, are recoded or combined in different ways for computer analysis, the data are, in effect, being examined through different conceptual lenses. McCaughyet al (136) in their study of ‘families in need’ in Melbourne, for example, found that, depending on which particular set of variables ('hard' only or 'soft' and 'hard') were fed into the computer for cluster analysis, different ‘tree diagrams’ of a family typology emerged.

An exposition of the ‘conceptual lenses’ to be used in the present work —pressure groups, social movements and networks — together with a consideration of why these rather than others were chosen is provided in the following chapter.

In one sense, the use of Allison’s ‘blueprint for examining evidence’ implies at least tacit acceptance of the assumptions underlying phenomenological sociology which, according to Springborg, “has joined forces with symbolic interactionism and has become all but indistinguishable from the sociology of knowledge”. (137) The term phenomenology “refers to appearances, the way in which things show themselves, that is to say, reality mediated by consciousness”. (138) The school of thought labelled phenomenology

maintains that knowledge is created rather than discovered. That is to say, it is concerned not with the criteria for verification or the rules of inference for establishing and ordering information that might be discovered, but rather with the description and analysis of that which is already taken for granted as knowledge, the commonsense world of everyday life. (139)

One of the clearest expositions of ‘what phenomenology is on about’ is to be found not in the somewhat tortuous writings of some of its more formal adherents such as Jack Douglas (140) or Berger and Luckmann (141) but rather in those of Carlos Castaneda — The Teachings of Don Juan, A Separate Reality, and Journey to Ixtlan. (142) In Journey to Ixtlan he writes:

---

(136) MCCAUGHEY, Jean et al: *Who Cares?* Sun Books. Melbourne. 1977 Appendix E. What they call soft data were, by other standards, not really all that soft — coded attitude scales, for example.
(138) Ibid. p 96.
(139) Ibid.
For the purpose of presenting my argument I must first explain the basic premise of sorcery as don Juan presented it to me. He said that for a sorcerer, reality, or the world we all know, is only a description. For the sake of validating this premise don Juan concentrated the best of his efforts into leading me to a genuine conviction that what I hold in mind as the world at hand was merely a description of the world; a description that had been pounded into me from the moment I was born.

He pointed out that everyone who comes into contact with a child is a teacher who incessantly describes the world to him, until the moment when the child is capable of perceiving the world as it is described. According to don Juan, we have no memory of that portentous moment, simply because none of us could possibly have any point of reference to compare it to anything else. From that moment on, however, the child is a member. He knows the description of the world; his membership becomes full-fledged, I suppose when he is capable of making all the proper perceptual interpretations which, by conforming to that description, validate it.

For don Juan, then, the reality of our day-to-day life consists of an endless flow of perceptual interpretations which we, the individuals who share a specific membership, have learned to make in common.

The idea that the perceptual interpretations that make up the world have a flow is congruous with the fact that they run uninterruptedly and are rarely, if ever, open to question. In fact, the reality of the world we know is so taken for granted that the basic premise of sorcery, that our reality is merely one of many descriptions, could hardly be taken as a serious proposition. (143)

In an interview with Sam Keen (who calls don Juan a good sociologist of knowledge), Castaneda elaborates, with particular reference to the phenomenological problem of whether we can ever know the way things really are, or whether reality is always reality perceived, mediated by consciousness:

Castaneda: ... Our normal expectations about reality are created by a social consensus. We are taught to see and understand the world. The trick of socialization is to convince us that the descriptions we agree upon define the limits of the real world. What we call reality is only one way of seeing the world, a way that is supported by a social consensus.

Keen: Then a sorcerer, like a hypnotist, creates an alternative world by building up different expectations and manipulating cues to produce a social consensus.

Castaneda: Exactly. I have come to understand sorcery in terms of Talcott Parsons' idea of glosses. A gloss is a total system of perception and language. A child reconnoiters the world with few preconceptions until he is taught to see things in a way that corresponds to the description everybody agrees on. The world is an agreement. The system of glossing seems to be somewhat like walking. We have to learn to walk, but once we learn, there is only one way to walk. We have to learn to see and talk, but once we learn we are subject to the syntax of language and the mode of perception it contains.

Keen: So sorcery, like art, teaches a new system of glossing ...

Castaneda: ... An artist usually just rearranges the old glosses that are proper to his membership. Membership consists of being an expert in the innuendoes of meaning that are contained within a culture. For instance, my primary membership


(143) loc. cit. pp 8-9.
like most educated Western men was in the European intellectual world. You can’t break out of one membership without being introduced into another. You can only rearrange the glosses.

Keen: Was don Juan resocializing you or desocializing you? Was he teaching you a new system of meanings or only a method of stripping off the old system so that you might see the world as a wondering child?

Castaneda: Don Juan and I disagree about this. I say he was reglossing me and he says he was deglossing me. By teaching me sorcery he gave me a new set of glosses, a new language and a new way of seeing the world... don Juan thinks that what he calls seeing is apprehending the world without any interpretation; it is pure wondering perception. Sorcery is a means to that end. To break the certainty that the world is the way you have always been taught you must learn a new description of the world — sorcery — and then hold the old and the new together. Then you will see that neither description is final. At that moment you slip between the descriptions; you stop the world and see. You are left with wonder; the true wonder of seeing the world without interpretation.(144)

By taking a set of data and looking at it through different ‘glosses’, in this case, social science models, it is possible to see which aspects of that data are highlighted or distorted by which glosses and which are not seen at all. By applying more than one gloss or conceptual lense to the same set of data, the contents of those glosses are brought most clearly to the surface for many embody taken for granted ways of seeing that perhaps should not be taken for granted.

(144) KEEN, Sam: “Sorcerer’s Apprentice — Interview with Carlos Castaneda” in Psychology Today. Vol 6 No. 7. December, 1972 p 95. Whether Castaneda is a fraud, dissenting anthropologist, or whatever, as is examined in MILLE, DE, Richard: Castaneda’s Journey. Capra Press. Santa Barbara 1976 is irrelevant to my use of his explanation here. Whether he fabricated his anthropological data or not and for what purposes, he is still a clear writer in the sociology of knowledge — allegory is a perfectly legitimate and most useful explanatory device.
D. SOME POINTS OF CLARIFICATION

1. WHAT THE THESIS IS NOT

Work on the thesis has led me to read in areas of tangential relevance to its main concern and it is to be stressed that it is not a thesis on the philosophy of the social sciences, nor on the relative merits of qualitative versus quantitative research methods, nor on whether there can be 'group properties' over and above those of the members of groups nor . . . . .

It is about the question of what, if anything, can social science language, concepts, and models add to our understanding of the activities and interactions of the liberation movement groups in Sydney in 1972-1973 and, if they do add to that understanding, what, if any, are the costs and what form do they take. It is also about what we can learn about those concepts and models by applying them to a particular set of data. When a set of data is overlaid by a social science model certain aspects of those data are highlighted, other aspects fade into insignificance; the model signposts the data. But looked at from underneath, as it were, from the data up, certain qualities of the model also become more clearly visible, and this too is what the thesis is about.

2. AH BUT, ONE EARTH TREMOR DOESN'T SPELL THE END OF THE WORLD

What if, in this particular case, the social sciences do not add anything to our understanding, what if, in this particular case, their use does involve 'unacceptable costs'; this particular case may be the exception to the rule and a trivial exception at that.

But what if, this particular case is not the exception to the rule; what if all cases in their particularity, are exceptions to the rule: what then.

There are really three separate but related questions involved here:

(a) whether this particular case study of the liberation movements is the exception to the rule, and that, if other case studies were done, we would find that the social sciences did add to our understanding at nil or minimal acceptable cost;

(b) whether, because the concepts and models that the social sciences have so far developed are inadequate, all studies of particular cases could involve costs. In psychology this question has been phrased as follows:

averages misrepresent people because averages are statistical fictions, abstractions, which, while they can be very useful, may nevertheless end up describing the behaviour of no particular person at all. (145)

(c) whether, because the whole notion of conceptualization in the social sciences represents a certain degree of abstraction from reality, all studies of particular cases inevitably involve some costs, and whether these costs are acceptable or not depends, in part, on what you think the social sciences should be doing.

I am not here concerned with the third question but it is related to the first two. In considering the first question, it must be remembered that three not just one, conceptual lenses all different, are applied to the same data. Three is not enough, try six. Six is still not many, try another six. One set of data is not enough, try another set. Try two sets of data. Perhaps it is the second question we should be looking at. After all, the social sciences have not been around all that long. How long is long enough and what do we do in the meantime. Do about what.

(145) WERTHEIMER, Michael: op. cit. p 206.
3. THE BENEFITS (OR COSTS ?) OF HINDSIGHT.


In George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four the Records Department of the Ministry of Truth had as its task the continuous alteration of written accounts of the past so that they would fit in with the present

Day by day and almost minute by minute the past was brought up to date . . .
All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place . . . Even the written instructions . . . received . . . never stated or implied that an act of forgery was to be committed: always the reference was to slips, errors, misprints, or misquotations which it was necessary to put right in the interests of accuracy (146)

Historians warn us that

History is a selective view of the past whose scope is limited more by the realities of the present than through a clear understanding of the past. As historians perceive shifts in the present power structure they consciously or unconsciously alter their view of who was important in the past. (147)

Dean and Whyte refer to that

Widespread tendency we all have to modify a recollection of past feelings in a selective way that fits them more comfortably into our own current point of view. (148)

We are, each of us, our own historians and the historians — in our own memories at least — of those groups, organizations, institutions and activities with which we have been involved. We continuously, as Shutz phrases it, “reconstruct our biography”. (149) It is not a deliberate process, nor for the most part conscious and we are usually quite oblivious to the fact that it has been occurring unless and until we are confronted by our own past selves — in the form of an old friend we haven’t seen for years, for instance, or something we once wrote.

The writing of this thesis five to six years after the events described in it has involved just such a confrontation with a past self. What is of concern here is the possibility that the present self 'reinterprets' the actions and beliefs of the past selves (my own and others) to fit in better with the present. For the most part this has been preventable because in reconstructing the past I have relied on notes made at the time. For the rest, I have tried, by maintaining a constant awareness of the differences between my past and present selves, to minimize the interference such a reinterpretation could have in presenting the data. To that end, I attempt here to present, without, as Gouldner puts it “defensiveness or self-flagellation” (150) an exposition of the relevant biases held by my past (1972-73) and present selves:

PAST
(1) Primary minority group identification - homosexual
   Secondary minority group identification - woman
(2) Primary involvement - CAMP
   Secondary involvement - Gay Liberation
   Tertiary involvement - Women's Liberation

PRESENT
(1) Primary minority group identification - lesbian
   Secondary minority group identification - woman
(2) Sole active involvement - Women's Liberation

(147) SMITH, Hilda: op. cit. p 368.
(149) Cited in Footnote 29 at p 52 of scan, Marvin Band LYMAN, Stanford : op. cit.
Belief that male and female homosexuals working together is both possible and desirable, or that it is neither possible nor desirable.

Belief that homosexual males are inevitably as sexist as heterosexual males.

Belief that within liberation movements, formal structure, roles, and organization not necessary, is disadvantageous and potentially damaging.

Priorities for involvement in issues: 1st male homosexual; 2nd lesbian; 3rd heterosexual female. Priorities for involvement in issues: 1st lesbian; 2nd heterosexual female.

It is fairly obvious from the above statement of biases that I do not consider myself to have been totally ‘objective’ — if indeed that is possible. I have followed Myrdal’s advice:

there is no other device for excluding biases in social sciences than to face the valuation and to introduce them as explicitly stated, specific and sufficiently concretized value premises. (151)


In the Foreword I referred to my dual commitment to being a participant in, and an observer of, the sexual liberation movements. It is appropriate at this point to spell out some of the implications of this dual commitment. As a participant in the sexual liberation movements I was (and still am) a political activist; as an observer I was (and still am) a political scientist. Being at any one time neither, but at all times both, can be difficult; it can also be productive. It has led, for example, to my being charged with being too emotionally involved (read also dogmatic, subjective, biased, one-eyed) a political scientist and too intellectual (read also abstract, theoretical, cautious, impractical) a political activist — the assumption, of course, being that the emotions have no place in political science, nor the intellect in political activism. To have my political activism inform my political science and vice versa is an aspiration in which this thesis is but one exercise.

The preceding chapters can be said to reflect more clearly the concerns of the political activist. The chronological reconstruction of the development and activities of the Sydney sexual liberation movements during the years 1969 -1973 and my own part in those activities is not, of course, a complete representation; nor is it one which is free from the concerns of the political scientist. My observations are unavoidably, if unintentionally, ‘theory dependent’: (1) I have selected and emphasized particular aspects of that development which others may not; and I have offered interpretations, analyses, and explanations of particular events with which others may disagree. One of the factors that has undoubtedly influenced those processes of selection and emphasis has been the purpose of the reconstruction. The political scientist, in a sense, has written about the political activists. And what the political activist has found so exasperating is the restrictiveness of language and form. The seemingly straightforward task of trying to write down ‘what happened’ imposes an artificial order on the chaos of experience and change that was our lives during those years. What, on paper, looks like a fairly sensible progression from one stage of development to the next, from one area of activity to another, is not at all what it felt like at the time; it is only in looking back that patterns become discernible. At the time, there did not appear to be any order at all. There seemed never to be enough time to try to work out whether what we had done, were doing, and intended to do, formed any kind of coherent plan that would lead us, if not in the direction of where we thought we wanted to go, then at least away from where we knew we no longer wanted to be. Everything around us seemed to be moving and we were moving, constantly being changed by the things we ourselves were beginning to change.

While I may only very inadequately be able to convey the feelings of pain and exhilaration that those early years of change, simultaneously sought and resisted, produced, I can at least recall them and share those recollections with my movement contemporaries. The effect we had on those around us, the people with whom we lived and worked, I can only try to imagine. We were no part time activists who took time off from the business of living to attend a few meetings and toss around a few ideas; the sexual liberation movements were, and are, ‘greedy institutions’ (2) The logic of our commitment demanded that we take the movements and the new consciousness they had developed in us to the how of where we lived and worked. Those around us must have felt as though they were the unwilling victims in a never-ending

(2) COSER, Lewis A :Greedy Institutions. Free Press. New York. 1974 p 4. "... the modern world, just like the world of tradition, also continues to spawn organizations and groups which... make total claims upon their members and which attempt to encompass within their circle the whole personality. These might be called greedy institutions insofar as they seek exclusive and undivided loyalty and they attempt to reduce the claims of competing roles and status positions on those they wish to encompass within their boundaries. Their demands on the person are omnivorous."
ethnomethodological demonstration of the type Alvin Gouldner condemn so strongly.

Ethnomethodologist Garfinkel, in Gouldner’s characterization of his work, tries to expose the rules, the conventions, the tacit understandings that make stable social interaction possible by developing game like “demonstrations” of what happens when people, “without informing others of their intent, deliberately proceed to violate those tacit understandings”. (3) Garfinkel’s students are instructed to engage friends or acquaintances in ordinary conversation and, without indicating that anything special is afoot, to pretend ignorance of everyday expressions: “What do you mean, she had a ‘flat tyre’?” “What do you mean, ‘how is she feeling’?” Undergraduates are assigned the task of spending time with their families, all the while acting as if they were boarders in their own homes. Again, students are instructed to engage someone in conversation and, while doing so, to assume that the other person is trying to trick or mislead them. (4)

It takes little effort to think of different examples — “what do you mean, all homosexuals are ‘sick’?” “What do you mean, all normal women want a child?” — or to imagine that the reactions of people around us whose tacit understanding of reality we were challenging were too dissimilar to those of Garfinkel’s “victims”:

“She became nervous and jittery, her face and hand movements . . . uncontrolled.”

“Quarreling, bickering, and hostile motivations became discomfitingly visible.”

“I actually came to feel somewhat hated and by the time I left the table I was quite angry.”

“Attempted avoidance, bewilderment, acute embarrassment, furtiveness, and above all uncertainties of these as well as uncertainties of fear, hope, and anger were characteristic”. (5)

To Gouldner, as a sociological methodology, Garfinkel’s work is unacceptable:

The cry of pain, then is Garfinkel’s triumphal moment; it is dramatic confirmation of the existence of certain tacit rules governing social interaction and of their importance to the persons involved. That he feels free to inflict these costs on others, on his students, their families, friends, or passersby — and to encourage others to do so — is not, I would suggest, evidence of a dispassionate and detached attitude toward the social world, but a readiness to use it in cruel ways. (6)

Garfinkel’s students at least knew what they were doing and where they were going: their “victims” were eventually released from the Kafkaesque games that had been constructed around them, the point of the exercise explained, and life allowed to return to normal. For us, it was not a game but a struggle not only with those around us whose reality we no longer shared but also with ourselves as we fought to get a firmer grip on our new, and only slowly emerging, reality: we too were ‘victims’ in somebody else’s ethnomethodological demonstration. There were those around us who reacted as if it really were a game that would end, a fad that would pass, an enthusiasm that would fade. There were others who were genuine in their desire to understand, eager to participate in the unfolding of this new reality but who would never be able to become full participants. These sorts of reaction were much more difficult to deal with than straightout hostility and resistance. It is much easier to leave behind those ideas and people who refuse to


I leave it to the sociologists of sociology to explore the relationship between the development of ethnomethodology and the appearance of the liberation movements — student, black, women’s and gay — which in fact did a lot to challenge tacit understandings of reality.

(4) Ibid. p 393.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.
move with you than those who are trying to come but can't quite keep up, will never catch up, but who keep on trying. For some of us, what we were leaving behind was the lives we had lived up until we became part of the sexual liberation movements; for others, our lives became fragmented with different parts demanding of each other what they could no longer give. And in the attempt to re-integrate our lives, upheaval followed upheaval. Unless we began to try to live as if the revolution had already come there seemed no point in fighting for the revolution because it would never come. An impossibly romantic idea — but then the whole idea of a handful of women calling a public meeting to discuss with other women their intention of changing the world, beginning with themselves, and a handful of female and male homosexuals doing likewise, is itself impossibly romantic.

I am as conscious of the influence that the political activist had on my search of the literature of political science as I am of the influence of the political scientist on the chronological reconstruction. This is not to imply that I deliberately overlooked any events that did not coincide with my view of the movements or any political science findings that I found uncongenial; if I have overlooked anything it is attributable to a lack of thoroughness rather than anything else. It is an attempt, as Gouldner phrases it, to "disclose my operating assumptions", to warn of "the distortions and incompleteness to which this effort is inevitably subject". (7)

The starting point of this particular part of the exercise was taken up with the task of identification. If, to put the matter simply, political science was to tell me anything about what I have called the sexual liberation movements, I had to work out how political science would "classify" them: into which of the existing boxes of political structures or functions or processes, were they most likely to be slotted — when the discipline got around to acknowledging their existence. The most obvious label seemed to be that of pressure group or the interest articulation function. When the literature on the liberation movements did begin to appear in overseas publications, however, very little of it appeared in political science journals and even less appeared to categorize the movements as pressure groups. They were classified as social movements and written about in sociology journals. Political science, it appears, is less interested in social movements than in revolutionary movements which end with a sudden transformation or take over of the institutions of government. Political scientists write about the movements which produced the Russian revolution, the Cuban revolution, nationalist movements of the third world and the communist movements; sociologists write about religious movements, civil rights movements, student movements, and the black, women’s and gay movement. (8)

There were two other subject headings, neither of which are primarily the province of the political scientist, under which I thought I might find relevant material. The first was the small group to which the social psychologist lays claim. The autonomous groups which make up Sydney Women’s Liberation at first sight looked like the social psychologists’ small groups. After a reasonable sample of the literature, however, I abandoned that line of research as unfruitful. While the literature on pressure groups and social movements is relatively well endowed with case studies drawn from the real world, that on small groups seemed almost

(7) Ibid.
(8) The demarcation line is very clearly drawn in the Dewey system of cataloguing library books: all books dealing with political movements which lead to or directly aim at governmental overthrow (whether by violent means or otherwise) proceed to the 327s; those which deal with social movements which do not lead directly to governmental overthrow proceed to the 301s.
exclusively based on studies of how American college students (mainly male) behaved when placed in experimentally created groups, told to interact naturally with each other, and asked to perform some task or other under the watchful eye of one or more of their teachers. (9) The second subject heading, networks, came from anthropology and here there was an abundance of material drawn not simply from the real world but studying some of the sorts of things I was interested in and about which the pressure group and social movement literatures appeared to have little to say — political mobilization and the transmission of norms and gossip via friendship networks, for example.

These then seemed to be the most fruitful lines to pursue: besides, at first approximation, CAMP looked like it should be called a pressure group, Women's Liberation a social movement, and Gay Liberation and the Thor group looked very much like they should be called networks. The following chapter continues the exercise that began with the task of identification. In it, an attempt is made to draw out from the relevant literatures what they have to say; to construct models from the existing literatures, of a pressure group, a social movement, a network. In the chapter subsequent to that, the models developed are tested against the data presented in Part I in order to assess their adequacy for accommodating the reality of the sexual liberation movements. (10)

It is at this point that I recall the question of a colleague — “does it really matter if they do or not?” Both the political activist and the political scientist have to answer that it does matter. One of the major tasks that the body of knowledge called the social sciences has set itself is to make sense of the world: to describe and explain, and at its best (and rarest) to predict. To the extent that the social sciences (and I care little for disciplinary demarcation disputes) are up to that task, to that extent can my political activism be that much better informed, that much more effective. But the social sciences cannot begin to try to make sense of the world unless that body of knowledge is constantly updated to incorporate understandings of ‘new’ social phenomena, fresh insights into old problems, and so on. Without that constant update the social sciences will become moribund. Whether the sexual liberation movements represent new phenomena which cannot be accommodated within the existing models available or are new variations on old themes which merely require model modification should be of concern to the political scientist.

(9) Two American feminists have actually compared the dynamics of women's movement small groups with the findings of traditional academic small group research and found that “women's experience is different from men's, they behave differently in groups and their behaviour does not fit male models” p 82 of JENKINS, Lee and KRAMER, Cheri: “Small Group Process: Learning from Women” Women's Studies International Quarterly. Vol I No. 1. November, 1978 pp 67-84.

Political Science

Part Two
CHAPTER 4. THE MODELS

INTRODUCTION

Imagine that a murder has been committed: the body of a man with several stab wounds in his back has been found in a suburban flat. The task of finding the murderer and accumulating enough evidence to initiate a prosecution has been assigned to the newest member of the homicide squad. Our new detective has at her disposal a formidable armoury with which to pursue her investigations.

The coroner will be able to tell her the approximate time of death, the angle at which the knife was plunged into the victim's back, and hence the approximate height of the murderer and whether they were right handed or left handed; the force with which the knife was driven home and hence the approximate weight and strength of the murderer (which will be related to height); and what type of knife was used, so that she can work out the type of person who would have access to such a knife. The blood which was found under the victim's fingernails was not his own and neither was the hair; so our detective probably now has the blood type and hair colour of the murderer. While the coroner is providing all this information from an examination of the dead man's body (dead men do tell tales), other members of the investigating team are going over the victim's flat with a fine-toothed comb. They turn up several sets of fingerprints which do not belong to the deceased. And as the murderer was rather careless about leaving clues around, our new detective now knows the murderer probably now smokes herbal cigarettes, drinks brandy, was known to the victim, was wearing a green synthetic pullover (which now has a hole in it), was wearing ripple-soled shoes over a size 10 foot (which matches up with the height and weight picture the coroner gave her), and had been looking for something — the flat was in a mess.

Talking with the victim's workmates revealed that he had been visited by some suspicious looking characters several times during the week leading up to his demise. Meanwhile, back at the flat, the victim's neighbours were very forthcoming. The victim, they declared, was a man who kept very much to himself and went out regularly two nights a week to a destination not even the noisiest of them could extract from him — but judging from the chips found in the flat, his regular excursions were probably to one of the city's illegal gambling casinos. And, as luck would have it the nosy neighbour did recall something unusual on the night of the murder: the sound of two men arguing in the dead man's flat, the sight of a large, heavily built man with a limp, hurrying away from the scene of the crime to a black sedan parked outside. This he drove off at high speed, knocking over a garbage can on the way. A visit to the police psychiatrist and our detective now has a picture of what kinds of factors are likely to produce a murderer who not only plunges the knife in several times but gives it a twist each time as well. A trip to several of the casinos which officially do not exist and our detective turns up a probable motive for the crime: the victim had borrowed money from people right, left and centre, to try to win enough money to pay back his older gambling debts — but he kept on losing.

What our detective has been doing by building up this identikit composite of the murderer is successively eliminating categories of suspects. At the start of her investigations, as far as she was concerned, anybody (and hence everybody) could have been the murderer. When the coroner tells her that the murderer was a man, the number of suspects is reduced by more than half, i.e., by the number of women and children thereby eliminated. To be of assistance, each piece of information that goes into the composite must make the murderer stand out more and more clearly from the mass of people surrounding him: to discover that he drinks white tea with two lumps of sugar is not going to be of much help in that process; to discover that he drinks it with eighteen lumps, and always out of a rusty strawberry jam tin, is. What the identikit composite has helped her to do is to work out that the murderer belongs amongst the 6-6½ ft tall, 12-14 stone,
blood type A, brown haired, brandy drinking, herbal cigarette smoking, right handed, money borrowing, limping, gambling, etc., section of the adult male population.

When our new detective makes her arrest one week later — which she does at 8 a.m., because at that time late night gamblers are most likely to be sleeping soundly and hence less troublesome — she discovers that he possesses characteristics not included in the composite: those which make him the distinctive individual that he is; a mole behind the left ear, for example. So long as he does not possess characteristics which contradict the composite on its fundamentals — he turns out to be only 3 ft 7 inches tall for example — then the composite has not been misleading. Similarly, she did not apply the composite rigidly. She did not, for example, eliminate from her list of suspects, those men who did not limp: after all, the limp may have been caused by an injury that had since healed. It is possible for a man to limp one week and not the next; it is highly unlikely, the miracles of modern medicine notwithstanding, that a man can be between 6 ft and 6½ ft tall one week and 3 feet 7 inches tall the next.

In much the same way, by scouring the relevant social science literatures, it is possible to build up identikit composites, or models, of pressure groups, social movements, and networks. The literatures do more than simply provide nominal definitions which enable us to “know one when we see one”. Embedded in the literature on, for example, pressure groups, are sets of related concepts (e.g., interest, group cohesion), variables (degree of group cohesion and group effectiveness), propositions which relate one variable to another (e.g., ceteris paribus group effectiveness increases with group cohesion), and sets of interrelated propositions (e.g., the effectiveness of the group is related to the degree of group cohesion which, in turn, is related to the nature of the interest the group is pursuing and the relationship between group leaders and followers). From a variety of sources — case studies of individual pressure groups, comparisons of the activities of pressure groups in different polities, theorizings on the role of groups in liberal democracies, and so on — it is possible to build up an identikit composite of a pressure group which will tell us not only what one looks like, but how it works, what it does, how and where it fits into the larger political system and so on.

The rest of this chapter is devoted to the delineation, from the existing literatures, of models of pressure groups, social movements, and networks. The stimulus to the adoption of this approach, as mentioned earlier, was Graham Allison’s Essence of Decision — Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Within his three models of conceptual lenses which “lead us to see, emphasize, and worry about quite different aspects of events like the missile crisis” he sets up each model with the following components

A Concepts
B Paradigm
   I Basic Unit of Analysis
   II Organizing Concepts
   III Dominant Inference Pattern
   IV General Proposition
   V Specific Propositions
   VI Evidence


(2) Without getting into any word-consuming discussion of whether such composites should be called models or theories, it is perhaps worthwhile indicating the reason behind my preference for model. If both theories and models can be said to consist of complex sets of interrelated propositions which describe and explain a set (or sets) of events, then one difference between the two can be said to lie in the level of confidence with which each is asserted. Models, as it were, are tentative theories. To use a distinction drawn by Boring, a model is subjunctive (demonstrating what is imagined or possible), a theory is indicative (stating a thing as fact): “The model is a pattern to be abandoned easily at the demand of progress”. BORING, E. G.: “When is Human Behaviour Predetermined?” (1957) quoted in MARX, Melvin and HILLIX, William: Systems and Theories in Psychology. McGraw Hill. New York. 1963 p 52.
A similar approach is used by Siegler and Osmond in their Models of Madness, Models of Medicine (5) in which they compare eight models of madness over twelve dimensions: definition or diagnosis; etiology; behaviour (how it is to be interpreted); personnel (who the practitioners shall be); the rights and duties of the patient, client, etc.; the rights and duties of the family; the rights and duties of the community or society; and the goal of the model. (6) And, on the same subject matter, Erica Bates, in her Models of Madness (7) compares seven models in terms of their ability to explain “how madness is to be conceptualized, how it might have come about, what is to be done with it, how the people involved with it ought to behave, and what the outcome is likely to be, both for the person involved and for the social system in which he moves”. (8)

The following dimensions will form the basis on which each of the models to be considered is drawn up:

I Definitions of the Unit of Analysis.

II Organizing Concepts of the Model: including any attempts to draw up typologies on the basis of these concepts.

III The ‘Intellectual Ancestry’ of the Model: including the areas of the literature from where the model is drawn.

IV Propositions about Internal Organization: what the model has to say, for example, about the nature of the membership, relationships between members, organization structure, group cohesion.

V Propositions about External Activities: including such things as the aims and goals of the organization, types of tactics adopted for goal achievement, relationships between external effectiveness and organizational structure, relationships with similar organizations and with the political system as a whole.

VI Emphases of the Model: including the things about which the model has little to say, its ideological assumptions and implications.


(4) Ibid. p v.
(8) Ibid. p 7.
A. PRESSURE GROUPS

1 Definitions of the Basic Unit of Analysis.

'Interest group', 'lobby (group)', 'pressure group': at times the three terms are used interchangeably to refer to the same phenomenon; on other occasions individual authors express a preference (with or without an accompanying justification) for the use of one term rather than another or use one term to represent a refinement of another. Thus we have:

[A lobby is comprised of] persons, not being members of the legislature, who undertake to influence its members and thereby secure the passing of bills. (9)

[Interest groups are] all groups or associations which seek to influence public policy in their own chosen direction, while declining to accept responsibility for ruling the country. (10)

[A pressure group is] any organization which seeks to influence government policy without at the same time being willing to accept the responsibility of public office. (11)

Interest group is used interchangeably with pressure group. (12)

Then there are the preferences of individual authors for one term rather than the others: Finer's for 'lobby' because 'pressure' implies that a group will apply sanctions if its demands are not met and most groups are not in a position to do this and because 'interest' is too narrow a term, implying that groups represent economic interests only; (13) Wootton's dislike of the terms 'lobby' because of its derogatory connotations and the implication that activities are aimed only at legislators and of 'pressure' because it suggests only one of the many methods that groups use and his preference not for 'interest group' but for 'interest—group'; (14) and to complete the confusion, the preference of Kimber and Richardson for 'pressure group' which does not, as Finer suggests, necessarily imply the application of sanctions, because 'interest group', in Britain at least, has selfish connotations and 'lobby' is perhaps best reserved for use as a verb. (15)

In the category of refinements:

... an interest group is a shared-attitude group that makes certain claims upon other groups in the society. If and when it makes its claims through or upon any of the institutions of government, it becomes a political interest group. (16)

When interest groups act at the political level, they are called pressure groups. (17)

Pressure group: A group of people with one or more interests in common (interest group) which attempts to influence the decisions of one or more levels of government for the purpose of obtaining decisions which are favourable to them (or preventing unfavourable decisions). (18)

---


(14) WOOTTON, Graham: Interest Groups. op. cit. p 17.


Or Dillon's refinement which begins with the general definition of pressure group as

> a non-partisan organization of the people formed to exert influence upon
> the legislature, the executive, or other governmental agency through public
> opinion for the enactment or the rejection of certain legislation, or for the
> adoption, modification or discontinuance of a public policy (19)

and reserves the term 'lobby' for "the direct effort to influence legislators by personal contact." (20)

The inclusiveness or exclusiveness of definitions also varies. Most authors seek to exclude political parties and do so by stipulating that pressure groups do not seek office. W. J. M. MacKenzie narrowed the field by eliminating first, groups which did not possess a “specialized formal organization”, (21) then those which had "only limited dealings with the organization of the state", (22) and finally, those bodies which were in law organized groups but which, in practice, were "so constituted that it is not easy to say who their real members" were: (23) Hartl, likewise, excluded groups which did not “possess a specific formal organization structure”. (24)

James Q. Wilson, writing in 1973 is more inclusive than most in one respect—he included political parties amongst his political organizations—and exclusive in another: his ‘‘formal voluntary associations’ must have “a clearly definable membership . . . and a consciously adopted name”; (25) a formulation developed to exclude the loose ‘social movements’ which so confused the politics and the political scientists of the 1960s.

While at the end of the definition which applies to the groups themselves there appears to have been an attempt to narrow the definitional field by excluding those groups which do not have a formal organizational structure (however defined), at the end of the definition which applies to the targets of pressure group activity there has been a broadening to acknowledge the role of the bureaucracy in governmental policy formulation and administration. Where definitions once named ‘legislators’ or the ‘legislature’ as the target (26) of pressure group activity, now they nominate a much broader group of targets:

> ... a pressure group may be regarded as any group . . . which articulates
> a demand that the authorities in the political system or subsystem should
> make an authoritative allocation . . . (27)

There is one final source of inclusiveness — exclusiveness in definitions of pressure groups and this refers to the amount of effort that groups have to put into their activities. W. J. M. MacKenzie seems to be suggesting that groups have to be successful to qualify as pressure groups when he writes:

organized groups possessing both formal structure and real common interests,

_in so far as they influence_ the decisions of public bodies. (28)


(19) DILLON, Mary E quoted from _American Political Science Review_ (1942) in WOOTTON, Graham: _Pressure Groups in Britain op. cit._ pp 1-2.

(20) Ibid.


(22) Ibid. p 136.

(23) Ibid.

Trevor Matthews allows for more ambiguity:

any association that makes a claim, either directly or indirectly, on the Government so as to influence the making or administering of public policy. . . (29)

Moodie and Studdert-Kennedy are less demanding:

By 'pressure group' we mean, simply any organized group which attempts to influence governmental decisions . . . (30)

Bridget Pym even less oriented to action:

By pressure group we mean subsections of the population organized on the basis of fairly specific common interests or attitudes and aiming to influence government. (31)

and finally Kimber and Richardson are least committal to action:

. . . any group which articulates a demand . . . (32)

The wide range of variations all, however, centre on the following basic ingredients of a pressure group as:

An organized group of people (without specifying the degree of organization) who attempt to influence (whether they are successful or not) by direct or indirect means, the making and/or administering of public policy.

II Organizing Concepts.


Whatever the nature of the relationship between pressure group analysis and what is referred to as 'group theory' and it has been characterized as a misinterpretation of the original theory which represented a marked improvement (33) as well as an attempt at empirical investigation of some of the universe of groups in Bentley's group theory (34), pressure groups are seen as collections of individuals rather than as group theory's masses of activity. (35) These individuals group together on the basis of a common interest(s) rather than on the basis of some characteristic shared by a section of the population—blonde hair, to cite Truman's citation of Bentley's example. (36) In other words, pressure group formation is purposive rather than coincidental and that purpose is the pursuit of the interest(s) that the members have in common through joint action. (37) The degree to which a group is organized can range from the simple

---


(26) For example, DILLON, Mary (1942): loc. cit.


(36) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. p 23 refers to these as categoric groups.
delineation of a boundary between those who are part of the group (members) and those who are not, to more complex specifications of roles within the group and clearly defined relationships between those roles.

2. Interest.

There is very little discussion in pressure group literature itself on the concept of interest. Individuals have interests, collections of individuals (groups) too can have interests. The implicit assumption appears to be that interest is synonymous with need, desire, or want in so far as those are conscious:

the settled and avowed aspirations of a man or group of men which he or they — or people interested in them — believe to be more or less realizable. (38)

We know what the interests of a group are from listening to what it says they are. While Bentley warned of the twin dangers of taking the interests expressed by the group at face value and of disregarding the group's expressed evaluation of itself and assigning an objective value or meaning to it (39) pressure group analysts, by and large, have heeded only the second warning. Groups manipulated by, or acting as fronts for, other groups which camouflage their 'real' interests with a rhetoric of community spirit is not what is meant here. These can be, and have been, quite adequately accommodated within the pressure group conception of interest. Matthews cites, for example, the cases of the National Smoke Abatement Society in England which had amongst its members and financial supporters, manufacturers of smokeless fuels and of the London Foundation for Marriage Education which promoted mechanical (rather than oral) contraceptive methods being a front for Britain's largest manufacturer of rubber contraceptives. (40)

What is meant is the Marxist conception of the 'objective interest' of a class or group which may differ from what that class or group says and believes its interests to be; it is this kind of objective determination of interests which has no place in pressure group analysis. Rationality therefore cannot apply to a group's interests; it can apply only to the relationship between that interest and the means adopted to pursue it.

A second important feature of the treatment of interest is that for the most part interests are seen not as 'justifiable claims, but rather as psychological facts — as demands, wants, desires or preferences'. (41) Plamenatz's attempt to incorporate some notion of 'justice' within the concept of interest has not been replicated. (42) Pressure group analysis starts from the premise that all interests are equally justified in the group struggle; there is no way to rank one group's interests as more important than another's or their claims as more justifiable.


It is the attempt to influence the making and/or administration of public policy (the institutions and agencies of government) that is the most clearly defining characteristic of pressure groups. There is, in most of the literature, an acknowledgement that this is not the sole preoccupation of pressure groups nor even that which consumes most of the time and energy of their members; but it is only when they are attempting to influence government that pressure

---

(37) "The modern pluralist idea of the group, however, is based on individualism, rather than an older corporate or communal understanding of the group. According to the pluralist conception the groups exist to facilitate the individual in the pursuit of his interest" p 753 in COCHRAN, Clarke E: "The Politics of Interest: Philosophy and the Limitations of the Science of Politics" in American Journal of Political Science. Vol XVII No. 4. November, 1973 pp 745 - 766.


(39) BENTLEY, Arthur: op. cit. p 212.

(40) MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. p 221.

(41) COCHRAN, Clarke: op. cit. p 751.

(42) PLAMENATZ, John: op. cit. p 7. "We must always distinguish between men's desires and needs, on the one
group analysts become interested in them. Government, the recipient or target of these attempts to influence, appears to have been assigned three possible conceptual roles. A discussion of these three is most clearly articulated in the group theory literature. They are: government as just another group in the group struggle; government as the resultant of the group struggle; and government as the arbiter in the group struggle.

