



**on the
left**

Essays on Socialism in New Zealand

Edited by **Pat Moloney & Kerry Taylor**

On the Left: Essays on Socialism in New Zealand

Edited by

Pat Moloney and Kerry Taylor



Published by University of Otago Press
56 Union Street West/PO Box 56, Dunedin, New Zealand
Fax: 64 3 479 8385
Email: university.press@stonebow.ac.nz

First published 2002
Introduction © Copyright Pat Moloney and Kerry Taylor 2002
Individual essays © Individual authors as listed in the Contents 2002

ISBN 1 877276 19 7

Printed and bound in New Zealand by Astra Print Ltd, Wellington

Cover image courtesy Dave Kent. The image appeared on a poster for the 2nd N.Z. Marxian Political Economy Conference, produced by Dave Kent for the Wellington Media Collective, 1979.

Contents

Acknowledgements	6
Timeline	7
Introduction: Bringing the Left Back In Pat Moloney and Kerry Taylor	11
1 Whose Left/Who's Left? The Knights of Labour and 'Radical Progressivism' Robert E. Weir	21
2 State Socialism and William Pember Reeves: A Reassessment Pat Moloney	39
3 Bringing the Storm: Syndicalist Counterpublics and the Industrial Workers of the World in New Zealand, 1908–1914 Fran Shor	59
4 'Billy Banjo': Coalminer, Socialist, Poet and Novelist Len Richardson	73
5 Governments, the Police and the Left, 1912–1951 Graeme Dunstall	87
6 'Potential Allies of the Working Class': The Communist Party of New Zealand and Maori, 1921–1952 Kerry Taylor	103
7 The New Left in New Zealand Toby Boraman	117
8 Feminism and the Left: An Interview with Gay Simpkin Kerry Taylor	133
9 Organising the Unemployed: The Politics of Gender, Culture and Class in the 1980s and 1990s Cybele Locke	151
10 New Zealand Utopian Literature: A Short History Lyman Tower Sargent	169
11 Writing the Left into the Picture: An Interview with Erik Olssen Kerry Taylor	179
Appendix: Select Biographies	199
References	204
Contributors	251
Index	253

CHAPTER 7

The New Left in New Zealand

Toby Boraman

The rebellious spirit and moral outrage of the New Left is well captured in the leaflet, *Youth Manifesto – Damn Your War*, published by the Auckland Progressive Youth Movement (PYM) in 1969:

Damn your war ... Damn your closed eyes when a peasant's guts spills into Vietnam's bomb soaked soil – and open wide when somebody says damn ... Damn your lies, hypocrisy, split tongues, double standards ... Damn your sterile parrot learning education. Damn your useless bureaucracy, dumb laws, arrogant cops ... Damn your monied class politics, your churches, your wars, your system, your filth. You offer us your world. It stinks – and you aren't making it any better so damn off and let us try – we are the young and it's our world.¹

The publication also highlights some of the complexities of the New Left in New Zealand. Although the epitome of New Left rhetoric, the leaflet was not typical of the Auckland PYM, nor in fact authored by them. According to Bill Lee, it was originally written by Auckland anarchists, with their earlier version using the expletive 'fuck' rather than 'damn'.² While a distinction will be elaborated in this chapter between the 'old' left and the 'New Left', it is important to note that such categories cannot do complete justice to the fluid and intricate patterns of behaviours and commitments amongst a comparatively small group of New Zealand socialists in this period. The Auckland PYM, as we shall see, though one of the most important New Left organisations, was paradoxically dominated by the Communist Party of New Zealand (CPNZ), one of the prominent old left organisations. Another irony, also to be explored in this chapter, is that while the New Left of the late 1960s defined itself in opposition to the rigid and doctrinaire Leninist parties of the old left, by the time New Left organisations began folding in the early-to-mid 1970s, a large minority of their members became sympathetic to the very Leninist parties the movement had initially scorned.³

A comprehensive history of the New Left in New Zealand has yet to be written. This chapter is intended to be an introductory overview. After briefly

comparing the main features of the New Left in America, Britain, Australia and New Zealand, it details the emergence of the early New Left in New Zealand from 1956 to the late 1960s. The main section examines the ideas, practices, organisations and publications of the New Left in New Zealand from the late 1960s to the mid-to-late 1970s. The chapter ends with a brief account of the demise of the New Left and some reflections on its legacy.

The fifties and sixties were an era of sustained prosperity in New Zealand.⁴ This relative affluence underpinned an economic, political and cultural consensus. A compromise between capitalists and workers muted class conflict up to the late 1960s.⁵ In return for not challenging the capitalist status quo, workers enjoyed rising living standards and the security of full employment and the welfare state; capitalists accepted state regulation and control in return for a profitable and stable business environment.⁶ The two major political parties, National and Labour, shared the same economic goals of full employment and the welfare state, and in foreign affairs, when the Cold War hotbed up, both believed in New Zealand fighting the 'communist' enemy alongside the United States of America. Culturally and socially New Zealand was rather conservative, bland and repressive. Bruce Jesson has claimed that New Zealand was ruled by a militaristic 'generation of returned servicemen' from the 1950s to the 1980s and that an 'authoritarian mood' prevailed.⁷ It was in this context that the New Left emerged in New Zealand.

What was 'new' about the New Left was its questioning and rejecting of the values, ideology and political tactics of the old left, which in New Zealand was represented by the New Zealand Labour Party and various Leninist parties including the CPNZ and, after 1966, the Socialist Unity Party (SUP). The old left, a product of the 1930s depression and the Second World War, focused almost solely upon issues of class exploitation and material well-being.⁸ By contrast, New Left activists, growing up in what has already been noted as the relatively affluent post-war years, reacted against the authoritarian, bureaucratic and repressive norms of New Zealand society; their agenda was to overcome depersonalisation and alienation, and to improve the quality of life.

For the younger generation of radicals, the old left exhibited the same authoritarianism and puritanism found in society at large. Tim Shadbolt, for example, an important figure in the New Left in Auckland, wrote that 'the majority of protesters consider the Communist Party too conservative and unimaginative, caught up in political ideology rather than capturing the spirit of revolution or freedom'.⁹ Shadbolt was also opposed to the Labour Party, which he saw as a conservative party little different from National.¹⁰

Developing outside of and in opposition to the old left, the New Left was an attempt to find a third way that transcended the existing reformist and revolutionary options.¹¹ While the old left aimed to capture the power of the state through representative democracy or a revolution, the New Left aimed for participatory democracy through direct action in the streets. Unlike the hierarchical political parties of the old left, the New Left evolved informal

groupings that were non-sectarian, anti-bureaucratic and decentralised. The old left viewed the working class as the agent of revolutionary change, whilst the New Left also saw revolutionary potential in third world peasants, students, ethnic minorities and other groups marginalised by 'the system'.¹²

As has already been indicated, the classification of New Left groups is not straight-forward. The anti-apartheid group Halt All Racist Tours (HART), for example, emphasised confrontational direct action as did the New Left, but was a single-issue group that lacked the New Left's broader socialist aims.¹³ Other groups, such as the Trotskyist Socialist Action League (SAL), combined aspects of the old and the New Left.¹⁴ Formed in 1969 by young students at Victoria University, it played an important role in the mobilisations against the Vietnam war. Independent of the old left, it was opposed to both social democracy and Stalinism; on the other hand, it was a centralised Leninist party, critical of the 'vague' eclectic ideology and confrontational direct actions of New Left groups like the PYM.¹⁵

Crystallising in the mid-to-late 1950s around opposition to issues such as racism, the nuclear bomb and – most importantly of all – the Vietnam war, the New Left was a complex and amorphous international movement.¹⁶ Largely young, white, male, middle-class and student dominated, it drew upon a wide range of beliefs, from radical liberalism, the counter-culture, Christian pacifism, anarchism and neo-Leninism, to libertarian forms of Marxism such as council communism. Differing significantly from country to country, it was not unified internationally, nor was it even represented by a single organisation in each country. If the European New Left was more socialist and class conscious than its more liberal American counterpart, the New Left in New Zealand shared elements of both.

