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The difficulties as well as the excitement of bringing into being a new university could be better understood. These essays should make a considerable contribution to that end. It would do no harm if those who try to change universities, especially if they try to do so from without and rather rapidly, would ponder upon these things. One of the difficulties about creating a new university is that we try to do in a short period of years what has in the past taken decades if not centuries of slow growth and changing character for these institutions to reach their present usefulness. This is apparent in three ways.

Whether by accident or design universities in the past have gained a certain aura from the place which they occupy, and in turn they have contributed to that place. It is impossible to think of Marburg or Heidelberg, Bologna, Oxford or Berkeley without thinking of its university. These places hold the loyalty of their alumni, those who have been nurtured there. One of the intangible things about a university is its sense of place. The ambience is a part of the condition of learning. Learning needs time and space within which to flourish. Older universities could grow from small beginnings, shaping their environment. New universities, like Aphrodite, are required to spring from the sea fully formed — or almost so.

Hence it is inescapable that there should be a master plan, for the landscape and its buildings. It is inevitable (or almost so) that the modern university should have a campus and not simply infiltrate the town as in Uppsala or Cambridge. This encourages some people to think that they can see the end from the beginning, that god-like they can shape our ends, rough hew them how we will. The history of universities suggests that it is by growth from within, and gifts and understanding from without, that they gain many of their virtues and values. This is a book about beginnings, and only about ends in that those beginnings were principled. La Trobe University was founded by men and women who knew, or thought they knew what a university existed for, the promotion of learning, which would involve research and teaching; and it was their job to start it on its way. They could from the beginning do something about the beauty and the convenience of the environment; and visiting that university today he would be a brave man who denied that they had made a bonny start.

Secondly universities have grown up slowly over many years as communities of scholars, the teachers and the taught, working and to some extent living in close proximity one to another. They lived and worked so close together that they often argued and fought among themselves, but more importantly they learnt one from the other. In this they were like families, they had their infant rages and adolescent turmoil, their middle-aged complacency and their old-aged crustiness. They had their ups and downs, but by and large they were mighty interesting places in which to live: they provided a secure place in which to learn, and to learn not only subjects of study but also to learn about life. The advantage of being brought up in a family is that it is impossible to believe that one created it, and while it is easy to destroy, it is likely to survive our individual bad temper and for most of us who do not write novels or short stories it wins our affection and even our respect.

One of the difficulties about founding a modern university is that it has to be brought into being instantly. It is as though you never had to roast or grind beans in order to brew coffee, it
is there in a tin, or cook porridge, all you need to do is add the water and salt. In the sixties
instant universities were brought into being all over the Western world and expected to be
have like mature communities. It is not surprising that they did not always do so. Something
of the story of an attempt to create a human environment at La Trobe University, to bring into
being a place where people could meet and study and live together transcending traditional
divisions, something of that story, with its successes and failures, is told with considerable
honesty in the following pages.

In this connection one thing should be said which some of the contributors would be too
modest to say on their own account, too humble indeed to be aware of: La Trobe University
was extraordinarily fortunate in being able to recruit as some of its centrally placed figures men
and women who were already experienced, indeed in some cases distinguished, university
figures, and who were determined to make this 'instant' academic community work. It would
be invidious to mention many names, but the way in which the Chairman of the Interim
Council, the first Chancellor, bound the members of that Council into a common purpose
ought to be recorded; and David (and Beverley) Myers were from the beginning at the centre
of a community which for all the quirkiness which characterises any academic community, or
perhaps because of it, was a society of friends. So many public policies have the effect of
setting people against one another, are destructive of creative thought and relationships of
trust, that one comes to value more and more the builders of community life. We had them in
the early days at La Trobe.

The third way in which universities have in the past had time to grow and learn to live is
in relation to the surrounding community. Certainly they have been founded by princes and
great benefactors, but frequently without being told how they must respond, at least in detail.
They have been related to the learned professions for which they provide practitioners but in
an atmosphere of give and take. They have learnt gradually how to relate their fundamental
and applied studies to the needs of the commercial and industrial world in which they are
placed. Today they are expected to respond to national needs defined in terms which satisfy
bureaucrats and politicians. Today there is much talk about accountability which has to be to
a government that provides almost all the university's financial support and must by the nature
of the case put the short term interests of the national economy before other considerations.
In these conditions the integrity of a university which has a mind and purpose of its own, and an
institutional dignity to be respected, count for little. The universities are not regarded as rela-
tively autonomous institutions to be consulted, but agencies to be instructed. Their officers
are not seen as senior academic figures but as senior executive officers, their councils like the
board of directors of a public company. The managerial model takes over from that of a
democratic state within a state, wherein formulations of policy and resolution of conflict is by
way of reasonable discourse.

La Trobe as a university has a particularly important part to play in the current, threatened
university scene. It has little (a little but only a little) in the way of professional faculties. It has
to justify itself on grounds other than utilitarian. It has the opportunity to show that
knowledge has more than instrumental value. Its schools probe the mysteries of the natural
world around us, physical and biological, they disclose to us the depths of which the human-
ities speak and which the social sciences would analyse. These things should be known, and
what is known of them should be passed on to succeeding generations in ways that expand
and enhance that knowledge. The result will be that new things will be said and understood
which were seen differently or but dimly perceived before. Perhaps above all La Trobe Univer-
sity will send into the community men and women (many more women than before) who
have learnt to think, and to think critically. Many will come not because they want to be
trained or qualified for particular jobs in society: some will come for that reason and will be
none the worse for that if their 'training' is in the context of learning; most will come because
they want to be better educated, training will come later. They will be drawn from the many
ethnic backgrounds which characterise the new Australia and especially the new Victoria.
They will be richer in mind and more sensitive in spirit than if they had not entered this
University; and they will look back with gratitude to the years spent at La Trobe. Indeed in an important sense they will never leave the University in loyalty or affection.

That at least was part of the hope of those who founded this University, and the following pages record some of the ways in which that hope is being realised.
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Introduction

One can work in an institution, even a new institution, for a very long period of time without really understanding its history. There is, of course, the institutional folklore which is handed down in bits and pieces — usually at social gatherings and sometimes on official occasions. What is remembered is episodic and fragmentary and tends to revolve around particular individuals or events. Institutions, unfortunately, have very short collective memories: it is alarming how quickly events fade as the individuals associated with them move on or retire. Although we have each taught at La Trobe University for over twenty years, it was only in editing this volume that, for the first time, we felt we fully grasped the idealism that surrounded its establishment, the implications of the early struggles to define the direction of the new institution, and the way in which internal and outside pressures have shaped the development of the campus. Producing this volume has, therefore, a rewarding, if rather arduous, experience.

For La Trobe University, 1989 is a peculiarly appropriate year in which to publish this volume. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the University is an event worth celebrating in its own right and an appropriate occasion to reflect on how the institution has developed and where it is headed. However, for La Trobe, this anniversary year also coincides with perhaps the greatest upheaval in tertiary education in Australian history. The federal government has decided that bigger is better as far as institutions in the tertiary sector are concerned. For La Trobe University, which has just completed one amalgamation with the Lincoln Institute, the new government policy will probably mean additional amalgamations with the neighbouring Phillip Institute of Technology and with the Swinburne College of Advanced Education. This year will mark not just the first quarter century but the end of the first era of La Trobe's history. It seems likely that the second era will witness the emergence of a very different institution, much larger, much more diverse in its offerings, and catering to a broader range of student needs than in the past. One hopes that in the amalgamations La Trobe will manage to preserve the best of its own past as reflected in this volume.

The idea for this volume originated in 1986 in a report to Council from the Archives Committee. Council accepted the concept and appointed a 25 Year History Committee chaired by Professor John A. Salmond of the History Department. In addition to Professor Salmond, the Committee was composed of Professor D. Elwyn Davies of the Physics Department (shortly to be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic)), Emeritus Professor John S. Gregory, recently retired from the History Department, Dr John G. Jenkin, of the Physics Department, Dr Margaret James, Research Fellow — Status of Women at La Trobe who later accepted an appointment as Equal Opportunity Co-ordinator at Monash University, and Dr William J. Breen of the History Department. When it met, the first issue facing the committee was to define the type of volume that would be appropriate for the twenty-five year celebration. A proposal that it should be a formal, commissioned history was rejected by Council and the Committee then recommended the publication of a collection of essays written by individuals who had some past or present connection with the institution.

The first group of essays by the founding Chancellor, the first Vice-Chancellor, the Master
The production of this kind of institutional history depends upon the willing and generous co-operation of a broad range of people. We would like to acknowledge the assistance of the members of the 25 Year History Committee who were helpful and supportive and the various contributors to the history who not only wrote their essays more or less on schedule but who also responded generously to editorial suggestions. To some extent all of the contributors were dependent on the co-operation of various individuals in the university administration. On behalf of the contributors, we would like to thank Ralph M. Gallagher, Director, Planning and Development, and Allen D. Gravier and the staff of the Management Information Unit for their assistance particularly with the statistical information contained in the essays. Various other members of staff in the Central Administration, especially in the Registry and the Staff Office, have been extremely helpful. In the Borchardt Library, Ann Miller, Government Publications Librarian, deserves special mention. Joan Price, the University Archives Officer and the secretary of the 25 Year Committee has also been of great help. Although no longer directly connected with the University, Allan W. Martin, the foundation professor of history at La Trobe who is now at the Australian National University, was also very generous in his support for the project.

On a more personal note, the editor would like to thank Donne Simpson (formerly Sherwin), Personal Assistant to both Vice-Chancellors, who agreed to return from an active retirement to act as research assistant to the 25 Year Committee and as assistant to the editor. Her detailed knowledge of the early years at La Trobe coupled with her fine eye for detail has saved the volume from some egregious errors and her assistance has been invaluable. Finally, we would like to thank the History Department for providing the secretarial support for the history and, in particular, Merelyn Dowling whose unfailing good humour and good sense in deciphering both original manuscripts and editorial amendments greatly eased the task of the editor.

William J. Breen
Editor
25 Year History

John A. Salmond
Chairperson
25 Year History Committee
OVERVIEW
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Qui cherche, trouve:

an overview of the first twenty-five years

John S. Gregory

'Whoever seeks shall find'. La Trobe's motto, adapted from the family motto of the first governor of Victoria after whom the University is named, provides a convenient peg upon which to hang this introductory essay. In any major enterprise what one actually finds is rarely exactly what one seeks or hopes for, and this has been, in some measure, the case with La Trobe so far. In the mid-sixties the new institution set out confidently and vigorously towards certain fairly clearly defined objectives and expectations. Some of these, however, soon proved to be more difficult of attainment than was originally anticipated, so that alternative paths, alternative ends, had to be defined and sought. The losses and disappointments involved in such forced changes of direction have been real; but so, too, have been the achievements, the strengths created and consolidated, the new goals set. This essay surveys various major features of La Trobe's development over this mixed initial quarter century of its life and, in doing so, endeavours to set this development within a general context of university growth over recent decades. Subsequent essays will explore certain themes more fully.

La Trobe was Victoria's third university, established by Act of Parliament in 1964, following the earlier Melbourne (1853) and Monash (1958) University Acts. Its main campus is situated in Bundoora, a northern suburb about fifteen kilometres from the centre of Melbourne. The most recent major addition to the University, the Lincoln School of Health Sciences formed by a voluntary merger with the former Lincoln Institute, is still housed elsewhere but will, in whole or in part, progressively move to the main campus as new facilities become available. The other nine schools which constitute the University are all housed within the spacious, 484 acre main site, which also embraces three residential colleges, a large staff-student housing development, sports and recreation areas, and an extensive Wildlife Reserve. The main staff-student housing project comprises eighty-eight flats, for between two and six people, located on the southern perimeter of the campus. The extent and the contours of the site, the landscaping and the integrated planning of the buildings on it (though not always the details of particular buildings) make La Trobe undoubtedly one of the most attractive of Australian university campuses.

The new University began teaching some 500 students in March 1967. By 1988, the total enrolment was 13,165 of whom 8218 (62 per cent) were women, 2285 (16 per cent) were postgraduate or higher degree candidates and 4155 (32 per cent) were part-time. These students were enrolled in ten 'schools', not faculties, which in order of foundation were: Humanities, Social Sciences, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences (1967); Agriculture (1968); Education (1970); Behavioural Sciences (1973); Economics (1977); Mathematical and Information Sciences (1984); Health Sciences (1988). Before the creation of the Lincoln School of Health Sciences in 1988 over two-thirds of these enrolments were in the four 'Arts-based' schools, but the addition of 2767 students in the new School has helped move La Trobe away from the strongly 'liberal arts' profile that characterised it over its first decades. An early statement of intent, published in the Victorian Year Book for 1966, read: 'Initially the emphasis will be on the humanities, social sciences and science in depth; professional courses in law, agriculture, education and commerce will follow. In the less immediate future schools of
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medicine and engineering will be established. 'Much of this has indeed come about and, as the list of schools indicates, there have been other developments not spelled out in this statement. But the major professional schools of law, medicine and engineering have not been established and, save perhaps in the case of law, seem now unlikely to be created in the foreseeable, not to mention 'the less immediate future' looked to in 1966.

La Trobe, therefore, is now a sizeable University, situated in the suburbs of a large metropolis, offering a wide range of courses but lacking certain major disciplines which, although in the eyes of some purists not central to the idea of a university at all, are among the most highly respected, sought after, and therefore influential, in the eyes of the community at large. It stands in a difficult intermediate position, between two somewhat larger, better placed, older universities (Monash only a very few years older, but a crucial few years in terms of opportunities for full growth) and the younger, smaller, fourth university, Deakin, established in 1974 outside Melbourne and strongly directed by its incorporating Act towards a clear constituency of external students, and thereby to a range of disciplines suited to such students. The particular time at which La Trobe came 'on stream'; its sitting in the less affluent, less populated northern suburbs of the metropolis; the continuing strong growth of the two, older Victorian universities; the ever more decisive influence of Commonwealth government policies in determining the pace and direction of tertiary education in Australia — all these factors have meant that, more than any other of the existing Victorian state universities, La Trobe has had to seek out and define for itself a distinct place and identity in the hierarchy of Victorian universities.

A brief comparison of the objects clauses in the founding acts of the three younger Victorian universities may serve to illustrate this problem. For Monash, 'the last of the old universities' as its first Vice-Chancellor once described it, the preferred paths, and to some extent the priorities, of its development were clearly set out in the first sub-section of its objects clause:

To provide facilities for study and education in all branches of learning as may from time to time be prescribed by the Statutes including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Pure Science, Applied Science & Technology, Engineering, Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Medicine, Law, Arts, Letters, Education and Commerce.

With the exception of Agriculture, which went to La Trobe, and Veterinary Science, courses in all these areas were in place at Monash within a decade or so. No such clear cut statement is to be found in either the La Trobe or the Deakin Act, only an open-ended phrase about 'such branches of learning as may from time to time be prescribed'. As already noted, Deakin was strongly directed towards an external studies program, but La Trobe was not directed, or limited, in any precise way, beyond a requirement that its standard of graduation 'be at least as high as prevails in the University of Melbourne and in Monash University'. Deakin was not set so firmly between, as it were, such a rock and a hard place, being simply authorised to confer degrees 'after appropriate assessment'. The first of La Trobe's objects did, however, also set the high ideal, not directly required of either Monash or and Deakin, and still less Melbourne (which has no objects clause at all in its updated 1958 Act), of 'providing an institution in which all enrolled students will have the opportunity of fitting themselves for life as well as becoming learned in a particular branch or branches of learning.' One can only say 'Amen' to that, while wondering exactly how such graduation for life was to be achieved and assessed.

Thus Monash began, catching the full strength of the tide of university expansionism set flowing in Australia by the Report of the Committee on Australian Universities (1957), chaired by Sir Keith Murray, as a very comprehensive university placed in close proximity to the prosperous middle class suburbia that supplies it with most of its students, and for whom it, in turn, supplies most of the courses they seek, while Deakin began when the tide of growth was visibly receding, with aims and expectations consequently lower but reasonably precise. La Trobe began when the tide seemed still to be running strongly, on a large metropolitan site capable of accommodating a very full scale and diverse university including, as early
plans clearly anticipated, engineering and medical schools, with a teaching hospital nearby and even (briefly) sites for a university regiment and a religious centre, all embraced within a ring of eight or ten residential colleges. Many of these plans were, of course, never more than notional, for the longer term; but the general expectations were, as the 1966 statement of intent indicates, high and comprehensive. Acts of Parliament and official statements of intent, however precisely worded, cannot determine the course of events, and the uncertainties and revisions that so soon developed for La Trobe stemmed from the changing nature of the times, not from any document. Yet, somehow, the relatively more open-ended, idealistic wording of the La Trobe Act seems to encapsulate the dilemma of defining a clear role and identity that has faced Victoria’s third university more acutely than any of its contemporaries. Adaptation, deferment and adjustment of hopes and objectives have been required of all Australian universities during the past couple of decades, but surely of few more than La Trobe.

'La Trobe has been born in favourable circumstances', its first Vice-Chancellor, Dr David Myers, stated when opening a press conference called in October 1966 to introduce the University and some of its educational experiments to the public. Along with its close contemporaries, Macquarie in Sydney and Bedford Park (now Flinders) in Adelaide, La Trobe was one of a new generation of universities in Australia, committed to maintaining established standards of teaching and research but organised along more flexible and participatory lines. With a distinctive college system designed to include all staff and students, and an academic organisation into schools designed to cut across the fairly rigid discipline lines of the large faculties of traditional universities; with academic governing bodies which made room for elected junior as well as senior staff, La Trobe indeed seemed to be setting out even faster in new directions than Macquarie or Flinders, though they were innovative enough.

By the time of that optimistic press conference, held some months before the arrival of the first students, the first planning committee (Third University Committee) set up by the Victorian government in May 1964 and the Interim Council which had followed it in 1965 and 1966, had virtually completed the complex but heady task of creating the framework — physical, administrative, academic and social — within which the new institution would develop. It was all done in less than three years, about the same take-off time Monash had received but less than that available to Macquarie and Flinders, which had the benefit of better prepared State governments. It was done largely in response to the promptings of the Commonwealth government’s Australian Universities Commission (AUC) which, in its 1963 Report judged that new state universities would be necessary in the metropolitan areas of both Melbourne and Sydney by 1967, clearly implying that it would not recommend Commonwealth funding for new universities set up elsewhere. The Victorian government of the time, however, for its own political rather than educational reasons, preferred such a new development, the need for which it recognised well enough, to take place somewhere outside Melbourne. Sydney’s third university was already incorporated by the time the Victorian government, reluctantly deferring its rural preferences, appointed a Third University Committee, under the chairmanship of the managing director of ICI Australia Ltd, Mr (later Sir) Archibald Glenn.

It was fortunate for the government that this eleven man-two woman committee proved so energetic, organised and realistic — as well as idealistic in certain respects — so that gloomy prophecies that Victoria’s third university would not be ready to receive students by 1967 were unfulfilled. The planning committee wasted no time in seeking out a suitable metropolitan site from among the twenty-seven its subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Dr Phillip Law of Antarctic fame, actually visited on often wintry weekends. Certain constraints applied to any choice. These were, first, of area — ‘adequate for a full and balanced university’; second, of cost — Crown rather than privately owned land which would require large compensation payments; and third, of locality — somewhere reasonably close to the demographic centre of Melbourne (calculated to be in the Cambervell area) and to public transport. The subcommittee soon recognised that ‘somewhere on the eastern side of
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Melbourne stands out as the right location, but of course Monash was already growing in the southeastern suburbs. A jotted early list of possibilities read

‘Outer — Bundoora, Lilydale, Channel O.
Inner — Burnley Horticultural College, Wattle Park, Caulfield racecourse, Kew Mental Asylum.’

These inner sites were all probably either inadequate or unattainable, especially the racecourse, although twenty-five years on the splendid Kew site would have been a real possibility. One cannot help speculating how La Trobe might have developed on one of them, perhaps as a more perpendicular than horizontal campus, rather than on the Bundoora site which was unanimously agreed upon by the end of July. ‘While not quite in the right spot’ it was, the sub-committee suggested, ‘fairly well located in relation to some suburbs’. Indeed it is not so very ‘outer’, a good deal closer to central Melbourne than is Monash, but being to the north it tends still to be perceived as outer, in more ways than one.

The northern suburbs of Sydney probably provide a better regional base for Macquarie than their less fashionable counterparts in Melbourne do for La Trobe, though geography may ultimately work in its favour.

Once chosen the site lent itself well to sensitive and integrated landscaping and building programs. The name La Trobe was also agreed upon unanimously by the planning committee after some alternatives, including the supposed aboriginal name for the region, Birrarang (‘difficult to pronounce; not euphonious and already in use — “Prahran” is a corruption of it’) and Deakin (‘probably the most distinguished name among Victorians born in Victoria’) were thoughtfully put aside. State parliamentarians however, when they came to debate the La Trobe University Bill, which had been rapidly prepared by yet another active sub-committee, were far from unanimous about either the name (‘redolent of the Folies Bergére and prurient Parisian life’ complained one who, perhaps more seriously, proposed ‘Churchill’ as an alternative), or about the site, anywhere within Melbourne being objectionable to most Country Party members, some of whom questioned the need for yet another university at all. But in the absence of any general agreement about alternatives, whether of name or site, and in face of what the Minister of Education called ‘the virtual compulsion of the [Commonwealth] Government to establish the university in the metropolitan area’ the Bill passed, in a thin house and without amendment — or any discussion of its objects clause.

The site naturally and the name effectively, despite some odd parliamentary interpretations of it, were local. But for other basic features of the embryonic university the planning committee looked further afield for models. Recommendations on the administrative structure, ready by early August, were influenced by what was developing at Macquarie and Flinders, and by what had taken shape at such post-war English university foundations as Keele and Sussex. Naturally there was also knowledge of, and consultation with, Melbourne and Monash but, in respect of academic organisation, La Trobe was conceived along significantly different lines from its near neighbours. With later developments in mind, certain major points made in the early planning documents seem worth listing here:

- Schools, ‘intermediate in size between a Department and the traditional Faculties of Arts and Science’ were to be the fundamental academic units, in which it was hoped ‘that the gulf between professors and sub-professorial staff will be smaller than has been customary’;
- Professors were to number at least one per 100 students and to be of high academic standing, but their rank ‘will not connotate formal administrative responsibilities such as traditionally attach to a head of Department’;
- Deans would ‘normally be chosen from the Professors in the School for a limited term of office, say four years’, with the possibility of reappointment for further terms, and would exercise substantial academic, financial and planning powers;
- Boards of Studies within Schools were to include ‘both professors and more junior people’, and be not too large — say twelve;
- There was to be no professorial board of the traditional kind to oversee academic matters
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but a Senate, 'numbering not more than (say) twenty, with a membership of both professorial and sub-professorial staff';

• A Council of about twenty-four, empowered to pass Statutes, was to preside overall under a Chancellor, who might be co-opted.

Worth repeating also is the first of the 'further principles' enunciated by the sub-committee on administrative structure chaired by Professor T.M. (later Sir Thomas) Cherry, of the University of Melbourne, to the effect that 'we should be firm that our university is to undertake the full range of academic activities, including research'. A university of at least 10,000 was envisaged, at a point in time when the University of Melbourne was about that size, and the rapidly expanding Monash was enrolling just over 2,000 students.

When finally proclaimed in December 1964 the La Trobe University Act provided for a Council of up to twenty-nine members; for an Academic Board rather than a 'Senate', including elected professorial and sub-professorial staff; and for Schools under Deans assisted by elected Boards of Studies. The thrust of the sixties towards wider participation in decision-making processes was clear in this Act, reflecting the forward-looking principles of the planning committee. Subsequent administrative developments, examined elsewhere in this collection, were to demonstrate how innovative structures may preserve their paper form and terminology while changing, effectively, into something old and familiar.

The sub-committee on residential accommodation, while drawing on its local knowledge and experience, also looked afar for models and ideas. It had reported early in August insisting that 'far better facilities should be provided for non-residential students than are provided in most universities at present ... there should not be a privileged minority enjoying residential accommodation and an unprivileged majority without this advantage.' It went on to recommend that provision be made for up to 40 per cent of students (of a possible 20,000 in some of its calculations) resident on campus, providing a table showing that in 1963 as many as 86 per cent at New England and 45 per cent at the Australian National University were in college-type accommodation, while Melbourne had over 14 per cent and Queensland 18 per cent. Further, on the laudable principle that 'universities should not provide merely a 9 am to 5 pm culture' it proposed restaurants, shops, banks, child minding centres etc., as well as recreation areas for music, art and drama, and for sport. There should be 'provision of a work place of their own for non-residential students', and possibly dormitory-type accommodation to allow them to spend 'occasional nights on campus'.

These general proposals, unrealisable as they soon proved to be, stemmed from a reaction against the often crowded and inadequate facilities, for both study and recreation, available to students in older universities, and from a desire to see the full learning and living potential of university life shared as widely as possible and the loneliness and alienation, believed to affect many students in older universities, prevented. The very distinctive La Trobe college concept, which developed out of these early proposals, was an attempt to achieve these objectives by making college affiliation a central part of university life for all students, residential or not. Everyone, including staff, was to be a member of a college, and every college was to provide a wide range of activities and facilities, academic as well as social. A kind of modified Oxbridge or, more accurately, Keele-Sussex pattern was to be established in this antipodean university. Not surprisingly it did not transplant easily to the suburbs of Melbourne, but it was surely worth a try. The scheme embodied a mix of practicability and idealism, of innovation and traditionalism — the last quality very apparent in the comments by the sub-committee that women undergraduates need more storage space in their rooms for clothes, and that 'women's colleges need more social areas, as most men still call for women when they take them out and also deliver (!) them home'. Such ideas reflect a world that was rapidly being lost at the very time that La Trobe was coming into being.

By the end of 1964 then, La Trobe was set moving by its early planning committee towards what was, for Australia, some quite unexplored academic terrain. Macquarie and
Flinders were moving in similar directions, though more strongly towards new schools than towards new colleges. Over the next two years a race developed, involving progressively more and more people, to be ready to enrol students, the raison d'etre if not the absolute justification for the whole enterprise, by early 1967. Under the overall authority of the Interim Council staff of all kinds were appointed, detailed and general plans were prepared, buildings begun—first a library, placed symbolically at the centre of the academic complex and, across a watercourse (soon called the Moat) which almost accidentally formed itself and became another kind of focal point for the campus, a college. This was named Glenn after the planning committee and Interim Council chairman who was, in due course, to become the University's first Chancellor. These were exhilarating, energetic days, when all involved seemed to share a strong sense of camaraderie and of commitment to a great new enterprise.

But, as one member of the Interim Council, who was later to become Governor of the State, recalled, it was 'fiendishly difficult' to get the right balance in all these projects.

An Interim Council, and even a Council in the first years of a university, must certainly do all those things which are necessary to get the university started, [but] it must try to avoid making decisions which will properly be made by the staff and students of the university when they are there and taking a high degree of responsibility for their own affairs. I don't suppose anybody has ever got this quite right.

This was said apropos of the college concept in particular, but the comment applies equally well to the school concept. The Interim Council and its Academic Planning Board sought to establish these distinctive features, but as staff and, by 1967, students came in rapidly increasing numbers it became apparent that a majority of 'the people who really mattered', as Dr Davis McCaughey recognised them to be, were far less committed to both these concepts, or at least came to see them in terms very different from those of the early planners. The University, as it now took shape, soon began to seek out other, more familiar and, some would insist, more realistic, paths.

Perhaps had there been time to proceed more slowly, catering over these first few years for a few hundred rather than the thousands (2154 by 1970) of students La Trobe had to prepare itself for, and establishing, say, just one college, allowing it to consolidate the close identification with staff and students it appeared to be achieving during 1967, then the principle of colleges at the centre rather than on the periphery of university life might have become more firmly set in place. And if the relatively young group of foundation professors appointed in quick succession during 1965 and 1966 had not had to recruit so many staff and set up so many courses so quickly, the principle that these staff and their courses (and thereby ultimately their students) were to be school rather than department and discipline focussed might also have set more firmly. But, with some exceptions and despite the development of a number of inter-disciplinary programs, 'the old departmental cafeteria' system, which the Academic Planning Board wished to avoid, re-emerged fairly quickly in most schools.

However, much more than speed of growth was pushing La Trobe away from the original planners' concepts. Macquarie grew even faster than La Trobe (4229 students by 1970) but appeared to hold on rather more firmly to the school concept. The determination of La Trobe's foundation professors to create their own areas of academic excellence, and the conviction of many of them that a strong discipline core was essential to maintaining good degree standards, was a major factor, and they were generally supported by junior staff who mostly only knew and understood the old forms. A small specialist school such as Agriculture, recruiting most of its early staff from outside the groves of academe, was able to resist departmentalisation, as did Biological Sciences for a time, but for most of the University, discipline-based departments soon became the main academic focal points, and eventually this had to be recognised in the Statutes.

The college concept also foundered within a few years, sunk partly by the refusal of the powerful AUC to provide the kind of funding necessary to implement such a scheme, and
partly by the resistance of most staff and students to being required to use colleges as major centres of their social life on campus. The foundation professors decided early on that 'all academic teaching should be controlled by their Schools, departments and divisions'; many of La Trobe's staff were young, with young families, and much preferred, like most students, to be off campus after 5 pm; many students, at a time of rapidly escalating political consciousness, were suspicious of a system that seemed designed to fragment them into small 'college-unions' — in short, college life was unfamiliar to most and was not seen as a desirable alternative to suburbia or to a central union.

The symbol of the collapse of the college concept was the decision to establish a general student union. After much debate and enquiry, including all-day seminars and even the despatch of two students overseas to survey the working of comparable schemes in England and North America, Council resolved in August 1971 to abandon the college union principle and to proceed with a general student union building which, not having been part of the original master plan, had to be placed somewhat inconveniently across the Moat, well away from the central core of the campus. Membership of this central union became compulsory for all students (not staff) by the time the new union building was opened in 1973. A separate Staff Club followed in 1975. The three colleges by then in existence were reduced effectively to residences for a minority (eleven per cent by 1987) though, being placed relatively close to the academic buildings and having no kind of social exclusiveness, they possibly still impinge a little more closely on campus life and the consciousness of the generality of students than do their counterparts in some other universities. But there have been no additions to them since the early seventies, nor have any church affiliated colleges developed at La Trobe. The 1972 review of the master plan realistically marked in as carparks some of the 'future college' sites shown on earlier plans, and that is indeed what they have become. That plan also still hopefully marked in sites for medical and engineering schools. These early years of fully functioning life did indeed demonstrate how 'fiendishly difficult' it can be to find exactly what one sets out seeking.

On the evening of 8 March 1967, the day on which the University was officially opened, the Council held an inaugural ball in Glenn College. A dedicated and active member of the Council and of the original planning committee, Mrs Ethleen King, has described the scene:

It was a dear and balmy night. During the course of the evening a group of us, including the Chancellor and his wife, strolled over to the Library. From the top of the Library steps we saw in the distance the lights of Melbourne. We viewed close at hand Glenn College, shining with light, pulsating with music. There was indeed a sound of revelry by night, but it was not the eve of a battle. It was a happy and joyous night, celebrating the birth of a university. We rejoiced that our child, after two years and nine months of gestation and hard labour, had really come alive.

Such moments are well worth recording and recalling, for they capture something of the essence of the prevailing mood — a mix of satisfaction at a now visible achievement and all that it embodied, and of keen anticipation of the prospect ahead. Battles of many kinds were to come soon enough, and the just born 'child' was quick to insist upon going its own way. But, as already indicated, those who had conceived and brought it into existence with such energy and dedication did not wish, even if they could, to crib or confine its independent development. Though sometimes sorely tried, they continued to stand by it with care and concern, many remaining as active members of Council well into the following decade.

Despite some early major adjustments and debates the anticipation that La Trobe would, within a reasonably short span of time, achieve 'the full range of academic activities' remained strong during these early years. In August 1969, presenting to Academic Board a proposal for a Long Range Academic Planning Committee (the first of several such committees set up over the years), the Vice-Chancellor, while optimistically anticipating that 'future planning should not be unduly restricted by considerations of finance', nevertheless suggested that it was necessary that 'special emphasis should be placed on the priorities of various
developments for at least six or seven years ahead'. Those six or seven years were, of course, to see a much changed economic, and political, climate. Overall La Trobe continued to grow quite vigorously, reaching a total enrolment of 7758 by 1975, but the range remained restricted and, in consequence, the Arts-Science balance very uneven. Of the seven schools in existence by 1975 none of the four ‘Science-based' schools reached as much as ten per cent of the student total, and collectively they accounted for less than twenty-five per cent. The decision of the Federal government in 1973 to provide funding to expand the Melbourne and Monash medical schools rather than for a new school suggested by La Trobe, entry to which would be restricted to graduates in science, was a particular set-back in this respect. ‘At most universities', the Council's 1973 report observed, 'engineering and medical students are a major component of the science based population'. Disappointment, not to say frustration, at this situation comes through strongly in Council and Vice-Chancellor reports over the next few years, with phrases such as 'limited in diversity by factors beyond its control' (1974), 'delay the balanced development of the university' (1975), and ‘minimal involvement in education for the learned professions’ (1976) recurring.