(i) Government as One Group Among Many:

The directors of a corporation may finish their ordinary business and turn at the same meeting to discuss the part the corporation will take in the next political campaign. Their activity, which a moment before was industrial or economic, then becomes at once political — or part of the governing process of the country — and is to be studied specifically as such. Moreover, the corporation as activity will be represented through its members along with other corporations, in various organizations, which operate in the political field; and the activity of all these organizations is part of the government in the intermediate sense. (43)

(ii) Government as the Resultant:

There is the view that the government is not a group . . . at all, but is the system of political interactions of contending groups, the government here not producing so much as itself being the “balance” or “adjustment”, being a “network of activities”. (44)

(iii) Government as Arbiter:

The legislature referees the group struggle, ratifies the victories of the successful coalitions, and records the terms of the surrenders, compromises, and conquests in the form of statutes. Every statute tends to represent compromise because the very process of accommodating conflicts of group interests is one of deliberation and consent. (45)

Few pressure group analysts, not even Bentley’s followers, would be prepared to accept the first conception of government as appropriate. Most would agree that within the institutions of government itself various collections of individuals can and do act as pressure groups, pushing for the adoption of one policy rather than another, but taken as a whole, the institutions of government are marked out from the universe of pressure groups by the possession of some special characteristic. For Latham, for example, it is officiality:

The designation “official” is the sign which manifests that the bearer is authorized by the social understanding to exercise against all groups and individuals certain powers which may not be exercised against him . . . the differences between the public and private groups is the “officiality” of the former. (46)
Similarly, there is little evidence in the pressure group literature of acceptance of the view of
government as the resultant of group pressure: such a view is far too metaphysical for the empirically
oriented pressure group analyst.
Not simply by process of elimination, but also by definitional implication, the conception
of the role of government most suitable to pressure group analysis is that of government as some
sort of arbiter of competing group claims. For the institutions of government to be in a position
to yield (or not) to pressure group attempts to influence its policy making and administering
functions it must both be sufficiently distinct for them to constitute a separate entity and possess
some characteristic (officiality) which groups do not share with it.
Part of the role of arbiter involves, as Truman puts it, acting to “establish and maintain a
measure of order in the relationship among groups”, (47) to ensure group adherence to the
‘rules of the game’. The government as arbiter codifies and ensures compliance with what
Bentley called ‘the habit background’, those aspects of the political culture which keep the group
struggle orderly and with certain limits. (48)

4. Typologies of Pressure Groups.
The temptation to draw up typologies seems to be almost
irresistable among pressure group analysts. At times these very clearly reflect the interests of
the particular analyst, as in the case of Galnoor and Pym, to be discussed below, but most often
they centre on one (sometimes two) of the organizing concepts outlined above. By far the most
common, especially with British analysts, is that which focuses on the nature of the interest the
pressure group is pursuing or defending. Kimber and Richardson, Finer, Moodie and Studdert-
Kennedy, W.J.M.MacKenzie, Ehrmann and Sinclair (49) all distinguish between (variously named)
sectional pressure groups and cause or promotional pressure groups. The basic difference is that
sectional groups seek to defend or advance the interests of a recognizable section of society and
promotional or cause groups seek to promote a cause or ideal which arises out of a given set of
attitudes or beliefs. A variant of this twofold classification based on interest delineates a third
category of sectional-cum-cause or hybrid group, to take account of the fact that some sectional
groups promote causes. The Returned Servicemen’s League, for example, promotes the retention
of (or resumption of) a restrictive (White Australia) immigration policy as well as looking after
the interests of returned servicemen. (50)
Less common are typologies based on the nature of the groups with respect to organization.
Wilson, for example, distinguishes between the “caucus form” and the “primary form”. The
caucus form is characteristic of an organization “in which one or a few leaders carry out the work
of the organization, supported ... by persons who rarely, if at all, are brought together in
meetings or are otherwise asked to concert their actions in co-operative ventures” and the primary
form is one where “members regularly come together to act in concert and to discuss associational
affairs or are otherwise mobilized to carry on group activities.” (51)

(47) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. p 45.
(48) BENTLEY, Arthur: op. cit. p 372.
(49) KIMBER, Richard and RICHARDSON, J. J.: op. cit. p 3.; FINER, S. E.: Anonymous Empire op. cit. p 8 ;
MOODIE, Graeme and STUDDERT-KENNEDY, Gerald: op. cit. p 63; MACKENZIE, W. J. M.: op. cit. p 139;
the British Political Process” (1958) reprinted in KIMBER, Richard and RICHARDSON, J. J. (eds): op. cit. p 281
still qualifies as one of this group of analysts: he has three categories — sectional, promotional and catchall
for those groups not covered by the first two.
(50) See VIJAY, Kumar Indra: op. cit. p 140; MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. p 221; JAENSCH, Dean and
than specifying a distinct classificatory scheme, lists a set of variables relating to organization which may reveal distinguishable categories — types of membership, the relationship between management and membership, the existence and nature of internal democracy, for example. (52)

Typologies which centre on the concept of government are even less common. Wootton’s scheme depends on “whether in the eyes of the Government, a group manifestly performs (or is based on a group that performs) a fundamental ‘societal task’.” (53) Two others are based on the relationship between group and government. Bridget Pym, analysing the activities of British pressure groups concerned with moral issues (abortion, homosexual, and divorce law reform) in the 1950s and 1960s writes:

The most important dividing line is between groups that are politically acceptable and groups that are not. Out-groups are out because they propagandise for unpopular causes or minority interests, or because they are judged unrepresentative of those they claim to speak for. In-groups, that is to say, those readily and regularly admitted to consultation with government departments, may derive their legitimacy from their indispensability to the economy, because they speak for acceptable causes like animal or child welfare or because, like church groups, they have become over the years simply part of the British way of life. (54)

And Galnoor, writing about the role of information in the political process, makes a distinction which is similar but more refined when he speaks of established, less established and non established lobbies:

In pluralistic terms, lobbying entails an ever present conflict between adversary and co-operative relationships with governments ... A group becomes established when the option of open conflict has been replaced by some form of mutual accommodation with government decision makers ... Exclusiveness (and the secrecy which makes it possible) is the chief concern of the established lobby. The less established lobby operates in an environment where there are still no dominating arrangements with government, no prescribed channels of communication, and no fixed commitments on either side ... there are also organizations, groups and individuals which are out of the information exchange marketplace altogether. They cannot or do not want to have discrete relationships with government: (55)

What should, but rarely does, flow from the development of typologies of pressure groups is the exploration of other differences which stem from the basic ones: are, for example, sectional groups and cause groups the same in every respect save one or does pursuing an economic interest rather than pushing a cause mean that the group is likely to organize itself differently. That there is such a gap in the literature is due in part to its heavy concentration on studies of sectional groups.

III Intellectual Ancestry.

It may not be essential to look at the kinds of literature that a model comes from to develop it; it is, however, likely to be useful in trying to understand any limitations the model has in terms of its applicability. One way of doing this could include a study of the actual practice of lobbying over time, such as that found in Graham Wootton’s Pressure Groups in Great Britain 1720-1970 (56)

TEICHMANN, Max: op. cit. p 184; and CRISP, L. F.: Australian National Government. Longmans-Cheshire, Melbourne. (1965) 1973 pp 160-161. There does not appear to have been developed a cause-cum-sectional category in the literature yet.

(51) WILSON, James Q: op. cit. p 217. It is well to remember that Wilson includes political parties amongst his political organizations.

(52) MACKENZIE, W. J. M.: op. cit. p 140.
or the more detailed work of D. A. Hamer in *The Politics of Electoral Pressure — A Study of the History of Victorian Reform Agitations*. (57) Such studies are interesting but for my purposes they are less valuable than an attempt to draw out some of the implications of exactly where those authors who have anything to say about pressure groups are most likely to locate themselves. And for pressure groups three broad areas are important: the group theorists; students of comparative politics; and students of individual pressure groups or the 'universe' of pressure groups within a particular society.

1. Group Theorists.

It seems to be obligatory for pressure group analysts to acknowledge some sort of debt to the group theorists — whether Bentley, Truman, Latham, or Hagan. (59) Most feel the need to refer to Bentley however far they depart from his actual writings (60) and not a few denounce group theory with the fervour of atheists who have just discovered that they have been duped into following a false faith. (61)

Group theorists themselves owe an intellectual debt to philosophical and analytical pluralism (62) and to the models of perfect competition that belong to economic theory. (63) In the economic model of perfect competition supply and demand always tend, with the aid of Adam Smith’s invisible hand, toward a stable equilibrium; in group theory, with the aid of the invisible hand of the ‘habit background’, the group struggle is kept within the bounds of a stable equilibrium:

> When the struggle proceeds too harshly at any point there will become insistent in the society a group more powerful than either of those involved which tends to suppress the extreme and annoying methods of the groups in the primary struggle. It is within the embrace of these great lines of activity that the smaller struggles proceed, and the very word struggle has meaning only with reference to its limitations. (64)

(53) WOOTTON, Graham: *Interest Groups*. op. clt. pp 30-44.

(54) Emphasis added. PYM, Bridget: op. clt. p 19.


(56) op. clt.


(58) It is interesting, for example, to note that what was hailed as WEL’s novel approach to politics (its interviewing of candidates for the 1972 federal election to ascertain their stance on women’s issues) is not quite so novel:”Almost every pressure group in the 19th century engaged in a basic form of electoral action. This consisted of submitting to candidates a list of questions as to their attitudes to the policies of the pressure group.” *Ibid.* p 23.


(63) Charles Hagan most clearly reveals this debt to economics. Just as economists had been unified in their study of economics by the concept of supply and demand, political scientists could be unified around the concept of the group: "the equivalence ... for the supply and demand curve is the group struggle", op. clt. p 42. Just as in the economic model of perfect competition supply and demand would find (with the aid of Adam Smith’s invisible hand, or market forces) their optimal level in a situation of stable equilibrium so, implicit in much of group theory, was the invisible hand of the ‘habit background’ which produced an equilibrium of competing groups which would ensure political stability.
Arthur Bentley was an American who had a tendency, as Rothman puts it, "not limited to American scholars, to universalize their own political experience". (65) Bentley claimed that his The Process of Government — A Study in Social Pressures (1908) was but "an attempt to fashion a tool", an attempt to develop a methodology appropriate to the scientific study of politics. But as Bernard Crick points out "a particular methodology becomes a way of stating what is alone thought to be significant political experience". (66) For Bentley, the tool was measurement — "It is impossible to attain scientific treatment of material that will not submit itself to measurement in some form. Measure conquers chaos". (67) And the proper study of mankind was not man but "the action of men with or upon each other". (68) "The society itself [being] nothing other that the complex of groups that compose it" (69) and a group being

a certain portion of the men of a society taken, however, not as a physical mass cut off from other masses of men, but as a mass activity, which does not preclude the men who participate in it from participating likewise in many other group activities ... It is always so many men, acting, or tending toward action — that is, in various stages of action (70)

then

the great task in the study of any form of social life is the analysis of these groups. It is much more than classification, as that term is ordinarily used. When the groups are adequately stated, everything is stated. When I say everything I mean everything. The complete description will mean the complete science in the study of social phenomena, as in any other field (71)

Bentley had much more in common with the German social theorist Georg Simmel (72) on whom he sought to improve than Truman, Latham and other self-proclaimed Bentley disciples had with their master: Bentley and Simmel were operating at a much more abstract level of argument than those who followed. Beginning with Truman who, as Parker notes, "quite humanly cannot help thinking of groups as collections of people" (73) the heuristic group of Bentley's theory was gradually transformed from a mass of activity into a collection of people. The homeostasis implicit in group theory that was to some extent masked by Bentley's abstruse style became much more clearly identifiable, and thus open to criticism, in the writings of Truman, Latham and others. This does not mean that Bentley's work did not provoke a great deal of controversy, but with Bentley, his critics could never be sure that they weren't shadowboxing, and his defenders were quick to claim that they were. (74)

(64) BENTLEY, Arthur F: op. cit. p 372.
(68) Ibid. p 176.
(69) Ibid. p 222.
(70) Ibid. p 211.
(71) Ibid. pp 208-209. A similarly modest claim on behalf of group theory was put forward by Charles Hagan when he argued that the traditional study of politics covered the union of the four Is — interests, ideas, institutions, and individuals. A group approach to the four Is was not only superior to any other approach but "whatever qualities those words have that are not incorporated into the group activity are irrelevant for political science. The same can be done for all the other explanatory principles..." HAGAN, Charles :op. cit. p 51
(74) See for example: CRICK, Bernard: op. cit.; DOWLING, R. E.: op. cit.; ECKSTEIN, Harry: op. cit.;
2. Comparative Politics.

If, as Dowling suggests, then it is to Truman rather than Bentley that pressure group analysts owe an intellectual debt. Group theory, according to Young, lends itself to empirical investigation and "is couched in language suggesting a strong interest in comparative analysis". Ironically, it has been empirical investigation and comparative analysis (together with a consistent application by Olson of the economic theory to which people like Hagan looked so enviously) that have done most to undermine the status of group theory—which may go part way to explaining why it has been from amongst the ranks of the comparative political scientists that the most vehement denunciations of group theory have come.

One of the fundamental tenets of group theory was that people joined groups. But when empirical investigation began it was found that this was not even true of the culture by which the theory was supposed to be bound: Americans were not the nation of joiners that writers from de Tocqueville onwards had thought them to be. In 1963, only 57% of Americans belonged to some organization or other and the figures for other countries were even less—47% of Britons, 44% of Germans, 29% of Italians, and 25% of Mexicans. For Australia in 1967, the figure was 47%. When it came to membership in more than one organization, one of the factors that Truman argued contributed to the relative stability of American democracy, the figures were even more disappointing: 32% of Americans, 16% of Britons, 12% of Germans, 6% of Italians, and 2% of Mexicans belonged to more than one association. For Australia in 1967, it was 24%.

The obvious weakness of group theory as an over-arching theory has not meant that groups are not considered an important and appropriate area of study. LaPalombara writes that although it would be wrong to consider the political process as being "characterized exclusively by group behaviour...it is obvious that no political process...can be understood without according serious attention to the role of interest groups". And, as far as comparative...
politics is concerned, they are very important:

We turn to the comparative study of interest groups not with the hope that these rather than parties or governmental institutions will yield the principles of discrimination between types of political systems, but rather with the expectation that the systematic examination of interest groups in their complex interrelations with public opinion, political parties, and formal governmental institutions will enable us to differentiate more accurately between wholes. (84)

Almost all standard texts in comparative politics, whether they adopt the ‘institutional’ approach as does Ball, Curtis, Finer and Rowe (85) or the functional approach as does Almond and Powell and Jones (86) or are collections of readings — Blondel, Macridis and Brown, Eckstein and Apter (87) — devote a significant portion of their descriptions of systems of government to the role of pressure groups or the function of interest articulation. And, as with group theory, the systems compared are closed, the analyses static and oriented toward understanding how different components of the different systems contribute to system stability.

3. Case Studies.

In 1958 Samuel Eldersveld was able to claim that three areas of American interest group study were well developed: studies of single interest groups; studies of interest groups as they operate in a single area over a short period of time; and studies of interest groups concerned with particular laws or policy conflicts. (88) What he did not find in the literature, however, was “a clear understanding of the intrinsic nature of the interest group, the reason for the diversity in style and tactics, or the implications of organization for interest group effectiveness”. (89) That was 1958 when a majority of participants (from nine different countries) could announce with some pride at the Fifth Round Table of the International Political Science Association that the study of pressure groups in their respective countries was then very popular and an expanding area of interest. (90) If the 1950s represented a peak in pressure group analysis popularity then the 1960s marked a definite trough: by 1964 Frank Sorauf was lamenting that “large and powerful groups now languish as an unexplored area of political science”. (91) The 1970s, however, seem to have witnessed a resumption of interest in pressure groups analysis which some authors seem to feel the need to justify James Wilson, in 1973, for example, opened his book with:

Some readers will find it strange that in the 1970s a book about American politics should have as its focus the behaviour of organizations, especially those organizations that are sometimes called "lobbies" or "pressure groups".

Most of the recent writing on politics has been devoted either to studies of

(89) Ibid. p 178.
(90) EHRMANN, Henry W (ed): op. cit.
voting behaviour (or more broadly the "mood of the electorate") or to analyses of public policies and the government agencies that make, or fail to make, them. At one time, of course, pressure groups seemed to be the essence of politics. From the early 1930s through the 1950s such organizations were widely thought to play a central political role. 

During the 1960s, the focus of popular and scholarly attention shifted. The growing importance of public-opinion polling and of television led some experts to conclude that the mood of the electorate was no longer hard to discern or without consequence for public policy. That mood could not only be known, but also manipulated; politicians acquired "images" and policies were hoped to have "vote appeal" ...

Simultaneously, new issues were emerging that led many concerned citizens to respond in terms of a movement rather than an organization ... Corresponding to these shifts in the practice of politics were changes in theories of politics. A political theorist trying to give a systematic account of popular understandings would be pardoned for ignoring such terms as "pluralism" or "interest group bargaining" ... and reaching instead for concepts more suitable for analyzing a conflict of consciousness in a plebiscitarian democracy. (92)

What few observers of the fluctuating fortunes of pressure group analysis have commented on, and Moodies and Studdert-Kennedy and Vijay (93) are exceptions here, is that the pressure group analysis industry that was thriving in the 1950s was a very lopsided one; it was concentrated heavily on sectional pressure groups. It is equally important to note that in the revival of interest in pressure group analysis that occurred in the 1970s, the literature on cause groups seems to be growing at a much faster rate than that on sectional groups: (94) Two factors would seem to have contributed to this shift in relative emphasis. First, there was the 1960s when ideology (ideologies) rose phoenix-like from the ashes of Daniel Bell's pronouncement (95) of its death to inform the politics of that decade. While some of the political activity of the 1960s, particularly that which focused around opposition to the Vietnam War in both America and Australia, was in a form to which governments could respond (e.g., by troop withdrawals and an end to conscription) much of it not only eschewed electoral politics but also made demands, the content of which could not readily be translated into claims to which governments could respond: it takes times, for example, to translate a demand for an end to sexism into a concrete proposal for anti-discrimination legislation, as one step toward having that demand met. So, there was not only the usual delay between the time that something happens on the ground and the time that academic analysts pick it up, but the additional delay on the ground itself as various parts of the 1960s movements worked out ways in which some of their demands could be translated into demands of government. And it is only insofar as groups make demands of governments that they are of interest to pressure group analysts.

(92) WILSON, James Q: op. cit. pp 3-5. These are the same sorts of factors I outlined in the Introduction to Chapter I. An examination of the pages of Politics, the Journal of the Australasian Political Studies Association, would seem to indicate that the same pattern of popularity applied to Australian political scientists: from Vol I No 1, which appeared in May 1966 to Vol V No 1, which appeared in May 1970, there were no articles published dealing with pressure groups; between November 1970 (Vol V No. 2 and November 1978 (Vol XIII No 2) 10 had been published.
(93) MOODIE, Graeme and STUDDERT-KENNEDY, Gerald: op. cit. footnote 1 p 66; VIJAY, Kumar Indra: op. cit. pp 137-138.
(94) VIJAY, Kumar Indra: op. cit. p 135.
The second factor which may have contributed to this shift is what seems to have happened to the study of sectional interest groups. While there have always been writers (96) who have pointed to the very close relationships between powerful sectional groups and governments, it has become increasingly difficult to draw up boundary lines which mark off discrete entities which we can call sectional pressure groups, and traditional pressure group analysis carries a strong requirement that we be able to do so. Writing in 1975 A. King characterized the problem of governing Britain in the 1970s as one of 'overload': at the same time as the range of matters for which British governments held themselves (and were held by their electorate) to be responsible grew, their capacity to "exercise their responsibilities had declined. The reach of British government exceeds its grasp". (97) One response of governments to this problem of overload which is not restricted to Britain, has been to 'contract out', as it were, some of its responsibilities to what have traditionally been seen as private sector bodies in which sectional pressure groups play very important roles. (98)

The limitations of governmental power in a democracy, as well as the complexity of modern society, prevent the State from fulfilling the various tasks of assuring social and economic welfare and managing the economy without the assistance of private groups. . . . Government, if it is to gain the co-operation of these private interests, must attempt to satisfy their demands, which often include that of sharing in the decision-making process . . . Thus, the great expansion of the role of government in society and in the economy has, at the very same time demanded that private interests become increasingly involved in the processes of government. (99)

Similarly, Galnoor writes that certain parts of the established lobby "have opted for a formal role in governmental decision making and have in fact become part of the administrative machinery": (100) With private interests becoming more and more involved in both governmental decision making and administration it is not only becoming increasingly difficult to draw up boundary lines but it is also being seen as increasingly inappropriate and misleading to persist in doing so. (101) The large and powerful sectional pressure groups which once constituted the major ingredient of studies of 'the universe of pressure groups' (102) now form the major ingredient of studies of the ruling class or the governing elite. (103)

"Interest group structure is also undergoing change. There are fewer social movements and more structures of power. The interest group has become a formalized, independent action system, attempting to maximize its potential strength and durability". p 193.

(96) See for example MILLS, C. Wright: The Power Elite. Galaxy Books. New York. (1956) 1967 or for Australia, ENCEL, Sol: Equality and Authority. Cheshire. Melbourne. 1977 pp 351-352. "The interlocking of business and government in the 20th century has been marked, above all, by the rise of the organized pressure group or lobby whose structure and activities give it a quasi-governmental character. The interaction between government and business pressure groups is one of the most important aspects of the growth of the 'power elite' which exists, in varying forms, in all advanced industrial communities."


(100) GALNOOR, Itzhak: op. cit. p 36.

(101) COLEBATCH, H. K.: op. cit. See also NETTLE, J. P: "Consensus or Elite Domination: The Case of Business" (1965) in CASTLES, F. G. et al (eds): op. cit. pp 242 - 263: " . . . the famous British consensus is not a sort of social or political ectoplasm which emanates from, and hovers over, the continent, but a social institution with its own structures, procedures, attitudes, beliefs. Nor is it equally shared. Instead, like a magnet, it sucks in members (or servants) from the periphery - away from their own self-interested groupings. In doing so it emasculates these groups, while preserving their outward shell of autonomy and independence. Pressure group
Sectional pressure groups have, to some extent, vacated the field of pressure group analysis but they have left it with a legacy — a method of analysis, a model, based primarily on an examination of their operations. In this light, some of the difficulties experienced by, for example, Condon, Goldstein, and Heineman, when they tried to apply the model to resident action groups in Sydney, the Consumers' Association of Canada, and the British Campaign Against Racial Discrimination respectively, may be understandable. (104)

IV Propositions about Internal Organization.

1. Membership:

The assumption which underlay group theory and was implicit in most pressure group analysis, that individuals form or join pressure groups in order to pursue their individual interests through collective action, was shown to be rather questionable, at least as far as large sectional economic pressure groups were concerned, by Mancur Olson. In his The Logic of Collective Action (104) he argued that traditional American group theory was logically inconsistent because if individuals were the rational self-seeking beings that group theory claimed they were, then the last things they would do to try to pursue their personal interests would be to join a large group pursuing those same interests:

In a large group in which no single individual's contribution makes a perceptible difference to the group as a whole, or the burden or benefit of any single member of the group, it is certain that a collective good will not be provided unless there is coercion or some outside inducements that will lead members of the large group to act in their common interest. (106)

What Olson is claiming is that individuals join large pressure groups not in order to pursue their interests through collective action but because of the benefits attached to being a member or the penalties attached to not being a member.

The large and powerful economic lobbies are in fact the by-product of organization that obtain their strength and support because they perform some function in addition to lobbying for collective goods. (107)

The corollary of Olson's hypothesis is that "small groups will be able to further their common interests better than large groups". (108)

The standard for determining whether a group will have the capacity to act, without coercion or outside inducements, in its group interest... depends on whether the individual actions of any one or more members in the group are noticeable to any other individuals in the group. This is most obviously, but not exclusively, a function of the number in the group. (109)

Olson's work was important if only because it focused attention on a hitherto unquestioned assumption. The difficulty with it, however, is that it uses the same model of 'rational economic politics are therefore less 'real' than they seem..." p 242.

(102) Typical of this type of work is FINER, S. E.: Anonymous Empire. op. cit.
(106) Ibid. p 44.
man' that group theory does and argues that individuals make calculations of the costs and benefits of joining pressure groups in much the same way as the firm in the economic model of perfect competition calculates its marginal cost of producing an additional unit of output to determine its optimal (profit maximizing) level of production. Olson acknowledged that his theory "like any other theory, is less helpful in some cases than in others" (110) and that it would be less applicable to "lobbies with 'non-economic' interests". (111) But when David Marsh tried to test Olson's hypothesis on exactly the type of group that Olson was talking about, by asking firms whether they joined the Confederation of British Industry for its services or to forward public policy related aims, he found that "Olson's analysis seems to have limited utility as far as this particular interest group is concerned". (112) The attempt to operationalize Olson's model revealed two major problems: first, Olson, because of the source of his model, tended to assume an optimal decision-making situation i.e., a state of perfect knowledge which is unrealistic; and secondly, that his concept of collective good left a lot to be desired:

If one looks empirically at any complex economic interest group, it is evident that there are few, if any collective goods in Olson's terms. Instead one is faced with a great number of "limited collective goods", goods that collectively benefit certain sections of the actual and the eligible membership of these economic interest groups . . . But these same collective goods may in fact be collective baddis for certain other sections of the actual and eligible membership of the same interest group. (113)

Similarly, the corollary of Olson's major hypothesis — that small groups will be able to further their common interests better than large groups — is at first sight, appealing. He cites examples with which common sense and experience agrees: small meetings being able to reach decisions more quickly than large ones; small groups being able to perform certain tasks more efficiently than large ones; that we are more reluctant to let down a small group by not turning up to a work meeting than a large work group because the social pressures (ostracism etc) are more keenly felt in a small group than in a large. (114) But here again, there appear to be some questionable assumptions underlying it: that speed in reaching decisions is the only criterion on which groups evaluate the decision-making process; that the group's interests are of equal importance to all members; that all tasks a group has to perform call on the same skills; and that the group is performing its tasks and holding its meetings in vacuo. The size of the membership of a pressure group, especially a cause group, is of great importance, precisely because it does not operate in vacuo but in the public arena.

A pressure group will aim to have as large a membership as possible so that, in making its demands of government, it can claim to speak for a sizeable section of the population. It will also try to have as many members as possible in relation to its potential membership in order to lend weight to its claims to represent that section of the population for which it speaks — all other things being equal. (115)

(107) Ibid. p 132.
(108) Ibid. p 52.
(109) Ibid. p 45.
(110) Ibid. p 159.
(111) Ibid.
(113) Ibid. p 268. WILSON, James Q: op. cit. p 24 also criticizes Olson's hypothesis on the grounds that it fails to account for the behaviour of "persons who join despite their inability to affect goal achievement and without expectation of material benefit or fear of penalty. The model is useful in making us see a problem but only of
In terms of a pressure group's ability to attract members Finer argues that sectional groups will find this easier than cause groups because “they provide services for their members instead of demanding sacrifices”. Such a statement reflects, more than anything else, the time at which it was made — 1958 — before, to remain in Britain, the formation and growth of such huge organizations as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) which was able to draw over 150,000 to marches and rallies and see 800 people at a time arrested ‘for the cause’ in the 1960s.

It also reflects a tendency to undervalue those rewards which are not readily translatable into economic currency.

It is not simply the numbers of members which is important to pressure groups but, and this applies particularly to cause groups, the ‘quality’ of the membership.

Pressure groups will aim to attract respected members of the community who are willing to lend their names to the cause.

By and large the success of a promotional group as an organization, unlike that of a spokesman group, is not dependent on how fully it organizes its constituency. Quality (the prestige of members and their ability to argue a case) is more important than quantity.

There are numerous examples of the use by cause groups of ‘famous people’: the CND’s use of A.J.P. Taylor, Kingsley Martin, Victor Gollancz, J.B. Priestley and others for example. And the British Homosexual Law Reform Society which worried lest the organization should become dominated by homosexuals who might ruin the society’s image and chances of success, deliberately left the status of their supporters vague. They continually sought subscribers, especially among the wealthy ...

It had as its Chairman, Kenneth Walker, well known surgeon and sexologist, and as its Secretary, Rev. A. Hallidie Smith. It is also of interest to note that in Pym’s study of British pressure groups concerned with abortion, homosexual and divorce law reform, in no case “did we find that all the groups concerned with an issue took some action”; and the same was true with the British Campaign Against Racial Discrimination.

limited value in making us solve it.”

(114) Ibid. Ch II.

(115) Finer calls this ratio of member:potential member the primary density of a group. FINER, S. E.:“Groups and Political Participation” (1972) pp 255-275 in KIMBER, Richard and RICHARDSON, J. J. (eds): op. cit. p 263. See also on size of membership, amongst others, MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. p 230: “A Government, if it wishes regularly to consult with a sectional pressure group, will try to deal with one that is ‘representative’; that is, one which represents a high proportion of the section for which it claims to speak”; and PYM, Bridget: op. cit. p 16; VIJAY, Kumar Indra: op. cit. p 144; SINCLAIR, John: op. cit. p 17; EHRMANN, Henry: op. cit. p 487; MOODIE, Graeme and STUDDERT-KENNEDY, Gerald: op. cit. p 67; LAVAU, George E.: “Political Pressures by Interest Groups in France” in EHRMANN, Henry (ed): op. cit. pp 76-77.

(116) FINER, S. E.: Anonymous Empire. op. cit. p 122. James WILSON carries this line of argument to a much greater degree of specificity and argues that amongst purposive associations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Student Non-Violent Co-Ordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in America, the more that an association required of an average member the more powerful would have to be the incentives it offered. op. cit. pp 181 - 183.


(118) POTTER, Allen: Organized Groups in British National Politics. Faber and Faber, London. 1961 p 133. Note: promotional = cause groups; spokesman = sectional groups.

(119) YOUNG, Nigel: op. cit. p 149 and footnote 32 p 436.

(120) PYM, Bridget:op. cit. p 62

2. Structure and Organization.

Pressure group analysts who make statements along the lines that 'the structure of pressure groups mirrors the structure of the organizations they are trying to influence' (124) are usually referring to one or both of two things: (i) the structure of the pressure group, that is, its division into constituent parts and on what basis; (ii) the differentiation of roles within a pressure group, that is, roles of leaders and followers, and the nature and degree of internal democracy, its organization.

(i) Structure: The basic distinction most often drawn in the literature is between unitary and federated structures. A unitary group is a single organization that may "have subdivisions to carry on various functions or stages of functions" (125). A federated group on the other hand is an "organization of organizations in which powers or functions are divided . . . between the constituent groups on the one hand, and the more inclusive organization on the other" (126). Organizations may be federated on the basis of geography or on the basis of function. (127) It is understandable that it is Australian and American analysts who seem to be most conscious of the difficulties experienced by geographically federated groups. (128) and British writers most conscious of functionally federated groups. (129) Whether discussing geographically or functionally federated groups all argue that

Federated pressure groups experience greater difficulties in maintaining group cohesion than unitary groups.

Thus we have Potter speaking of federated British sectional groups

In general, the wider the range of interests, the harder it is to reach positive decisions, not only because a clash of interests is more likely, but also because there is relatively less to be gained by sacrificing particular points of view to reach positive decisions. (130)

Truman goes further than most in spelling out the conditions most likely to lead to problems with group cohesion for federated groups. Such difficulties are more likely to occur when: the constituent units antedate the federal body; the basis of federation is functional specialization rather than geographical location; the central body attempts to increase its powers at the expense of the constituent groups which will try to resist any such move. (131)

(ii) Organization: Organization is seen as a very important determinant of a group's ability to achieve its aims:

The better organized a group is, the more effective it is likely to be, whatever its membership or purpose. (132)

---

(122) PYM, Bridget: op. cit. p 121.
(123) HEINEMAN, Benjamin W. Jr: op. cit.
(125) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. p 116.
(126) Ibid. p 115.
(127) See SINCLAIR, John: op. cit. pp 4-5; MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. refers similarly to the geographic basis.
(128) See for example, MATTHEWS, Trevor: op.cit.; TRUMAN, David: op. cit. pp 115-128.
(129) See POTTER, Allen: op. cit. p 114; MARSH, David: op. cit.
(130) POTTER, Allen: op. cit. p 114.
(131) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. pp 120-128.
(132) MOODIE, Graeme and STUDDERT-KENNEDY, Gerald: op. cit. p 67.
Although what authors mean by 'organization' is rarely spelt out in any detail, what is implicit is the existence of some sort of hierarchy of democratically elected officials, with or without the aid of salaried staff, who run the organization efficiently and at the same time try to be responsive to membership needs. The internal organization of pressure groups reflect the structures of the organizations they are trying to influence in two senses according to the literature: first, they have to (appear to) reflect the democratic norms of the political culture which requires periodic election of office bearers, however much of a 'sham' those elections may be; (133) and secondly, the hierarchy of office bearers, duly elected, is essential if pressure group leaders are to be able to speak with any authority, negotiate from any position of strength, with their counterparts in the government. (134) Both these external factors and the internal dynamics (of all but small groups) posited in Michels’ iron law of oligarchy have produced a fairly consistent pattern of claims about the organization of pressure groups. Holtzman summarizes these succinctly:

A characteristic of virtually all organized groups is government through an "active minority". Or, to restate the proposition, almost all organizations tend to be oligarchical. The membership plays a peripheral role in the internal government, whereas a small number of individuals make the decisions and speak for the group. Sometimes they mold the group to their own image. The forms of democracy may be present affording members formal opportunities to participate in policy making, to vote for their officers, and to compete for office; but the actuality of power permits "insiders" to play a more significant role than the mass of the membership. (135)

There are really two basic propositions here:

The internal organizational structure of pressure groups will be oligarchic with an active minority making all decisions of importance to the group. This is the way in which power is distributed within the organization and it may or may not correspond with the formal (i.e., constitutional) distribution of power.

The active minority, democratic election of office bearers notwithstanding, will seek to perpetuate its control of the organization.

Most pressure group analysts subscribe to these two basic propositions about the organization of pressure groups. They differ however, on two questions: first, the extent to which they regard this minority control as the result of the iron law inevitability of organization per se or of the machinations of power hungry individuals; and, related to this, whether they regard it as a good thing or a bad thing — under what conditions, on what criteria, and for whom. Truman offers eight possible factors which contribute to the ability of the active minority to retain control of their group: they acquire manipulative skills and tools not available to the uninitiated; leadership positions give their occupants control over the flow of information to the rank and file; the financial structure of the group which gives major contributors a disproportionate influence on the group’s affairs and greater tenure in key positions; the time consuming nature of leadership which only a few can afford to carry on without remuneration; the qualities peculiar to leaders as persons; the influence of custom; the strategic position of the group in relation to other groups and where this relationship is one of conflict the need for quick


(134) ECKSTEIN, Harry: op. cit.

(135) HOLTZMAN, Abraham: op. cit. p 14.
manoeuvres and discipline will promote the influence and authority of a few; and the qualities peculiar to those who are led. (136)

Finer is one of a few writers who suggests that there may be a difference between cause and sectional groups with respect to this aspect of organization, but his is a very tentatively worded suggestion:

One would surmise that since these are committed to a cause, and often deliberately confront the government, the leadership is more responsive and the rank and file more active in these associations. So far [1972] no data exists. (137)

James Wilson is another author who distinguishes between cause and sectional groups in terms of the types of incentives they offer members. His entire book is an attempt to put forward what he considers to be a “controversial perspective” (138) on political organizations:

The central theme of the study is that the behavior of persons who lead or speak for an organization can best be understood in terms of their efforts to maintain and enhance the organization and their position in it... Whatever else organizations seek, they seek to survive. To survive, they must somehow convince their members that membership is worthwhile. (139)

He spells it out:

[organizational] maintenance... chiefly involves supplying tangible and intangible incentives to individuals in order that they will become, or remain, members and will perform certain tasks. (140)

On closer examination, his book boils down to making two major thrusts. First, he makes the point that however successful an active minority may be in perpetuating its control over an organization they have always to keep an eye to ensuring that there is something there for them to control (the organization maintenance part of his perspective). The second thrust is an attempt to adapt Mancur Olson’s approach to cause (as well as sectional) groups using intangible as well as tangible incentives (the method whereby members are convinced that membership is worthwhile).

While his perspective may thus be less controversial than he claims, he does add to the literature on cause groups. He distinguishes four kinds of incentive that groups can offer to members:

(a) material incentives — tangible rewards such as money or things readily convertible into money;

(b) specific solidary incentives — intangible rewards “arising out of the act of associating that can be given to, or withheld from, specific individuals. Indeed, their value usually depends on the fact that some persons are excluded from their enjoyment”. (141) Here, the examples are offices, honours.

(c) collective solidary incentives — intangible rewards created by the act of associating which have to be enjoyed by the group if they are to be enjoyed by the individuals; the fun of coming together, the sense of group membership, etc.

(d) purposive incentives — the “intangible rewards that derive from a sense of satisfaction of having contributed to the attainment of a worthwhile cause”. (142)

(136) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. pp 142-155.
(137) FINER, S. E.: “Groups and Political Participation” op. cit. p 262.
(138) WILSON, James, Q: op. cit. p 9.
(139) Ibid. pp 9 - 10.
(140) Ibid. p 13.
The four kinds of incentive differ in two respects: the precision or selectivity with which they can be applied to individuals; and the extent to which they implicate the stated purposes of the organization. For example, material incentives will have little to do with the purposes of the organization while purposive incentives will. (143)

He distinguishes between three kinds of organization relying on purposive incentives to attract and maintain members. Goal-oriented organizations have a single purpose or set of purposes with respect to a particular segment or aspect of society e.g., the Salvation Army, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the RSPCA. Ideological organizations espouse a systematic critique of, and programme for, society and favour goals which derive from fundamental assertions about the nature of man and society; their principle focus is on the reconstruction of society or the redemption of people in general e.g., the John Birch Society, and certain sections of Students for a Democratic Society. Redemptive organizations “seek not only to change society and its institutions but also to change its members by requiring them to exemplify in their own lives the new order. The way in which goals are sought is as important as their substance” (144) e.g., Student Non-Violent Co-Ordinating Committee (SNCC) pre-1965 and the American Socialist Party. On the basis of these distinctions he argues that:

ideological and redemptive organizations display little flexibility about their objectives or, if the objectives are changed, the transformation exacts a heavy price in factionalism and sometimes in fissure. (145)

and that with redemptive organizations

very little flexibility about tactics will be displayed, because how one acts is as important or, perhaps even more important than, the ends to which the action is directed. (146)

Wilson applies this scheme to three groups within the American civil rights movement: NAACP, CORE and SNCC. (147) Of these three groups only the NAACP has been successful in terms of organization maintenance and enhancement. All three were purposive organizations but the NAACP from the first developed a structure and program that required little of the average member, permitted a variety of incentives to be employed at the branch level, limited its purposes to fairly specific goals ... and engaged in campaigns that made it possible for victories to be won in the short term. CORE and SNCC, by contrast, developed a structure that required a great deal of the average member, and so these organizations were forced to make use of powerful incentives whose appeal would inevitably be limited; furthermore they embraced goals that were expressive of the broad and intense commitment of members, and selected strategies that offered little hope of making significant progress toward those goals and thus little prospect of winning victories that could sustain the commitment ... the NAACP was a goal-oriented organization relying on specific purposive incentives combined with solidary and material ones; CORE and SNCC were redemptive associations relying on broadly stated purposes the achievement of which required not only a general transformation of society but also the exemplary conduct of members. (148)

(141) Ibid. pp 33-34.
(142) Ibid. p 34.
(143) Ibid. pp 35.
(144) Ibid. p 47.
(145) Ibid.
(146) Ibid. p 48.
(147) See footnote 116 above.
(148) loc cit. p 181.
A compound proposition can be derived from Wilson's arguments:

*A cause group will better be able to maintain and enhance itself: the less it demands of its members; the wider the variety of incentives it can offer its members; and the more it limits its purposes to specific goals.*

3. Group Cohesion and Multiple Membership.

What is meant by group cohesion is not always clearly defined in the literature although most authors regard it as an asset (149) that increases the effectiveness of pressure groups in their attempts to influence. It can be regarded as a sticking together of members, a tendency to remain united or, as Truman suggests "the maintenance of leaders and followers in harmonious relationship" (150) and clearly group members may be in agreement or disagreement (more or less cohesive) on a whole range of issues, revolving around group goals, tactics, forms of organization and so on. It is also clear why group cohesiveness is seen as an asset: a group trying to influence policy making and administration will be in a much stronger position if it can claim not only that it is representative of the section of the population it speaks for but also that it speaks with one voice.