Like the first British New Left, the early New Zealand New Left developed directly out of the traditional or old left, was given impetus by the anti-nuclear movement, and was formed by dissident intellectuals who founded discussion groups with a social democratic outlook. The first British New Left existed between 1956 and 1962 and was a university-based intellectual movement that revolved around publications like *Universities and Left Review* before 1960 and *New Left Review* from 1960.¹⁷ Similarly, the early Australian New Left has been called 'a socialism of magazines'; it too was an intellectually oriented movement that was closely connected to publications like *Dissent* and *Outlook*.¹⁸

The American New Left began in the late 1950s and was inspired by the civil rights movement that confronted racism, particularly in the American south.¹⁹ In 1960 two significant American New Left organisations emerged: Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC). By the mid-to-late 1960s, as their confrontations with the government over the Vietnam war increased, the American New Left became more radicalised. It reached its peak in 1968, but quickly declined thereafter as a result of repression and internal splits. As the American New Left grew into a

mass movement in the late 1960s, it had a significant influence over the later New Left in New Zealand and Australia in both style and content. Many of those involved in groups such as the Wellington PYM, Dunedin Anarchist Army and the Friends of Brutus were strongly influenced by the theatrical style of the Yippies, a group on the counter-cultural wing of the American New Left. Some of the main organisations of the later Australian New Left, the Sydney Students for a Democratic Society and the Melbourne Students for a Democratic Society were named directly after the American SDS and were known as the SDS. The other main organisations of the later Australian New Left were the Brisbane Students for Democratic Action and the Adelaide Students for Democratic Action (both known as the SDA).²⁰

However, the New Left in Australia and New Zealand, unlike that in the United States, did not establish a national New Left organisation comparable to the American SDS. There were attempts to set up one in Australia in the late 1960s, for example the Socialist Students Alliance, but they quickly foundered.²¹ In New Zealand no such attempts were made. The most important New Zealand New Left groups – Socialist Forum, the PYM and the Resistance bookshops – were composed of completely autonomous branches. As a consequence, the New Left in New Zealand and Australia differed significantly from city to city: for example, the ideology of the Auckland PYM was Maoist, the Christchurch PYM up to 1972 largely anarchist.²²

The New Zealand New Left was unique in that Socialist Forum, the PYM and the Resistance bookshops were not university-based student organisations (with the exception of the Wellington PYM). The PYM was largely made up of working-class youth. Even the university-based Wellington PYM had a mixed working-class and middle-class membership. This contrasts with the main organisations of the Australian New Left and the American New Left, which were student organisations. The working-class base of the PYM was reflected in the attention it paid to working-class politics. The Auckland PYM published leaflets that supported striking boilermakers,²³ and the Christchurch PYM had an alliance with the Lyttelton branch of the Seaman's Union.²⁴ However, like the American New Left, the main focus of the PYM was upon anti-Vietnam war and anti-racist or anti-apartheid activity.

The Early Phase

The early New Left in New Zealand was born out of disillusionment with the old left, with key events being the suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 by the Soviet Union and Khrushchev's revelations about Stalin's tyranny. With their 'blind confidence' in the Soviet Union shattered, socialists abandoned 'communist' parties world-wide; some of these 'defectors' brought into being a New Left.²⁵ Many New Zealand communists, particularly in the intellectual wing of the party, left the CPNZ after 1956. Con Bollinger, Jim Delahunty and Max Wilkinson, for example, got out and became key figures in Wellington

Socialist Forum.²⁶ The secretary of Auckland Socialist Forum from 1961 to 1969, John Colquhoun, resigned from both the CPNZ and the Labour Party.²⁷ A Socialist Forum leaflet written in 1960 described the New Left emerging 'out of the groundswell with the protests on nuclear and colonial policy, the rank and file revolt against bureaucracy in the old left (Labour and Communist Party), political and trade union organisations, and the humanist revolt of the younger generation against the illogic of old political patterns.'²⁸

Socialist Forum was the most important New Left grouping formed by dissident communists.²⁹ It was literally a *forum* for *socialists* to freely discuss their ideas; it also sought to be an independent educational group that would promote socialist ideas in the labour movement (trade unions and the Labour Party) and in mainstream New Zealand society.³⁰ To this end it produced a number of pamphlets, and organised discussions. Although more concerned with talk than action, many of those in Socialist Forum were active as individuals in other political organisations. Auckland committee members, for example, were involved in anti-racist, anti-Vietnam war and anti-nuclear bomb organisations as well as in unions, the Labour Party, and the workers' education movement. Tom Newnham, secretary of Citizens' Association for Racial Equality (CARE), was an Auckland committee member.³¹ Socialist Forum was thus a broad church – embracing those from the left of the Labour Party to anarchists – with debate ranging from extending the welfare state to establishing workers' control. Wellington Socialist Forum stated that it was 'an independent group of socialists of various shades, whose general political line approximates to that of the 'New Left' journals overseas – say *Outlook* in Australia, *New Left Review* in Britain and *Monthly Review* in the United States.'³²

Unlike its counterparts in Britain and Australia, the early New Zealand New Left did not revolve around its own publications. The short-lived journals *Polemic* (1961–2), edited by Kenneth Maddock, and *Dispute* (1964–8), edited by Owen Gager, were the only intellectual publications of the early phase of the New Left in New Zealand. The most important left-wing magazine of the period, *New Zealand Monthly Review* (founded in 1960), described itself as an independent and socialist publication, but was considered too conservative by the New Left. Wellington Socialist Forum claimed that *New Zealand Monthly Review* 'did not reflect our views except in the few articles we had been able to contribute' and withdrew its affiliation to the magazine.³³

It is likely that Socialist Forum in New Zealand took its name from an organisation formed in England in 1957.³⁴ Wellington Socialist Forum (1958–65) was the first of these groupings to begin there, and the first to end. It was followed by Auckland Socialist Forum (1961–71) and Christchurch Socialist Forum (1965–c.1968).³⁵ Wellington Socialist Forum, like the first New Left in Britain, was largely middle-class and intellectual.³⁶ The majority of people involved were male Pakeha intellectuals in some form of public employment (teachers or government bureaucrats),³⁷ numbering fifty-six members in

1961,³⁸ and forty in 1963 (but with a further 185 on the mailing list).³⁹ Auckland Socialist Forum members, by contrast, were predominantly either working-class or lower middle-class male Pakeha, numbering 138 members in 1963,⁴⁰ and 392 in 1967.⁴¹

Despite the fact that many revolutionary socialists were involved, the politics of Socialist Forum tended to be social democratic. Like the early British New Left, Socialist Forum was often little more than an independent pressure group critical of the Labour Party, but hoping to push it leftward through intellectual influence. While ultimately advocating the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, both Wellington and Auckland Socialist Forums preferred, in the meantime, to aim for mild reforms: diversification of industry, workers representation in management, the establishment of workers' cooperatives, restrictions on overseas monopolies, a more comprehensive welfare state, a better standard of living and further nationalisation of industry.⁴² By the mid-to-late 1960s the early New Left had largely faded away. Auckland Socialist Forum (the longest running of the forums) disbanded in 1971 (see Fig. 16). Herbert Roth, a key figure in both Wellington and Auckland forums, noted that Auckland Socialist Forum had 'failed to move with the times' as a new group of youthful leftist protesters – the later New Left – had come into prominence.⁴³

With its single-issue focus, the New Zealand Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) cannot be described as a New Left organisation – nor was it dominated by New Leftists – but many New Leftists participated; Graham Butterworth, Jim Delahunty and Helmut Einhorn of Wellington Socialist Forum, for example, were all prominent in the CND. It began in 1959 and soon blossomed as a movement with annual Easter marches into Wellington from 1961 to 1964.⁴⁴ It became 'vaguely subversive and definitely radical' to be a member of the CND in the early 1960s.⁴⁵ The anti-nuclear movement of the early 1960s was an important extra-parliamentary movement independent of the Labour Party and the CPNZ, much like the anti-Vietnam war movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. It could be said that the Ban the Bomb movement represented the first questioning of the consensus that dominated New Zealand society during the 1960s, whilst the anti-Vietnam war movement actually *broke* that consensus. The later anti-Vietnam war movement, involving thousands of demonstrators, was significantly larger and more threatening to those in power than the Ban the Bomb movement. For the early New Left, the Ban the Bomb movement 'opened up possibilities for independent action beyond the party system and the binary logic of the Cold War' and thus gave it much impetus.⁴⁶

Immediately after the National government committed New Zealand troops to Vietnam in 1965, that war became the new focus of protest in New Zealand and the Ban the Bomb movement declined. With the first nationwide 'mobilisations' against the war in 1970, a mass movement was born.⁴⁷ These anti-war demonstrations led directly to opposition to compulsory military training and American military installations.⁴⁸ There was also a substantial anti-apartheid movement, with many large-scale protests against New Zealand sporting contacts

with apartheid South Africa.⁴⁹ The later New Left had its origins in this wave of protest. Many young New Zealanders became 'radicalised' (or alienated from mainstream society and the conventionally accepted channels of dissent), through their experiences in demonstrations.⁵⁰ Instead of the theoretical and intellectual stance of the early New Left, they sought confrontation with authority and preferred spontaneous protest actions, often of a humorous, satirical nature.

The Heyday of the New Left

Exuberant, controversial and radical, the New Left was in the forefront of the mass protest movement in New Zealand in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Excited activists were optimistic that society could be changed for the better through protest. Inspired by students and workers taking to the streets in France in 1968, many thought 'revolution was just around the corner'. Tim Shadbolt, writing about the protest movement in Auckland in 1969, called it a 'wonderful, amazing, almost incredible outburst of frustrated energy and creativity ... It was more than just talking about freedom, it was really experiencing it. For those who were really involved it was our own little '68 French Revolution.'⁵¹

The New Left in New Zealand at this time can be characterised as a loose 'scene' of young people who participated in protest activity together. Out of this scene a number of organised groups emerged during the late 1960s and early 1970s. They included the PYM, the Resistance bookshops, AUSAPOCPAH (Auckland University Society for the Active Prevention of Cruelty to Politically Apathetic Humans), the Friends of Brutus (Auckland), the New Left Club at Massey University, the Victoria University Socialist Club, the Anarchist Congress (Wellington), the Radical Students' Alliance at the University of Canterbury, the Anarchist Commune (Christchurch), the Progressive Left Club at the University of Otago and the Dunedin Anarchist Army.⁵² In contrast with the earlier groups, most of these organisations did not explicitly identify as 'New Left'. The PYM, for example, did not call itself a New Left organisation. However, these groups shared the same core characteristics as the New Left overseas, and are categorised as New Left groups.