Of course La Trobe was by no means unique among Australian universities in having to lower its sights during the long, so called 'steady state' years that set in by the mid-seventies, but it seems not unreasonable to suggest that, within its particular generation of new university foundations, it has been the most disadvantaged in respect of the development of the major professional schools of medicine, law and engineering. Monash had gained them all by 1964; Flinders a medical school at its foundation in 1966; Macquarie a law school in 1974. But La Trobe has not been enabled, despite many plans and submissions, to develop full degree courses in any of these major areas, although it did establish, in 1972, what has proved to be a very strong and innovative Department of Legal Studies within one of its Arts-based Schools, and, in 1974, with considerable help from a special endowment, the Tad Szental chair and a Department of Communication Engineering (now the Department of Electronic Engineering) within its School of Physical Sciences. In 1973 a School of Behavioural Science, embracing first Psychology and later Social Work, was also established. Diversity was being developed, but not on the scale nor altogether in the directions so optimistically set by the early planners.

One quite unlooked for development during this first decade was the emergence of a very vehement radical student movement. This was a phenomenon which affected many Western universities in the late sixties and early seventies. In Australia certain of the newer universities, in particular Monash and Flinders as well as La Trobe, experienced quite traumatic upheavals. Though in a sense a sideshow rather than central to the lines of major development within the University with which this essay is primarily concerned, the collective experience of the student 'troubles', and the threat they seemed at times to pose to the effective functioning of the young institution, were such that some discussion of them seems warranted here.

By 1971 La Trobe's enrolment had grown to 3019 students, over one third of them in those still fee-paying days funded by the Victorian Education Department. Although approximating to the national averages on such criteria as sex, age and socio-economic background, La Trobe's student body even then displayed the distinctive characteristics of having a higher proportion of women, as well as of students coming from the relatively (in terms of opportunities for higher education) less affluent strata of Australian society. Given the patchy nature of the statistics available, accurate comparison is difficult, but the following table, based on a study of entrants to Melbourne and Monash universities in 1970 and a survey of about twenty-five per cent of La Trobe's 1971 students, may serve to help substantiate the point being made:
In 1971, in all three universities, women as a percentage of total enrolments were 32, 32.9 and 40.1 respectively against a then national average of 31.5 per cent; of 1970 Melbourne entrants 23 per cent had fathers and 12 per cent mothers with university qualifications whereas of the 1971 La Trobe sample 85 per cent had parents neither of whom had attended universities.

How much relevance such figures have in explaining the strength of the student protest movement at La Trobe during these early years is uncertain. Monash, though more average, had troubles enough, and even Melbourne was not immune. Probably a sense of anomie, of being trapped by day on still rather raw campuses, had more to do with the relatively stronger and more sustained protest movements at the newer universities than any social, and still less any supposed intellectual (as claimed by some commentators), differences.

Whatever the sociological and psychological factors behind the student protest movement, basic to it was the sense of outrage in many students at certain policies respecting the Vietnam war pursued by the Australian government at that time. Many others who also opposed such policies nevertheless deplored the manner in which opposition was expressed on campus by the more radical students who sometimes seemed to be, but never were, the majority. That the University as an institution should be attacked on the very generalised ground of serving 'imperialist' policies seemed to make little sense to many but, for the radicals, symbolic targets, institutional and individual, were essential. 'We took up symbols you know. Our aim wasn't to destroy those symbols or to destroy big business at La Trobe. I think right from the start we understood that we couldn't do that. The greatest effect we could have would be an intangible one, that is on people's minds — through agitation, through opposition to these things.' Thus one radical student, who went on to emphasise to his interviewer his absolute belief in the necessity of authority and power in any society. Whatever the uncomfortable and generally inaccurate headlines suggested, anarchy was not the basic ideology of the radical student movement.

Looking back one may reasonably conclude that violence was not really at the heart of the movement, but all too frequently it seemed to threaten to erupt, and sometimes actually did so — on one notorious occasion by the provocative actions of the police, lined up just outside the campus, rather than of students; but on other occasions by students acting against Council members, against invited visitors, and against other students. Fortunately, such actions rarely involved serious injury, though one radical student was reported as requiring some fifty stitches after being defenestrated from the first floor of the Union building by other students, also radical but of a differing ideological persuasion. This incident, coming four years after a very aggressive, lengthy lock-in of Council members in July 1971, probably marked the final loss of credibility and significant following for the radicals. But even if rarely actual or extreme, the threat of violence was felt by many to be real, and was deeply disquieting. The administrative staff of the University had to bear most of the disruption, discomfort and fear that student sieges and invasions (rarely involving more than 100 activists) and threatening phone calls generated; for most academic staff teaching and research went on very much as normal, so that the Vice-Chancellor could quite accurately assure a questioning Minister of Education in May 1972 that 'in spite of the disturbances which have taken place during the past twelve months the interruption to the academic work of the University has been insignificant'. It was, as the Chinese said when trying to re-
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assure themselves about the incursions of Western barbarians, a disease of the limbs rather than of the heart; even so it was sometimes quite painful and debilitating.

Over several years the Vice-Chancellor’s position, and that of his senior advisory staff, was a very difficult one. He has been accused by one leading student participant, who has subsequently written extensively on the subject, of creating ‘a repression-resistance cycle [which] constituted the dynamic of the campus crisis after July 1971’. The repeated, lengthy and messy occupations of administrative offices in 1972 which prompted the Minister of Education’s questions (as well as comments in Parliament by the then federal Minister of Education, Malcolm Fraser) resulted from disputes over the payment of fines and the enforcement of exclusion orders imposed on a number of students by the University’s Proctorial Board after the Council siege. The issue escalated to involve Supreme Court injunctions and the indefinite imprisonment of three students in Pentridge for contempt of court during mid-1972. No other campus in Australia produced such martyrs, for they refused to purge their contempt in order to win quick release. Passions understandably were high; staff as well as student opinion was divided about how to resolve this far from ivory tower situation. In response to a message from the Vice-Chancellor in April 1972 urging all staff and students ‘to give their support to the University’s policy of resisting demands which, by their very nature, are not negotiable’ twenty-five academics (mostly from the Arts-based Schools) urged Council to negotiate, while eleven others (all scientists) wrote expressing full support for the Vice-Chancellor’s position.

By this time Vietnam was ceasing to be the major issue; at La Trobe attention was now focussed on, first, the question of disciplinary powers (was the campus a sanctuary, police to be admitted only by general agreement? should the SRC, which was by no means the centre of the radical student movement, be permitted to use its funds to pay the fines imposed by the University?) and, second, the demand of the pace-setting radicals for the resignation of the Chancellor and his deputy. As chairman ofICI Australia Ltd, a company alleged to be providing chemicals for the war in Vietnam, Sir Archibald Glenn was presented by leading radicals as ‘a symbol of imperialism and how the University served it ... in Glenn the student Left could not have wished for a finer symbol’. It is never easy to debate rationally (which is what universities are supposed to train students to do) around ideologically based symbols, but it is difficult to see how any university, whether under duress or not, could have negotiated about a demand for the resignation of its founding Chancellor on the grounds put forward and still retain any credibility or sense of decency. Some appear still to regard this as having been a reasonable and negotiable demand, though the main student historian of these events has admitted, ten years later, that ‘As a student activist I supported certain activities to which I now attribute a portion of the blame. Also, I remain opposed to war profiteering by large companies, but I am able to recognise inaccuracies in specific accusations against Sir Archibald Glenn’. No doubt feeling somewhat wounded by these inaccuracies, Sir Archibald resigned as Chancellor in July 1972, six months before his second term was due to end.

The injunction problem was resolved soon after and, although incidents of one kind or another occurred for a few years yet, the high drama and passion of 1971-2 subsided. The Vietnam war was ending, a new government was in power in Canberra, and many of the radical leaders moved on to other, more acceptable activities, including the writing of history. Though fundamentally peripheral to the real life, work and character of the University La Trobe’s experience of the radical student movement had been a lengthy and quite searing one. Some would argue that the resulting publicity seriously distorted the public image of the institution at a crucial point in its development, and that it has, even yet, not fully recovered. This may be an exaggerated view but, conceding the genuineness of the convictions of many of the radical students, La Trobe surely has, like Monash, cause to deplore their extremes of action and demand even at this lapse of time. As an academic observer of, but non-participant in, these events (save for helping to clean up the mess after one of the invasions of administrative offices) I am left asking what exactly these students were looking for.
Recent decisions made in Canberra suggest that universities in our society are more likely to become, perforce, servants of a capitalist-corporate state by the end of the century than the still reasonably autonomous institutions of the seventies ever were. Were these radical students a generation too soon with their agitations and symbols?

Though infighting among a rump of radical student groups continued, becoming something of a local tradition, the 'troubles' passed, and student extra curricular energies and organisations became directed more and more towards less total, more practical and realisable objectives. Symbolic or serious, programs and movements dedicated to shaking and perhaps even overturning, through some miraculous 'worker-student alliance,' the established order faded at last to the periphery, while by the mid-seventies programs directed towards improving on-campus facilities for students developed strongly. Among these were a dental service, one of the first on any Australian campus, and a legal advisory service, both funded by the SRC, and a book exchange. Strong organisations to serve the needs of particular groups, such as postgraduate, part-time and mature age students also developed under SRC auspices, as did action committees promoting programs both on and beyond the campus in such specific areas of concern as education, welfare, women's affairs, the environment.

The commonly drawn contrast between the 'idealism', to use the kindest word, of the Vietnam generation of students and current student 'apathy' seems too facile. It may be true that, at La Trobe as elsewhere, the students of the eighties are less obviously committed (on campus at least) to much beyond gaining their various degrees, and active involvement in student affairs and organisations is indeed patchy. But students of this decade face a much less accommodating socio-economic environment than did the radicals of the late sixties and early seventies — most of whom seem now fairly comfortably installed within the once reviled system. Current student organisation and policies at La Trobe, though to some degree probably trailing still some remnants of the radical tradition, seem basically a good deal more realistic and practical in their objectives, and sophisticated in their methods, than in that first hectic decade. For that the whole University, and the community at large, has cause to be thankful.

By the later seventies La Trobe settled, as all Australian universities had to, into the 'steady state' years. In terms of on-campus politics such a change of atmosphere was welcome, but financially it imposed strains of a different, hardly less trying sort. The campus seemed to many to become not just calmer but almost becalmed. This was an illusion, just as some of the earlier high hopes had been illusory, but certainly La Trobe had now to adjust itself to the reality of moving at a much slower pace towards less extensive horizons. The need for this adjustment was spelled out very clearly by the second Vice-Chancellor, Professor John Scott, a statistician who came from Sussex University, in his inaugural lecture delivered in September 1977.

The halcyon days are over. For fifteen or twenty years in most countries there has been a rapid expansion in the university operation. Money in very large quantities has been poured into universities. Many of my younger academic staff cannot remember the time when universities were not launching new and exciting developments. But now this has changed. We are promised only slow growth in the next three to five years. In my view we shall be lucky if we have any growth at all — certainly the future is obscure ....

Under this new leadership La Trobe was still to seek to move forward, wherever and whenever circumstances allowed, but it was very clear now that some of the old directions and objectives had to be abandoned.

By 1976, at the end of its first decade of enrolments, La Trobe had a total of 8549 students; Monash at a comparable stage in its development (1970) had numbered 10384. After such rapid early growth a much slower rate was to be expected for both universities, though Monash continued to grow strongly well into its second decade, reaching 13751 by
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1976. Over the next ten years numbers at both universities, and at Melbourne also (16087 in 1976), moved little, although the newly established Deakin grew to 6698 by 1985, catering for a significant number of external students. From the mid seventies to the mid eighties La Trobe's total student enrolments remained fairly static. With the recent Lincoln merger it has now surged forward to be not far behind Monash in total enrolments, though current government policy, pushing for many more mergers between universities and tertiary colleges, is likely to see Melbourne and Monash grow very much larger. La Trobe itself will probably also grow substantially through mergers with Phillip Institute, Swinburne College of Advanced Education, and probably Bendigo CAE; if these mergers go ahead La Trobe is likely to remain at least as large as the other two universities.

Size, however, is no certain guide to quality, and the main thing to be said about the numerically static years of the late seventies and early eighties is that within the existing academic structures, and the tight budget, significant change and development continued. While for a decade student and staff numbers grew hardly at all the number of undergraduate course offerings grew by forty per cent between 1976 and 1985. In the largest School, Humanities, new disciplines, added to the original core departments of History, English Literature, Philosophy, French and Spanish, included Art History, Music, Linguistics, Pre-history (now Archaeology), Religious Studies, Italian and Modern Greek; within the School of Behavioural Studies a strong professional Department of Social Work was developed from 1976 on; two new Schools were established — of Economics in 1977, by the former large department of that name hiving off from Social Sciences, and of Mathematical and Information Sciences in 1984, by the foundation Department of Mathematics fusing with the younger Departments of Statistics and Computer Science; the percentage of higher degree enrolments doubled (though in respect of postgraduate studies it may be added that in many areas La Trobe's skills and resources remained greatly underutilised); a wide spectrum of research centres and institutes, drawing together many on-campus skills, was created, including a very active Brain Behaviour Research Institute and, in conjunction with the then separate Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences, a Human Resource Centre which developed strong links with many welfare agencies within the community. Though to many it felt so at the time, 'steady state' was not stagnation.

Nevertheless, the process of adjustment and diversification was often painful and discouraging. One professor, of well established international reputation, who joined the University in the mid seventies to found a major new department, reported to Council in October 1983 that 'if I had known that at the end of ten years this department would be faced with both the staffing problems and, more importantly, the accommodation problems that beset it, and worse, that this situation will obviously not change in the foreseeable future, I would not have accepted the Chair ...'. These were not easy years for any publicly funded institution and, putting aside those frustrated early major hopes, La Trobe generally received a fair enough portion. But for ten years no funds for new building were available, while funds for new academic initiatives depended on ever tighter, more centralised, budgeting. During these difficult years there was inevitably some sagging of morale, some loss of earlier élan and confidence. But, as subsequent essays illustrate, a great volume of high quality research and teaching continued, to an increasingly diversified student body within which the 'mature age' group shone especially brightly.

Throughout the seventies higher percentages of women and of older students, were entering all Australian universities. With the introduction of an 'early leavers' entry scheme (modelled on a Sussex precedent) La Trobe has been a pace-setter in Australia in the encouragement of educationally less well advantaged students undertaking university studies. Each year students who left school without having had the opportunity to reach the academic levels normally required for university entrance are selected after careful interviewing and aptitude testing procedures. The first group of twenty was admitted to the School of Humanities in 1972. Within a few years the scheme was adopted by the School of Social Sciences, and for a short time the School of Physical Sciences also tried a modified and more
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restricted program which was not sustained. On the Arts side however success has been very substantial. Since 1972 over 2500 students have been admitted in this way, and their general performance levels, carefully monitored, have been well above average. Despite some objection that the admission of any students by such a side door is at the expense of other (marginally) qualified 'normal entry' students, the benefits to the institution, as well as to the early leavers themselves, have amply justified the initiative taken. The whole program, which many other tertiary education institutions have subsequently adopted, has been a successful and well sustained application of the ideals that went into the founding of La Trobe.

The more socially representative character of La Trobe's student body, encouraged by such policies, is a continuing feature of the campus, so that it is probably of all Australian universities, and certainly of the larger universities, the one which fits least well the conclusion of a recent influential Canberra-based study that 'higher education in general and universities in particular remain socially elite institutions.' Another essay in this collection explores this theme, but to illustrate it briefly here we may note that of La Trobe's 1987 new entrants 44 per cent had spent their last year in a State secondary school, against 20 per cent in independent schools and 23 per cent in Roman Catholic schools, (with 13 per cent 'other'.) These are percentages which just about parallel the general distribution of students in Victorian secondary schools, but certainly do not parallel the distribution of those actually entering Victorian universities, the independent school percentage being there far higher. It is clear that in this respect, as well as in others such as ethnicity (less than half of the 1987 entrants had fathers born in Australia), La Trobe's student body mirrors Australian society far more accurately than any 'access to privilege' stereotype would suggest. It will be interesting to see over the next few years how far the graduate tax, introduced this year by the Commonwealth government in a package of policies designed in part to extend tertiary educational opportunities to less advantaged socio-economic groups, affects enrolments at La Trobe — the University so far closest to such groups. Let us hope the tax proves to be less of a blunt instrument than many predict.

By the mid eighties growth was again visible on the campus, with some new buildings actually taking shape — notably the third stage of the long delayed and desperately needed library complex. Other buildings will need to follow over the next few years if the looked for benefits from the Lincoln merger are to be realised. This merger was negotiated voluntarily by the two institutions, with blessings from the sidelines from the State government but a notable lack of enthusiasm from the Commonwealth's Tertiary Education Commission, well before the appearance of any Dawkin's papers, green or white, pressuring universities and colleges towards just such mergers. There were those at both Lincoln and La Trobe who questioned the wisdom of such an amalgamation, but the generally perceived advantages for both institutions seemed substantial — for Lincoln (an institute scattered over cramped sites in inner Melbourne) ample space for future building, plus access to wider teaching, research and library resources; for La Trobe a considerable strengthening of its professional course offerings on the numerically weaker science side of its academic spectrum, plus an opportunity to develop, if not the once imagined on-campus teaching hospital, at least strong teaching and research links with nearby existing hospitals. By thus entering the rapidly developing field of para-medical training, which includes nursing, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and many other related specialities, La Trobe was taking a long step towards a fuller range of academic activities, even if those activities are now most unlikely ever to include the once anticipated traditional school of clinical medicine.

Like the benefits, the short term costs and risks involved in this Lincoln merger are, however, substantial. For fulfillment of the potential much depends on the future flow of funds for teaching, research and buildings, while disturbingly, at the point in time when this collection goes to press, great uncertainty hangs over the retention of physiotherapy within the new La Trobe School of Health Sciences. Professional groups are seeking to detach this major area in order to concentrate future training in it at the University of Melbourne, in
Building La Trobe University

effect boycotting La Trobe because, among other reasons, it has no medical school. The responses of the University of Melbourne and of the State government, which gave its full blessing to the original merger, will be crucial — and revealing. If this campaign succeeds, and there are real fears that it may, it would be a serious blow both to the general principle of the academic autonomy of higher educational institutions, and specifically to La Trobe's search for satisfying alternatives to earlier unrealisable objectives. Who seeks alternatives often finds unlooked for difficulties!

Another very important and potentially enriching (both academically and financially) recent development has been towards creating a Research and Development Estate — one of several high technology precincts encouraged by the Victorian State government in association with universities and some colleges of advanced education. The La Trobe estate is planned for a large site, about six kilometres from and equal in extent to the present campus, on which, in addition to commercial and residential developments, it is proposed that industrial research facilities will be developed under joint government, University and business management. Balancing the traditional academic principle of free and open research enquiry with business and commercial needs and interests is not easy, as was evidenced by the agonising of La Trobe's Academic Board during 1987 over a proposal for an on-campus science park development in association with a large firm in the field of bio-technology. The Board set such stringent conditions, in the face of mild advice from the Vice-Chancellor to the effect that 'this is not the way commercial enterprises work', that the proposal did not proceed. There is no doubt that over the next quarter century — and beyond — universities in Australia which wish to develop and diversify, perhaps even just to survive, will be able to do so only by drawing on financial flows other than those controlled by the Commonwealth government. This will involve academics learning to sup with businessmen, with a long spoon if necessary, but not too much fastidiousness. La Trobe, like its sister institutions, is learning to operate in the new style, one hopes as fast as any. The appointment of its third Vice-Chancellor, due to succeed Professor John Scott in January 1990, will be a crucial decision in this respect.

To review and conclude — La Trobe was set up in the expansive years of the mid-sixties in the anticipation that it would develop, as its near predecessor Monash was manifestly doing, into a large university offering, on the Melbourne model, the full traditional range of disciplines. Although in certain respects it was to be organised in quite novel ways (Schools, not faculties; colleges for all) in range and essentials it was expected that it would soon become an institution fully comparable to, and on the scale of, the other two universities in the metropolis. It would be Melbourne's third university only in a chronological sense. The large site on which it was set down encouraged such assumptions and high expectations.

Though growing very rapidly, Melbourne was not quite ready for three such universities, especially if growth was to continue vigorously, as it did, in both the older ones. Also, within the first formative decade of La Trobe's foundation, the relatively easy flow of the vital Commonwealth government funding for universities (turned on by the governments of R.G. Menzies, surely the greatest patron ever of Australian academia) became much less reliable. Thus La Trobe's anticipated growth was soon inhibited, and by the mid seventies it was stabilising as a medium size university which produced many more arts than science graduates and no medical, law or engineering graduates at all. Its siting in an outer northern suburb proved also to be something of a limiting factor, given the overall geography of Melbourne. Although Monash too had been placed on an outer and less attractive suburban site (not the kindest environments for such sophisticated institutions as large universities) it at least was firmly within a major corridor of Melbourne's residential and industrial growth. Time and place those impersonal forces which condition all things, have worked rather less benignly for La Trobe so far than for its slightly older contemporary, though the future growth of the metropolis may alter this balance somewhat. Its younger contemporary, Deakin, though severely handicapped from the start by very restricted funds for its building
program, was never planned as a full scale metropolitan university, so that its place and identity within the quartet of Victorian universities was always less complicated than La Trobe’s.

Monash, it must be said, also had its identity problems in the very status conscious (‘which suburb/school/university do you come from?’) community of Melbourne. Early in 1980 soon after retiring as its foundation Vice-Chancellor, Sir Louis Matheson, reflected

Monash is very distinguished in world academic opinion, and yet I don’t think it has achieved standing in Melbourne eyes. There is no doubt that the pecking order in the eyes of potential students is Melbourne, Monash, La Trobe, Deakin. It will take generations to change this. Australia is much worse than England in this respect. (The Age 22.3.80)

However, to update Sir Louis, there is no doubt that in recent years the local estimate of Monash has risen considerably, thanks not least to high profile medical research programs.

Though comparisons are natural enough, across the board quality judgments on such complex and constantly developing institutions as modern universities must always be very suspect, and the main thing to be said on this question is surely that metropolitan Melbourne is fortunate in now having three large diverse universities, each of high quality with many particular strengths and each, as Sir Louis put it, ‘very distinguished in world academic opinion.’ La Trobe, however, still has difficulty in achieving ‘standing in Melbourne eyes’ so that, despite the high quality of its staff, many students who would do well to go there do not think to do so. Its neighbouring universities, it is worth adding, have no problem in recognising true quality, the Philosophy Department at Monash for example having appointed the last three of its professors from its La Trobe counterpart. The general community, however, tends still to undervalue and underutilise the resources and skills available on the Bundoora campus — partly just because it is out there on the north side of a mainly southern and eastern oriented community. It is to be hoped that, well within the next quarter century, Melbourne finds, and uses to the full, its third university, as it has its second.

In a basic sense La Trobe, as much as Monash, was among the last of the old universities in Australia. Those that have come into existence since the sixties, as well as those about to be created under pressure from Canberra by fusion processes applied to existing colleges and institutes, have all been conceived in less wide-ranging terms than characterised the main universities that developed in the capital cities between the mid 19th and the mid 20th centuries. La Trobe’s early search for the means to match that kind of academic model has realistically shifted to a search for the means to develop major strengths in some less traditional areas, such as communication science, legal studies in a social context, the health sciences. In these initiatives, and in others, including policies towards student enrolment, it has remained, as it began, an innovative and distinctive university. It enters the next decade with a good deal of apprehension, as all Australian universities must, very conscious from the experience of its first decades that the world which once seemed to lie before it so various, beautiful and new — as on that balmy night of its inaugural ball — has indeed a good deal less certitude than ideally it would wish. But it is sure to continue growing in stature, seeking out truths and finding its way.

A Note on Sources
Much of the essay is based on the relevant document files, printed reports, and related papers held in the archives of the University, and the locus of many particular references is fairly evident from the text. Dr J.D. McCaughey’s reflection on how far an Interim Council can control developments comes from the tape of an interview with him held on 12 January 1981, also in the archives, and Mrs Ethleen Whitney King’s recollections are in her book Dreams Become Deeds (1986), p. 61. Sir Louis Matheson’s reference to Monash as the last of the old universities is in his memoir Still Learning (1980) p. 171 (note also p. 9), and to its standing
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The table on page 11 is drawn from Kwong Lee Dow, et al, 'The social composition of students entering the University of Melbourne in 1969 and 1970, Melbourne Studies in Education 1972, pp. 77-95; Ann Smurthwaite, 'Entrants to Melbourne and Monash Universities', The Australian University, vol 12, no 2 (July, 1974), pp. 165-96; and M.J. Henry, 'La Trobe: a study of the idea of a university', MA thesis, La Trobe University, 1972, Appendix 1. The interview with the non-anarchist student radical is reported at length in J.A. Walker, The Perception of Conflict: Profiles from Student Politics', MA thesis, La Trobe University, 1974, p. 158, and the other quotes from the main student historian of 'the troubles' all come from Barry York, 'Sources of Student Unrest in Australia — with Particular Reference to La Trobe University 1967-72', MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1983, pp. 2, 213, 381 ff. This thesis is summarised (without the partial apology to Sir Archibald Glenn) in Barry York, 'Sources of Student Dissent — La Trobe University, 1967-72', Vests, vol. 27, no. 1 (1984), pp. 21-31; this journal (vol 16, 1973) also has an article by P.W. Mathews, 'From College Unions to a General Union at La Trobe University, 1964-71.' In addition to the masters theses noted above there is another by A.N. Marshall, 'La Trobe University: the Vision and the Reality', MEd thesis, La Trobe University, 1979, which is summarised in Melbourne Studies in Education 1982, pp. 1-41, and commented on in the La Trobe University Record Feb/March 1982. A valuable early essay by R. Goldman and A.W. Martin, 'La Trobe — a Case Study of a New Australian University' is in the World Year Book of Education 1972-3, pp. 220-34, which also contains an essay on Flinders University. A comparative study of the sixties generation of university foundations, especially of Macquarie and La Trobe, both third universities in a large metropolis, would be of great interest.

The quote from the influential study (Mr Dawkins has surely studied it closely) on Australian universities being still, despite the abolition of fees in 1974, socially elite institutions is from D.S. Anderson and A.E. Vervoorn, Access to Privilege (ANU Press, 1983), p. 170.
ESTABLISHING THE UNIVERSITY
The Planning Phase

J.R. Archibald Glenn

The establishment of a new university falls to the lot of very few people. It carries with it a great responsibility, to create an institution known for its scholars in the centuries ahead. King Alfred must have felt this sense of history when over eleven hundred years ago he started, in the forests of Oxford, a home for poor and scattered scholars. These people started the tradition of intellectual leadership that was to give Britain pre-eminence in generations to come. He could not have realised that it would become ultimately a source of inspiration to other centres of learning, far beyond his island home in the remote corners of the earth. In its own way La Trobe University was about to carry on this tradition by creating opportunities for young people who might otherwise have missed the chance for higher education.

The University of Sydney, the oldest university in Australasia, was established by an Act of Parliament in 1850, and enrolled its first students in 1852. The University of Melbourne followed shortly after, under an Act of Parliament in 1853, with students enrolled in 1855. Both of these universities provided in their Acts that the standard of graduation should be equal to that of Oxford and Cambridge, and the older English and Scottish institutions. La Trobe University in turn linked its standard to that of Melbourne and Monash, so that the connection with a tradition of academic excellence has been preserved.

It is interesting to record the events in the post-World War II period that led to the establishment of La Trobe University. There was a worldwide recognition of the need to expand facilities for higher education. In Britain, the Robbins Committee reported in 1963 on the need for the expansion of tertiary education in that country. During the 1950s in the United States, President Eisenhower moved with great speed in establishing a grand plan to vastly expand facilities for higher education including many new universities. Sir Robert Menzies, in 1957, recognising Australia's needs, set up a special committee to report on the future of Australian universities and invited Sir Keith Murray, Chairman of the University Grants Committee of Great Britain, to chair it. The Murray Committee, in a far-reaching report submitted in September 1957, recommended a major expansion of university facilities in Australia together with changes in administration and financing.

As a direct outcome of the key recommendation of the Murray Report, the federal government, in 1959, established the Australian Universities Commission (AUC) and appointed Sir Leslie Martin to chair it. The creation of the AUC gave the federal government a much more important role in co-ordinating and funding Australian universities although they still remained state institutions. In 1961, the Prime Minister appointed Sir Leslie Martin to chair a special committee to report to the AUC on the escalating demands for higher education in Australia. Figures for that year showed Victoria seriously lagging in university enrolments compared with all other states [See Table I]. In its 1964 report, the Martin Committee predicted a massive increase in university enrolments over the next decade [See Table II].

In its second report, in August 1963, the AUC recognised the urgency of Victoria's situation: '...the resources of Melbourne and Monash Universities are not likely to meet the long term demands for university education beyond 1966. The Commission therefore is willing to support in the 1964-66 triennium the extension of University facilities in the Melbourne
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metropolitan area.' As a result of the AUC recommendation, the Commonwealth government passed the Universities Assistance Bill in October 1963 which provided a grant for the 'third' university for recurrent expenditure in 1965 of $106,000 (L-53,000) and $210,000 in 1966. The first capital grant was for 1966 and amounted to $1,000,000. These grants were to be matched by equivalent state grants. This cleared the way for a new institution to proceed.

TABLE I
University Enrolments as a proportion of State Populations 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population aged 17-22 years</th>
<th>University Enrolments</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>332,278</td>
<td>23,908</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>244,797</td>
<td>11,814</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>130,305</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Australia</td>
<td>78,633</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Australia</td>
<td>62,579</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>29,829</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>878,421</td>
<td>56,494</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE II
Predicted Growth of University Enrolments 1963-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population in millions</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>27,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>86,400</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>30,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>45,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia. Tertiary Education in Australia: report to the Australian Universities Commission [The Martin report], 3 vols., Canberra, AGPS, 1964-65. Vol I, pp. 27, 38 (Figure 4, Tables 31, 33).

It should be recorded that the Victorian government had also, in 1961, set up the Ramsay Committee to report on the special needs of the State for additional educational facilities at university level over the next ten years. It reported in August 1963 and recommended an immediate expansion of university facilities but could not agree on whether to establish a third independent university or to create further campuses of Melbourne and Monash Universities which could at some future date become independent. The AUC and the Martin Committee favoured the immediate establishment of a third university because it considered the huge lag in enrolments in Victoria warranted this more positive step. This view was accepted by the Victorian government which needed the support of matching federal finance in such a major undertaking.

In April 1964, I was invited by the Premier, Mr Henry (later Sir Henry) Bolte, to chair a 'Third University Committee'. The Premier generously consulted me on the membership of the committee, so it was possible to gather a group with vast experience and knowledge. What was equally important, those selected proved to be a compatible, friendly team who could
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work under pressure with commendable speed. The thirteen members were announced on 21 May, 1964 (See Appendix A). The terms of reference of the Committee were to advise the Government on all matters relating to the establishment of a third university in Victoria. This included the selection of the site, the preparation of a detailed development program, planning and calling tenders for buildings, the formulation of an administrative structure, the appointment of an Academic Planning Board and the recruitment of key staff. It was to plan, if possible, to enrol students in March 1967. The point of reference with the State government was Mr John (later Sir John) Bloomfield, the Minister for Education, who proved very supportive at every stage.

The first meeting was held on 2 June 1964 at the rooms of the Historical Society of Victoria in Victoria Street. For me, this was history repeating itself, as I had met there several years earlier as a member of the Interim Council of Monash University under the Chairmanship of Sir Robert Blackwood.

The choice of a site was a matter of urgency. It was limited in the terms of reference to one within the area of Greater Melbourne, but this in any case would have been the recommendation. Two-thirds of the people of Victoria lived in the metropolitan area and this proportion was increasing (See Table III). No other centre had a population sufficient in itself to support a new university. To have located outside the Greater Melbourne area would have necessitated the construction of extensive residential accommodation which would have involved a large capital outlay. In addition, it would have been costly for a larger proportion of the students. Attracting high quality academics to a country centre would also have been difficult, particularly at that time.

### TABLE III

Victorian population 1954-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan Melbourne</th>
<th>Rest of State</th>
<th>Total Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At census June 30 1954</td>
<td>1,524,111</td>
<td>928,240</td>
<td>2,452,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At census June 30 1963</td>
<td>2,003,100</td>
<td>1,052,631</td>
<td>3,055,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 1965</td>
<td>2,128,391</td>
<td>1,080,784</td>
<td>3,209,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 1970</td>
<td>2,476,986</td>
<td>1,150,360</td>
<td>3,627,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fifty-seven sites were considered and twenty-seven were inspected; a number of these prospects were the result of submissions by local councils and other interested groups.

High on the list was the ‘police paddock’ on Plenty Road, Bundoora, but the ultimate choice proved to be on the other side of the road at the farm attached to the Mont Park Mental Hospital. It was located from aerial photographs provided by Mr Hepburn, the Chief City Planner, who was a member of the Committee. Dr Cunningham Dax, the head of the Mental Health Authority, was most co-operative but indicated that the loss of the farm would be serious for the hospital. An alternative site for the farm, a little further out on Plenty Road, was acquired and that problem was solved.

The search had its lighter moments. We usually travelled in black government cars and the weather at that time of the year was often bleak. When we visited the ‘police paddock’ it was little wonder a small boy approached Phil Law who was wearing a long black overcoat, and asked him whose funeral it was.

An interim Academic Planning Committee was constituted and one of its initial tasks was to consider the broad administrative structure. After the fourth meeting and much intensive sub-committee work, I was able to report the Third University Committee’s recommendations to the Government on 7th August 1964. These can be summarised from the report as follows:
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1. The site of choice was the Mont Park Farm, eight miles to the north-east of the city centre. This was Crown Land so was already State owned and met the Committee's requirements of about 500 acres. The site was large enough to provide in the future for a medical school with teaching hospitals. It was ideal for landscaping and architectural development, and services were available nearby. The location complemented Melbourne and Monash and, demographically, a metropolitan site best served the State of Victoria for this third university.