Several factors have been isolated as important in weakening group cohesion: a federated structure, as has already been mentioned, especially if the basis of division is function rather than geography; the sheer size of the group itself is another because of the increased heterogeneity that is likely to accompany a mass membership. Underlying these, according to Truman, is a single explanatory factor "that no individual is wholly absorbed in any group to which he belongs" (151) and may belong to more than one group — the problems brought about by multiple membership. Some of Truman's suggestions about multiple membership are worthwhile investigating so long as: (i) we do not claim that large sections of the population are members of more than one organization; the empirical evidence presented above does not support such a claim; (ii) we do not try to use multiple membership as a device for 'explaining' political stability but look at it in relation to groups; (iii) we accept that if individuals are going to join more than one group they are not likely to join groups which are diametrically opposed in their aims but ones which have aims that are perceived (at least at time of joining) to be tending in the same direction — it is more likely, for example, that an individual will join the Council for Civil Liberties and the Humanist Society than it is for an individual (cases of spying purposes aside) to join both the Right to Life Association and the Women's Abortion Action Campaign.

Truman's suggestions follow two main lines: the effects on the individuals of such a conflict of interest arising from multiple memberships; and the effects on the groups when sections of the membership experience such conflicts. As far as the effects on the individual are concerned, Truman, arguing on the explicitly stated assumption that individuals seek to maintain a state of inner equilibrium and that "the equilibrium of an individual consists of his adjustment in the various institutionalized groups and associations to which he belongs" (152) claims that "felt conflicts of this sort are painful. They compel the individual to seek a readjustment by altering the character of his participation in the groups or by changing his group affiliations". (153)

(150) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. p 156.
(151) Ibid. p 157.
(152) Ibid. p 162.
(153) Ibid.
He cites two American case studies which showed that:

Those subject to conflict because of their multiple memberships... resolved it by partly or completely dropping out of one group or by withdrawing from both with respect to the issue that produced the difficulty. (154)

This can be turned around into the proposition that

Individuals who experience a conflict arising out of the membership in more than one group will seek to resolve that conflict by either (i) dropping out of one of the groups or (ii) withdrawing from participation in both groups with respect to the conflict-producing issue.

As to the effects on group cohesion of the conflicts resulting from multiple memberships, Truman argues that that will depend in the first place on the number of members of the group experiencing the conflict. Where this number is appreciable, the implications for group cohesion will be serious. Where the number is small, the consequences for the group will depend on the roles played by the individual or individuals affected. If these individuals are among the official or unofficial leaders, the effects may be disproportionately extensive, involving the possibilities of temporary or permanent schism... In the second place, the effects for any particular group will depend upon the way in which the conflicts are resolved. Temporary loss of interest or reduced participation in the group because of a conflict of limited duration may affect cohesion slightly or not at all. If the lowest rate of interaction or the withdrawal becomes permanent however, the effects may be considerable. (155)

The reduction in group cohesion resulting from the conflicts in individuals who are members of more than one group will be more substantial where: (i) a large number of members experience such conflicts; (ii) those who experience the conflicts are amongst the group’s leaders; (iii) the reduced participation resulting from an attempt to resolve such conflicts is long term.

V Propositions about External Activities.


In any study of a pressure group or groups the prevailing political culture should be (but not always is) taken into account — prevailing political culture in two senses. First, there is the question of whether pressure group activity in general is regarded as a legitimate form of political activity, and this has changed over time. To an Australian Prime Minister in 1962, it was not:

There are plenty of pressure groups in Australia and there are plenty of pressure groups in the world... It is the age of pressure groups. It is a period of time, politically and internationally, in which people seek to promote differences and seek to promote a clash of interests so that in the waters they stir up they may fish to their advantage... Therefore I say: Away with all the pressure group idea! (157)

If pressure group activity is not regarded as legitimate the result is not likely to be an end to pressure group politics but simply a more clandestine style of pressure group politics. The second


(155) TRUMAN, David: op. cit. p 164. HOLTZMAN, Abraham: op. cit. adds that “the more involved members are in the affairs of a particular group and the more they interact with each other and the organization, the more likely they will respond in terms of an organizationally acceptable frame of reference. Conflict resolution in such individuals... tends to favor the organization.” p 36

(156) See VIJAY, Kumar Indra: op. cit. pp 141-142.
sense in which pressure group analysis should take account of the political context in which a
group(s) makes its demands refers to the relationship between the demands that a pressure group
is making and the acceptability of the values underlying those demands to the rest of the community.
Thus, we have Pym

Groups whose aims are consonant with commonly held social values
are more likely to be acceptable than groups with esoteric standpoints. (158)

and Moodie and Studdert-Kennedy

a group will be stronger or weaker depending on whether it is swimming with
or against the tide of socially acceptable standards and beliefs. To stand for
something which 'no decent respectable citizen' would publicly oppose ... 
is a clear asset which groups will seek to acquire. (159)

In other words, an organization making demands for government funds for Community Urban
Guerilla Training Centres in Sydney is not (in 1980) likely to be very successful.

The use of material gathered in public opinion polls, or the actual commissioning of it
by pressure groups, and the public relations exercises engaged in by some wealthy sectional
pressure groups such as the Australian Uranium Producers Forum which try, as it were, to get
socially accepted beliefs to swim with the tide of their aims would seem to indicate that pressure
groups themselves, if not all of their analysts, regard this as an important factor with respect to
their effectiveness. Bridget Pym, whose distinction between in-groups and out-groups was
mentioned above, relies very heavily on this factor in her explanation of why the pressure groups
which were demanding changes in laws relating to abortion, homosexual behaviour, divorce,
censorship and capital punishment failed in Britain in the 1950s and succeeded in the late 1960s-
early 1970s. (160) In 1979 Gelb and Palley (161) analysed four cases of feminist groups acting as
interest groups in the American federal policy making process in an attempt to isolate those
factors which contributed to the success (not necessarily total victory) of some and the failure of
others. They contend that success may be attained if, amongst other things, "issues are perceived
as dealing with role equity as opposed to role change for women". (162) They argue

on issues which are narrow and which focus on role equity, activity by
women's rights groups has found considerable favor ... When more
dominant values are in question and role change issues regarding women's
family and dependent status are at stake, the possibilities for success
become severely limited. (163)

WESTERWAY, Peter: "Pressure Groups" in WILKES, John (ed): Forces in Australian Politics. Angus and
Robertson. Sydney. 1963 p 120. See also ECKSTEIN, Harry: "The Determinants of Pressure Group Politics"
op. cit. p 409.

(158) PYM, Bridget: op. cit. p 16.

(159) MOODIE, Graeme and STUDDERT-KENNEDY, Gerald: op. cit. p 68.

(160) PYM, Bridget: op. cit. See also GREY, Antony : op. cit. pp 38-39. "How was it then, that between 1966 and
1969 so many sensitive social issues were tabled by Parliament? Partly, I think, because there were an unusually
large number of liberally (small 'i') minded MPs of all parties in that Parliament; but also because the changes they
enacted reflected a majority view in the country that the time was ripe for reform in these matters. The Labour
Government reacted to the climate of opinion by providing sufficient Parliamentary time for several important
private members' Bills to become law on a non-party, free-voting basis."

(161) GELB, Joyce and PALLEY, Marian Lief: "Women and Interest Group Politics: A Comparative Analysis of

(162) Ibid. p 364. Equity means equity with men.

(163) Ibid. p 389.
Role equity for women, in other words, was consonant with commonly held American values, role change was not — in the 1970s.

The effectiveness of a pressure group will be increased if its demands are (or can be presented as) consonant with widely held social values.

A related aspect of the importance of political culture, but one which is less frequently covered in the pressure group literature, is the possibility that a successful or partially successful campaign by one pressure group may provoke the formation of another group trying to exert diametrically opposed influence. Pym’s study does pay some attention to this aspect of the political context of group activity but statements such as “the failure of the reforms is in a sense the success of the conservatives” (164) and “the successful campaign often means an unsuccessful defence” (165) do not reveal very much. Raewyn Stone’s 1977 study of the campaigns of three pressure groups concerned with the issue of abortion law reform in New Zealand 1970-1975 (166) is much more informative, and will be considered later.

2. Group Tactics.

The broadest categorization of pressure group tactics is into direct and indirect methods of attempting to influence with the latter referring to those cases where a group attempts to influence “through a more immediate target. An association’s use of public relations to influence public opinion in favour of a certain policy is an example of a claim being made on the Government in an indirect way.” (167) Whether a group adopts direct or indirect tactics and which particular method of persuasion it does use will depend on a range of factors which can be summarized under three broad heads: the resources of the group, the nature of the demand, and the level of authority the group is seeking to influence.

Under the heading of resources are usually listed such factors as those considered above — quantity and quality of members, group cohesion and organization, having acceptable demands, and additionally, wealth, access to decision makers and control over resources (information, skills, etc) required by those the group is attempting to influence. (168) It is the possession of these resources in great measure which qualifies a group, under Galnoor’s classificatory scheme, for inclusion within the ‘established lobby’, when “the option of open conflict has been replaced by some forms of mutual accommodation with government decision makers” (169) and, as Goldstein reminds us, accommodation politics can only work for those who can bargain as equals. (170) Almost all pressure group analysts claim, as a generalization, that the more a pressure group has of these resources, the greater its strength and the more effective it will be. Wilson, however, does pressure group analysis a service when he points to what he calls the “strengths of the weak”:

Though protest organizations do not always succeed, they have two advantages not always possessed by their targets: they are sure of the rightness of their cause, and, lacking in resources, they appear selfless while their opponents, having resources, do not. (171)

(164) PYM, Bridget: op. cit. p 53.
(165) Ibid. p 117.
(167) MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. p 221. See also WILSON, James Q: op. cit. Ch 14. where his categories of ‘bargaining’ and ‘protest’ are roughly equivalent.
(169) GALNOOR, Itzhak: op. cit. p 35.
The greater the resources of a pressure group the more likely it is to try to exercise influence by direct means.

Sectional pressure groups are more likely to use direct means of influence than cause groups.

Perhaps because the pressure group model was developed with reference primarily to sectional rather than cause groups, the literature pays less attention than is warranted to the role that the nature of the demand plays in the tactics a pressure group is likely to adopt. It is also partly a function of the model's theoretical foundation lying in group theory which, as pointed out above, treated interests more as 'psychological needs or wants' than as justifiable claims. What I mean here by the nature of the group's demand is a question which must be asked prior to that which involves the consonance of the group's demands with socially held values. And this is whether or not the group's demands are seen as an issue to which governments can and should respond. An early 1950s pressure group analyst, for example, busily working on a model which could incorporate farmers' groups, professional associations, trade unions, and the RSPCA would probably have reacted with disbelief to the suggestion that in the not too distant future there would be groups demanding that governments do something about the quality of the air people breathe. A pressure group which first has to convince public policy makers that its demands should fall within their jurisdiction and then to establish that its demands can be met and how, before it even gets to the point of trying to influence the direction of the resultant policy will have to adopt tactics which are different from those adopted by a group whose demands revolve around issues already on the public policy agenda. Sinclair is one author who does discuss this issue:

To put new issues on the political agenda, decision-makers must be convinced that there is significant public concern and support for the issue. Civil rights and various protest groups were able to use mass media coverage of their conflicts with government authorities to stimulate the involvement of other groups in society, expand the scope of the conflict from a minor disturbance to a major social injustice, and thus present decision makers with a situation that they could no longer avoid... The various groups involved in the environmental movement have helped to convince Americans that there is an environmental crisis that requires the attention of private citizens and political leaders. (172)

It is worthwhile noting that the examples Sinclair uses are cause rather than sectional pressure groups.

A pressure group whose demands do not revolve around issues already on the public policy agenda will adopt indirect methods of applying pressure to have them so placed.

In 1958 S. E. Finer claimed that British sectional pressure groups approached different levels of government in a distinct order: executive, parliament, party, public:

Now, the first characteristic of these is that they are, pretty well, all "domesticated" - they work and are expected to work closely with the Ministries, and it would be both impolite and imprudent of them to agitate publicly before first seeing what the Ministry proposed to do about the matter. Hence their relationship with the executive ought

(170) GOLDSTEIN, Jonah: op. cit. p 145. See also COLMAN, Andrew: "The Psychology of Influence" in FROST, Brian (ed): op.cit. pp 11-24: "A pressure group finds itself in a bargaining situation vis-a-vis the government when the ability of each to achieve certain desired ends depends on what the other does". p 20; and WILSON, James Q: op. cit. p 284-285.

(171) WILSON, James Q: op. cit. p 289.

(172) SINCLAIR, John: op. cit. p 44.
For cause groups, he suggested, the order of appeal would be reversed. Writing of British pressure groups in 1973, Kimber and Richardson argued that the picture was a little more complicated and that “In many instances groups try to use several channels simultaneously”. Their contention receives some support from Stone’s study of groups involved with the abortion question in New Zealand 1970-1975. After consideration of the campaign styles of SPUC (Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child), ALRANZ (Abortion Law Reform Association of New Zealand) and WONAAC (Women's National Abortion Action Campaign), she concluded that

the most important factor in determining the success or otherwise of the groups in achieving their aims was their ability to build a co-ordinated two-level campaign, consisting of a power base in Parliament supported by mass public activities.

Not only may pressure groups simultaneously adopt different types of tactics, but they may regard different tactics as more appropriate at different stages of a campaign, particularly if it is a long term campaign. The British Homosexual Law Reform Society, for example, at one stage of their campaign to have the laws against male homosexual behaviour reformed, thought that

time was needed to educate the public towards general acceptance of the [Wolfendon] Report’s recommendations, and the Society regarded itself as the chief instrument of public education. At this stage it mostly kept away from Parliament and concentrated upon the Press and the public.

Later, during 1965-67

... we had learned somewhat painfully from the 1958 debate that blanket circulations of all MPs are almost certainly a mistake. Consequently, we were largely guided in what we did by the advice and requests of our chief Parliamentary sponsors ... This involved the supplying of information which they needed and, when necessary, research into detail, they were (sic) also a good deal of routine clerical work ... the keeping of comprehensive lists of all MPs on record as having spoken or voted in favour of or against homosexual law reform, and so forth — but very rarely the making of direct approaches by the HLRS to Members in either House who were not already known to us.

3. Coalitions and Alliances.

By and large, the interest of pressure group literature in group alliances and coalitions is of fairly recent origin. Donald Hall's Co-Operative Lobbying — The Power of Pressure (1969) represents an attempt to study co-operative lobbying amongst major economic pressure groups in the United States.

Considered as a process, co-operative lobbying consists of three major stages: establishment of an alliance among groups (the stage at which intergroup lobbying occurs), co-operation amongst groups during the period of the alliance (the stage at which co-operative lobbying is directed toward government), and reaction by government to the co-operative lobbying used by the alliance. This last stage also may be described in

(173) FINER, S. E.: "Interest Groups and the Political Process in Great Britain" in EHRMANN, Henry (ed): op. cit. p 130. Finer includes the bureaucracy within the Executive in this discussion.


(175) STONE, Raewyn: op. cit. p 145.

(176) GREY, Antony: op. cit. p 43.

(177) Ibid. p 45.
terms of the application of boundary limits to cooperative lobbying or lobbying generally.(179)

His hypothesis is stated as follows:

that there is a reciprocal relationship between a group's dynamic structure and its ability and desire to engage in intergroup and cooperative lobbying; further, that involvement or non-involvement in intergroup cooperation may be a determining element in interest group effectiveness.(180)

Hall's work is of less relevance to my purposes than Wilson's discussion of alliances, coalitions and competition amongst voluntary associations. (181) Starting from the fundamental assumption that organizations seek to maintain themselves, he asserts that

Associations . . . are highly averse to risk and thus to active rivalry except under special circumstances. The easiest and most prudent maintenance strategy is to develop autonomy — that is, a distinctive area of competence, a clearly demarcated and exclusively served clientele of membership, and undisputed jurisdiction over a function, service, goal, or cause . . . The extent to which competition between associations will exist will depend on both the relative degree of autonomy and the relative level of resources of any pair of organizations . . . When there is organizational competition stimulated by conflict over autonomy . . . the association will seek ways of creating an identity, and this often means attacking head-on established organizations including potential ones, especially important ones. To acquire autonomy, one must first call attention to oneself and, unless there is an organizational vacuum one can fill (a rarity), this often means picking a fight with an established group. The bigger the opponent, of course, the more attention one obtains. (182)

Wilson distinguishes between alliances and coalitions of organizations in terms of the enduring nature of the latter. Coalitions are "ongoing mechanisms" for explicitly co-ordinating some or all of the actions of the organizations involved. (183) An alliance, on the other hand, "typically takes the form of loose, cooperative relations between two or more associations with respect to the attainment of a particular end or the performance of a specific task". (184) Alliances, he argues, are quite common but always remain ad hoc: they disband as soon as the particular end for which they were formed has been attained. Coalitions of organizations, he argues, rarely last. He finds both the minimum size (or payoff) and the ideological incompatibility theories of coalition formation inadequate for explaining why organizations so rarely form lasting coalitions. He attributes their failure to be able to do so to the assumption underlying both theories; that the organizations involved know in advance of their chances of success. While this may be applicable to parliamentary coalitions where the number of seats at stake is known in advance, it does not apply to political organizations working in a much more uncertain environment. (185)

(178) HALL, Donald: op. cit. He refers to the paucity of "published studies of co-operative and intergroup lobbying" p xi.
(179) Ibid. pp x - xi.
(180) Ibid. He means by the dynamic structure "that constellation of variable factors that define its character at any given moment: its legacy from history; its objectives and motives; its leadership, membership and organization; its mode of intragroup communications; and its recruitment and deployment of staff in relation to group objectives."
(181) WILSON, James Q: op. cit. Ch 13. Hall's work presents a stark contrast to Wilson's and makes one wonder whether the continued classification of groups as different as the SNCC and the American Chamber of Commerce as two variants of the same phenomenon is not more misleading than useful.
(182) Ibid. pp 263-266.
(183) Ibid. p 267.
An adequate theory of coalition formation, he argues, would probably have to integrate both theories and take into account the special characteristics of political organizations, some of which he outlines. Because political organizations have maintenance needs, they are likely to find participation in a coalition threatening:

resources, autonomy, and purposes can be jeopardized if the organization must share the credit for victory and the blame for defeat, increase its competition for funds, moderate its commitment to a particular purpose, or weaken its distinctive identity and competence in the eyes of the members...

Furthermore, an organization is itself a coalition, the members of which are likely to see the costs and benefits of an even larger coalition very differently. Militant members will label any hint of compromise with a coalition partner a sellout; moderate ones will criticize a refusal to compromise as being heavy handed and rigid... associations can often find similarity threatening, especially when autonomy is low. The more alike two organizations are, the greater the likelihood that they lay claim to identical causes, attempt to serve the same constituency, or compete for the same resources. Further jeopardizing one’s weak autonomy by joining a coalition is not attractive to many organizations. This may help explain why ideologically similar political parties are often the most quarrelsome. (186)

From Wilson’s hypotheses we may derive the following propositions:

A new pressure group forming in an area in which another organization(s) already exists will seek to establish a separate and distinctive identity by attacking the other organization(s).

Organizations working in the same area will be unable to establish coalitions which endure.

Where alliances are formed between organizations working in the same area they will be disbanded after the specific task for which they were formed has been completed.

VI Emphases of the Model.

1. The Consequences of Definition.

There was a young man who said, God
Must think it exceedingly odd
If he finds that this tree
Continues to be
When there’s no one about in the Quad. (187)

The term "Lobby" covers both classes of organization, since it embraces all groups but only in so far as they seek to influence public policy. (188)

Of course, many of the groups mentioned above make demands of the system only very occasionally. Much of their activity is geared to providing services of one kind or another for their members. Only when they begin to articulate demands do they become pressure groups. (189)
The implications of pressure group analysis restricting its interest to pressure groups only in so far as they seek to influence public policy is that it is much more interested in pressure groups than in pressure groups. Information about the groups themselves — membership, structure, organization and so on — is of relevance only insofar as it sheds light on the effectiveness or otherwise of the group when it does seek to apply pressure on governments. Again, pressure group analysis is concerned with only those interests which the group seeks to further through the attempts to influence public policy; its other interests, which all analysts acknowledge that a pressure group is likely to have, are rarely examined. The possibility of a conflict between the two sets of interests rarely occurs to pressure group analysts: what is treated in the literature as the ineffectiveness of a group in terms of its failure to have its demands met may result from precisely such a conflict. The Women's Electoral Lobby (WEL) for example, would be classed as a pressure group with aims to influence public policy with respect to certain issues perceived as relevant to the interests of women. It also acts, as one member has characterized it, as a 'sheltered workshop' aiming to develop self confidence and skills in women by giving them experience in the political arena. If for example, WEL sent an inexperienced negotiator to put its demands to a section of the bureaucracy and she failed to accomplish her mission, pressure group analysis would consider this an irrational (in terms of the appropriateness of the means to goals) use of its resources. Looked at from the perspective of WEL's sheltered workshop aims, however, WEL acted rationally. Only if the pressure group were allowed to enter the model with its aims of fostering self confidence and so on would the picture become more complete and more complex.

It is worth re-emphasizing that not all pressure group activity is directed towards government policy. Pressure groups feature more or less prominently in the operations of all other aspects of the political system. (190)

But again, by definition, pressure group analysis is only interested in pressure groups when they attempt to influence public policy making and/or administration. Groups which try to influence other groups or organizations (American gays trying to influence the American Psychiatric Association, resident action groups trying to influence land developers) are not catered for at all by the model. Christopher Condon, when he tried to apply the pressure group model to resident action groups in Sydney found it inadequate for this and other reasons. With the Victoria Street Resident Action Group for example, their concern is not with the inadequacies of the present decision-making process, but rather with the process itself. What this section of the movement is interested in is a restructuring of the process by which decisions are made, not simply winning a say in the existing structure.(191)

Further, when Kimber and Richardson claim that

Even though an analysis of group activity will not provide a complete picture of the political process it will at least give a clear indication of where power lies in a given political system (192)

(187) The answer comes back:
Dear Sir,
Your astonishment's odd:
I am always about in the Quad
And that's why the tree
Will continue to be,
Since observed by
Yours faithfully,
God.

MARX, Melvin and HILLIX, William: op. cit. pp 110-111.
they are not entirely correct. An analysis of pressure group activity will give a picture of where power lies in a given political system which is distorted by being viewed through the lens which restricts such activity to its relationship to government; it implies that all power is tied to government institutions.

Again, because pressure group analysis is interested in groups only insofar as they attempt to influence governments it tends to concentrate on particular campaigns or decisions and therefore consists primarily of a series of ‘slice through time’ static portraits of the activities of pressure groups; it shows little interest in group dynamics.

2. The Ideological Implications of the Model.

The pressure group model has inherited many of the criticisms that its intellectual ancestors, group theory and pluralism, attracted. (193)

Pressure groups are necessary to the government of our complex society ... They have become the fifth estate, the means by which many individuals contribute to politics. Without them discontent would grow and knowledge be lost. (194)

... lobbying embodies two basic democratic procedures: the right to participate in policy making and the right to demand redress of grievances ... In the age of bigness and technology, the lobby tempers the system. (195)

Collectively, the people and groups involved in interest group activities constitute an important link between people and government. (196)

The structure of British Government includes besides the hierarchical world of public servants and the parliamentary world of party politics a very complex world of organized groups; and public decisions are the result of interplay between these three worlds. Does the public get left out in this process? Perhaps, but then no public or publics exists politically except in so far as they can express themselves through this process: access to it is open to all, and the entry fee can be paid in brains and energy as well as in cash. This may sound a complacent conclusion, but it is one implicit in this method of analysis. It is extremely illuminating sometimes to consider politics as a process or equilibrium, in which decisions are taken not by men but by the inter- relation of events. (197)

Pressure group analysis tells us very little of those groups and demands which cannot make it into the pressure group system at all; by concentrating on those groups which are at least partially

---
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successful in the sense that even if all of their demands are not met they are at least heard, the model endorses 'moderate demands (of policy makers and administrators) pursued through the proper channels' as the best means of achieving change. Studies of the activities of several groups around a particular piece of legislation will admittedly acknowledge that some groups fail at pressure group politics but, because the loss of one group is treated as the consequence of the success of another, the system of pressure group politics itself is not called into question. To the contrary, the system is portrayed as functioning properly (keeping discontent within manageable limits) because those groups which did not win this time, may win next time — if they organize themselves a bit better. The fact that, increasingly, whether your cause is heard or not may have more to do with whether you can find the fee to buy the services of the best professional lobbyist available rather than with the worthiness of your cause has done little to shake the pluralist faith in the value of the pressure group system as an essential component of liberal democracy. Neither has the revelation that whether you are found guilty or innocent of a crime has more to do with whether you can find the fee to buy the services of the best lawyer available than with whether you actually committed the crime or not. The pressure group system may have as little to do with liberal democracy as the court system has to do with justice: but a widespread belief in both serves important symbolic functions.
B. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

I Definitions of the Basic Unit of Analysis.

In the pressure group literature there was a high degree of definitional uniformity. Writers differed over whether what they were talking about should be called a pressure group, an interest group or a lobby group but, whatever label they attached, they were all talking about the same thing. With social movements, the reverse is the case: the term social movement is attached to a range of phenomena which do, however, bear some relationship to each other. This is a reflection of several factors which will be elaborated on later but are worth mentioning at this point: first, from the start, there have been two dominant approaches to social movements, the sociological and the psycho(patho)logical; second, much more of the social movement literature (more than the pressure group literature) is at what could be called the theorizing level; and third, there has been a much more systematic attempt to modify the older approaches to social movements in order to incorporate the kinds of social movements which developed during the 1960s.

The range of definitions of social movements varies from Blumer (1951):

Social movements can be viewed as collective enterprises to establish a new order of life. (198)

to King (1956)

A social movement will be understood to be a group venturing beyond a local community or a single event and involving a systematic effort to inaugurate changes in thought, behavior, and social relationships (199)

to Turner and Killian (1957)

A collectivity acting with some continuity to promote or resist a change in the society or group of which it is a part (200)

to Toch (1965)

A social movement represents an effort by a large number of people to solve collectively a problem they feel they have in common. (201)

Zald and Ash (1969)

A social movement is a purposive and collective attempt of a number of people to change individuals or societal institutions and structures. (202)

Wilson (1973)

A social movement is a conscious, collective, organized attempt to bring about or resist large scale change in the social order by non institutional means. (203)

and finally Traugott (1978) who is very concerned to shake the study of social movements free


of its very broadly defined ‘collective behaviour’ origins

Use of the two distinguishing criteria — positive solidarity and an anti institutional orientation — would define a field of study concerned exclusively with social movements. (204)

If we look for the common denominators amongst these and other definitions of social movements we find that social movements involve numbers of people collectively trying to change something in the society of which they are a part. Broadly speaking, the numbers of people involved are usually large, and the methods used to bring about the changes sought can range from “the expression of a preference for a change” (205), having “socially shared demands for change” (206) through pursuing an objective which (inadvertently ?) “affects and shapes the social order” (207) to “ any means, not excluding violence, illegality, revolution or withdrawal into ‘utopian’ community”. (208) What it is that these social movements seek to change ranges from Zald’s and Ash’s “individuals or societal institutions and structures”, (209) Turner’s and Killian’s “society or group of which it is part”, (210) King’s “thought, behavior, and social relationships” (211) through to Heberle’s creation of “an entirely new order”. (212)

What is particularly noticeable if we look at how definitions of social movements have changed over time is the growing reluctance to continue to regard social movements as just another type of ‘collective behaviour’. Orrin Klapp’s Currents of Unrest, subtitled An Introduction to Collective Behavior, published in 1972 with its chapters on ‘Crowd Behavior’, ‘Mass Contagions’, ‘Gossip, Rumor, and Talk’, ‘Fashion and Fad as Style Search’ and ‘Meaning Seeking Movements’, (213) stands out as an exception to the direction the bulk of the more recent literature seems to be taking. More typical of this new direction are first, the increasing frequency with which adjectives such as ‘purposive’, ‘conscious’, or ‘deliberate’, are used to qualify the words collective enterprise or collective behaviour, and second, the increasing (re)consideration given to the ideological dimension of social movements. Both can be seen as attempts to much more clearly set social movements apart from the general field of collective behaviour. (214)

While it is most common to see social movements linked to large scale changes to the ‘social order’, or to see some reference to the changes sought being ‘fundamental’ there is still a significant part of the literature which distinguishes between reform social movements and revolutionary social movements. (215) Such a distinction (which is based on the same criteria as I delineated in Chapter I) clearly envisages some social movements seeking changes which can be accommodated within the existing social order as well as social movements which seek changes to that order.

(209) ZALD, Mayer and ASH, Roberta: op. cit. p 464.
(211) KING, C. Wendell: op. cit. p 27.
Social movements, as they are conceived of by the literature are: purposive collective attempts by a large number of people to promote changes to some major part of or the entire, social order.

II Organizing Concepts.


That the collective behaviour which characterizes social movements should be purposive in the sense of collective purpose is an important attempt to separate out social movements from two other phenomena which, in the older literature, were considered to be closely related — trends or fashions and panics or crowds.

Social movements are conscious, purposive attempts to bring about change. This part of the definition is important because not all collective episodes which affect social change are the results of planning. Social movements must be distinguished from mere aggregate action, such as a run on a bank or a collapse of the stock market, in which change takes place by accident. They must be marked off even more clearly from changes which are the result of mass action, such as a rise in the birth rate, but which are clearly not consciously collective attempts to achieve the actual result . . . social movements must be understood as conscious, previsioned attempts to alter the social order. (216)

To the possible objection that a run on a bank represents purposive collective behaviour, the purpose of those involved being to withdraw their money as rapidly as possible, Traugott has closely argued that such behaviour is individually, but not collectively, purposive:

Panics presume no bonds of solidarity among participants, but the opposite. Once the cry of “Fire!” is raised in the proverbial crowded theatre, each person reverts to action based on individual interest . . . Although collective behaviour theorists persist in the attempt to explain them, panics are not obviously sociological behavior. Those caught up in a panic reaction respond to one another not in a sociologically meaningful relational context, but as objects, in an almost purely physical sense, aiding or impeding escape from danger. If one adds as a factor . . . an appropriate degree of pre-existing positive solidarity (imagine that the group is not a randomly assembled film audience but a gathering of relatives), organization (an army platoon), or leadership (a conference on civil defence preparedness conducted by an expert in evacuation procedures), then panic is correspondingly less likely to occur. Yet the very factors inhibiting the panic reaction are among the most essential preconditions of social movements . . . Bonds of positive solidarity are so essential to social movements as to constitute one of their defining characteristics. (217)

What Traugott refers to as ‘bonds of positive solidarity’ other writers refer to by other terms. Heberle writes:

Group consciousness, that is, a sense of belonging and of solidarity among the members of a group, is essential for a social movement, although empirically it occurs in various degrees. (218)

and Killian makes

A sense of membership or participation — a “we-ness”, a distinction between those who are for and those against (219)

one of his four salient characteristics of social movements.
2. Change.

The concept of change(s) sought is essential to social movements; it is their raison d'etre. Whether or not social movements have an explicitly stated ideology which acts as a critique of the social order in which they are located and offers an alternative order with guidelines on how to change from one to the other, whether the changes sought are to parts of the order or to the whole, and whether they involve what Killian refers to as “personal transformation” or “societal manipulation” (220), social movements, according to the literature, are characterized by the ‘uninstitutionalized’ means by which they seek to change things.

Social movements use uninstitutionalized means to achieve their objectives. A pattern of behaviour is said to be institutionalized when it is “widely accepted as binding in society or part of society” . . . There are many methods of expressing a grievance and pressing for solutions to social problems which have gained this kind of acceptance. These include petitioning, electing representatives to a deliberative body, making out cases to judicial bodies, and organizing strikes . . . Social movements also make use of them when it is strategically necessary. They are much more inclined, however, to step outside them and use unconventional methods to make themselves heard and to bring pressure to bear upon those who have it in their power to effect change" (221).

While Wilson is one of the few writers who spells out the uninstitutionalized nature of social movement means of change it is implicit in much of the literature: in that on the relationship between social mass politics and social movements, for example, it is called anti-democratic; it runs through the social psychology literature especially that, epitomized by Hoffer, which characterizes social movement participants as pathological individuals trying to work out their frustrations or resolve authority figure conflict; and it also reflects the legacy of the collective behaviour origins of the literature which links social movements to crowds, panics and lynch mobs.

Besides these literature linkages there are two major reasons why social movements are more inclined to use uninstitutionalized means. First, the institutional machinery for dealing with the changes sought may not exist, it may never be established because of the nature of the change sought, or it may not exist initially. It is difficult, for example, to envisage machinery being established to deal with the changes implied in the exhortation to ‘Smash the State’. In the second place, it may take time for the machinery to be established. Such a time lag is implicit in Turner’s often cited characterization of the transformation of perceived misfortunes into perceived injustices:

A significant social movement becomes possible when there is a revision in the manner in which a substantial group of people look at some misfortune, seeing it no longer as a misfortune warranting charitable consideration but as an injustice which is intolerable in society. A movement becomes possible when a group of people cease to petition the good will of others for relief of their misery and demand as their right that other ensure the correction of their condition. (224)

(218) HEBERLE, Rudolf: op. cit. p 439.
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The second major reason for the tendency for social movements to use uninstitutionalized means is a conscious refusal to adopt traditional methods.

The movement may spurn traditional methods of advocacy and representation as part of its total rejection of the status quo. It may have tried to use the old methods without success or, anticipating failure, decide not to even try to use them . . . It may be part of a wholesale and widespread rejection of the old political forms. The social movement, in its attempt to develop new forms of grievance articulation may, therefore, operate in a vacuum of social legitimation, helping to establish the direction in which such processes will proceed in the future. (225)

It is this second reason, the refusal to use institutionalized means which Traugott calls the antiinstitutional orientation of social movements and he further advocates that the field of social movement study be restricted to movements with an antiinstitutional orientation. (226)

To be considered antinstitutional, it is sufficient that the movement engage in or envisage acts that when successful bring it into an inevitable confrontation with the existing order. (227)

Crowd, and other forms of so-called primitive collective behaviour would be quite separate because they are noninstitutional rather than antinstitutional, and purely reformist social actions would also be excluded because they operate within, and in positive relationship to, the existing institutional framework. From time to time social movements may adopt what he calls an extrainstitutional orientation by which he means a sort of strategic withdrawal most likely to be adopted at a stage of movement formation or transformation:

The movement adopts an extrainstitutional orientation which, if not passive, at least avoids the sort of overt defiance that might provoke a hostile reaction from the forces of social control. It seeks to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the constituted authorities or to offer indirect and veiled resistance. (228)

3. The Social Order.

The 'social order' or some aspect thereof is the object of social movement activity. It is very broadly conceived in the literature to include structures, institutions, social, economic, and political, relationships, norms, values, attitudes and behaviours. It is the existing social order or some aspect of it which social movements seek to change with no requirement that the movements have worked out in advance some future alternative order.

4. Typologies.

As was the case with the pressure group literature, typologies of social movements abound. Most centre on the concept of change in one way or another but there are two others worth mentioning first. One has its roots in the social psychology tradition of social movement literature and this is Heberle's three part classification of movements according to the prevailing motivation of their members into

(1) the value-rational "spiritual community" or "fellowship" of believers in the truth of the constitutive ideas and in the practical aims of the movement.
(2) the emotional-affectual "following" of a charismatic leader.
(3) the purposive-rational or utilitarian associations for the pursuit of individual interests. (229)

(225) WILSON, John: op. cit. p 10.
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He does acknowledge that combinations of motivations are possible and that movements may change over time from one type of prevailing motivation to another but it still seems a rather unproductive classificatory scheme not least of all because he fails to elaborate on the implications for movement strategies or organization of such differences in prevailing motivations.

Turner's and Killian's approach to classification is rather different from most in that it is based on how social movements are seen by "a public which observes, interprets and labels the movement" (230)

The public definition affects the character of recruitment to the movement, the means which the movement is able to use, and thus, the strategies which the movement evolves and the kind of opposition it encounters. These features in turn largely determine the way in which members think of the movement and of themselves, the types of ideology they develop for the movement, and the aspect of the ideology and value which become most salient. (231)

On the basis of this rather powerful role given to public definition a fourfold classification is possible:

1. revolutionary — defined as immediately threatening to the society, its core members defined as vicious and its peripheral members as disloyal or deluded, forced to recruit heavily from alienated populations, denied access to legitimate means ... and opposed by repression ...
2. peculiar — defined as deviant but not threatening, its members defined as "odd balls" but amusing, forced to recruit from the marginal and unsuccessful, granted limited access to legitimate means, and oppressed only by ridicule;
3. respectable-factional — defined as being within the acceptable range of conventionality, its members being regarded as respectable but sometimes misguided, able to recruit responsible citizens, granted full access to legitimate means, but opposed by countermovements ...
4. respectable-nonfactual — similar to the preceding except that the movement meets no organized opposition and its objectives are defined as consensual.

The scheme is an interesting way of categorizing public images of social movements, but to suggest that movement strategies and ideologies are largely determined in response to public images is stretching the relationship a little too far; it renders social movements rather too passive. Monica Morris tested the hypothesis by trying to ascertain what effect the image of the Women's Liberation Movement in Los Angeles County conveyed by mass circulation newspapers had on the movement's ability to recruit members, to grow, and to act, at two points in time — July 1969 and March 1971. (233) For the first time period she found that:

There was a sizeable movement in July 1969, which had recruited, grown, and acted since its first early stirrings in 1967, in spite of a virtual black-out of information about the movement by the press in the area. (234)

By March 1971 the women's movement in the area had grown in size to something four to five times larger than it was in July 1969 and newspaper coverage (mostly neutral rather than favourable or unfavourable) had increased by more than 50 times. A correlation implies no causal realtionship
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and some of her other findings — that there were factional fights within groups about which the media said nothing, and that when the movement tried to have its revolutionary aspects publicized the media reported only on its reformist demands — would seem to indicate that the media may be able to define reality for the public and may have some influence on which of the movement's demands are given a public airing and support: the public image conveyed by the media is not, however, likely to have the effect on the movement's ideology and demands that Turner and Killian postulated.