As has been already noted, this later phase of the New Left in New Zealand did not produce a nationwide student organisation – even though students made up the majority of activists. There were Radical Activists Congresses (RAC) held at campuses in Dunedin in 1969, Wellington in 1970 and Palmerston North in 1971.⁵³ These were attempts to bring together radical activists from both the 'old' and New Lefts to forge a common goal and strategy, but instead they highlighted the tension and conflict between the Leninist wing of the 'old' left and the anarchistic wing of the New Left, especially the Wellington Congress. At the Wellington RAC, Christchurch PYMers and their allies caused a near riot during a public debate between Ray Nunes of the CPNZ and Keith Locke of the SAL by throwing projectiles at them, shouting them down, and playing music to drown them out.⁵⁴

The Progressive Youth Movement (PYM)

The PYM and the Resistance bookshops were the most important and influential of all of the groups that made up the later New Left in New Zealand. The most controversial New Left organisation was undoubtedly the PYM. The first PYM was established in Auckland in 1965, and as it gained notoriety, other radical youth around the country formed independent PYM branches.⁵⁵ In 1970, there were PYM groups in Whangarei, Auckland, Kawerau, Palmerston North (Massey University), Wellington and Christchurch, who all attended a PYM national conference in Wellington.⁵⁶ Tim Shadbolt reported small PYM branches in Rotorua, Hamilton and Napier as well.⁵⁷ There was no PYM in Dunedin, but the Dunedin Anarchist Army was considered by some to be the equivalent of a Dunedin PYM. Much like the PYM, the Anarchist Army was an action-based group that eschewed theory.

Using shock tactics and direct conflict with the authorities, the PYM generated much publicity and controversy. Media attention inflated their significance: 'anyone under 25, politically active, and with long hair, is automatically assumed to be a member of PYM.'⁵⁸ By 1969 the PYM had become a nationwide bogey – the very epitome of youthful lawlessness.⁵⁹ Both Labour and National politicians blasted the PYM. Norman Kirk, then leader of the Labour Party, said of the Auckland PYM's plans to march on Anzac Day in 1970 that 'the PYM. might as well know that the public is sick and tired of them and their antics. Their behaviour is a fertile seed-bed for disorder and one that should be firmly controlled by the appropriate authorities.'⁶⁰

A common and somewhat misleading assumption made about the PYM was that it was 'communist' led.⁶¹ While 'communists' did at times seek to infiltrate and direct the PYM, many PYMers resisted this old left paternalism and strived to maintain their independence. This can be seen even in the Auckland PYM, a group that was largely under CPNZ control. The Auckland PYM was known to many as the unofficial youth organisation of the CPNZ – the 'junior CPNZ' – because it was founded and led by young CPNZ members such as John Gabolinsky, Anna Lee and Bill Lee. However they were often at odds with their rank and file members, who were more New Leftist in orientation. In Christchurch the majority of PYM members from 1969 to 1972 were anarchists; hence the CPNZ had little influence there.⁶² The Wellington PYM was not CPNZ dominated, though it did include two CPNZ members with limited influence. In response to CPNZ criticism that they were a disorganised rabble, and in a satire on Auckland PYM's magazine *PYM Rebel*, the Wellington PYM called its publication *PYM Rabble*.

The Auckland PYM represented a concerted and in part successful attempt by the CPNZ to identify with the New Left and recruit from it. Though New Leftist in its confrontational style and its emphasis on action, it was also a centralised, hierarchical organisation that diligently studied the works of Chairman Mao. It pursued traditional left-wing aims of improving working conditions and wages, rather than New Leftist critiques of alienation and the

lack of quality of life; its publications were written in conventional old left terminology, and were rather staid; its most successful leaflet, *Youth Manifesto – Damn Your War*, as we noted at the start of this chapter, originated elsewhere; often chided for being puritanical, the Auckland PYM banned members from taking 'any form of illegal drug or living where drugs are taken'.⁶³ Not only was there continuous conflict between the CPNZ leadership of the Auckland PYM and New Leftists within it,⁶⁴ the wider Auckland New Left often differed with the Auckland PYM. Some, like Sue Bradford, got out of the Auckland PYM because of its 'totalitarianism of communist beliefs' and went on to become involved in the Auckland Resistance bookshop.⁶⁵ Given these tensions and contradictions, the Auckland PYM must be seen as something of an old left/New Left hybrid. But its importance cannot be denied; it was the first, largest and longest running PYM group (1965–77); it was active and controversial – instigating numerous protests.⁶⁶ Writing in 1970, Tim Shadbolt described the group as having 'developed from about 50 odd, flag waving chanters to a protest movement capable of rallying 300 well disciplined marchers questioning the reason for ANZAC day'.⁶⁷ Its newsletter, *PYM Rebel*, was at one stage a fortnightly publication; 117 issues came off the press between 1970 and 1977.

Other New Leftist groups in Auckland in the late 1960s and early 1970s included the Auckland Resistance bookshop (see below) and AUSAPOCPAH and its successor, the Friends of Brutus. The Friends of Brutus, named after Tim Shadbolt's dog, helped organise the Myers Park free speech movement which led to the 'liberation of Albert Park' in 1969. This was a remarkable movement in which tens of thousands of Aucklanders held largely spontaneous festivals in Albert Park every Sunday in protest against Auckland City Council by-laws repressing freedom of speech and assembly.⁶⁸ The group produced a weekly newsletter called *Brutus Says*. Despite the involvement of the larger-than-life Tim Shadbolt, the group rejected the 'cult of personality', and tried to avoid having leaders.⁶⁹ With its version of the 'fun revolution', the Friends of Brutus can be seen as a New Zealand example of the counter-cultural wing of the New Left, like the Yippies in America. It combined vaguely anti-capitalist and anti-statist views with the absurd and comical. For example, in their 'Manifesto For a Rot Revolution', they declared they would blow up Parliament House and replace it with a Maori pa, let students control 'all university affairs', let workers run all factories (but only after 'minimum industrialisation'), and create a people's militia armed with rotten eggs, blow pipes and laughing gas.⁷⁰

Sally Lake founded the Wellington PYM in 1969. It had a shorter life (two years) and was smaller (with a core of about twenty members) than both the Christchurch and Auckland PYMs. It was composed of a loose assortment of Maoists from the CPNZ, Trotskyists (of the Spartacist League), anarchists and radical leftists who did not adhere to any particular ideology. With this mixture of the old left and the new, there were always tensions. CPNZ members in the Wellington PYM tried (unsuccessfully), for example, to stop other PYM members taking drugs. What held them together was their commitment to anti-

Vietnam war and anti-apartheid activity. They conducted weekly demonstrations outside the South Vietnamese Consulate in Wellington. The burning of an effigy of Richard Nixon outside Prime Minister Keith Holyoake's home for television cameras in 1970 earned the Wellington PYM considerable fame and infamy. This was one of the first protests in New Zealand staged specifically for television; questions were raised in Parliament about why a state-owned television channel broadcast the effigy burning.⁷¹ The Wellington PYM placed little emphasis upon theory. Roger Cruickshank, an anarchist within the Wellington PYM, used to quote approvingly the Yippie Abbie Hoffman that 'ideology is a brain disease'.⁷²

The Christchurch PYM came into existence in 1969 through the work of Brian Rooney, Christine Bird, Richard Hill and Christine Anderson. A large number of protests, forums, sit-ins, stunts, demonstrations, 'happenings', free rock concerts, paint-ups and other protest activity (such as a hunger strike against the Vietnam war) were organised by the group.⁷³ Murray Horton, the charismatic speaker of the Christchurch PYM, wrote that 'we defined ourselves as left-libertarians and proposed stunts to outrage the bourgeoisie – such as burning money'.⁷⁴ On 25 April 1970 the Christchurch PYM attempted to lay a wreath 'to the victims of Fascism in Vietnam' during the Anzac Day memorial service in their city – a ceremony they saw as glorifying past wars whilst ignoring the present war in Vietnam. The Mayor of Christchurch, Ron Guthrey, ripped up their placard, describing the Christchurch PYM as 'dumb, long-haired louts who have nothing to contribute to our society – who damn everything we have ever fought for – and who must not be allowed to insult our war dead'.⁷⁵ The PYM action and Guthrey's reaction created a storm of controversy.⁷⁶

To counteract the negative criticism which protests like that at the 1970 Anzac Day service provoked, the Christchurch PYM decided to try something a little more constructive. In late 1969 it copied the famous white bikes scheme of the Dutch anarchists, the Provos, proposing that some bicycles be painted white, be declared public property, and be available to anybody who needed them.⁷⁷ Once a white bike was finished with, one would leave it on the footpath for someone else to use. The Christchurch City Council took the matter seriously, and undertook feasibility studies, but ultimately stonewalled the proposal.⁷⁸

Unity was secured around what they were opposed to, rather than what they were for. Dave Welch of the Christchurch PYM noted 'the [Christchurch] PYM message ... was extremely vague. This was inevitable in a group oriented towards action and not to ideology'.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, the Christchurch PYM did produce some manifestos. 'We believe in TOTAL REVOLUTION – political, moral, social, sexual and cultural revolution. Purely political revolutions change only the rulers and only total revolution can effect change in the exploitive [sic] nature of present NZ society and create a better society'.⁸⁰ They also aimed for the 'abolition of private ownership of land, industry and the news media. Worker control of industry, student-teacher control of schools and universities'.⁸¹

Mass protests that would radicalise participants, as well as confrontational

protests and stunts performed by committed groups of activists 'pushing things to the limit' were the dual tactics pursued by the Christchurch PYM. They noted in 1972 that 'the HART people ... have taken to disparaging "mass action" in favour of disruptive tactics. What are we going to disrupt until the 'box [Springboks] get here? ... Mobilisation or disruption? WHY NOT BOTH?'⁸² The Christchurch PYM demonstrated against the Vietnam war, against the Rugby Union and sporting contact with South Africa, against the Security Intelligence Service and police brutality, as well as being the main organisers of the protests against the American military installations at Woodbourne and Mount John. In 1969 it had a fluid eighty members, but by 1970 this number had decreased and an active core of a dozen remained.⁸³ In 1973 it was wound up.