2. The administrative structure was based on a university of at least 10,000 students. The Council was to be the governing body and composed essentially of lay members. The Vice-Chancellor as chief administrator was also to be the head of the Academic Board. (Note: This need for the Vice-Chancellor to be both the academic and executive head of the whole institution was emphasised by the Murray Committee and this view coincided with that of our Committee.) The productive activity performed by the academic staff was to be organised by 'schools' under deans as distinct from 'faculties' as in other universities. Rather than a Professorial Board, there was to be an Academic Board of say twenty members which, it was anticipated, would give manageable leadership. Other key administrative positions were to be that of Registrar and Bursar (Business Manager) both reporting directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

3. The name La Trobe University was a unanimous recommendation after considering many others. It is useful here to summarise the reason for this choice. Lieutenant-Governor Charles Joseph La Trobe has great historic significance for Victoria and Australia and his name is recognised internationally. La Trobe was not a university man (which was not uncommon in his day), but he appears to have had almost every quality one would desire in one. He had a lively interest in every aspect of life of the community, the will to work for the good of other men, and a sense of responsibility towards posterity. He came to the infant town of Melbourne on 30 September 1839 as Superintendent, and became the first governor when Port Phillip District was separated from New South Wales in 1850. He granted the sites for the State Library and Melbourne University, took the chair at the meeting which inaugurated Royal Melbourne Hospital, and was the prime mover for the establishment of the Botanical Gardens.

4. An itemised program to achieve student intake by March 1967 was submitted, just thirty-three months from the date of the first meeting of the Planning Committee. This included the timing for key staff appointments. Early acceptance of the report was requested of the Government because of the tight program. The response from the Government was prompt and the search for key staff commenced. The preparation of a University Bill was undertaken in conjunction with Parliamentary draftsman Mr John Finnemore. A great deal of care was taken in the preparation of this document and John was most helpful working with us in sub-committee on many evenings.

The Minister asked me to set out the guiding principles which had been evolved and accepted by the Committee. It may be useful to quote this letter to him dated 23 September 1964, as he quoted this in full to support his submission of the University Bill to Parliament on 30 September 1964.

Dear Mr Bloomfield

As promised I have set out in this letter a summary of the basic features of the administrative structure that we plan for La Trobe University. Naturally we are anxious to preserve some flexibility pending the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Planning Board.

We have assumed a large university of 10,000 students, so that the administrative structure must be capable of matching this size.

A university is a corporation devoted to education, scholarship and research. It should evolve in accordance with social requirements, intellectual ideals and develop-
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ment in knowledge and in educational theory and practice. It is appreciated that it is largely supported by public funds.

The governing body will be the Council as defined by Act of Parliament, and it will be composed predominantly of lay membership, with a Chancellor as chairman.

The Vice-Chancellor is the leader of the academic community and chief executive of the university. The productive activity of the university is teaching and research performed by the academic staff, organised by schools. These schools will be intermediate in size between the traditional faculty and department. Each school will be headed by a Dean with a Board of Studies representative of the professors and academic staff of the school.

It is proposed that the traditional Professorial Board, which can become so large and unwieldy in a large university, will be replaced by an Academic Board of about twenty. The Vice-Chancellor, Deans and the Chief Librarian will be ex-officio members, and most of the remainder would be elected from the academic staff. The function of the Academic Board will be similar to that of a professorial Board in that it will consider academic matters which affect the whole university. The Vice-Chancellor will probably be its chairman.

A large modern university has a very heavy component of non-academic work which requires very careful consideration if the university is to achieve its objectives without serious upset. As chief executive this is the responsibility of the Vice-Chancellor, but he must be supported by staff of high calibre if his burden of office is not to be too onerous. In our view this work is best divided into two — the first part under the registrar, covering the student services, and the second part under the bursar or business manager, covering the financial and commercial aspects and the co-ordination of the all-important budgeting and control. Sound organisation and high calibre staff here are essential, to ensure the wise use of public funds that are available.

I hope this gives you a reasonable picture of our broad plans.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) J.R.A. Glenn
Chairman, La Trobe University Committee.

‘An Act for the Establishment and Incorporation of a University to be known as La Trobe University and for other purposes’ was passed by the Victorian Parliament on 9 December 1964.

It will be noted that the Act does not specify the Vice-Chancellor as Chairman of the Academic Board, despite this being included in the Committee’s recommendations. While accepting that this was the Committee’s intention, the parliamentary draftsman pointed out the Act should avoid being so specific as it must accommodate a future situation where a departure from the normal for some reason may be necessary.

The passage of the Act paved the way for the appointment of an Interim Council. Before moving to this phase of the history, tribute must be paid to the work of the Third University Committee, and others who were co-opted to assist them. All were extremely busy people in their own fields of endeavour who were willing, without demur, to undertake long hours of unpaid work in the community interest. In a period of two months, from the first meeting on 2 June 1964 to the submission of the report to the Government on 7 August 1964, a site had been selected and the character of the new university had been established.

The Interim Council was appointed and held its first meeting on 22 December 1964 (See Appendix A). Its membership of twenty-one included all the members of the Third University Committee less Sir Michael Chamberlin, who expressed the wish to retire. Mrs Kathleen Fitzpatrick, recently retired Associate Professor of History at the University of Melbourne, although appointed, also expressed the wish to retire. The Interim Council under the Act was to have all the powers of the Council except those relating to the appointment of members by co-
option and the election of a Chancellor. The Chairman was to have the same powers and obligations as the Chancellor.

Naturally the affairs of the University from this point on became much more formalised. Sub-committees were appointed and delegated to take decisions and to report to Council regularly. (See Appendix B). The chairman of each sub-committee was a member of Council but outside members were co-opted for their knowledge and experience. For instance, the Academic Planning Board of the Interim Council comprised the following distinguished individuals: Professor Emeritus Sir Thomas Cherry FRS, Chairman (pending the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor); Professor Sir Macfarlane Burnet OM, FRS; Professor J. S. Turner, Botany Department, Melbourne; Professor Hugh Stretton, History Department, Adelaide; Professor R. Selby Smith, Faculty of Education, Monash; Professor R. S. Street, Faculty of Science, Monash; the Council Chairman, ex-officio. The other four Committees of the Interim Council were ‘Finance and Administration’, ‘Building’, ‘Colleges and Housing’ and ‘Legislation’.

The appointment of the Vice-Chancellor was a matter of the highest priority and a special sub-committee of six members was established: J. R. A. Gunn, Chairman; Professor S. Sutherland, Dean of Medicine at Melbourne University and a member of the AUC; Professor P. H. Partridge, Research School of Social Sciences, ANU, Canberra; Dr J. A. L. Matheson, Vice-Chancellor, Monash University; Sir Thomas Cherry; and Professor R. Selby Smith. It was decided that for this particular post the appointment should be by invitation. About twenty names were considered and finally it was narrowed down to ten each of whom was then formally asked if he was willing to be considered. The usual interviews were conducted.

The name of Dr David Myers came as a late suggestion. Our enquiries quickly revealed that he could be the front-runner. He had been at Sydney University as Professor of Electrical Engineering before his appointment as Dean of Applied Science at the University of British Columbia in Canada (See Appendix B). He came from Vancouver for an interview early in March, 1965, and the sub-committee was greatly impressed by his understanding of the problems ahead, his interest and breadth of understanding of university education in its widest sense. He was also strongly supported by Dr Norman McKenzie who had recently retired as President of the University of British Columbia. The Council agreed to his appointment on 15 March and his acceptance was immediate. He was not free to take up his appointment until September but in the interim was able to make several visits to Australia and was in regular communication.

The appointment of the Chief Librarian was also a matter of urgency. It was decided that such an important position might also best be filled by invitation. The successful candidate was Mr Dietrich Borchardt, MA, the Librarian of the University of Tasmania. He was invited to accept the position on 2 February 1965 and became the first full-time employee of La Trobe University. He was overseas in Italy at the time and both a letter and a cabled invitation were sent to him there. He took up full-time duties on 22 March and his work from that date speaks for itself. The library collection was wisely established under his leadership with the careful use of available funds. In his honour the University library is now known as the Borchardt Library.

The appointment of the Business Manager, Mr Frank Barnes, BEc, DipEd, was also a fortunate one. He had been Assistant Secretary of the Universities Commission and later Assistant Secretary of the Martin Committee. He was therefore well accustomed to negotiations with the AUC and was favourably regarded by them. His first appointment to La Trobe, on 1 May 1965, was as Executive Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and he was later confirmed as Business Manager on 1 November 1965. His flair for organisation, his drive, and his cheerful manner were very important in achieving the opening date of March 1967.

The Registrar, Major General T. S. (Tim) Taylor, CBE, MVO, MC, took up his appointment a little later, on 1 April 1966, in time to deal with the preparation for student intake. Again his organising ability and his decisiveness ensured that all plans came together from March 1967. He had been a career soldier and well aware of the need for meticulous planning.

The appointment of the Master Planner had been under close examination since the
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establishment of the 'Third University Committee'. A decision to appoint the firm of Yuncken Freeman Architects with Mr Roy Simpson (later awarded an honorary doctorate by La Trobe), as the responsible partner was made at the first meeting of the Interim Council in December 1964. He was requested to prepare a Master Plan for the 484 acre site at Bundoora, and he set about his task with great diligence. He wisely made a visit overseas to brief himself on developments in university planning and architecture which had seen great changes in recent years. He was also responsible for starting our art collection by introducing four generous donors, Mrs Douglas Carnegie, Lady Potter, Mrs J. M. Baillieu and Mrs R. C. M. Kimpton, who commissioned and presented to the University three important paintings of the site as it was before construction.

At the beginning of 1965 we were a University without a home. Fortunately we were able to take over the premises occupied by the AUC at 474 St Kilda Road, and we continued there for two years. The Chief Librarian moved in during April and the Administration followed in May. By the end of 1965 the total establishment had risen to thirty-five which comprised fifteen administrative and twenty library staff. St Kilda Road proved a convenient temporary location but as the library staff grew and books began to accumulate it was necessary for them to move to a warehouse in Beatrice Avenue, Heidelberg, pending the availability of the library building.

Dr Simpson, the Master Planner, will deal elsewhere in this history with the Master Plan which was accepted by the Interim Council in July 1965, but one or two observations can be made here. The clever use of the saucer shaped site will be obvious with its main pedestrian walkway (the 'red route') at first floor level. However, it did take some time to convince the Chairman of the AUC that this novel arrangement was both economical and functional. The compact layout with its focus on the library was very much in line with the views of Dr Myers who had come from the University of British Columbia. There he had seen the University buildings scattered over a huge site of over 1000 acres, squandering the use of land and making student and staff movement time consuming. He was determined we would not repeat this mistake with our four hundred odd acres. The other influence was Professor Hugh Stretton of Adelaide who so generously gave his time to our Academic Planning Board. He felt that the buildings should be almost crowded into the centre to provide an exciting sort of 'bohemia'. We did move in this direction but we felt we had not gone far enough. The layout also provided a ring road which prevented traffic from disrupting pedestrians in the central academic area.

Having developed a Master Plan we were fortunate in having Professor Lindsay Pryor of the Australian National University as our advisor on the landscaping and the selection of tree and plant types. His plan was wonderfully executed by Mr Frank Saul, the Head Gardener, as can be seen today.

The four Schools to be established initially were Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Biological Sciences. The subjects to be available initially were English, History, Philosophy, Spanish, French, Sociology, Politics, Economics, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and Biology. The addition of a School of Agriculture was agreed at an early date but professional schools were only to be added as the need was substantiated. The recruitment of the foundation professors and staff began in earnest after the arrival of the Vice-Chancellor in September 1965, and most of the appointees took up their positions in 1966. The high quality, loyalty and solidarity of the staff proved a great support for the Council and the Vice-Chancellor in the difficult years immediately ahead.

The proclamation of the Governor-in-Council as required under article 43 of the La Trobe University Act took place on the third of August. This enabled the Council of the University to hold its first meeting on 19 December 1966. The membership of the Council was substantially that of the Interim Council with the addition of four Professors elected by the staff — E. C. Forsyth, A. W. Martin, R. D. Topsom and A. B. Wardrop. At that first meeting of Council, which was held in the council room of Glenn College, I was elected Chancellor, a position which I occupied for the next five years. Mr Bernard Callinan was elected Deputy-Chancellor.
The Coat of Arms was approved and the Chancellor was asked to write formally to the College of Arms requesting the Grant-of-Arms. The approval of a course in Agricultural Science marked the establishment of the fifth School.

At that meeting the Council paid tribute to Sir Thomas Cherry whose death just a month before had robbed us of one of our most dedicated and distinguished members. He never lost sight of the fact that the development of a sound academic program was one of our prime objectives. A little anecdote about Tom that he himself laughed about is worth recounting. One of the last meetings of the Interim Council was held in the board room of the Mont Park Mental Hospital. Tom was making a telephone call from that room and he asked the switchboard girl to connect a number for him. She asked who was calling and he replied that it was Sir Thomas Cherry. She responded: 'Are you a patient?'

To the end of 1972, the year in which I retired as Chancellor, it was interesting to see the University develop from nothing to a student population of 4,304, and from an open paddock to a well built-up campus. In that period which, in terms of government funding, spread across three triennia (1964-66, 1967-69, and 1970-72) the total sum recommended to the Commonwealth government by the Australian Universities Commission for the physical planning and construction of the new university was almost $26 million in the dollar values prevailing at that time.

The creation of La Trobe University occurred at a time when universities throughout the western world were caught up in the Vietnam protest. It was quite a traumatic period for a new institution such as ours which in any case was having the inevitable growing pains. An overly simplistic view would say that the very students we were striving to provide for were the ones who were making our lives difficult. 'Sit ins' at Council meetings and in offices, and the use of loud hailers to drown out discussion were among the problems. Apart from a handful of people who went out of their way to be unpleasant, we felt that we understood the attitude of the students of that era. They had a legitimate interest in world trends that were affecting their lives. Universities throughout the free world were all caught up in the same revolt which was levelled at authority in any form. Arising out of student proposals many changes in administration and planning were made after full and frank discussion. One such change was to add student representatives on the Council and to have observers admitted. This change quickly disposed of the view that all manner of things were perpetrated in closed sessions.

Through all this turmoil the work of the University went on. As in other tertiary institutions it was the Vice-Chancellor, more than any other individual, who had to cope with the volatile situation on a day-by-day basis. I pay special tribute to Dr Myers who, throughout it all, was calm, patient and understanding. The students could not have had a better champion and I think deep down they knew it. He was fortunate in having a fine staff who supported him all the way. The Council also showed great solidarity and, as I have said, were not insensitive to those issues involving the concerns of genuine students in a changing world.

From the inception of the initial Third University Committee, the AUC and the State Government had asked us to take an innovative approach to our task. Our scope proved somewhat limited by finance and in some cases the conservatism of the AUC, but generally there was a sympathetic ear for what we tried to do.

In the early stages, consideration was given to designing the first student academic year as a general rather than a specialised introduction on the model of Keele University in Britain. This would permit a better orientation of students, many of whom enter university without any real idea of where their true career interests lie. However, it was decided that this approach would have added a year to most courses and would have been very costly to the students and to the State in time and money, so the idea was dropped for the time being. Twenty-five years later it is interesting to observe that this concept is again being discussed in the political arena.

The concept of residential colleges, including the affiliation of all non-residential students
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with a college, was strongly favoured by the Council. Many of us had been fortunate enough
to belong to university colleges at Melbourne or overseas, and knew the great benefits of the
system both in developing the whole person and in allowing scholars to meet in smaller, more
relaxed groups.

The ultimate design of about eight or ten colleges got as far as the first two — Glenn and
Menzies. There was much debate and students pressed for a central Union. This was at the
time when student protest was at its height and the more vocal students felt that the smaller
units, the colleges, would tend to divide their effectiveness. Dr Myers will refer to this later but
as the years go by there may be a realisation of the benefits of the early plan; I am sure the site
would still accommodate the concept or a variant of it. Chisholm College was added as a third
college, but it was established on a non-traditional basis.

As already mentioned, the compact layout of the University with peripheral access and a
unique walkway system (the 'red route') was a new concept. The plan for a school to be the
basic unit rather than a faculty certainly worked well in the early years. Other writers will
comment on its subsequent effectiveness. An Academic Board rather than an unwieldy Pro­
fessorial Board was included in the original plan on the grounds that it could lead to wider
representation from the staff.

An example of conservatism attempting to stop innovation in architectural design was in
the General Science building (later called the Thomas Cherry Building). Mr Rod McDonald,
the architect, put forward an elegant economical design with the first floor slab continuous and
extended out as a cantilever. This provided external access ways and necessary escape routes
all around the outside of the laboratories and incidentally cut down the thickness of the con­
crete slab. It took some time to convince Sir Leslie Martin, the chairman of the AUC and a
scientist himself, that this was a workable plan which also had considerable safety benefits.

It is interesting to compare the growth of La Trobe University with that of Melbourne.
Melbourne started in 1855 with sixteen students and only five survived the first year and three
of them took out BA degrees in 1858. By 1890, forty-five years later, the number of students
had risen to 502 and ultimately rose to 1000 in 1909, 4000 in 1942, and 9500 in 1948. La Trobe
opened its doors in March 1967 to 552 students, and 1163 and 2052 in the two following years.
In five years the numbers had grown to 4304. These figures are given to demonstrate the
tremendous pressure on the whole organisation compared with those early Melbourne Uni­
versity years. Not only did the numbers multiply rapidly but there was the complexity of
equipment, the buildings and the whole infrastructure, and the rapid build up in staff num­
bers. As an indication of the general level of effort that made this possible, the Building Com­
mittee held a small dinner party on 3 August 1971 to mark its hundredth meeting. The other
sub-committees similarly had given generously of their time.

Another historical comparison that surprised me was that in 1855 the four foundation
professors at Melbourne were recruited at salaries of $2,000 per annum (£1000) with houses
provided on campus. At La Trobe 110 years later the starting salary of the foundation profess­
ors was $10,400 per annum with no house.

The installation of the Chancellor by the Visitor, His Excellency Major-General Sir Rohan
Delacombe, Governor of Victoria, and the Official Opening of the University by the Premier,
the Hon. Sir Henry Bolte, took place at an open air ceremony at the Bundoora campus on 8
March 1967. Although initially somewhat threatening, the weather on the day turned
beautifully sunny for the opening ceremony which was attended by 2500 guests. Since then
the University has grown steadily in size and in stature and will, I feel sure, continue to fill a
vital place in our community in the generations ahead. I felt very proud to have been one of
the founders and to have led, for those eight formative years, a team of such capable in­
dividuals who possessed the highest ideals and sense of duty.
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Laying the foundation
The passing of the La Trobe University Act 1964 by the government of Victoria, was the formal beginning of the University's history. The University was officially opened on 8 March 1967 by the Premier of Victoria after the installation of the Chancellor by the Governor in his capacity as Visitor. In spite of some early uncertainty about the weather, the sun finally emerged and the ceremony took place in the open air, its solemnity relieved only by the academic procession slowly moving in full regalia to the dais to the strains of 'Now Your Days of Philandering Are Over', played by the Southern Command Band.

The Act of course did little to indicate the great contribution already made by members of the Third University (Promotion) Committee, whose recommendations became the guidelines for the drafting of the Act, and who formed the nucleus of the Interim Council which met for the first time on 22 December 1964, less than two weeks after the passing of the Act. My association with La Trobe began on 26 April 1965, when I was invited to join in the task of its development. It ended in 1976 when I retired as a result of the passing of the years. For the period of about a dozen years I was an eye witness of most things that took place and can relate my experiences of that exciting stage of development. What came before and after is for others to describe, but I hope I can be forgiven for saying a few words about the environment I entered in 1965 and how it came to be.

I quickly became aware of the conclusions reached by the Promotion Committee, the Interim Council and the Academic Planning Board, and it is dear that future generations will have cause for gratitude to those bodies for their wisdom and forethought. Without in any way disparaging their individual efforts, it is timely for me to pay a special tribute to Mr J.R.A. (later Sir Archibald) Glenn who, after discussions with the Premier of Victoria, became the driving force in establishing first the Promotion Committee, then the Interim Council and finally the Council, which elected him the first Chancellor. His continued interest and sound advice were of inestimable value to those of us entrusted with the continued operation of the new University. Mr B.J. (later Sir Bernard) Callinan was elected the first Deputy Chancellor and for many years gave valuable service in that capacity and as chairman of the Building Committee.

From experience of universities on three continents I had formed views regarding their structure and administration. At the time of my appointment I was gratified to discover that these views accorded well with those of the Interim Council. Moreover, I found that an admirable site had been chosen and excellent arrangements made for its landscaping. From early discussions I had with the planning architect, Mr Roy Simpson, it was clear that his views on its development were consistent in all important respects with my own. In particular I was convinced that the 'heart' of the university should be the library, that access to it from all academic buildings should be easy and that student residences should be situated close to the academic buildings. These views conformed with the concentric plan envisaged by Roy Simpson, and the overall physical plan was readily approved by the Interim Council.
The Interim Council, aware of the time needed to develop an adequate library, had given priority to appointing a Chief Librarian. Dietrich Borchard was chosen and became the first person to take up duty at the University. The wisdom of this choice became apparent very soon and the Library flourished under his leadership.

So far as the academic structure was concerned, I held strong views on the dual role of a Vice-Chancellor. Apart from his duty to provide academic leadership, he is responsible for maintaining the financial and administrative services which enable the academic work to thrive. Although the latter function, including the seeking of funds and overall supervision of their application, requires constant attention, I have always firmly believed that the prime duty of a Vice-Chancellor is to provide leadership and encouragement to the academic staff. In particular, he should present and support the views of the academic body to the governing body. This can be done most effectively if he is the chairman of the senior academic body. Since the Australian universities operate as bicameral organisations the Vice-Chancellor, as a member of the governing body, is equally in a position to interpret its decisions or opinions to the academic body. Accordingly, I made my opinion clear to the Interim Council, which accepted it and, although not specifically required by the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe has been ab initio the chairman of the Academic Board.

For two years after the passing of the Act the University occupied rented quarters in St Kilda Road, an address which had acquired considerable distinction as the former residence of a great Australian, Sir David Rivett, and later as the headquarters of the Australian Universities Commission. This was a fitting locale for the birth and early development of the University. After we moved to the present site at Bundoora, our former quarters became a massage parlour.

The two years in temporary accommodation were, for many of us, a most exciting period. By the beginning of 1967 the planning and construction of the first two buildings, the Library and Glenn College, were completed, the former to do temporary extra duty as a science laboratory and the latter as office space for academic and administrative staff.

The move from St Kilda Road to Bundoora brought a dramatic change in working conditions. Urban comfort gave way to the noise of earth-moving equipment and building operations, accompanied by dust during the hot, dry summers and slippery, adhesive mud in the winter, once forcing the Chancellor to abandon his car in mid-campus. Looking back to those days, from the comfort of the present buildings and surroundings, those of us who took part in the transition recall with pleasure the sense of community and of achievement that came to us through working together in the comparative hardship of the early years.

In 1965 the University not only had no permanent home but also faced the prospect of setting up an administrative structure to deal efficiently and accurately with such matters as building contracts and other financial transactions, secondary legislation, terms and conditions of staff appointments, the registration of students and the recording of their progress.

On 1 May 1965, Mr Frank Barnes took up duty as Executive Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and six months later was appointed Business Manager. On 1 April 1966, Major General T.S. Taylor commenced duty as Registrar.

Both Frank Barnes and Tim Taylor embarked on their duties with energy and imagination. It is in a great measure due to their efforts and those of the staff appointed to assist them that the initial group of academic staff was able to concentrate on courses of study to be implemented in 1967 and maintain considerable research activity using facilities generously provided by Melbourne and Monash Universities, CSIRO, and other organisations. A valuable addition to the team was Donne Sherwin with her wide knowledge of Commonwealth universities.

Four professors, Alan Wardrop, Brian Ellis, Ron Topsom, and Don Whitehead, were appointed as the Deans of the four Schools for the first year of student intake.

During the two year gestation period in St Kilda Road, the Interim Council continued to meet regularly and most of its members served actively on its various committees including
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those dealing with buildings, finance, legislation, colleges, and housing. Meanwhile the Academic Planning Board comprising initially a group of professors from Melbourne, Monash, and Adelaide Universities, was augmented by the addition of increasing numbers of La Trobe staff, moving towards its eventual replacement by the Academic Board constituted under the Act.

The small band of 'early birds' had an exciting but satisfying task and most of their achievements are recorded in the formal minutes of various committees. Two of them made valuable contributions which have not been similarly recorded. One is Frank Saul, who led a hardworking team in converting what was an almost treeless dairy farm into a garden university. The other is Pat Vondrejc who, with her band of telephone operators, are always so courteous and helpful that many visitors have commented on the friendliness of their first contact with La Trobe.

By the time the University accepted its first students, the pattern of planned academic and social development had been decided and was summarised in the inaugural lecture which I delivered on 20 March 1967. I propose to quote in this article passages relating to some of the plans outlined in that lecture and to examine the extent to which they matured during the first decade.

In that time La Trobe underwent a rate of growth almost unprecedented in Australian universities. The immediate demands for establishing courses and providing the necessary support for them, together with the difficulty of securing any assurance of funds beyond the next few years, reduced long term planning to little more than speculation:

With the exception of agreed fundamental concepts, plans for development should be sufficient only to establish an initial direction of activities and to enable the academic and physical growth of the University to be adjusted from time to time to the needs of a changing world.

During the 1950s the Australian universities, faced with vastly increased enrolments, had lived precariously since they depended for their continued existence mainly on the support of state governments and, to some extent, the receipt of tuition fees from students. The former varied from state to state, while the latter demanded financial sacrifices from individuals, or even prevented them from enrolling in a university. This problem was partly alleviated by the award of exhibitions and bursaries, but this made inroads on the limited funds available. Some support from the federal government and from commercial and industrial institutions enabled research to be carried on, but in general this was little more than a drop in the ocean.

The decision in 1959 by the federal government to establish the Australian Universities Commission (AUQ) gave promise of a far better future, especially as it involved the entry of the Commonwealth into university financing, hitherto regarded as a state responsibility. One result was the expansion of existing universities and the formation of new ones. Funds on a reasonable scale became available to meet the growing demand for university places, for providing commensurate academic and support staff and for the design and construction of buildings and equipment. La Trobe University came into existence during this period of apparent prosperity and was initially able to carry out its program of expansion, although not entirely in the directions originally envisaged. From the point of view of the universities, the arrival on the scene of the Commission was a welcome change and the Commission carried out its formidable task with great thoroughness. In doing so, it found itself in the unenviable position of assessing the priorities of requests from a dozen or more institutions all competing for what were, and always will be, insufficient funds to satisfy all of them. To do this it had to find formulae for the assessment of teaching loads, building costs and various other aspects of a university's operation. This led inevitably to the accretion of power in the hands of the Commission, since the freedom of a university to determine its academic priorities could now be heavily influenced by that external body. While some may disagree, it is my opinion that, at least during my association with La Trobe, any interference by the Commission with our academic development was minimal and based on a reasonable assessment of our needs.
My retirement in 1976 coincided approximately with the federal government's decision to halt the rapid growth of university facilities which had taken place over the previous decade. The honeymoon was over and it is not for me to say how well the universities have reacted to the more static conditions which followed except to observe, as an outsider, that they appeared to adapt admirably to the change in tempo.

Academic planning

It was recognised early that the basic teaching and research unit of the University should be the department involved in an individual discipline such, for example, as history, mathematics or economics. To ensure a reasonable co-ordination between the various disciplines, a number of Schools were established, the initial groupings being humanities and the social, physical and biological sciences. This differed from the normal Australian pattern of faculties such as Arts and Science which are, inter alia, responsible for determining the criteria for the award of a degree in their own areas of competence. The division into Schools appeared to provide more flexibility in arranging courses of study to meet individual needs. In particular, the expansion of knowledge and the trend towards specialisation during the twentieth century have emphasised the need to provide an ever broader range of offerings without the sacrifice of depth. Scientists should experience exposure to the social implications of their efforts; archaeologists need an understanding of the earth sciences, and so on. Although this is not easy to achieve in the few years of a normal course, it was felt that the schools would at least provide more flexibility than more rigid faculty requirements.

It was recognised, of course, that in the early years the academic butter should not be spread too thin and many subjects normally covered in a university curriculum had to await the full development of others. There was considerable discussion of the teaching of languages in view of Australia's changing role in the international theatre. Consideration was given to the teaching of Asian languages, with particular reference to South East Asia, but it was found that other universities already provided excellent courses in them. Eventually it was decided to concentrate on romance languages. Other disciplines, which were to wait some time for their introduction, included psychology, the earth sciences, music and the history of art. Steps were taken to establish a chair in geography and proceeded so far as the offer of an appointment, but (strangely for such a discipline) this project lost its way and disappeared into the jungle of superannuation regulations.

It was, at the beginning, our intention to establish a firm basis of studies in the humanities and the social, physical and biological sciences and then extend our activities into 'professional' areas such as law, medicine, engineering, agriculture and education, all of which would rest on a firm base of the liberal arts or science or both. I was approached from time to time, as were some of my colleagues, by prominent members of these professions, urging that we should proceed to establish one or other of the professional schools during the honeymoon period of academic expansion. We did, indeed, decide to set up Schools of Agriculture and Education, in both cases with the support of the Universities Commission. As I stated in my inaugural lecture in 1967:

It is lamentable but true that many universities feel bound to exclude from their attention the study of any discipline which appears to have direct practical significance. This is a form of intellectual snobbery which brings little credit to the university and little benefit to the community. There is no inherent reason why a liberal education should be a useless education. The idea of providing education as a step towards professional or other occupations is not a product of modern technology. It existed long before the technological advances of the nineteenth century demonstrated the connection between education and material progress.

They have illuminated an important principle. The professional man will have a greater impact on society if he has learned to view himself and his profession with detachment; the more abstract scholar will find that his horizons are wider if he has some degree of awareness of his physical surroundings.
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No branch of knowledge should be rejected simply because it has practical value or, for that matter, because it has no practical value. The sole criterion should be that of excellence. If the study of a subject requires the integrity of thought and the quality of mind normally associated with good scholarship, it matters little whether the subject is abstract in the extreme or of immediate material significance. Indeed, the main value of a university education lies in the interaction between the minds of scholars and students having varied interests and experiences, and in the sharpening of the intellect that results from the interchange of ideas. Excellence is infectious and, if judiciously spread, can extend into widely different fields of endeavour.¹

We considered the desirability of extending into law, medicine and engineering. Our deliberations led us to the conclusion that, without prejudice to future action, the time was not yet ripe to establish a law school. It appeared that graduates of the Melbourne and Monash law schools often had difficulty in finding the postgraduate employment necessary for them to complete their professional training. It did appear, however, that we could profitably introduce a course in legal studies which would not only be of academic value in its own right, but would provide a useful qualification for those of its graduates who might wish to enter an existing law school.

In the early days of our existence there appeared to be a strong case for establishing a medical school at La Trobe. The science schools were developing strongly and could provide much of the pre-clinical teaching as a foundation for clinical studies, while the University was in close proximity to several general hospitals as well as a network of psychiatric and geriatric institutions. Provision had been made in the campus plan for the future development of a medical school with ancillary facilities in an area adjoining the School of Biological Sciences.

I was urged strongly by several bodies and individuals to recommend that Council take steps to proceed with this plan and I was invited to join the (then) Hospital and Charities Commission, where this possibility was discussed at length. Nevertheless, I was not satisfied that the demand in Victoria for medical graduates would justify the establishment of a third medical school, even though enrolments at Melbourne and Monash appeared to have reached saturation. Accordingly, in 1970, I undertook a statistical study, admittedly involving some speculation as to future needs and trends, and reached the conclusion that ‘subject to the validity of my assumptions, the two existing medical schools in Melbourne can meet the foreseeable demand for graduates until about 1987, by which time an additional medical school will be needed. If one of the existing schools is expanded, the need for a third school will be delayed by approximately one year for every nine additional graduates per year added to the graduate output of Melbourne and Monash universities’.

Our data were appended to our submission to the Australian Universities Commission’s Committee on Medical Schools, which met first in June 1972 and recommended in July 1973 the expansion of the Melbourne and Monash medical schools to produce, between them, about fifty extra graduates per year. Thus the inclusion of a medical school at La Trobe is still a matter for the future. In the meantime the teams involved in pre-clinical studies have grown stronger and indeed have been successfully involved in a number of research projects of a medical nature.

The situation in regard to an engineering school is less clear. Statistics regarding supply and demand for engineering graduates in the 1960s indicated that the existing faculties at Melbourne and Monash would meet foreseeable requirements for some years to come, and we took no action to develop a comprehensive engineering school at La Trobe. A number of us, however, were conscious of the industrial, social and economic changes that were certain to occur through modern technological developments, particularly those related to solid state devices and computers and to chemical and biological processes. We foresaw an increasing need, in the very near future, for scientists and engineers who could enable Australia to take an adequate part in what had already become the second industrial revolution. It seemed to us that, irrespective of the overall demand, there was an urgent need to produce engineering
graduates with a stronger background in the physical and biological sciences than is normal in most engineering courses, and with advanced training in communication, chemical and biological engineering. A proposal for this effect was considered by the University in 1973. After considerable discussion it was decided to limit the proposal for the time being to communication engineering.