By far the most common basis for developing social movement typologies is in terms of the orientation or goals and aims of the social movement. There is first the broad distinction between movements which attempt to achieve their goals, as Killian characterizes it, by societal manipulation or by personal transformation. (235) The former

depends upon the exercise of power in the society in order to bring about the realization of the movement's values regardless of the extent of popular support for those values . . . The movement which tends toward a strategy of personal transformation seeks success through widespread conversion of individuals. In some types of movements, particularly religious movements, all the strategy requires is that the majority of the people in the society believe in and practice in their personal lives the precepts of the movement. In other movements, conversion of large numbers is expected to lead to concerted action to change the institutions of society. (236)

Similar types are discussed by Morrison — power-oriented movements and participation-oriented movements (237) and by Gusfield — public policy or private persuasion (238).

This basic twofold classification can be carried further by adding to it the most common distinction drawn in the literature (of societal manipulation movements) between revolutionary social movements and reform social movements:

- A reform movement seeks to change some specific phase or limited area of the existing social order . . . A revolutionary movement has a broader aim; it seeks to reconstruct the entire social order. (239)

In addition, according to King, because revolutionary movements aim "at a complete alteration of the social order and reform movements aim at modifying only certain parts of it" (240)

- Reform movements tend to stress existing ethics, are therefore considered more or less "respectable" and utilize discussion in gaining the support or tolerance of public opinion. Revolutionary movements, on the other hand, often attack traditional ethical codes, are so lacking in respectability that they are frequently driven underground, and seek converts rather than public commendation. (241)

The same distinction is drawn by Smelser who uses the terms norm-oriented (reform) and value-oriented (revolutionary) movements. (242) Gusfield, likewise, makes a distinction between
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reform and revolutionary movements but adds two further types:

Withdrawal movements [which] are only indirectly preoccupied with producing change in institutions or cultural values. Protest movements are episodic rather than permanent forms of collective action. They take on significance as agents of change, as precursors of movements, in connection with a series of episodic actions. Taken by themselves they are diffuse and vague, often seeming to express hostility rather than to advocate any form of change. (243)

The line between reform social movements as characterized by the sociology literature and cause pressure groups as characterized by political science becomes very difficult to draw, as J. A. Banks points out. (244)

III Intellectual Ancestry.

The study of social movements is rooted in two distinct scholarly European traditions: the first is the historical-sociological tradition with which the names of Durkheim, von Stein, Sombart, Weber, Marx, and Tönnies are associated; the second, the social psychological collective behaviour tradition and such writers as Le Bon and Freud. Only very recently, again, mainly as a consequence of the politics of the 1960s, have the ideological assumptions underlying, and the normative implications of, both strands of thought been subjected to critical examination.

In 1951 Thelma McCormack claimed that

The analysis of social movements and social change presupposes three categories of data: (1) on the institutional structure or historical period (including events which may act as an impetus) in which the desire for change develops; (2) on the structure and development of social movements for change as well as those opposing it; and (3) on the motivation of those who participate in such movements. (245)

These three categories of data have been taken up by three different schools of sociological analysis each imprinting their particular strengths and weaknesses on their areas of study.

Structural-functional theorists have focussed mainly upon the structural conditions within social systems as such, which are conducive to the emergence of movements, treating these in terms of such sociological concepts as 'structural strain', 'societal disequilibrium', 'cultural malintegration' and the like. In this perspective, movements would be seen as explicitly collective, and sometimes concerted, endeavours to restore equilibrium within the system through some kind of reconstitution of social values and/or norms. Interactive theorists, while generally taking some condition of socio-cultural disorganization as their point of departure, would give more explicit attention to the collective interactional process through which movements arise, develop, maintain themselves and change. (246)

The third area is dealt with by

motivational analysis [which] has aimed at identifying the psychological factors which render people susceptible to the appeals of movements and which motivate and sustain affiliation with them. (247)
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Structural-functional and other analysts who concentrate on the emergence of social movements include the mass society theorists as well as Gurr, Gusfield, Heberle, Parsons and Smelser. (248) The interactionists are represented by Blumer, Lang and Lang, Turner, Killian, and King (249) and the social psychologists or motivational analysts by Cantrill, Lasswell, Toch, Hoffer, and McCormack. (250)

If the cosmology of Bentley and the pressure group analysts can be described as mechanistic then that of social movement analysts is organic and at times the literature reads as though the medical model informed the whole field: the emergence of social movements is seen as a symptom of some social pathology, strain or stress, the people who join them are maladjusted individuals trying to resolve their pathologies by participating in social movements which have their own life cycle of birth, growth, and decay.

It is from Gustav Le Bon’s (1896) characterization of the crowd that the worst of the psycho(patho)logical literature on social movements descends:

By the mere fact that he forms part of an organized crowd, a man descends several rungs in the ladder of civilization. Isolated, he may be a cultivated individual; in a crowd, he is a barbarian — that is, a creature acting by instinct. He possesses the spontaneity, the violence, the ferocity, and also the enthusiasm and heroism of primitive beings, whom he further tends to resemble by the facility with which he allows himself to be impressed by words and images — which would be entirely without action on each of the isolated individuals composing the crowd — and to be induced to commit acts contrary to his most obvious interests and his best known habits. (251)

Crowds, riots, and lynch mobs were at one end of a continuum of collective behaviour with social movements at the other. And if Le Bon is at one end of a time continuum then Eric Hoffer is at the other:

A rising mass movement attracts and holds a following not by its doctrine and promises but by the refuge it offers from the anxieties, barrenness and meaninglessness of an individual existence. It cures the poignantly frustrated not by conferring on them an absolute truth or by remedying the difficulties and abuses which made their lives miserable, but by freeing them from their ineffectual selves — and it does this by enfolding and absorbing them into a closely knit and exultant corporate whole. (252)

According to Hoffer it mattered little to true believers which social movement they joined because they joined out of individual personality needs rather than ideological commitment. Social movements as Toch, who offers a much milder version of this approach, implies, offer individuals the opportunity to solve personal problems not necessarily by confronting the problems but more commonly by acting out their individual frustrations in a collective and transferred fashion. The critics of the extreme psycho(patho)logical approach have taken three main lines: first, Traugott has argued that social movements should be considered as analytically distinct entities rather


than on the same continuum as a crowd because the factor which inhibits the ‘irrational’ behaviour characteristic of crowds is the factor which is an essential ingredient of social movements — bonds of positive solidarity; (253) second, the emphasis on individual pathology implies that the formation of social movements is not a legitimate way of trying to redress genuine grievances which a society has not yet recognised or is unwilling to recognise; and third, as Marx and Holzer point out, the subsuming of the study of social movements under the heading of collective behaviour has meant that “the intimate relationship between movements and ideologies was and continues to be underanalyzed”. (254)

Gamson outlines the effect that the politics of the 1960s had on what he calls the ‘collective behaviour paradigm’. Many of the academics who were working in the social movement area became involved with the campus activity of the 1960s.

They marched on picket lines to boycott chain stores that discriminated or went to the South to work on voter registration; they organized teach-ins and marched against the war in Vietnam... And if they didn’t actively participate, they talked to many who did. This was not a felicitous circumstance for the continuing acceptance of the collective behavior paradigm... [they] were hardly ready to embrace an explanation that would tar themselves and many friends. Movement sympathizers and participants... were quick to produce evidence on student activists that severely undercut any explanation based on malintegration and personal pathology...

If the collective behavior paradigm seemed so inadequate to deal with the challenge that one experienced at first hand, perhaps it was equally questionable for other movement phenomena normally viewed at a distance with hostility. (255)

That part of the social movement literature which sought the causes of social movement formation in some form or other of social dislocation, maladjustment or disturbance and saw social movements as safety valves or equilibrium restorers, as “merely epiphenomena which accompany inevitable cultural changes” or “the creatures rather than the creators of social change” (256) has also undergone a reworking; thanks to the work of Turner, and more particularly Oberschall. Turner helped to transfer social movements from passive ‘creatures’ of social change into active participants in it with his characterization of social movements as composed of people who no longer conceived of their social situation as a misfortune which called for charity but as an injustice which they demanded be corrected. (257) Anthony Oberschall’s Social Conflict and Social Movements (258) represents an attempt, centering around social conflict, to use the concept of ‘resource management’ to explain the emergence
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of groups and opposition groups.

Group conflict in its dynamic aspects can be conceptualized from the point of view of resource management. Mobilization refers to the process by which a discontented group assembles and invests resources in the pursuit of goals. Social control refers to the same process, but from the point of view of the incumbents or the group that is being challenged. From a societal perspective, from the perspective of conflict and change, mobilization in the broad sense refers to the process by which an opposition assembles resources for challenging the incumbents, and social control to the processes by which incumbents seek to protect their vested interests. (259)

In Oberschall's work social movements become one aspect of 'normal' political action, as another worker in what has been called the 'resource management school' has phrased it. Collective actions are conceptualized as organizational phenomena which occur, not merely because of widespread discontent with war, unemployment, or whatever, but because organizations exist which make possible the channeling and expression of that discontent into contented social action. (260)

While this new 'resource management' or 'resource mobilization' approach has been generally welcomed because it 'normalizes' social movements and allows people to participate in them out of rational self interest rather than some personal pathology, it does focus on social conflict, seems particularly interested in violent social conflict, and, as Marx and Holzner complain, "underemphasizes the importance of ideological belief systems and their crucial connection with conflict groups and movements". (261)

The third major category of data collection about social movements, that of movement organization and structure, the domain, according to Zygmunt, of the interactionists, has also been put up for reconsideration. Luther Gerlach, after looking at the movements of the 1960s (Black Power, the new left, women's liberation, the PLO, the Viet Cong and the ecology movement) has argued that the traditional emphasis on organizational structure which characterizes the social movement literature needs to be re-examined:

According to this powerful bias, centralized, bureaucratic organization with a pyramidal chain of command is efficient, rational, proper, and a sign that the organization is mature and effectively able to mobilize its members and accomplish its objectives... A movement, or a collectivity which does not have such essential structure is either considered to be unqualified as an organization at all, or, perhaps, if the analyst is charitable, it is described as an "organization in embryo", or a "rapidly emergent institution". (262)

The bias is indeed strong, even in the literature which has come out in the 1970s. Buckman (1970) for example, was pessimistic about the future of radical protest in America and partly because he could not see how the protest movements of the 1960s could draw increasing numbers of people and "neither their present tactics nor their organization (or deliberate lack of it) seems likely to bring this about... Outside the black forces, the radical groups are split and disorganized, so
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disunited in detailed matters that their overall unit of purpose is quite hollow" (263) or James Wilson (1973), whose work was referred to in the preceding section on pressure groups:

But consider the civil rights movement of which so much was heard in the 1960s and little is heard today; to all appearances it is dead or dormant. The NAACP and the Urban League, however, are still very much in business, carrying out essentially the same activities as before . . . If the causes represented by these [civil rights, peace etc] mass efforts are to continue to be espoused, they will continue through organizational efforts or not at all. Passions can be aroused and for the moment directed; they cannot be sustained. Organization provides continuity and predictability to social processes that would otherwise be episodic and uncertain. (264)

Wilson underlines one of Gerlach’s points: that a social movement which is not organized in the traditional centralized bureaucratic manner with a pyrimidal chain of command does pose a problem — “but perhaps more for those who wish to predict, control and destroy it than for those who use it to achieve their ends — not the least of which is survival, and the confusion of their enemies”. (265) It is not, he argues, that social movements of more recent origin have no organizational structure, it is simply that the organizational structure they do have is different. A social movement

has a definable structure which we term “segmentary, polyccephalous, and reticulate” in structure. Such structure is not inefficient but rather is highly effective and adaptive in innovating and producing social change and in surviving in the face of established order opposition. (266)

Gerlach’s work will be discussed in more detail later and it remains at this point to mention one further area of the literature which has been found wanting by the politics of the 1960s. It is related indirectly to the social movement literature through its traditional emphasis on bureaucratic organization and the concepts borrowed from the literature on bureaucracy to set up models of how an “efficient” social movement should organize itself. I refer to the literature on “collective organization” and in particular to the work of Joyce Rothschild-Whitt. (267) She bases her study on the range of alternative institutions fulfilling social needs in the areas of education, food, medical aid, and so on which are “one of the enduring legacies of the anti-authority movements of the 1960s”. (268) She contrasts the more recent phenomenon of “collectivist organization” with the traditional model of bureaucratic organization (derived from Weber) which is based on formal rationality and argues that “collective organizations should be assessed not as failures to achieve bureaucratic standards they do not share, but as efforts to realize wholly different values”. (269) The difference in values is paramount - “where bureaucracy is organized around the calculus of formal rationality, collectivist - democracy turns on the logic of substantive rationality”. (270)
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The literature on social movements, to a far greater extent than that on pressure groups, has tried to incorporate ways of analysing new social movements and has also led to new ways of analysing old social movements. It is in a state of flux, of Kuhnian crisis (271) with the new paradigm(s) still being formulated in sociology and fed into related fields as well; into the literature on social change and social conflict, (272) bureaucracy, (273) and organizations. (274)

IV Propositions about Internal Organization.

It is difficult to draw out from the literature clearly agreed upon propositions about social movements precisely because it is in a state of flux. In whatever areas of the literature, where there has been a considerable shift away from the traditional way of viewing a particular aspect of social movements, therefore, I will try to indicate the major differences by outlining both the dominant paradigm (traditional approach) and what I shall call the emergent paradigm(s), none of which appear to have established any claim to preeminence over the others.

1. Membership.

The major questions that the traditional literature on social movements addressed itself to in the area of membership was why people formed or joined social movements but the questions were very loaded; they were directed toward finding out what was wrong with the individuals who became participants. Rinaldo (1921), for example, defining a reformer as anybody who does not accept society as it is, claimed that

the drive to reform society, whatever its social direction, is a frustrated sexual need producing hysteria in the individual, which latter is expressed in the drive to reform society. The adjusted person is the one who accepts the prevailing institutions. (275)

Lasswell's Psychopathology and Politics represents a similar approach to the search for underlying pathology in the motives of movement participants as does Hoffer's The True Believer. Even what might be called the milder social psychological approach exemplified by Toch's The Social Psychology of Social Movements with its discussion of individual predispositions and susceptibility to the appeals of movements, illusions, frustrated expectations, the benefits of perceiving conspiracies, indoctrination in childhood, the need for absolutes, the search for a new identity and so on, all point to the conception of social movement participants as being motivated by non-rational, if not irrational, factors. Individuals do not join social movements to pursue their interests collectively, they join to collectively solve their individual personality problems; and they come from among the ranks of society's undesirables, misfits, deviants, sinners and the "inordinately selfish". (276) This orientation toward regarding participation as primarily non-rational or, as Horowitz puts it, "psychotherapeutic" (277) is reinforced by the attention paid to leadership types, especially those able to appeal to and manipulate the susceptibilities of potential members. Blumer, for example, speaks of movements requiring different types of leadership at different stages of development — the agitator, the prophet or reformer, the statesman and the administrator. (278) And there are different types of agitator:
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One type of agitator is an excitable, restless, and aggressive individual. His dynamic and energetic behavior attracts the attention of people to him; and the excitement and restlessness of his behavior tends to infect them. His appearance and behavior foster the contagion of unrest and excitement.

The second type of agitator is more calm, quiet, and dignified. He stirs people not by what he does, but by what he says. He is likely to be a man sparing in his words, but capable of saying very caustic, incisive, and biting things—things which get "under the skin" of people and force them to view things in a new light.

Similarly, Killian separates out three types of leader, each required by a social movement at a different stage of its development—the charismatic, the administrative, and the intellectual.

An important variant of the charismatic leader is the martyr. By his "glorious suffering" for the cause he symbolizes full, unreserved commitment and makes lighter by comparison the burden of lesser demands on other followers.

There has always been some acknowledgement in the literature that individual frustrations, feelings of powerlessness and so on may be rooted in conditions of social and economic inequality which in a sense both explain and justify those feelings. But the importance attached to psychopathological motives has tended to overshadow the roles that commitment to an ideology and the pursuit of changes that will improve the positions of the participant can play in motivating individuals to join social movements. Any notions that movement joiners have justifiable grievances which they seek to have redressed by participating comes into the literature at a different point—that which concentrates on the societal strains and stresses which produce social movements.

These have traditionally been regarded as separate but related areas, as Geschwender writes:

One may attempt to ascertain those factors which dispose specific individuals or types of individuals to take part in revolutionary activity or one may attempt to ascertain those factors which produce a revolution at a particular time and place. These two problems require different types of information. The former requires a theory of motivation. The second problem requires an explanation in terms of conditions which disrupt the normal societal or institutional processes operating at a given time.

Concepts such as 'relative deprivation', 'rising expectations', 'downward mobility' and 'status inconsistency' have traditionally been used to explain social movement participation at the macro level, Geschwender's second problem. There have been, in more recent literature, several attempts made to link the two related problems. Denton Morrison (1971), for example, takes the concept of 'relative deprivation' and looks at it from the perspective of individual
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experience (284) and Joseph Zygmunt (1972) suggests that the "problem of movement affiliation be approached through the study of the broader recruitment process, with explicit recognition of its socio-cultural context, its interactional character, and its typically longitudinal span". (285) This is one factor which has led to a shift in the way that social movement participation has been conceived; the second, as mentioned above, is not only the experience of academics in and with the student protest and other movements of the 1960s but also their studies of movement activists. Flacks, Keniston, Gold et al (286) and others produced data which discounted explanation of movement activism based on personal pathology: ideals, values, ideologies and the 'rational pursuit of self interest' were more important explanatory factors. Even within the traditional model, case studies did not produce results which supported hypotheses. Catherine Arnott, (287) for example, tested Hoffer's assertion that radicals and reactionaries are drawn from the social group — frustrated failures — and found, using feminists and anti-feminists, that it was wrong: neither group gave evidence of being "frustrated failures" seeking an outlet through any ideological outlet. In terms of background, attitude to autonomy for women, in relationship to husband and children, and in their life-goals they were highly divergent groups. (288)

Against the characterization of social movement participants provided by the traditional model of social movements:

**Dominant Paradigm:** Individuals who are drawn to social movements come from amongst society's misfits and join in order to solve collectively individual personal problems.

**Emergent Paradigm:** Social movement participants (particularly during the formative stages) will come from amongst a group of people who have looked at some misfortune, seen it no longer as a misfortune warranting charitable consideration but as an injustice intolerable in society, and demanded as their right that others ensure the correction of their condition. (289)

Oberschall provides a second strand in a specifically worded hypothesis:

**Emergent Paradigm:** "Participants in popular disturbances and activists in opposition organizations will be recruited primarily from previously active and relatively well-integrated individuals within the collectivity, whereas socially isolated, atomized, and uprooted individuals will be under-represented at least until the movement has become substantial". (290)

2. Structure and Organization.

The traditional approach to social movements portrays them as gradually developing out of some form of social unrest, becoming more and more distinct as
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as organizational phenomena, and proceeding through stages which are marked by an increasingly
developed set of rules and oligarchically arranged roles. One possible path then has the social
movement becoming institutionalized in two senses: first, its internal organizational structure
develops the characteristics of a full blown bureaucracy complete with all the negative connotations
—rigidity, goal transformation and displacement — attached to that form of organization; and
secondly, it becomes institutionalized in the sense that it achieves some of the changes it was
set up to pursue, its radical demands of today become part of tomorrow’s status quo. Another
possible path is that where the movement disintegrates because it cannot achieve any of its
goals; a third, takes the movement into withdrawal. The first path has had the approbation of
so much of the social movement literature, even some of the more recent literature, that unless
a social movement begins to develop along those lines it is not regarded as having much chance
of becoming a “successful social movement”.

As regards the structuralization of the movement, Women’s Liberation
has to find ways to cope effectively with problems of organization on
the national (and international) level. Such a large-scale organization
should provide a certain mobility and also make possible distinctions
among leaders and elites, members, sympathizers and followers, and the
masses. The importance of leadership, from both theoretical and practical
viewpoints, is known only too well. For the time being, the radical groups,
absorbed as they are in their utopian dreams of a leaderless society,
refuse to recognize the crucial nature of this problem. One should seriously
doubt, however, whether the movement can survive and succeed without
this sort of “leadership” in the broad sense of that term — a responsible
(yet moral and sensitive) representative agency for decision making and
ideo-crystallization. (291)

To return to the dominant paradigm, Killian describes the requirements for the development of
a social movement as follows:

A social movement emerges out of a background of general dissatisfaction,
concern, and unrest. This state is “general” in that it is shared by many
members of the society or group in which the movement develops, yet
has not been formulated into a specific program . . . . In the absence of
leadership, the most that can be expected to arise from such mass
dissatisfaction is sporadic crowd behavior, often simply expressive, through
which people give vent to their feelings but do not really attempt to change
the social order. A leader, or a number of leaders, is required to give the
concerns of the many potential followers a unifying theme. (292)

At this stage of development, the type of leader required is, according to Blumer, Lang and Lang
and Hopper (293) “the agitator” who can manipulate the feelings of dissatisfaction and channel
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them into the formation of the social movement.

The initial period extends through the time when a small nucleus of followers comes to share the leader's ideas and enthusiasm. Throughout this period, the organization of the movement is almost always simple... Initial members necessarily constitute a primary group marked by face-to-face informal relationships, and generally there is no more differentiation of statuses than the inevitable distinction between the founder and his coterie. (294)

The next phase, according to the traditional model, sees the leader plus small group of disciples begin to attract more and more members and problems of growth require two sorts of response: a means of handling the developing plans of the movement more efficiently — organization; and the development of a sense of solidarity and persistency, what Blumer calls esprit de corps and morale. (295) The organizational side will see the beginnings of a division of labour into functional specialities and a growing distinction between leader and followers. Esprit de corps is developed by fostering an in-group—out-group view of the world, a sense of fellowship, and the use of ceremonial behaviour and rituals. Morale is based on the convictions that the movement's purpose is correct, that its goal(s) are ultimately attainable, and that the movement's mission is sacred. It is fostered by the following means: the choosing of a set of major and minor movement saints; the development of a creed and sacred literature; and the elaboration of a set of movement myths. (296) Finally, solidarity and persistence are fostered by the development of an ideology which consists of a statement of objectives and purposes; a critique of what it is the movement is seeking to change and why; a doctrine of defence of the movement; a body of beliefs covering policies, practices and tactics; and the myths of the movement. This ideology will appear in two forms — one scholarly which is aimed at gaining the respect of the intellectual community, the other designed to appeal to the uneducated masses. (297) This is referred to as the "organizational phase" by King and the charismatic leader may continue through it or be replaced by the legal type. (298)

As far as politics is concerned, social movement transformation entails a shift toward mediated centralization, whatever the circumstances of origin... routinlzation tends to lead in the same direction — toward the concentration of the responsibility for making and executing decisions in a "managerial elite"... The phenomenon of oligarchization is closely tied to the process of structural differentiation. (299)

The final stage according to King is the "stable phase" when the movement settles down to getting on with working toward its goals (300); here Blumer's leader is likely to be an administrator (301). Taken a stage further by Wilson, the movement may begin to experience some success and public acceptance and become institutionalized in both the senses referred to above. (302) A large membership will reduce the informality of relationships between members...
and lead to increasing reliance on rules to regulate member behaviour; problems of recruitment become overshadowed by problems of retaining member participation in the face of failure to achieve the movement’s goals immediately; and the need to maintain a viable movement in order to achieve change becomes truncated — the means become the end — and “the shift in priorities away from goal-attainment and toward self-preservation prompts a heightened concern for efficiency and stability of organization”. (303)

This particular model of bureaucratization and institutionalization as the fate of social movements which endure for any length of time has been criticized by Zald and Ash as incomplete:

There are a variety of other transformation processes that take place including coalitions with other organizations, organizational disappearance, factional splits, increased rather than decreased radicalism, and the like. (304)

Basing their work in organization theory Zald and Ash distinguish what they call an MO (social movement organization) from other complex organizations on two criteria: they have goals which are aimed at changing individuals or society rather than providing goods and/or services and they are characterized by incentive systems in which purposive incentives predominate. The MO operates in two environments: the broader social movement of which it is a part consisting of its potential supporters, members and financial supporters and other movement organizations and the larger society, parts or all of which it is seeking to change. (305) Within these two environments there are three factors which will affect the transformation process which an MO will undergo: the ebb and flow of supporting sentiments toward the organization; the possibilities of success or failure of goal(s) attainment; and the existence of other organizations with similar goals which may lead to alliances and/or competition. (306)

Zald and Ash develop 17 propositions, not all of which are relevant to my data. Those stated below can be said to form one part of the dominant paradigm — that which concentrates on the options open to social movements as they tend toward institutionalization.

Proposition 3: Goal and tactic transformation of a MO is directly tied to the ebb and flow of sentiments within a social movement. The inter-organizational competition for support leads to a transformation of goals and tactics. (307)

With respect to the tendency of movement organizations to factionalize and split, they postulate:

Proposition 12: The more the ideology of the MO leads to a questioning of the basis of authority the greater the likelihood of factions and splitting. (308)

Proposition 13: Exclusive organizations are more likely than inclusive organizations to be beset by schisms. (309)

And finally, trying to specify the conditions under which movements will become more rather than


(304) ZALD, Mayer and ASH, Roberta: op. cit. p 462.
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(307) Ibid. p 471. Emphasis added.

(308) Ibid. p 479. Emphasis added.

(309) Ibid. Emphasis added. An inclusive organization requires little commitment and demands little participation from members; an exclusive organization demands much of members and permeates all sections of their lives.
less radical with a decline in member apathy, they put forward:

*Proposition 15*: If a leadership cadre are committed to radical goals to a greater extent than the membership-at-large, member apathy and oligarchical tendencies lead to greater rather than less radicalism. (310)

Zurcher and Curtis tested nine of the propositions developed by Zald and Ash against what they called “small or emerging social movement organizations” involved in anti-pornography crusades in two American cities. (311) The social movements they categorized as a Smelser type norm-oriented movement with definite social movement organizations which directed the movement and its campaigns. In general, they found that the Zald and Ash propositions were supported; those which were not were explained in terms of the “overriding operation of other variables” (312) a rather nice, but unsatisfactory, let out.

While the resource mobilization approach to social movements represents a departure from the traditional model with respect to what it has to say about why people participate in social movements, as far as its treatment of the development of social movement structure and organizations is concerned the approach represents a significant refinement rather than a radical departure.

The new approach depends more upon political sociological and economic theories than upon the social psychology of collective behavior. (313)

The influence of economics in their description of the constituent parts of social movements is especially noticeable in the later (by 8 years) work of Zald (with McCarthy):

A *social movement* is a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of society. A *countermovement* is a set of opinions and beliefs in a population opposed to a social movement. . . A *social movement organization* (SMO) is a complex or formal organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement these goals . . . All SMOs that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement constitute a *social movement industry* (SMI) — the organizational analogy of a social movement. . . The definition of SMI parallels the concept of industry in economics . . . The *social movement sector* (SMS) consists of all SMI s in a society no matter to which SM they are attached . . . (314)

That influence becomes more pronounced when they begin to develop their propositions:

Assume that SMOs operate much like any other organization . . . and consequently, once formed, they operate as though organizational survival were the primary goal . . . (315)

And further

Treating SMO target goals as products, then, and adherence as demand, we can apply a simple economic model to this competitive process. Demand may be elastic, and its elasticity is likely to be heavily dependent upon SMO advertising. Products may be substitutable across SMI s . . . This


(312) Ibid.


suggests that effective advertising campaigns may convince isolated adherents with high-issue elasticity to switch SMOs and/or SMIs ... Perceived lack of success in goal accomplishment by a SMO may lead an individual to switch to SMOs with alternative strategies or, to the extent that products are substitutable, to switch to those with other target goals. It must be noted, however, that there is also an element of product loyalty in this process. Some isolated constituents may continue to purchase the product (to support a SMO) unaware of how effective or ineffective it may be. (316)

The social psycho(patho)logists' claims that the ideological orientation of the social movement joined was irrelevant (which was rejected by the resource mobilization theorists) has crept back in through the economists' concept of product substitutability and the marketing manager's effective advertising campaign — campaigns can induce adherents to switch not merely from one brand of SMO to another (from one brand of whisky to another) but from one SMI to another (from whisky to brandy or milk). If the 'resource mobilization' approach looks at times as though it merely substitutes the terminology of economics for that of social psychology, then it may end up buying into as many difficulties as it gets rid off. It continues to assume that social movement organizations operate much like any other organization and that once formed, they act as though survival were the primary goal. This involves the continued acceptance, as the norm, of the development of a division of labour on the basis of functional specialization, a break up into leader and followers, and the inevitability of the emergence of oligarchic hierarchies. The normative implications are also there — organize in this particular way or perish.

Luther Gerlach's work does represent a real break with what he calls the 'powerful bias' in the literature toward regarding a "centralized bureaucratic organization with a pyramidal chain of command [as] efficient, rational, proper, and a sign that the organization is mature". (317)

By expressing the bias he also questions the value judgements of the traditional model which considers segmentation, disunity, factionalism, and the like to be signs of weakness or inefficiency. Taking Black Power, Women's Liberation, the new left, the counterculture, the Viet Cong, Palestinian Liberation, and ecology-environmentalism as his examples, Gerlach develops a model of social movement organization and structure which is completely at odds with the traditional model. The movements are neither emergent, incipient, nor inefficient; nor is it that they have failed to discover "an organizational strategy that would then turn [their] new consciousness, if it exists, into concerted political action", as James Q. Wilson claims. (318) It is simply that they have developed a structure and organization which is very different from that regarded as a sign of organizational maturity. This new form Gerlach calls segmentary, polycephalous, and reticulate.

(a) Segmentary: a movement is composed of a range of diverse groups, or cells, which grow and die, divide and fuse, proliferate and contract.

(b) Polycephalous: this movement organization does not have a central command or decision-making structure rather it has many leaders or rivals for leadership, not only within the movement as a whole, but within each movement cell.

(c) Reticulate: these diverse groups do not constitute simply an amorphous collection: rather, they are organized into a network, or reticulate structure through cross-cutting links, "travelling evangelists", or spokesmen, overlapping participation, joint activities, and the sharing of common objectives and opposition. (319)
He describes four basic ways in which movement cells split, merge, or proliferate: groups and individuals are encouraged to "do their own thing" which derives from that part of the ideology which stresses personal power and individual initiative; pre-existing socioeconomic cleavages, factionalisms and personal conflicts are carried into the movement and increase the chances of splits; movement members compete for a wide range of rewards which leads to continual splitting of cells and realignment of followers; and keenly felt ideological differences which are acted upon cause segmentation. (320)

On the polycephalous or 'many leaders' characteristic of the movements he argues that leadership is often situation specific: Black Power leaders such as Stokely Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver and Dick Gregory may have power over their own segments of the movement only and for a limited time. There is no 'movement leader' in the sense that most of the traditional literature demands: leaders disagree of movement goals, priorities and means; they cannot possibly know about all the groups which consider themselves part of the movement; they cannot make decisions which are binding on all or even a majority of participants; they cannot regulate the movement or its participants; and finally, there is no such thing as a card-carrying member of the movement. All of these features contribute to the polycephalous and the segmented nature of the movement. (321)

Gerlach borrows from the literature on networks to describe the manner in which some degree of movement cohesion is achieved — through unbounded network linkages. Ties of friendship and kinship may form the basis of a network between different groups or localities; individuals may be active in more than one group; movements have 'travelling evangelists' who move around different groups or localities; marches, rallies and conferences serve important reticulating functions; and finally, "a crucial cross-cutting linkage providing movement unity are those basic beliefs which are shared by all segments of the movement, no matter how disparate their views on other matters". (322)

Most of the traditional literature would not be prepared to call such movements organized at all or, if it did, it would consider the organization to be inefficient, or dysfunctional. Gerlach, however, regards the characteristics of segmentation, ideological diversity, and cell proliferation as "highly adaptive in situations of social change" and for several reasons. (323) Such a structure and method of organizing prevents effective suppression by the opposition — intelligence agencies have to infiltrate all segments of the movement to gather useful information or, as Gerlach suggests they have begun to do, develop a polycephalous, segmental, reticulate counterintelligence structure themselves. It also facilitates penetration by the movement into a wider range of "social niches". (324) Third, the multiplicity of cell types maximizes adaptive variation in a multifaceted environment which is constantly changing — even Uncle Toms can play their part. Fourth, according to Gerlach, the duplication and overlap which the proponents of movement centralization regard as inefficient, contributes to system reliability — if one group fails to follow through, for whatever reason, on a particular project, another group will pick it up or a new one will do the job. Fifth,

when a militant segment of a movement acts, a host of more moderate groups benefit. On the grounds that they agree with the goals but not the means of the militants, representatives of the affected established

(320) Ibid. pp 820-821.
(321) Ibid. pp 821-822
(322) Ibid. p 823.
(323) Ibid. p 825.
(324) Ibid. p 826.
order make concessions. In the end, overall movement goals are achieved. This inspires a sort of escalating dynamism. Today's radical is tomorrow's Uncle Torn, no matter what the movement. As one segment of the movement goes militant and attracts public attention, other segments are motivated to stop out and upstage it. Thus, demands or concepts which were once received as outrageous, soon appear as relatively moderate or reasonable.  

The final two adaptive features of the segmental, polycephalous, reticulate form of organization are related: such a form encourages experimentation with new forms and, with this system of trial and error learning, the chances of successful social 'mutations' are greatly enhanced.  

While most of the examples that Gerlach cites in this article come from movements such as Black Power, the Palestinian Arab guerilla movements and the American Indian movement, he argues that they did not develop the particular structure and form of organization they did in response to white control and manipulation — white, middle class, 'established' movements such as the participatory ecology movement and the charismatic renewal movement have followed similar lines of development.

Gerlach concludes with some tentative suggestions as to why the Black Power and student movements appear to have been the first (in advanced countries) to develop segmental, polycephalous and reticulate structures and organizations. A possible answer, he suggests, may lie in the (yet to be empirically verified) lack of experience that these groups have with large scale centralized bureaucratic organization. Such inexperience may lead them to look to what he calls their “premovement social structure” for guidance, in which case, the method of organization would represent the formalization, as it were, of the informal methods of organization and communication characteristic of these groups.

The difference between the traditional literature and Gerlach’s model is marked:

**Dominant Paradigm:** A social movement will develop from a relatively unstructured group of participants gathered around a leader into a clearly defined organization with a functionally based division of labour and an oligarchic hierarchy. With its institutionalization its primary goal will become organization maintenance.

**Emergent Paradigm:** A social movement will develop a structure and method of organization which is segmental, polycephalous and reticulate.

V **Propositions about External Activities.**

As mentioned above, three groups of specialists have staked out claims of interest and expertise with respect to three areas of social movement analysis: the structural-functionalists are concerned with the causes of social movement formation, the social psychologists with the motivations of movement participants and the interactionists with the internal development, natural history or resource mobilization aspects of social movements. This leaves that area of the literature which deals with the relationship of the movement to its environment, movement strategies and tactics relatively underdeveloped.

Much of the literature concerned with the causes of social movement formation is at a fairly theoretical level: competing hypotheses about the relationship between social movements and social change, and debate over the relative merits of the ‘rising expectations’, ‘relative deprivation’, ‘structural strain’, ‘status inconsistency’, ‘rise and drop’, and ‘downward mobility’

---
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explanations all refer to the origins of social movements. I will not consider these explanations here, only note that they all treat the emergence of social movements as a symptom of some major social disturbance. Both my data and my interest date from the formation of the Sydney sexual liberation movements not from the conditions which resulted in their formation.


It is here that the broad categorization of social movements into those which attempt to achieve their goals by personal transformation or by societal manipulation and the latter into reform social movements and revolutionary social movements is of some use if considered in conjunction with Traugott’s discussion of the range of possible orientations to societal institutions. On his criteria only some revolutionary social movements, those which adopt an antiinstitutional orientation, should be categorized as social movements at all. Reform social movements are those which are prepared to work within the existing social framework seeking to change only parts of it and likewise for personal transformation movements. The essence of the antiinstitutional orientation is “inevitable confrontation with the existing order”. (328) The usual characterization of a reform social movement as seeking change to some limited area of the social order, stressing ethics, being considered to be more or less respectable and utilizing discussion to achieve its aims (329) makes it difficult to draw the line between a reform social movement and a cause pressure group. The difficulty becomes more pronounced in that part of the literature which distinguishes social movement organizations from social movements. Indeed, McCarthy and Zald acknowledge that the distinction may be simply in the eye of the beholder:

While political scientists focus upon interest groups’ organization and not the groups themselves, sociologists largely have focused upon social movements rather than upon social movement organization. (330)

There is little concern in the social movement literature with the relationship between social movement tactics and public values and what little there is seems to be contradictory. John Wilson, for example, argues that social movements are likely to opt for the politics of disorder because they are advocating changes which find little support in the established circles and have to shout, and otherwise draw attention to themselves, in order to be heard. (331) Boulding, on the other hand, argues that:

when a nation provides even a minimum rhetorical respect to a value, such as social integration, protest movements can afford to be disruptive. But without widespread commitment to a value such as pacifism, successful protest movements must be calm, educational, and basically acceptable. Otherwise the protest itself becomes the object of controversy, which creates a strong backlash. Thus, whether protest brings a new legitimation or a new backlash depends, in part at least, on the values of the public. (332)

2. Strategy and Tactics.

In the older literature scant attention is paid to the strategy and tactics that social movements employ to go about trying to achieve the changes to the social order which is their raison d’être. Where there are sections of books or articles labelled ‘external development’
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or ‘the role of tactics’ they consist not of a discussion of the activities that social movements engage in in order to further their aims which might include pamphleteering, applying pressure to the institutions of government, holding rallies and so on — but of a discussion of how the external environment can be used to foster the internal development of the movement. Thus, for example, Herbert Blumer’s discussion of the role of tactics starts off with

> Obviously the tactics are evolved along these lines: gaining adherents, holding adherents, and reaching objectives. (333)

And when it comes to a consideration of the third line, we are told that tactics are too situation specific to discuss. Similarly, C. Wendell King’s section on ‘external development’ addresses itself to

> what happens to the movement rather than what happens to the society as a consequence of the existence and activities of the movement. (334)

The resource mobilization theorists, therefore, with their direct statements that the primary goal of social movements is (or becomes) organization maintenance are really making explicit an orientation to the study of social movements which has been implicit in the older literature all along.

Some of the more recent literature does, however, address itself to the question of tactics. The Skolnick Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (335), for example, considers, under the general rubric of ‘the politics of confrontation’ the methods used by the American anti-war, student protest, and black power, movements to try to achieve their respective goals. The anti-war movement used dialogue, civil disobedience, symbolic protests, marches, rallies, draft-card burn-ins, bargaining, provoking and responding to confrontation and violence, efforts to change public opinion by teach-ins, producing literature, organizing community projects and the like. (336) He discusses the use made by the student movement of sit-ins, pickets, boycotts, marches, vigils, and the use of negotiation and bargaining, public meetings, occupations, strikes, the attempt to block troop trains as well as a consideration of the effectiveness of confrontation tactics. Confrontation tactics, for example, are claimed to be good methods of arousing moderates to action, of educating the public, or preparing participants for the possibility of greater repression and so on. (337) And finally, he comes to the methods adopted by the black power movement — riots in black ghettos, the arming of black self defence groups, the fostering of black consciousness and cultural autonomy, political autonomy and the development of separatist black organizations to try to gain control of community projects operating in black communities. (338) And there is Saul Alinsky’s Rules for Radicals, subtitled ‘A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals’ (339) and Peter Buckman’s The Limits of Protest (340)

---
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What is most noticeable is that the literature on strategy and tactics, the methods of achieving change that social movements adopt, comes not from academic sociology, by and large, but from practitioners and popular authors.