The Resistance Bookshops

The initial protest phase of the later New Left was followed by the growth of Resistance bookshops in Auckland (1969–74), Wellington (1970–7) and Christchurch (1972–c.1977).⁸⁴ Both the Wellington and Christchurch bookshops developed directly out of the PYMs in those cities. Activists realised that protest alone was not going to change society, and they formed bookshops whose aim was to distribute radical literature and become non-sectarian resource centres for radical socialist politics. More educational and long-term in their strategy, the Resistance bookshops represented a new and more constructive phase – the Resistance era – in the later New Left.

Without directly organising political action themselves, Resistance bookshops sought to facilitate radical socialist activity. Christchurch Resistance, for example, defined its role as: '1. To provide a neutral meeting place for people of all tinges of leftist ideas, and all social action groups. 2. To try to foster and support progressive discussion and action. 3. To provide a co-ordinating centre for activities'.⁸⁵ Consequently a New Leftist political and social community did form around them. Although each Resistance bookshop was independent, there was some voluntary cooperation between them, including the exchange of stock and the organisation of nationwide conferences.

The importance of Resistance bookshops as *bookshops* was that they sold a wide variety of radical material previously unavailable in New Zealand. Before Resistance, material on subjects like libertarian socialism and psychedelic drugs was almost impossible to acquire. The Wellington Resistance stocklist of 1973 carried books on the third world and American imperialism, women's liberation, Marxism, Leninism, anarchism, music, sex, vegetarian cooking, drugs, libertarian education, the Black Power movement, Eastern religion and the counter-culture; about half of the Wellington Resistance turnover was made up of counter-cultural material, the other half was radical politics.

On the heels of the 'liberation of Albert Park', a large group of people, including Pat Bolster, Alan Robson, Roger Fowler and Graeme Whimp, opened the first Resistance bookshop on Queen Street, Auckland, in 1969.⁸⁶ Auckland Resistance was established independently of the Maoist Auckland PYM, who

had their own bookshop. By 1971 three or four dozen people were involved, with seventy associate members.⁸⁷ Its activities were various. It functioned as a meeting centre for the (high school) Students Liberation Council and showed films for the anti-war mobilisations; it had its own food cooperative, a 'crash-pad' system, its own library and printshop; it distributed its own newsletter; and even had its own soccer team. Pat Bolster summarised the aims of Auckland Resistance:

1. To be, and to be seen to be, non sectarian. To try to unite students, workers, Trots, Yippies, SUP'ers, PYM'ers, Polynesian groups, High School groups, and Women's Liberationists so that we can all work together to (a) Fight various particular issues, and (b) Move NZ society in a Socialist direction.
2. Provide facilities towards achieving these ends.
3. Provide information to the general public, and practical help for fledging political groups of a progressive nature as well as advice.⁸⁸

In true New Left style it banned political parties from using its meeting room.⁸⁹ By 1973, however, Auckland Resistance was in decline. In 1974 it reported that the bookshop was a 'relic of the "great radicalisation" that has passed away';⁹⁰ lacking support and customers, it folded.

In the capital city the Resistance Bookshop grew out of the Wellington PYM in 1970. Indeed, the first shop in Cuba Street was called the PYM bookshop (a somewhat misleading name, as it was modelled on Auckland Resistance). The first shop was burnt down in suspicious circumstances that same year. Insurance money from the suspected arson helped set up the next shop in 1971, called Wellington Resistance, in upper Willis Street, situated above the hippy capitalist shop Merchant Adventurers of Narnia. Key figures in Wellington Resistance were Andrew Dodsworth and ex-Wellington PYMers Richard Suggate and George Rosenberg. Like the other bookshops, Wellington Resistance served several functions: it was a meeting place; it distributed information; had a wide range of radical literature and a library; had printing facilities; and provided accommodation. Run by a collective, Wellington Resistance was a cooperative bookshop; it was owned and operated by those who took part in it. In 1975, it had about fifty shareholders. Although it did have a full-time paid manager, it was largely run by volunteers. In 1975 Resistance moved down Willis Street (from number 156 to 144) to its third and final location. In 1977 the bookshop closed, and the building was demolished.

The Christchurch Resistance Bookshop and Action Centre was formed in late 1972 in Ferry Road, modelled loosely upon Auckland and Wellington Resistance. Operating a food co-operative and a library, it occupied three adjoining shops and a warehouse. The bookshop sold radical and underground material of all shades, while the 'action centre' was a meeting place for a diverse

array of groups. The Kozmik Krumbia printing collective produced material in the printshop of Christchurch Resistance, including the underground magazine *Ferret*. When fake bomb recipes appeared in *Ferret*, police raided the shop.⁹¹ In 1973 Christchurch Resistance involved two or three dozen people, mainly Christchurch PYMers, as well as others from the OHMS (Organisation to Halt Military Service) and anti-apartheid groups.⁹² Unlike the heterodox atmosphere of counter-culture, anarchism and Marxism at Wellington and Auckland Resistance, Christchurch Resistance was more Maoist in orientation, with many being sympathetic to the CPNZ.

Decline and Dispersal

With the election of the new Labour government in 1972 and the rise of the 'new social movements' of the 1970s, the New Left lost much of its prominence.⁹³ Labour delivered on many of the New Left's demands: withdrawing New Zealand troops from Vietnam in 1972; ending compulsory military training in 1972; and terminating sporting contact with South Africa (it cancelled the proposed Springbok tour of 1973).⁹⁴ As a result, the large protest movement died down and support for radical causes dwindled. New Leftists were still active in radical politics (largely through such things as the Resistance bookshops), but the more liberal wing of the protest movement had been largely appeased by the Labour government.

The belief that 1960s radicals 'retreated' into mysticism, drugs and communes in the 1970s was not true of the New Zealand New Left.⁹⁵ Certainly, some New Leftists became involved in communes, and some 'dropped out' of political involvement, mainly because of family or job commitments. But most stayed involved in some form of overt political activity: some became active in unions and political parties (especially the Labour Party); some took up single-issue campaigns; some became members of other social movements, especially the women's liberation movement; and a significant minority remained committed to radical leftist politics. Of this minority, many joined or became sympathetic to Leninist parties; a few formed anarchist groups.⁹⁶

The New Left did not disappear overnight. Out of the demise of the Resistance bookshops in the mid 1970s came a number of activist groups and movements, such as CAFCINZ (Campaign Against Foreign Control in New Zealand), which still exists today as CAFCA (Campaign Against Foreign Control of Aotearoa). CAFCINZ was formed in 1974 by people such as Murray Horton and Owen Wilkes, who had both been involved in the Christchurch PYM and Christchurch Resistance. Protest against the Vietnam war and American military installations led to opposition not only to foreign military activities, but also to foreign economic activities in New Zealand.⁹⁷ CAFCINZ helped organise the Resistance Ride of 1975, one of the last large-scale protests organised by the New Left in New Zealand.⁹⁸ It also represented a continuation of many features of the Christchurch PYM. For example, its charter stated it was for 'mass based direct

action' and a pragmatic, anti-theoretical, extra-parliamentary approach: 'CAFCINZ does not advocate a general alternative to the existing system: we are united in what we are against rather than what we are for.'⁹⁹

As noted, a significant minority within the New Left became influenced by, or became members of, Leninist parties by the early to mid-1970s (particularly the Maoist ones). Maoism was more influential in New Zealand relative to other countries because the main Leninist party in New Zealand – the CPNZ – was Maoist.¹⁰⁰ Most Leninists viewed New Left organisations like the PYM as a recruiting ground for radicalised youth.¹⁰¹ This strategy had some success. The CPNZ influence on the Auckland PYM has already been discussed. The CPNZ and Spartacists tried to recruit from the Wellington PYM, but gained few members. The CPNZ had much more success in the end with the Christchurch PYM. By 1972 about half of the Christchurch PYM became sympathetic to the CPNZ brand of Maoism. This was a remarkable change since the Christchurch PYM was originally opposed to the CPNZ. Members of the Christchurch PYM shifted from an organisation that had consensus decision-making, free discussion of ideas and 'no enforcement of [a] "party line"',¹⁰² to a rigid organisation (the CPNZ) that often expelled its members for 'deviations' from party orthodoxy.¹⁰³ Thus a small minority of New Leftists ended up becoming what they had originally opposed. Although this metamorphosis in the New Left from a vaguely anarchistic position to a hard-line Leninist one was not nearly as pronounced as in the United States, it was not uncommon in New Zealand.¹⁰⁴

This turn-around occurred for several reasons. One major feature of the later New Zealand New Left was its stand against American imperialism or foreign control.¹⁰⁵ Given this moral outrage against the United States of America and her allies (including New Zealand) waging war on Vietnam, many found it an easy step to identify with the enemy: the NLF (National Liberation Front), who were Vietnamese Stalinists.¹⁰⁶ For Murray Horton 'there was inspiration from the uprisings abroad – foreign icons were Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh and Che Guevara.'¹⁰⁷ Many New Leftists went further and developed an uncritical identification with any national liberation struggle in the third-world, which meant turning a blind eye to the reality of third-world dictatorships (Cuba, 'Communist' Vietnam, China, and sometimes even North Korea).¹⁰⁸ In the early and mid 1970s, support for Maoist China in the New Left was shored up by visits (some of them free) to China undertaken by young radicals in the 1970s, including people like Shadbolt and Horton.¹⁰⁹ Some came back 'singing the praises of China' and spreading glowing reports of a workers' paradise.