Since it was a requirement of the Universities Commission that it should be advised of the introduction of new courses and its approval sought for those considered to be major developments, our intention to develop a course in communication engineering within the School of Physical Sciences was included in our submission in 1971 to the Commission for the forthcoming triennium, entry to the two-year course being at Bachelor of Science level. The course would be thus at graduate level, leading to a degree in Bachelor of Communication Engineering. It would provide an alternative avenue for science graduates who might otherwise seek graduate work in other areas, and would not materially affect the number of enrolled students in the University, nor would it involve the heavy costs normally associated with engineering education. Despite this, the AUC in May 1972, stated the following:

The Commission believes that engineering science should not be introduced as a new discipline in a university as a part of another school or faculty, but that if engineering is to be developed at a university, it should be in the form of an integrated and balanced School of Engineering in which the major branches of engineering are represented. The Commission is also concerned that the course proposed by La Trobe University would not necessarily receive professional recognition. There is, in addition, some evidence that, with the rapid development of engineering and technology courses in colleges of advanced education, the case for further engineering places in universities is relatively weak. Accordingly, the Commission believes that La Trobe University ought not to implement its proposals on Engineering Science.

The University was not prepared to accept these views and, whilst appreciating the Commission's concern over the possible appearance of another integrated and balanced engineering school, our limited proposals should not have been considered in that light. There followed a prolonged interchange of letters and visits, culminating in the acceptance of our proposal by the Commission, conveyed in a letter dated 4 July 1973, subject to our assurance that no comprehensive engineering school was involved. The Council decided, on 18 February 1974, to establish a department and a chair in communication engineering within the School of Physical Sciences, and the first professor took up duty at the beginning of 1975. It was agreed that the annual cost should be absorbed in the recurrent budget of the University. The establishment of the department was facilitated by a substantial grant from a private source.

Other professional areas, such as architecture, dentistry and veterinary science, were not seriously considered during the first decade, but both the academic and physical structures are such that these, or related disciplines, may be readily introduced when appropriate.

Residential and social planning

From the very beginning of La Trobe there had been much discussion of how best to mix the various disciplines together so as to provide the maximum of opportunity for informal discussion between chemist and philosopher, mathematician and sociologist. In my inaugural lecture in 1967, I outlined the approach which we had decided to adopt:

I am convinced that there is a critical size of a community of students, beyond which the incentive to step outside one's own field of study rapidly diminishes. Opinions vary on the determination of the critical size, but it is the considered opinion of the University's Council that a community of about a thousand students, together with the appropriate number of professors, lecturers and tutors, is large enough to encompass a wide variety of interests and, at the same time, small enough to provide the kind of intellectual and social environment in which curiosity and catholicity of interest can be encouraged to expand.

Accordingly, we are dividing the University into a group of colleges, each being a
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self-contained community of appropriate size. It is not feasible in a metropolitan university to provide living accommodation for all students, however desirable this may be. Nevertheless, we do intend to provide for non-resident students in the colleges all the facilities enjoyed by resident students other than a place in which to sleep.

In the design of the first two colleges, Glenn and Menzies, steps were taken to include in them more than the usual provision for academic activities, including lecture rooms, study space and accommodation for teaching staff. We were fortunate in arranging the appointment of an eminent classical scholar, Professor A.D. Trendall, as a University Fellow in residence at Menzies College.

Our ambitious plans for the integration of academic and collegiate life were never realised. Although in the initial year or two the first two Colleges, Glenn and Menzies, seemed to be headed for success, it became apparent that a number of factors were combining to prevent the full development of the concept. At this stage the third College, Chisholm, was planned on a different basis, taking into account the growing interest of students in a less formal type of accommodation. Since government grants to universities were determined on a triennial basis an agreement had been reached between the universities and the Universities Commission to avoid the hiatus in planning and building expenditure at the end of each triennium by the advance approval of up to roughly the annual expenditure for such projects in the expiring triennium. These were known as ‘green light’ projects, in which there was keen internal competition for inclusion. Professor Jim Morrison, as Chairman of the Planning Committee for Chisholm College and a member of the Council, presented Council with an outline of the plans, which involved a departure from the conventional pattern of separate wings for male and female students, the allocation of rooms being independent of the gender of the students. On the question of urgency he warmed to the task and in his enthusiasm recommended that the college should be a ‘red light’ project. The plans were accepted and the college was built.

Opposition to the ‘college concept’ came from many sources. The attitude of young people was changing: this was manifest in their reaction against any form of parental or institutional restraint, and even extended to their preference for the pizza parlour rather than the formal dining hall. This attitude was reflected in the complaint that, for those not in residence and thus the majority, the college provided nothing but a locker. Many members of the academic staff felt that their participation in college life, which was intended to foster closer communication between those in various disciplines, would, in fact, adversely effect their communion with their own kind. Some of the more radical students saw this proposed departure from normal practice as a veiled attempt by the authorities to limit their solidarity and their freedom to protest. It was a departure from what they had come to expect, and there is nobody so reactionary as a radical student.

The college question was debated at great length and became the subject of a seminar held on 29 and 30 November 1968. The findings of the seminar were less than enthusiastic.

Meanwhile, the Students’ Representative Council considered the matter sufficiently important to send one of its members to the United Kingdom and the USA to visit a number of new universities that were developing on lines similar to those at La Trobe. The Council welcomed this student initiative and agreed to provide funds for the SRC to send a second member of their own choice on the basis that, in such a venture, two heads were better than one. On their return, they reported favourably on the universities visited but by this time the tide of opinion in the University had turned against the college system, which moreover failed to gain the support of the Universities Commission. Accordingly, we reverted to the more usual arrangement involving the establishment of a central union, while the colleges continued essentially as residential facilities.

In spite of its delayed start, the Union was well established by the end of the decade. The first three colleges, Glenn, Menzies and Chisholm, were also in full operation. But quite apart from the academic and social implications of the college system, there was still a serious shortage of accommodation for students at a reasonable cost. On the initiative of Frank Barnes, a
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A group of flats close to the University was acquired and made available on a rental basis to La Trobe University personnel. The success of this enterprise prompted the University to embark on a novel venture into on-site housing, with the construction of a block of twenty-four flats on land at the southern end of the campus. These flats, offering seventy-two places, were rented to University students and staff through the agency of La Trobe University Housing Limited, a non-profit-making company established for the purpose. Next came the development on adjacent land of twenty terrace units providing sixty-three places for groups of two, three, four or six people. To select the project design, a competition was held among final year architecture students at the University of Melbourne, two of whom took part later in the detailed planning of this, the second stage of the University's staff-student housing project, which was immediately successful and has remained consistently popular amongst University people.

The end of the first decade

In retrospect, it may be said that by the end of the first decade La Trobe University had met the requirement of rapid growth. So far as one can judge at an early stage, in the quality of its graduates it had fulfilled the expectations of its founders, while the academic staff had achieved an excellent reputation for scholarship as judged by their publications and their recognition by learned societies. Its physical development and landscaping have been widely praised, while the foresight of the founders in giving high priority to the Library, has been more than justified.

On the other hand, the breadth of its offerings has been limited, mainly by the apparent lack of demand in the community for graduates in the professional areas. Although the concept of a collegiate university was not realised, the three colleges provided living accommodation in 1976 for 841 students, whilst other University facilities provided for a further 231.

My task during the first decade was made easier by the constant support and encouragement, not only of Sir Archibald Glenn and his successor in 1972, Mr Justice (later Sir Reginald) Smithers, but also of the chairmen and members of the Council's committees, all busy people who gave generously of their time in the interests of the University.

For one who has been closely associated with the development of the University, it is very difficult to make an objective judgement of how well the institution has progressed, especially when his association with it ceased formally more than a decade ago. I therefore conclude this contribution by saying that whether or not we got the University off to a flying start, we have at least left the way open for other developments to take place when considered desirable. I am sure my former colleagues would agree with me in expressing the hope that, as the years go by and the University grows older, it will not grow old.

ENDNOTES

2. Ibid, p. 22.
Acceptance by the Interim Council of the development proposed in these pages will conclude the first stage of this challenging assignment. It is the outcome of six months of carefully programmed investigation, analysis and design — a short time indeed in which to lay the foundations of a great new university. As this is a task to which many institutions have devoted years of preparation, it is the more important that this submission should be regarded as the beginning of planning, rather than the end. (Master Plan, July 1965)

Twenty-five years ago La Trobe University's campus was an empty stage, awaiting setting, plot and players. So often, in the years since its transformation into today's populous, landscaped city of learning, visitors have asked me: did you ever dream it would be like this? How does the vision compare with the reality, they ask, enthusiastically embracing the whole environmental spread of buildings, trees, lawns, streams and courtyards — intriguing questions for which I can offer no easy answers.

At the beginning the dream was ethereal: a collective aspiration diffused through the minds of the founders, but lacking a definitive focus. The Third University Committee, after considering some fifty-seven possible sites, had recommended and received Government approval for the transfer to the University of approximately 500 acres of vacant farm land attached to the Mont Park Mental Hospital, Bundoora. With the proclamation of the La Trobe University Act in December 1964, the Committee became the Interim Council, under the continuing chairmanship of Mr J. R. A. (now Sir Archibald) Glenn. When he telephoned on Christmas Eve of 1964, informing me of his Council's appointment of my firm, Yuncken Freeman Architects, to undertake the master planning of the new University, and nominating myself as the responsible partner, my colleagues and I were precipitated into a new world. Here was a project large enough to stir the imagination and give scope for the creation of a total environment, yet small enough to offer the hope that its development could be comprehensively regulated; and one which offered the satisfying prospect of seeing the results in one's own lifetime.

The political vision had been romantically summarised by the Minister of Education, Mr (later Sir) John Bloomfield, when presenting the enabling Bill to the Victorian Parliament. Recalling the benevolent influence of Lieutenant-Governor Charles Joseph La Trobe in the foundation of the University of Melbourne over a hundred years before, he concluded: "... my most satisfying reflection at this moment is that my father's father sought for gold in our hills,
and he knew this city in the days of the man whom, at the behest of others, I am now trying to acknowledge. If Providence and this Parliament will it, my son's son may be taught in his aura and tradition."

When we came on the scene, the Interim Council, through its inaugural committees, was still developing its policies in such vital matters as academic planning, legislation, finance, colleges and housing. The timetable allowed only seven months in which to carry out planning research, develop a brief of requirements, and complete the master plan. This would leave only twenty months for construction of the engineering headworks and the design, building, furnishing and landscaping of the first academic buildings. Although this was obviously a high-pressure program, with many attendant risks, it was confidently assumed that it would be achieved, on time and without compromise. Which it was.

Looking back, I am amazed at what was accomplished in those first hectic months — by the Interim Council and its committees as much as by the consultant team of architects, planners, engineers, landscapers, costing experts and programmers that we had assembled. When we started in January 1965 it was a new type of problem for us, as for most of our colleagues. It was a challenge to excite the imagination and it unleashed great creative energy. Within three months we had made detailed surveys of the site, assembled a comprehensive data base, completed a world-wide investigation of outstanding new universities, and helped the Academic Planning Board to tabulate its requirements. By July, a comprehensive master planning report had been prepared and approved by the Interim Council. Buildings and site engineering works were being designed, the first trees were being planted and the bulldozers were waiting in the wings.

What followed was like the first stirrings of biological life: out of a sea of mud arose the beginnings of the plan's fulfillment. Ideas were being translated into construction; and that process continues to this day. I do not propose to dwell in detail on the long list of building and engineering works that have progressively transformed the farm into a campus. This chapter is about planning, which is to say the system whereby each of these projects was enabled to fit naturally and harmoniously into the total scene. However, in trying to recapture the mood and influences that prevailed and give something of the background to our quest for functional and environmental unity, the projects completed in the first ten years or so have particular significance, because they established the physical form and character of the University. The fact that their designers carried them through so closely in sympathy with the spirit and intent of the master plan was vital to its effectiveness. The authors of the main projects involved in this rather rare demonstration of professional co-operation are worthy of special note (See Appendix C).

****

This report is both a brief and a solution. For critical reasons of timing, it has been necessary to plan the University concurrently with the formulation by Interim Council of much of its policies. These policies have been clad with detail obtained by reference to the Committees of Council (and latterly to members of staff), and by the results of the planners' investigations at home and abroad. (Master Plan, July 1965)

In an ideal building world, the client knows what he wants and is able to provide a brief which clearly expresses his objectives. The architect takes it from there: there are well-trodden paths which lead to the conclusion of a normal building contract. In a project as unusual and complex as a completely new university, however, there are few precedents. Instead of a path, the planner faces a jungle. It is a unique experience; there are many issues, many committees, many ambitions. In university administrations decision making tends to follow democratic processes — admirable in drawing out collective wisdom, but not always to be relied on to keep pace with the exigencies of a high-speed, critical path, construction program. With only six months in which to research the problem, develop a brief and prepare the final master plan, one might have sighed for autocracy; were it not for the marvellous grasp and dedication of the members of the Interim Council and its committees.
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At the outset there was little for us to work on apart from a site, and a general intention that La Trobe would develop at a similar rate to Monash University, expanding from an initial enrolment of under 500 undergraduates to 10,000 over about ten years. It was simple enough to estimate the approximate extent of buildings, playing fields, car parking needs; but there were a thousand questions to be answered before even the first buildings could be located: the form they should take, their relationships to each other, the sort of environment in which they should be located, how they should be serviced, and so on. An established university is usually able to provide this kind of information by means of what is sometimes called an 'academic brief' — a working document that informs the planner of the client's practical and philosophical objectives, his space requirements, planning standards, enrolment projections, economic criteria and the like, all suitably tabulated for physical planning purposes. At La Trobe, where full-time staff would not be available for several critical months, it became one of our first tasks — and one of the most rewarding — to help put this together. It was done, quite informally, in a fascinating sequence of question-and-answer exchanges, mostly with members of the University's Building Committee, Academic Planning Board, and Colleges Committee. (See Appendix C). These included some of the most eminent visionaries in our community, and it was mainly through our discussions with them that their aspirations started to merge into a shared concept that could be written down, debated, quantified and agreed to as a practical starting point.

Equally important was the task of getting to know the site. Although the Mont Park farm had seemed at first unstimulating, closer inspection revealed a number of subtle characteristics which tied in well with the picture that was emerging from the academic brief. We arranged for a series of surveys to be carried out, to provide a topographical and geophysical information base in which every contour, tree and other significant feature of the site was recorded. We obtained information about the soils, the vegetation, the prevailing winds, the climate and the frequency of air traffic. With future generations in mind, the appearance of the site before the first bulldozers moved in was recorded in a comprehensive set of photographs. More subjectively, three distinguished artists were commissioned by a group of well-wishers to record their impressions. Their paintings were probably the first gifts to the University, and are the foundation of its now extensive art collection.

By the beginning of April we had reached the halfway point in the master planning timetable — the time by which academic requirements needed to be matched to the site characteristics and a common set of principles established. This is a crucial stage in any planning problem in which the shimmering goal can only be brought into focus through step-by-step analysis and progressive consultation with the decision-makers. Options are available at every stage, and the emergent plan will be the sum of the choices made at each of the many forks and crossroads along the way.

In considering their choices, members of the Interim Council were not content merely to follow local precedents, old or new. Many older universities, both at home and abroad, were struggling to escape the tangles of obsolescence and expediency that difficult times and unlucky or inadequate planning had forced upon them. Since that time, some brilliant recoveries have been made (the University of Melbourne being a notable example), but in 1965 the older Australian universities had little to offer venturers in a new age. Not for us the tired, inflexible old buildings, the lack of space for orderly expansion, the hazardous roads, the 'temporary' sheds left over from wartime emergencies, the duco-infested landscape.

Of our post-war universities, the Australian National University in Canberra was the first and most ambitious. It had been conceived as a national research and postgraduate institution, and planned accordingly. When it became obliged, under political pressure, to combine with the primarily undergraduate Canberra University College, which was situated on an adjoining site, the ANU's long-range campus planning had to be drastically modified. There were valuable lessons for La Trobe in the ANU experience: it offered, on the one hand, a shining example of environmental design and, on the other, a timely warning on the importance of
incorporating sufficient innate flexibility in the long-range plan to accommodate major changes of direction. Elsewhere, interesting developments were taking place: the University of New South Wales was expanding; Macquarie was moving; new ground had been broken dramatically at Monash; a stimulating planning report for the future Flinders University was starting to be put into effect.

But there was also a ferment of new thinking in other parts of the world. Many new universities under construction or already established in Great Britain, North America and elsewhere were experimenting with new planning and building concepts, in response to changing social attitudes, educational patterns and teaching methods. They were facing the realities of the post-war demographic bulge with a vigour and philosophical diversity that could not be ignored. With scarcely a backward glance at dreaming spires, red brick, or ivy league, the new campuses were advancing into the new age. We wanted to be in the vanguard.

Our clients were well aware of the winds of change and it was vital that we should find out what was going on. So it was with their encouragement that I undertook a five-week journey, racing round the world from university to university at a most un-academic pace, to talk to those involved about their motives and methods and to study the resulting work. This kind of research on-the-run may seem superficial by academic standards, but five weeks was all the time that could be afforded. Despite the headlong pace, the trip was extraordinarily informative and quite invaluable.

****

The Master Plan has been prepared under the guidance of the Building Committee, its details being presented to them stage by stage, and referred as appropriate to the Academic Planning Board and the College Committee. It is thus a collaborative interpretation of objectives... (Master Plan, July 1965)

The layout of the university clearly reflects the combined influences of site and academic objectives and their fusion into an integrated plan of development. The academic approach was positive and full of promise, whereas the physical approaches to the campus site were undistinguished. Once inside the boundaries, however, one could mentally screen out the peripheral blemishes and appreciate that they were merely wings on the empty stage, to be used or planted out as the mood took us. The opportunities for creating a new environment within the secluded valley became excitingly apparent. The planning and design conclusions that emerged were summarised at the time as follows:

1. The gently undulant valley calls for a horizontal rather than a vertical development.
2. Traffic problems should be forestalled by providing safe road systems and ample parking spaces, by grouping the main buildings within easy walking distance, and linking them with pedestrian concourses that by-pass motor traffic.
3. The plan must allow for a phased development in which the University is functionally and visually complete at each stage of its growth.
4. Within its framework there must be flexibility at all stages: flexibility for growth and change within the buildings and services, and in the nature and relationships of later additions.
5. There should be an affinity of design between all buildings and between buildings and the landscape.
6. The physical and economic necessities underlying each building problem should place no limits on design creativity; provided always that in the balance of taste, individual virtuosity is subordinated to the interests of overall cohesion.
7. To minimise problems of sun control, naturally lit spaces should face due north or south.
8. Rigid boundaries between Departments and Schools should be avoided, using modular integrated buildings as far as practicable for structural economy and to allow for changes of size and curricular requirements.

A further influence had been the condition attached to the transfer of the site under which
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the University was required to give back land for a new road link between the cities of Heidelberg and Preston. This new road was to relieve the serious hazard caused by general traffic using the private internal roads of the neighbouring Mont Park group of psychiatric hospitals as a through route. It was at first thought that the new road would follow a long peripheral route inside the University's boundary, thus leaving the bulk of its site intact. As we became more familiar with the academic requirements and with the characteristics of the site, we were drawn to a surprising and different conclusion, which came to exert a significant influence on the whole campus layout.

The shortest and most economical route for the new road would have been along a diagonal line roughly bisecting the site from its south-east corner in Heidelberg to its north-west corner on Plenty Road, Preston. A campus divided by a major traffic artery seemed, at first, unthinkable; but we were interested to note that by slightly bending the diagonal line southwards, the northern part of the site would be sufficiently enlarged to accommodate the whole academic building complex, whilst the flatter land south of the line would be ideal in size and terrain for outdoor sportsgrounds. A bridge would be needed near the mid-point of the new road, to maintain reasonable gradients across the valley and allow the passage of potential flood waters.

We recalled the busy ring road at the University of Mexico which divides the academic centre from the adjacent sporting facilities, including the famous Olympic stadium, and the clever underpasses that give safe walking access between them. It was only a short step to the realisation that if the bridge were widened sufficiently, the campus could flow beneath it in a generous landscaped sweep through which not only flood waters, but also pedestrian and vehicular traffic, could all be given safe passage.

The bent diagonal alignment had the further advantage (so far only partially realised) of bringing vehicular access close to the centre of University activity. The main entrance could thus be marked, not with crested piers and wrought iron gates but, in true 20th century style, with a landscaped, free-flowing clover-leaf intersection. This was agreed: the first of the proposed dual carriageways and bridges was constructed and duly named Kingsbury Drive, in honour of a local war hero.

Although only one of the clover-leaf ramps has been built so far, it illustrates the potential of what I have always regarded as the University's natural and most interesting approach. Entering the campus by this route, the whole southern aspect of the academic complex comes dramatically into view, framed by the bridge. Continuing up the valley, the road skirts the lakes to reach the security gates. Beyond them, if dreams come true, the Great Hall will be seen rising from the waters and reflected in them. As traffic intensifies, it may well become necessary to complete the original plan by duplicating Kingsbury Drive and adding the missing ramps to make this a full clover-leaf intersection. It would be a considerable relief if this could be planned in such a way that the on-grade junction of Kingsbury Drive and Waterdale Road, with its frustrating traffic lights, could be eliminated.

The Interim Council's desire for a compact central core had been well supported in our investigations. In the new universities we had visited there was a growing emphasis on the desirability of easy access between departments, of minimising delays in getting from lecture to lecture and from seminar to library, and for encouraging social intermixing rather than departmental isolation. The principle was exemplified in a number of American universities which had adopted a rule that academic facilities should be contained within a circle that could be traversed on foot in ten minutes. However, concentrations of buildings bring concentrations of people. Buildings have to be stocked, serviced and maintained, and these necessary activities require vehicles. People and vehicular traffic do not mix well and should be segregated. Therefore, the ten-minute walking circle containing the main university buildings needed to be planned as a pedestrian precinct, with vehicular traffic confined to outside its boundaries. This concept developed into the dual ring road system that now operates at La Trobe. An outer ring road (formed partly by the curving portion of the new public road)
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provides unrestricted access to the general parking areas, the playing fields and the security-controlled gateway to the inner campus. The inner road, accessible only through the controlled gateway, enables essential service vehicles, departmental cars and other authorised traffic to gain access to the buildings in the inner campus from the perimeter, without crossing the internal pedestrian routes. This circular complex of buildings, carparks and traffic routes could be fitted neatly into the enlarged northern sector of the site, leaving generous reserve space beyond the outer ring road in which ancillary developments could be accommodated.

The essential thrust of the overall plan was to have on the periphery an outer ring road with associated car parks, enclosing an inner circle of college sites which, in turn, enclosed the academic heart of the University. In this central area the Library and the large lecture theatres were deliberately placed around a two-level 'Agora' in order to generate the greatest concentrations of student movement at that point. As I wrote in 1967, the aim was to create a 'clustered Bohemia' where all members of the University would meet and mingle. The Agora was envisaged as 'a bustling precinct where one can shop, take a snack, scan notice boards, see a lunchtime film, attend meetings, entertain parents and friends — a forum where exposure to the richness and diversity of the academic community is inescapable.' In the central area, between the Agora and the colleges, were the teaching and research departments 'broadly zoned into Arts, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Biological Sciences.' Sites for a possible Medical School and for a teaching hospital in the north-west corner were to be linked by a system of elevated concourses designed to 'provide swift and safe pedestrian communication between departments at a higher level than service traffic.'

No master plan, however long considered, should be devised as an inflexible mould, but rather as a guide to the fulfilment of a concept within which adjustments can be made to accommodate changing academic needs ... The [La Trobe University] Master Plan, in its site layout and general recommendations, lays down a discipline which offers a fair guarantee of efficiency and architectural cohesion. Within it lie quite broad areas of freedom for academic and architectural expression. The significance of this discipline, in which practical and aesthetic considerations share equal importance, may not be evident for some time ... (Master Plan, July 1965)

No doubt the terms 'Master Plan' and 'Master Planner' have different meanings to different people. In the La Trobe context, the Master Planner's role was one of generous scope and special professional interest. The University's letter of invitation had stated: 'The Master Plan will provide a unity of conception which, while possessing a unique architectural character of its own, will enable freedom for the exercise of creative imagination by the individual architects ... [The Master Planner] would be required also to take responsibility for the co-ordination of all engineering services on the site ... [and] expected to co-ordinate the work of the architects of the individual buildings, in order that the characteristics of these buildings will contribute to the planned overall pattern of the University as a whole.'

The machinery for putting this magnificently understated brief into effect involved a great deal more than a roll of drawings, a plastic model and a bound report. These are important tools, but have the drawback of trying to give a static representation of a fast-moving train. As a university develops, there is a constant need for interpretation and adaptation of its physical planning to meet new requirements, and further safeguard the future. The recognition that needs must change with time is itself an important element in the plan. This point was emphasised, in the late 1950s, by the distinguished English architect, Sir Hugh Casson, in his development report to the University of Birmingham:

It is a truism that a university is a society founded for the advancement of learning and the dissemination of knowledge. This means that it is constantly changing, always on its way, its work never completed. Departments expand, contract, quadruple in size or virtually disappear within a few years, often in defiance of the most knowledgeable and expert forecasts. Any attempt to constrict the building's movement, either academically or physically, seems doomed, and rightly doomed, to failure.
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For all these reasons, historical data on which the master plan was based — demographic, geophysical, educational, philosophical, structural and aesthetic — are recorded in the master planning reports, as are the principles by which we hope the future may flow logically out of the past without loss of capital investments or spiritual direction.

Today, few people who visit or work on the campus are likely to give a passing thought to the carefully studied design processes by which the original physical environment was transformed into something unique and identifiable that of La Trobe University. They might admire the ornamental lakes and streams, little realising that they are part of a tightly engineered system of flood control. As they move through the buildings, courtyards and gardens, it is unlikely to cross their minds that they will be walking over a subterranean labyrinth of service access tunnels and ducts through which the engineering and communications services are distributed all over the campus and linked to the public utilities systems, with never a pole or a power line in sight. The fact that such diverse essentials as super-heated hot water, cold water, gas and electrical services and an ever increasing range of electronic communications lines invisibly follow their predestined routes from building to building, and that they do so in a landscaped environment in which pedestrians are protected from traffic, and buildings from fire and flood, well illustrates the diversity of considerations that had to be resolved into a unified system, namely the master plan.

I was fortunate to be able to call on consulting engineers of outstanding skills and experience to advise on such vital matters as traffic engineering, hydraulics and flood control, civil and structural engineering, energy sources and reticulation, acoustics and other specialised considerations. (See Appendix C). There were also programming experts to develop and monitor critical path timetables to ensure that the many strands of research, design and approval were brought together on time and in the right sequence; and costing specialists to guide the planners in keeping development costs within budget.

Another speciality which called for particular skills and experience was that of landscaping. Landscaping is often thought of only as providing pleasing surroundings to buildings and other structures but it also has important functional uses: proper attention to landscaping can minimise dust nuisance, can provide shelter from the wind, and can also provide necessary shade from the sun. In early 1967, I commented that, in relation to the Bundoora site, it was our intention to use landscape 'more than any other feature, to weld and unify the campus.' I added that it was this consciousness of the importance of landscaping that led to flood control measures being designed as a system of streams and lakes rather than drains, for example; of access roads as parkways; of car parks as glades.''

I had nominated Professor Lindsay Pryor of the ANU for this role. He and I had collaborated successfully on a number of projects in Canberra when he was in charge of landscaping there for the Department of the Interior. His experience in bringing botanical delight into the then vast, empty spaces of the national capital was unique, and he was thoroughly familiar with the special problems of universities. His presence in the planning team added an indispensable dimension to our enterprise. While his approach was no less scientifically-oriented than those of the engineering consultants, there was an underlying aesthetic consequence to his contributions which he understood and manipulated to splendid effect, in a way that is immediately appreciated by the lay observer. Everybody loves a garden, whereas the brilliant engineering works, subsumed into the landscape so effectively as to seem part of the natural order of things, are taken for granted.

At this point I must claim some credit for architectural perceptions. It has been said before that an architect is jack-of-all trades and master of none. I plead guilty, for without these magnificent specialists beside us, our planning would have been toothless. But I rejoice in what I see as the architect-planner's proper role: of probing out the human and physical elements of a problem, of analysing the components, of getting the right advice, of understanding the options and selecting from them in such a way that there is harmony between the parts, and unity in the whole. There is no single 'right' solution to this kind of problem. The
answer is a conditioned response to all the factors that impinge on it, and it may take many forms. The solution finally adopted is part reasoned, part spontaneously revealed, after exhaustive and often frustrating exploration. Of all the alternatives, it is the one that feels right and can be proved right by rigorous back-checking. It is a product of one's experience and perceptions, and it does not come out of a computer.

Architects' perceptions vary widely, of course. In the case of La Trobe, the authors of the early buildings were asked to subscribe to the over-riding perceptions embodied in the master plan; that is, to restrain the urge for extremes of individual expression in the broader interest of campus-wide cohesion. Was it too much to hope for the sense of unity that distinguishes a Georgian London square, or a hill-side village on a Greek island, or Jerusalem, built over millennia of the creamy stone on which it stands, but which is so rarely found in this, our land of contrasts run riot?

To my eternal gratitude, these colleagues entered into the spirit of ensemble, rather than one of virtuosi competing for attention. They collaborated as a group in establishing a common approach, based on a range of materials, planning principles and design elements, and these they applied sympathetically and imaginatively to their individual projects. Their buildings, designed in an age when architectural gymnastics are widely mistaken for creativity, are models of restraint, and the key to La Trobe's environmental cohesion.

 ****

Pending the appointment of foundation professors, the planning of academic departments has been sketched in only lightly; other details are still in need of definition. On the other hand, the Interim Council and its committees have been quite definite about the kind of university they require. (Master Plan, July 1965.)

When master planning started in January 1965, the University had no administrative staff to support the voluntary, part-time membership of the Interim Council and its committees. The Building Committee, under the vigorous chairmanship of Mr B.J. (later Sir Bernard) Callinan, provided us with an enlightened and responsive reference point. As dreams gave way to action, a more detailed level of liaison became necessary. David Myers has written of the consistency of our respective thoughts about the development of the site. I often wished for closer contact with him during those formative months but alas, he was mostly in Canada and unable to take up his appointment as Vice-Chancellor until September.

Some relief came with the appointment, in March 1965, of the University's first staff architect, Stewart Morton, as the foundation Buildings Officer. A month later, the redoubtable Frank Barnes took up duties, initially as Executive Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and subsequently as Business Manager, a position he held until 1972 when he resigned to become General Manager of the Sydney Opera House. These two figures were central to the transition of the master plan from ideas on paper to concrete construction in the field. With Barnes' vision, drive and infectious zest for the finer things of life, and Morton's effectiveness in meticulously extending the spirit of the master plan into detailed project briefs, events started to happen with a new sense of purpose and reality.

There was something symbolic about the choice of the first two buildings to be erected on the site. The Interim Council, in considering the academic structure in its broadest terms, had determined that the spiritual heart of the University should be its library, that the domestic and social activities of both students and staff should be based on colleges, and the academic activities on schools. It was expected that these fundamental intentions would be given expression from the very beginning; this naturally led to the library and the first of the colleges (Glenn) being selected for the initial building contracts.

Obviously, the small enrolment of students in the first year or two would not fill a college or populate a library; but there were many advantages in building two major projects, rather than a multiplicity of small ones, and using parts of them temporarily for teaching and administrative accommodation. Dietrich Borchardt has referred to some problems arising from the 'tenancies' in the library building which now bears his name but they did not last long and do
not appear to have impeded the library's fulfilment of its destiny to become the 'heart' of the University.

The appointment of my own firm to design the library building gave us the opportunity of testing out some important aspects of our master planning theory. At the same time, Jack McConnell of Hassell and McConnell Architects, was putting his own delightful interpretation of the master plan into effect in the design of Glenn College. This was to be the first and last college that wholly met the original intentions of the Colleges Committee. The 'college concept' was more fragile than that of the central library, and failed to survive the climate of unrest of the early 70s to which Sir Archibald Glenn and Dr Myers have referred in their essays.

At the outset, Interim Council had decided that every member of the University, whether resident or otherwise, would be attached to one of a number of colleges. Each college would incorporate certain academic and union-type facilities. In the master plan, sites were allocated for up to ten of these 'college-unions' as they were sometimes referred to, to be developed around the perimeter of the academic centre. Of these, only Glenn and Menzies Colleges were built in accordance with the original intent. By the time the third college (Chisholm) was being designed a different feeling was gathering force, and in 1971 Council decided to abandon the requirement on all students, whether resident or not, to be attached to a college. This substantially changed the nature of the colleges, which thus became more akin to halls of residence. In these circumstances the case for providing a conventional central union became irresistible.

Finding a suitable site for such a substantial addition to the building program placed a severe test on the plan's ability to meet unexpected changes, since the central areas, in which a union building would be most desirably located, were already fully committed. The master plan, rising to the challenge, provided a prominent and accessible site. The Union building, although not strictly central, lies well inside the pedestrian precinct. It is a popular success and a credit to its architects.