John Wilson’s *Introduction to Social Movements*, with its chapter on the Problems of Tactics, is thus somewhat of an exception. (341) Defining tactics to mean both the set of principles concerning methods and techniques of action and those concrete activities intended to further the aims of the movement, (342) he discusses the kinds of tactics social movements use insofar as they are different from those used by other social groups. And, broadly speaking, these tactics involve the ‘politics of disorder’. (343) He draws a distinction between these tactics and those he characterizes as the ‘politics of order’, “in which reliance is placed on the courtroom, the legislature, and the mass media” (344) and the ‘politics of violence’, “in which the accepted rules of bringing about social change are rejected and resort is made to mob demonstrations, bombing, and physical assault”. (345) He does acknowledge that social movements do use both the politics of order and those of violence but argues that this is as a result of extensions of the politics of disorder rather than as deliberately and separately conceived tactics. The politics of disorder or direct action are characterized by three important features. First, there is “their purposely ambiguous legality”. (346) Sit-ins, building occupations, the disruptions of meetings are technically illegal but public support for application of legal sanctions is so weak that authorities acting in accordance with the letter of the law are more likely to be condemned for their heavy handedness than the law breakers. The second feature is their directness. If, as he suggests, “the object of social movements is ... to wield power without formal authority”, (347) then direct action is

The expression of a conviction that pressure of an immediate and powerful nature can be exercised through unmediated confrontation and that swift results can be achieved only by circumventing the channels of articulation and aggregation which usually process political demands. (348)

The third feature of the politics of disorder is that its tactics have a high turnover rate. He suggests two reasons for this transience. As well as serving instrumental (goal achievement) purposes, the politics of disorder also serve expressive functions for movement members as both outlets for accumulated emotional tensions and as means of fostering solidarity; they are therefore subject to fluctuations in popularity. The second reason is that government authorities are likely to try to resolve legal ambiguities to prevent continued movement exploitation of their weakness. (349)

The tactics a social movement adopts, because they represent the most public face of the movement, must be a fusion of both symbolic and pragmatic elements. One of the major determinants of the nature of this fusion is the relationship between the movement and the opposition it encounters. (350) In a relationship of ‘partial equality’ (e.g., WTCU) the emphasis...
will be on establishing a favourable bargaining position from which to operate and the movement will be very reluctant to use the tactics which might be regarded as illegitimate for fear of endangering the position they already have. (351) Where the relationship is one of dependency with the target group, the movement will adopt tactics aimed at convincing the target group of the legitimacy of its claims by education and moral suasion (e.g., the early US civil rights movement). (352) Finally, where the target group dominates to the extent of economic exploitation and denial of civil rights, the movement has to defeat its opponent and will favour tactics which involve some form of intimidation — harassment, obstruction and the like. (e.g., Black Power). (353) The only paradigm of social movement tactics postulates:

Social movements will employ tactics of direct action: which exploit areas of legal ambiguity.
There will be a high turnover rate of the direct action tactics employed by social movements.
Where a social movement is in a relationship of partial equality with the target group it will employ legitimate bargaining tactics.
Where a social movement is in a relationship of dependency with the target group it will employ tactics of education and moral suasion.
Where a social movement is subjugated by the target group it will employ tactics of intimidation.

3. Coalitions and Alliances.
That part of the social movement literature which does cover the question of coalitions and alliances is that which distinguishes social movement organizations from their broader social movement bases. The work of James Q. Wilson discussed in the corresponding section of the pressure group model is typical of this area of the literature and indeed Zald and Ash and McCarthy make constant reference to his work. It is therefore not worthwhile repeating the discussion.

VI Emphases of the Model.

The literature on social movements is very uneven and at present is in a state of flux. It concentrates almost exclusively on three sets of questions: why do social movements form; why do people join social movements; and how do social movements organize themselves initially.

The answers offered to the first question constitute variations on the theme that social movements are both a symptom of societal maladjustment and a means of rectifying the problem. The normative implications of much of the writing in this area of the literature seems to show concern less that the social system under consideration contains instances of major injustices and inequalities than that the system has not been able to process demands for change through the proper channels in time to avoid major readjustments. By and large, social movements do not therefore constitute a 'normal' form of political activity in the way that pressure group activity is seen to. They are ‘abnormal’ means called forth by ‘abnormal’ circumstances.

The answers to the second question offered in much of the literature reinforce the image of abnormality which surrounds social movements. The pressure group literature, in contrast, may ask who joins pressure groups but it does not ask why. Hans Toch and Eric Hoffer devote
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entire books to the question of why people join social movements while in the pressure group literature Mancur Olson takes a book to explain why people do not join large pressure groups. While some of the stigma which the literature attached to social movement participants has been removed recently, the question is still asked.

The final question asked of social movements has, until very recently, permitted of only one answer: social movements proceed through stages in development marked by an increasingly bureaucratized and oligarchic form of organization. By treating social movements which do not follow this path as either embryonic or inefficient the literature discourages recognition of socially adaptive innovations such as those discussed by Gerlach.

If the pluralist assumptions underlying the pressure group literature endorse moderate demands pursued through the proper channels by extolling the virtues and normalcy of pressure group activity, the social movement literature endorses the same moderation by stigmatizing social movements and their participants as abnormal.

**Note: Pages 346–354 do not exist due to error in pagination.**
C. NETWORKS

I Definitions of the Basic Unit of Analysis.

Individuals' social relations, both personal and intimate ones and impersonal and formal ones, can be thought of as strands in the webs of their "social networks". The networks radiate out from the individual to close associates and then to the society beyond. Conversely, society can be thought of as the complex mesh of all these social networks, an intricate lattice-work... The challenge to sociologists is to turn the "network" from image to instrument, to apply the concept in ways that will inform us about the nature of society. (354)

In the quotation above, Fisher et al point to the two major uses which the social sciences have made of the concept of networks. These are what Barnes and Mitchell, two of the most influential writers in the area, have both referred to as its metaphorical and its analytical uses. (355) By metaphorical use both mean that some writers use the term network to conjure up images of the essential interconnectedness of social life. Other writers use the notions of 'web' or 'overlapping circles' to the same end. (356) Beshers and Laumann, for example, writing about social mobility, use the concept of network metaphorically when they write:

we propose to view social structure as a network, and argue that statistical description of the social structure should be able to be interpreted in terms of a network . . .

When we view social structure as a network, we imply that social structure may be represented as a set of flows among points (or vertices) and the constraints upon these flows. In particular we want to consider all possible paths (or flows) through the network, rather than restricting our attention to adjacent flows directly between pairs of points that neglect possible flows over intermediate points. (357)

Both Barnes and Mitchell warn against confusing the two major uses of the term network and Barnes proposes a rule of thumb which would aid in distinguishing between the two: the metaphorical use of the concept is usually phrased as 'the network of social relations' and the analytical use as 'the social network'. (358) He might also have added, at the time he wrote (1972), that the metaphorical usage was more common amongst sociologists working at the macro level and the analytic amongst anthropologists working at the micro level. I say 'at the time he wrote' advisedly because there is a growing body of literature which is attempting to translate, with the aid of mathematics, graph theory, and sophisticated sociometric techniques, the metaphorical usage into an analytically useful concept. (359) I will not be concerned with this part of the literature
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for two reasons: first, quite simply, I do not have the mathematical competence to assess its worth; and secondly, even had I this competence, the micro level of analysis is more relevant to my purposes.

At the micro level of analysis, there are differences in definition stemming basically from whether the author wishes to place a particular individual at the centre of a network or not. Adams, for example, writes:

The individual's social network consists of those persons with whom he maintains contact and has some form of social bonds. (360)

and Boissevain

By social or personal network I mean the chain of persons with whom a given person, ego, is in actual contact, or with whom he can enter into contact. The personal network of each person is distinct although it may touch and very often partly overlap that of others. That is, they have several members or linkage chains or persons in common. (361)

Others make the egocentric aspects of networks less important. Barnes, for example, writes:

Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of other people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not. Similarly, each person has a number of friends, and these friends have their own friends; some of any one person's friends know each other, others do not.

I find it convenient to talk of a social field of this kind as a network. The image I have is of a set of points some of which are joined by lines. The points of the image are people, or sometimes groups, and the lines indicate which people interact with each other. . . A network of this kind has no external boundary, nor has it any clear cut internal divisions, for each person sees himself at the centre of a collection of friends. (362)

Others make the egocentric aspects of networks less important. Barnes, for example, writes:

Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of other people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not. Similarly, each person has a number of friends, and these friends have their own friends; some of any one person's friends know each other, others do not.

I find it convenient to talk of a social field of this kind as a network. The image I have is of a set of points some of which are joined by lines. The points of the image are people, or sometimes groups, and the lines indicate which people interact with each other. . . A network of this kind has no external boundary, nor has it any clear cut internal divisions, for each person sees himself at the centre of a collection of friends. (362)

or Katz

Networks are defined as the set of persons who can get in touch with each other.

“Getting in touch” may include indirect as well as direct interaction . . . Contacts . . . are individuals who comprise a network; they are the members of the network sets. Ego's network then, consists of all the persons with whom he can get in touch. (363)


Different writers introduce a variety of qualifying adjectives to delimit particular areas of networks and these will be discussed shortly. For the moment, what is important are the two basic ingredients of a network and these are: a set of units — whether individuals, families or organizations — linked to each other by interaction — actual or potential.

![Figure 1.]

Alpha's Partial Network.

Figure 1. shows Alpha's partial network with Alpha (A) at the centre. A is directly linked to B and D but only indirectly linked to C and E; A is in touch with B and D but can get in touch with C (through B) and E (through D or B). Network analysts are interested not simply in the fact that a whole range of units, individuals, for example, are directly or indirectly in contact with each other, a mapping exercise. The network concept derives its explanatory value from the (most often unstated) assumption that the linkage between A and B will affect A's behaviour and that the linkage between B and C and E may also affect A's behaviour — and so on with all other individuals to whom A is directly or indirectly linked. A, in other words, is affected by the links she or he has with other individuals and conversely, A can affect others through those direct or indirect links.

II Organizing Concepts.

A great deal of the literature on networks is devoted to sorting out the concepts and sets of subconcepts that are used in network analysis and most of it is devoted to a consideration of the characteristics of the links between units and their overall patterning.

As stated above, the particular units or 'nodes' in a network may be individuals (364), families or wife-husband pairs (365) or organizations. (366) The emphasis in the literature, however, (364) Most of the anthropology based literature refers to individual networks.

is not on these units but on the relationships or linkages between them. Taking the individual as the unit for purposes of illustration, a person Alpha has a total network which consists of the links to all other persons with whom Alpha interacts directly or indirectly. Those links can be based on friendship, kinship, employment, church attendance, hospital patient, supermarket shopper and so on. Such a network is obviously far too cumbersome for analysis and large parts of it will be irrelevant for any particular analysis. For this reason, it is usually one of Alpha’s partial networks that is extracted and discussed in the literature — the particular partial network extracted is determined by the analyst. Thus, for example, if we are interested in how an individual goes about mobilizing support for their stand in an election, as Adrian Mayer (367) was, we are interested in Alpha’s political links or the political use to which Alpha put some of her or his links.

If Alpha is in direct contact with six other people, B, C, D, E, F, G, then Alpha’s links with them constitute Alpha’s primary or first order star (Barnes) or Alpha’s bounded ego-centric network (Mitchell). (368)

Figure 2.
Alpha’s First Order Star

Alpha’s first order or primary zone takes into account that some of the people in the star will be linked to each other.

Figure 3.
Alpha’s First Order Zone
Alpha's second order star consists of the first order zone plus the links that B, C, D, E, F, and G have to other individuals.

And Alpha's second order zone is formed when the links between these second order contacts are drawn in.
This process can be repeated to the Nth order star and zone. It is probably the simplest aspect of network analysis and it has been used to investigate what has been called the 'small world' phenomenon by Korte and Milgram. (369) Based on the common experience of two people meeting each other for the first time and finding that they have a third friend or acquaintance in common ("small world, isn't it") Korte and Milgram investigated the number of links (or zones passed through) in an individual's network that have to be activated to send a booklet from that individual to another specified individual, unknown to them. In their 1970 research, they added an additional potential barrier by investigating how links were made across racial barriers. Such a distinction between zones is also at the base of Lee's study of how American women in 1965-66 found, through their networks of acquaintances and friends of friends, an abortionist — how many zones or links they had to go through to reach that particular contact who could put them directly in touch with an abortionist. (370)

Once these basic defining characteristics of network have been established, it is then possible to discuss the ways in which one individual's network differs from another. This is done in terms of a number of 'subconcepts' which can be grouped under two broad headings: the morphological characteristics of an individual's network which refers to the overall patterning (structure) of the network links; and the interactional characteristics of a network which refer to the nature of the links between the individuals in it.

1. Morphological Characteristics.

(a) Anchorage:

This refers to the point of orientation of the network, what I have referred to above as the unit or node. It can be an individual, group, family, or organization. The unit is important at least in terms of designation and consistency. Part of the controversy over Bott's work, for example, stems from the fact that later researchers did not really try to replicate her work because they used different units. At times Bott herself is unclear as to whether her anchorage was the married couple whose conjugal roles she examined or the individual spouses, and certainly, some of her followers have used different units. Aldous and Strauss, for example, sampled wives only and Udrey and Hall, sampled couples. (371)

(b) Reachability:

This is the term used to refer to the number of zones or links which have to be gone through to get from one unit in the network to any specified other unit. If a large number of people in a network can be contacted within a small number of steps, then the network is relatively compact. The dimensions of compactness are the proportion of people who can ever be contacted by each person in the network and the number of links which have to be traversed in order to contact others. Lee, for example, found that while 77% of the women she spoke to had had to go through only one, two, or three intermediaries before they found an abortionist, some had had to go through as many as seven links. (372) Korte and Milgram's small world experiment involved the sending of a booklet from 540 white people living in Los Angeles to 18 selected targets (9 white and 9 Negro) living in New York in 1970. They found that while
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33% of the white-to-white paths were completed through a mean of 5.5 links only 13% of the white-to-Negro paths were completed—and with a mean of 5.9 links. (373) In addition, the number of links in the white-to-Negro paths which were on the white side of the racial barrier were usually much higher than those on the Negro side; (374) in other words, out of a mean of 5.9 links traversed between white and Negro, usually four or five were from white-to-white and only one from white-to-Negro.

The reachability of a network is important in terms of the effect it can have on the transmission of information, and the collection of information. The transmission of gossip is a case in point: the greater the number of links traversed, the more likely is it that distortion of the original message will occur as each individual forgets some parts, adds their own embellishment and so on. The party game which involves a long queue of people asked to transmit a sentence in whispers from one person to the next is an everyday example of the effects of the number of links on what is being transmitted: “Send reinforcements we’re going to advance” ends up “Send three and fourpence we’re going to a dance”.

(c) Density:

There is more than the average amount of confusion in the network literature over the use of the term density. It refers to the extent to which links which could possibly exist among people in a network do in fact exist.

![Network with 100% of Maximum Possible Density](image)
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When Bott talks about loose-knit and close-knit networks she is really talking about networks of low and high density. She also uses the term “connectedness” to refer to density when in fact she is talking about reachability as conceptualized above. What Bott studied was the relationship between conjugal role segregation (the division of labour between wife and husband in the home) and high (close-knit) and low (loose-knit) density of the first order network zones. She did find a relationship: that highly segregated conjugal roles went with high density networks and joint conjugal roles went with low density networks. Bott’s study has been criticized on several grounds: most importantly, that she made an unwarranted causal leap — she claimed that it was the density of the network which determined the nature of the conjugal role segregation. Failing, for example, has argued that it would have been equally legitimate to ask how the relationship between the spouses affected their external networks and he did just that with his own data. (375) Udry and Hall tried to replicate Bott’s study in America with middle-class middle-aged couples and found that their results did not match hers. (376) Aldous and Strauss found that Bott’s hypothesis was confirmed by their sample of farm women but not amongst urban women (377) and Cubitt, trying to account for the discrepancies between the various conjugal role studies, pointed to an important factor rarely taken into consideration — that in an overall network of low density, there may be knots of high density. (378) The possibility of distinguishing knots of density in networks makes it possible to delineate cliques (areas of 100% density) and clusters (areas of high, but less than 100% density).

Figure 8.
Low Density Network with Knots of High (Cluster) Density and Maximum (Clique) Density.
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Epstein (379) refers to these relatively dense zones as Alpha’s “effective networks”, those people with whom Alpha interacts most frequently and most regularly and who are also likely to interact with each other. It is amongst these relatively dense zones of a network that norm enforcement is likely to be most effective. Studies of community elites and conceptions of a (non-conspiratorial) ruling class rest implicitly on the notion of the existence of relatively dense zones in networks within wider social networks. Kadushin’s study of the friends and supporters of psychotherapy (380) which showed how the decisions of individuals to enter psychotherapy were based on discussions and influence among an informal group of people who had an interest in psychotherapy amongst other things, in common, relies on this notion. In a later paper (381) he makes more explicit the value he sees in studying elites by adopting a network approach.

(d) Range:
The range or span of a network refers to the heterogeneity of the individuals with whom Alpha is in contact directly. An individual who is in touch directly with other individuals in a wide variety of capacities—academics, doctors, criminals, company directors, politicians, and plumbers—is said to have a network of wider range or span than another individual whose contacts are restricted to say academics, company directors, and doctors. Boissevain (382) calls the individual who specializes in maintaining as wide a range of network contacts as possible for instrumental purposes (i.e., profit) a broker.

(e) Criticality:
This refers to the extent to which an individual or number of individuals are crucial to a network in the sense that they either connect several individuals in a network other than through Alpha thus providing additional bonds between them or in the sense that they provide the only link for Alpha to other individuals.

![Figure 9. Beta is Crucial Because of Links with other Members of Alpha's Network](image)

![Figure 10. Beta is Crucial to Alpha Because it is Only through Beta that Alpha Can Reach the Cluster](image)
If, for example, the cluster is a public service department in which Beta but not Alpha works, then if Alpha wants to get information out of that department the only link to it is through Beta. If Beta leaves their job, Alpha’s source of information dries up until such time as a new link can be forged. Beta is thus in a powerful position, that of being an information gate-keeper.

2. Interactional Characteristics.

(a) Content:

This refers to the meanings which persons in the network attribute to their relationships with each other. Content refers to two sorts of attributions: the role relationships between any two or more individuals in a network and the nature of any particular interaction between them. The first refers to the fact that individuals, by virtue of their participation in various fields of activity, have sets of role relationships; they interact as neighbours, kin, work colleagues, church attenders and so on. The second refers to the particular purposes to which the links in any particular interaction are put: an individual may exchange gossip with a neighbour but not a fellow church goer, or call on only some parts of their network for particular purposes. In this respect, Chrisman (384) following Parsons distinguishes between the instrumental and the expressive orientations of networks.

In the first instance, if the link between two individuals has only one exchange content, it is referred to as uniplex or a single stranded link. Alpha and Beta may interact only as workmates, for example. Where individuals are linked by more than one exchange content the links are referred to as multiplex or multi-stranded. Alpha and Beta may be sisters who are also workmates. Boissevain (385) uses the image of a hand fan with all the blades converging on one point, Alpha, and with each blade seen as a partial network consisting of different activity fields to illustrate the difference between uni- and multi-plexity. The fan half closed indicates a few fields of activity with a great degree of overlap, the characteristic arrangement of roles in a small community where the mayor may also be the community doctor and the coach of the soft ball team. Here the relationships are few and multi-stranded. The fan fully open characterizes the relationships of more complex societies where the bulk of Alpha’s linkages are uniplex and there is very little role overlap. The mayor, the doctor and the soft ball coach are likely to be different individuals. It is one of the ways, according to Frankenberg, (386), to distinguish between rural and urban societies.

The content of network relationships can be important in a negative sense too. One of the most interesting findings to come out of Lee’s study of American women seeking an abortion was the links the women did not activate in their search. They did not seek information across authority lines (from employers, teachers and so on) nor from people they did not know very well and, by and large, not from kin. (387) Multiplex links between individuals in a network are represented diagramatically (as far as is feasible) by multiple lines linking the nodes.
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(d) Directedness:

This refers to whether the links between individuals are reciprocal or one way and is represented diagrammatically by arrows. It is also referred to in some parts of the literature as symmetry. Thus, for example, a friend-friend link is symmetrical while an employer-employee or doctor-patient relationship is asymmetrical. The importance of symmetry or directedness is obvious for networks based on information exchange, norm enforcement and so on and it is one way to conceive of power relationships. In Adrian Mayer's study of political mobilization in Dewa the candidate standing for election activated a wide range of linkages which were based outwardly on kinship, political party, religious sect, occupation, sports affiliation and so on; all inward linkages to the candidate were based on providing political support for the candidate. (388)

Katz (389) uses the notion of 'riders' in a way which illustrates clearly how anticipated and unacceptable asymmetry may enter into an individual's calculations of whether or not to activate a particular link in a network for a particular purpose. The individual who prefers to go to a bank for a loan for which they will have to pay a high interest rate rather than ask a family member for an interest free loan because of the riders (demands for increased contact, for example) the family member may attach is, according to Katz, calculating the cost of anticipated asymmetry. There are always people one will not ask for help because the cost of that help is too high — 'more trouble than it is worth'.

(c) Durability:

This refers to the persistence of links between individuals through time. The links between individuals can lay dormant for years and be activated for specific purposes and only infrequently: families which gather only for weddings, funerals and the like are evidence of this as are reunion dinners and 'the one day of the year' rituals. The durability of relationships in networks is important in studies of geographic or social mobility where links in old networks may persist or be 'allowed' (or encouraged) to lapse and new links forged.

(d) Frequency:

This refers to the number and regularity of contacts between the individuals in a network. Taken alone, it may be of little value in explaining anything: the bus driver we speak to every day is likely to be less important than the sister we see once a year.

(e) Intensity:

The intensity or strength of links between individuals in a network refers to the "degree to which individuals are prepared to honour obligations, or feel free to exercise the rights implied in their link to some other person". (390) While there would appear to be some intuitive support for the idea that strong links in an individual's network will be more important than weak links, cognizance must be taken of the purpose to which the link is going to be activated as Lee's study illustrates. Similarly, Granovetter (391) in his study of how professional, technical and managerial workers found new jobs stresses what he calls 'the strength of weak ties'. Those who did best in finding new jobs were those whose contacts were occupational rather than social, whose ties with contacts were weak rather than strong, and who were in short rather than long information chains. (392)
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A natural a priori idea is that those with whom one has strong ties are more motivated to help with job information. Opposed to this greater motivation are the structural arguments . . . those to whom we are more weakly tied are more likely to move in circles different from our own and will thus have access to information different from that which we receive. (393)

III Intellectual Ancestry.

Networks concepts have been developed in more than a dozen fields, including sociology, anthropology, psychiatry, psychology, administrative sciences, geography, city planning, communications engineering, and several different subfields within these disciplines. The physical science and applied technical fields generally focus on electrical, mathematical, communication and transportation networks, while the social science disciplines most often are concerned with networks among individuals and organizations. Although there need be no relationship among the usages of the same term in different fields, in this case the general attributes of the term network are remarkably consistent across fields. This is especially noteworthy, since individuals using network concepts in any one field are often unaware of the concepts' use in other fields; there is little if any cross indexing among fields. The fact that similar network concepts arose independently in a large number of fields suggests that network is a needed and potentially powerful concept for describing and providing insights into many aspects of contemporary society. (394)

Sarason et al might also have added biography to their list of fields which employ the concept networks, especially those which focus on individuals who were parts of 'circles' of one sort or another. Paul Roazen's Freud and His Followers (395) for example, implicitly relies on the notions of network relationships. In his Bloomsbury (396) Quentin Bell makes the network more explicit when he draws up a boxed diagram of the names of the people (unconnected by lines in his diagram but spatially located toward the centre or periphery) who were part of Bloomsbury at a particular point in time. While Barnes and Mitchell would probably regard these as examples of the metaphorical use of the concept, their translatability into analytic usage is made more obvious by John Carswell's description of how, as a boy, he tried to sort out the literary relationships of his parents:

My parents, for instance, lay at the centre of their own system and on the edge of others. Then I found, rather to my surprise, that two people who belonged to the periphery of our own circle, coming rarely to our house — and then separately — were in fact close friends dwelling very near one another's respective centres . . . I sought to contrive ever more complex systems of circles intersecting at the right place so as always to take in these people but not those. Some of these circles cheated by having wavy edges to bring in him but not him. It was all in vain. The wealth of knowledge from direct observation and supplementary enquiry was too rich. (397)
introduction becomes understandable. The sociologist's enthusiasm for networks stems in large part from its potential for mathematical manipulation of data. Its direct links are with sociometry and graph theory (398) and as such it represents an extension of one of the directions in which sociology has always aspired to travel — toward greater scientific rigour and mathematical precision. Sarason et al point to some of the reasons for the sudden burst of work on network concepts in sociology which occurred after the second world war. The two most influential factors were first, "the emergence of technology capable of analyzing the complex interrelationships among a large number of units that make up networks" (399), and in particular, computer technology and related developments in mathematics. The other major factor was that the kinds of problems that researchers were called upon to solve during wartime were ones which directly related to conceptualizations of networks — the movement and co-ordination of troops and supplies through linkage channels. After the war, industry called upon the same researchers to solve the problems which had begun to become more and more apparent as interdependence of parts or sectors of the economy became more marked. Again, the underlying conceptualization involved in organizational structure, information chains, movement of stock and so on, was networks.

As far as anthropology was concerned, the adoption of the network concept represented a clear and strongly felt break with the dominance of structural-functionalism in that discipline. Some indication of the strength of the hold that structural-functionalism had on anthropology is provided by both the frequency and the vehemence with which those anthropologists who have transferred their intellectual allegiance to network analysis denounce it. Over half of the papers in Boissevain's and Mitchell's Network Analysis' Studies in Human Interaction, for example, begin with a description of the inadequacies of structural-functionalism before each author 'comes out' as a network analysis enthusiast. In his Friends of Friends, Boissevain devotes his entire first chapter to an exposition of the deficiencies (almost, the evils) of structural-functionalism and ends it with an analysis of why the 'myth' of the value of the approach persisted for so long — the power of the professors. (400)

Structural-functional analysis by definition views societies as essentially static, moral corporations whose members' behaviour is explicable in terms of, if not determined by, jural rules. The behaviour of persons is explained in terms of their roles, that is, the rights and duties devolving upon them as the result of the formal positions they occupy in various institutions. These institutions are explained, in their turn, in terms of the contribution they make to the maintenance of the social structure. Conflict is usually regarded as dysfunctional, although some view certain conflicts as salutary as they foster the formation of groups and the demarcation of structural boundaries. Thus conflict is regarded as dysfunctional when it brings about change and functional when it helps preserve the status quo. Behaviour which does not conform to the prevalent norm is regarded as deviant. Change is seen as coming from outside, as impinging upon a system in equilibrium. Hence change, too, is regarded as dysfunctional, for it disturbs the postulated harmonious balance. It is viewed as something of secondary importance. (401)

Network analysis held out the promise of being able to accommodate three areas of interest to anthropologists (and some sociologists) that structural-functionalism ignored or denied were
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important. It was more amenable to analyses of change: as Garbett remarks, it is significant that
"its analytical development occurred, in the main, in central Africa where societies lack lineages
and where the mobility of populations and the fluidity of groups is a marked feature". (402)
Secondly, it promised to provide the answer to Homans' pleas to bring the individual back into
sociological focus: "network analysis is thus first of all an attempt to reintroduce the concept of
man as an interacting social being capable of manipulating others as well as being manipulated
by them". (403)
Network analysis would not only reintroduce the individual to sociological
focus but also provide the means by which the individual could be seen to be linked to the
broader society of which she or he was a part. And finally, network analysis promised to provide
a place for non-groups or quasi-groups:

the forms of social organisation that lie somewhere between interacting
individuals, on the one hand, and formal corporate groups, on the other . . .
the network of relatives, friends, and acquaintances, and to the more intimate
but often temporary coalitions which are formed out of these: cliques, interest
groups and factions of which all persons are members . . . They have been virtually
ignored, or at best swept, unanalysed, under a small fuzzy carpet labelled 'informal
organisation' . . . This is because social anthropologists and sociologists have so
defined their subject matter that they deal only with groups and enduring social
relations. Unstable collections of persons which are less clearly observable have no
place in this scheme of things. They do not fit, thus they are ignored . . . Moreover,
this preoccupation with groups has not only clouded sociological analysis in
complex (if not also in simple) societies, it has distorted it and even led to the
creation of groups through what has been called 'the group fulfilling prophecy'. (404)

Despite its relatively short life so far (from the 1950s) network analysis as practised by
anthropologists, and to a lesser extent sociologists has already developed two quite marked strands.
The first emphasizes the influence that the structure of the social networks has on the individual's
actions, the second, the ability of individuals to manipulate their social networks to their own
ends. (405)
The first strand, according to Banck, is typified by the 'conjugal-role-network' studies
which began with Bott's work, is associated with the Durkheimian quest for solidarity and
consensus, borrows from interaction theory and can be summarised by the saying 'birds of a
feather flock together'. The second strand is associated with the work of Adrian Mayer, Boissevain,
and political studies in general, is associated with the idea that social controls can be overridden
by manipulation and bargaining, borrows from role theory, exchange theory, bargaining and game
theory, and could be summarized by the saying 'politics makes strange bedfellows'. (406)
Garbett makes a similar distinction when he speaks of those studies which place emphasis on the
morphological characteristics of networks (Bott and the family studies) and those which
emphasize the interactional characteristics (political studies) (407) as does Aronson who distinguishes
between what he calls the stemming of network analysis from the structural-functional tradition
(network analysts who haven't quite given it up) and those which stem from an opticative
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(manipulative) tradition. He finds those network studies which set out in “quest for structure in the midst of flux” quite remarkable because they take anthropologists right back to the reason why, and the point from which, they departed from structural functionalism and “down a new road to equilibrium analysis, and ultimately, in fact, to social structure built with new tools”. (409)

There is a second and very important division which has become increasingly visible in network analysis and is quite fundamental to its status as a method of analysis: it hinges on the perceived differences between quasi-groups and corporate groups. Network analysts such as Boissenvain argue that quasi-groups are forms of social interaction in the process of becoming (corporate) groups. In part this stems from their taking the concept of quasi group from British sociologist Morris Ginsberg (1934) who defined quasi-groups as

aggregates or portions of the community which have no recognizable structure but whose members have certain interests or modes of behaviour in common, which may at any time lead them to form themselves into definite groups. (410)

In this view of quasi groups, coalitions, factions, gangs, action sets are quasi groups — they may disintegrate or they may develop into more structured and enduring corporate groups; quasi groups, in this conception lie at one end of some kind of continuum with corporate groups at the other end. (411) The implication of this kind of approach is to limit network analysis to the study of ego-centred networks or ‘lower level’ groups; network analysis was developed to accommodate this particular form of social interaction which structural functionalism could not.

Opposed to this type of approach is that adopted by Mitchell who argues that “the opposition of networks and corporate groups (or institutions) must be a false dichotomy: they are social phenomena at different levels of abstraction”. (412) What Mitchell is arguing for is network analysis as a method of analysis appropriate to all forms of social interaction at whatever degree of structuration — quasi groups and institutions — because it represents a means by which the same actual behaviour can be studied, different aspects (structural, categorical, and personal) of it abstracted and analysed to achieve different types of understanding and explanation.

**VI Emphases of the Model.**

For some of its supporters network analysis has proved a disappointment. Kapferer is one such supporter:

*The high expectations which have been advanced concerning the utility of the concept ‘social network’ have largely not been realised even allowing for the recent introduction of the concept into sociological and anthropological usage.* (413)

He claims that two main factors account for its present inability to live up to the high expectations
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held of it, “particularly from the aspect of developing testable hypotheses”. (414) The first is the undue emphasis placed on definition and classification and the insufficient attention paid to “the basic theoretical assumptions which should guide this work”. (415) Network analysis, he argues, is not a theory in itself, but “a set of rules by which we seek to ‘organise human perceptions’”. (416) The second factor to which he attributes the disappointing performance of network analysis is the double-edged sword of Bott’s work. On the one hand her work helped to establish network analysis and some of its concepts as a legitimate sociological and anthropological method of analysis and it is the single piece of work which has generated the most interest. On the other hand, there are a number of assumptions and propositions underlying Bott’s analysis which by their very nature “may impede the further development of network analysis”. (417)

Henry Irving too expresses disappointment in network analysis’ failure to move further than it has in a shorter period of time. He suggests that “this stunted growth stems not from the lack of theoretical investment, for there has been plenty of that, but from the reluctance of social scientists to operationalize the idea”. (418) He too refers to “the heavy hand of Bott’s hypothesis” (419) as one of the retarding factors and adds another — the problem he sees caused by the confusing position which kin relationships play in a network. He argues strongly that “kin relationships in modern society should be analytically separated from social relationships with non-kin” (420) and that much of the work on network density “has been rendered rather meaningless by the inclusion of kin and non-kin in the same index”. (421)

The current status of network analysis is ambiguous. Laumann and Pappi claim that network analysis consists “at least in part, of some rather old ideas that have been refurbished and made more attractive by being combined with sophisticated mathematical and quantitative tools”. (422) What is important, they concede, is the translation of the metaphorical usages of the network concept into analytical usages and this only really began in the early 1950s. The network analysis literature has not yet generated a body of testable hypotheses or verifiable propositions — unless one is interested in trying to replicate Bott’s hypothesis. There are three possible reasons for this. The first is the relative youth of network analysis — the first edition of its specialist journal Social Networks published in association with the rather appropriately named International Network for Social Network Analysis, for example, did not appear until 1978. A second possible reason is the nature of the highly specific case study material — it comes mainly from transitional societies in Africa and non-industrialized communities in Malta and Sicily. A third reason may lie in the very reason for its development as a method of analysis — to restore the individual to sociological focus, which makes studies highly idiosyncratic and, almost by nature, non-generalizable.

While there are no propositions derivable from the literature about the internal developments and external activities of networks — indeed networks recognize no such boundary distinctions unless set arbitrarily by the analyst — against which I can test my data, the concepts of networks
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as a method of analysis, of organizing perceptions, is usable with parts of my data. The fact that the data were not gathered with network analysis specifically in mind is of no import—network analysis has been, for example, by Boissevain (423) to look once again at some of the data collected by William Foote Whyte in his Street Corner Society and to reinterpret turn of the century data on the Mafia's activity in Sicily by Bök. (424) By applying the concepts and subconcepts of network analysis—the morphological and interactional characteristics—to my data or at least some parts of it, a different light is likely to be shed on it than either pressure group analysis or social movement analysis has to shed.

CHAPTER 5
MODEL TESTING

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The express purpose of most social science model building and theory construction is to enhance our understanding of the social world. 'Good' models and 'good' theories make sense of the past, explain the present and, when they are also predictive, reduce uncertainty about the future; in this way they are emotionally reassuring as well as intellectually satisfying. They reassure us that amidst the chaos of seemingly unrelated events patterns of order are discernible. A 'good' model works like a transparent overlay. It provides bold outlines which, when laid over a detailed map of raw data, allow us to recognize familiar signposts, see relationships between parts that seemed to be totally unrelated, reduce the amount of data we have to take into account by telling us which bits are irrelevant, and point us in the direction of acceptable explanations.

Good models, especially ones which work over time and place, are scarce and reluctance to discard any model which holds out some promise of working is perfectly understandable. Rarely will a new set of data render a model totally obsolete at one blow and the temptation to try to modify it to take account of new data is very strong. But continued model modification carries its own dangers: at times the end product will bear feint resemblance to the original; but this is less problematic than when the modifications which are introduced to take account of new data change the model to such an extent that it can no longer accommodate the material it was originally developed to explain. The model modifier is often placed in a position somewhat like that of the Treasurer who, by constantly introducing supplementary legislation to close existing tax loopholes, constantly creates new ones through which ever ingenious tax evaders can slip.

The point at which it becomes less useful to try to keep on modifying a model than to throw it out and start from scratch cannot, unfortunately, be specified abstractly, nor in advance. Nor is it easy to determine whether the reluctance of social scientists to discard reassuringly familiar ways of viewing the world represents legitimate caution or obdurate resistance to change for other than intellectual reasons. Such resistance, however, is most likely to be strongest when there is no new model to replace the old one. The angry retort that is levelled at political activists who condemn all or parts of the existing system - 'well, what do you propose to put in its place' - is levelled equally anxiously at those who point to the inadequacies of existing social science models without simultaneously offering better ones; intellectual anarchy, it would appear, is as fearful a spectre as social anarchy.

In this chapter I propose to test the adequacy of three social science models by examining the kinds of pictures of the Sydney Sexual Liberation Movements (1969-73) which emerge when the models of pressure group, social movement, and network outlined in Chapter 4 are laid over the data presented in Chapters 1 and 2. What will, for example, Sydney Women's Liberation look like if we conceive of it as a pressure group? A social movement? A social network? What kinds of questions will each model ask of the data? What kinds of data will each exclude as irrelevant? What kinds of explanations will they offer for the developments which occurred? And so on.

Following America's lead in the sexual revolution, many Women's Liberation groups sprang up on the Australian campuses in the late 1960s. Ideological cleavages soon split the movement into the competing factions that exist today. In many ways it is misleading to treat Women's Liberation as a pressure group for it (or those who speak for the movement) have not attempted to influence public policy. But Australia's gay liberationist associations — the branches of the Campaign Against Moral Persecution (CAMP) — are pressure groups. When CAMP was first organized in Sydney in July 1970, it announced that one of its aims was to secure for homosexuals 'equal treatment under the law'; shortly afterwards it established a law reform subcommittee. In 1971 it organized Australia's first homosexual demonstration — outside the headquarters of the NSW Liberal Party during the pre-selection for the Commonwealth seat of Berowra.

1. Sydney Women's Liberation.

Thus wrote Trevor Matthews early in 1972 categorizing both Sydney Women's Liberation and CAMP as promotional associations. Matthews may be perfectly justified in arguing that it is misleading to treat Women's Liberation as a pressure group but he will have to do so on other than definitional grounds. It is simply inconsistent to argue that CAMP was a pressure group because, by demanding homosexual law reform and demonstrating outside the Liberal Party headquarters, it attempted to influence public policy and at the same time argue that Women's Liberation did not try to influence public policy — unless demanding abortion law repeal and demonstrating outside the NSW ALP State Conference in 1970 constitute attempts to influence public policy which are of an entirely different order.