In many cases, New Leftists were instrumental in forming the 'new social movements' which emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s. These new grassroots movements ranged from the women's liberation movement to the ecological movement to the anti-nuclear and peace movement, and included the renewal of the Maori struggle for self-determination.¹¹⁰ Several of the earliest Maori and Polynesian protest organisations of the 1960s and 1970s were formed by people who were involved in the New Left or had contact with New Leftists.

Tama Poata, for example, the secretary of the leftist Maori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR), was involved in the Wellington PYM. The Polynesian Panther Party was modelled on the Black Panthers, a militant group that had a significant influence on the American New Left.

Many of the first women's liberation groups were 'started by women who were connected with existing left-wing or progressive political organisations.'¹¹¹ Women from the Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch PYMs were involved in some of the earliest women's liberation groups. For example, Therese O'Connell of the Wellington PYM was the first president of the Wellington Women's Liberation Front in 1970 and 'the Auckland Women's Liberation Front was not so independent of its parent body, the Auckland Progressive Youth Movement'.¹¹² The Auckland group, Women for Equality, was formed by non-sectarian Marxist feminists who were involved in the Auckland New Left. At the 1969 Radical Activists Congress, Janet Bogle 'wanted to discuss women's liberation ... and was howled down by the men present'.¹¹³ Frustrated by their subordination in 'progressive' New Left organisations and inspired by the development of the women's liberation movement overseas, many women in the New Left departed to form separate women's liberation groups.

New social movements grew out of the protest movement of the 1960s and took up many of the tactics, style, methods of the New Left. Direct action, confrontation and building coalitions of support around an issue with a minimum of theorising are evident in all of the large grassroots movements of the 1970s and 1980s, particularly the anti-nuclear and anti-apartheid movements. New social movements were, like the New Left, extra-parliamentary, concerned with direct democracy, 'strongly committed to direct action, and localist, indeed consciously decentralist, in [their] image of a new politics based on the neighbourhood and municipality as the basic arena for political activity.'¹¹⁴ Focused on single issues, however, many lacked the larger social agenda and the revolutionary anti-capitalist rhetoric of the New Left.¹¹⁵

The Legacy

The New Left made an important contribution to the liberalisation of New Zealand society. The stifling conservative consensus that dominated New Zealand society up to the late 1960s was torn asunder by the protest movements which the New Left led and inspired. Inaugurating a new style of politics, the rebellious New Left came to represent the spirit of the times. Even if the novelty and shock value of its antics were quickly exhausted, more enduring were the wide variety of grassroots social movements of the 1970s that developed out of it, movements which in their turn had a major impact upon society.¹¹⁶

Lacking a coherent and positive alternative to capitalism, the New Left was a disparate movement, united only in what it opposed rather than what it stood for. Its immediate goals – the elimination of nuclear weapons, an end to the war in Vietnam, the cessation of sporting contacts with South Africa and the shutting down of US military installations in New Zealand – could all be satisfied without

posing any threat to the capitalist establishment. When many of these causes were achieved, the movement quickly fragmented and faded away.

Despite its revolutionary, anarchistic and anti-capitalist rhetoric, the New Left tended to be reformist and liberal in practice (although its *radical* liberalism was extra-parliamentary). As a product of affluence, it often downplayed the fundamental importance of class. On the whole, it reacted against the authoritarianism and social conservatism of the time, not the capitalist system of class exploitation. Moralistic rather than economic in its rhetoric and critique, it was not at heart a class-based movement.¹¹⁷

For many on the left, the late 1960s and 1970s – the heyday of the New Left – was a missed opportunity for raising class consciousness in New Zealand. With the collapse of the economic boom during this period, the country experienced one of the highest rates of strike activity in its history.¹¹⁸ The anti-capitalist potential of this strike wave was never tapped by the New Left.¹¹⁹ Instead, their rebellion was centred on personal moral issues or leftist nationalism. One might diagnose the left's failure to meet the challenges posed by the New Right in the 1980s as stemming from this blurring of the socialist vision that had its origins in the New Left.

In escaping the theoretical straitjacket of the old left, the later New Left frequently went to the opposite extreme and condemned all theory.¹²⁰ This anti-theoretical stance often led to incoherence and contradictions. For instance, the New Left opposed what it perceived to be the American invasion of Vietnam, but slipped uncritically into support for totalitarian North Vietnam, simply because it was an enemy of America;¹²¹ while claiming to be against the state and capitalism, it often ended up with a romantic vision of, and hence supporting, Stalinist/Maoist dictatorships in the third world, dictatorships which can plausibly be called 'state capitalist'.¹²²

Despite its shortcomings, the New Left protested with spontaneity, imagination and creativity, calling for a 'total revolution': a truly wide-ranging cultural, sexual, social, economic, personal and collective revolution. In doing so it challenged the traditional socialist assumption that revolution should be purely economic. It promised instead a comprehensive leftist praxis of human liberation that was opposed to all forms of domination, not just class-based exploitation. The left today has yet to coherently integrate the best features of the 'old' and the 'new'.

- 62 * *Red Worker*, 1 October 1930; *Worker's Weekly*, 10 November 1934.
- 63 See Stuart Macintyre, *The Reds: The Communist Party of Australia from origins to illegality*, St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 1998, pp. 130, 265-7, 353. On the CPUSA see Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem During the Depression*, New York, 1983. The CPUSA had a significant representation of African Americans amongst its national leadership, see Harvey Klehr, *Communist Cadre: The Social Background of the American Communist Party Elite*, Stanford: Hoover Institute Press, 1978, ch. 3.
- 64 For an interesting reflection of the contemporary scene see Sue Abel, *Shaping the News: Waitangi Day on Television*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1997.
- 65 In mid 1939 the CPNZ membership was distributed as follows: Auckland (City and District) 170; Wellington 60; Dunedin 20; Christchurch 15; Invercargill 8; Bluff 6; the West Coast 'a handful'; individuals 50. Total 375. For a fuller discussion of membership distribution see Kerry Taylor, 'The Social Basis of New Zealand Communism,' in Kevin Morgan and Gordon Cohen, eds, *Agents of the Revolution? New biographical approaches to the history of the Comintern*, New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- 66 Tom Murray, Kerry Taylor, Joe Tepania and Nora Rameka, 'Towards a History of Maori and Trade Unions' in John Martin and Kerry Taylor, eds, *Culture and the Labour Movement*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1991, p. 51.
- 67 For the shift in focus see Leo Sim, *Unity Peace and Progress: Why the Communist Party Want to Affiliate to the Labour Party*, Auckland: CPNZ, 1937; CPNZ, *For the Defeat of Hitler: Conscript Wealth Now*, Auckland: CPNZ, 1939; Sid Scott, *New Zealand for the People*, Auckland: CPNZ, 1939; Sid Scott, *The People's War*, Auckland, 1942 and Harold Silverstone, *Fight Hitler First*, Auckland: CPNZ, 1943.
- 68 For an insightful discussion see Bert Roth, 'The New Zealand Trade Union Congress' in Eric Fry, ed., *Common Cause: Essays in Australian and New Zealand Labour History*, Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1986, pp. 124-38.
- 69 See Taylor, *Workers Vanguard or People's Voice?*, ch. 8.
- 70 Agenda and Remits, CPNZ Conference, Gerald Griffins Papers, ATL, 4/19.
- 71 'Maori Self Determination: a controversy', *Communist Review*, May 1936, p.17.
- 72 Draft Letter to New Zealand, 20 November 1929, CIP, 495/72/52.
- 73 Sid Scott, 'The Ancient Maori', *New Zealand Labour Review*, September 1947, p. 27.
- 74 *Worker's Weekly*, 23 November, 7 and 21 December 1935.
- 75 Ernie Brooks, 'A Reply', *Communist Review*, May 1936, pp. 20-25.
- 76 Reg Scott, 'The Maori Wars', *In Print: a Magazine of Marxism*, June-July 1945, p. 7.
- 77 *Red Worker* 1 October 1930.
- 78 *Forward to Victory in 1943*, Auckland: CPNZ, 1943, p. 13.
- 79 *People's Voice*, 17 July 1946.
- 80 Sid Scott, 'The Ancient Maori', *New Zealand Labour Review*, September 1947, p. 24.
- 81 Executive Committee, Communist International, Letter to New Zealand September 1933, *New Zealand Labour Monthly*, March 1934; Draft Letter to New Zealand, 20 November 1929, CIP, 495/72/52.
- 82 *Red Worker*, 1 October 1930; *Worker's Weekly*, 10 November 1934.
- 83 Sid Scott, 'The Ancient Maori', *New Zealand Labour Review*, September 1947, p. 27.
- 84 *People's Voice*, 17 January 1946.
- 85 *People's Voice*, 19 June 1946.
- 86 *People's Voice*, 19 October 1949.
- 87 *Red Worker*, 1 October 1930.
- 88 *New Zealand Labour Review*, July 1951, p. 15.

