

INTRODUCTION

As long as there is an Australian Labor Party (ALP) there is likely to be a Labor rat.¹ The concept of the Labor rat in Australia has proved remarkably resilient: accusations of betrayal and treachery punctuate the history of the ALP at regular intervals, and rats are plentiful in its folklore. The publication of *True Believers: The Story of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party* in May 2001 highlighted the importance of the type in the mythology of the ALP. In the final chapter of the study, the Australian historian and publisher John Iremonger used the stories of some well-known Labor rats—Billy Hughes, Jack Lang, Joseph Lyons, the Groupers and Mal Colston—to illustrate the flexibility and resilience of the Labor caucus.² More recently, the former federal secretary, Bob Hogg, called the South Australian state parliamentarian, Ralph Clarke, a Labor rat over his challenge to party processes in the South Australian Supreme Court in 1999. The term appears regularly in the Australian press: during a period of instability in Simon Crean's leadership of the ALP, the *Melbourne Age* published the following letter: 'There is a famous word for Labor people, such as [Kim] Beazley and the NSW Right, who put self before the party—rat'.³

Iremonger's essay was the first systematic discussion of the phenomenon of the Labor rat but betrayals have attracted a great deal

of attention in the general historiography of the ALP.⁴ For example, V. G. Childe wove the theme of treachery through *How Labour Governs*, even including 'Rats' in the index with a cross-reference to treachery. Childe emphasised the fate of the New South Wales 'rats' who failed to support the introduction of the solidarity pledge in 1895: they either 'disappeared from political life or became merged in one or other of the bourgeois parties'. He also examined the treachery of the New South Wales Labor deputy premier, William Holman, and the Minister of Lands, George Beeby, over the Federal Referenda of 1911, which proposed to extend federal powers over the states: the pair's refusal to support the federal Labor government was seen as a threat to Labor solidarity overall, and tested the power of conference to control Labor politicians. In *Civilising Capitalism* Bede Nairn recounted the condemnation of the Labor members and protectionists Fitzgerald, Kelly, Johnston and Sharp who were branded as traitors for voting with the Dibbs' government over the arrest of the Broken Hill strikers in 1893. The despicable conduct of the four renegades 'drove the concepts of caucus, pledge and solidarity deeper into labour consciousness', according to Nairn.⁵

Holman also participated in one of the most infamous of 'rattings', the campaign for conscription in 1916 and the formation of a new party, the National Party, with the former Labor prime minister, Billy Hughes, and others. Historians have emphasised the effects this betrayal had on the future of the party. In their history of the New South Wales branch of the Labor Party, Jim Hagan and Ken Turner argued that the rattling of Hughes, Holman and the others weakened the movement's faith in a parliamentary strategy, resulting in more rigorous control of parliamentarians by conference. Also, as most of those expelled were older and had been born overseas, their exit brought in fresh, Australian-born faces as well as a substantial increase in Catholic members, which would alter the tenor of the party.⁶ Brian McKinlay concurred, arguing that the split led to a 'considerable radicalisation of the party' and a new wave of labour leaders. A new tradition emerged: that the rank and file could remove the leadership to defend party policy.⁷ Graham Freudenberg also discussed the impact of the split on the party, claiming that it increased the authority of the central executive in New South Wales and 'speeded the growth of Labour's national organisation'.⁸

Despite often careful analysis, the stories of these betrayals necessarily unfold in a rather black and white fashion, leaving an impression of heroes and villains, on one side the betrayed party or movement, and on the other side the lost leaders; the traitors who leave or are expelled. An exception to this has been the biography of Holman by a former leader of the ALP, Herbert Evatt. In his introduction, Evatt drew attention to the dialectical relationship between leaders and the party, warning against simply blaming a leader for a damaging split:

For one thing, black treachery is most rare and the disastrous results of division and split may be caused as much by lack of loyalty to a chosen leader as by the leader's failure to appreciate that his primary duty is to the working classes whose sacrifices have enabled the political organisation to succeed.⁹