On strict definitional criteria Sydney Women's Liberation would have to be eligible for consideration as a pressure group. It was an organized group of people who attempted to influence, by direct and indirect means, the making and administering of public policy and it became eligible when it began to lobby for the repeal of the NSW abortion laws early in 1970.

In pressure group analysis, Sydney Women's Liberation would be seen as a collection of individuals who joined together to pursue collectively interests they believed they had in common. Those interests, broadly conceived, would be seen as revolving around the desire to improve the position of women in Australian society. But only when and in so far as it pursued that interest by attempting to influence public policy does it fall within the concerns of pressure group analysis. So, strictly speaking, during the period under consideration, Sydney Women's Liberation was a pressure group when it demanded:

1. the repeal of the NSW laws governing abortion;
2. that free birth control centres be set up by the government;
3. that the NSW Public Service Board advertise its job vacancies in a non-sexist fashion;
4. that the ALP adopt a policy of one rate of pay for the job;
5. that the ACTU adopt a policy of equal pay for work of equal value;
6. that the NSW government reform its child welfare system;
7. that it have a say in the selection of the federal government's Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister.

And, strictly speaking, Sydney Women’s Liberation was not a pressure group (or is of no interest to pressure group analysis) when, amongst other things: it produced and distributed the information booklet What Every Woman Should Know; tried to change the medical profession’s treatment of, and attitudes toward, women patients; tried to change the church’s stance on abortion and contraception; acted to liberate the pubs and get them to serve women in the public bar; demonstrated against the supermarket practice of searching shoppers’ bags; demonstrated against the offensive advertising of Colonel Sanders; demonstrated against the commercial exploitation of Mothers Day; set up alternative means of communication such as Mejane and Refractory Girl and the publications of Words for Women; established its own systems of support and development in consciousness raising and radical therapy; set up the art workers group; and tried to influence psychiatric treatment of women by participating in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium on Liberation Movements and Psychiatry. Pressure group analysis will thus narrow the focus of attention to those activities of Sydney Women’s Liberation which constituted attempts to influence public policy; it will exclude as irrelevant those other activities which Women’s Liberation participants considered equally, if not more, important.

If, according to the standard typologies of pressure groups, a sectional pressure group seeks to defend or advance the interests of a recognizable section of society, and a cause pressure group seeks to promote a cause or idea which arises out of a given set of attitudes and beliefs, with the only suggested alternative the hybrid sectional-cum-cause, then Sydney Women’s Liberation is difficult to categorize. It sought to advance the interests of a recognizable section of society — women — and in the case of the fight for equal pay and non-sexist job advertising, there were clearly economic interests at stake — the most favoured basis for categorizing a pressure group as sectional. It also sought to promote a cause — the liberation of women — which, it was argued (most strongly in the earlier literature) would bring in its train, human liberation. The hybrid sectional-cum-cause which has been suggested, and the possible cause-cum-sectional which has not been suggested, in the literature combine the two types and simultaneously indicate a weighting of interests. Neither of these provides a satisfactory solution to the problems of how to classify Sydney Women’s Liberation especially if we look at the entire range of its activities. It was both a sectional and a cause pressure group and any weighting we might possibly give to these types of interest would be influenced more by what has been excluded from consideration on definitional grounds than by the proclaimed interests of the movement itself.

Because pressure group analysis does not simply say ‘Sydney Women’s Liberation is of interest because it attempted to influence public policy’ but more importantly says ‘Sydney Women’s Liberation is of interest only in so far as it attempted to influence public policy’, it narrows our focus of attention and at the same time pushes the movement toward the categories of cause-cum-sectional, sectional-cum-cause, or straight out sectional pressure group. Almost all of the movement’s activities which might lead a pressure group analyst to categorize it primarily as a cause group have already been excluded from consideration because they do not constitute attempts to influence public policy.

Given that pressure group analysis is more interested in the pressure that groups try to apply to the public policy process than in the groups themselves, it is most suitable to examine Sydney Women’s Liberation through its attempts to influence public policy.

(a) Abortion.

In NSW in 1970 to procure an abortion, except under very restricted circumstances, was a criminal offence. The climate of public opinion was, in general, in favour of abortion being legal only under certain conditions: where there was some danger to the woman’s life; where she had been raped; and where the child the woman was carrying was likely to be born with severe
mental or physical defects. Despite the state of both the law and public opinion, abortion clinics were operating in Sydney. In May of 1970 the Heatherbrae Clinic at Bondi Junction was raided by the NSW Police, several of the staff charged with performing illegal abortions and stood over for trial. These trials saw a new pressure group, calling itself Women's Liberation, join those (Abortionial Law Reform Association, Humanists) who had been calling for the reform of the abortion laws for some years. Loosely associated with student and New Left politics, the women who founded Sydney Women's Liberation late in 1969 were young, educated, and middle class; and they were dissatisfied with the scant interest in women's issues shown by the left in general.

Initially, most of their time was spent discussing matters of concern to women, but the arrest of the Heatherbrae staff saw them mount a campaign, independently and, for a time, in alliance with other groups, to repeal the state's abortion laws. As a pressure group, Sydney Women's Liberation had limited resources. It had no formal membership and was thus unable to establish the legitimacy of its demand by claiming to speak for a sizeable section of the population it could be seen as representing — women. Neither had it managed to attract as supporters respected members of the community who could have added weight to its demands; indeed, it appeared not to have tried to do so. In addition, it had to carry the burden of being associated in the public mind with lesbianism, despite the meagre interest it showed in espousing that cause. It had few financial resources and direct access to decision makers was non-existent. It had nothing — status, skills, information— with which it could bargain and was organizationally ill-equipped to do so. Besides having no formal membership, it had no formal positions of leadership to the occupants of which could be entrusted the job of speaking on its behalf. While it thus had no de jure leadership, it did have a de facto leadership made up of some of its most vocal and articulate participants.

Unable as it was to bargain with the public policy makers it had therefore to adapt its tactics to its resources. It developed, as did the alliance, a campaign on two levels. It sought to arouse public support for its demands by conducting a series of demonstrations (outside the courts where the Heatherbrae staff were being tried) and marches through the streets of the city. On another level it sought to influence state parliamentarians by inviting them to participate in public discussions on abortion and by trying to have a petition of 9,000 signatures presented in the NSW Legislative Assembly.

At neither level of its campaign was Sydney Women's Liberation noticeably successful. Its demonstrations were covered by the mass media but there is no indication that they led to an increase in public support for its demands. At the parliamentary level their tactics appear to have been counterproductive — for the first time in 56 years the parliament refused to accept a petition and its presenter was reprimanded by his party. The law remained unchanged.

Failure to Change the Statute Law: Pressure group analysis leads us to look in two directions for possible explanations for the failure of Sydney Women's Liberation to have the abortion laws changed: internally and externally. First, at its internal weaknesses: its lack of formal organization; its absence of official spokespeople; its failure to establish the legitimacy of its demands. In addition, it lacked cohesion, partly because it had no formal mechanisms for conflict resolution, and partly because of the multiple memberships of some of its participants. The former is illustrated by the fact that it was unable to settle on one slogan but used both 'abortion on demand' and 'abortion on request'. Had it settled on the latter uniformly, it may have quelled those fears which existed, especially amongst the medical profession, that doctors would be forced to perform abortions against the dictates of their consciences. As far as multiple memberships is concerned, while these would not have produced conflicts over the specific issue of abortion,
the simple fact that some women were active in one or more other organizations, which made
demands on their time and energy as well, undoubtedly weakened the effectiveness of the
campaign. Finally, Sydney Women's Liberation was unable to participate effectively in the alliance
of groups which operated under the name of the Campaign for Legal Abortion. It was unwilling
to relinquish its autonomy and was not prepared to compromise its position on methods of
organization and the style of the campaign in order to work toward the ultimate goal of law repeal.

As far as external factors are concerned we have to take into account the political context
in which the demand for law repeal was made. The 1967 opinion poll had very clearly revealed
that there was little support for abortion being made legal under any but a few special circumstances.
In NSW itself, the Liberal Party Government had also made it clear that there would be no change
to the law during its term in office. Moreover, the opposition ALP was dominated by its Catholic
right wing who would not countenance changes to the law either. In such a political context,
to seek to change the abortion laws was a futile gesture.

Partial Success through a Change in Case Law: Given that the ultimate aim of abortion law repeal
was to make access to safe, inexpensive abortions easier for all women, what are we to make of
the partial achievement of this aim not through the repeal of the statute law but through changes
to the case law which were embodied in the Levine Ruling of October 1971. The court system
has to be considered to be a part of the public policy process. Its officers, the judges and magistrates,
are meant, on the one hand, to be impervious to public pressure, but on the other, to ensure that
their judgements keep pace with changing socio-economic conditions. The Levine Ruling can
perhaps best be viewed as a reflection of the latter; by demonstrating outside the courts, Sydney
Women's Liberation was both an indicator of those changed conditions and an agent of further
change. Change was occurring more slowly than Sydney Women's Liberation was demanding, but
it was occurring nonetheless: from the 1967 opinion poll, to the 1970 refusal to accept a petition,
to the 1971 Levine Ruling and, the lapsing of Jim Cameron's motion to reaffirm the abortion
laws as they stood, in 1972. In 1973, another opinion poll, tackling the question from a slightly
different angle (3) found that 75% of Australians would mind their own business if they learned
that a qualified doctor sometimes carried out illegal abortions.

Given this apparent lack of enthusiasm amongst the general public for preventing doctors
from performing abortions we now have to explain why, in the same month (May 1973) as the
poll was conducted, the Lamb-McKenzie Medical Practices Clarification Bill was so soundly
defeated in the federal parliament. Newspapers ran more articles in favour of 'sane abortion laws'
than ever before and fed any halo effect that the changes in the US abortion laws may have had.
This time, however, the field of lobbying was not left entirely to the law reform seekers. The
liberalisation of community attitudes, the relaxation of restrictions in NSW and the existence of
the campaign itself, had provoked the formation of opposition groups, most importantly, the
Right to Life Association. In contrast with the Women’s Liberation groups which had very weak
interstate links with each other, the Right to Life was a well organized, well disciplined, cohesively
federated, single issue, pressure group. It was able to mount a very effective campaign against the
Bill, inundating individual parliamentarians, who were to vote on conscience rather than along
party lines, with letters and its highly emotive literature as well as personally visiting them and
demonstrating outside parliament during the debate.

(2) HASELTON, Simon: "We're Growing Up on Homosexuality and Abortion" Nation Review. 1-7 June 1973.
(b) Work.

As was the case with abortion law repeal, Sydney Women's Liberation bought into a campaign which had been going on for some time when it began to demand changes to the situation of working women. There were two major thrusts to its campaign: first, the demand for wider training and job opportunities for women and second, the demand for more equitable wages for women workers.

The demands for wider job opportunities for women initially received lower priority than the fight for better wages. Again, the early phases of the campaign involved discussions in groups and at conferences which acted not only to spread awareness of sex discrimination within the organization itself but also to provide focal points for the accumulation of a great deal of useful information. In August 1970 when the NSW Public Service Board advertised a series of jobs divided up into 'sex-appropriate' categories, Sydney Women's Liberation reacted by demonstrating. They marched to the Public Service Board to present their demands, not all of which could be met by the Board. After discussions with an officer of the Board, one of their demands was partially met — when the Board re-advertised the positions women were excluded from applying for fewer positions than they had been before. Direct lobbying over a short period of time was partially successful. Given that Sydney Women's Liberation was the same organizationally deficient group which was ineffective in achieving its demands for abortion law repeal, we have to look outside it for possible explanations for its success in this instance. The issue of sexist advertising and of equal employment opportunities for women can hardly be said to have been an issue on the public policy agenda; it had barely begun to seep through into public awareness. This very factor may have worked in favour of the demand being met: no clear political lines had been drawn on the issue, no opposition developed and not enough time allowed for possible unwanted consequences to have been worked out. In addition, it was a demand made of part of the bureaucracy for changes in administration rather than of the legislature for the formal formulation of a policy. It is also possible that the employment situation which prevailed in 1970 (under full employment) was such that the Public Service Board had nothing to lose by changing its advertising practices -- they did have to re-advertise the jobs. It cost them nothing to accede to the demand in another sense: by changing the sex classification of some of the jobs they avoided further embarrassment at the hands of the demonstrators while still controlling the selection procedures which determined (in secret) who ultimately got the jobs being advertised.

In its campaign for better wages for women workers, Sydney Women's Liberation participated in indirect lobbying, through the ALP and the ACTU, and in an education campaign designed to gain public support for the issue. It did not, however adopt a consistent approach in terms of the demand it was making. When it lobbied the Conference of the NSW ALP in June 1970, it demanded 'one rate for the job' on the grounds that equal pay for work of equal value undervalued women's work. When it lobbied the Australian Council of Trade Unions in August 1971, it demanded that the ACTU fight for, amongst 16 other things, 'one rate of pay for every job irrespective of age and sex'. When it came to the public education campaign which reached its high point late in 1972, while the Arbitration Commission was hearing both a National Wages and an Equal Pay Case, the demand was for equal pay.

In December 1972 the Commission granted equal pay to women which was to be phased in over three years. It would be naïve to argue that the Commission responded to the pressure applied by women's organizations alone. There had been a change of government federally and the new ALP Government had put its own case for the granting of equal pay before the Commission which it had asked to re-open its hearings specifically for that purpose.
(c) Child Welfare.

The deplorable conditions under which young girls who fell into the hands of the NSW government's child welfare system lived was brought to the attention of Sydney Women's Liberation by Bessie Guthrie in 1972. Again, the initial stages of the campaign to have the girls' homes run by the state reformed involved a great deal of internal discussion. The first publicity shot in the campaign was fired in August 1972 when the organization's newspaper, Mejane, published one young girl's account of her experiences of the system. The article was designed both to inform the public and to provoke the NSW Department of Child Welfare into action. If it would not act to change the system then it might act to censor Mejane which would thereby gain the publicity it could not attain off its own bat. The Department was not, however, to be provoked into making either of the desired responses.

In March 1973 Mejane published an even more provocative article but again the Department did not initially respond. Several months later, however, in August 1973 the Department acted to clean up the messiest parts of its own house by suspending two senior officers at the Parramatta Girls Training School. This was taken by the mass media as an acknowledgement by the Department that there was some substance to the attacks being made upon it. Sydney Women's Liberation was then able to use its contacts with television journalist Peter Manning to gain wider coverage for its campaign. Manning used the material collected by Guthrie and Women's Liberation to compile a segment (for a nationally shown current affairs programme) critical of the entire child welfare system. The television segment provoked a response from sections of the Department, from the Minister (Waddy) and from other sections of the public. Waddy denounced Guthrie in the Legislative Assembly on 21 August 1973 and, under privilege of Parliament, produced a statement from a child welfare girl alleging that Guthrie had dobbed her in. The girl denied — to Waddy and the press — the allegations. WEL and the Penal Reform Council of NSW bought into the fight and protested to Waddy, and several members from inside the Department began to express their own doubts to its critics.

In December 1973 Sydney Women's Liberation organized a demonstration outside Parramatta Girls Training School. The protesters demanded an end to the enforced virginity tests for girls, the immediate removal of male staff from all girls homes, the replacement of institutional care by a cottage system, the immediate closure of the maximum security prison at Hay, and an end to punishment for actual or alleged lesbianism amongst the girls. A similar demonstration was organized outside Bidura Girls Home in Glebe in 1974, and again it attracted media coverage. By August 1974 some sort of victory could be claimed: Hay had been closed down, Parramatta had been reformed, Bidura was to undergo substantial changes, and compulsory virginity tests had ceased.

The campaign against the Child Welfare system illustrates very clearly the type of lobbying which has to be done when an issue has not reached the public policy agenda and where the changes sought are major. First, the issue has to be made part of that agenda. In this, Guthrie alone had been unsuccessful despite her 20 year persistence. With the support of Sydney Women's Liberation her fight was assured a wider audience through Mejane and thence to the mass media. Only the establishment media could provoke a response from the public policy makers. When the campaign reached that stage what was then required was also forthcoming. The demands made by the organization were consistently expressed and specific, its accusations were detailed and


Although the campaign had its conclusions beyond the time period under consideration here coverage of it is included in order to put into overall perspective the stage the campaign had reached by August 1973.
well documented, primarily by Guthrie's work. The issue was one with which decent minded citizens could identify — the care of young girls — and it could be seen as the case of one group unselfishly taking up the cause of another group of people less fortunate than themselves — a tactic which the Right to Life Association later used to the full with their slogan of ‘Who will speak for the unborn child’ - the ultimate in self-helplessness.

(d) Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister.

Least successful of all its attempts to influence public policy was the response by a small section of Sydney Women's Liberation to the new Whitlam Labor Government's decision to establish the position of Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister. In response to newspaper reports of the promise of total support from all candidates for the job to the woman who would eventually fill the position, the Mejane group, without prior consultation with the rest of Sydney Women's Liberation, sent off a registered letter to the selection committee. It demanded answers to a series of questions about the selection procedures (for publication in Mejane) and promised the new government a 'maximum of positive non-co-operation'. Copies of this letter, together with a leaflet of more detailed criticisms of the position and of the applicants for the position themselves, were sent to the mass media for publication. Not only were their demands for answers unmet but the entire exercise was counterproductive — it produced criticisms of the Mejane group both from within the movement and from the established mass media.

In terms of the political context in which the group's demands were made, it was an ill-advised move. A new government had just been elected (after 23 years in Opposition), partly on its promises of social change. Its decision to establish the position of Women's Advisor represented a public commitment to improving the position of women which could only be applauded by other women in the community. It had already shown its 'trustworthiness' in this respect by re-opening the Equal Pay Case and arguing for equal pay. Before the selection of the successful candidate had even been made, let alone before she had had a chance to try to do something on behalf of women, the attacks of a small group of women on the position and its applicants could only be seen as the action of a groups of narks.

2. CAMP (NSW)

As was the case with Sydney Women's Liberation, on definitional grounds CAMP qualifies for consideration as a pressure group because it attempted to influence public policy making and/or administration. As soon as it included amongst its original aims 'to agitate for homosexual law reform' it so qualified. Once again, however, pressure group analysis is interested in CAMP only in so far as it attempted to influence public policy which immediately narrows the focus of attention to a consideration of CAMP's

(1) demands for homosexual law reform;
(2) calls for changes to those federal taxation laws which discriminated against homosexual couples and single people;
(3) calls for legislation to outlaw discrimination in employment on the grounds of homosexuality;
(4) the attempts to influence the NSW Health Department's treatment of homosexuals in state run psychiatric hospitals.

Pressure group analysis is not interested in, amongst other things, CAMP's: attempts to change the attitudes and teachings of the churches toward homosexuals and homosexuality for these were ends in themselves rather than efforts at indirect lobbying; attempts to change the attitudes of the medical profession in general and psychiatrists in particular toward homosexuals and homosexuality, again because they were, for CAMP, ends in themselves; establishment of Phone-A-Friend as a telephone counselling and information service; stance of non-participation
in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium

With CAMP's fielding of candidate Widdup in the 1972 federal elections, technically the organization ceased to be a pressure group because most definitions found in the literature stipulate that pressure groups decline to accept responsibility for ruling the country. Nobody, not even in their most adventurous fantasies, would have given Widdup the slightest chance of winning the seat of Lowe and certainly not of ruling the country had he managed to oust the then Prime Minister, so it would be a ridiculously rigid application of definitional criteria to reclassify CAMP as a political party with Widdup’s declaration of his candidature. Even though CAMP was not strictly speaking a single issue group (it had aims in addition to that of homosexual law reform) it is perhaps best to adopt the line that Matthews applies to DOGS, the Defence of Government Schools groups:

a group which promotes a single cause and which fields candidates in a general election . . . is best regarded as a pressure group that uses the electoral machinery as an effective means of publicizing its cause. (4)

As to what type of pressure group CAMP was, we are faced with a problem similar to that posed by Sydney Women’s Liberation: it was sectional because it sought to promote the interests of a recognizable section (homosexuals) of society; and it was cause or promotional because it sought to promote a cause (homosexual liberation) which arose out of a giveen set of beliefs. Again, although to a lesser degree than was the case with Sydney Women’s Liberation, some of the interests that it sought to promote through public policy were economic — taxation law reform and anti-discrimination legislation moreso than homosexual law reform. And again, much of what would lead one to categorize CAMP as a purely cause group — its activities at establishing the normality of homosexuality in the eyes of the church, the medical profession, and the community at large — have already been excluded from consideration.

(a) Homosexual Law Reform.

In 1970 homosexual behaviour between males was illegal in all states and territories in Australia. An opinion poll conducted in 1967 had found only 22% of Australians agreeing with the statement that ‘it should no longer be an offence for consenting males to engage in homosexual acts in private’. Into this rather harsh climate of public opinion, possibly modified in some degree by public statements in support of homosexual law reform from some opinion leaders, CAMP was born in July 1970. The ground had been prepared somewhat by the small Homosexual Law Reform Society operating in the ACT since July 1969 and formed specifically to make recommendations on the ACT Draft Criminal Code. CAMP’s approach to the question of law reform was rather different from that of its forerunner in that it was an organization openly comprised of homosexuals while the Society had presented itself as a group of concerned citizens - sexuality unspecified.

CAMP launched itself in September 1970 as a group of male and female homosexuals. The fairly good media coverage it received is in part attributable to the novelty of a group of homosexuals prepared to fight for their own rights. CAMP’s main political aim was to agitate for homosexual law reform. Some indication that this was a possibility, at least as far as the Australian territories were concerned, was given by Attorney General Tom Hughes in May 1970 when he announced that the new criminal code for the territories might not outlaw homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private. Further grounds for optimism had been provided by the West

(4) MATTHEWS, Trevor: op. cit. p 466.
Australian Conference of the ALP which adopted a policy of homosexual law reform in July 1970 and by the federal ALP which had committed the party to a conscience vote on the issue—at least it wasn't opposed. These seem like small grounds for optimism but they did constitute some sign that it was now an issue which had finally made it to the public policy agenda. Shortly after CAMP had been launched the Federal Attorney General discounted the possibility of homosexual law reform in the new Draft Criminal Code. Despite this, CAMP's membership grew to 300 by the end of 1970 and it had the public support of the NSW branches of the Council of Civil Liberties and the Humanist Society.

Laws proscribing (male) homosexual behaviour came under state jurisdiction and hence would have to be changed state by state and territorially; but law change in one state could be used in a campaign for law change in other states. For this reason CAMP in NSW became involved in seeking information on the position of federal parliamentarians with respect to the Draft Criminal Code. Given that any vote on the matter would be one on conscience rather than along party lines, the Law Reform Committee of CAMP wrote to all 185 members of federal parliament late in 1971. The response rate was disappointingly low with only 32 members replying at all. Of these, 19 (all members of the ALP) stated that they favoured homosexual law reform and 13 were non-committal—hardly grounds for confidence.

Early in the development of its campaign, the Law Reform Committee had decided on a 'softly softly' approach, reasonable argument and quiet persuasion. Even its first demonstration was a gentle affair. In October 1971 the preselection for the federal Liberal Party held seat of Berowra, then held by the Attorney General Tom Hughes, was contested by state Liberal MLA Jim Cameron whose views on homosexuality were known to be far from liberal. CAMP organized a colourful demonstration outside the Liberal Party headquarters in Sydney in support of Hughes who retained his preselection.

CAMP's lobbying for homosexual law reform in NSW became more and more indirect and took on a much longer time perspective. Given that the state was governed by the Liberal Party and had, in Opposition, a catholic dominated ALP, there was little chance that a private members bill, even if it were allowed to be voted on, would pass. Homosexual law reform became an issue to be raised in wider context whenever opportunities presented themselves: whenever a respected community organization, such as one of the churches, supported homosexual law reform, that support was reported in Camp Ink and the journal sent to the mass media; as much publicity as was possible was wrung out of the murder in Adelaide of homosexual law lecturer George Duncan; and the subsequent South Australian homosexual law reform; a march was organized through the streets of the city to coincide with the 10th anniversary of law change in Britain; and CAMP stood a candidate in the federal elections of December 1972.

In seeking answers to the question of why CAMP failed to achieve its aim of homosexual law reform major weight must be given to the political context in which the demand was made and in particular, the composition of the NSW Parliament. Given that context, CAMP's reordering of its priorities to place homosexual law reform lower down on its list of goals is perfectly understandable.
(b) The Taxation Laws.

CAMP's foray into the arena of taxation law reform was a once-off letter sent to federal parliamentarians in August 1972 demanding the formal recognition of the de facto status of homosexual couples with all the attendant privileges and the abolition of economic discrimination against single people. No response was forthcoming, no campaign mounted: there was little enthusiasm either inside or outside the organization for such a proposal.

(c) Anti-Discrimination Legislation.

When CAMP was founded in July 1970 only one of its four aims pointed the organization in the direction of political activism — agitation for homosexual law reform. In April 1972 with its adoption of a formal constitution this was changed. The political activism strand of CAMP's activities was broadened to 'support full legal, political and social equality for homosexuals and to work against all forms of discrimination and persecution directed against the free expression of sexual preference'. The demand for legislation which would outlaw discrimination in employment on the grounds of homosexuality began to appear more frequently amongst CAMP's demands during 1972. A letter to NSW state parliamentarians in August 1972 made it one of two minimum requirements for change, the other being homosexual law reform. When CAMP Secretary Peter Bonsall-Boone was dismissed from his position as Secretary of St. Clements Church of England in Mosman because he appeared in an ABC television documentary on homosexuality, the demand for such legislation took priority over the demand for homosexual law reform. But once again, given the political context in which the demand was made and the cost to individuals of fighting for it, no lobbying campaign was mounted; public education was a pre-requisite.

(d) The NSW Health Department.

One of CAMP's other areas of interest — psychiatric treatment of homosexuals and the psychiatric classification of homosexuality as a personality disorder — reached into the public policy domain via the state's psychiatric hospitals. Some contact between the organization's Homosexual Guidance Service and individual psychiatrists from one of those hospitals had found them willing to distribute the group's brochures to people who had been admitted because of difficulties they were experiencing in coming to terms with their homosexuality. The organization delegated a representative to negotiate with the Health Department for the placement of HGS brochures in all psychiatric hospitals. These negotiations were unsuccessful except insofar as the Department agreed to leave the decision on whether to accept the brochures or not up to individual hospitals. CAMP's partial success in this matter is attributable to the fact that while the Director General of the Department was unable to officially commit it to agreement with CAMP's beliefs, privately he believed that homosexuals were one of several groups who would be better off in the community than cluttering up the state's psychiatric hospitals.

CAMP's direct access to the Health Department proved to be of value with respect to the matter of health education. In October 1972 it was called on by the Health Education section of the Department to provide speakers for a series of seminars the Department was running for its health educators. CAMP was seen to possess a resource — insider expertise — which the Department could not readily obtain access to elsewhere.

Amongst the factors which contributed to the partial success of CAMP in this area when measured against its failure in all other attempts to influence public policy must be the non-public nature of what transpired. CAMP negotiated with a part of the bureaucracy: it had something to offer — expertise and an alternative to treating homosexuals as psychiatric patients — which the Health Department could make use of; what it wanted from the Department would be of no cost to it; and it involved one-to-one negotiation rather than a confrontation
in which the Department would have to take a public stance on homosexuality — one which
would have to coincide with the government of the day’s stance on the matter.

In 1973 CAMP virtually ceased all lobbying activities. It became involved in areas, such as
the establishment of the telephone counselling service, Phone-A-Friend, which did not directly
involve changes to public policy. Moreover, it was beset by organizational infighting which
reduced its ability to lobby: it fought interstate branches over the status of Camp Ink; and within
the NSW Branch itself a challenge to the old leadership was developing. 1973 also saw the gradual
resolution of the conflict produced in women members of the organization by their dual
membership in CAMP and Sydney Women’s Liberation; that conflict produced withdrawal
from participation in CAMP’s activities and eventually, for many, a withdrawal from the organization
altogether.


By definition, Sydney Gay Liberation does not qualify for consideration as a pressure group —
it did not seek to influence public policy. Part of its ideological stance was to have no truck
with homosexual law reform, nor with electoral politics. Its members had originally constituted
a cell within CAMP and when it decided to break away and form itself into a separate organization
it did all it could to clearly distinguish itself from CAMP by pointing to the differences — some
real, some exaggerated — between itself and its parent organization. In this it behaved similarly
to WEL when it tried to distinguish itself from the already existing Women’s Liberation movement.
Despite the differences in image the two organizations tried to establish—WEL wanted to appear
more moderate, reasonable and business-like than Women’s Liberation, Gay Liberation wanted
to appear more radical than CAMP — the tactic adopted by both was the same: both publicly
and strongly attacked the group with which they were most likely to be confused.

4. Thor.

The publishers of the newspaper Thor were part of the Sydney Push/Libertarians. They
were, until early in 1973, interested in publishing erotica, political comment, articles of drug use
and the like for its own sake rather than as part of any campaign to change Australia’s censorship
laws. With the election to federal government of the ALP, some relaxation of the federal laws had
occurred; but these had no effect on the Thor people who had been charged with the publication
and distribution of obscene material under NSW state laws.

In January 1973 the NSW Chief Secretary announced that he intended, in collaboration
with his Victorian counterpart, to crack down on pornography by introducing new legislation
into the NSW Parliament in March; this was the Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill. The
producers of Thor formed the nucleus of a loose alliance of individuals and groups all opposed
to the introduction of more restrictive censorship laws for their own reasons. The alliance
included individuals from Sydney Women’s Liberation, Sydney Gay Liberation, CAMP, Civil
Liberties, the Push, book shop proprietors and commercial publishers and distributors of what the
proposed law would ban. It was a fragile alliance which certainly had no interest in forming
itself into any ongoing coalition. It maintained a publicly united front and avoided splitting
itself wide open by avoiding discussion of the issue that could have undone it and weakened its
effectiveness as a campaign group. By maintaining the focus of attention on the harshness of
the penalties proposed in the new legislation, the plan to do away with trial by jury, and the
increased powers the bill would give the police, the alliance avoided an examination of pornography
itself and ensured that it would hold together for as long as it took for both houses of the NSW
parliament to debate the bill.

The alliance adopted a very pragmatic approach. It never lost sight of its one goal of
defeating the bill and was eager to find as many and varied arguments and supporters as it could toward this end: psychiatric opinion on the mental health of censors, the spectre of a police state, accusations that parts of the establishment media empires wished to maintain their monopoly on soft-core pornography, and the thin edge of the wedge to political censorship argument, all formed part of the case against the bill.

The political context in which the campaign was waged was, in one respect, favourable. Australians had just been told by the Federal Labor Government that they were adult enough to make up their own minds about what they read and saw and here was a state government trying to return them to a state of infantilism. The Chief Secretary himself, especially as he was portrayed in the mass media, aided and abetted his opponents by the way he presented his campaign. His constant references to liking being called the gestapo reinforced fears of a police state and his frequent portrayal going through piles of pornographic material looking for filth and smut lent support to the opinion that censors could be sicker than the people they try to censor.

The major part of the alliance’s campaign was conducted before the bill was debated in the NSW Legislative Assembly where it passed on party lines. Again, the reality of a Liberal Party government who supported the bill and a catholic dominated ALP in opposition which was split on it was something which no amount of successful campaigning outside the Parliament, even with the support of the mass media, could change. The alliance was left very little time in which to try to mount a campaign aimed specifically at the undemocratically appointed NSW Legislative Council which had next to debate the bill. At this point the alliance’s very public campaign virtually fizzled out. It had, however, provoked opposition to the bill from far more respectable community groups than its own constituent groups. And these lodged their objections to the bill not with the mass media but with Legislative Councillors — groups like the State Council of the Liberal Party of NSW, the Women’s Conference of the ALP, the Victorian Young Liberals, the Literature Board of the Australian Council of the Arts, the Bar Council of NSW, as well as several trade unions. In the Legislative Council the bill was referred to a select committee for consideration on the votes of a Liberal Party member who also happened to publish a magazine which could be affected had the bill been passed, a Country Party, and two independent Labor members. The Bill itself was never voted on and so no members were forced to breach party solidarity; it was allowed to lapse when Parliament was prorogued.

As pressure groups, how effective were the Sydney sexual liberation movements? In tabular summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sydney Women’s Liberation</td>
<td>(i) (a) Repeal abortion laws</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Make abortion more accessible</td>
<td>Yes - partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Change Public Service Board job advertising</td>
<td>Yes - partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Equal pay</td>
<td>Yes - full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Child welfare system change</td>
<td>Yes - partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Women’s Advisor to Prime Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CAMP</td>
<td>(i) Homosexual law reform</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Taxation law reform</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Anti-Discrimination legislation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Health Department</td>
<td>Yes - partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THOR Alliance</td>
<td>(i) Defeat Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill</td>
<td>Yes - full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we ignore questions of whether the campaigns conducted by the groups were solely or even mainly responsible for the achievement of their goals and look simply at which groups
achieved their goals then we can see that, Matthews notwithstanding, Sydney Women's Liberation was in fact a reasonably effective pressure group, and certainly more effective than CAMP. Taking the groups as a whole we can also see that they were less effective when they tried to influence the legislature than when they tried to influence the bureaucracy. Abortion law repeal, homosexual law reform and taxation law reform were attempts to change existing legislation and they failed; anti-discrimination legislation was a call for new legislation and it went unanswered. The only time there was any success in the legislative arena was the defeat of a proposed piece of legislation and even that came close to failure. They were much more successful in their attempts to influence through the various arms of the bureaucracy: abortion became more accessible in NSW through a judicial ruling; the Public Service Board altered its job advertising practices; equal pay was decided upon by the Arbitration Commission; the changes to the treatment of girls in child welfare homes required administrative changes; and the Health Department's granting of access to its psychiatric hospitals — none of these required legislative change.
Late in 1969 groups of women began to meet in Sydney to discuss their position as women both in the political groupings in which many of them were involved and in Australian society at large. They were mostly young, tertiary educated, and with a history of involvement in the politics of the decade: student politics, opposition to the Vietnam War, New Left politics or membership in one or other of the more established leftist political parties. Their discussions revolved around their lives as women and they helped each other to see that what each woman thought that she alone had experienced, they had all experienced and that they had done so because they were women. And they determined to do something about their own situation and that of other women.

Why these women? What motivated them? It is possible to follow two lines of speculation in answer to these questions. Analyses of past social movements have found that amongst the ranks of joiners has been a good smattering of social misfits and deviants; individuals who, unable to solve the problems which beset their personal lives, seek salvation by totally committing themselves to some cause or other where they can act out those inner conflicts. Many of the women who formed the first Sydney Women’s Liberation groups were indeed dissatisfied with their personal lives: some were experiencing difficulties in their relationships with men, others were finding the constant burden of child rearing without assistance difficult to bear alone, a few were lesbians. Their adoption of the slogan ‘the personal is political’ to characterize the way they perceived their situation carries with it an acknowledgement that they themselves saw that the solution to their personal problems lay in political activity. Psychiatric opinion, expressed at the 1973 Symposium on Liberation Movements and Psychiatry, provides supporting evidence for this line of speculation. At the Symposium, Dr. Beverley Raphael from the University of Sydney offered her analysis of what motivated women’s liberationists: pathological anger toward men, penis envy, a pathological denial of their sexuality, a desire to negate their child-bearing, child-rearing, and mothering functions which reflected their hatred of their own mothers, and an identity quest still unresolved from their estranged adolescence. Dr. Neville Parker from the University of Queensland supported her analysis with studies from his own clinical experience which had led him to conclude that the activities of women’s liberationists were a substitute for what would otherwise be regarded as a neurotic illness. He agreed with others who had seen that women’s liberationists were really protesting against their lack of femininity but conceded that, as a neurotic equivalent, political activity was more productive than lying in bed with a tension headache. Once thus committed, the early Women’s Liberationists sought and found followers who were attracted to the movement by its promises of new ways of seeing the world in which male domination became the cause of all their troubles and its promises that, through participation in its groups they would gain the strength to change themselves and the society which had kept women in chains of one sort or another for centuries.

The second line of speculation offers a somewhat different interpretation. Those early groups discussions became a process of consciousness-raising which enabled women to transform their perceptions of their lives and their position in society: what each had once seen as an individual misfortune, for which she herself was partly to blame, came to be seen as a shared social injustice which could be rectified by collective action. Seemingly trivial matters, such as not being allowed to drink in the public bar at hotels and having their shopping bags searched at supermarkets, came to be seen as examples of the same pattern of women’s oppression which expressed itself in fewer job opportunities and lower wages for women workers. The political,
economic, and social forces which kept all women in a position of overall subordination to men kept each individual woman subordinate to, and dependent on, the individual man in her life, be it father, husband, or boss: her personal life was political reality in microcosm. Armed with a rudimentary analysis of the position of women which they had put together from their discussions and reading, they called a public meeting in January 1970. To this meeting more women came and from it grew more groups which took the analysis further and into new areas.

Whichever line of speculation is followed in trying to understand the motivations of the early Sydney Women's Liberationists, by early 1970 it had qualified for consideration as a social movement: it was a purposive collective attempt by a number of women to promote changes to the entire social order. Initially the numbers of women involved was quite small, as is to be expected with the birth of any social movement, but it grew — by exactly how many and at what rate is difficult to determine because it did not allow for a signed up membership. It developed a group consciousness, strong bonds of positive solidarity, and a sense of we-ness. This sense of we-ness operated in two ways. First, in line with its more common usage, it operated to cover those who were active in the movement, attended its meetings or participated in its marches and demonstrations, and distinguished them from those women who had not yet become involved. And second, and the 'not yet' part of the first usage is important, here, the we-ness operated to cover all women and distinguish them from the other, men.

Sydney Women's Liberation was a revolutionary social movement. It saw total transformation of society as essential for achieving its goal of women's liberation. As to how this was to be accomplished, the movement adopted a dual approach: it saw personal transformation and societal manipulation, as Killian dichotomized it, as both being essential ingredients of any strategy which would lead to real and lasting change. Different groups within the movement attached differing degrees of importance to these means but both were part of the movement's ideology of change. It also recognized that reforms within the existing system, abortion law repeal and equal pay, for example, especially those which would bring immediate and direct benefits to women, were worth fighting for. They were worthwhile in themselves and as interim concessions which would sustain women in their longer struggles for more fundamental changes to the system. But Sydney Women's Liberation was a revolutionary social movement with no blueprint of what a future 'liberated' society would look like; it knew only what that society could not look like if women were to be free in it.

Sydney Women's Liberationists were developing a systematic critique of society which saw power and authority not solely attached to, and deriving from, the institutions of government. Wherever they had experienced oppression in their own lives — in their families, at school, in their jobs, at the hands of professionals, in the images of women conveyed by the mass media — there too must lie power. They had seen how it operated in the political groups to which many of them had belonged: how a few dominated the many; how policies were pushed through by weight of numbers rather than on their merit; how easy it was to manipulate the forms and structures set up to ensure democratic elections and democratic decision making; and what a toll it took on people's personal lives. Their past experiences had also taught them to be cynical about achieving real social change through electoral and parliamentary politics. In the first place, women were relatively powerless in that arena but more importantly, the means which would have to be adopted in order to succeed were totally unacceptable. Sydney Women's Liberation rejected established political forms and means as well as goals. Finally, many of the changes sought by the movement could not be achieved through public policy manipulation. Governments have no power over the way doctors treat their women patients, they have no power over the way men relate to women and indeed, had they this kind of outreaching power the movement would have fought against it as it did the power the government reserved for itself.
of controlling women's fertility through its abortion laws. Government was a powerful and active agent in the oppression of women and there was no way the movement was eager to hand it more areas of women's lives to control.