- 7 Jesson, pp. 20-21.
- 8 For an overview of differences between the New Left and the 'old', see David Caute, *Sixty Eight: The Year of the Barricades*, London, 1988, pp. 20-23. Newfield presents a good summary of differences between the 'old' and the New Left in the United States. See Jack Newfield, *A Prophetic Minority: The American New Left*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967, pp. 149-74.
- 9 Tim Shadbolt, *Bullshit and Jellybeans*, Wellington: Alister Taylor, 1971, p. 171.
- 10 See Shadbolt's comments about Labour Party leader Norman Kirk and National Party leader Keith Holyoake in his *Bullshit and Jellybeans*, p. 115.
- 11 It could also be argued that the New Left was not only the search for a third way on the left beyond social democracy and Stalinism, but also a third way beyond the Cold War blocs of the USSR, the leader of the Stalinist East, and the USA, the leader of the capitalist West.
- 12 For useful definitions of the New Left, see Wini Breines, *Community and Organization in the New Left 1962-1968*, New York: Praeger, 1982, p. 8, and George Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968*, Boston: South End Press, 1987, pp. 23-7.
- 13 However, many individuals involved in HART were New Leftist in orientation. For an overview of HART, see Trevor Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones: New Zealand, South Africa, Rugby and Racism*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999.
- 14 It is generally accepted that the Leninist parties of the 1960s and 1970s originated from, and were part of, the 'old' left rather than the New Left (even though – particularly in the later 1960s – they had substantial influence over the New Left, and often adopted New Left rhetoric). See Breines, *Community and Organization*; Lin Chun, *The British New Left*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993; Michael Kenny, *The First New Left: British Intellectuals After Stalin*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995; and Newfield, *A Prophetic Minority*.
- 15 For example, the SAL claimed the confrontational direct actions of the PYM were 'ultra-leftist'. 'The Threat of Fascism: Present or Future? Does the Ultraleft Help the Ultraright?', *Socialist Action*, No. 2 (1 October 1969), p. 2.
- 16 There are very few historical studies which provide an overview of the New Left worldwide, most of which tend to focus on the later New Left of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Brief international overviews are found in Tariq Ali and Susan Watkins, *1968: Marching in the Streets*, New York and London: Free Press, 1998; Caute, *Sixty Eight*; and Katsiaficas, *The Imagination of the New Left*.
- 17 For the First British New Left, see Chun, *The British New Left*, and Kenny, *The First New Left*. The second phase of the British New Left, from 1962 through to the late 1960s, still largely revolved around intellectual journals and clubs, but broadened greatly as a result of mass protest against the Vietnam war. For other studies of the British New Left, see Peter Shipley, *Revolutionaries in Modern Britain*, London: The Bodley Head, 1976; and Nigel Young, *An Infantile Disorder? The Crisis and Decline of the New Left*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- 18 John Murphy, *Harvest of Fear: A History of Australia's Vietnam War*, St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 1993, p. 125.
- 19 For historical accounts of the American New Left, see Terry Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995; Greg Calvert and Carol Neiman, *A Disrupted History: The New Left and the New Capitalism*, New York Random House, 1971; Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*, New York: Bantam Books, 1993; and James Miller, *'Democracy is in the Streets': From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- 20 For the Australian New Left, see Richard Gordon, ed., *The Australian New Left: Critical Essays and Strategy*, Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1970; Murphy, *Harvest of Fear*, pp. 123-5 and 219-26; Chris Rootes, 'The Development of Radical Student Movements and Their Sequelae', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol. 34 (1988), pp. 173-86.
- 21 See Rootes, 'The Development of Radical Student Movements', p. 180.
- 22 For the differences between the later student New Left in Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney, see Rootes, 'The Development of Radical Student Movements'.
- 23 Paul Jackman, 'The Auckland Opposition', p. 169.
- 24 Murray Horton, 'Radicals in Retrospect', *New Zealand Monthly Review*, No. 331 (August/September 1991), p. 30.
- 25 Richard Gombin, *The Radical Tradition: A Study in Modern Revolutionary Thought*, London: Methuen, 1978, p. 11.
- 26 Bollinger and Delahunty were responsible for forming Wellington Socialist Forum in 1958. Delahunty joined the CPNZ under unusual circumstances. He briefly joined the party after 1956 in the hope that many CPNZ members might have their thinking freed up by the events of 1956, but this belief proved mistaken and he left.
- 27 See the interview of John Colquhoun in 'Path from Stalinism, through Social Democracy, to Revolutionary Socialism', *Socialist Action*, No. 174 (18 November 1977), p. 10.
- 28 (Wellington) Socialist Forum leaflet (1960), Socialist Forum Papers, MS papers 82-213-16, Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL), Wellington.
- 29 Aside from Socialist Forum, the early New Left in New Zealand consisted of a few university clubs such as the New Left Club at the University of Canterbury.
- 30 These were the stated aims of Auckland Socialist Forum, see *Socialist Forum* (Auckland), No. 4 (November-December 1963), p. 1. In addition to these the Wellington Socialist Forum sought to produce socialist analysis and action relevant to New Zealand conditions, rather than copy analysis and action from overseas. For example, its most influential pamphlet questioned New Zealand's colonial relationship with the Cook Islands. See Gerry Mills, *Islands in the Shade*, Wellington: Wellington Socialist Forum, 1962.
- 31 *Socialist Forum* (Auckland), No. 22 (March 1968), p. 2.
- 32 'Socialism in the Sixties', (Wellington) Socialist Forum leaflet (1961), Socialist Forum Papers, MS papers 82-213-16, ATL.
- 33 *Socialist Forum Newsletter*, No. 15 (April 1962), p. 2.
- 34 For some details on the English Socialist Forum movement, see Kenny, p. 25. There was also a Socialist Forum movement in Australia in 1957 and 1958. See Gordon and Osmond, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in Gordon, ed., *The Australian New Left*, p. 14.
- 35 Auckland Socialist Forum was originally known as the New Labour Group (which was formed in 1961) before changing its name to Auckland Socialist Forum in 1962. John Colquhoun, 'Auckland Socialist Forum', *Socialist Forum* (Wellington), No. 22 (November/December 1962), p. 15. Little is known about Christchurch Socialist Forum.
- 36 Wellington Socialist Forum was made up of trade unionists, students, and middle-class professionals. 'Socialism in the Sixties', (Wellington) Socialist Forum leaflet (1961), Socialist Forum Papers, MS papers 82-213-16, ATL. Socialist Forum was not a student-based organisation. Key positions in Socialist Forum were not held by students, but by