Of necessity, the master plan included provisions for other dreams and assumptions which have slipped into limbo — so far without dire consequences. It has been kept under review and adjusted to meet new requirements, without sacrifice of its major characteristics. The University's inability so far to develop professional courses to the extent intended at the outset has meant that large areas reserved for such facilities as engineering workshops and a teaching hospital have been encroached on, but not, I think, irredeemably. The amalgamation of the University with the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences and the siting of new buildings for its accommodation may close off some of these options; but ample scope remains for reinstating them in modified form and providing for further academic growth, as needs arise.

***

The Master Plan ... embodies a certain discipline which, in placing some limits on freedom in individual buildings, adds greatly to the scope for significant architectural achievement. It has built-in factors of basic economy, flexibility and cohesion ... simplicity, and opportunities for some subtle values and perhaps some splendor to emerge. (Master Plan, July 1965)

At the beginning, our sights were set on planning to accommodate 10,000 students within ten years. A quarter of a century later, it is gratifying to reflect that the University has not only surpassed that goal, but also successfully weathered a variety of political, social and economic storms, without being seriously deflected off course — at least, in respect of its physical development. It must be admitted, however, that the tremors have been fairly minor on prevailing scales of global mischief; and twenty-five years is far too early in La Trobe's history to risk extravagant claims for the long-term success of its planning. In the shorter term, we know that the first several generations of students have studied, played and graduated in as good an environment as any in Australia. The plan's ability to deal efficiently with both expansion and radical changes of direction has been proved and I feel confident that the in-built provisions for flexibility, cohesion and adaptability will enable these things to continue to happen more graciously and expeditiously, and with much less cost, debate, compromise and disruption, than would otherwise have been the case.
We are frequently reminded that we live in an age of change. It would be surprising, and beyond all my expectations, if the next quarter century did not bring quite dramatic changes. Indeed, it could even be a sign of effete middle age if the University was not obliged to contemplate quite major changes in that period, to enable it to meet future challenges effectively. In doing so, I hope for only three things.

First, that what I have referred to as ‘cohesion’ will be jealously maintained. By this I mean the general character of fairly low, earth-coloured buildings, harmoniously unified in a landscape of shrubs, trees and water that is basically Australian in feeling and endowed with something of the timelessness of our continent.

Second, and preferably in my lifetime, I would like to see the Great Hall completed on its lake-side site, set against the deliberately fine-grained background of the David Myers Building. I say this not only because there is a real and practical need for such a facility, but also for the reason that the composition of buildings on the formal approach to the University from the south will remain incomplete without it. The quiet, consistent character of nearly all of the present buildings is one of the campus’s greatest assets. In such a setting, it leaves scope for the occasional, well-placed jewel. The Great Hall site especially invites that touch of architectural exuberance that could give La Trobe what King’s College Chapel is to its precinct in Cambridge and St Mark’s Basilica to its piazza in Venice — the much-loved building by which an institution becomes identified.

Finally, and in all humility, I would like to see the appointment of an external planning consultant resumed. This post has been unfilled since my retirement as Master Planner in 1979. My experience in acting as site planning consultant to both La Trobe University and the ANU, through years of intense activity as well as years of doing little more than dream of better times, convinces me that the informed advisor from outside, regularly attending planning meetings and acting variously as watch-dog, critic and initiator, can play a vital role in helping a university maintain the high standards of physical planning and aesthetic quality to which its founders aspired. He is the ‘seeing eye’, unencumbered by internal politics and administrative routines, and detached from the contriving sectional interests that set traps for in-house planning staff.

I had been tutored in these matters in various places, and particularly by the central administration of the University of California, whose several beautiful campuses are models of efficient management and individual distinction. As I recall their rules, the master plan of each of these campuses is formally reviewed every year, and up-dated every five years. No buildings or grounds projects would be considered for approval by the Regents in Berkeley before the plans have been endorsed by the campus planning consultant and the consulting landscape architect (both prominent private practitioners) and the internal campus architect or buildings officer — a group which meets monthly to review and advise on every project and design detail that affects the environmental quality of the campus for which they are responsible. At La Trobe, which started bravely along similar lines, there has been no such procedure for over a decade — and it is starting to show.

...fulfilment will not come without interpretation. It is vital that the Master Plan should be regularly reviewed, refined in its detail, and adjusted within its general outlines to meet the new needs that undoubtedly will arise. Planning should be a continuous and evolutionary process ...
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The University Library
Dietrich H. Borchardt

1. The Setting

"... in Australia, the period that followed the Second World War and ended with the nineteen seventies must be recognised as one of distinctive importance in the formation and development of academic and research libraries ..." — thus the late Sir Peter Crisp, one-time chairman of the Australian Advisory Council on Bibliographical Services (AACOBS). Those of us who were privileged to be active librarians in that period have cause to be grateful: we had an opportunity to contribute to the rebirth of librarianship and library service which other generations must envy. Even more thankful were those who were involved in the creation of a new library at a time when national government and local community were seemingly at one in the belief that libraries mattered.

The foundation of La Trobe University fell into that very period. The Act proclaiming its establishment received the Royal Assent on 9 December 1964, about six years after the influential Murray Report which reiterated, as so many had been saying for decades, that a good university can be judged by the quality of its library and library service. In retrospect it has to be acknowledged that La Trobe University’s birth occurred when the high wave of popular and governmental support for institutions of higher education had already rolled over and begun its downward turn; but at the moment when this new institution was emerging from its relatively short period of gestation it was not yet evident that the depth of support for national academic development was slackening.

The invitation to join La Trobe came as a surprise. While in Turkey, on a UNESCO assignment in 1964, I received a letter from Mr (as he then was) J.R.A. Glenn asking for my agreement to my name being placed on the short list for the librarianship of a new university to be established in the north-eastern suburbs of Melbourne. I raised no objection — and then forgot all about it. On our return journey by car from Ankara to Paris we (my wife, my son and myself) called at the post office in Rome where to my astonishment I found the following telegram on 5 February 1965: ‘Letter written above address inviting you to accept appointment as librarian to La Trobe University stop warmest congratulations and hope you can accept. Glenn.’ It amused me to reflect many years later that I only received a formal instrument of appointment some weeks after having taken up duty, a sharp contrast to the approach taken in 1982, when the second incumbent was to be appointed. In 1964-65 the role of university librarian at La Trobe was still somewhat ill-defined; the only clear indication of University policy was contained in the newspaper advertisement which had clearly stated that the position was to be equal to that of a professor in the University. At the time, the equivalent position at the University of Melbourne appeared to be under a cloud of mismanaged personal relations while at Monash University personality issues had soured the claims of that library to lead Australian academic research libraries in the terms and conditions it offered to its staff. Having looked at the Melbourne scene from Tasmania, partly with envy, partly with a good deal of compassion and sympathy, I was anxious and determined not to have a repetition of the unfortunate history of Victorian academic librarianship visited upon me or the institution which I had been asked to join.
2. Library and Academia

Fundamental to the growth and achievements of La Trobe University's Library has been the fact that it was from the beginning recognised as a quasi-independent unit on a par with the various academic Schools. It was regarded as a discrete financial sector with a legitimate claim for financial support not essentially different from that of the Schools or of the administrative sectors of the University.

Two complementary notions followed this. One was that the Library was seen as a service department with the primary obligation to cater for enrolled students as were the departments in their teaching. The other was that the Library was expected to develop collections and services that would support research interests throughout the University, including those of the Library staff itself. This expectation was perhaps not fully understood by all who joined the University in the first few years, but it was clearly the view of the Council, of the senior administrators, and of the foundation deans.

From this view of the role of the Library in the academic community it followed that the Chief Librarian must at all times be fully aware of academic issues and plans. As a result the Chief Librarian was included ex officio on all committees and boards where the Library's interests were likely to be discussed. This had far reaching effects and caused a good deal of misunderstanding, jealousy and ill feeling among those members of the teaching staff whose own vision of the role of an academic library was derived from the past. Over the years, much of this feeling disappeared, though it re-emerged from time to time when overall University structure was discussed; however, it must be added at once that, except for one or two isolated instances, there was considerable harmony between the teaching staff and the Library staff.

Even the use of these terms: teaching staff, library staff, academic staff, attained somewhat new dimensions when it was accepted that the professional library staff was as academic as most teaching staff. These matters may seem, in retrospect, to be footling, mean, and irrelevant but at the time they became quasi-philosophical issues when the professionally qualified library staff was granted conditions of appointment substantially equal to those of the teaching staff. This equation brought in its train the presence and acceptance of Library staff on University committees. It also brought with it an obligation — strongly fostered by the administration, the senior librarians, the Library Committee and many others — for the professional Library staff to engage in appropriate research activities, be they related to academic disciplines or to the profession of librarianship.

The Library's main link with the other sectors of the academic community was based on the Chief Librarian's ex officio membership of the Academic Board. It is at this supreme academic level that decisions are made and it was quite clearly in the minds of those who drafted the Act that the Chief Librarian should fully participate in that body's deliberation. It should not need spelling out that the purpose of that provision was to ensure that the Library would be at all times well informed of academic plans and policies because all of these do affect the Library's own programs.

Membership of the Academic Board brought in its train participation in other senior committees. By resolution of the Board, early in 1967, the Chief Librarian joined the Dears' Committee and the Budget Advisory Committee. Other ad hoc committees also included the Chief Librarian whenever academic policy was likely to impinge upon the Library, a point well noted by the library profession one of whose senior members made the following observation: 'La Trobe has attempted to establish specialities in teaching and study and the position of the librarian is designed to ensure that the proper equipment of the library will both precede and accompany such developments.'

In this context of the relationship between the Library and the academic community, it should be noted that the Library Committee, established in 1967 was made a committee of the University Council. The purpose of this move was to avoid the vicissitudes experienced by the library in other academic institutions where this central university organ
First Meeting of Third University Committee, May 1964. Clockwise: Emeritus Professor Thomas (later Sir Thomas) Cherry PhD, ScD, FRS; Mr John (later Sir John) Buchanan CMG; Dr W.C. Radford MBE, MA, MEd, PhD; Mr F.H. Brookes MSc, DipEd; Mr J.A. Hepburn; Mr C.E. Newman LLB; Mr Henry (later Sir Henry) Bolte (Premier) GCMG, KCMG; Mr J.R.A. (later Sir Archibald) Glenn OBE, BCE; Mr John (later Sir John) Bloomfield MLA, QC, LLB; Mr J.D. Norgard BE (later AO); Professor R. Selby Smith OBE, MA (Oxon), MA (Harvard); Mrs Kathleen Fitzpatrick BA, MA (Oxon); Dr P.G. Law CBE, MSc (later AO). Missing: Sir Michael Chamberlin OBE; Mrs Whitney King BA, LLB.

Looking south-west in December 1966 over Car Park 6 to Glenn College and the Library. Kingsbury Drive and the main sports oval are under construction at the rear of the site.
Looking west northeastern across the University site in July 1965 towards the Preston Central Cemetery. These trees shall exist and no close to the rear of the present Union Hall. The present central campus area is behind them and the Kinghorn Drive–Plenty Road intersection further behind on the horizon.
Looking north-west from the present Chisholm College site to the Library and Thomas Cherry Building under construction. Taken in 1967.

The first appointments. Staff at the temporary location of the University on St Kilda Road in December 1965. From top: D. Borchardt; F. Barnes; D. Breeton; Dr Myers; J. Quixley; G. Stecher; E. Richardson; E. Small; F. Saul; A. Stengierska; R. Griffiths; D. Lee; H. Landers; P. Breen; J. Scrivener; S. Morton; Mrs McGregor; S. O’Donoghue; C. Davies; S. Boreyn; A. Bush; P. Longley; M. Low; P. Doyle; F. Angus; D. Egan.
Opening of the University and Installation of the Chancellor, 8 March 1967.

Sir Robert Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, congratulates J.R.A. Glenn, the newly-installed Chancellor of La Trobe University, 8 March 1967.
La Trobe's first graduation ceremony held in the Glenn College Dining Hall, December 1969.

Arthur Gray (left) and Les Moon of the Services Branch presenting a 'Battle Honours' banner at the retirement function for the first University Registrar, Major-General T.S. Taylor, 7 November 1974.

Major-General T.S. (Tim) Taylor, the first Registrar of La Trobe University, 1965.
The Vice-Chancellor, Professor John Scott, congratulating Roy Simpson, University Master Planner after he was admitted to the Degree of Doctor of the University during the graduation ceremony on 20 May 1983.

Mr Frank Saul, the University’s first Curator, handing out pay slips to landscaping staff shortly before his retirement in 1976.

La Trobe University looking east-south-east, March 1976.
Three La Trobe Chancellors. (L-R): Sir Archibald Glenn, 1st Chancellor of the University (1967-72); Hon. Mr Justice R.E. McGarvie, 3rd Chancellor of the University (1980-); Hon. Mr Justice R.A. Smithers, 2nd Chancellor of the University (1972-80). This photograph was taken at a ceremony on 18 February 1981 when Mr Justice McGarvie was installed as the 3rd Chancellor, and the degree of Doctor of the University was conferred on Sir Archibald Glenn and Mr Justice Smithers.

Dr David Myers, the first Vice-Chancellor, and Mrs Beverley Myers at a farewell dinner held in their honour on 2 December 1976.

The University's first Chief Librarian, Dietrich Borchardt, with his H.C.I. Anderson Award from the Library Association of Australia, September 1979.
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was given inferior status under some academic body and as a result became the football of the more influential professors whose irrational demands on its services placed the library in a subservient position where it could make no independent contribution to academic life.

At La Trobe, it was agreed from the beginning that the Library Committee, however constituted, would be a source of advice to the Library and its staff. It was firmly precluded, however, from having any direct influence on library administration or indeed on any internal library matters. It was understood, of course, that the Library Committee, representative as it was of the academic community, would be a sounding board and a supportive group for the Chief Librarian who in fact consulted with the Committee on many proposals for actions or changes in the running of the Library, for example hours of opening, reserve book supplies, fines, serials policies, and specific complaints from users. The constitution of the Library Committee, with the Chief Librarian as its ex officio chairman, was laid down early in the Statutes and remained unaltered, except for size, until the end of 1981. On the impending retirement of the foundation Chief Librarian, a Council Committee was set up in 1979 to examine the future role and status of the Chief Librarian in the University. The only major change recommended was that the chairmanship of the Library Committee should be held by a lay-member of Council. The change was to take effect after the retirement of the foundation Chief Librarian. Though possibly coupled with a desire to diminish the Chief Librarian's role, the proposed change had the advantage of the Library now being directly represented on Council and, thanks to the perception of the new chairman, the relationship between the Library Committee and the Library administration and the general running of the Library remained unaltered.

Lastly, in this context it is important to note that the management of the Library's financial resources was recognised as being the responsibility of the Chief Librarian and those senior members of the Library staff concerned with acquisitions and services organisation. There was to be no indirect allocation of funds to Schools or Departments to which the label 'for library purposes' might be attached — a practice all too common in other Australian universities. During the foundation period it was arranged that the Library had a sufficiently large allocation to meet the University's aim of having a reasonable collection of books and serials on the shelves on opening day but it had to take its place in the queue once teaching and research got under way.

Fortunately, the foundation Vice-Chancellor had a very clear view of the role and significance of the library in the academic community. Furthermore he had a firm conviction that senior academics would do best if given full responsibility for their respective areas and that government by committee would resolve any difficulties where such responsibilities overlapped or might clash. Consequently a Budget Advisory Committee was established consisting of the heads of all major spending areas — the Deans, the Chief Librarian, the Registrar and the Business Manager — to discuss the Vice-Chancellor's budget proposals for the ensuing year. While the allocations to Schools were based largely on student numbers (a formula which caused no serious problems during the first ten years but became more and more of a procrustean bed as public and student interest drifted away from the science Schools) the Library's allocation was set at about nine to ten per cent of the University's total income from government sources. This figure actually applied from 1972; until then the Library's percentage had been considerably higher to meet the costs of the establishment years.

The Library was expected to meet the cost of staff, materials, equipment and minor repairs from its allocation. Naturally, the actual payments were made by the Business Manager's Department as was the case with all other spending areas. This 'global' approach to library funding was at the time another innovation in the Australian academic scene. It greatly assisted planning for resources and services. While staff establishments were subject to Council approval, it was relatively easy to arrange transfers of
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funds from one column to another, provided the overall restraints were met. The requisite procedure allowed the University to keep an oversight over monies spent and internal allocations to the Library. In the wake of the federal government's down-grading of universities in 1974/75, certain aspects of these financial arrangements were revised towards the end of the seventies. In particular, stringent controls were imposed upon staffing, especially through restrictions on the filling of vacancies. The effects of this revised policy were not felt seriously until about 1980 and thereafter more severely in the period 1981-85 when non-professional support staff was allowed to be seriously reduced. During the ensuing quinquennium the staff ratios appear to have been returned at least close to the original plans.

At all times it has been University policy to allocate to the Library a sum believed to be sufficient to meet the University's bibliographic needs. This policy was wholly supported by the foundation Chief Librarian on the assumption that the Library would provide services commensurate with the monies allocated; if these were insufficient, the sufferers would be those engaged in teaching and research, not the Library. Consequently, supplementation of financial resources was a very rare exception in the first decade and a half, arising solely from conditions outside the University's control, such as the devaluation of the currency or special decisions of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC). While arrangements were made occasionally to divert money from the Schools to the Library, these were essentially ad hoc arrangements and were never used for purchases involving continuous commitments such as subscriptions to journals. By the mid 80s, in the face of a shrinking library dollar, the University accepted the principle of supplementing library funds in accordance with the CTEC's formula in calculating the amounts due to the universities; that formula took into account the inflation factors affecting the cost of library materials.

3. Library Staff

Each professional appointment made in the foundation period was considered by a selection committee, and this became the established practice. The nature and composition of these committees changed over the years until, in the late 1970s, their constitution and range of control was enshrined in the University's Administrative Handbook. While this later codification of staff selection guidelines attempted to define the hierarchical relationship between staff ranks, a precise and detailed prescription of desired qualifications was found to be as impractical then as it had been in the beginning. For all senior positions, management skills and professional interests were of course rated very high, but evidence was also sought of creative talent and of written contributions made or about to be made to the profession or to some academic disciplines.

Given the University's view of the role of its Library, it will come as no surprise that the conditions of appointment for the professional Library staff were kept very similar to those of tutors, lecturers and professors. This arrangement has been criticised by some university administrators as well as by government authorities at state and federal level. When eventually such criticism from the (as it then was) Australian Universities Commission (AUC) became almost a threat, La Trobe's administration asked for guidance and suggestions for an alternative set of conditions. In its Delphic reply the AUC advised La Trobe that it could and should choose between three possible scales of salary and attendant conditions of employment: the public service schedule as implemented by the State Library of Victoria; a scale and conditions based on those applying to the University's clerical staff; or set up a scale which it determined itself. La Trobe chose the third suggestion and, for better or for worse equated professional Library staff with the teaching staff.

In supporting his recommendation that the equation with the teaching staff should be maintained, the Chief Librarian convinced the University that the activities of the senior Library staff were not essentially different from those of the teaching staff. It was
argued that the choice and preparation for use of library materials as well as helping students to exploit them was different in method but not in nature or purpose from the task in which every lecturer was constantly engaged when facing a class. If teaching skills were to be taken as criteria in the assessment of staff, library activities should be equally respected, and if lecturers were to be rated for their research activities, library staff should also have to engage in similar activities to be considered for promotion or tenure.

The most outstanding characteristic of La Trobe University's Library staff was — and still is — the harmony and co-operation existing between all sections and individuals and this deeply affects staff performance. This co-operative spirit was fostered by a non-traditional practice of democratic organisation which enabled the professional staff to operate and manage their areas of responsibility according to their own lights. Staff meetings would establish policies but there was no paternalistic supervision and no control of day-to-day performance. Results were expected, failure to deliver was noted, but nobody was held to a strict time schedule. This attitude and the personal response to the daily demands of work have made it possible to live as professional family in the best sense of the word.

Staffing at the non-professional level has always seemed very important to the senior professional staff and during my tenure of the post of Chief Librarian care was taken that there was enough support staff to underpin the services the Library was expected to render. Inevitably, there was more coming and going of non-professional staff, many of whom were female clerical assistants whose marriage and family responsibilities caused many changes in personnel. There can be no question however, that it is the clerical and support staff who in the end make library services possible.

Professional staff interested in pursuing research into librarianship, theoretical or applied, were given all possible encouragement. In particular the Library began quite early in its history to issue a series of Library publications which is self financing and provides the staff with a means of getting the results of research into print. The series includes significant bibliographic studies such as *Bibliographies on the Australian Aborigine* by John Thawley (2d ed., 1987), *Nineteenth century plant nursery catalogues* by Rosemary Polya (1981), *Local history in Victoria ... and Victorian directories, 1831-1974* by Carol Beaumont and Margot Hyslop (1980), and the *Checklist of Royal Commissions Select Committees of Parliament and Boards of Inquiry*, a well known index to Australian public tribunals of inquiry compiled by D.H. Borchardt (Pts. 1-3 published in Sydney; Parts 4 & 5 and supplementary volume for 1960-1980 published in the Library series, 1975-1987).

Numerous other bibliographies and works on librarianship and related topics have been compiled by members of the Library staff. Examples include *Australian bibliography* by D.H. Borchardt (3d ed. 1979), *Librarianship in Australia, New Zealand and Oceania* by D.H. Borchardt and J. Horacek (1975), *Australian official publications* edited by D.H. Borchardt (1979), and *Bibliographical services to the nation ... Proceedings of a conference...* edited by D.H. Borchardt and John Thawley (1981). D.H. Borchardt and John Horacek have also edited one of Australia's leading scholarly journals for the profession, *Australian academic and research libraries* (1970-)

4. The Building
The first pencil line for the prospective library building plans was drawn, figuratively speaking, on the day I arrived back in Melbourne from my UNESCO assignment in Turkey, on Saturday 13 March 1965. Arrangements had been made for me on that auspicious day to be collected from the airport and taken almost directly to meet the Chairman of the University's Interim Council, Archibald Glenn, at the house of the Master Planner already appointed by the Council, Roy Simpson. Jet lag and some apprehension made it difficult for me to cope with so important an interview with persons I had never met before and I scarcely took in all the questions to which they wanted answers. One and, in retrospect, clearly the most important issue discussed and solved was that we all
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wanted a centralised library system, a single library building and no nonsense about departmental collections or branch libraries.

To reaffirm that decision it was also agreed that the Library should be at the centre of the academic building complex and that it should be possible for a healthy person to walk from any academic area of the campus to the entrance of the Library within five minutes. Thanks to the Master Planner this has been achieved and has helped to prevent any serious clamour for the establishment of specialist collections on campus. The only exception was made by the Library itself in creating an education curriculum laboratory collection located in the School of Education; the main reason for this exception being the special nature of the material held in that collection.

Stage I of the Library building was one of the first two buildings to be erected on the campus (the other being Glenn College). Both were intended initially to serve multiple purposes and had therefore to be so designed that each could eventually be dedicated solely to its originally intended purpose and also be extended in the fullness of time. The three storied area of ca. 5200 square metres built in 1965-67 was therefore fitted out at first to house not only the Library but also the laboratory-based departments of the University's science Schools. A small lecture room was also provided.

It should be made clear, at this stage, that there were strongly divergent views on the needs of the science Schools. Several of the foundation professors in the sciences and most other senior academics believed that first year science students were not dependent on the traditional laboratory sessions. If that view had been accepted much building expense could have been saved and more attention could have been given to the detailed needs of library services in a building intended to revert to library purposes after twelve to fifteen months. In the event however, the University's chief adviser on science teaching (himself a physicist) persuaded the majority of those concerned to construct first year laboratories and to allow no compromise of traditional science teaching methods. Here, as in most other academic disciplines, La Trobe chose to follow in the well worn path of academic tradition and such innovations as were eventually incorporated in the curricula and teaching methods developed much later. New approaches to academic processes were as hotly resisted at La Trobe as at any of the older universities and much time was lost in the process of creating a genuinely new academic institution. The reason for this is perhaps not far to seek: every one of the new appointees had been taught and had worked within a traditional setting before joining La Trobe.

It is worth recording briefly that library operations had, of course, started many months before the first building was ready for occupation. Staff began collecting and preparing books and journals from the moment a set of rooms had been assigned to them in the St Kilda Road suites in June 1965 and after a few months boxes of books and journals were sent to a factory building in West Heidelberg. The processing staff — cataloguers and others associated with preparing the books for the shelves — followed and soon the factory building was a hive of activity. All material ready for shelving was placed in boxes which in turn were so stacked that on the appointed day they could be easily transferred by lorry to the new library building and arranged in a meaningful order on the floor near the shelves on to which they were to go.

The refurbishing of the first stage building, when the science Schools had moved into their own quarters, was another traumatic experience. All of a sudden, there was enough space to swing any number of cats; books and periodicals could be housed comfortably and became much more readily accessible to library users. However, some areas still remained sequestered to science teaching for a further twelve months. By 1969, all traces of the science Schools had disappeared from the Library building and the Library's proper functions and services began to develop according to the original plan. In conformity with the Master Planner's overall design for an above ground communication passage throughout and between the academic buildings, the main entrance to the Library was
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placed on the second level of the Library building and protected against inclement weather by Allen David's large and colourful glass screen — intended it was said to symbolise the Australian sun or the sun in Australia.

When the broad plans for the University Library were first being prepared, the Chief Librarian's estimates for the housing of a collection of 1 million volumes and seating for twenty-five per cent of the University's population were scarcely taken seriously by the University Council of the day. Finance had been provided for staff and materials to have a basic collection of 50,000 volumes ready for the first student intake but few could imagine what they meant in terms of shelf space and fewer could envisage the need for a large academic collection. Comparisons with other institutions and perhaps the persuasiveness of those most concerned led to an early extension of the first stage building to more than double its size. Early in 1971 the temporary north wall of the first building was taken down to open up the greatly extended floors. All present were astonished at the considerable distance that had now to be walked from the entrance to the new northern wall of the building, but this was only one consequence of a novel and complex approach to library services offered over three levels on a gross floor area of ca. 11,000 square metres.

One must remember, of course, that an increase of the Library building was not just the result of hopeful thinking. Indeed a great deal of pressure from users and library staff was needed to persuade the authorities that the Library was gradually becoming too small to render quality services. Submissions made by the University to the government eventually reached ears willing to listen and, with the support of CTEC, a leading architect was engaged to prepare first drawings for a magnificent tower-like extension to the Library in 1979/80. Unfortunately the submission was overtaken by a freeze on all new government capital projects and the drawings were set aside. It was not till 1983 that the University's pleas for Library extensions were heeded. Entirely new plans were prepared and accepted leading to the present building. I for one was much more pleased with these new plans, drawn up by a firm widely experienced in library design.

Despite several relocations of functional areas in the course of two major extensions the overall design for the whole Library building and its services has remained much as it was originally planned. To this day, all serials holdings and associated services as well as the bindery and staff areas are on the ground level. To those functional areas a large compactus shelving system was added in 1985/86. The second level contains the main entrance, reader services including a large reference collection, the public catalogues, technical services and the Library administration, as well as, since 1985/86, the microform and music collections and associated services together with general non-book materials. Monographs — split at one stage into a High Use Collection and a Research Collection (more will be found on this point below) — are now all shelved together in one classified sequence on the third level, surrounded by the bulk of reading areas. In all, the Library now offers a total of 1700 seats and forty-nine carrels. The capacity of the Library is now far in excess of 1 million volumes.

On the retirement of the foundation Chief Librarian, the University named the building the Borchardt Library.

5. Collection building

The Chief Librarian's mandate at the time of his appointment was to have ready for use, in a building still to be designed and constructed, a collection of about 50,000 volumes covering a set of University disciplines as yet totally undefined and to be taught at depths which would only be determined by teaching staff still to be appointed. An initial student population of about 500-600 bodies was expected. I have often been asked: 'Where did you start? How did you guess?' It has always been difficult to give an answer.

I had a vision of what I wanted, and I could see no other institution offering anything comparable. In my valedictory address, in December 1981, I called it 'The bibliovision
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splendid'. A university library, in my view, is a purposeful assemblage of monographs and serials that meets the needs of its prime users in two ways. On the one hand it offers them, as far as possible, the very text they want at the time they want it; on the other, it provides an unfailing source of information on where to locate any reference not available on the spot. To achieve the first objective, the library needs financial resources that are rarely within its reach. To attain the second, one needs a moderately large but specialized collection of books skilfully brought together to serve as a bibliographic reference collection, particularly in the fields where the library's own holdings are relatively weak.

On this basis I set out to plan an acquisition program which would in the first place, cover the standard disciplines such as English language and literature, history in general and Australian history in particular, geography, economics, social sciences, basic philosophy and psychology, mathematics, biological sciences, chemistry, physics and earth sciences. There would be no doubt that these disciplines would be taught. It was more hazardous to guess which modern languages would be offered and what particular brand of reforming zeal would dominate the disciplines that make up the social sciences.

Another factor influencing the choice of books and journals was the presence of four major collections in Melbourne: the State Library, the Libraries of the University of Melbourne and of Monash University, and the principal library of the CSIRO complex. Ideally it would have been most desirable to ensure that, while each of these institutions offered basic bibliographic fare to its clients, each would also develop excellence and in-depth resources for particular subjects. A few meetings were organised during 1966-68 to discuss this and similar proposals but a marked difference between the university libraries soon became obvious. Though the two older universities, and Monash University in particular, had considerable financial resources, much greater than those of La Trobe, their librarians appeared to have little freedom in using those resources as they thought fit. In the event, no progress of substance was made in the field of co-ordinated acquisition policies and personality problems further bedevilled any future attempts in this direction.

The point has already been made that La Trobe's Chief Librarian had the right and the duty to determine how the money allocated to his area of responsibility was to be spent to bring the maximum benefit to the University. This might be amplified by the simple and categorical statement that the Library would receive requests and suggestions for the acquisition of library materials, but that it would not receive orders or demands. The Library retained at all times, and to this day, the right to reject requests for the purchase of materials considered undesirable, unsuitable or unnecessary. The Library had the obligation, however, to ensure that all reasonable requests were fulfilled — an obligation which became more difficult as the University grew and specialist areas of academic concern needed attention. Nevertheless, the principle has always been honoured as long as the Library's funds could manage it.

Two methods were used to meet these legitimate expectations with respect to monographs. One was for the Selection Librarian to discuss with teaching and research staff in detail their bibliographic needs, refining their areas of interest, pointing out the means of identifying the literature, and exploring the means of supplying the material. The teaching and research staff were asked to supply lists of wants and to identify the subject fields of interest to them. On the basis of this information the Selection Librarian would proceed to search for and order monographs — consulting with the appropriate staff members whenever necessary. The other method was simply to pass on to the interested staff member publishers' advertising leaflets and the like, and let the staff member do all the work of evaluation and choosing and passing his or her recommendations back to the Selection Librarian. Both methods worked reasonably well and allowed the Selection Librarian to exercise considerable discrimination in his efforts to build a strong collection in the various disciplines.
These recollections need some amplification to explain why La Trobe chose its particular road to collection building. Going back to that question “Where did you start?”, it may amuse those who really want to know that among the first books acquired were some standard English and foreign dictionaries. One day very early in the piece, I wandered into the city to pick off Cheshire’s shelves a small number of basic reference books; alas, there was nowhere to have them sent until the University took over several offices in St Kilda Road. Eventually the books arrived there, were unwrapped and placed in the Chief Librarian’s new office. It was not much to boast of and I became anxious to have before me more substantial evidence of my professional acumen and financial resources.

So I sent a cable to Martinus Nijhoff, in The Hague, asking for a first edition of Diderot and D’Alembert’s Encyclopedia. This was indeed the first major purchase made by La Trobe University Library. It arrived in the fullness of time, much admired to this day as one of the most significant acquisitions made by the Library and treasured in its Rare Books collection.

When La Trobe began its search for a foundation professor in foreign languages, a good deal of discussion took place regarding any specifications the University might set out in its advertisement. Some Council members expressed concern lest the best candidate might turn out to be a specialist in Icelandic or Flemish or Polish, but it was agreed after some lengthy discussions, to have the advertisement phrased quite without bias and prescription. La Trobe wanted the best qualified professor of a foreign language it could get. In the event two persons were chosen, one offering French, the other Spanish. With regard to the latter I was deeply interested when the applicant explained that his particular field was Latin America — and so it happened that La Trobe University Library developed one of the strongest Latin American collections in Australia.

This belies the claims made by most other university libraries that the day-to-day demands for library materials to meet the needs of staff and students in the university’s officially recognised disciplines make it impossible for the library to have a specific acquisition policy of its own. La Trobe’s Library is no less hard pressed to purchase monographs and serials for its own staff and students than other institutions but an enlightened library policy does make it possible for the Library to have its own acquisition program. This also allows for some continuity of acquisition projects which may be temporarily abandoned, or relegated to a low priority, by changes in the teaching staff.

The policy adopted with regard to library materials for the pure and applied sciences was based on different considerations. Acknowledging the presence in Melbourne of the substantial science collections in the two other universities and of the very extensive holdings of the Head Office Library of CSIRO, it was decided to acquire in the first place only some standard texts and backsets of periodicals going back no more than ten years, to rely on interlibrary loan services to supply materials not yet acquired, and to await the arrival of the foundation professors for a revision of this policy. It turned out, however, that the incoming professors were entirely in agreement with this approach and merely added requests for specialised periodicals and textbooks in their particular fields.