Like Evatt, Ross McMullin has questioned the dichotomy of heroes and villains in these dramas. He recalled that, in 1954, when many Labor Catholics defected over the failure of the Labor Party to separate itself completely from communism, dead rats were sent to opponents. In McMullin's analysis, Herbert Evatt's leadership actually aggravated the split, in sharp contrast to the prevailing myth, which portrays him as a principled radical and the split as 'inevitable'.¹⁰

The term 'rat' might not have the same resonance for the Labour Party of Great Britain, or the British press, but the issue of betrayal persists as a potent theme. Recent examples include the Gang of Four's exodus in 1981, and, for some, Tony Blair's repositioning of the party as 'New Labour' in 1996. The most infamous example, however, remains the 'betrayal' by Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Snowden, and Jimmy Thomas, who—in 1931—failed to follow the rest of the Labour ministry in resigning their positions rather than make cuts to unemployment benefits, and remained to serve in a National government alongside the Conservatives. A fourth minister, Lord Sankey, also remained but is not usually included in the roll call of traitors. Perhaps MacDonald's betrayal was less surprising than that of the others because of his class background. This incident, and the way in which it has been covered in the historiography, raises many of the themes I explore here.

Ramsay MacDonald has received the lion's share of the blame for the events of August 1931. In 1938 the Scottish MP L. MacNeill Weir published *The Tragedy of Ramsay MacDonald*, a vitriolic attack on the personal character of MacDonald, which helped to consolidate the party's generally negative view of his behaviour.¹¹ According to MacNeill Weir, MacDonald had acted out of self-interest: 'Just for a handful of silver he left us, Just for a ribbon to stick in his coat'. The allusion is, of course, to Robert Browning's poem 'The Lost Leader' from *Dramatic Romances and Lyrics* (1845): 'Just for a handful of silver he left us, Just for a riband to stick in his coat'.¹²

He had never been a socialist but was, rather, a Liberal opportunist.¹³ One of his fellow 'traitors' eventually abandoned MacDonald. In his autobiography, Phillip Snowden published the contents of his 'stinging letter of resignation' in which he told MacDonald he could 'no longer endure the duplicity, evasion and betrayal which he had long witnessed'.¹⁴ He called MacDonald 'a one-time Socialist who has seen the error of his ways, and has found salvation and a spiritual home in the Tory Party'. In Herbert Tracey's *The British Labour Party: Its History, Growth, Policy and Leaders*, John R. Clynes, the Home Secretary in MacDonald's second Labour government, wrote of the 'amazing conduct of the Leader of Labour in procuring the break-up of the Labour government and leading the one which displaced us'.¹⁵ Although MacDonald was already well established as a traitor, Clyne's emphasis on his sole responsibility for the government's demise further entrenched his infamy into Labour folklore: he was assigned 'a traitor's grave'.¹⁶

More recently this blanket vilification has been questioned by a number of historians who have demanded a more balanced view of MacDonald's actions. Chief among these has been David Marquand, who suggested that the truth was more complicated than it appeared and called for a more careful analysis of MacDonald's role in the events.¹⁷ Keith Laybourn backed Marquand, arguing that the evidence suggests MacDonald had no intention of replacing the second Labour government with a National government. Nevertheless, as Laybourn laments, the myth lives on.

The role that betrayals play in the renewal of the organisation is, then, acknowledged. Nevertheless, these betrayals are generally portrayed as detrimental for the radical organisation—at least in the

short term—as it is assumed that the renegades demonstrate a weakness in solidarity and discipline. I take a fresh approach to the topic in this study. Influenced by Evatt’s warning, I am less interested in using betrayals to blame either the traitor or the movement for their failings, or even in establishing the veracity of accusations of betrayal (with one notable exception). Rather, I aim to tease out the complexity of meanings that lie behind the different types of betrayal (and accusations of betrayal) and their timings. I do this by examining the ways in which certain types of betrayals emerged in specific historical contexts, how traitors managed their conflicting identities and the uses to which the labour movements put these betrayals—especially how they explained to the remaining members why some people fall away. More broadly, I aim to illuminate the nature of the emotion of trust and the role it played in maintaining solidarity in groups that were operating outside society’s existing parameters.