All of these factors led the movement to adopt an essentially anti-institutional stance and to try to organize itself along lines which would structurally prevent the growth of the type of power politics they had experienced elsewhere. From its inception Sydney Women's Liberation was its autonomous groups. These were completely autonomous: whatever line of discussion or activity a group pursued was up to the individual women involved; it had to seek the prior approval of no higher authority for there was none. Each group could put out its own leaflets, issue its own press releases, organize its own demonstrations provided it did so in its own name— but even this proviso was a matter of tacit understanding rather than one agreed upon by vote. Thus, the Working Women's Group published and distributed What Every Woman Should Know, the SLUT Brigade painted the houses of politicians with slogans, the Mejane collective wrote to the selection committee for the job of Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister, Words for Women produced and distributed monographs, the Refractory Girl collective produced and distributed the journal, and special groups set themselves up to organize marches, conferences, and commissions. Each was as open or as closed as the group itself decided, each had to raise its own funds if funds were needed and so on. The fact that one group may have adopted a policy with respect, for example, to excluding men from its meetings may have been taken into consideration by other groups but it in no way constituted a precedent which had to be followed by all subsequently formed groups. Any collection of women could set themselves up as a group 'of' or 'within' Sydney Women's Liberation and there was no way that any groups could have been prevented from so doing and yet no groups which did not subscribe in general to what was understood to be the broad ideological commitment of the movement ever did. In its early days, Sydney Women's Liberation was portrayed, in Turner's and Killian's scheme, as peculiar by the mass media but was probably seen as peculiar-cum-revolutionary by its opponents. Its goals were trivialized, its hostility toward men exaggerated and ridiculed, and its participants treated as ratbags of the man-hating lesbian variety. But beyond the trivialization and the ridicule there was a grudging acknowledgement that some of the movement's complaints were justified and with time, the movement came to be seen, in some quarters, as a threat to the established order.

In mid-1970 Sydney Women's Liberation can be said to have reached a crisis point in its development as a social movement. It had grown in size and diversity to a point where some co-ordination of its activities was seen as essential if it was to continue to develop. And there was some disillusionment with the movement's ability to achieve this co-ordination in a way that it had originally been thought both desirable and possible— without formal organization.

Perhaps we were throwing the baby out with the bathwater, because without clear alternatives, we ended up with little formal organization but informally an organization based on activity, friendship and status that was almost as rigid in its own way. Although good attempts were made to develop responsibility to collective opinion—for instance, by not taking votes so that the majority didn't rule over the minority—often the reality behind our 'consensus' was that the stronger, more energetic, more socially acceptable women repeatedly did things their own way... Periodically, too, there would be onslaughts against the tall poppies—women who were, in fact, leaders. Since we said we didn't want to have leaders, other women blamed them personally for the continuing imbalance of power instead of re-examining our structures. (5)

In July 1970 a good many of those tall poppies, the more energetic and socially acceptable (within Sydney Women's Liberation) women were concentrated in the Glebe group. And it was this group which was most adamant that the movement continue to work without formal structures. To the Glebe group came another group of women (distinguishable because they also belonged to the Socialist Youth Alliance) who were determined to convince the Glebe group, and through them the rest of the movement, of the need to establish some sort of more formal structure and method of organization. If Sydney Women's Liberation was to mature into an effective social movement it would have to develop mechanisms whereby it could recruit a mass membership and mobilize it, work out a set of aims and a coherent programme for achieving them, establish democratic decision-making procedures, and ensure responsible administration of the day-to-day operations of the movement by providing for democratically elected office bearers and a co-ordinating committee on which all groups could be represented.

Throughout much of 1971 the movement was preoccupied internally with the question of how it should structure itself. Attempt after attempt was made to introduce more formal methods of organization and each failed. The literature on social movements offers two lines of interpretation of the sequence of events. The first line sees it as a failure to organize effectively. By the end of 1970 it was time for Sydney Women's Liberation to enter a new stage in its natural development, to mature organizationally, to shift in its leadership styles from those of the agitator and prophet, essential at the beginning of any movement, to that of administrator, and to adopt a centralized bureaucratic organizational structure with a pyramidal chain of command able to recruit and mobilize members to work effectively to the achievement of its aims. The failure of the movement to so organize condemned it to remaining permanently incipient, arrested at a stage of development which it should have passed through. Without the adoption of a clearly defined set of aims and a programme setting out how they were to be achieved it could not attract the mass membership it needed and would remain a victim of its own image as an incoherent, undisciplined rabble. Without democratic machinery for electing office bearers it would remain the creature of the de facto leadership of the most vocal and energetic few. Without democratic procedures for making decisions, conflict could not be kept within manageable limits and would continually break out, becoming increasingly bitter as new areas of divisiveness overlaid past unresolved conflicts. Evidence of the deleterious consequences of this failure to organize effectively abounded.

In 1972 there was the constant bickering over which particular political grouping had control of the organizing committee for the March Action Campaign and the resultant refusal of Mejane to advertise the Campaign unless it was as a paid advertisement. There was the constant atmosphere of suspicion which surrounded the question of the motivations and role of political party women in the movement. In 1973 there was the turmoil which surrounded the question of the status of the issue of lesbianism — had there been proper decision making machinery the question of the priority the movement wanted to attach to that issue could have been properly settled. Again in 1973, had there been proper procedures for consultation the Mejane collective's attacks on the position of Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister and the candidates for that position would either have had the support of the entire movement or not have been permitted to damage the credibility of the movement as it did. With no proper methods of ensuring editorial responsibility, Mejane, instead of acting as the voice of the movement, became the mouthpiece for a small minority and eventually folded. Had there been proper decision making machinery the question of whether the movement should hold yet another abortion march or begin planning to set up its own clinic could have been resolved one way or the other instead of dividing the time and energies of the movement by allowing both to be held on the same day. And finally, had there been adequate machinery for co-ordinating and controlling the activities of different sections of the movement, of reaching decisions by which the movement as a whole could be bound, the fiasco of one part of the movement participating in an alliance to boycott the CIBA-GEIGY
Symposium and of another part agreeing to participate in it would never have occurred.

The second line of interpretation offered by the social movement literature sees the events of 1971 not as a failure to organize effectively but as a decision to organize differently. The structure and method of organization the movement adopted was segmentary, polycephalous and reticulate. It was segmentary in that it was composed of a range of diverse groups which grew and died, divided and fused, proliferated and contracted: Mejane grew and died, as did two radical therapy groups and the Balmain group; the Working Women's group and the Equal Pay group fused; Refractory Girl was set up as a semi-academic publication by those interested in that kind of publishing activity; and the pre-existing political commitments of some movement participants led them to start up the Bread and Roses group. It was polycephalous with no central command or decision-making structure and many situation- or group-specific leaderships which lasted for limited time periods rather than having one overall leader. The Glebe group's dominance of the movement did not last; groups chose their own spokespersons and there was a deliberate rotation of this role; the movement's leaders were leaders in the sense that they were initiators or organizers rather than media created and manipulated celebrities. And Sydney Women's Liberation was reticulate: individuals were active in more than one group; the monthly general meeting and the newsletter acted as important means of information exchange; marches, demonstrations, commissions, and conferences served important reticulating functions and provided means for public reaffirmation of commitment to the movement's goals.

Such a structure and method of organization had obvious advantages. The way that it ensured that conflict was kept within manageable limits was not to establish authoritative decision making machinery which could only ever suppress conflict never resolve it, but to constantly expand the limits within which conflict, seen as productive rather than destructive, could be accommodated. It encouraged diversity and experimentation: the 1973 Women's Commission was the first time consciousness raising on a mass scale had been attempted and it worked because the organizers were flexible enough to let the Commission take over itself. New groups formed and were able to develop along their own lines at their own pace rather than being bound by decisions taken by other groups at other times and under other circumstances.

If the Mejane collective felt strongly enough about what they saw as the domination of the March Action Campaign by political party women then there was no reason why it should be forced to endorse something about which it had strong ideological reservations; and free advertising space would have implied such an endorsement. Political party domination of one group did not mean automatic domination of any other. On the status of the issue of lesbianism, the fact that the movement had no machinery for formally assigning priorities probably saved it from being quashed altogether. New issues were given time to percolate through the movement groups and the particular stance ultimately adopted on the issue was left to those most interested in it rather than to a group of officials who would have little knowledge of, and less interest in, what was involved. This allowed for the development of pockets of genuine expertise and commitment around particular issues: the campaign for the reform of the child welfare system is a case in point. As far as the content of Mejane was concerned, the paper never claimed to speak for the movement as a whole — it published what it wanted, when, and if, it wanted and never became caught up in the counterproductive bind of having to publish — anything — for the sake of getting the paper out. When there was sufficient discontent about its contents the matter was resolved by the establishment of a group to put out another publication — Womanspeak — rather than by issuing directives to the Mejane collective; and Womanspeak would reach into an entirely different social niche. The Mejane collective's actions with respect to the position of Women's Advisor to the Prime Minister reaffirmed its anti-institutional stance, rang a note of warning to the rest of the movement not to be taken in by a token gesture, and undoubtedly
confused the new government — all without committing the movement as a whole to any particular stance on its relations with a social reform government. The dilemma of whether to hold an abortion march or a meeting to discuss setting up an abortion clinic was resolved by changing the 'or' to an 'and'. Marches served important public educative functions whether their demands were met or not. There were differences within the movement and the expression of those differences was far more productive of an escalating dynamism than the suppression of one or more views in the name of preserving a facade of false unity. And finally, with respect to the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium, the different approaches of different sections of the movement achieved their different aims: those who wanted to voice their opposition to McConaghy's work on homosexuals did so by draining his energies, confusing him, and boycotting his Symposium; others used him and his Symposium to reach other people with their message.

Overall, a segmented, polycephalous, reticulate structure allowed constant change in a constantly changing environment; it provided a built mechanism for growth and simultaneously afforded a very effective defence. Any organization, be it political party trying to take over, intelligence agency trying to infiltrate, or government institution trying to co-opt, would face a formidable task if it sought to control the movement: it would have to gain and maintain control of each individual group.

The nature of the relationship between Sydney Women's Liberation and the opposition during the period 1969-1973 can be described as one where the target areas it wished to change were dominant. Different groups within the movement were not dependent on, nor had any of them attained the status of partial equality with, those targets. The tactics most groups adopted were those of (attempted) intimidation, of harassment, and obstruction. They demonstrated against the Public Service Board, harassed hotel proprietors, obstructed supermarket staff, tried to intimidate politicians where they lived, tried to embarrass Colonel Sanders, interrupted the proceedings of Parliament and so on. But they also tried to educate through speaking wherever and whenever invited, by organizing public discussions and conferences, by publishing and distributing their own material. It is difficult to argue that the movement as a whole adopted one particular type of tactic as the social movement literature invites us to do because the movement as a whole did not adopt anything. WEL tried to establish (and to some extent succeeded) a relationship of partial equality with its target group — candidates for the 1972 federal election. It had something to offer — its endorsement — and was reluctant to downvalue what it did have to offer by using tactics which might be regarded as illegitimate. This is a possible partial explanation for WEL's stance with respect to tactics. We also need to bear in mind that an important means in WEL's attempts to establish itself as a distinct entity was to attack Women's Liberation and show how different it was from the movement. Likewise, in understanding why many Sydney Women's Liberation groups adopted the tactics of intimidation and obstruction we have to look beyond the nature of their relationships with their target groups and remember where many of their participants gained their political experience — in the anti-Vietnam War movement and the student movement where confrontation of the system was very important tactically and ideologically.

What were some of the characteristics of these tactics? The social movement literature suggests that where a social movement engages in the politics of disorder rather than those of order or violence, the tactics it adopts will be characterized by purposely ambiguous legality, directness, and a high turnover rate. Technically, hotel publicans were well within their legal rights to call the police in order to eject the women from their public bars: in the case of the Petersham Inn such an act would probably have alienated some of its other customers who enjoyed the stand that the Working Women's Group was making; in the case of the hotels in Manly, it did not. Similarly, invading the Legislative Assembly while the Peterson petition
was being rejected was of ambiguous legality and the women were simply ejected. Again, the
deliberate attempt by Mejane to provoke an over-reaction by the Department of Child Welfare
by publishing actionable material tried to exploit the double bind it placed the Department in:
if the Department had taken action it would have drawn more attention to the Mejane attacks
than they were getting and have been condemned for attempting censorship and been able to get
nothing in the way of damages; by taking no action, it initially may have prevented wider
circulation of the criticisms of the Department but it also implicitly acknowledged their validity.
Directness was a characteristic of all demonstrations and most other tactics. The turnover rate
of tactics was not particularly high and, with the possible exception of the pub liberation activities,
what turnover that did occur was less the result of authorities closing up legal loopholes than of a
realization that the mass media rapidly tired of covering 'just another' demonstration, march or
meeting — Germaine Greer was quickly categorized as 'over exposed' and without Honor
Blackman, an abortion rally may not have been covered at all.

2. CAMP

In July 1970, John Ware and Christobel Poll gather together some of their homosexual
friends to discuss establishing Australia's first mixed-sex, openly homosexual organization. In
September of that year they publicly launched CAMP and called for other homosexuals to join
them in their fight against Australia's oppressive laws and community attitudes — attitudes
toward homosexuality which many homosexuals themselves shared. Most of those who did
join the organization had had little or no prior political experience; most would never be able
to 'come out' as Poll and Ware had done; and most were men. What they would get out of
joining the organization was a safe haven, a place to be their homosexual selves without the
fear of discovery and persecution with which their daily lives were imbued.

As to what motivated these people to establish CAMP, the traditional social movement
literature has a rather difficult job in answering that question. In general, it suggests that those
who join social movements are misfits and deviants, individuals with personal problems who try
to solve those problems by political activism. But, by the definitions of the time, all homosexuals
were deviants — whether they joined social movements or not. In order to distinguish those
homosexuals who became involved from those who did not we would have to consider the
former as deviant homosexual — deviant to the extent that they did not accept their characterization
as deviant and wanted to do something about that very labelling process. And are those who did
not join, who accepted their assigned status as deviants with personality disorders, then to be
considered normal homosexuals? Some psychiatric opinion expressed at the 1973 CIBA-GEIGY
Symposium would seem to suggest just this interpretation. Neil McConaghy, for one, implied
this when he pointed out to the homosexual activists who had just thrown eggs at him that he
had treated over 200 homosexuals in Sydney and none of them felt as strongly as the activists
about his aversion therapy. He later went on to characterize the ideas of the activists as
irrational and disturbed. In similar vein Dr. Barrow of the University of Adelaide, interpreted
their failure to actually hit McConaghy with any of their eggs as deliberate, an expression of their
unresolved adolescent identity crises; he had also noticed a cry of recognition from them when
McConaghy had called them disturbed.

Contrary psychiatric opinion at the Symposium came from a somewhat unexpected
source — Neville Parker. While he could see nothing but neurosis in Women's Liberation activism,
he could understand perfectly why homosexuals would want to join CAMP: “their own sexual
orientation has resulted in experiences which cry out for reform” (6)

(6) PARKER, Neville: "A Psychiatrist's Viewpoint of Women's Liberation" in MCCONAGHY, Neil (ed): Liberation
part of the literature which sees a social movement emerging when a significant number of people shift their perceptions of their condition from one of misfortune deserving of compassion to one of injustice demanding remedy. When he founded CAMP, Ware hoped to facilitate that kind of shift in perception by providing its members with a place and an opportunity to discuss their oppression as homosexuals: self-hatred and self-pity could be transformed into self-acceptance and with self-acceptance would come rejection of an oppressive social system and moves to change it.

Can CAMP justifiably be conceived of as a social movement? It was a purposive collective attempt by a number of people to promote changes to some major part of the social order. Without reference to the literature at all, however, CAMP does not fit very well into the popular image of a social movement at all. And yet it behaved much more in accordance with the traditional model of social movement development than Sydney Women's Liberation did which does fit much better the popular image. Ware's early leadership of CAMP can be characterized as charismatic. He personally attracted to the movement many people who were 'willing to be conned by the man because he was right'. His visions for CAMP were revolutionary — the entire society was in need of change, not simply those laws which proscribe male homosexual behaviour. He tried to lead the organization into areas — abortion law repeal, censorship battles, women's liberation analyses — which the bulk of the members did not want, or did not feel able, to enter; they wanted a reformist social movement. His stance was anti-institutional, theirs was institutional. Why CAMP looks less like a social movement than Sydney Women's Liberation is because it did not develop a distinct ideology in the way that Sydney Women's Liberation did. Ware was trying to but he was doing so initially alone and with concepts borrowed largely from the developing women's liberation analyses of the position of women in society. But those concepts did not transplant very well at all. Male homosexuals are, after all, men and not women. And an analysis which attempts to explain the oppression of one sex by another is not really geared to explain within-sex oppression especially when that occurs within the oppressing sex. At best all it could lead to would be a kind of double-edged 'us-tooism': they (heterosexual men) oppress us (homosexual men) like they — and we — oppress you (women).

It was not only a women's liberation analysis that Ware tried to transplant: he wanted CAMP to be organized along the same lines too. He saw CAMP as leaderless, consisting of autonomous groups each of which set their own goals and worked at its own pace in its own way. But what Ware wanted simply did not happen. Initially, several groups did start up and begin to work autonomously — the law reform committee, the women's, church, and married members groups. But after only a short period group growth stopped and many of those which had formed began to wither. Nor were they 'allowed' to be as autonomous as they should have been: the original women's group was 'invaded' by men; the gay lib cell was prevented from holding a party in the house. This was not the kind of group autonomy which existed in Sydney Women's Liberation and, eventually, the most promising group — the gay lib cell — split off from CAMP and took a lot of the organization's potential for growth and diversity with it.

It was at this point that Ware, who had always been under some pressure from some members of the organization to structure it 'properly', succumbed to that pressure. He had tried to stave off a full blown formal structuring of the organization in July 1971 by accepting the establishment of the Advisory Committee. But this did not have the desired effect of activating members. Faced with what he saw as two alternatives — organize or perish — he agreed, reluctantly, to organize. In terms of the dominant paradigm, CAMP was about to enter the phase of its development which, given that the right path was being followed, would make it a mature, effective, social movement. The formal method of organization and structure which CAMP adopted was classic. It drew up a formal constitution which laid down the aims of the organization, the number
of positions and how they were to be filled, how the executive was to be constituted, the requirements for expulsion of members, what status groups within the organization could be granted, how many special meetings it was to hold each year in addition to the annual general meeting, and how the constitution itself was to be changed. In April 1972 that constitution was adopted and the organization's first set of de jure leaders elected.

In one sense, there was a split within the first formal leadership of CAMP. The two Co-Presidents tried to retain, within a structured organization, some of Ware's ideals by declaring that CAMP was more of a movement than a society and stressing that the executive was to be seen as a co-ordinating body only; co-ordinating the activities of the autonomous groups. They also tried to project a politically active, agitational, image of the organization. The rest of the leadership was much more involved in the administration of the organization and keen to have it project an image of responsibility. Ultimately, the latter won through — autonomy cannot be imposed from on high.

Having adopted the method of organization the dominant paradigm said it should, CAMP then proceeded to behave almost exactly as predicted by that paradigm. First, it became increasingly pre-occupied with the survival of the organization. Most of the time of the Executive was spent in working through the minutiae of gas bills and working bees, in membership fees and finding and maintaining suitable clubrooms. Parties had to be held to pay the rent so that parties could be held. Secondly, the control of the organization became more and more centralized within the Executive: the so-called autonomous groups could write whatever they liked to whomever they liked — provided a member of the Executive approved; the Executive reserved for itself the power to grant Special Purpose Group status — and to withdraw it; all monies raised by groups had to be handed over to the Executive and expenditure of even the smallest amounts of money by groups was subjected to Executive scrutiny and dependent on Executive approval. And finally, rule manipulation began to increase: the Executive tried to rule on the kind of language that could be used in group newsletters; stacking the Executive with representatives from non-existent groups became an end in itself; the witholding of money from groups was justified by appeal to rules which had just been passed in order to withhold the money; and interference in the internal affairs of one of the 'autonomous groups' was justified by the allegedly unconstitutional behaviour of the group. The making of a decision — committing CAMP in alliance to non-participation in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium — on behalf of the organization without prior consultation with the Executive could also work because of manipulation: information to the Executive was channelled through one Co-President and the timing for Executive rubber-stamping of that commitment determined by the other.

In trying to settle on the most appropriate way of characterizing the relationship between CAMP and its target groups we come up against two difficulties. The first one is the problem, acknowledged in the literature, of distinguishing between a reform social movement which CAMP (leadership aspirations notwithstanding) ultimately was, and a pressure group, for which label CAMP also qualifies. Organizations, as has been pointed out above, qualify for consideration as pressure groups only in so far as they attempt to influence the public policy process. Reform social movements however, are definitionally allowed to try to influence other areas of the social system in addition to the institutions of government. As a reform social movement CAMP is then seen to be in a relationship of dependence on its target groups and would then be seen as adopting tactics designed to convince those target groups of the legitimacy of its demands — the politics of order. This, to some extent, is an accurate portrayal of the tactics CAMP adopted. It did not adopt the tactics of disorder and it certainly did not employ violence.

The second difficulty arises because in one way CAMP's target groups were dominant.
Using the examples cited by Wilson of economic exploitation and the denial of civil rights, these characteristics of dominance applied to homosexuals under certain circumstances but not under others. Economic exploitation and the denial of civil rights were not determined by being homosexual as they were by being a woman or a black but by being known to be a homosexual. And most homosexuals are able to deny target groups that knowledge — women and most blacks are not. If the call by the CAMP leadership for homosexuals to come out had been answered by a large enough number then CAMP’s relationships with its target groups might have shifted from one of dependence on them to one, initially at least, of being dominated by them, and CAMP’s tactics may have shifted from the politics of order to the politics of disorder.


Does Sydney Gay Liberation qualify for consideration as a social movement? Its original numbers were no smaller than those of Sydney Women’s Liberation and the nature of its birth — a dramatic departure from an existing organization — probably indicates a much stronger purposive solidarity than either of the other two initially had. If the early stages of the development of CAMP and Sydney Women’s Liberation can qualify them for consideration as embryonic or incipient social movements then it is difficult to justify not treating Sydney Gay Liberation in the same way.

When we look, as the social movement literature directs us to, for answers to the question of what motivated the Sydney Gay Liberationists to establish the movement we are really asking for two sets of motivations. First, what motivated them to become politically active, and second, what motivated them to split off from CAMP. As they were originally members of CAMP the first question has already been answered. As to the second question, the literature is not much help. What it does offer is a Zald and Ash proposition which attributes their departure to CAMP’s lack of success in goal accomplishment — a totally inadequate explanation.

Having established itself as a distinct entity in January 1972, Sydney Gay Liberation was sustained for a while on the wave of enthusiasm which sprang, in part, from a sense of release from the rigidities of CAMP. Its numbers remained small and for most purposes Sydney Gay Liberation continued to act as a single group: the exception was a series of smaller consciousness raising groups which lasted for only a short time and the zap and publications groups. It was revolutionary in its outlook seeing a total transformation of society as essential for its goal of gay liberation; indeed, it scorned the reformist activities of CAMP. Its stance was anti-institutional and it attacked traditional ethical codes as repressive.

During the early stages of its development, the traditional social movement literature would assign it a charismatic leader and undoubtedly see Altman filling that role. Yet Altman’s ‘leadership’ was media created and imposed. There was another set of leaders who came from within Sydney Gay Liberation and were recognized as such by themselves and others. Like Sydney Women’s Liberation however, Gay Liberation had adopted an ideology which was anti-leadership. And like Sydney Women’s Liberation, its de facto leadership was composed of its most energetic and articulate participants.

Sydney Gay Liberation can be said to have faced a series of possible turning points with respect to its internal organization. The first would have to have been the acknowledgement by the de facto leadership that it was in fact being drawn to and thrust into that kind of role. Their solution — to withdraw from active participation — would be seen by the dominant paradigm as an opportunity missed; an opportunity to transform de facto leadership into elected and responsible de jure leadership and to organize effectively. That their solution was no solution is evidenced by the fact that the leadership roles did not go away simply because the people who
occupied them vacated them.

The January 1973 Return to Minto week represented another potential turning point in the development of Sydney Gay Liberation as a social movement. The emerging differences between men and women, new participants and old hands, could have been resolved, according to the dominant paradigm, by the adoption of a hierarchically arranged, democratically elected set of structures in which all the diverse interests could have been represented — in much the same way that CAMP solved its problems. But once again Sydney Gay Liberation missed its opportunity to mature. To some extent, and for a limited period of time, some of the difficulties were resolved by the adoption of a segmentary, polycephalous, and reticulate structure. After the Minto Week, Sydney Gay Liberation developed two major autonomous groups — the official Gay Liberation and the pissed off activists — separating the new members/old hands source of conflict and each pursued its own particular interests in its own particular way. One of the interests of the pissed off activists was the pursuit of gay liberation goals by strategies in addition to consciousness raising and education. The group further segmented itself into those who were, and those who were not, prepared to make a shift in tactics from the politics of disorder to the politics of violence. In was at this stage in their development that the ‘McConaghy plan’ was conceived, preparations for its execution begun, and shelved. Following this, and learning from their mistakes, the pissed off activists who wanted to pursue the strategy of terrorism further segmented and became non-reticulate — until after they had achieved their particular goals.

The manner in which the pissed off activists reacted to the invitations to participate in the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium illustrates quite clearly the advantages which Gerlach attributes to the segmentary, polycephalous, reticulate form of organization that Sydney Gay Liberation was trying to develop and sustain. To call a meeting to form an alliance of all potential liberation movement participants and gain an assurance of a joint boycott, to write to McConaghy outlining conditions for participation and then, while he was trying to negotiate on those conditions, to publish a newspaper article announcing that the letter was a sham and there would not be participation under any circumstances, and then, ultimately, to attend the Symposium and throw eggs at him and make clear to the other psychiatrists there what their objections to psychiatry and McConaghy were would, at the very least, have to be acknowledged as flexible, adaptive, and confusing of the enemy.

Almost immediately after the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium however, Sydney Gay Liberation disintegrated. The dominant paradigm would argue that this was the result of its failure to organize. The emergent paradigm offers no explanation at all: Sydney Gay Liberation did begin to develop a segmentary, polycephalous and reticulate structure but it could not sustain that development.

The relationship of Sydney Gay Liberation to its target groups can be characterized as one where the target groups were dominant leading the movement to adopt tactics of intimidation, harassment, and obstruction: zap actions at theatres and hotels, the dumping of brains into psychosurgeon Bailey’s office, disrupting the Symposium, and handing out ‘Are You a Pooftah’ leaflets to school children, all share the characteristics of the politics of disorder — purposely legal ambiguity, directness, and a high turnover rate. Had that part of Sydney Gay Liberation which contemplated a shift from the politics of disorder to the politics of violence carried through their plan to destroy McConaghy’s equipment then Sydney Gay Liberation would have entered an entirely different relationship with its target groups.
4. The Thor Group.

The group of people who produced the newspaper Thor cannot legitimately be considered as a social movement — incipient or otherwise. They did not seek to change a significant part of the social order and they had no plans for continuing as a group, and social movement definitions insist that continuity at least be intended. Indeed, had not the NSW Government introduced the Indecent and Restricted Publications Bill in March 1973, the group would probably have subsided back into the Push sooner than it did.

What we are left with when we lay the social movement models over the data of the Sydney sexual liberation movements (1969 - 1973) is:

(1) the dominant paradigm being able to ‘explain’ the way CAMP developed and why Sydney Gay Liberation disintegrated but not being able to account for Sydney Women’s Liberation’s survival despite its failure to organize ‘effectively’;

(2) the emergent paradigm being able to accommodate the way Sydney Women’s Liberation developed but being unable to explain why neither CAMP nor Sydney Gay Liberation, despite their attempts to do so, could not sustain a segmentary, polycephalous and reticulate structure.

By now it is obvious that neither pressure group nor social movement analysis is at all interested in, or capable of accommodating, the detail of the relationships between individuals. They deal boldly with larger entities characterizing role types (agitator, administrator, negotiator) and relationships (leader—follower) rather grossly. Network analysis makes a strong contrast with the other two in this respect — it is interested in individual relationships. By and large, neither the pressure group nor the social movement models is interested in the activities of the movements surrounding the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium: pressure group analysis excludes it from consideration on the grounds that it does not represent an attempt to influence public policy; and the social movement literature's overriding concern with the causes of social movement formation, the motivations of movement joiners, and the internal development of social movements relegates it to a position of no importance.

Network analysis can be applied to any area of the data, including the activities of the movements surrounding the Symposium, and when it is, it reintroduces the individual into sociological focus. The network literature acknowledges that it cannot (yet?) offer a theory or model but claims that it should be regarded as a set of rules by which we can organize our perceptions. In a sense what it does is to remind us that, when we look at a set of interactions between individuals or groups, we should not forget to take into account a list of qualities which attach to those relationships.

It would be a mammoth task to try to apply the rules of network analysis to anyone of the Sydney movements as a whole and certainly not one which can be attempted here. What is possible here is to see what, if anything, network analysis can add to our understanding of why the individuals who were associated with the question of participation or non-participation in the Symposium behaved in the way that they did. Did the nature of the relationships they had with each other and the overall patterning of their networks affect their behaviour and if so, how.

**Dennis Altman:**

If we look first at Altman's decision not to accept McConaghy's invitation to give a paper at the CIBA-GEIGY Symposium, at first glance, his reasons for making that decision appear deceptively obvious and can be characterised primarily as political. As he stated in his letter of refusal to McConaghy, and at the joint meeting of 11 March 1973, for him to agree to give a paper could indicate to McConaghy and others that he condoned McConaghy's stance on homosexuality. Given his association with Gay Liberation, Altman was not prepared to risk these conclusions being drawn. Not only was Altman personally unwilling to participate in the Symposium but he was also instrumental in trying to organize a joint boycott of it by all the Sydney movements — again for political reasons. A joint boycott would indicate to McConaghy and others that the homosexual movement was not entirely powerless and alone in its opposition to him.

Altman's motivations and the pressures he felt were, however, much more complex than this and to ignore these complexities would be foolish. For his decisions were not reached in isolation, but in the context of his relationships with other people and of their relationships with each other.

For a start, his relationship with McConaghy was not simply one of homosexual and oppressor: they were also both academics in a relatively small academic community (Sydney had only three universities) and both were also linked to third parties who were also linked to each other. In addition, Altman and McConaghy were likely to meet socially from time to time. In
other words, the relationship between Altman and McConaghy was a multiplex rather than a simplex one. Being part of an academic community places obligations on its members one of which is participation in scholarly conferences, especially when personal invitations are issued. McConaghy initially tried to stress that strand of his relationship with Altman and put aside the ‘oppressor-homosexual’ strand. Altman tried to stress the latter aspect of their relationship and set aside the academic strand by stating that he did not consider the Symposium to be an academic meeting. Their relationship was thus also asymmetrical. This, at least, was Altman’s public stance. What he did not tell McConaghy (nor anybody else save Barry Prothero) was that he was never entirely convinced that participating in such discussions with psychiatrists was totally worthless; indeed he had done so before.

What was most influential in Altman’s decision was not his relationship with McConaghy but his relationships with other people. His links with the pissed off activist part of Gay Liberation, with people like John Lee and Paul Foss, were multiplex, durable, activated frequently, and intense. These people, Altman felt, would have attacked him (as they had done in the past) for ‘selling out’ had he agreed to participate. His relationships with them were asymmetrical: only they could give him one of the things he wanted from them — their approval, his ‘radical credentials’, as Altman himself put it. And they were totally opposed to either Gay Liberation or Altman participating. Altman’s links with Barry Prothero involved Gay Liberation political strands and personal political strands: Prothero held very strongly to their view that the Symposium should be disrupted; and Altman was reluctant to attract further publicity to his own activities and overshadow Prothero even more than the publication of his book had already done.

The idea of trying to organize a joint boycott of the Symposium by all the Sydney liberation movements and their participants had been floated after McConaghy had invited Sydney Gay Liberation and Sydney Women’s Liberation to provide speakers for it but before Altman had officially received his invitation. It was not taken past that stage until all invitees had been contacted — Altman, Fell, Bacon, Gay and Women’s Liberation. Altman, who had already discussed his fears of the way in which his participation in the Symposium could be used with some people in Gay Liberation and with Lex Watson and myself, fully endorsed the idea of a joint boycott. If it could be agreed upon then not only would he not participate but neither would any of the movements.

Altman argued hard for the joint boycott but had decided that if it could not be agreed to by everybody then he would participate in the Symposium. Once the joint meeting of 11 March 1973 had endorsed a boycott and he too signed the letter that went to McConaghy. Bacon had signed it and the letter was taken to Fell who endorsed only part of the demands made of McConaghy as conditions for participation. Altman had made a public commitment in front of a group of people whose friendship and ‘approval’ were important to him. His anger at Fell’s refusal to boycott as well as her successful efforts to get Bacon to change her mind was not at the actual breaking of the joint boycott but at their ‘unrestrained individualism’. In other words, Fell and Bacon could change their minds and participate, could break the boycott with impunity, but he could not have — despite the fact that he felt that giving a paper might have been worthwhile. The biggest push for solid non-participation was coming from Gay Liberation where Altman’s network was particularly dense and its links very intense and asymmetrical — much moreso than were either Fell’s or Bacon’s.

Liz Fell:

The kinds of pressures that Fell’s network links exerted on her with respect to her decision to participate in the Symposium were very different from those operating on Altman.
Her relationship with McConaghy was of much longer duration than Altman’s was and they were in contact with each other more frequently. It was also multiplex — friendship, academic, and an interest in psychiatry — and intense. Once McConaghy began to seek her advice on the planning of the Symposium it acquired another strand and became asymmetrical especially with respect to her being able to provide him with the contacts he needed in parts of the movements. The particular part of Fell’s network which was densest and where the links were most intense was not in either Sydney Women’s Liberation or Gay Liberation, but in the Push — with the former, her links were relatively weak in a loose-knit zone of her network.

Fell already considered herself to have participated in the organization of the Symposium had agreed to present a paper at it herself, and had arranged for Bacon to do so, when the meeting to organize the boycott was called. She was unable to attend it but its decision, the letter to McConaghy, was brought to her afterwards for her concurrence by Foss, Martin, and Lee. Having obtained her signature on it they would probably have been better off leaving immediately. But they did not and the more they talked the more uneasy Fell became about having signed it. She had been part and parcel of the organization of the Symposium but had just signed a letter demanding some say in that organization. Fell was, in a sense, placed in the position of having to choose between damaging one or other set of relationships. If she had left her signature on the letter where she had placed it with all the others she was likely to damage her link with McConaghy but strengthen her ties to Altman, Gay Liberation and Women’s Liberation and, most importantly to Bacon with whom her link was most intense. If she removed her signature, her link with McConaghy would remain intact but those with Altman, Gay Liberation, Women’s Liberation, and again, with Bacon, would be weakened. What she did had the effect of maintaining the two most intense (at the time) links in her network that were affected by the decision and risk weakening those which were already comparatively less intense. This she did first by crossing out her signature from the list of those making two demands of McConaghy and write her own single demand (that the Symposium be open) on the back of the letter. This still left her somewhat at odds with Bacon and would have left her, at this stage, alone in presenting a paper to the Symposium. What she did then was to convince Bacon to change her mind as well. Both gained assurances from McConaghy that the Symposium would be open and both presented papers to it. Fell went further: she assisted McConaghy in getting a speaker from Sydney Women’s Liberation and in this respect she was a critical link in his network into the movement because she provided him with access to a part of it — Joyce Stevens and through her to Judy Mundey who gave a paper at his Symposium — which had not participated in the boycott meeting and indeed, knew nothing about it. Fell could break the boycott with impunity because those who were most anxious for it to remain in tact represented the loosest knit zone of her network where her links were weakest. And starting off alone in agreeing to give a paper, she secured the participation of Bacon and a Sydney Women’s Liberationist.

Wendy Bacon:

Bacon’s network links with Sydney Women’s Liberation and Sydney Gay Liberation were even weaker than Fell’s and her links to McConaghy were indirect — through Fell. With the possible exception of her links to Gill Leany, which had a common Push strand to them, Bacon’s links with Women’s Liberationists were uniplex and asymmetrical: they were based on an awareness of their different positions adopted with respect to pornography. For many Women’s Liberationists Bacon presented something of a problem: she had run foul of the law for publishing what they considered to be sexist pornography which objectified women, and yet the tactics she used in her fight — her militance, her anarchism, her disrespect for the law — they found admirable. Bacon had been made aware of the hostility of Women’s Liberation to
what she published and she was also aware that those sections of Gay Liberation which were closest to adopting women's liberation concepts and analyses were not entirely comfortable with the contents of Thor either.

When she went to the joint meeting she had already agreed via Fell to give a paper on censorship to the Symposium. Her closest ally, Fell, was not at the meeting. Under the pressure of having to be the only individual at the meeting who disagreed with a strongly held position, she signed the letter to McConaghy and was assured that it would immediately be taken around to Fell for her signature. At this stage, Bacon can be seen as having strengthened her weak links with Altman, Women's and Gay Liberation in two ways: by not presenting a paper she expressed her solidarity with the fight of homosexuals against McConaghy; and by not presenting a paper which was to be on censorship and pornography she would not voice once again her views on pornography with which the Liberation movements disagreed. She had only an indirect link with McConaghy, through Fell, and so it would be Fell's relationship with McConaghy that would be damaged if any damage was to be involved — but this would occur anyway when Fell signed the letter herself. Her link with Fell, which of all those involved at this stage was the most intense, would remain unaffected.

When it came, as it did shortly after that, to making a choice of who 'to back up', Bacon, understandably, chose to back up Fell. It was her link with Fell (rather than her indirect link through Fell to McConaghy) that was strongest: it was intense, durable, activated frequently, and it was part of a very dense zone in which they both participated — the Push. By contrast, her links with Altman, Women's and Gay Liberation were already weak, asymmetrical, and infrequently activated: it cost her less to change her mind (again) and present a paper than it would have to stick to her agreement to boycott the Symposium when Fell had not.

The Pissed Off Activists:

It is also possible, though less useful and more difficult, to try to apply the methods of network analysis to the pissed-off activist section of Sydney Gay Liberation which began to meet separately and in intended secrecy in February 1973. Starting out from discussion amongst people involved in the movement from its inception and who were pissed off with the influx of new people into Gay Liberation in January, it quickly spread via the networks links of some of the people involved to some they intended to invite and to others they had not intended to invite. John Lee and Pam Stein started off the chain reaction and they spread the invitation out — basically along sex lines.
After several meetings, the patterning of the overall network began to differentiate itself into zones of differing intensity. First, the links amongst the women were intense, symmetrical, and of 100% density, they formed a clique.