Like other university libraries, La Trobe has found it difficult to set down on paper details of its acquisition policy. It has been easier to define what will not be collected, or at least what subjects and areas the Library will not seek to develop in depth. Thus, a formal decision was made in 1967/68 that the Library would not collect Asian language materials; yet some monographs in Chinese and in some other oriental scripts have been added to the collection on the basis of their being exceptions. The same applies to books printed in Cyrillic characters. It was also decided quite early in the history of the Library that there should be no competition with the Australiana collections in the State Library and elsewhere. However, the development of courses in Australian literature, history, politics and society, on the one hand, and the research interests of the Science-based Schools in Australian earth sciences, flora and fauna have brought with them a need for extended
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collections of Australian publications, including retrospective publications. The increasing availability of relatively cheap reprints has obliged the Library to change this aspect of its policy somewhat. Even so, the acquisition of Australian imprints is restricted to publications required by the user rather than for their rarity or collectors' interest.

The continuous problem of serial subscriptions, their frightening impact on the Library's budget and on its ability to acquire other materials, has brought in its wake some minor level of co-operation between the major Melbourne libraries. A lot remains to be done. As far as periodicals are concerned, regional committees under the auspices of various national and regional organisations have examined the existing level of duplication and some steps have been taken to reduce the number of subscriptions for specialised journals. This has had the sad side-effect of pushing up prices of journal subscriptions. The problem is still with us and the continuing shortage of library funds makes decisions on periodicals even harder. Like other universities, La Trobe has been obliged to resort to the simple rule that requests for new journal subscriptions can be acceded to only if an existing subscription is cancelled. This is a most unsatisfactory way of proceeding but in the interest of maintaining monograph acquisitions programs it in a rough but acceptable economic measure.

Apart from the modest Latin American collection, the Library has developed special strengths only in a few narrow disciplines or areas. The lack of a genuine stimulus from the teaching and research staff and, of course, the lack of substantial financial resources largely explain this limited development. However, the Library did succeed in building up a strong collection of government publications and, perhaps more importantly, in organising and servicing it better than was (or is?) the case in any other academic library in Australia. None would dispute, one hopes, that the output of the country's most prolific publishers — the Commonwealth and state government printers — is of vital interest to the community at large and to academia in particular. Strangely, very few libraries are prepared to spend time and effort on making this vast resource of statistical, legal, social science and particularly economic data available in a manner that facilitates its use. While Australian federal and state documents quite naturally represent the largest portion of the La Trobe collection, there is also quite some strength in documents emanating from the British and Canadian governments, from the European communities and several other national series, with material of parliamentary, legislative and statistical importance dominating.

6. Services

If buildings, books and bibliothecaries a library make, they do so only for the benefit of users who consist, of course, of many different types, though in our universities two categories prevail: undergraduate students who need books and occasionally journal articles for basic information and supporting data to compile assignments, and senior students, teaching and research staff with scholarly objectives that require a bibliographic infrastructure to support research at varying levels of sophistication. This section describes our attempts to meet these two requirements and the steps taken to assist in the educational aims of the University.

In spite of the noisy and often immoderate claims made for the new computer-based reference retrieval methods, a rather different cry for help sounded clearly in my ears: it was a cry for help and it came from the ordinary, unsophisticated student. The ordinary student is the daily bread of every academic institution in Australia. It is a figment of librarians’ imagination that these students want or need computerised services to pass the first three stages of almost any subject. It seemed to me most important to satisfy the students' needs first. With this attitude, and without shutting our eyes either to the technological evolution in library services or to the numerous failures which accompanied the development of computer-based systems, La Trobe University Library concentrated first on creating quality manual systems which were to meet immediate needs and to lay the
The advent of computer-based, bibliographic retrieval systems has imposed upon libraries the need to adopt a uniform approach to descriptive cataloguing, an approach taken up at the international level and based to an important degree on Library of Congress practices. These considerations persuaded the senior Library staff to make certain decisions which led to practices now so well established that they are taken for granted. For instance, the Library adopted the seemingly simple rule: 'No conflict with Library of Congress descriptive cataloguing' - except in the case of Australiana where local knowledge might persuade us to prefer Australian practice should they differ from the Library of Congress. The effect of this decision benefited us when computerisation eventually arrived.

In the choice of a classification system to arrange the books on the shelves, the Dewey Decimal System was adopted, not because it is considered the best, but because it is used in the other major collections in Melbourne and thus would lead to less conflict and confusion in the mind of users.

As the collection grew it became more and more obvious that the bulk of the student population made use only of a relatively small number of volumes — an observation which was neither original nor restricted to Australia. At the time few other Australian libraries had drawn practical conclusions from this fact. The concept of separation, as exemplified at the University of Sydney and the Australian National University, seemed to me an ideal solution — practiced also in many North American universities — and a successful campaign was mounted to have the teaching staff accept a Research Collection clearly separated from an undergraduate collection, with different lending policies and eventually slight variations in access rules. The undergraduate collection, once separated, was dubbed the 'High Use Collection' or HUC for short, to indicate clearly that the material there housed was not only designed for undergraduates' needs, but included all that was in very frequent demand. However, space problems caused by the delay in the construction of the third stage of the Library, a reassessment of educational needs at the retirement of the foundation Chief Librarian, and the rapid growth of the Library's holdings prompted the new Library management in the mid-80s to do away with the division and to re-integrate the HUC collection and the Research Collection into one single sequence.

The appointment of a Reader Education Librarian in the early 1970s focussed attention on how to introduce new students to the Library. A serious effort was made to contact all new students each year and to ensure that they learned to get the most out of 'their' Library. Students in their second and later years were offered library use courses on demand and with special emphasis on their own needs. These sessions were often organised as workshops and carefully prepared in association with the teaching staff who frequently participated. When computer based data retrieval became firmly established, the Library's reference staff organised sessions of instruction and helped senior students and researchers to identify search processes and helped establish bibliographic infrastructures for specific topics. These processes were of course the same in every academic and research institution that had the equipment, so that La Trobe students became properly prepared in the universal information retrieval game.

Conclusion
During the twenty five years since its foundation the Borchardt Library has made significant contributions to the Australian library scene as well as to the international standing of librarianship. The holdings have grown from the 50,000 volume collection on Opening Day to close to 750,000 volumes and over 11,000 serial titles in 1989, all of which can now be identified through the Library's computerised catalogue. Special bibliographic strengths have developed in addition to the few already mentioned — a fact reflected in the increased demand for La
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Trobe library materials on interlibrary loan. The computer based reference services are being fully used.

Since 1982 two persons have held the post of Chief Librarian. One was Christopher Hunt (1983-85), and the other Earle Gow (1985-). However, I have avoided referring by name to my professional colleagues who helped me to create what is now the Borchardt Library and to the many contributions they have made individually because this account is intended to deal with the development of a section of the University. Most of my colleagues have been deeply involved in the acquisition of the Library's resources and the creation of the Library's services, but the history of the institution's personnel will have to await another historian. The Borchardt Library, as it now stands some ten years after my retirement, has unquestionably grown in all respects but it has retained its standing in the University and continues closely in the image in which it was originally conceived.

I am indebted to friends among the teaching staff, to Earle Gow, and to several of my former colleagues, particularly Jeff Scrivener and John Horacek, who have helped me in verifying my recollections and presenting them here; however, they are in no way responsible for opinions expressed.

ENDNOTES
3. The term Chief Librarian for the principal officer in charge of the Library was written into the La Trobe University Act before an appointment to the post was made. The term has seemed most appropriate to the first incumbent who saw the Library staff as consisting of professional equals—a view not common at the time.
4. The Deans' Committee remained throughout its long life (1967-1982) a rather strange organ; it had no standing under the Act, nor was it recognised as having executive powers and it did not even benefit from a formal secretariat. However every individual member had well defined responsibilities and prerogatives as well as decision making rights. (See chapter 6)
6. Though this volume is primarily concerned with the University's foundation years, it is worth adding here that the decision made in 1983/84 to opt for a turnkey integrated system of computerisation brought the Borchardt Library into the forefront of Australian library automation. Within four years the staff succeeded in implementing all six modules of the system—a feat not accomplished as far as I know by any other institution in Australia. Within La Trobe University, the Library is held up as a model on how to go about the computerisation of operations.
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In the first handbooks and other explanatory documents distributed by La Trobe University, the institution was at pains to explain why the original planning committee — the Third University Committee as it came to be called — had adopted a ‘school’ rather than the traditional ‘faculty’ structure in its academic organisation. The traditional structure, it was argued, had ‘been designed for about 3,000 students and had not been found to work properly for 10,000 students.’ The school system, the grouping together of like disciplines in aggregations smaller and more cohesive both intellectually and administratively, was seen to be the answer. Each school would be administered by a dean, and headed academically by professors, ‘who should number overall at least one per 100 students in the university’, and who would assist the dean in his administrative role, ‘commensurate with their special knowledge and ability.’ The professors, however, would not be heads of departments, as in the more traditional institutions, for there were to be no formal departments, but disciplines. The administrative unit, however, was to be the school.

The Third University Committee did not, of course, come to this decision out of a clear, blue sky. All over the British Commonwealth, with the expansion of higher education made necessary both by the post-war ‘baby boom’ and the expectations generated by increasing affluence and rising expectations, new institutions were being created. Of enormous influence in this process was the University of Sussex, which first departed from the faculty structure in favour of the school system. Sussex, in fact became the model in the 1960s for a host of new institutions in Britain, in Canada, in New Zealand, in Australia, whose planners were looking for new, more relevant ways of departing from traditional disciplinary boundaries which, it was believed, the departmental administrative structure reinforced. La Trobe’s decision therefore has to be seen in this context.

Today, even though La Trobe’s schools continue to thrive, it would have to be said that the notions of the ‘Founding Fathers’, very quickly became obsolete. Departments flourished in Bundoora’s receptive soil, indeed by 1971 they had become firmly entrenched as the University’s key administrative and academic units, to the extent that single discipline schools, such as Agriculture, and later Economics, became known as ‘one-department’ institutions. Budgets were decided on departmental lines, professors, far from being freed from administrative duties of a departmental kind, found themselves as department chairmen (not ‘chairpersons’ in those days) and, most telling of all, the statutory school meeting, the forum where school members would meet to thrash out common academic problems, was progressively diminished in importance till its final disappearance in most schools around 1978. Tradition, in most important ways, supplanted innovation.

There were two basic reasons for this, perhaps the first of the significant changes to occur in La Trobe’s academic structure. In the first place, it would have to be said that a number of the foundation professors were uneasy at the prospect of having little official responsibility for, or control over, either the formal development of their disciplines or of those appointed to teach in them. The notion that this belonged to the dean, and to the dean alone, was anathema to some, and they worked hard to change it. They wanted to be heads of department,
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they believed administrative and academic leadership could not be separated in the way the
school structure seemed to imply, and if it took the imposition of a departmental system on it
to secure their point of view, so be it.

It was not only the professors who felt this way, however. Many of those appointed to the
lecturing staff felt uneasy in an interdisciplinary situation. Products of departments them­selves, they too wished to see the familiar structure recreated.

Finally, the mushrooming growth of some sections of the University quickly ensured that
the school would lose some of its functions. Nowhere was this more obvious than in the
Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences. Almost from the beginning it was clear that the
science schools were going to have difficulty sustaining their projected growth rates. There
simply were insufficient qualified applicants for them to be able to do so. Yet the University's
growth rate had to be maintained, to attract the funding necessary for sustained development.
The answer, therefore, was to increase rapidly the growth rates in those schools where
qualified applicants abounded — Humanities and Social Sciences. Both Schools grew so
rapidly, both in terms of student and staff numbers, that the school as the key academic unit
quickly became far too large to function effectively. At the end of 1968, for example, there were
twelve staff teaching history, by the beginning of 1970 there were 33. In 1968 there were 7
sociologists, one year later, there were 17. Economics staff numbers jumped from nine to 23 in
the same period. A combination, then, of rapidly increasing staff numbers and the preferences
of the vast majority of them quickly resulted in the 'departmentalisation' of the university,
despite the intentions of those who had planned it.

This first substantial change in the University's structure, and the circumstances which
had brought it about, soon led to others. Perhaps the most important were those affecting the
University's most important institution of academic governance, the Academic Board.

Again, in a break from tradition, the University's planners decided not to establish a
professorial board as its senior academic policy-making body. Instead, they decided on an
'Academic Board', to be smaller in size than a professorial board, and with substantial sub­
professorial representation, and equal representation for each school. The Deans, Vice­
Chancellor and Chief Librarian were to be members ex-officio. In addition, each school was to
have one professorial and one non-professorial representative, to be elected by members of the
school.

The Academic Board, chosen under the above provisions, first met on 30 June, 1967, yet
hardly had it done so when there were calls for its reform, and these gained in intensity as the
numerical imbalance between the Science and Arts halves of the University grew more acute.
In particular, the large schools wanted proportional rather than equal representation, arguing
that the existing system led to gross inequities, and gave to the smaller schools a degree of
influence on the formation of University policy which their size simply did not warrant.

In time, their views were heeded, particularly after the creation of the School of Education
added a new and powerful voice to the debate. The composition of the Academic Board was
reviewed in 1971, and in 1972, after protracted and at times bitter argument, the Board was
reconstituted along proportional lines. School membership was henceforth to be tied to the
number of professors in each school. Small schools with four or less established chairs were
entitled to only one representative, those with five to eight chairs to two, nine to twelve to
three, thirteen to sixteen to four, and schools with over seventeen established chairs to five.
The balance between professorial and non-professorial staff was to be maintained, and the ex­
officio membership did not change. Thus, the proponents of proportional representation
according to school size won a major victory over those who argued for equality between
schools on the ground that, as the Board was supposed to take a university view, relative
school size was of no consideration. It represented not only a major shift in the Board's
balance, but also in the University's philosophy.

The 'new' Academic Board began operating in 1972, with the provision that a further
review would take place after five years. This did not occur for a variety of reasons, not the
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least of which was the fact that in mid-July, 1977, the new Vice-Chancellor took up office, and it seemed hardly fair to hit him immediately with the prospect of changing the University's most important policy-making body. Moreover, Academic Board agreed in June of that year to the appointment of a committee to inquire into, and make recommendations on, all aspects of university government — the important Reid Committee, of which more later. Obviously the structure, composition and function of the Board would come within the purview of this committee.

The Reid Committee did in fact scrutinise the role of the Board carefully, and though it stopped short of recommending changes to its membership, it nevertheless drew attention to considerable unhappiness within the university as to its structure. In particular, ran its report, 'the main dissatisfaction is with the present School representation system.' There was, the report continued, still bitter division as to equal versus proportional representation. Though the Reid Committee, believing that the Academic Board should, 'take a University view' on matters of policy, 'ideally' favoured 'equal representation of all major teaching and research areas', yet it recognised 'the reality of the situation' that such a proposal would be unlikely to be 'endorsed by the University Community.' Yet the current situation, in particular the linking of membership to the number of chairs in each School was hard to justify. The committee, then, recommended 'that the University now undertake a further review of the composition of the Academic Board', and that particular attention should be given to ensuring that professorial representation should be kept at an acceptable level.

After some delay, an Academic Board Review Committee was set up early in 1980 under the Chairmanship of the Chief Librarian, Mr D. H. Borchardt. The Committee deliberated for much of the year, reporting in November, and proposing far-reaching changes to the Board's composition and function. Without doubt the most controversial of these was the recommendation that an Academic Senate should be established. This was to be a broadly based consultative body, to which all senior members of the university would belong, including of course, all professors, which would deliberate on all important matters of academic policy. Obviously, the proposal was an attempt to address the frequently-heard complaint that, with the progressive 'democratisation' of University government, and, in particular, the provision for elected, non-professorial deans and chairmen, some professors were finding it extremely difficult to find a forum on which to exercise the role of academic leadership their position supposedly invested in them. The University community, was, however, not remotely sympathetic to the idea, and it quickly vanished from the scene.

There was much broader support for the reforms to the composition of the Academic Board suggested by the Borchardt Committee. The Committee recommended that proportional representation should continue, but that the basis for differentiation should no longer be the number of chairs in a School, but rather the number of its full-time academic staff. This was subsequently modified by the Board itself which in March 1981 carried a motion basing membership on 'the number of units of 500 WSU, or part thereof, enrolled in each school.' The continued representation of the professorial staff was ensured by the provision that in schools with two or more elected members, one must be a professor, and by the introduction a new category of members, those elected at large across the University. The Borchardt Committee recommended the addition of four 'at large' professorial representatives and though the Academic Board subsequently modified this to two professorial and two non-professorial members, the principle was clearly established, and, as such, represented a departure from previous policy.

Its adoption also contributed to the growth in size of the Board, as did the provision for student membership, initially set in train in 1982, but not completed until the La Trobe University Act was changed several years later. The establishment of the new School of Mathematical and Information Sciences in 1985 further increased the Board's size. Membership of the Board in that year was thirty-seven, not counting the students in attendance as observers pending the changing of the Act. The Borchardt Committee had recommended a further review of the
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Board in 1985. This was deferred for three years, till 1988. During this time its size was increased even further by the addition of the Dean and four elected members from the new School of Health Sciences, together with five student members. When the Board met in February 1988 it numbered 48. Clearly, if one of the objectives of the original planning committee had been to create a policy-making body smaller and less amorphous and therefore more efficient than the traditional professorial board, the passage of time and the processes of growth had served to nullify its intent.

The Academic Board recognised this, and moved to rectify it. At its meeting of 17 February, it set up a committee, again under the chairpersonship of the Chief Librarian, to review the Board's composition and structure, yet again. The Gow Committee met frequently during the first half of 1988 eventually producing a report which recommended a reduction in the number of elected members from both the schools and the student body, doing away completely with members-at-large and with the ex-officio position of past deputy chairperson, and abolishing the distinction between professorial and non-professorial members. Though both Pro-Vice-Chancellors and the Vice-Principal were added to the Board's voting membership, the net result of the Committee's report — eventually accepted virtually unamended after prolonged debate — was a Board reduced in size from forty-eight to forty-one. The Gow Committee further recommended substantial changes in procedures, including switching from afternoon to morning meetings, all in the search for greater efficiency. Whether this has been achieved will doubtless be eventually revealed.

One of the reasons for the rapid growth in Academic Board numbers was the fact that the University's original four Schools had grown to ten by the beginning of 1988. Of these, two had always been planned. The Schools of Agriculture and Education, which began teaching in 1969 and 1970 respectively, were always in the original master plan, and their creation was thus part of the orderly process of development. The same could be said about the School of Behavioural Sciences which was created in 1973, with its centrepiece the Department of Psychology. There was controversy preceding and following the appointment of the foundation professor, George Singer, as to where the new department should be located, with some strongly advocating its incorporation into the School of Social Sciences. Both the research interests of Professor Singer, however, and his strong advocacy, dictated the establishment of a new school, one with close attachments to the biological sciences, but administratively independent from them. There had always been strong support for a School of Behavioural Sciences. Its creation, therefore, should also be seen as occurring within the broad parameters of the master plan.

Rather different were the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the School of Economics. Economics was a foundation department in the School of Social Sciences, indeed the School's first two deans were both economists. Yet it was not long before tensions developed within that School, mainly to do with the economists' increasing concern with professionalisation, the notion that, as they were training economists, they had less and less in common with the other departments of the School whose task was rather to provide a general undergraduate education. Yet the other departments could always outvote them, even on such vital matters as degree structure. Personal differences simply served to heighten this divergence over direction. By 1973 the economists had resolved to go it alone, and accordingly, the chairman of Economics proposed to the Board of Studies of the School of Social Sciences that a separate School of Economics be established.

Neither the Dean of Social Sciences, Professor H. A. Wolfsohn, nor the chairmen of the School's remaining departments were in the slightest way sympathetic to the proposal. An exhaustive School inquiry neither resolved the matter nor lessened the tenseness of the atmosphere. Eventually, the School's Board reported negatively to Academic Board on the issue, with the Department of Economics dissenting vigorously. The Board decided to refer the matter to the Advisory Committee on Academic Developments (ACAD), one of the many committees at one time or another concerned with long range planning at La Trobe. These
committees have all had short lives, and ACAD was no exception, but in this case ACAD performed a useful service. Largely through its efforts, some of the heat in the debate was diffused. A settlement was reached in 1974 in which, in return for the granting of greater flexibility in its degree structures, the Department of Economics agreed to postpone its pursuit of school status.

Nevertheless, the basic issues remained unresolved. In particular, the question of course development continued to cause friction, with the economists claiming that, despite some increased flexibility, the degree regulations of the School of Social Sciences prevented them from offering to their students the training available at other Victorian universities, and for which there was a demonstrably strong demand. Professor Donald Whitehead, of the Department of Economics was eventually asked to prepare a report for ACAD which would attempt to both quantify these assertions and also state the case for sub-dividing the present department into several smaller departments. This, too, was a development favoured by the Department of Economics, but opposed by the School’s other members. Eventually, ACAD decided the matter had to be resolved one way or the other. It set up, therefore, its own sub-committee to investigate the issues and, eventually, to make recommendations on ‘the future of Economics.’

The sub-committee deliberated for some months, before recommending that discussion on the proposal to form a separate School of Economics be ‘deferred for the present’ preferring if possible to deal with the issue through the liberalisation of the BEc degree structure within the School of Social Science’s degree regulations. This approach however, was no longer remotely satisfactory to members of the Department of Economics, if, indeed, it ever had been. When, in July 1975, ACAD received a paper submitted by thirty members of the Department’s staff insisting that a School of Economic and Financial Studies be established as the only possible way of settling the issue, members at last were prepared to agree, despite the continued objections of the three other departments in the School. These, however, were met in part by a concession on the part of the economists that students in the new School would still be able to take a minor sequence in Legal Studies, Politics and Sociology if they so wished. The impasse was now broken. In April 1976, ACAD recommended to the Academic Board that it ‘approve in principle the formation of a School of Economic and Financial Studies’, and that it establish ‘a committee to consider all aspects concerned with the creation of the new School, including that of timing and the necessary changes in legislation.’

The committee was duly set up under the chairmanship of Professor H. J. McCloskey. It made certain recommendations as to the administrative and academic structure of the new School, it protected the interests of the remaining departments of the School of Social Sciences, it recommended that ‘Financial Studies’ be dropped from the School’s title, and most important of all, it recommended that the School commence operating on January 1, 1977. All these recommendations were accepted and the School of Economics was at last born, the result of five years of, at times, heated argument and violent disagreement, as well as academic vacillation. It was not exactly an object lesson in crisp forward planning.

Much less divisive were the circumstances surrounding the formation of the School of Mathematical and Information Sciences though it, too, came about as a result of the division of one of the University’s foundation schools, Physical Sciences. In late 1982, after several years of increasing financial strain and internal tension, it was decided that there should be a thorough-going review of the School of Physical Sciences with a view to making recommendations as to its future operations. This committee — the Strategic Planning Committee for the School of Physical Sciences as it was called — met in the second half of 1983 under the chairmanship of Professor J. W. Freebairn, eventually reporting in December. Its recommendations were far-reaching, with implications for all aspects of the School’s program and administration, but easily the most controversial was that which suggested that the Departments of Mathematics and Computer Science form the nucleus of a new School of Mathematical and Information Sciences.
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Though there was initially some opposition to the recommendation it was soon overcome. The University Policy Advisory Committee (the successor to ACAD) quickly approved of the report's main recommendations, and, indeed, its response formed the basis for Academic Board's eventual acceptance of the new School's formation. An implementation committee, chaired by Professor D.R.C. Marsh, worked throughout 1984 tidying up what loose edges remained, and the new School came into being on 1 January 1985, its relatively easy passage through the University's several councils as much a tribute to the good sense of those responsible as the circumstances surrounding the creation of the School of Economics pointed to their occasional contrariness.

The creation of the University's tenth school, Health Sciences, was neither the result of planned development or internal division, but arose from the merging of La Trobe University and the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences. This development has been well covered elsewhere in this volume, and thus needs only the briefest discussion here. Informal negotiations between the two institutions became part of public debate in 1985. It would have to be said that the initial response from the University community was not overwhelmingly favourable; however the persistence of the Vice-Chancellor and the then-director of the Lincoln Institute, the painstaking attention to detail on the part of those committees charged with specifying the details of amalgamation, and the full and free debates held at the Academic Board all helped to allay fears. In 1986, the two institutions agreed in principle to merge from January 1, 1988. The year 1987, therefore, was one devoted to tidying up detail, resolving outstanding points of difference, and most important of all, completely restructuring the administration of both institutions — a process, incidentally, not without considerable human cost. Nevertheless, the amalgamation took place as planned, the Lincoln Institute becoming La Trobe's tenth school, the Lincoln School of Health Sciences.

If the creation of new schools at the University has occurred in three ways, planned development, the division of existing schools, and finally, through amalgamation with an external institution, new departments have almost always been added as a result of forward planning, and usually without contention. Some schools have created them out of existing divisions within departments — the creation of Archaeology and Linguistics in the School of Humanities are good examples of this — but most have been built from scratch, following the appointment of a foundation professor, as part of the particular school's natural expansion.

There has been one exception to this in the University's history, and that surrounded the decision of the School of Social Sciences to establish a Department of Geography. Geography had often been talked about as a subject appropriate for that School, and an ACAD sub-committee created to investigate and make recommendations on the establishment of a department made a strong academic case in its favour in 1973. Nevertheless, it was clear that the School of Social Sciences as a whole was far from united on the proposition, the more so as the protracted discussions over the proposed School of Economics indicated that the department most strong in its advocacy of the new department could well shortly quit the School. Nevertheless, the School's Board of Studies, after bitter debate, eventually endorsed the sub-committee's recommendation by the narrowest of margins, with the solid support of the Department of Economics, and the backing of Board members from the Departments of History and Philosophy who were not 'core' members of the School. It was hardly the happiest of circumstances.

The proposal to establish a Department of Geography proceeded through ACAD, the Academic Board, and Council, despite the continued keen opposition of senior members of the School of Social Sciences. It was planned to begin teaching, first in 1975, (later revised to 1977), a foundation chair was advertised, a strong field was attracted, and an offer was duly made. After considerable delay, the first candidate declined; when the committee's second choice also declined appointment, in June 1977, because the University had been unable to give him certain assurances as to the future development of his department, it was decided to re-evaluate the whole proposition.
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The reason for this, ostensibly, was financial. In the lengthy period between the original offer and the second refusal, the University's financial position had deteriorated so seriously that, in November 1976, all school reserves had to be recalled. In such a serious situation the University accepted the failure to fill the chair with something like relief. It took the School of Social Sciences' Board of Studies little time to recommend the postponement of any further moves to create the new department, and to recommend that, if financial circumstances permitted the establishment of geography in the future, the matter of its 'suitable location in the University' should be re-examined. The proposal has never again been raised, and though the primary cause for the abandonment in 1977 was clearly shortage of funds, it is equally clear that the dissension within the School was a strong underlying factor. As such, the story of geography at La Trobe illustrates how important it is to have a strong consensual base of support when attempting new developments.

Though the principle was clearly established that the creation of a new department, as in the abortive case of geography, required the consequent creation of a foundation professor who should lead the department for a substantial period of time yet, at the same time, the general role and function of professors was, in some minds at least, less certain. Professors were the academic leaders of their disciplines, traditionally they had also been the administrative leaders of their schools and departments, as the twin functions had been seen to be intertwined. This traditional pattern had been followed initially at La Trobe, yet by the mid 1970s it was being called generally into question. Few disputed the claim of the professor to academic leadership, but did it follow that he or she should also be the chairman or dean in perpetuity because of this? Were competent sub-professorial staff to be denied the chance to exercise their administrative skills — and at times indulge their ambitions — as a result? Were those professors who were reluctant administrators going to be forced to continue to fill the role? Were those few who, by their incompetence, had forfeited any right to future administrative leadership going to be, nevertheless, confirmed in office? Were, in short, the academic administrative structures going to become more flexible, more democratic, more accessible? The answer, by 1975, on the Arts side at least, was clearly yes. Non-professorial chairmen had been appointed, and some schools had adopted 'constitutions' ensuring the use of the elective principle wherever possible. Others, of course, had not. The lack of uniformity that had developed in University government as a result was one compelling reason for the establishment of a Committee of Inquiry into University Government (Reid Committee) in June 1977.

The background to the establishment of the Committee is bewilderingly complex. Indeed, the story of the successive reviews of University government could be said to have begun as early as November 1968, with the establishment of the Schools Structure Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Warren Ewens. Its task was to review anomalies resulting from the differing degree structures of the various schools, a matter of particular concern to the Department of Mathematics, which taught students in all the existing Schools. The Committee reported in November 1969, having identified a series of problems which it believed could not be addressed unless and until the Academic Board had undertaken a thorough review of the existing system.

This the Board declined to do, thus the anomalies arising from differing degree structures continued. The next attempt to address these was not made until September 1972, when the Academic Board set up a Committee on Evaluation of the School Structure, with terms of reference sufficiently broad as to enable it to examine not only matters of structure, but matters of school and departmental government as well, should it choose to do so. Again, the invitation was declined, though the Committee continued in existence.

In November 1974, Dr R. Smith, an elected member of the Board, proposed that it appoint a widely representative sub-committee to examine 'the broad issue of University government.' The context of Dr Smith's recommendation was the growing tension in some areas of the University, especially between certain professors and their sub-professorial staff, over broad issues of power, including the elective principle, the rights of professors, and the role and...
function of chairmen. The Academic Board, where this tension had also manifested itself in certain ways, declined to appoint such a sub-committee. Instead, it decided 'to refer the question of consideration of University government to the Committee on the Evaluation of the School Structure [CESS] and to request this Committee, in consultation with the Boards of Studies, to define the terms of reference in which it, or another committee, might consider the broad issues of University government, and to refer these findings to the Board'. In addition the Board agreed to advise Council of this decision, and to recommend that it should not itself initiate any action in relation to a review of University government, which it was threatening to do, until Academic Board had reported to it on the advice it received from the CESS. It was a holding, if not a delaying action, a triumph for those Board members most resistant to change.

There followed much activity on the part of the CESS and its various sub-groups, more related to the collecting of information on present practices than on drawing up blue-prints for the future. Indeed, in October 1975, the Board instructed it to proceed more expeditiously with its task, and in particular, to provide the Board by March 1976 with its descriptive report on current practices. Not until July did it do so, providing at the same time information on the variations between Schools 'in practices and decision making processes and, in many cases, lack of clearly defined duties and responsibilities of key academic staff.' School practices in key areas such as promotion, selection, and budgetary allocation were also found to be at variance with university procedures. CESS informed the Board that its review of University government would continue.

Its next report to Academic Board was not until June 1977. Its suggestions were lengthy and often detailed, as was its account of its procedures, but the key recommendations indicated their overall thrust. The Committee's first two recommendations were as follows:

(a) the University should set up a Committee of Enquiry into University Government and that this Committee should invite submissions from all interested members of the University Community;

(b) the Committee of Enquiry should, in the main, draw its personnel from the academic staff of the University.

Further, more detailed recommendations followed, including the notion that a senior academic be appointed chairman of the enquiry 'with a corresponding reduction in normal teaching and research duties.'

The CESS report resulted in a major Academic Board discussion on June 29, 1977, the final result of which was that the Board endorsed the general recommendation that a Committee of Enquiry into University Government be established. Its terms of reference, given the importance of the decision, are worth quoting in full. They were:

To inquire generally into the government of La Trobe University. Consideration should be given to such matters as:

(a) The role of departments (or divisions and centres in Schools which have no departments). This includes the status of recommendations of departmental meetings, the precise composition of departmental meetings, whether chairmen of departments should be elected and if so by whom, the role of departmental committees in formulating recommendations concerning, for example, course offerings, promotions and appointments, and the responsibilities and accountability of chairmen of departments.

(b) The role of professors. This includes such questions as whether professors should be expected to accept greater administrative responsibilities than non-professorial staff, whether chairmen and deans should normally be professors, and whether professors should play a special role in formulating departmental, school and University policy, and if so, what that special role should be.

(c) The role of deans. This includes such questions as how deans should be selected, their responsibilities and accountability, their relationship to the Board of Studies of their School, the function of a dean with regard to decisions by departments to their
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chairmen, and the relationship and responsibility of the deans to the Vice-Chancellor.

d) The role of the Vice-Chancellor.
e) The composition of Council, Academic Board, Boards of Studies and School meetings, their respective responsibilities and accountabilities and their inter-relationship and place in the general structure of the University.

These terms of reference held cloaked in the formality of their language the unresolved problems of University government at La Trobe, as well as the conflict between the traditional and the contemporary. In particular, the question of the administrative role of professors opened up the whole issue of the democratisation of University structures from top to bottom. The Committee thus had the opportunity to formalise the course towards democratisation that sections of the University had been informally embarked upon or to recommend a return to more traditional academic structures. It was an awesome responsibility.

The Committee was formally constituted on 19 September 1977, not under the chairmanship of a senior member of the academic staff, as had been suggested, but with the recently-retired and widely-respected Foundation Dean of Agriculture, Emeritus Professor R. L. Reid, as its head. There were four academic staff members, Mr P. J. Bayne (Legal Studies), Professor J. S. Gregory (History), Dr G. C. O'Brien (Economics) and Dr M. J. O'Connor (Chemistry). Mr W. G. Philip, a prominent lawyer and a member of Council, was also appointed.

The 'Reid Committee', as it soon came to be called, met for nearly a year, more often than not in Professor Gregory's office. During that time it examined nineteen submissions and fifteen letters from interested groups and individual members of the University. It heard oral submissions from thirty-six members of staff and one student. Indeed, it met in total for forty-three working days, of itself an impressive statistic, evidence of the seriousness with which it approached its responsibilities.