- older leftists such as Herbert Roth, John Colquhoun, Con Bollinger and Jim Delahunty.
- 37 Herbert Roth, 'Looking Back', *Socialist Forum* (Auckland), No. 35 (June 1971), p. 3.
- 38 Roth, 'Looking Back', p. 9.
- 39 *Socialist Forum* (Wellington), No. 23 (March 1963), p. 3.
- 40 *Socialist Forum* (Auckland), No. 5 (March 1964), p. 2.
- 41 Almost a third of these were from outside Auckland. Roth, 'Looking Back', p. 11. These figures are somewhat misleading as the actual active membership of Auckland Socialist Forum was far less, possibly one or two dozen people.
- 42 See *A Take-Over Bid for New Zealand? A Programme for the Defence of New Zealand's Economic Independence*, Wellington: Wellington Socialist Forum, 1960; *Towards a Socialist Programme for New Zealand*, Wellington: Wellington Socialist Forum, 1961; and *A Policy for New Zealand*, Auckland: Auckland Socialist Forum, 1963.
- 43 Roth, 'Looking Back', p. 12. Roth was involved in Wellington Socialist Forum from 1958 to 1961, and Auckland Socialist Forum from 1961 to 1971.
- 44 Elsie Locke, *Peace People: A History of Peace Activities in New Zealand*, Christchurch: Hazard Press, 1992, p. 164. For a brief history of the CND see Kevin Clements, *Back from the Brink: The Creation of a Nuclear-Free New Zealand*, Wellington: Allen and Unwin in association with Port Nicholson Press, 1988, pp. 99-102, and Locke, pp. 16-79.
- 45 Clements, p. 100.
- 46 Kenny, p. 193. Although Kenny is commenting about the first British New Left, his view also applies to the early New Left in New Zealand. Perry Anderson in the *New Left Review* noted that the CND questioned the whole basis of the Cold War: the CND 'insisted that the primary reality of the Cold War was not a struggle between democratic West and totalitarian East, but an arms race which threatened to wipe out both.' Anderson quoted in Richard Gordon and Warren Osmond, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in Gordon, ed., *The Australian New Left*, p. 23.
- 47 The anti-Vietnam war movement was largely organised by groups like the Committees on Vietnam. These groups were not New Left organisations; however, many New Leftists were involved in them, alongside 'old' Leftists and liberals of different shades. For an overview of the anti-Vietnam war protest movement, see Locke, pp. 188-261 and Roberto Rabel, 'The Vietnam Antiwar Movement in New Zealand', *Peace and Change*, No. 17 (January 1992), pp. 3-33; and for the protest movement up to 1970, see Tim Shadbolt, 'New Zealand Protest Movement', *Guerilla*, No. 1 (June 1970), pp. 4-6, though Shadbolt focuses on the Auckland protest movement. *Guerilla* was the 'street newspaper' of the Auckland Resistance bookshop.
- 48 See Owen Wilkes, *Protest: Demonstrations against the American Military Presence in New Zealand: Omega 1968, Woodbourne 1970, Mount John 1972, Harewood/Weedons 1973*, Wellington: Alister Taylor, 1973.
- 49 For an overview of protests against sporting contact with South Africa, see Richards, *Dancing on Our Bones*; and Richard Thompson, *Retreat From Apartheid: New Zealand's Sporting Contacts with South Africa*, Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- 50 Many protesters were shocked by the behaviour of police who attempted to break up demonstrations. For example, a protest against the All Blacks departing for a tour of South Africa in Wellington in 1970 (resulting in forty six arrests) was called a 'police riot' and the 'battle of Willis Street'. See Lyn Brooke-White, Alister Taylor, and Chris Wheeler, eds., *The Whole World Watches: A Record of Wellington Protest against the All Black Tour, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, June 11, 12, 13, 1970*, Wellington: Cockerell Press, 1970. Other examples were the Agnew protest in Auckland in 1970 and the Mount John protest in 1972.
- 51 Shadbolt, 'New Zealand Protest Movement', p. 5.
- 52 This list is not exhaustive. There were probably a number of other later New Left groups such as the Radical Students' Alliance at the University of Auckland (which was independent of the Christchurch Radical Students' Alliance), but little is known about them. It is difficult to find information about many of these groups as they were small and ephemeral.
- 53 The Dunedin RAC was organised by the Progressive Left Club at the University of Otago, the Wellington RAC by the SAL, and the Palmerston North RAC organised by the New Left club at Massey University.
- 54 The debate was titled 'Mao or Trotsky: which way forward for the New Zealand revolution?', and was attended by 350 people. The anarchistic wing of the New Left saw this debate as irrelevant for New Zealand conditions and hence disrupted it. For an account of the Wellington RAC, see CHAFF, 27 July 1971, p. 8.
- 55 Jackman, 'The Auckland Opposition', p. 75.
- 56 For a short report on that conference, see 'Peter Young Morris', 'PYM National Conference and Activities', *New Zealand Monthly Review*, No. 111 (May 1970), p. 23. As far as this author knows, this was the only national conference of the PYM.
- 57 Shadbolt, *Bullshit and Jellybeans*, p. 133.
- 58 Paul Piesse, 'Christchurch Comment', *New Zealand Monthly Review*, No. 113 (July 1970), p. 21.
- 59 See an interesting account of the 'PYM bogy' in a report based upon a speech by 'fiery' Tim Shadbolt in Christchurch in April 1970. 'Incitement to violence against P.Y.M.', *New Zealand Monthly Review*, No. 111 (May 1970), p. 3.
- 60 Norman Kirk in Parliament, 21 April 1970, quoted in *PYM Rabble*, No. 2 (June 1970), p. 2.
- 61 'Communists are exploiting this country's discontented youth. Many of New Zealand's angry young men and women are being led by the Progressive Youth Movement – and the Reds are behind the PYM.' 'Damn You, Shrieks the PYM', *New Zealand Truth*, 2 Dec. 1969, p. 52.
- 62 'The myth that PYM is communist or communist backed had no truth as far as Christchurch was concerned.' Dave Welch, 'PYM', *Canta: End of Year Supplement*, 1972, p. 16. However, as will be discussed below, by 1972 about half of the Christchurch PYM became sympathetic to the CPNZ.
- 63 *PYM Rebel*, 98 (16 November 1974), p. 9. 'The [Auckland] PYM sees drugs for what they are: diversions like alcohol in excess and commercialised sex, distracting the people from attempting to improve their conditions. 'Heads' are not known for clear thinking or decisive action.' Auckland PYM leaflet *PYM – Our Policy and Aims!!*, n.d., quoted in Jackman, 'The Auckland Opposition', p. 169.
- 64 In 1973 there was an attempt to redirect the Auckland PYM by setting up a rival PYM to the CPNZ-controlled one. It was claimed that the Auckland PYM was 'doctrinaire, involved, puritan, and as remote and irrelevant to the youth of New Zealand as anything could be.' See 'Mao's Angels: Rebel P.Y.M.ers Let it all Hang Out', *Earwig*, 8 (n.d., c.1973), p. 15. It is not known if this group was ever formed.
- 65 Nicola Legat, 'Street Fighting Woman', *Metro*, No. 143 (May 1993), p. 64.
- 66 For an account of some of the activity of the Auckland PYM, see Jackman, 'The Auckland Opposition'.

- 67 Shadbolt, 'New Zealand Protest Movement', p. 4.
- 68 For an account of the 'liberation of Albert Park', see Shadbolt, *Bullshit and Jellybeans*, pp. 105-15.
- 69 The name 'Friends of Brutus' was chosen because it meant anybody from the group could speak in the name of Brutus; this avoided the problem of any one person being identified as more important than others in the organisation.
- 70 Friends of Brutus leaflet, 'Manifesto For a Rot Revolution', reproduced in *Cock*, No. 9 (October 1969), pp. 20-21.
- 71 'The burning was a protest against Holyoake's statement of support for Nixon's invasion of Cambodia. Placards reading "Holyoake sells us out again" and "Holyoake to follow Nixon?" were left at the scene.' *PYM Rabble*, No. 2 (June 1970), p. 8.
- 72 For example, Cruickshank cited the Hoffman quote in an advertisement for the Anarchist Congress in *PYM Rabble*, No. 2 (June 1970), p. 9. Cruickshank also was involved in the Anarchist Congress group.
- 73 For an outline of the activities of the Christchurch PYM, see Horton, 'Radicals in Retrospect', pp. 30-34; Welch, 'PYM', *Canta*, pp. 15-17; and wurzil, hog [Tony Currie] and bloflee [Murray Shaw], *Christchurch PYM Report on Activities etc. 1969-1971*, Christchurch: Christchurch PYM, n.d., c.1971.
- 74 Murray Horton, Letter to the author, 17 September 1995.
- 75 'Mayor Removes Placard; Declines Debate', *Christchurch Press*, 27 April 1970, p. 1.
- 76 Letters flowed into the Christchurch papers for and against – some from 'indignant' war-widows and ex-servicemen who returned their medals. Brian Rooney, who was a key figure in the Christchurch PYM, wrote 'certainly we did not consider removing his [Guthrey's] wreath, even though we question everything he represents.' 'Christchurch Comment', *New Zealand Monthly Review*, No. 112 (June 1970), p. 14.
- 77 For an outline of the Dutch Provos and their influential provocative style, see Peter Stansill and David Mairowitz, eds, *BAMN: Outlaw Manifestos and Ephemera 1965-70*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971, pp. 17-35.
- 78 See 'Community Bicycles', *Christchurch Press*, 27 November 1969, p. 1. An editorial in the *Christchurch Press* objected to the scheme on the grounds that if it failed 'the P.Y.M. could always retrieve its fleet to form a mobile brigade of mounted demonstrators'. "'Public" Bicycles', *Christchurch Press*, 2 December 1969, p. 16.
- 79 Welch, 'PYM', *Canta*, p. 16.
- 80 Wurzil, hog and blofee, *Christchurch PYM Report on Activities*, p. 2. Strangely, the necessity of an economic revolution is left out. In their first publication, *Journal of the Christchurch Progressive Youth Movement* (1969), they specifically produced a manifesto to counter the claim that they lacked well-defined aims. Brian Rooney, 'A Few Words on P.Y.M.', *Journal of the Christchurch Progressive Youth Movement*, No. 1 (October 1969), p. 3.
- 81 'A.P.Y.M. Manifesto', *Journal of the Christchurch Progressive Youth Movement*, No. 1 (October 1969), p. 6.
- 82 'Editorial Comment', *Rag-Tag Rabble Rousing Mickey Mouse Stuff*, 3 (c.1972), p. 1. *Rag Tag Rabble Rousing Mickey Mouse Stuff* was the magazine of the Christchurch PYM. It took its name from a derogatory Christchurch SAL report on the Christchurch PYM which claimed the politics of the Christchurch PYM were 'rag tag rabble rousing Mickey Mouse stuff'.
- 83 Welch, 'PYM', *Canta*, p. 15 and p. 17.
- 84 There was also a short-lived Resistance bookstall in Dunedin in 1973. For details see