Trust is a basic, if contested, human emotion. It operates at all levels of society: between individuals in personal relationships, in social groups, in commercial operations, in political institutions and in the relationship between citizens and governments. In an era in which trust and its absence have become of increasing interest and concern, an examination of the construction and maintenance of solidarity in radical organisations offers useful insights. Fred Inglis has asserted that in the novels of the cultural theorist Raymond Williams ‘there is a blank assumption that something called socialism entails something called loyalty’.¹⁸ Williams’s insight underpins the assumptions of this study. Organisations that are attempting to achieve social change operate outside society’s existing parameters, often within a context of conflict, and this position both constructs and threatens solidarity. Loyalty, or the maintenance of solidarity, is therefore both more difficult and more desirable for such organisations, as more is at stake than for groups operating within the status quo.

Most theorists judge trust to be a modern phenomenon that emerged as a means of negotiating the gap left by the weakening of previously shared evaluations but as the division of labour increased and new group identities emerged, trust declined as a social cohesive. This is particularly relevant to the subject of this study. Familiarity within the radical groups to be examined here was based on a common position—opposition to capital—within the division of labour but the

nature of capitalist society undermined a mass movement, and the use of representative democracy further weakened intimate familiarity. As the roles of elected members increased, familiarity with their constituencies weakened and distrust emerged. Radical organisations often tried to control this weakening by means of oaths and pledges but some analysts argue that system constraints such as oaths are, in their very nature, inimical to the development of trust, because trust necessarily involves a vulnerability occasioned by some form of ignorance as to the other's motives.¹⁹

Recent scholarship on trust in organisations has defined trust as a multidimensional construct, which is founded on notions of vulnerability. In this analysis, trust is a set of distinct beliefs or expectations that combine in some form to represent overall trust. Kramer and Tyler identified four distinct dimensions or components in their definition: 'Trust is one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable'.²⁰

All the components of this definition are relevant for the case studies in this book but the final component, reliability, is especially salient for organisations in crisis. As we shall see, situations of crisis for radical organisations—strikes, lockouts, wars and periods of high unemployment—put some leaders under particular pressure, and assessments of their trustworthiness in these situations depended on their history of reliable behaviour, their accumulation of trust from their fellow members, and the depth of the 'reservoir of trust' on which they could draw as the pressures increased.

Another important concept for the purposes of this study is the idea that trust and distrust are complements of each other rather than polar opposites; trust is constructed through its relationship with distrust and vice versa.²¹ Most useful are ideas of identity-based trust, which propose that it is more difficult for a reservoir of trust to accumulate in collective contexts than it is in dyadic relationships. This is because, in the latter, individuals are more directly involved, and have a better sense of the shared history on which to base their decision to trust that all individuals in the relationship share aims and objectives. Individuals in collective contexts possess only partial and selective data on which to base their decision to trust because they cannot have direct contact with everyone in order to assess the degree

to which aims and objectives are shared. When there is an in-group bias, or strong categorisation or self-categorisation effects (such as the class identification of labour organisations), collective trust is likely to be stronger as people tend to perceive members of their own social groups in relatively positive terms. They also tend to assume similarity and consensus within their social groups, and to share tacit understandings regarding the norms, duties and rights that govern their relationships with other organisational members. The resilience of identity-based trust is dependent on numerous actions, cues and contexts and, like identity itself, is a socially constructed product.²²

It is hardly surprising that groups that come into being to oppose the status quo should then be riddled with insecurities. When the radical group itself is working just outside social norms—recruiting from the disaffected, perhaps meeting secretly, certainly planning political, social and economic changes that elites and the yet-to-be-enlightened are likely to resist—it seems reasonable to conclude that others are playing by the same rules. In *Trust: A Sociological Theory*, Polish sociologist Piotr Sztompka provides a useful analysis of the complexities of trust and distrust in revolutionary movements, which can be applied to groups or organisations striving for social change. Sztompka points out that a limited culture of distrust is required to bring about social change and that distrust is actually built into the formation of radical groups. Although a strong culture of trust must exist within the ranks of the revolutionaries, they must also distrust political authorities and class enemies or they will not form a grouping in the first place. This is, perhaps, why ‘the rat’ is primarily a Labor appellation. The more ambitious the aims of the political organisation, the greater the loyalty it demands. If the two requirements are present there exists what Sztompka calls an ‘us’ category. Three moral obligations define the parameter of an ‘us’ category: the first of these obligations is mutual trust; the second is loyalty and the third, solidarity.²³