Its final report, presented to the Academic Board in September 1978, was equally impressive. It had carried out its terms of reference admirably, for the sixty pages of the report contained a blueprint for the future, a coherent plan for University government which offered a way of resolving the major problems and tensions that had arisen over the years. To detail the Reid Committee's recommendations here is unnecessary. What has to be said, however, is that they resolved the problems of 'tradition vs democratisation' unequivocally in favour of the latter. The elective principle was firmly established at the departmental level, there were to be no more permanent chairmen, unless the department so wished. Secondly, academic and administrative leadership were separated, the Committee firmly asserting 'the chairmen and deans need not be of professorial rank', but that professors should be enabled to participate fully in the decision making processes. The elective principle, too, was introduced into the selection of deans. Furthermore, the reality of a 'Deans Committee' was finally recognised and codified. From the University's first days, one of its most powerful committees had had neither statutory nor regulatory existence. The deans, meeting regularly and informally, frequently took important decisions, or shaped future policies, without any legal sanction to do so. The Reid Committee ended this, giving to the Committee of Deans statutory recognition for the first time, giving it a structure, and a permanent chair in the person of the Vice-Chancellor. Not all were happy at the change, preferring the old, informal arrangement, but for most the bringing of the 'Deans Committee', fully into the area of academic scrutiny was a welcome and long overdue development. Since then, it has been subsumed into the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee.

The detailed recommendations of the Reid Report were, of course, various, but the two great principles of democracy and administrative devolution were plain enough for all to see, and were what lay in everyone's mind as it was debated at the departmental and School levels, and then, finally in 1979, at Academic Board. The debate was lengthy and, at times, bitter. Those who held strongly to the more traditional approach, who believed in professorial leadership in both the academic and administrative spheres, and who did not support the general-
ised application of the elective principle, fought a valiant rearguard stand. Certain recommendations were modified as a result and a few, for example that a Pro-Vice-Chancellor be appointed, were rejected. Yet it would have to be said that the outcome of the debate was a vindication of the work of Professor Reid and his colleagues. The University’s structure was permanently democratised as a result, with administrative opportunities opened to a ‘greater array of talent.’ Non-professorial chairpersons and deans have become an unremarkable fact of life at the University and, though a few still doubtless mourn the passing of the ‘god-professor’, most agree that the change was entirely beneficial. The Reid Committee profoundly and permanently altered La Trobe’s academic structures, and altered them for the better.

There is little else to add, and even less space to do it. Two developments of the 1980’s, however, need a sentence or two. One concerns the growing awareness of the inequalities historically affecting women in Australian academic life, and the need to correct these. In terms of the academic structure, this has resulted in an insistence that women be represented on all the University’s committees and governing institutions, even if it has meant altering their composition to do so, and this has generally been adhered to.

The second involved the acceptance, in 1987, of a Reid Report recommendation rejected in 1979. The University Policy Advisory Committee, in 1984 and 1985, again considered the question of appointing a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, eventually recommending that two such positions be created, both to be part-time, and both to be filled internally. One would have the responsibility of superintending the University’s research activities, itself partly a recognition of the much closer controls now being imposed on these by bodies outside the University, particularly the federal government. The other would assist the Vice-Chancellor in various ways, including automatically taking over during his absence. Eventually UPAC’s recommendations were accepted, the two positions were advertised internally, and Professors R.D. Topsom and D. E. Davies, both from the School of Physical Sciences, were appointed to the research and general positions respectively. The Pro-Vice-Chancellorships subsequently became full-time positions.

Academic structures at La Trobe University, then, have not remained static; how could they, when so much in the community La Trobe serves has been in flux. At times these changes have been resisted, or accepted grudgingly; given the conservative function of universities this is not necessarily to be deplored. Nevertheless they have occurred, and they have generally enabled the institution to perform its several roles more effectively in a changing environment. This paper has detailed but a few of the more important of these changes.
La Trobe as a Teaching University
John Jenkin and Judith Richards

By the time the La Trobe University Act was drafted, several formative decisions about the nature of the new institution had been taken. The founders were concerned from the outset to establish it not just as Victoria’s chronologically third university, but as one which was different, and which particularly addressed contemporary educational concerns. The actual readiness to experiment, however, was always qualified by the requirement that, in the words of the founding Act, ‘the standards for graduation in the University shall be at least as high as prevails in the University of Melbourne and in Monash University’. One form of difference—the collegiate focus—is the matter for another chapter, but a comparably fundamental decision had already been taken to have the basic academic unit as the school—incorporating academics from several related disciplines—rather than smaller departments or larger faculties. This pointed to a stress on enabling integrated and interdisciplinary studies, which was intended as part of the preferred strategy for establishing a distinctive third university. The Third University Committee had set up a sub-committee, chaired by Professor T.M. Cherry, to draft the Act, including the objectives of La Trobe. Mrs Whitney King, a member of the committee, later lamented the changes imposed by the parliamentary draftsmen. Their surviving proposals, however, included the statement, unique to La Trobe, that it would be a university ‘in which all enrolled students will have the opportunity of fitting themselves for life as well as becoming learned in a particular branch or branches of learning’. The Act was also unusual in specifying that the University was to teach, rather than reiterating the more usual formula for ‘the provision of educational facilities’. The impulse to be innovative, the drive to maintain parity with the existing universities—which is always difficult to measure except in terms of similarity—the particular sense of social responsibility, and the practice of teaching at La Trobe are the foci for this chapter.

Before beginning to draft the Act, the Third University Committee had interviewed senior officials at Monash, Melbourne, New South Wales and Macquarie universities, and studied the new English universities of Kent, Lancaster, Keele and Essex. From those studies had emerged the proposed school system which has shaped La Trobe’s academic life ever since, and always been a source of controversy. The original plan was based on schools—initially four of them—headed by deans with a limited term of office. The deans were to be entrusted with considerable powers, as an alternative to the more usual professorial or ‘god professor’ model, and they were to be expected to have a ‘reasonable’ understanding of all the disciplines taught within the school. (Foundation professors, it should be noted, retained considerable freedom of appointment and other action.) Each school was to ensure the provision of a first-year course of ‘general education’ rather than begin with a more specialised training. After the proclamation of the Act and the establishment of an Interim Council and Academic Planning Board, Professor Cherry (now Sir Thomas Cherry) continued to chair the academic planning process. Among other members of the Academic Planning Board to make significant contributions were Professor Hugh Stretton of the University of Adelaide and Sir MacFarlane Burnet, Nobel Laureate and Director of the Walter & Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research. The founding principles of integrated and interdisciplinary studies, directed away from the estab-
lished specialisations and towards breadth and flexibility continued to be a shaping concern. Problems were soon encountered with detailed planning and it was in part Professor Stretton's influence which induced the Academic Planning Board to leave it to a nucleus of the yet-to-be appointed academic staff to plan the role and scope of the schools in the humanities and social sciences.

The Planning Board agreed to recommend the establishment of the Schools of Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Biological Sciences, with several disciplines in each. Following the pragmatic Stretton solution to planning difficulties, decisions regarding further disciplines could be postponed until the appointment of the foundation academic staff. Among the areas suggested for future development, but without any firm commitment, were East Asian studies, agriculture, earth sciences, law, commerce, education and, more unusually, 'world conditions a generation hence'. Medicine and engineering were also foreshadowed, as was a proposal for an 'Institute of Tertiary Education' which was particularly promoted by Sir Macfarlane Burnet. His advocacy was based on two major premises: that La Trobe would be permanently subordinate to the two existing universities if it sought to excel only in the areas already established there and that a major way in which universities were letting down the community was by their failure to provide an adequate number of secondary teachers, particularly in science 'and, perhaps equally important, their failure in the science faculties to influence the almost universal feeling amongst their graduates that a career in full-time research is more desirable than an academic post with opportunities for tertiary (and quaternary) teaching'. Such issues, it was hoped, the projected Institute of Tertiary Education would address.

But that project was for the future. Late in 1965, with the arrival of the first Vice-Chancellor and the appointment of the first foundation professors, planning gave way to implementation. The architects had given physical expression to the shared hopes for an integrated campus and easy movement of students by planning the academic buildings as a closely grouped series of connected blocks, mostly three or four storeys high, converging on a hub of common facilities, dominated by the Library as focal point for the whole academic community. The individual appointees to the foundation chairs began by joint discussions to shape their shared aspirations, and the detailed forms of the first year offerings within each school took shape. The advertisement for foundation professors had specified the basic disciplines at the broadest level without, for example, seeking to define which modern European language or what areas of Sociology were preferred, leaving such matters to be settled by the nature of the applications which were made. Some of the professors, however, felt that although at their appointment they had been promised a free hand in shaping the academic offerings of their schools and making academic appointments for the first three or four years, in practice many of their options had been pre-empted before they actually took up their positions.

On the other hand, Professor Donald Whitehead, one of the two foundation professors of Economics, recalled an exciting period when discussions with Jean and Allan Martin (foundation chairs of Sociology and History respectively) helped to define the basic teaching processes for the arts-based parts of the University. To counter the system of large, impersonal seminars masquerading as tutorials that several academics believed had taken over in the existing Australian universities, a stress on tutorials based on groups of six was decided on at the first joint meeting of humanities and social science professors. Six seemed a pedagogically sound number, large enough to stretch the good students and small enough to keep all the students in dialogue with their tutor. From this, other decisions followed. If students were to be extended in their weekly tutorials in the ways envisaged, then three units a year would be as much as they could manage, and in those courses the number of lectures was likely to be reduced from the prevailing norm, as part of a move to shift the focus of the University from an academic delivering knowledge to the student reading widely, and then formulating and defending an argument.
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About tutorials there was little dispute, but about the nature of the foundation schools and what they represented there was much more. From the start there was disagreement about whether the schools were there to facilitate an eclectic crossdisciplinary study, viewing each unit of study as a 'separate miracle', or whether each school should aim to develop a specific ethos, largely through carefully-devised, close interrelationships over a rather narrow field of study. There was also disagreement about the proper place of each discipline within the schools. Although the initial letters of appointment to the foundation professors offered appointments to a chair in their discipline, the chair was within a specified school in lieu of the more usual departmental organisation. The early stress on the place of the deans of each school has already been indicated, but there were professors who from the start were anxious to establish their own departments and to establish as much disciplinary autonomy as possible — in other words to make La Trobe as much like other Australian universities as could be achieved.

Despite such tensions throughout 1966, most of the academics already appointed worked within the framework of the schools as generally delineated in the introductory pamphlets issued about the University. The pamphlet of July 1966, for example, announced the identifying features of each school. The School of Humanities was to offer five major disciplines, English, History, Philosophy, French and Spanish, with a 'useful degree of integration between these disciplines' being provided by a common compulsory unit in first year and some interrelated areas or periods in units taken in first and later years. Similarly, the School of Social Sciences declared that, for the five disciplines in that School, Economics, History, Philosophy, Politics and Sociology, one of the aims would be 'to show, throughout the whole period of study, the ways in which the various Social Sciences complement one another'. The School of Physical Sciences announced that it would embrace Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics and that for the first two years students would be allowed to study certain approved courses from other Schools. The new School of Biological Sciences presented an interdisciplinary course, integrating traditional studies in Botany and Zoology, 'together with recent developments'. At the same time, the liberalised entrance requirements for the following year's first intake of undergraduates were announced; in general they were the standard VUSEB requirements but with no specific prerequisites except for matriculation French for those wishing to study French.

The academic organisation of the University outlined in the July pamphlet was confirmed at a press conference held in October 1966. Although it was only some four months before the first students were due to enrol, the Vice-Chancellor's introduction included a plea to the assembled media representatives to help make more generally known that La Trobe was not at 'Morwell or Yallourn, but at Bundoora, some eight miles north of Melbourne'. The four professors speaking on behalf of their four Schools all paid special attention not only to what was to be taught but also to how it would be taught. Professor Parsons reiterated a strong commitment by his school to teaching Biology as an integrated entity, at least in the early years of study. He also stressed that 'discussions and contact between staff and students will be encouraged. In particular, practical classes will be places where students will discover things for themselves'. The commitment of the School of Physical Sciences as expressed by Professor Topsom, was somewhat different. Greater attention to discipline-based learning, but a similar teaching impulse was announced, with Physical Science students having, as well as the customary lectures and laboratory periods, one tutorial period a week in each subject. Professor Whitehead announced the School of Social Science's plans for a 'rather wider range of Social Sciences than are usually contained in these faculties but without sacrificing the advantages of a well-integrated course structure'. He confirmed the University's widespread concern to create closer contact between staff and students, and focused on the role of the smaller tutorial group as the key to the effort to make the student's first year 'more of a spring board and less of a hurdle'. The School of Humanities representative, Professor Forsyth, explained his School's strategies for integrating studies and for individualising contact with students as far as
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possible. The means for this included not only small tutorial groups — a standard six or seven students was anticipated — but a common first year course, Humanities I, which was intended to offer each Humanities student individual tutorials on books described as 'milestones in the development of western thought'. Social Sciences IA was established to serve a comparable purpose in that School.

In March 1967, La Trobe University began teaching its first undergraduate students. The concept of school-based teaching was already under attack from those people and forces that found the traditional discipline-based system much more acceptable. Even among the foundation professors there was often some ambivalence about their commitment to the school system. Philosophy was perhaps the most interdisciplinary of all the founding disciplines, since from the start it taught students from all schools and was a member of two, but its departmental focus took form very early. History collaborated closely with Sociology to promote an interdisciplinary study of Latin America, intended to evolve into a full set of courses in Latin American Studies, but collaboration never did rule out separate departmental organisation as well. More than one founding professor who worked hard for truly integrated undergraduate courses has pointed out that the moment issues of funding for postgraduate students arose, the interdisciplinary impulse disappeared. There, the research-based status of each discipline was at stake. Fully-integrated courses within a school required of each discipline a series of self-denying ordinances which were increasingly hard to maintain as new staff were appointed for their academic qualifications, regardless of their commitment to principles of a school system which had never been completely formulated. As several founding professors complained, students were enrolled in such numbers and staff appointed so rapidly, that there was no time for induction into those principles which were intended to make La Trobe different, or working through the strenuous planning process that Professor Stretton had looked for. This encouraged the drift back to the conventional discipline-based standards of international traditions of scholarship and research. Only a minority of students — and in some schools a very small minority — showed much interest in innovative, paradigm-breaking new courses. Above all, from an early stage there were severe staffing and funding constraints, and problems were raised about the long-term economy and practicality of, for example, continuing the early practice of sharing facilities between physics, chemistry and mathematics. The School of Biological Sciences exemplified many of the problems inherent in the school system. Strongly committed to the concept initially, the School felt compelled to departmentalise in 1968 for several reasons. One was political, for while it was constituted as an integrated whole, the School generally was regarded by the University as little more than a department in the hierarchy of power bases. Students themselves resisted the integrated studies, showing a strong preference for a specialised degree based upon one or two disciplines, a preference which reflected many employer expectations. Finally the staff themselves tended to resist an integrated curriculum beyond the first year.

Nevertheless, the collapse of the founding plans for school-based studies has not proved complete. Indeed, there are many and varied legacies of the school system which have left their mark on undergraduate teaching at La Trobe over the length of its history, and left an impressive range of integrated courses. Although, at first glance, only the administrative shell of the academically-inspired schools has remained in most cases, some of the initial philosophy has survived and been adapted, often by staff appointed well after the fragmentation into discipline-based departments had begun. The case of Professor Bob Reid, foundation professor of Agriculture, is an impressive example of the appeal of integrated studies. Disregarding the thrust of the advertisement for the La Trobe post which anticipated the need for future specialist graduates, he based his application in terms of a strong commitment to a broad, integrated course in which the interrelationships between climate, soils, plants, animals and economics, and their dependence on a sound basis of primary sciences — chemistry, physics and mathematics — was stressed. After his successful application, he appointed other staff in sympathy with his convictions from the School's foundation in 1968. Late in the 1970s, when there were three professors in the School of Agriculture and Reid's retirement was
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imminent, the School debated a proposal to separate into three departments. It was finally
decided that this fragmentation of the School would disrupt the teaching and research arrange-
ments and reduce the flexibility for future development, especially in a time of limited finances
and resources. The proposal was rejected. Professor Cherry would have been pleased.

Similar points can be made about developments following the appointment of Professor
Alan White in 1971 to establish the Department of Geology in the School of Physical Sciences.
He brought with him a commitment to teaching and to breadth in education which led him to
resist suggestions for a third year based entirely in the Geology Department, despite the bud-
getary advantages that would have brought. The initial commitment of the School of Biological
Sciences to integrated studies can still be seen in the first-year course provided for its students,
de spite the considerable increase in the number of departments within that School. Mathematics
which like Philosophy has always served students in all schools, joined Computer Science and Statistics to become the School of Mathematical and Information Sciences in 1985.
From that base are offered a series of joint degrees combining mathematics with accounting,
electronic engineering, economics, logic, linguistics, philosophy, physics and psychology as
well as the more conventional courses which also allow for considerable flexibility and a range
of combinations across the schools. The schools may have become much more aggregations of
discipline-based departments than La Trobe's founders had intended, but they have also
provided the umbrellas under which academic expansion and innovation has been able to take
place.

After the very rapid expansion of the tertiary education sector in Australia in the 1950s
and 1960s, extraordinary growth in student numbers and the introduction of new disciplines
was projected, all premised upon continuing substantial funding. The reality proved quite
otherwise, with first a much slower increase in funding and then the onset of a 'steady state' in
funding. As early as 1968 the School of Physical Sciences was predicting that, unless finances
improved, the new undergraduate practical courses would be inadequate and the develop-
ment of research crippled. Reduced funding continued to be a significant problem through
much of the 1970s and in 1981 the University Council received a report detailing the effects at
La Trobe of reduced federal funding. One major problem identified was an acute shortage of
space for the new developments which were taking place. In the Schools of Biological and
Physical Sciences, new Departments of Microbiology, Communications Engineering and
Computer Science, often under-resourced, forced themselves into space reluctantly surrend-
ered by established departments which thereby lost laboratory space and teaching rooms. The
problems for members of the Music Department established in 1975 within the School of
Humanities, proved particularly acute. Only in 1988 were they able to move into purpose-built
rooms, escaping from the scattered, inadequate and unsuitable areas they had previously
occupied, where their activities inevitably led to numerous complaints from their quieter
neighbours. The proximity to some members of the Philosophy Department was particularly
difficult for all involved.

Despite such problems, there were many new disciplines established, and occasionally
new Schools. The School of Economics emerged as a separate identity from the School of
Social Sciences in 1977 and expanded particularly its accounting courses. The School of Education
founded in 1970 may not have been addressed to the specific ambitions of Sir MacFarlane
Burnet, but it was, in general, in accordance with the purposes of the founders. In its concep-
tion it was the most interdisciplinary School in the University — and in practice it has remained
truly interdisciplinary. In place of the discipline-based departments of the conventional
educational faculties, it is divided into problem-focused centres. The effect is that within each
centre there are people from a range of disciplines united by a common concern, but sharing
interests also with members of other centres. Consequently there is also interaction and com-
munication between centres to an unusual degree. The centres have also shown a flexibility in
responding to shifting definitions of their 'problem' area. For example, the Centre for Urban
Studies began with a marked sociological slant, but has moved through an increasing recogni-
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ion of the issues of teaching migrant children to a concern with the wider issues of language in education. It accordingly has acquired more staff with a background in languages. Perhaps as a consequence of so much interdisciplinary contact, the School has developed a strongly professional commitment both to improving the practice of education and to offering courses which combine the theory and practice of education very closely. Thus, a feature of its BEd and Masters courses is the Task Force option, which involves identifying the aims of a particular project within a cluster of schools, conducting the research to define the objectives of the intervention, conducting the intervention and then evaluating and writing up the whole program. There have been a number of important innovations within the School, which was the first at La Trobe, for example, to establish a Masters degree by coursework. The BEd in Counselling is another important and significant initiative undertaken by this School.

Although welcomed as a new discipline in 1972, both by staff and by students, Psychology found it most satisfactory to establish its own school — Behavioural Sciences, later to be joined by Social Work. Teaching in the School is notable for its incorporation of a wide range of other disciplines — sociology, genetics and zoology, statistics, economics, computer science, legal studies, physiology and nutrition — and for other innovations. These include: the abolition of annual examinations and the early introduction of continuous assessment, the sequencing of the course in terms of content rather than difficulty, and the integrated treatment of behaviour from many concurrent viewpoints (social, developmental, biological, abnormal, differential) rather than separately and sequentially. But the symbiotic relationship between interdisciplinary studies and established disciplines has probably been most fully exemplified in the arts-based schools. Under the aegis of Inter Disciplinary Studies, both Drama and Religious Studies were supported until the demonstrable demand for their courses enabled their separate identities to be established, and many other interdisciplinary courses are still supported that way. The aspirations of the founders are also still reflected in a whole range of areas of study, essentially interdisciplinary in outcome, though their component parts are often taught as discipline-based courses within specific departments. There are, among others, Aboriginal studies, North American studies, Australian studies, Latin American studies, Pacific studies, revolutionary studies, peace studies and — most recently — women's studies as well as several others. In many ways then, the original notion of studies integrated beyond the conventional discipline boundaries which the Schools were established to express, continues to be a shaping force in undergraduate and, to a lesser extent, postgraduate studies at La Trobe.

A number of criticisms of the school structure, however, have been expressed. One of the major and most serious consequences has been actual restrictions on the possibilities students are offered to study courses outside their own school. Such restrictions vary from school to school and, it could well be argued, are consistent with the ambitions of those who wished to define distinctive schools each with their own particular ethos. With the demise of such peculiarly school-based subjects as Humanities I and Social Sciences I, designed to serve a comparable purpose, the case for any such distinctive ethos became weaker. The problem that remains is that, with degree structures varying from school to school, equality of course is difficult to address. At the time of writing there is a fresh initiative afoot to standardise the degree structure across the university, as a first step to encourage further widening of studies between schools, but any change is unlikely to come rapidly.

Another impulse which distinguished La Trobe in its founding statements from other universities, apart from the extent of the commitment to integrated and interdisciplinary studies, was its stress on the University as a teaching institution. This is most usefully discussed under two heads: the recognition of the special needs of La Trobe's student populations and the concerns to address them on one hand, and the provision of help for academics to develop and enhance their teaching skills on the other. This discussion will address the latter first.

In terms of formal developments, the record of the provision of teaching advisory assistance at La Trobe is a sorry one. Various proposals for training-in-teaching, or assistance with
teaching have been recurrently discussed since at least 1968. Nevertheless, at the beginning of 1988 the only unit for the development of teaching skills within the University was one which had been developed at Lincoln Institute prior to the amalgamation. A unit with a very high reputation, it has been fully occupied servicing the Lincoln School of Health Sciences, although discussions have also begun in 1988 as to the future relationship between that unit and the Bundoora campus. So, as yet, the University founded with an unusually strong commitment to its teaching function has not yet developed a staffed scheme for assistance with academic teaching skills. But to suggest that the absence of such a unit demonstrates lack of commitment by La Trobe academics to their teaching responsibilities would be misleading. A considerable number of academics have always agreed that such a facility would have many advantages. In one university-wide survey, some forty-four per cent of all academic staff answered a questionnaire on the issue. Of those, some ninety-four per cent declared they would be interested in seeking assistance with their own teaching. But despite a series of working parties, committees and consultative groups, no such proposal has yet been put into effect. In 1978, a member of one such committee remarked that for any such proposal to succeed it would need to devise ways to improve teaching skills without threatening anyone or spending any money. Events have shown the wisdom of that view.

The most usual resistance to the creation of a teaching skills unit over the years has indeed been framed in terms of cost, but there has also been widespread doubt about such a central unit's capacity to comprehend the particular needs of each discipline — a view often expressed in terms of university teaching being an 'apprenticeship', by which senior academics should properly induct their juniors into the craft. Repeatedly the point has been made in terms used by one board of studies, that 'the sort of assistance available from a specialist educational unit would be of less value than the advice and guidance of those within the discipline or related disciplines'. And it is certainly true that if one reviews the teaching history of La Trobe, there is an impressive history of teaching seminars and discussion groups being formed within the various schools, and a range of teaching innovations being set in place. The School of Agriculture, for example, introduced peer-group teaching, in which a staff member or external expert (the 'monitor') set the direction of the course and guided the work and discussion of participating students, who found their own way through a topic, presented their findings to the class, and were assessed by their peers. The Physics Department adopted a radical American experiment for its first-year laboratory course, involving extensive use of electronics to illuminate a variety of physical phenomena and throughout the University there have been many experiments to move away from the conventional examination system. Departments in both Humanities and Social Sciences have experimented with a range of teaching and examining techniques.

But always there have been anxieties, especially when a teaching assistance unit has been discussed, about the costs to be incurred through a period when both teaching staff and teaching facilities have been reduced as a direct result of the funding reductions of the 1970s and 1980s. In the science schools, teaching equipment as well as research equipment was becoming obsolete and unreliable, and funding constraints also led to the reduction of course options in all the science-based schools, particularly at third and fourth year (honours) levels. In the classrooms themselves there were fewer technicians in the schools that employed them, and fewer tutorial staff across the whole University. In all parts of the University, the founding principle of small tutorial classes was undermined, not because the academics disliked them but because changing staff-student ratios made the pedagogic luxury of concentrated teaching in small groups no longer possible. In the arts-based schools, funding cuts led to the virtual disappearance of tutorial assistance staff in many departments.

As financial cuts imposed ever larger tutorial groups, and as the composition of the student body changed, there were also many academics who became increasingly dissatisfied with the pedagogic success, in the changing circumstances, of the tutorials on which the founders of La Trobe had pinned such hopes. The arts-based schools, in particular, have seen

---

The Teaching University

---

81
Building La Trobe University

much experimentation with various forms of workshops, based on much larger groups of students working on shared problems for much longer periods — up to three hours, in lieu of the original standard one-hour tutorial. Despite the range of principles and models which underlay the move to workshops, the stress on forms of written work and the standards expected have remained very much the same, although there have also been some experiments within the School of Humanities in allowing students to opt for ungraded passes. There was some hostility to this, identifying non-graded passes with collapse of academic standards. They have now generally lapsed, but much less for reasons of anxieties about maintaining academic standards than because the most able students were being disadvantaged, since scholarship granting committees require grades of the conventional sort. It also has proved to be true that most students prefer to be graded. A more enduring legacy from the experimentation of the early seventies has been the workshops themselves, which have in various ways sought to promote discussion between students without the necessary intervention of the tutor at every stage, and without relying on the most articulate, the most confident students to carry the group.

The importance of academic teaching within the University received added recognition from the Academic Board decision in July 1983 that for promotion to senior lecturer 'equal weight should be given to teaching and research'. Subsequently there was renewed activity by those concerned to provide expert teaching advice to academics now required to demonstrate a greater level of teaching competence, but problems of evaluation have always haunted such discussions, and continue to do so. There are those who argue that students are unreliable judges of the quality of the teaching they receive, and that in any evaluation a time-lapse factor needs to be built in to allow any short-term 'popularity' factor to be dissipated. Peer assessment was more generally commended, but not in any very systematic way. Despite such unease continuing, and despite always the resistance on the grounds of cost, in December 1985 it was decided there was enough support for a new proposal for a Learning and Teaching unit to be presented to Academic Board. There it was agreed, in May 1986, to defer further consideration of the proposal until a decision had been taken, in principle, on a merger with Lincoln Institute. The discussions indicated at the beginning of this section were resumed in June 1988.

Much thought had been given to the presentation and integration of studies for first year students, and some consideration given to the desired characteristics and likely career paths for the graduates of at least some Schools. Nevertheless, the founders seem to have expected Anglo-Saxon, middle-class students, perhaps of an antipodean Oxbridge model, rather than to have anticipated the diversity of background and preparation of those who actually would enrol. When solutions to those unanticipated student difficulties, particularly with writing academic English, were looked for, examples of possible strategies were already in place at the School of General Studies at the ANU, at Monash, and under discussion at Adelaide University. At the ANU, by 1976, there was a unit of five people to address similar problems among perhaps fifteen per cent of the students of the School of General Studies. But the recollection of one emeritus professor of the student who, when faced with her first Humanities I individual tutorial simply burst into tears, illustrates what a profoundly alien environment many students found the University to be. Some professors in the early years — Allan Martin in the History Department was a case in point — certainly looked for staff who included among their qualifications a capacity to teach students who, although clever, were likely to be culturally deprived and ill at ease in the University milieu.

By 1974 the University's Advisory Committee on Academic Developments was reflecting a widespread concern about the level of achievement shown by many students in writing academically desirable English. The Language Centre had already been established in 1974, initially on a two-year experimental basis, but its brief was primarily to provide courses of instruction in languages for members and departments of the University. Some courses included instruction in English as a second language for students and staff members who had a native language other than English. The initial ACAD scheme for all students was a university-
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wide 'Essay Writing Assistance Unit' which was approved in principle but deferred in implementation until 1977 'subject to funds being then available'. The proponents of the scheme pointed out that not only was there general agreement that many students had significant problems with written expression, but also that, with the move in many parts of the University away from the traditional 'do or die' examinations to continuous assessment, the problem would increase in significance. Responses from various School boards showed the usual mix: the recognition that there was a problem and that it needed addressing; the sense that there already existed the appropriate personnel to do it — the Language Centre, the Counselling Service and academics doing their job properly; the problems of cost 'in times of stringent financial conditions'.

By mid-1976 it was clear that a decentralised approach was being adopted to solving the problem. The Language Centre ran some courses, particularly for the School of Physical Sciences, the Counselling Service ran some courses — and has always continued to do so for students across the University — but a school-based approach was also emerging. The first Adviser in the Use of English — initially called a 'Lecturer in the Use of English' until he himself pointed out what a misdescription of his role that was — took up his appointment in the School of Humanities in April 1977. That he was quickly involved in giving assistance not only to the customary and conventional kinds of students but also to mature age students and early leavers illustrates how widespread were the needs for such assistance with essay writing and the formal demands of University work, so different from the demands that newly enrolled students had previously faced. It has been suggested that academics effectively require their students to acquire another dialect; many students seemed to think so. The Humanities appointment was intended partly as a pilot model for the rest of the University, although the appointment was also, from the start, intended as a permanent one. In the same year, additional funds were made available to the Language Centre to provide more assistance to foreign students for whom English was a second language. The benefits of such courses as these, and the acceptance of the effectiveness of the school-based positions, was illustrated by the first appointment to a comparable position in the School of Social Sciences. By 1984 Advisers in the Use of English had also been appointed to the Science Schools and to Economics, though the Language Centre also continued to give assistance especially to students from those areas. The advisers now covering all schools serve the specific discipline-based needs of students from the various areas. They co-operate closely among themselves, with the Language Centre, and with their colleagues in the Counselling Service. Despite the particular diversity of age, experience and cultural backgrounds of the students at La Trobe, many of the problems identified and addressed by these advisers are widespread throughout the Australian tertiary student population.

This has long been recognised by the provision of introductory courses for newly-enrolled students. There have also been some innovative new processes devised for addressing the problems almost before they are encountered, not to forestall them (which would require a miracle) but the better to prepare students for them. Examples might be offered from the programs devised by what is now the Language and Academic Skills Unit in the School of Social Sciences. Since 1985 it has received funding from a CTEC Equity grant to provide introductory courses for first-year students. Initially it was a course offered to those deemed to be most 'at risk' in the academic context of the school's new intake; experience led to its being widened to be available to all new enrolments in the school, including those formally enrolled in Humanities but with a substantial Social Sciences component to their degree. Such schemes are still at the experimental stage, but early results suggest that the performance of students who completed that course has been markedly improved. Interesting implications for the complexity of the concept of educational disadvantage as experienced by many students prior to their admission are also being worked through. Since 1985 less well-prepared students entering the science schools have also been helped by special bridging courses funded by the CTEC Participation and Equity Program, and other sources. All advisers also offer a great deal of individual assistance, and public classes in essay preparation and essay structure are avail-
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able at intervals throughout the year. Interestingly, students actively seeking assistance represent all years of the undergraduate degree, including the honours year and all levels of achievement. They also represent all categories of students, with mature age students often drawing particularly heavily on these sources early in their studies. All this is in no way peculiar to La Trobe. As already indicated two universities at least provided such assistance before this one did, and such language skills assistance schemes are now commonplace in most tertiary institutions — but it is an area where La Trobe has been in the forefront of recognising a new need among students and seeking to provide for it comprehensively.

La Trobe was also a leader in opening its doors — or allowing some schools to open their doors — to new categories of students. Perhaps one of the most innovative — and certainly one of the most rewarding — was in admitting students who had not formally qualified for university entrance. Part of the impulse for this initiative came from Professor Allan Martin, who had seen similar schemes in operation in the United Kingdom. A proposal to admit unqualified students was exactly the kind of proposition to be taken by some of the more conservative elements as fulfilment of their direct predictions that the move to institutional difference could only lead to a serious decline in academic standards. In spite of such misgivings, the School of Humanities was permitted to enrol an experimental group of unmatriculated students in 1972. This was the start of the Early Leavers Scheme which is more fully discussed elsewhere but is mentioned here as an eminently successful example of the University being prepared to consider admission for possible students who had never even attempted the formal entrance requirement — often, it eventuated, for reasons of social and economic disadvantage. The initial pilot group was limited to twenty and their results subjected to careful scrutiny. They were so impressive that in 1973 the scheme was expanded, and in 1975 a similar scheme was introduced in the School of Social Sciences and a comparable ‘special entry scheme’ in the School of Physical Sciences. That category is now a normal subgroup for students in most schools, and many academics would argue that many of their most rewarding and successful students have been admitted under that scheme. Its success has made it easier, in subsequent years, to introduce other experiments which departed from the rigidities of the early admission system. The results have helped in the establishment of the diversity of students which makes La Trobe such an interesting University in which to teach — and such a challenge.