- 'Resistance Folds', *Midnight Rider*, No. 7 (1973), p. 1.
- 85 Tony Currie, 'Resistance Conference', *Assistance*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (16 January 1974), p. 1. *Assistance* was the newsletter of Christchurch Resistance.
- 86 See Pat Bolster, *Resistance Shop Manual and Report of the Retiring Secretary*, Auckland: Auckland Resistance, 1972, p. 3. Bolster and Robson were involved in the Friends of Brutus group. The majority of people involved in Auckland Resistance were a mixture of different types of leftist radicals who were independent from political parties.
- 87 Bolster, p. 5.
- 88 Bolster, p. 6. Bolster claims that these aims 'have never really been fully debated and codified', but these are *his* understanding of the shops aims.
- 89 Bolster, p. 7.
- 90 'Auckland Resistance Bows Out', *Midnight Rider*, No. 10 (February 1974), p. 6.
- 91 Besides *Ferret* (1973), there were a number of underground magazines in New Zealand in the late 1960s and 1970s: *Cock* (1967-1973), *Earwig* (1969-1973), *Counter-Culture Free Press* (1972-1974), *Uncool* (1972), *Itch* (1972-c.1976) and *Midnight Rider* (1973-1976). Many of these publications were New Leftist in tone, especially the infamous *Cock*, edited by Chris Wheeler.
- 92 'Life in the Booktrade', *Midnight Rider*, Vol. 4 (1973), p. 1.
- 93 This gradual fading away contrasts with the later New Left in the United States, which self-destructed into splinter Maoist sects.
- 94 Jesson, p. 30. Labour also gained prestige in the eyes of many protesters when, for example, it sent a frigate to Mururoa in 1973 to protest against French nuclear testing, and established the Domestic Purposes Benefit and the Ohu commune scheme.
- 95 'Whilst its leaders have not (yet) turned to mysticism and drugs, much of the milieu from which the movement came has.' *Resistance News-Sheet*, Auckland: Auckland Resistance, c.1973, p. 2. This pamphlet was reprinted as 'Old Boy's Notes: 1' in *Earwig*, (c.1973), pp. 12-14.
- 96 For example, anarchist groups were formed out of the demise of both Auckland and Wellington Resistance bookshops.
- 97 For a history of the beginnings of CAFCINZ, see the report by John Christie in *Foreign Control Watchdog*, unnumbered (c.1976), p. 5. There Christie notes 'CAFCINZ was a continuation of organisations growing out the anti-war movement and the PYM'.
- 98 For a very brief account of the Resistance Ride, see Locke, p. 283. Perhaps the last large scale protest specifically organised by a New Left group was the 1976 demonstration in Wanganui against the Wanganui Police Computer, which was organised by the Auckland PYM.
- 99 CAFCINZ charter, *Foreign Control Watchdog*, No. 29 (August 1980), p. 9.
- 100 By 1963 the CPNZ became the only Western 'Communist' Party among the member parties of the 'Communist' International to adopt Maoism. The smaller pro-Soviet faction of the CPNZ split off to form the Socialist Unity Party in 1966.
- 101 For example, an anonymous article in *PYM Rabble* said the PYM was 'simply a jumping off place, an arena where people can be introduced to radical [meaning Leninist] ideas, can reject them or accept them; then join or form a revolutionary [meaning Leninist] party and turn their ideals to the highly practical and arduous task of transforming society.' 'Why a PYM?', *PYM Rabble*, No. 1 (April 1970), p. 4, an article almost certainly written by a Wellington PYMer who was sympathetic to the CPNZ.
- 102 Wurzil, hog and blofee, *Christchurch PYM Report on Activities*, p. 1.
- 103 For example, the entire Wellington branch of the CPNZ was expelled in 1969. For an

- account of this expulsion, see Ron Smith, *Working Class Son: My Fight Against Capitalism and War*, Wellington: Ron Smith, 1994, pp. 138-55.
- 104 For a critical study of the shift towards neo-Leninism in the New Left overseas, particularly America, see Young, *An Infantile Disorder?*
- 105 Not only did the New Left question New Zealand's military alliance with the United States of America, but went on to question the economic, social and cultural domination of New Zealand society by the US. Some New Leftists felt that New Zealand had changed from being a colony of Britain to being a neo-colony of US. For example, see the comments by Tony Currie of the Christchurch PYM and Christchurch Resistance in Locke, p. 281.
- 106 For an example of NLF admiration within the New Left, see Wilfred Burchett, 'Making an Army', *Red Spark*, No. 2 (June 1969), p. 6 and p. 14. *Red Spark* was the magazine of the Victoria University Socialist Club and was a mix of New Left views and Trotskyism. The Christchurch PYM, in its 1969 election manifesto, supported 'the programmes of guerilla groups such as the National Liberation Front'. *PYM Election Policy Manifesto*, Christchurch: Christchurch PYM, c.1969, p. 1.
- 107 Horton, 'Radicals in Retrospect', p. 30.
- 108 For an example of idolisation of Cuba in the New Left, see Steve Radich, 'Cuba: The Agrarian Situation', *Red Spark*, No. 3 (July/August 1969), pp. 9-12.
- 109 For a report of a trip to China, see Murray Horton, 'From Hong Kong to the Viet Cong', *Ferret*, No. 4 (December 1973), pp. 20-21.
- 110 For an overview of the women's liberation movement, see Christine Dann, *Up from Under: Women and Liberation in New Zealand 1970-1985*, Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1985. For the ecological movement, see Roger Wilson, *From Manapouri to Aramoana: The Battle for New Zealand's Environment*, Auckland: Earthworks Press, 1982. For the anti-nuclear and peace movements, see Clements, *Back from the Brink*, and Locke, *Peace People*. For the Maori movement for self-determination in the 1970s, see Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith, 'He Pokeke Uenuku i Tu Ai: The Evolution of Contemporary Maori Protest', in Paul Spoonley, David Pearson and Cluny Macpherson, eds, *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1996, pp. 97-116, and Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*, Auckland: Penguin, 1990.
- 111 Dann, p. 5.
- 112 Dann, p. 5. Auckland Women's Liberation Front was one of the first Auckland women's liberation groups. For other examples of PYMers who became involved in women's liberation groups, see the reminisces by Therese O'Connell (Wellington PYM), 'Singing to Survive', and Christine Bird (Christchurch PYM and Christchurch Resistance), 'Lighting up Oppression', in Maud Cahill and Christine Dann, eds, *Changing Our Lives: Women Working in the Women's Liberation Movement 1970-1990*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1991, pp. 71-6, 131-7.
- 113 Dann, p. 3.
- 114 Murray Bookchin, 'New Social Movements: The Anarchic Dimension', in David Goodway, ed, *For Anarchism: History, Theory, and Practice*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989, p. 264. Carl Boggs makes a similar point to Bookchin in his *Social Movements and Political Power: Emerging Forms of Radicalism in the West*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986, pp. 7-10.
- 115 There were exceptions to this, particularly the radical wing of new social movements. The Polynesian Panther Party, for example, aimed for a total revolution against racism, oppression and capitalism. Polynesian Panther Party, 'What We Want', quoted in Poata-Smith, 'He Pokeke Uenuku i Tu Ai', p. 103.
- 116 Tama Poata has called the era of the PYM as a 'springboard era' for a number of groups that have lasted till today. Tama Poata, interviewed in Russell Campbell's video documentary *Rebels in Retrospect: The Political Memoirs of Some Members of the Progressive Youth Movement*, Wellington: Vanguard Films, 1991.
- 117 Jesson, pp. 28-30.
- 118 See Jonathan Boston, *Incomes Policy in New Zealand 1968-1984*, Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1984, especially pp. 89-116.
- 119 However, some New Leftist groups and publications did address this strike wave, especially *The Paper* (1973-c.1975), an important Wellington based 'independent radical [monthly] newspaper' produced by an independent collective and largely edited by Jim Delahunty, who was an important figure in the early New Left. It differed from most New Left groups in that it was largely directed at factory workers and Polynesians rather than students and political activists. Ron Smith has claimed that many from the paper cooperative went on to form the Wellington Marxist-Leninist Organisation in the mid-1970s which eventually became a nationwide Maoist party, the Workers' Communist League, in 1979. Smith, *Working Class Son*, p. 162.
- 120 As Maurice Brinton has written, 'one doesn't refute dead dogma by the condemnation of all theoretical reflexion.' Maurice Brinton, *Paris May 1968*, London: Solidarity, 1968, p. 54.
- 121 For a similar critique of the New Left, see Murray Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism, and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993-1998*, Edinburgh and San Francisco: AK Press, 1999, pp. 59-111.
- 122 For the view that places like China were 'state capitalist' dictatorships where class exploitation was maintained by a party elite, see Richard Bolstad, *An Anarchist Analysis of the Chinese Revolution*, Christchurch: Christchurch Anarchy Group, c.1976; Cajo Brendel, *Theses on the Chinese Revolution*, London: Solidarity, 1974; and Simon Leys, *Chinese Shadows*, New York: The Viking Press, 1977. Bolstad was a member of the Christchurch PYM, and his pamphlet was written in response to the Christchurch PYMers who became sympathetic to Maoism.

9 Organising the Unemployed: the Politics of Gender, Culture and Class in the 1980s and 1990s

- 1 *Dole-drums*, 'Women's Involvement Gives Strength', No. 25, September 1984, p. 8.
- 2 'Women's Involvement Gives Strength', pp. 6-7.
- 3 The name Te Roopu Rawakore was given to the movement by Te Whare Awhina, an unemployed group in Mangataipa, Tai Tokerau, led by Huhana Oneroa; it means 'the people who have nothing'. Huhana challenged the movement to accept a Maori name with no English translation to show their commitment to a real bicultural movement. 'Te Roopu Rawakore' became the official name used by the movement, initially accompanied by an English subtitle though this was phased out in response to the demands of the Maori wing of the movement, Te Iwi Maori Rawakore. Interestingly enough, Te Roopu Rawakore was also an early name given to the Labour Party by Maori during the 1920s.
- 4 Minutes of the National Planning Committee, 21-22 June 1984, MS 90-385 3/16, ATL.