The construction of radical solidarity required the bridging of a number of differentiating characteristics, the most salient of which were class, gender and race. The first step in the construction of this solidarity defined a common antagonism to capitalists on the basis of class. As E. P. Thompson has pointed out, from about 1830 there developed in England a more clearly defined class-consciousness in which a diverse group of working people, including unskilled

labourers, skilled artisans and self-employed small producers, became increasingly aware of an identity of interests between themselves and against the interests of other classes. Workers shared their common exploitation more clearly as the result of the factory system, which brought them together working side by side, as well as suffering the severe repression of radical protest in the aftermath of the French Revolution. European-wide repression in 1815 sought to stamp out the development of a radical awareness awakened by the events of the French Revolution and, in Britain, the subsequent emergence of the plebeian Corresponding Societies. As circumstances changed—the growth of the factory system, the remaking of the family around wage labour and the idea of the breadwinner, and the spread of capitalist relations into a global system with competition between national economies and workforces—these solidarities had to be renegotiated and remade. Eventually, workers came to exclude women and, especially in Australia, some non-whites from the shared capacities of working-class solidarity.²⁴

Andrew Metcalfe has argued that socialists have failed to adequately theorise solidarity, preferring to ‘slip’ uncritically between conservative Durkheimian analysis and the ‘rational man’ theory favoured by liberals in their accounts of ‘social contracts’.²⁵ They accept, without question, the proposal that it is natural for social bonds to form in conditions of ‘categorical isomorphism’. Metcalfe argues that this ‘slippage’ hides the ‘complex and genuinely creative cultural processes by which identities are formed’. Moreover, Marx’s explanations of how a class-in-itself becomes a class-for-itself are too simplistic and ignore the multiple identities of individuals (gender, age, and ethnic identities for example), some of which will have been previously organised into divisions of labour. Metcalfe calls for analysts to resist assuming solidarity, and to pay attention to the other identities that workers might possess besides their shared identity as workers.²⁶ This is the approach to these issues taken in this study: it is assumed that class constituted just one identification for the participants in radical organisations, and that many other allegiances might emerge as a threat to solidarity.

In his essay, Iremonger used the term ‘rat’ as a catchall for traitors without drawing distinctions between the various motivations for betrayal, and the former Labor politician Clyde Cameron has written

that the traitors ‘who posed as Labor leaders’ were all the victims of flattery and stupidity rather than venality.²⁷ But there were, in fact, a variety of motivations for the betrayals discussed by these commentators. Billy Hughes’s betrayal over conscription in 1916 for example, was prompted by patriotism, that of the Groupers by religious conviction, and Mal Colston’s by greed.²⁸ Encompassing this variety is a key concern of the study. Consequently, the subjects of the study represent a cross-section of allegedly treacherous behaviours, which include hyper-individuality (Champion), self-interest, allegiance to a higher cause, for example, religious faith or patriotism (Adela Pankhurst Walsh), ‘duchessing’—an Australian colloquialism for getting a taste for the high life and forgetting one’s roots (William Trenwith, John Burns and Victor Grayson); being out of step—either too far behind or too far ahead of party policy (Champion again); and failure of nerve once in office (William Holman).

‘Groupness’—a group’s capacity to affect a member’s behaviour—is another variable that must be considered. Durkheim proposed that the ‘groupness’ of any group might be referred to as its solidarity: the more cohesive a group is, the greater the influence it casts upon its members.²⁹ Groups influence members by subjecting them to a variety of obligations to act in the corporate interest (the ALP’s solidarity pledge, for example) and by ensuring these obligations are fulfilled. Stable groups and social orders can be maintained only in the presence of institutions that promote dependence and control, and the extent of solidarity in any group is limited by its members’ dependence.