Second, the links amongst the men did not constitute a clique overall — there was a clique within a cluster. Only some of the links were intense and symmetrical — others were asymmetrical and some were weak to the point of being severed.

Frank Taylor was a person to whom, after only a short while, nobody wished to be linked. Almost all of Rod Byatt's links were asymmetrical — the people he considered to be key radicals did not see him in that light — and he wanted them too. Terry Rolfe, Lance Gowland, and Richard Wilson were on the periphery of the cluster, linked to only some individuals. The clique consisted basically of four people — Lee, Foss, Martin, McDiamid — with Prothero's position complicated by the perceived nature of his link to Altman who the pissed off activists did not want informed of their plans. Prothero was clearly very much a part of the group and was a leading participant in the action taken against Harry Bailey, yet none of the pissed off activists I interviewed mentioned him unless prompted.

The third thing to note is that the links between the women and the men were in the densest zone of the male network. And for the most part they were asymmetrical. The men wanted something from the women — acceptance as 'radical' and 'relatively non-sexist' — which the women could bestow on them and this was something the women did not want from the men but got from each other. All of the women were seen as radical by the other women
and by the men — but only a few of the men were seen as radical either by the women or by other men.

Thus, in the overall patterning, there were two very dense zones or cliques, which fed out into less dense zones or clusters and thence to loose knit networks. The content of the links within each clique were same sex, correspondence between self- and other-perceived radicalness, and commonality of past experience. The content of the links between the cliques, with the exception of the same sex link, were the same — radicalness, and commonality of past experience. Despite the fact that it was Byatt who actually went out to Prince Henry on the reconnaissance mission with Lee, he was not accorded the status of radical because of that action, and was not included in the clique. Again, despite the fact that it was Stein’s failure to maintain secrecy which led to the plan being called off, she was not excluded from the clique nor were her radical credentials questioned.

It is also interesting to note, with respect to the McConaghy Plan, the links that the pissed off activists did not activate which they conceivable could have. Besides Altman who was deliberately excluded from the group’s meetings, they could, in trying to locate McConaghy’s equipment, have activated their links to me — they knew I knew where the equipment was. But I was part of reformist CAMP.

The rules of network analysis can be applied to any collection of interacting individuals but it is much more useful when applied to ego centred networks than those which are not so focused — and easier to manage.
CHAPTER 6. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS.

A. THE IMAGES COMPARED.

Applying the three transparencies to the data is somewhat like using the zoom lens of a camera to focus sharply on specific aspects of the Sydney sexual liberation movements and blur the rest. Network analysis acts as the most powerful enlarger picking up in detail the actions and motivations of individuals in their relationships with each other. But it can best do this when the number of individuals involved is quite small and the action pivots around one particular individual. It does return the individual to sociological focus but it also produces a feeling of uneasiness that a great deal of the action is happening off camera. It is interested in all aspects of the activities of the movements, it excludes no data as irrelevant, but it can only accommodate little bits of it at any one time. Both the pressure group and the social movement models, on the other hand, exclude sections of the data as irrelevant to their particular concerns.

Pressure group analysis is interested in one quite specific type of activity that some of the Sydney sexual liberation movements sometimes undertook — lobbying for changes to public policy making and/or administration. It is interested in the internal workings of the movements only at the time of any particular lobbying exercise and only to the extent that what was happening inside may account for the success or failure of the lobbying. The social movement model concentrates almost exclusively on the internal developments of the movements as these occur over time and is interested in their external activities only insofar as these affect that internal development. Nor is it possible to combine the two models to give a more complete picture — they ask questions of the data which are too different.

1. Pressure Group Analysis:

Excludes as irrelevant, or is not interested in, a whole series of activities which the Sydney sexual liberation movements consider to be far more important than their lobbying activities:

(a) It is not interested in those activities which the movements undertake to change the self-images that women and gays have of themselves. Both the women’s and gay movements are concerned to achieve change through changing society and through changing individuals. Changed individuals are a co-requisite of (sometimes considered to be a pre-requisite for) a changed society. The small consciousness raising groups and the attempts at mass consciousness raising through, for example, the 1973 Women’s Commission, cannot be accommodated by the pressure group model without a good deal of distortion of their purpose. They were seen by the movements as ends in themselves or as means to long term revolutionary change. If or when enough individuals change the way they see themselves and the world around them that world itself will have to change — or it will already be changed. The pressure group model could see them incorporated as means to more pragmatic and limited goals — or it could see them much the way that WEL’s Beatrice Faust characterized them — as unnecessary and wasteful of resources. Consciousness raising involves a conception of social change which cannot be accommodated within pressure group analysis.

(b) Pressure group analysis is not interested in those activities of the liberation movements which aim at influencing decisions made by groups which are not part of the public policy process. It acknowledges the existence of important power bases, such as the medical profession, but only when those power bases themselves attempt to influence public policy. It does not recognize, as the sexual liberation movements did, that some groups, the medical profession in particular, can wield enormous power completely independently of the institutions of government. This, for a model which traces its intellectual ancestry back to normative
pluralism and laissez-faire economics, is rather paradoxical. The movements went directly to the medical profession and tried, by various means — blacklisting, dumping buckets of brains, argument, lecturing to medical students, throwing eggs, and publishing — to get the profession to change. Pressure group analysis, by indirect implication of its emphasis on public policy, would argue that they should have tried to (or they were trying by these acts?) to get the issues they were concerned with onto the public policy agenda and then have public policy regulate the profession. The movements tried to influence the profession in two ways: by challenging it head on and trying to whittle away some of the sources of its power. By blacklisting some doctors, by advising women to go to specialist rather than general practitioners for contraceptive advice, by attacking Bailey and McConaghy they were confronting parts of the profession. By publishing *What Every Woman Should Know*, by encouraging women to take control of their own bodies, by establishing the Homosexual Guidance Service, the movements were demystifying the role of the medical profession, discouraging people from consulting it in the first place. The attempts by both movements to demonstrate the political nature of the power of the profession took that demystification a step further. They tried to demonstrate to the profession itself, and to its potential clients, that by withholding information from clients, by insisting that some forms of behaviour required treatment while others did not, and by expending research funds and time in some areas and not in others, the profession itself acted as an agent of social control with much more subtlety and effectiveness than any set of public policy decisions could hope to accomplish.

(c) Pressure group analysis is not interested in the internal development of the sexual liberation movements unless these can be of some use in 'explaining' the effectiveness or otherwise of their lobbying activities. It might be interested in the issue of lesbianism within Sydney Women's Liberation if that can be related to its effectiveness as a pressure group: did it affect the movement's credibility, did it affect the movement's ability to attract supporters, and so on. The demand that CAMP lesbians made of Sydney Women's Liberation to confront the issue of lesbianism did not have to be tacked on to the end of it — so that you can help us influence public policy. Pressure group analysis is interested in internal structure and organization at particular points in time (when lobbying) as static variables on one side of an equation with success or failure on the other.

(d) Related to the preceding areas of disinterest and probably partially responsible for them, is the total lack of interest in the attempts of the liberation movements to develop living ideologies: ideologies which would not only explain why things were the way they were but also inform everyday practice — from interpersonal relationships and how the movements should organize themselves to how they should go about trying to achieve their goals. Pressure group analysis cannot accommodate that kind of ideological development nor the importance that was attached to it and this is partly because its own ideological underpinnings are so strong. An effective pressure group, and this above all is what the literature is interested in, is pragmatic, composed of individuals who act like 'rational political men', moderate in its demands and is able and willing to manipulate the rules of the game by which it agrees to abide, because from time to time, it can win by those rules. By restricting its concern to the lobbying activities of the liberation movements pressure group analysis takes those activities out of the context in which they were embarked upon by the movements and by doing this, it distorts. In some ways, with respect to trying to secure the participation of the gay movement in his Symposium, McConaghy acted as if we were a pressure group and he acted as if participation in his Symposium could be isolated from the wider ideological context of the movement's activities. He consistently misunderstood the very nature of the movement's objections to him.
areas:

(a) They ignore the way that social movements go about effecting change to parts of or the entire social system. They insist that this desire for change is the reason social movements form but once this is stated, interest in how they actually try to change things either drops out of the question altogether or is sustained only by relating it to how the movements develop internally. In the dominant paradigm all efforts at effecting change to the social order are seen in terms of their effect on the movement’s ability to recruit and retain members. It would look, for example, at the gay movement’s attacks on psychiatry not to see what effect they had on changing psychiatrists but in order to gauge what effect those attacks had on the movement’s ability to recruit more adherents. After stating that the raison d’être of social movements is social change, the dominant paradigm then in fact postulates a major goal displacement: once formed, the prime directive of social movements becomes organization maintenance and survival. And the best way to ensure survival is to develop a centralized, bureaucratic structure with a pyramidal chain of command.

The emergent paradigm also pays less attention than is warranted to how social movements go about effecting changes to the social order, but it does represent an improvement on the dominant paradigm. It does not assume that social movements undergo a goal displacement—it leaves their main goal at social change and argues that a segmentary, polyecephalous and reticulate structure is the most effective way of working toward that change and, incidentally, an effective way of preventing goal displacement.

(b) The second area which both paradigms neglect is the role of a social movement’s ideology in its development and the way it goes about trying to change what it wants to change. Because the dominant paradigm does not pay any attention to a social movement’s ideology, it cannot accommodate Women’s Liberation’s ideological objections to organizing itself along bureaucratic lines and treats the movement as one which has failed to mature organizationally.

(c) A third important area of neglect is anything which could account for shifts in tactics. Neither paradigm offers an explanation for why one part of Sydney Gay Liberation decided to opt out of the politics of disorder and into the politics of violence nor why it did not persist in that, but disintegrated. Neither does social movement analysis feel it necessary to explain why any social movement does not reject the accepted rules for bringing about social change and engage in violence. Given that one of the characteristics attributed to social movements is their anti-institutional stance what needs at least some consideration is why more social movements, especially those which are dominated by their target groups, do not opt for violence.

Pressure group analysis, perhaps because it is much more specific and narrow in its focus, could be applied to all the lobbying activities of the liberation movements and produce fairly consistent images—consistent in the sense that it attributed success to the same sorts of factors in all cases and looked in the same direction for reasons to explain failure. It can offer plausible—if not convincing—explanations for the failures of Sydney Women’s Liberation to achieve abortion law repeal and of CAMP to achieve homosexual law reform and it can offer reasons for Sydney Women’s Liberation’s success in trying to achieve changes to the child welfare system. Social movement analysis does not produce the same sort of consistent images—the dominant paradigm can accommodate CAMP and Gay Liberation but not Women’s Liberation; the emergent paradigm, Women’s Liberation only. Three different social movements all starting off from a position of being a small group of enthusiasts developed along entirely different organizational paths: Women’s Liberation into a segmentary, polyecephalous and
What the social movement literature does not offer us is any clue as to why they followed such divergent paths. Luther Gerlach's tentatively expressed suggestion that those movements which adopt a segmentary, polycephalous, reticulate structure are likely to be those whose adherents have had no experience with the centralized bureaucratic form does not hold for Women's Liberation — it was precisely their negative experiences with such forms of organization in the new and old left that led the early Women's Liberationists to try to develop a structure and method of organization for the movement which would prevent the emergence of a centralized bureaucracy. It is also difficult to see how the adherents of some of the other social movements Gerlach draws upon — black and student movements in America, for example — have escaped contact with centralized bureaucracies. The implications of his suggestion — that these adherents did not know how to organize bureaucratically — underlines the failure of even the emergent paradigm to accommodate the role of ideology. The student movement and the women's movement, at least, had ideological objections to a centralized bureaucratic form of organization.

How can we explain why Sydney Women's Liberation developed in one way, CAMP in another, and why Sydney Gay Liberation disintegrated? If we take only those two which did grow to be more than a small group of enthusiasts and try to look at the differences between them, we might be able to indicate the direction in which possible explanations lie, and, at the same time, illustrate some of the other problem areas in social movement analysis.

(a) Sydney Women's Liberation was comprised of women only; CAMP's membership was mixed, but predominantly male. Both women and men in Australia are likely to have some experience of centralized bureaucratic forms of organization, even if it is only being on the receiving end. But for men as a whole, at least some of that experience is more likely to have been of a positive nature than for women as a whole — simply because of the dominant position of men. The subordinate position of women in general, coupled with the direct negative experiences of centralized bureaucratic forms that Women's Liberationists had had, partly because they were women, is likely to have produced more hostility to that form of organization in Women's Liberation than in CAMP.

(b) Sydney Women's Liberation was potentially and actually much larger than CAMP. Potentially, Sydney Women's Liberation could encompass 50% of the population CAMP only 10% — 15%. The actual numbers of Women's Liberationists cannot be known but its International Women's Day marches attracted several thousand more participants than CAMP had signed up on its books. Size may affect the way a social movement organizes in two ways. First, it is possible that the smaller a social movement's potential and actual membership, the more likely it is that the movement will displace its social change goal by one of organization maintenance and survival. And in both cases, which is not possible for all social movements, it was possible to put a finite maximum on potential membership. Second, Gerlach's model of social movement development in which a range of diverse groups 'grow and die, divide and fuse, proliferate and contract' assumes that the movement is large enough for this to occur without the movement disappearing. In other words, there is probably a minimum number of groups which a social movement has to have before it can develop along segmentary, polycephalous, reticulate lines. The highest number of groups that CAMP ever had going at any one time before it adopted its constitution was 5 and just before it adopted the constitution it had only two. Once it had gone beyond its initial stages of three groups, Sydney Women's Liberation continued to spawn sufficient numbers of new groups to be able to afford the death of old ones — in April 1973, for example, it had around 25 autonomous groups; when the push was on in 1970-71 to organize bureaucratically, it had at least 6 or 7 groups. Sheer size as reflected in the number of autonomous groups possible may in fact be one of the most important
factors in explaining why Gay Liberation could not sustain the structure it tried to develop — if two groups were allowed to die, there were none.

(c) The costs of participation in Women’s Liberation were not the same (not as high) as the costs of membership of CAMP. Social movement models treat participation costs as the same for all social movements which is clearly not the case. Here, I am not talking about those costs which the literature does consider when it refers to demands on time and so on which must be offset by incentives. I am talking about something rather different. If I say to somebody that I am a Women’s Liberationist what I am telling them basically is that I subscribe to a particular set of beliefs and that I am likely to act in certain ways in certain circumstances. If, however, I say to somebody that I am a member of CAMP, I am telling them two things about me that they did not already know: I am telling them that I hold a particular set of beliefs AND, more importantly, I am telling them that I am a lesbian. For many homosexuals, to join CAMP meant that they risked being unmasked as a homosexual; to join Women’s Liberation involved no comparable risk. The cost affected the size to which CAMP could grow and the more the organization was seen as applying pressure to homosexuals to come out, the higher the risk, the higher the cost of membership.

There is an obverse side to this cost which may have affected the level of commitment to the goals of both movements; and it is related to the consistency with which the pressures which encouraged people to join in the first place are reinforced. Let us assume, for the moment, that a woman becomes active in Women’s Liberation because she feels oppressed as a woman and wants to do something about changing that situation. She can deny to the rest of the world that she is a Women’s Liberationist, but she cannot deny that she is a woman. Assume that a male homosexual joins CAMP because he feels oppressed as a homosexual and wants to do something about changing that situation. He can deny to the rest of the world that he is a member of CAMP AND he can deny that he is a homosexual — indeed, until he tells the rest of the world that he is a homosexual, it will assume that he is not. And the choice of whether he tells the world is largely in his hands. Holding constant for both, the psychological oppression felt by being a woman or a male homosexual, for the male homosexual, whether or not he is going to be denied a job, for example, because he is a homosexual is largely in his hands because he can deny that he is a homosexual; for the woman, whether or not she is going to be denied a job because she is a woman is entirely out of her hands because she cannot deny that she is a woman. When you cannot ‘opt out’ of whether or not you are going to be discriminated against it is possible that the commitment (because it is being more consistently reinforced by factors beyond your control) to fight is likely to be stronger.

(d) Sydney Women’s Liberation and CAMP differed markedly in the degree to which they emphasized social activities as part of their functions. One of CAMP’s first four aims was to entertain its members. Its clubrooms were important to members because they could be a refuge and provided a place to meet other homosexuals. And for most of CAMP’s members, this was undoubtedly its major attraction. Women’s Liberation, on the other hand, did not offer to entertain — it offered work. If women enjoyed participating in its activities then this was considered as a sort of ‘fringe benefit’. The fact that what most of CAMP’s members wanted out of the organization was its social life probably contributed to the goal displacement. CAMP could provide them with what they wanted only if it survived as an organization and it could survive quite happily without doing anything about social change. And again, probably the best structure for a small organization intent on sheer survival to adopt is a bureaucratic one.

(e) The final difference between the two is the extent to which each was developing a distinct ideology. As has been mentioned elsewhere, Sydney Women’s Liberation was
Developing an ideology which was becoming broader and broader, taking into account more and more areas of women's lives and explaining how the same basic pattern of oppression was involved. It was an ideology which was constantly expanding, constantly finding new manifestations of oppression and each new area triggered off a dozen new areas for investigation, analysis, and eventual incorporation into the larger picture. It was not an ideology that was handed down complete from the pen of some dead foremother and which had to be modified to take account of changed circumstances. It was one which was growing with the movement and in the same sort of piecemeal way—what triggered new developments in that ideological growth were not a series of intellectual decision but lived experiences. CAMP, on the other hand, or at most, the few individuals in it who were interested, was unable to develop a distinct ideology. The best it could do was to try to adopt the concepts and analyses of the women's movement to the position of male homosexuals—to the extent of declaring CAMP to be a radical feminist organization. And without that living, growing ideology, CAMP was pushed even more toward a goal of sheer survival.

These may be some of the factors which offer plausible explanations for why CAMP followed one path of development and Sydney Women's Liberation a totally different one.

3. Network Analysis:

The difficulties of trying to apply the concepts of network analysis to parts of the activities of the Sydney sexual liberation movements are of an entirely different order from those which accompany either pressure group or social movement analysis. In essence, the major difficulty is one of not being able to see the forest for the trees. The other difficulty which I became very aware of when applying those concepts to the particular decisions that Altman, Fell, and Bacon, made about whether or not they would participate in the Symposium was that network analysis offered me only two possibilities for characterizing the way an individual and their network are related, and I found neither of these entirely satisfactory. One possibility sees that the decision each made was determined by the structure of their network. The other sees each manipulating their social network so that whatever they decided would not ultimately work out to be detrimental to their network links. I do not find any difficulty in accepting the notion that the structure of each's network had some role to play—I cannot accept that it was the determining factor. I find it even more difficult however, to see each manipulating their network to the extent implied by that strand of the literature. The whole idea of network manipulation by individuals implies a degree of conscious calculation of the possible consequences of particular decisions on their networks which is far too reminiscent of 'rational economic man' working in a state of perfect knowledge. The structuralist strand to network analysis implies that anyone occupying that place in the network with those kinds of links would have made the same decision, and with that kind of determinism, the individual, who network analysis was meant to restore to sociological focus, disappears again. The manipulative strand to network analysis carries different implications. It takes the consequences for an individual's network of a particular decision or action and then invites us to regard them as the motives for that decision or action. By suggesting, for example, that the consequences for Fell's network links of her decision to participate in McConaghy's Symposium were that her links with McConaghy and Bacon were strengthened, it implies that she made the decision she did in order to have that effect on her overall network. It implies that she made some sort of calculation in advance about which links she could afford to see weakened and which she could not, and made her decision on the basis of such a calculation. This interpretation is wholly too manipulative and involves a degree of motive attribution which is both totally unjustified and likely to be wrong.
The other major difficulty with this branch of network analysis which seeks to restore the individual to sociological focus is that it works best when doing just that — restoring the individual. If you are interested in exploring the interactional characteristics (the nature of the links between individuals) of a particular network then it must be an ego-centric network, it must revolve around a particular individual. If you are interested in the network links of a group of people, such as the pissed off activists, it becomes very difficult to explore the interactional characteristics of the network and the emphasis shifts to the morphological characteristics — the overall patterning of the network.

With network analysis, we have a set of rules for organizing our perceptions which allow us to focus only on the individual liberationist but blinds us to the movement of which they are a part. With pressure group analysis we have a set of rules for organizing our perceptions which allow us to focus only on a limited range of the external activities of the movements taken out of context — more correctly the external activities of some of the movements. With social movement analysis we have a set of rules for organizing our perceptions which allow us to focus only on how the internal structure and organization of some of the movements are supposed to change over time with no consideration of what social movements are set up to do — change society or part of it.

B. SCIENTIFIC POLITICAL ACTIVISM — POLITICAL SCIENCE ACTIVISM.

Social science models are not merely different ways of looking at the world, they are very important ways of ordering the world. First, by focusing on particular aspects of the way the world operates they indicate that these aspects are important and that others are not — they bestow the epiphet 'worthy of study' on whatever they do study. Then, having settled on particular areas for study they then tell us how we should go about studying them. They seduce us into suspending disbelief, into no longer acting as if this were merely one way of viewing the world but into acting as if this were the way the world really is. And the more plausible the conception of the world the model offers, the more potent is its seductive power.

When I was researching the social movement literature, for example, for a long time all I came across was minor variations on the dominant paradigm. And the more I read about how a social movement had to develop a centralized bureaucratic method of organization if it was to mature into an effective social movement, the more depressed I became about what I too came to see as Sydney Women's Liberation's failure to develop. To me, the social movement literature was condemning the movement to a state of permanent infancy and ineffectiveness. It was even more depressing to constantly read about what happened to social movements once they did succumb to the inevitable and organize bureaucratically. The relief with which I greeted Gerlach's model was not purely intellectual. It offered more than simply a different way of viewing Sydney Women's Liberation it offered a rationale for the movement's structure, it turned a failure to organize effectively into a way of organizing differently that was more effective and it offered very good reasons for the movement to continue to organize in that way. The power to change the way I felt about participating in Women's Liberation, about its chances of accomplishing what it was trying to do, to change the way I would act in it, reminded me of an old music hall song. It tells of a man setting forth for a walk one morning feeling very chipper. As he walks along the street he keeps running into people who greet him with 'My word you do look ill'. As person after person passes the same judgement on his appearance he begins to feel more and more ill and is just about to crawl back home to die when he meets a friend who greets him with 'My word you do look well'.
Part of the reason why so much emphasis is placed by women's liberation movements
the world over on consciousness raising is the recognition of the tremendous power that how
you view the world and your place in it has over how you act in it. It has adopted a term to
describe the destructive impact of accepting another person's interpretation of your reality —
'gaslighting'. It is drawn from the movie Gaslight, in which Charles Boyer plays the part of a
husband who sets out to drive his wife, Ingrid Bergman, insane by manipulating her perceptions
of reality — he pretends that what she hears he does not hear and tells her that what she sees
is not really there. And by manipulating her reality in this way, by constantly implying that
she is already insane, he almost succeeds in driving her insane.

There is the same kind of self-fulfilling prophecy role built into the data manipulation
involved in the relationship between social science models and the data which they set out to
explain. They invite us to see the world in one particular way, to act as if it were the way
the world is, and then, by thus restricting how we act in the world, can show us that in fact
their way of seeing the world is the way the world really is. At the point at which I was
engrossed in the dominant social movement paradigm, had I, for example, been asked to decide
upon which way Sydney Women's Liberation should organize itself, I would probably have
acted on my belief in the inevitability of it developing a centralized bureaucratic form and the
advantages claimed for such a form and said, let us organize in this way. By so doing I would
have acted toward fulfilling the prophecy that this is the way social movements must inevitably
organize if they are to be effective. Social science models are thus very strong conservatising
forces — they conserve old ways of viewing the world and hence of acting in it.

In a sense, probably the most important lesson that I, the political activist, learned
from me, the political scientist, in working on this material, was to be extremely wary of
being 'gaslighted' by social science, of being locked into trying to work only within the
frameworks offered by social science conceptions of what I am involved in.

As a political scientist, what has the political activist been able to teach me? Has
anything been gained by overlaying the data, already informed and structured by my own
implicit theoretical and value orientations, my own ordering of reality, with the frameworks
of pressure group, social movement and network analyses. As has been spelt out above, each
regards some of what I considered important to be irrelevant, each requires some distortion
of the data if they are to be accommodated within the framework, and none is sufficiently
broad to cover all aspects of the sexual liberation movements. There does not exist, at
the moment, a social science model which can adequately accommodate any one of them.

The title 'pressure group' analysis is somewhat of a misnomer. It does not, in fact,
offer a way of analysing pressure groups but a way to analyse the process of lobbying. And
even here its applications would probably best be restricted — i.e., involve least distortion —
to groups set up primarily for the purpose of lobbying in the public policy arena. In this
way, conflict between the values that the model imposes and the values to which the groups
themselves subscribe is likely to be minimized and the model able to more accurately characterize
the activities of the groups. This would undoubtedly limit the field of study of pressure group
analysis quite severely, but justifiable.

As far as the social movement models are concerned they both need to be considerably
broadened in the kinds of things they deal with in order to help us understand what social
movements are on about. The dominant paradigm may remain dominant and indeed, it best
accommodates some of the data on CAMP — some but not all. The emergent paradigm looks
to be the most promising model available to accommodate the data on Sydney Women's
Liberation but its deficiencies in this respect point very clearly to the problems of model
modification. It started out from within the same broad framework as the dominant paradigm and it modified one aspect of it — how social movements develop internally — but it is still stuck with the other limitations of the framework because it still ignores the same areas, most importantly, the role of ideology and the way that social movements go about affecting the changes they form to achieve.

Network analysis is in some ways the most and the least promising. Most promising because it is still in its formative stages of development and least promising because it is difficult to see how it could accommodate the volume of data on the movements - except one bit at a time.
AFTERWORD
AFTERWORD

It is now eleven years since Sydney Women's Liberation, CAMP and Sydney Gay Liberation were small groups of enthusiasts fighting to change the world. From time to time a variety of small groups of gay activists have formed around particular issues or at particular times and, for the most part, they have subsided again fairly quickly. Various attempts have been made to establish umbrella organizations — federations of one sort or another — but these have usually been abandoned after bitter fights. CAMP has persisted as the single longest surviving homosexual organization Australia has known but it is a vastly different organization from the one John Ware and Christabel Poll envisaged. Over the years it has gone through a series of changes of leadership. It has modified its constitution, and wave after wave of women has tried to work within its framework, only to leave in despair and become more committed to Women's Liberation. It has moved further and further into the background of political activity and become more and more respectable. James Q Wilson would undoubtedly approve of its having become a registered charity and of its current moves to divest itself entirely of its membership and become an incorporated service organization.

Sydney Women's Liberation is also eleven years old. It has not adopted a centralized bureaucratic structure and, although cries that it should do so have been voiced from time to time, over the years those cries have become less and less frequent. Groups have formed and died, split and fused and that process is still going on. No single group has ever assumed the dominance that the Glebe group once had and the movement retains its many leaders characteristic. In its eleven year history on only a few occasions has a formal vote ever been taken, most often at particular conferences on procedural matters. In April 1977 a meeting was called to decide upon whether or not the Spartacist League should be expelled from general meetings of Sydney Women's Liberation. It was probably the most heated meeting the movement ever experienced, not least of all because there were those who wanted to vote for expulsion, those who wanted to vote against it, and those who refused (not abstained) to vote at all. The Spartacist League was not expelled and the principal of the autonomy of groups was reaffirmed — if any group wanted to exclude Spartacists from its meetings, it was up to the individual group. Sydney Women's Liberation is still its autonomous groups, and at present these number about 30. And it is still expanding into new areas of analysis and action. The biggest problem it faces now is not survival not how to organize itself, but how to cope with partial institutionalization and the constant rumours of its imminent demise. Patriarchy, like capitalism, has the most infuriatingly amoeba like capacity to engulf foreign objects and put them to its own uses.

And McConaghy? It would appear that he is finding it a little more difficult to find "subjects", as he still calls homosexuals, these days. In reply to a letter I wrote asking him whether he still offered aversion therapy to homosexuals, he wrote back on 19 January 1981 that their "research since 1973 has led us to believe that most forms of desensitization are as effective as aversion therapy in most subjects and this is offered as initial treatment of choice". And he estimated that over the last two years, the number of people seeking treatment for specifically "homosexual urges" was down to about one third of the average of the years 1964—1976.

APPENDIX

A. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON SYDNEY SEXUAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS PARTICIPANTS


This consisted of 270 names and addresses, very few of whom were identifiable in terms of their backgrounds. Of the 270, 13 were men and there were an additional 45 with whom it was impossible to tell whether they were female or male -- their surnames were preceded only by initials. Some of the men were identifiable as members of university staffs, left wing political activists, or friends and relatives of the women who were involved in Sydney Women's Liberation. Of the 270, therefore, 212 (79%) were identifiable as women who had either sent money, made enquiries, or subscribed to the newsletter, that is, they were potential supporters and participants. Of these 212 a further 20 were excluded from SES rating analysis because their addresses were beyond the Sydney metropolitan area which is the range of the atlas; they were in places such as Armidale, Terrigal, Parkes, Cootamundra and Broken Hill. Of the remaining 192:

- 38% lived in suburbs with the highest SES rating
- 45% lived in suburbs with intermediate SES rating
- 17% lived in suburbs with the lowest SES rating.

The suburbs with the highest concentrations of potential participants were Glebe (22) and Paddington (15) with other highest SES rating Eastern Suburbs such as Woollahra, Vaucluse, Edgecliff, and Double Bay accounting for another 20. Combining both the short and the long lists:

Table 1. Socio-Economic-Status Ratings of Residential Addresses of 1970 Glebe Lists of Activists and Potential Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES Rating</th>
<th>% of Short List Activists</th>
<th>% of Long List Potential Participants</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus there is some evidence to support the oft heard claim that Women's Liberation is a 'middle class movement' IF AND ONLY IF that claim is taken to mean that most of the women involved in the beginnings of the movement came from middle class residential areas.

2. Information Obtained from Wortley 1972 about the Membership of Sydney Women's Liberation and CAMP

(a) Sydney Women's Liberation:

Wortley sent out questionnaires to 150 subscribers, chosen at random from the mailing list for The Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter. 91 questionnaires were returned, 88 completed. If we compare the age distributions of the 1972 figures, and the 1970 Glebe short list, with those of the Australian female population as at 1971 and adjusted, the following picture emerges.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1970 Glebe Short List</th>
<th>1971 Australian Female Population</th>
<th>1972 Newsletter Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 30-40</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4,455,000</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjustment to the Australian female population figures of 1971 took the following form: Because the youngest of Wortley's respondents was 20 years old but the youngest on the Glebe short list was 17 years old, those under 17 years of age in the Australian female population figures were excluded and percentages calculated on the basis of women 17 years and over.

The distribution of ages in Sydney Women's Liberation amongst Newsletter subscribers in 1972 is skewed much more toward youth than that for the overall population of women and that for the 1970 Glebe list of activists, is skewed even further.
In terms of occupation, the 1972 Newsletter subscribers differed markedly from the Australian female population in some respects, most particularly with respect to the proportions engaged in paid employment rather than in the unpaid labour of ‘keeping house’.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Activity</th>
<th>Australian Female Population 15 Years and Over</th>
<th><em>Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter</em> Subscribers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Labour Force</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,623,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labour force statistics include full and part time employment as well as those unemployed but looking for work. When these figures are broken down, another difference appears:

Table 4. Level of Participation in Labour Force: Australian Female Population and *Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter* Subscription List, 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Employed</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Part Time Employment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,803,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, the *Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter* subscribers were far more likely to be in the labour force or studying than Australian women in general, and, within the labour force, more likely to be fully employed than engaged in part time work.

In terms of the occupations in which the Newsletter subscribers were employed, the overall picture of women being concentrated in ‘female occupation’ was repeated by subscribers. There were, however, major differences in terms of the particular female occupations in which the subscribers were concentrated.

Table 5. Percentages of Female Workforce (1971) and Percentages of *Sydney Women’s Liberation Newsletter* Subscribers (1972) in Major Female Occupations Classified According to Percentage of Occupation Female (1971).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Females as % of Total in Occupation (1971)</th>
<th>% of Female Workforce in Occupation (1971)</th>
<th>% of Newsletter Subscribers in Occupation (1972)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stenographers, Typists</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionists</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Workers, Private</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maids, Hotels, Hospitals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Machinists</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoneists</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machine Operators</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters, Waitress</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering and Kitchen</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and medical attendants</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressers, Beauticians</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packers, wrappers, labelers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and shop assistants</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblers, process workers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners — Office and building</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-keepers, cashiers, tellers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5, cont:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Females as % of Total in Occupation (1971)</th>
<th>% of Female Workforce in Occupation (1971)</th>
<th>% of Newsletter Subscribers in Occupation (1972)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Teachers Teachers with Tertiary Qualifications Clerical Workers (not classified elsewhere)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter subscribers did not specify whether they were tertiary qualified or not.
Thus, while the overall picture of concentration in female occupations is replicated by subscribers, it is clear that teachers and clerical workers are 'over-represented' amongst subscribers, and process-workers, packers, machinists, domestic workers, and so on, are grossly 'under-represented'.

(b) CAMP

Occupations of Female Members of CAMP Surveyed by Wortley.

- 6 students
- 2 laboratory technicians
- 2 nurses
- 2 teachers
- 1 each — librarian, computer programmer, secretary.

Occupations of Male Members of CAMP Surveyed by Wortley

- 11 clerks
- 6 students
- 5 nurses
- 4 public servants
- 4 university teachers
- 3 engineers
- 3 company directors
- 3 film/TV producers
- 2 accountants
- 2 technicians
- 2 writer/journalists
- 2 salesmen
- 1 each — sheet metal worker, chef, actor, proof reader, carpet cleaner, small shop proprietor, opal miner, hotel employee, tailor, telegraphist, electrician, secretary, farmer, artist, designer, credit control supervisor, solicitor, sub-editor.

3. The Wortley Survey.

As far as the actual content of the survey was concerned, using the method of paired comparison, the following viewpoints were tapped:

Part I A

A. Homosexuality is a disgusting perversion
B. There is something seriously wrong with a homosexual
C. Homosexuality is merely a matter of personal preference but should be kept strictly private
D. Homosexuality is as natural as heterosexuality and should be freely expressed.

Part I B

E. Being a full-time housewife is the most rewarding role a woman can play.
F. Since being a full time housewife can sometimes be tedious, additional outside activities are desirable.
G. More satisfaction can be obtained by combining the housewife role with an occupation or career.
H. Since many women find the housewife role frustrating and unfulfilling, a new role for women in society needs to be found.

Part IIA (Aims of therapy are . . .

I. To help the person give up his homosexual activity for heterosexual behaviour
J. To help the person understand the causes of, and possible, change, his homosexuality.
K. To help the person cope more effectively as a homosexual.
L. To help the person obtain maximum fulfillment from his homosexuality.

Part II B (Aims of therapy are . . .)
M. To help her relate more successfully to her situation.
N. Aimed at developing additional outlets for her individuality.
O. Which would investigate the relationship of her role as a woman to her problems
P. To help her change whatever situation it is that has caused her problem

There were four groups of subjects (N= 150):
(1) Practising psychotherapists (N=80 completed questionnaires)
(2) Members of CAMP (N = 74)
(3) Members who subscribe to Sydney Women's Liberation Newsletter (N=88)
(4) Control group of academic and non-academic staff at the University of NSW (N=59) NI = Not Involved.

Wortley summarizes her major findings as follows:
"Briefly, for the section on attitudes to homosexuality, the therapist and the NI (control) group held similar views, opinion being spread over the views that "there is something seriously wrong with a homosexual", "homosexuality is merely a matter of personal preference but it should be kept strictly private", and "homosexuality is as natural as heterosexuality and should be freely expressed"; although the NI group did tend more toward the conservative view. The WL and CAMP groups mainly supported the "natural" view, although a small proportion of the WL group endorsed the "strictly private" view.

For the section on therapy for homosexuals, each group was different to every other in its views. The NI group was most conservative, mainly advocating goals of "change", or "possibly change", with minor support for helping the client to cope as a homosexual. The therapists gave heavy support to "understand and possibly change" with some support for helping the client to cope as a homosexual; the WL and CAMP groups mainly supported therapy aimed at helping the client cope with and enjoy life as a homosexual; the WL group gave most support to these views, but a small proportion of the group supported "change" or "possible change" ...

For the general attitudes to women's role, the therapists, CAMP and NI group held similar views, spread over the views that housewives should have "outside activities", combine a career with being a housewife, or have their role completely redefined. CAMP gave more support to the last view, but the therapists and the NI group were about equally divided. The WL group strongly supported the "new role", with some support for the combination career/housewife.

Regarding therapy involving a frustrated and depressed housewife, the therapist, CAMP and WL groups were similar in their views, about half of each group advocating helping the woman to change the problem situation, with the rest of the group supporting either the goal of "additional outlets" or "investigating the influence of her role as a woman". The NI group only supported either the "additional outlets" goal or "change the problem situation" ...

4. Socio-Economic Status Ratings of CAMP and CWA.

CAMP Women's Association.
The Sydney suburban addresses of women who were receiving the CWA Newsletter in November (1972) (from subscription files) were the sources of the following information:

Highest SES ratings 31% of subscribers
Intermediate SES ratings 36%
Lowest SES ratings 33%
N = 127

CAMP Correspondence
The Sydney suburban addresses of letters in reply from the Secretary of CAMP during 1972, were the source of the following information:

Highest SES rating 30% of enquirers
Intermediate SES rating 38%
Lowest SES ratings 32%
N = 197

Sources of Information for Supplementary Information on Participants.
1970 Glebe Lists of Sydney Women's Liberation
Table 4. As for Table 3.

Table 5. Females in Workforce 1971: Power, Margaret: "The Making of a Woman's Occupation." Hecate. Vol 1


B. LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND DATES OF INTERVIEWS.

ALTMAN, Dennis - 12 October, 1974.
ANTOLOVICH, Gaby - 27 August, 1977
BACON, Wendy - 13 October, 1974 (with Liz Fell)
BELL, Terry - 12 October, 1974.
BELLAMY, Sue - 22 August 1977 (with Joyce Stevens) and 25 August, 1977.
BYATT, Rod - 16 October, 1974
FELL, Liz - 13 October, 1974 (with Wendy Bacon)
LEAHY, Gill - 17 October, 1974.
MCCONAGHY, Neil - 20 April, 1972.
PROTHERO, Barry - 16 October, 1974.
SCHLEEMAN, Garry - 28 October, 1974.
SOLDATOW, Sasha - 5 November, 1974
STEIN, Pam - 7 November, 1974.
STEVENS, Joyce - 22 August, 1977 (with Sue Bellamy).
FOSS, Paul - 12 October, 1974

C. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN TEXT.

The following documents are held by the author. While it is not necessary for a reader to sight them in order to understand the text, they are available on reasonable request from the author.


68. Letter: McConaghy to Wills. 7 June 1972.
74. WINKLER, Robin: "1. Two psychologists and a psychiatrist..." Handled out at CAMP Forum on Aversion Therapy. 22 July 1972.
83. TRANSCRIPT: Interview with Gaby Antolovich. 27 August 1977.
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