To commemorate the sixtieth year of the IPA Review, the IPA will now publish the IPA Review in full colour. We can do this at almost no extra cost, not because of the government or government regulations, but because of competition and technology.

This magazine, like many other niche publications, is highly sensitive to minor changes in production and printing costs, subscription base, and newstand sales. Significant technological developments in printing over the last half century have allowed us to now print in full colour. The dramatic changes in telecommunications technologies have obscured the parallel changes in the printing industry.

For six decades now the IPA Review has been producing its scintillating political, economic and social commentary using a variety of production techniques. The first two editions, March and June 1947, were produced using one spot colour, plus black. Spot colours are generated by a single ink—in this case, the dark red of the IPA logo—on a separate printing plate, the thin sheet of metal carrying the image of each page.

But after those first two editions, and until 1985, the IPA Review was printed in sombre black and white.

For the decade between 1985 and 1995, the magazine moved to full colour, generated by a four-colour process. This involves four coloured ink plates—cyan, magenta, yellow and black—which are printed semi-transparently over each other. However, to reduce costs, the review was returned to featuring one-spot colour inside its pages.

We now once again bring you full colour. Modern innovations have lowered the cost of production dramatically. Layout is done entirely on a computer, and the computer processing power available in 2007 makes the task relatively painless.

New stock photography websites open up the market for imagery, giving younger amateur and semi-professional photographers experience and income, as well as small scale magazines like the IPA Review enough flexibility (read: cheaper photos) to increase the graphical content of their layouts.

Faster and faster internet access means that once the IPA Review has been prepared for printing, it can be immediately uploaded to the printer. And as the amount of data storage available to individuals and small organisations increases, so does the producers' capability to work in high, print quality, resolutions. This edition of the IPA Review has utilised more than 1.2 gigabytes of pictures, graphics and text—the programs used to produce it are even larger.

Once the completed magazine—in three single files—is uploaded to the printer, the increasingly digitised presses take control. For instance, pages are printed directly from the computer to the printing plate, giving a sharper image than previous methods which relied more on human judgements.

These advantages work to the benefit of small, targeted magazines. There have been parallel developments in the production of publications with large print runs, like newspapers.

Capitalism is not celebrated enough. It has been the largely unregulated nature of print and digital technologies that has allowed these products to come to market. In this edition of the IPA Review, John Humphreys provides a beginner’s guide to the school of economic thought that embraces most wholeheartedly the dynamism of a open market economy, and in a companion piece, D.W. MacKenzie applies those lessons to the Bill Murray classic, Groundhog Day.

Sinclair Davidson and Alex Robson look at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and try to figure out what they mean by ‘almost’ certain. Tim Wilson looks at the pharmaceutical industry and Andrew Norton looks at proposals to make us happy that don’t involve the pharmaceutical industry.

There are fifty-six colour pages in this edition of the IPA Review. In 1947, there were twenty-five with one spot colour. There have been massive changes in Australia and the world since the late 1940s, but it’s worth sometimes reminding ourselves of the small ones.
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Strange Times
Those with eyes to see...

It seems that even the most obvious things can surprise people. An example of this comes in the form of the reaction to the recent publication of a book by left-wing British journalist Nick Cohen. *What's Left? How the liberals lost their way* examines the way in which the Left is now more likely to support dictatorship and tyranny than be on the side of liberal human rights. Or as one review put it ‘the book dissects the oddity—and the scandal—of how segments of the Left, in their willingness to discern progressive qualities in the most reactionary causes, went over to the other side of the political divide.’

So what’s new? It would require someone to be completely ignorant of a hundred years of history to believe that Cohen is providing some sort of new political insight. Since when hasn’t the Left sided with dictatorship and tyranny? From Lenin, to Stalin, to Mao, to Pol Pot et al there’s not much of the Left’s record to be proud of. If the definition of ‘the Left’ was widened just a little bit to include those who acquiesced to the more radical aims of the French Revolution the case study would extend back not just one century, but two. The ‘Terror’ of 1793 wasn’t much different to Stalin’s ‘Great Purge’ of the 1930s. Only the scale of death altered. During the ‘Terror’ up to 40,000 French were murdered. The best estimates are that more than one million Russians were murdered by Stalin during 1937 and 1938.

It’s bizarre that it has taken the sight of the Left finding common cause with radical Islamists to convince people like Nick Cohen that the Left has a problem.

Cohen is more than a little disingenuous on at least two counts. The first is his claim that the Left has only lately ‘lost its way’. In reality the Left has been struggling with its internal contradictions since the publication of *The Communist Manifesto*. Cohen also engages in a sleight of hand when he conflates ‘liberals’ with ‘the Left’. Liberalism has nothing to do with anything the Left espouses. Liberalism is not the creation of the Left—it is the creation of liberals. (That is unless the Left would like to claim for itself Montesquieu, John Locke, Adam Smith, and John Stuart Mill).

Wilful blindness is one of the most ugly features of the Left. In his review of Tony Judt’s *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* in *Quadrant* last year Peter Coleman brilliantly captures the reaction when Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago* was published in the West in 1973.

It was not news. Its anti-communist message had been well known to those with eyes to see for over fifty years. But many had not been willing to look. (One of the more disgusting Australian publications announced the book under the heading ‘Humbug Archipelago’.)

If only someone had bothered to look: accommodation in the Gulag in 1936