Attention should be paid to the internal dynamics of the groups by the examination of the various levels of control and the degree of dependence on the group of individual members. Also, as groups have a division of productive responsibility—for example the Conference, the National Executive Committee (NEC) and the Parliamentary Labour Party (PLP) in the Labour Party of Great Britain—analysts should consider the behaviour of leaders. Rational choice remains significant, though its ahistoricity means it cannot provide a sufficient explanation for solidarity or schism, and it is important to ask what determines the nature and strength of individual preferences (a key cause of dependence in groups), and to remember that preferences do not remain constant in different situations.³⁰ As we shall see in a number of the case studies presented here—for example

William Trenwith, John Burns and Adela Pankhurst Walsh—the passage of time has a significant effect on the personal preferences of radical activists, even if core beliefs remain stable.

As suggested earlier, the concept of the rat is predominantly a product of the left: until recently no one has talked of a conservative rapping. A notable exception to this is, of course, Winston Churchill who was characterised as having rapped and re-rapped. In the 2004 Australian federal election campaign, the disendorsed Liberal candidate for the blue-ribbon seat of Wentworth, Peter King, was repeatedly labelled a rat. King had not joined a rival party but was standing as an independent. Also Prime Minister John Howard was called a ‘lying rodent’ over his claims that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and was followed around the country by people wearing rat suits.

The relative absence of conservative rapping raises the question of why the left should have such intense norms. The sociologist Max Weber distinguished between associative and communal relationships, and this difference might explain the unique characteristics of the left.³¹ Associative groups are those associated through shared interests, like the Liberal Party of Australia. Communal or identity groups—such as the British Labour Party and the ALP—are those brought together by a shared identity that is defined by their exclusion from, and opposition to, another group. In other words these groups have a clear sense of the existence of an ‘Other’, and this sense helps form their identity. Discussing the construction of working-class solidarity in the USA, Johanna Brenner points out that organising against a powerful and seductive enemy can be frightening. This can fuel the construction of solidarity, which involves defining and maintaining group loyalties to defend against the threat of real and imagined betrayals.³² These groups will have a higher propensity toward schism than associative groups, particularly when participation is broad-based and emotionally intense, and—as it is in radical organisations like the Independent Labour Party (ILP) or the Social Democratic Federation (SDF)—when the collective identity of the group is in tension with dominant cultures.³³ Moreover, in contrast to individuals in associative groups, individuals in communal groups are likely to have been moved to participation by moral ends. Consequently they tend to view their own behaviour in charismatic or expressive terms, and to invest their whole

personalities in communal groups, not just segments of themselves. They view their participation as a moral duty and an expression of their identity.

Splits and schisms are much more likely when individual personality and group identity become fixed in this way: personal conflicts become easily politicised and political conflicts become quickly personalised. Identities are not easily divisible, and this can promote splits between groups that each claim to represent the 'true' identity of the larger group.³⁴ When collective consciousness is strong—as it is in the case of a radical organisation such as the ILP—control over the identity will be of major importance. To lose control over the identity is to lose control of the reason for being together in the first place.

Judith Brett has suggested that members of Australia's middle class were also motivated to join the Liberal Party by a belief in their duty to bring moral virtue to political life.³⁵ However, in contrast to the ALP, the Liberal Party struggled with its identity as a class party, preferring to argue that rather than being a party of the middle class, it was a party for all Australians.³⁶ It resisted adopting a class label and preferred to consider itself a grouping of individual interests. In other words, it resisted the merging of individual and group personalities, and so remained less vulnerable to splits and schisms.

For some the real rats are not those who leave the party but those who remain to direct its enthusiastic adoption of the principles of economic rationalism. Bob Hawke, Paul Keating and Tony Blair might be examples of such internal rats. In this analysis, the betrayal is not of the political organisation but of the workers who constitute the real labour movement. In her 1977 essay, Marilyn Lake argued that the widely used concept of the Labor rat was misleading and simplistic, and of little value for analysing the history and affairs of the ALP. The term misled commentators, prompting them to ask the wrong questions and to concentrate on the individual rather than on the party. Many traitors to the working class remained and prospered in the party and this was possible because it had never been a socialist class-identified party but was rather a 'middle-class representative party' from its inception.³⁷ Since Lake wrote, the discursive turn has demonstrated the advantages of an examination of the ways in which such a term as the 'Labor rat' is used, especially to highlight the issues,

concerns and ideas, which were and are important to a group at specific periods in its history. Moreover, it is important to draw a distinction between betraying the working class and betraying the labour movement or the Labor Party. The two are not the same thing, and rats betray a labour/Labor ideal of solidarity, not the working class.

The concept of class is an important consideration throughout this study, especially in its basic form of 'us and them', although it is not privileged over other analytical tools. Class is combined with gender and race in an examination of the relationship between prevailing ideas of masculinity and social status, and the part played by tensions concerning these issues in accusations of betrayal. An important part of this aspect of the study is an understanding of the relationship between the two strands of the labour movement, labourism and socialism. The significance of a working-class masculinity or, more properly, masculinities—that is, manly masculinities emerging from the idealisation of manual labour—contrast with the refined and feminised construction of the intellectual male, and are examined for impacts on accusations of betrayal.

The term 'race' is used despite its problems as a constructed category because the subjects of this study themselves used the term to explain differences between groups. The study also considers the significance of the achievement of electoral office by labour representatives for the type and frequency of accusations of betrayal, and asks whether covenants or pledges served as a uniting force for radical organisations, or simply highlighted the vulnerability of the collective ideal.

The individual case studies follow a chronology that traces the organisational development of the labour movements. The studies begin with the socialist pioneer, Henry Hyde Champion (1859–1928). Next are the Victorian labour leader, William Arthur Trenwith (1848–1920) and the British labour leader John Burns (1858–1928) who, as Lib-Labs, function as transitional unionists in the study. The British socialist Victor Grayson (1881–unknown) follows, representing the final struggle between socialism and labourism for dominance in the Labour Party. Next, Adela Pankhurst Walsh (1888–1960) stands for the socialist who, disaffected by the triumph of labourism in the Labour/Labor Parties, sought an ideological home in communist and

fascist parties during the 1920s and 1930s. Finally, an analysis of the writings of Ada Augusta Holman (1869–1949)—the wife of W. A. Holman, the Labor premier of New South Wales between 1913 and 1920, who ratted on the party over conscription in 1916—sheds light on the ways in which a committed socialist and collectivist might be ‘duchessed’ by unprecedented access to political power.

I examine betrayals in Great Britain and Australia largely because of H. H. Champion, who was suspected of betraying the labour movement in both countries. My interest in the role that betrayal might play in the maintenance of solidarity arose from a previous close study of his career, which also pointed to significant continuities and connections between the two labour movements, and I wished to examine these in greater depth. Generally, my study highlights the close links between members of the labour movement in both countries during this period. Adela Pankhurst Walsh’s mother—the English suffragette leader, Emmeline Pankhurst—sent her youngest daughter to Australia when she wanted her out of the way, and Adela never returned. On her travels in Europe, Ada Holman met some of Britain’s pre-eminent labour politicians. Even Victor Grayson had links to Australasia: he fought for the New Zealand Army in the First World War, and was ‘sighted’ in Melbourne and Western Australia after his disappearance.

The exploration of continuities and discontinuities in the language of betrayal and the theme of betrayal in radical fiction across distance as well as across time further demonstrates the significant links between the two countries. Moreover, comparing the experiences of leaders from similar backgrounds like William Trenwith and John Burns provides a more penetrating examination of the differences that class could make to the ways in which accusations of betrayal were constructed and used. Despite geographical distance, there are strong similarities between the two cases. Both men rose from humble working-class origins to become revered labour leaders before being lost to the movement by their acceptance of ministerial positions in Liberal cabinets. Both attracted substantial criticism for their treachery to the workers and were never properly reconciled to the movement.

I begin by examining the roles that shifting fusions of class, gender and race played in the construction of solidarity in three radical organisations: the socialistic Independent Labour Party (ILP) in

Britain, the British Labour Party, and the ALP, asking what happened as these nascent organisations moved towards closure. I look particularly at who was excluded, how were they excluded and why. This chapter sets the foundation for my attempt to unravel the complex systems of meaning that led to various accusations of betrayal.

The individual case studies explore the ways in which these fusions of class, gender and race interplayed with accusations of betrayal in specific historical contexts. As a labour leader from the upper classes, the case of H. H. Champion provides a useful intersection of class and masculinity, and allows an examination of the expectations a radical organisation had of upper-class leaders. Studies of William Trenwith and John Burns reveal the different expectations of working-class leaders, and the different reactions their betrayals might provoke. Victor Grayson's story is useful because it reveals the complexities of allegiance in the early years of the British Labour Party, and the ways in which accusations of betrayal—both by and against Grayson—could be used to help to define aims and objectives, to work out what kind of organisation the new party would be, and to signal this clearly to members. Also, as Grayson was on the left of the labour movement his 'betrayal' provides a revealing contrast to those of Trenwith and Burns. The former Communist turned 'Australia First' activist, Adela Pankhurst Walsh provides an important (and welcome) gender shift in this study, and her case brings up issues of expectation due to familial connections, as well as questions regarding the subjectivity of betrayal. The fictional and biographical writings of Ada Holman provide the basis for an exploration of the role of the spouse in accusations of betrayal.

Two further aspects of betrayal in radical organisations are considered here. The language of betrayal—the various terms that have been used to vilify traitors to radical organisations—is explored in both Britain and Australia. The examination of a range of radical fiction in which anxieties about solidarity and betrayal have been expressed—from Ernest Jones's *De Brassier* (1853) to Raymond Williams's *Loyalties* (1985)—shows the ways in which organisations attempt to explain the reasons why people drop away.

The themes in this fiction reflect those revealed in the individual case studies. They contain the full spectrum of human drama: the exhilarating fellowship that comes from shared commitment to a

cause; the pros and cons of charismatic leadership, the inevitable tensions around personal ambition within a group activity, anxieties about women's power expressed through accusations of 'pillow talk', the 'fatal flaws' attributed to many leaders (a penchant for women and wine, perhaps, or greed, or hubris), the petty jealousies and bitter rivalries, the punch-ups, and, of course, the black-hearted treachery of the political rat.

Notes

- ¹ Despite the various spellings that were used by different colonial parties at different times, in this study I will use 'Labor' for all Australian political labour organisations, 'Labour' for British political labour organisations and labour for the broader movements in Britain and Australia.
- ² John Faulkner and Stuart Macintyre, eds, *True Believers: The Story of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2001), pp. 265–83.
- ³ Bob Hogg, 'The ethics of public opinion', in *The Prince's New Clothes: Why do Australians Dislike Their Politicians?*, eds David Burchell and Andrew Leigh (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2002), p. 106; Age, 7 July 2003; V. G. Childe, *How Labour Governs: A Study of Workers' Representation in Australia* (London: Melbourne University Press, 1923).
- ⁴ For earlier discussions of Labor rats see Marilyn Lake, 'John Earle and the concept of the Labor rat', *Labour History*, no. 43 (1977) and Clyde Cameron, 'Labor leaders who betrayed their trust', *Labour History*, no. 53 (1987).
- ⁵ Bede Nairn, *Civilising Capitalism: The Beginnings of the ALP* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1989), pp. 96–106. Somewhat ironically the future rat W. A. Holman declared 'that these deserters should be treated with undying hostility'.
- ⁶ Jim Hagan and Ken Turner, *A History of Labor Party in New South Wales, 1891–1991* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1991), pp. 108–14.
- ⁷ Brian McKinlay, *The ALP: A Short History of the Australian Labor Party* (Melbourne: Drummond/Heinemann, 1981), pp. 46–7.
- ⁸ Graham Freudenberg, *Cause For Power: The Official History of the New South Wales Branch of the Australian Labor Party* (Sydney: Pluto Press, 1991), pp. 108–11.
- ⁹ H. V. Evatt, *Australian Labour Leader: The Story of W. A. Holman and the Labour Movement* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1940: 1954), p. 3.
- ¹⁰ Ross McMullin, *The Light on the Hill: The Australian Labor Party, 1891–1991* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 275–7. For more betrayals, schisms and splits in the historiography of the ALP see for example, L. F. Crisp, *The Federal Parliamentary Party, 1901–1951* (Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1978), pp.135–6; D. J. Murphy, ed., *Labor in Politics: The State Labor Parties in Australia 1880–1920* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1975).

- ¹¹ Keith Laybourn, *The Labour Party, 1881–1951: A Reader in History* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1988).
- ¹² *Robert Browning: Poems Selected by Douglas Dunn* (London: Faber & Faber, 2004), p. 28. Harold Laski appears to have been responsible for this allusion entering Labour mythology. David Marquand, *Ramsay MacDonald* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1977), pp. 678–9.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 93.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107.
- ¹⁵ Herbert Tracey, ed., *The British Labour Party: Its History, Growth, Policy and Leaders* (London: Caxton, 1948), p. 167.
- ¹⁶ Laybourn, *The Labour Party*, p. 94.
- ¹⁷ Marquand, *Ramsay MacDonald*, p. 791.
- ¹⁸ Fred Inglis, *Raymond Williams* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 290.
- ¹⁹ There is insufficient space here to deal with the complex issues these studies raise but the following list of works may be of use to those with a further interest in the scholarship on trust: Malin Åkerstrom, *Betrayal and Betrayers: The Sociology of Treachery* (New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Publishers, c1991); Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: Free Press, 1995); Diego Gambetta, ed., *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988); Russell Hardin, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Sage, 2002); ‘Trusting persons, trusting institutions’, in *Strategy and Choice*, ed. Richard J. Zeckhauser (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991); ‘Trustworthiness’, *Ethics*, no. 107 (1996); John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Martin Hollis, *Trust Within Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Keiron O’Hara, *Trust: From Socrates to Spin* (Cambridge: Icon, 2004); Onora O’Neill, *A Question of Trust: The BBC Reith Lectures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Adam B. Seligman, *The Problem of Trust* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); ‘Do we want trust in government?’, in *Democracy and Trust*, ed. Mark E. Warren (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); ‘The street level epistemology of trust’, *Analyse and Kritik*, vol. 14 (1992).
- ²⁰ Roderick M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, *Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996), p. 265.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 281.
- ²² Roderick K. Kramer, Marilyn B. Brewer, Benjamin A. Hanna, ‘Collective trust and collective action: the decision to trust as a social decision’, in Kramer and Tyler, *Trust in Organisations*, p. 377.
- ²³ Piotr Sztompka, *Trust: A Sociological Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 5, 113. Åkerstrom calls this a ‘We’ group, *Betrayal and Betrayers*, pp. 3–4.
- ²⁴ Dorothy Thompson, ed., *The Essential E. P. Thompson* (New York: The New Press, 2001), pp. 13, 17, 74. For an alternative and less deterministic analysis of these developments see Gareth Stedman Jones, ‘Rethinking Chartism’, in *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832–1982*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 90–178.

- ²⁵ For a summary of differing sociological approaches to solidarity see Michael Hechter, *Principles of Group Solidarity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 2–6. See also Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labour in Society* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1933: 1984); Anthony Giddens, *Durkheim on Politics and the State* (Cambridge: Polity, 1986); and Anthony Giddens, *Durkheim* (London: Fontana, 1978).
- ²⁶ Andrew Metcalfe, 'Sex and solidarity', in *Challenges to Labour History*, ed. Terry Irving (Sydney: University of NSW Press, 1993), pp. 88–93. For Marx on solidarity, see 'Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon', Section VII, *The Portable Karl Marx*, ed. Eugene Kamenka (New York: Penguin, 1983).
- ²⁷ Clyde Cameron, 'Labor leaders who betrayed their trust', pp. 117–18.
- ²⁸ Faulkner and Macintyre, *True Believers*, pp. 265–83.
- ²⁹ Hechter, *Principles of Group Solidarity*, p. 8.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 185.
- ³¹ Christopher K. Ansell, *Schism and Solidarity in Social Movements: The Politics of Labour in the French Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 15.
- ³² Johanna Brenner, *Women and the Politics of Class* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000), p. 93.
- ³³ Ansell, *Schism and Solidarity*, pp. 35, 228.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- ³⁵ Judith Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class: From Alfred Deakin to John Howard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 9.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 214.
- ³⁷ This is linked to the idea of the Labour *fakir* in labour movement discourse in the 1920s, and to the Communist characterisation of the 'social fascist'.