In conclusion: for the first year or two of its existence, the student intake at La Trobe was so small that a high proportion of admitted students had listed this University as their first preference. Among them were some very high quality students who were very positively attracted to La Trobe’s assertion of difference, as the founders had hoped they would be. On the other hand, anecdotal evidence suggests that many able students were hesitant about enrolling at such a different university for fear of encountering employer resistance in later years, so the assertion of difference probably cut both ways. As the number of students expanded, the proportion of first preference applicants dropped but this was compensated to some extent by the experiments with admission policy in the 1970s and 1980s. The proportion of students coming to La Trobe as the institution of their first preference in recent years has increased steadily, though the proportion of such enrolments varies markedly from School to School. The student body at La Trobe in the 1980s has been uncharacteristically diverse for an Australian university: the substantial representation of female students, students from migrant backgrounds, and students from lower socio-economic backgrounds has given it a student body more representative of the composition of Victorian society itself than of the standard university student profile. Perhaps, after all, at least in part through the care taken with its teaching, La Trobe has gone some way to meeting that other founding objective, ‘to serve the community and in particular the citizens of Victoria’.
How to do justice, in such a short article, to the range of excellent scientific research that has developed at La Trobe? The task seems impossible. The University has, to date, always been in the fortunate position of being able to appoint first-class researchers to its staff. And it has reaped the benefit of their collective abilities. I have therefore chosen to select a number of projects that seem not only to be of international repute, but also of general interest. These, I hope, will provide a 'snapshot' of some of the people and projects that have made significant contributions to scientific research at La Trobe during the first twenty-five years. I will also outline the development of computing at La Trobe, as the computing system during the past twenty-five years has become central to every area of scientific research.

**Early Days**

The initial science disciplines were Botany, Chemistry, Genetics, Mathematics, Physics and Zoology. The first three science professors appointed, Robert J. Magee and Ronald D. Topsom in Chemistry and Alan B. Wardrop in Botany, all brought staff with them and so research commenced rapidly. Technically, the first research directly related to La Trobe was carried out by two research fellows - Dr Bela Temai, who is still on the staff, and Dr P.R. Considine - working with Professor Topsom, in Chemistry. Monash University kindly made a laboratory available, without overhead costs, for much of 1966.

The first buildings at La Trobe were finished in early 1967 and science research was, in that year, located in the basement of the Library. In fact, full service links are still located under the carpet on the ground floor. It is hard to imagine a present day Chief Librarian agreeing to have disciplines such as Chemistry working inside the building.

The laboratories were moved to the Thomas Cherry Building in early 1968. In late 1966, it looked as if this building would be delayed and that the limited capacity of the Library building would necessitate a sharp reduction in the admission of science students in 1967 and 1968. However the Thomas Cherry Building was completed on time and by 1969 separate Chemistry and Biological Science buildings were ready for occupancy. The six initial science disciplines gradually expanded: Agriculture was added in 1968, Psychology and Biochemistry in 1971, Geology in 1972, and Microbiology in 1975.

The first year of teaching saw an enrolment of three postgraduate students in science, and the total number of science postgraduate enrolments over the first quarter century rose rapidly to 105 by 1971, 309 by 1978 and 418 by 1987. Likewise, research funding from outside the normal Government research and equipment grants increased rapidly. Only some $171,000 in 1972, it reached $5.7 million in 1987. The first person who qualified for a La Trobe University PhD was Ian McBean in Genetics at the beginning of May 1970, followed three weeks later by Greg Scollary in Chemistry. Both degrees, and also one to Sam Chase in Botany, were conferred in April 1971.

**Computing at La Trobe University: From Floods to Clusters**

Computing began at La Trobe University in 1968 with the appointment of John Edwards as Computer Centre Manager, now Director of Computing Services, and the acquisition of a
Digital Equipment PDP9 computer. This was the start of two major associations, the first being with Digital Equipment as the major supplier, the second with the tunnel system at La Trobe which was the location of the initial Computer Centre.

Within a few months, the Centre was driven from its basement location by a burst water main which flooded equipment and offices almost waist-deep and left a coating of sticky mud which could only be removed by using a hose. After washing computer logic boards in alcohol and drying out power supplies by fan, the computer system was re-assembled one week later — in a higher and drier location. It ran first time .... with one logic board left over.

Twenty years later, in 1988, the University Computing Services have returned to the tunnel system with the installation of a major Ethernet communications network. This links Computer Centre equipment to terminals and processors on every floor of every building in the inner campus. The only flood now anticipated is the rapidly rising demand for access to facilities for teaching, research, and administration coming from all areas of the University.

In 1970, the PDP9 was supplanted by a larger PDP15 processor, although the older machine continued to supply limited computing for teaching, research and even a rudimentary payroll system, until 1973. In that year, La Trobe jumped to the forefront of computing facilities available at Australian universities with the establishment of the present Computer Centre building, and the acquisition of what was, for that time, a large scale timesharing machine — a DECSYSTEM 10. Terminals were installed in departments in all areas of the campus and wired to a patch panel in the Centre. Demand for access to the sixty-four possible job slots grew over the years until it was calculated that one ‘phone call each minute was being received in the Computer Centre for a patchboard connection.

The DECSYSTEM 10 provided facilities for large-scale research tasks and many departments became dependent upon its capabilities, particularly its sophisticated numerical and statistical software packages. Extensive undergraduate access was also supported and computing skills were built into many courses. Administration, too, became dependent upon this system as procedures for payroll, student records and finance were implemented. Overnight batch processing capability and the acquisition of dial-in modems ensured twenty-four hour operation, seven days per week, without any dependence on operators being present.

By 1979, the demand for computing could no longer be satisfied, despite significant incremental growth in the capacity of the ‘TEN’. At this time, the University acquired one of the first of Digital’s newly announced VAX 11/780 to be released in Australia. It had 1.25 megabytes of memory and could support thirty-two users simultaneously. Virtual memory capability meant that the largest computational programs could be accommodated. It soon became heavily used for both teaching and research. Additional VAX computers were purchased in 1981, and 1983, and each was expanded internally as demand rose. Administrative systems were progressively migrated to one of the VAX. Then, in 1986, the DECSYSTEM 10 was finally retired, to the great regret of all who had used and relied upon it.

Also in 1986, the University switched from Digital and purchased a Data General computer for research. With approximately twelve times the speed of the VAX 11/780, it was considered a major acquisition, but incompatibilities with existing software packages, and a marked reluctance by users to migrate to a whole new way of computing, left it under-utilised, while the old research VAX continued to carry its previous load. In retrospect, the cost and effort of changing operating systems was seriously underestimated.

This unsatisfactory situation was finally resolved towards the end of 1987, when Digital Equipment made a dramatic offer: it would trade in the Data General and supply a cluster of machines comprising a VAX8700 for administration, a dual processor VAX8800 for research, and a VAX 11/785 for teaching. This would mean that there would be both a new VAX 11/785 and the existing VAX 11/780 available for teaching purposes. The cluster would provide approximately twenty times the power of a single VAX 11/780, include seventy-two megabytes of memory and over seven gigabytes of disk storage. Within one month of the offer being made, the equipment was installed and operational.
A policy statement recently approved by Council, advocates a computer rich environment, and La Trobe is well on the way to achieving this. Existing facilities provide a growth path to meet demand for the next five years and incremental acquisitions will ensure that we never need to experience a performance crisis again.

Elsewhere on campus, microprocessors and departmental systems have proliferated. With our Ethernet network in place, these can be easily linked together and to the central facility for data exchange, specialised processing, graphics, and quality document production. Links to Telecom provide access to other systems all over Australia and elsewhere in the world. A leased line joins La Trobe to the Health Sciences campus at Carlton, and from there to the University of Melbourne and a variety of other research institutes.

And what happened to all those old machines? They went back to Digital Equipment, of course—to become major exhibits in their computer museum. So, on to the first research 'snapshot', dealing with our substantial and widely recognised expertise in protein and enzyme studies.

Development of Protein Chemistry and Enzymology at La Trobe

Proteins, a class of compounds, have the operational control of cell behaviour. They provide the basic fabric of the cell. Most importantly, proteins are the catalysts of the many thousands of specific chemical reactions performed by cells. The study of enzymes—enzymology—is central to any biochemistry department. Therefore, it is not surprising that the first appointments to the Department of Biochemistry's staff, Dr Roger S. Holmes and Dr Robert K. Scopes, were two enzymologists. Dr Holmes subsequently took up an appointment at Griffith University.

Dr Scopes came to La Trobe in 1972 with a distinguished record in enzymology, particularly in respect to enzymes involved in energy production in the muscles. During his time at La Trobe, Dr Scopes has further enhanced his reputation by developing procedures for enzyme purifications based on separating enzymes from materials subject to chromatographic analysis and the innovative use of textile dyes immobilised on resins to purify enzymes. This is called dye- ligand chromatography. These techniques have most recently been applied to carbohydrate metabolising such as in the production of enzymes in ethanol-producing bacteria with potential industrial applications particularly for fuel alcohol. Dr Scopes' book Enzyme Purification, now in its second edition, is on its way to becoming a classic in the field.

Because of the central role of proteins in biological systems, other academic staff were appointed for their expertise in protein and enzyme technology. Dr Nicholas J. Hoogenraad's research deals with errors of metabolism in biosynthesis, the specific targeting of proteins into discrete structures within cells, known as organelles, and investigations into proteins relating to the effect of interferon on cells grown in culture. These studies have required the establishment of highly sensitive immunochemical and molecular biological techniques. In the early days of their development, Dr Hoogenraad introduced monoclonal antibody technology into his laboratory and this continues to be applied to his research and that of others. Exquisitely specific reagents, monoclonal antibodies, allow us to detect and quantify minute amounts of compounds. They are the basis of many modern diagnostic procedures for disease causing organisms and are also used for investigation into the effects of various hormones and pesticides.

Dr Hoogenraad and his colleague, Dr Geoffrey B. Fincher have also been instrumental in introducing recombinant DNA techniques to La Trobe University. These techniques have revolutionised modern biology and are being used to study proteins and enzymes, particularly the relationship between the structure and function of proteins.

Many proteins are modified during or after their synthesis by the addition of different chemicals. For example, adding or removing some phosphates provides a mechanism for controlling the activity of key 'rate limiting enzymes' in the metabolism of certain proteins. These have been the subject of Dr Gideon M. Polya's studies on metabolic 'signalling' in
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plants. They also form the basis of the modulation of protein synthesis on certain particles
called mammalian ribosomes contained in cytoplasm of cells, as another member of the
department, Dr Richard E.H. Wettenhall, has demonstrated. In many proteins, modification
may be caused by a small carbohydrate molecule; in others, such as the widespread ‘arabino-
galactanproteins’ (AGP) in higher plants, the carbohydrate portion causes no change.

The biological properties of each protein are determined by its unique amino acid
sequence which is encoded in DNA. The connection between protein sequence and DNA
sequence is the initial link between protein chemistry and molecular biology. Thus, by obtaining
the protein sequence from purified proteins scientists can obtain information on the DNA
sequence, based on a knowledge of the genetic code, which can be used to isolate the gene
encoding the protein. Conversely, using sensitive DNA sequencing procedures, the protein
sequence of an enzyme can be predicted without directly sequencing this protein. The first
protein sequence was achieved manually by Frederick Sanger at Cambridge University in the
late 1950s. Automated protein sequencing was developed at St Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne,
by P. Edman and G. Begg in 1960. More recently, improvements in sensitivity and in speed of
automated sequencing have been achieved through the introduction of commercially avail-
able, gas-phase sequencing.

Protein and enzyme research at La Trobe received an enormous boost when funds were
provided in 1985 by CTEC for an automated, gas-phase sequencer, DNA synthesiser and
amino acid analyser. This highly sensitive and specialised sequencing equipment has been
operated by Dr Wettenhall, and has provided partial or total sequences of proteins used in
research by several groups at La Trobe University and in other institutions. These sequences
have provided information for the chemical synthesis of oligonucleotides, small segments of
DNA, or co-enzymes, used, for example, to isolate the correct clones to help identify certain
genetic structures. Dr Donald R. Phillips has contributed extensively to these developing tech-
nologies. His expertise in physical biochemistry relates particularly to the interaction of drugs
and proteins with DNA and the regulation of gene transcription.

This involvement with proteins and enzymes, and the obvious potential of such research
in medical, industrial and agricultural applications, led to the creation, in February 1986, of the
Special Research Centre for Protein and Enzyme Technology. It was one of seven new re-
search centres established in Australian universities by the Commonwealth government after
nation-wide competition.

In addition to all members of the Biochemistry Department, the Centre includes Dr
Anthony G. Wedd, whose interests are in metallo-enzymes and who has collaborated with Dr
Scopes on enzyme purification, Dr Robert T.C. Brownlee, an expert in nuclear magnetic reson-
ance spectroscopy, Dr James A. Reiss, an expert in organic synthesis, all from the Department
of Chemistry, and Professor Roger W. Parish, of the Botany Department, whose research
interests are in proteins affecting invasiveness of cancer cells.

Space Research at La Trobe

Mention space research at La Trobe, and immediately the name of Professor Keith D. Cole
comes to the fore. When Professor Cole joined La Trobe as a foundation professor of Physics in
1966, he brought with him a background of many years of theoretical research in space
physics. Originally, he had entered this field a decade earlier when, in 1956, he spent a year on
an Australian National Antarctic Research Expedition to Macquarie Island as an auroral
physicist. In the first few years of the University he was joined on the staff by Dr Eric C.
Butcher, Dr Elizabeth A. Essex and Dr Peter L. Dyson, who had initially come to La Trobe on a
Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship, and later by Dr Peter Hammer.

It was not until 1970 that the group conducted its first experiments in ionospheric physics
using a ‘cossor’ ionosonde from a location at Yarrambat on a private block of land. In 1971, the
University purchased a 34 acre block of land at Beveridge, on which the group established its
field station. The Beveridge field station is now the site of operation of an ionospheric ‘Chirp-
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...sounder', a digital ionosonde, a Fabry-Perot Interferometer, a Faraday ionospheric polarimeter, and geomagnetic pulsation equipment. Soon it will have a new device to measure the electrostatic field of the earth.

Since the early 1970s, various experimental and theoretical studies of the upper atmosphere and ionosphere have been conducted including research on the wind speed and temperature of the atmosphere at 300 kilometres altitude, the ionospheric electric currents at 100-120 kilometres altitude, the total electron content of the ionosphere, geomagnetic pulsations, and internal gravity waves in the thermosphere, a region where satellites make their orbits. The experimental work of the group has expanded from ionospheric physics into upper atmosphere physics generally, magnetospheric research, and studies of the electric field of the Earth.

The group has attracted extensive funding from the Australian Research Grants Scheme (ARGS), the Australian Telecommunications and Electronics Research Board (formerly the Radio Research Board), and the Department of Defence. Papers of the group in the refereed literature number more than 300. In addition the group currently has twenty postgraduate students and has graduated sixteen MScs and twenty-two PhDs since its inception — a considerable achievement in a highly specialised and relevant field of scientific endeavour as we urgently need to find out more about the forces and phenomena that shape our biosphere.

The group hosted the first scientific meeting of the Australian National Committee on Solar-Terrestrial Physics in 1976. It has also conducted extensive collaborative research with the Australian government's Antarctic Division on geomagnetic pulsations and ionospheric physics as well as collaborating with the Institute of Physics of the Earth, Moscow, and with the Institute of Geomagnetism, Bombay, on ionospheric physics. In recent times, Dr Peter Dyson has been one of an eleven-man North American team developing a special new space radar for deployment of the Space Shuttle in the 1990s. Professor Cole was a co-investigator associated with NASA's Dynamics Explorer program, a double satellite experiment to probe the depths of space in the distant geomagnetic field and in the ionosphere.

Professor Cole's involvement in the international scientific scene highlights the extremely wide and co-operative nature of university research, in which La Trobe has played a significant part during the past twenty-five years. Recognised internationally as a leader in his area, he was appointed a 'discipline representative' to the Scientific Committee on Solar-Terrestrial Physics (SCOSTEP) in 1977. This is the principal body in the world responsible for the conduct of international, interdisciplinary programs in Solar-Terrestrial Physics and is a Committee of the International Council of Scientific Unions. He was elected President of SCOSTEP in 1977 and for a second term ending in 1986. During his terms, SCOSTEP conducted the International Magnetospheric Study (IMS) and the Middle Atmospheric Program (MAP). The IMS was a satellite rocket and ground-based study of the distant parts of the Earth's magnetic field and its entrapped fully-ionised gases — and La Trobe University hosted the first major symposium on the scientific results of the IMS in December, 1979. This attracted about 100 overseas scientists to the campus. MAP was a similarly wide-ranging study of the stratosphere and mesosphere of the Earth. Presently, Professor Cole is co-chairman of one of SCOSTEP's major programs, known as the World Ionosphere-Thermosphere Study (WITS).

Keith Cole was elected President of the International Association of Geomagnetism and Aeronomy (IAGA) from 1979 to 1983. IAGA is the chief international forum for presenting results of scientific research dealing with space physics and the Earth's magnetic field. He has received many honours for his contributions to space research. These include election to the Australian Academy of Science in 1983, election as an Associate of the Royal Astronomical Society in 1982, and the award of the Appleton Prize of the Royal Society of London for his contribution to ionosphere physics in 1984. Presently, he is Foreign Secretary and Member of the Council of the Australian Academy of Science and Australian delegate to the International Council of Scientific Unions.

With his great interest in the scientific questions relating to changes in the global environ-
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Professor Cole has been heavily involved, at both the national and international level, in planning scientific programs. One of his tasks is to Chair the Australian National Committee for the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programs (IGBP). The IGBP is now being planned for the 1990s and La Trobe will thus play a key role in one of the most comprehensive attempts ever made to understand man's impact on the environment, both locally and globally, and to compare it with natural changes. The long-term objective of the IGBP is to develop both a better understanding and proper management of natural resources and of the environment.

Key Centre in Statistical Sciences

The Key Centre in Statistical Sciences was established by the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC) in 1985 with a grant of $450,000 over three years. Along with La Trobe University's Department of Statistics, the Centre comprises the Statistics Department at the University of Melbourne, and the statistics sections of the Mathematics Departments at Monash University and at RMIT. The aims of the Centre are to develop statistical consulting as a major activity of the various Statistics Departments and Groups, to establish a coursework Masters degree program drawing on the combined talents of the Key Centre departments to offer a broad range of courses in applied statistics, and to give students practical experience in statistical consulting by involving them in the consulting activities of the Key Centre. It had long been recognised by statisticians at La Trobe that traditional courses in statistics were often not adequate for the education of fully-fledged professional statisticians. The ordinary BSc course involves only two years of statistics and the only requirement for second-year statistics is first-year mathematics. Students undertaking an honours degree have traditionally been prepared for postgraduate study rather than to be practising statisticians. The range of courses which can be taken by students in one year is not broad enough for the extensive knowledge now required. Rectifying this state of affairs based on additional teaching by La Trobe staff alone, was clearly impractical with only six teaching staff other than tutors. Thus, the creation of the Key Centre offered one of the most exciting prospects since the Department of Statistics was established.

MSc by coursework courses were first offered in 1986, with some twenty-five participating students. This number included honours students from La Trobe and the University of Melbourne, who now take courses offered by the Key Centre. Forty-five students enrolled in 1987 and twenty-five in 1988. These figures are quite sizeable, considering that in 1985, in the whole of Australia, only thirty students obtained honours degrees in statistics and, of those, twelve were from Monash. The number of courses offered in 1988 had risen to twenty-four, giving students a statistical education without parallel in Australia and rare anywhere else in the world. Having established the MSc course, the Key Centre departments are now seeking to attract fee-paying students from overseas.

Staff in the Department of Statistics have undertaken a considerable amount of consulting work. At La Trobe, most consulting work has been done for internal clients, mainly from the School of Biological Sciences. External clients have included Ford and Alcoa and various hospitals. The Key Centre has mounted some short courses, such as 'Time Series Familiarisation for Business and Industry', held in 1987, and involving La Trobe participants. In 1988, the course 'Statistics for Research Workers' was held at La Trobe and this is intended to be offered annually.

Apart from such links with business and industry, another benefit of the establishment of the Key Centre has been the increase in contact between statisticians in the different institutions. There have been one-day meetings on research and consulting activities, and the regular meetings of the Key Centre Executive have led to increased co-ordination and co-operation.

To varying degrees, staff of the Statistics Department at La Trobe have been involved in virtually all of the Key Centre's activities. Notable contributions have been made in particular by Dr Niels G. Becker, who was Director of Training when the MSc coursework program was being developed — his term being ended by a serious motor accident — and Professor J.
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Stephan Maritz (recently retired) who took over as Director of the Key Centre in September 1986.

Students in the MSc program at La Trobe have undertaken consulting projects at CSIRO, the Royal Children's Hospital and the Repatriation Hospital, and have been involved in the lunchtime consulting sessions organised by the Department of Statistics. At these sessions, staff or students of La Trobe can obtain free advice on statistical problems. In some cases, students have also suspended their courses to gain more practical experience in statistical consulting. Graduates of the course have been in very strong demand.

A history of the Key Centre is premature, but its establishment represents an important step in the history of research at La Trobe University. Much has been achieved by the Centre and there is much work in progress. As far as our national research strategy is concerned, statistics is an increasingly important field with widespread applications. Many further initiatives are needed to promote the study and use of statistics.

Island Colonisation and Ecosystem Assembly — the Krakatau Zoology Project

Moving from statistics to zoology, the following discussion deals with a project that, in a world concerned about ecological damage and the green-house effect, examines how our fragile — and dwindling — tropical forest eco-systems are formed. Professor Ian Thornton is a biologist particularly interested in the special problems, and special insights, that island systems can provide for students of evolution and ecology. During an outside studies project in 1982, he spent a short time on the island of Krakatau (Krakatau), in the Sunda Strait between Java and Sumatra. This volcano achieved world fame in 1883 when its eruption and accompanying tsunami (tidal wave) was the first natural disaster in recorded history to affect the whole planet. The explosion was heard in South Australia; sea level changes were recorded in Alaska and the English Channel, and meteorological effects caused by the globe-encircling dust cloud were seen in Europe and America. Biologists became particularly interested in the way the remaining third of the island and its two close companions were being recolonised by plants and animals. The sterilisation resulting from the deposit of some seventy metres of red hot ash by the catastrophic eruption, made Krakatau a classical 'natural experiment' in colonisation and ecosystem assembly. Professor Thornton's visit to the archipelago in 1982 was partly out of curiosity but was also to collect Pscoptera, the group of insects in which he specialises. He wanted to know which species had managed to establish themselves there in the past century.

Whilst there, he realised that botanists had monitored the succession of plant communities fairly frequently, most recently in 1979. However, colonisation by animals had not been studied since the expeditions of the Dutch zoologist Dammerman ended in 1934, apart from a survey of birds in 1951. Animal colonisation of the young island Anak Krakatau (Child of Krakatau), which emerged from Krakatau's submerged caldera in 1930 and is still active, had not been studied at all. On his return to La Trobe, Professor Thornton suggested an expedition to systematically survey the fauna for the first time in fifty years. About the same time, Neville J. Rosengren, a Research Fellow in the University of Melbourne's Geography Department, also gave a seminar on his work on the island's shifting coastlines and dynamic landforms. Both he, and several of the staff and senior students in our Zoology Department, were enthusiastic.

During Professor Thornton's visit to the Krakatoa Centenary Congresses, held in London and Jakarta in 1983, he formally announced that La Trobe University would be mounting a zoological expedition in 1984. To a tight deadline, the group sought funds, obtained permits, gathered equipment and selected participants. La Trobe provided an expedition photographer, sufficient entomologists, and some specialists in birds and reptiles. Two other bird specialists were found who were familiar with the S.E. Asian fauna, one a Melbourne-based conservation biologist, the other on the staff of the National University of Malaysia at Kuala Lumpur. Also included was a specialist in parasitic wasps and a botanist from the University
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of Hull, England, and mollusc specialists from the National Museum, Melbourne (now the Museum of Victoria), one of whom was a qualified nurse, as well as Indonesian counterpart scientists from the Zoology Museum at Bogor, West Java.

On the second expedition, in the following year, a bat specialist from the Australian National University was included as was an expert in the technique of detecting and recording ultrasonic calls, and on the third expedition in 1986, a zoologist from the Western Australian Museum was added. All honours and graduate student expeditioners undertook first aid courses. The second expedition also included a microbiologist who was completing his final year in medicine at the University of Melbourne. Altogether, in the major and the two smaller subsequent expeditions, eight graduate students and seven staff from La Trobe’s Zoology Department took part, as well as eleven Indonesians — thirty-eight scientists in all, from twelve institutions.

There was not time to apply for an ARGC grant for the initial expedition in 1984, so support was sought from the community. The Zoology Department set aside some funds for the expedition, some other departments in the School contributed, and The Age newspaper launched a public appeal. Substantial support came from Mr Dick Smith, who was about to launch the Australian Geographic Magazine, CRA Ltd, the Ian Potter Foundation, The Age itself, Friends of the University, the CSIRO Division of Entomology, the Museum of Victoria, and many private individuals in Victoria both within and outside the University. In a rare example of direct public enthusiasm about, and financial support for, university research, donations of two dollars came from pensioners; collections were made in school classrooms, and some donations of equipment and expedition supplies were also received. Expedition members bought all their own personal requirements, such as tents and rucksacks, paid for their injections and visas, and contributed a further $200 each to the expedition. The later expeditions, in 1985 and 1986, were supported by ARGC research grants.

The first expedition, in 1984, involved simultaneous work in southern Sumatra, the Javan Rhino reserve (Ujung Kulon) in West Java, and the Krakataus. Conditions were tough; water had to be taken out to the Krakataus and boiled before drinking; sea water was used for washing and food was local. However, team work and morale were excellent. During the visit, several earth tremors started landslides from Rakata’s peak which fell to one side of the camp, and one day a water spout — an aquatic, mini-tornado — moved through the islands passing very close to the campsite. Trapping and collecting schedules were adhered to whatever the weather, even when this entailed the difficult climb to Rakata’s summit along a narrow ridge of partially consolidated ash at the top of the island’s almost sheer BOOm cliff. One expeditioner, who suffered from vertigo, was excused from this duty; a graduate student, also a vertigo sufferer, only mentioned his problem after the climb. Others were reassured, and more determined, when told Professor Thornton’s wife had accompanied him to the summit in 1982.

Many young zoologists had their first taste of work in a tropical rain forest, and saw flying lizards, gliding snakes, Rusa deer, Siamang gibbons, forest oxen, leaf monkeys and many exotic tropical birds such as hornbills, jungle mynahs, peafowl and jungle fowl for the first time. Enduring international friendships were formed through hardship recalled with pleasure, not only between scientists, but also with the crews of fishing vessels used by the expedition, and with the Indonesian cook, Syerif. Staff and students from the Zoology Department, linked in pursuit of a common aim, and many of the technical staff worked enthusiastically on expedition matters both before and after the expeditions.

Preliminary results have generated considerable interest in Europe and in the USA, with post-expedition ‘collaborating specialists’ now located in some fifteen countries. The final results are beginning to appear in the more than twenty papers that have already been published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London.

Much has been learned about the process of colonisation of islands and about the way in which a tropical forest ecosystem is reassembled naturally from a zero base-line. However, this
natural process continues. Consequently, this very long-term project will need recruits from today's schoolchildren — and from zoologists yet unborn. We hope that the work will serve as a firm basis for comparison in the future, and that zoological monitoring of Krakatau will be continued at intervals of five to ten years, if possible from La Trobe University.

**Research Centre for Electron Spectroscopy**

With perhaps not the same sense of romance and anticipation associated with an expedition to the tropics, a group of academics of the School of Physical Sciences waited in March 1978 to hear if the Academic Board and Council had approved the formation of a proposed Research Centre for Electron Spectroscopy (RCES). The proposal was approved and it formalised a research cooperation in Photoelectron Spectroscopy (PES) which had developed over previous years between members of the Physics and Physical Chemistry Departments.

Like research on Krakatau, photoelectron spectroscopy has a long history dating back to the turn of the century, to heady days when physicists were unravelling the microscopic mysteries of the atom and the nucleus. La Trobe's science historian, Dr John G. Jenkin of the Department of Physics, has described this pedigree. The development of the area waxed and waned for seventy years, affected by wars and technological breakthroughs. However, in the early 1960s, Professor Kai Siegbahn in Sweden and Dr David Turner in England independently made crucial improvements to the experimental methods; the former in x-ray and the latter in ultraviolet techniques. At the same time, vacuum technology also dramatically improved, and these developments combined to give the impetus for the rapid development of photoelectron spectroscopy and related techniques.

Members of the La Trobe Physics and Chemistry departments noticed the reports of the 'newly developed' technique, saw its potential and started building their own spectrometers. The need for discussion of ideas and collaboration in the development of techniques led to the co-operation which, in turn, led to the formation of the Research Centre. Workshops for users of PES from around Australia first met at La Trobe in February 1976. These meetings have continued, although more recently, the increasing diversity of areas of application of PES has reduced the overlap of interests in the Australian electron spectroscopy community.

The Centre was formed at a time when emphasis was being placed by Governments on the funding of larger research groups and when La Trobe University was attempting to fulfil its earlier ambitions to establish structures which would enable interdepartmental and interdisciplinary collaboration. Its aims were many and covered all the varied activities of research, including the promotion of joint projects, the initiation of funding applications, the organisation of seminars, conferences and special teaching programs, and the collaboration with scientists outside La Trobe University.

An international conference on electron spectroscopy was organised by the Centre and held at La Trobe in August 1978. Ten invited speakers from outside Australia gave plenary lectures, though one eminent scientist arrived in Hawaii only to discover that a visa was required to enter Australia and was forced to spend some time in that out-of-the-way place. The eighty-five delegates filled the remainder of the four days with shorter research reports. The proceedings of the conference were reported in a large, special edition of the *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy*. This established La Trobe as an important centre for Electron Spectroscopy and provided the basis for overseas collaborations for many years to come.

The subsequent history of the Centre has been of collaborations, both internal and external, which have been both stimulating and fruitful. Members of the Centre have links to scientists in the USA, in Germany, China and the UK. Within Australia, collaborations exist with CSIRO, Telecom Research Laboratories, the Electronic Research Laboratories in Salisbury, South Australia, RMIT, and the University of Queensland.

Funds have been obtained from the University and the ARGS for an elaborate spectrometer system, which Dr Graeme L. Nyberg of Chemistry and Dr John Liesegang of Physics are using for surface studies. Both x-ray and ultraviolet techniques, along with a number of
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others, are used to examine the complex behaviour of atoms and molecules at surfaces. This co-operative research is directly attributable to the Centre and has led to further collaboration with other members of the Chemistry Department in the analysis of complex inorganic compounds using x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS). They have also used XPS as an analytical tool for industrial samples and have had useful input on plastics, ceramics, polymers and metal products.

Also under the auspices of the Centre, Dr Robert C.G. Lockey and Dr John D. Riley from the Physics Department, have developed a novel, angular resolving analyser which forms the basis of the University’s first patent. Two of these analysers have been sold to European groups and two are at other Australian universities. Collaboration with a group at the Max Planck Institut in Stuttgart has enabled the researchers to obtain access to the angular resolving spectrometer on the BESSY synchrotron storage ring in Berlin, which allows ultraviolet PES at a wide range of wavelengths. This angular and wavelength variation has enabled detailed studies of the electronic structure of metals and semiconductors.

One of the most recent collaborations has been between China’s Academia Sinica and Dr J. Barrie Peel of the Chemistry Department, whose research is the ultraviolet photoelectron spectroscopy of gaseous molecules. Discussions are currently under way for La Trobe to supply a complete gas-phase ultraviolet spectrometer to Beijing.

Brain-Behaviour Research Institute

In the twenty-five year history of La Trobe, the Brain-Behaviour Research Institute (BBRI), as a formal entity, can only claim a life span of less than seven years. However, the informal beginnings of co-operation with scientists of many disciplines and the endeavour to implement scientific findings to serve the community, date back to the very beginnings of the School of Behavioural Sciences.

There are many institutes of neurosciences, but the BBRI is unique in both its combination of the study of biological processes and behaviour, and in the diversity of behaviours which are covered by its researchers. It is also unique in the wide application of occupational psychobiology to industrial problems, in particular to shiftwork. Many thousands of workers have benefitted by changes in work organisation designed to improve their health and quality of life, as have a number of organisations, through improved productivity resulting from researcher intervention. In addition, the Health and Behaviour displays, a joint project of the Brain-Behaviour Research Institute and the School of Behavioural Sciences, have provided a valuable resource for the health education of high school students, as well as attracting them to La Trobe University. More recently, the BBRI, with the support of the Victorian Football League, has designed and built a fitness track which will help to improve the physical fitness of the La Trobe community.

The BBRI has not received funding directly from the University, itself, but has had generous support from the University’s Department of Psychology. In 1986, the BBRI received $463,986 of outside research grants, many from private organisations. More recently, the Institute launched the Dame Phyllis Frost Fund for memory research, with a target of $250,000.

Over the years, the Institute has arranged a number of public seminars and workshops. These have included: ‘Stress at Work’, ‘Work Effectiveness’, ‘Shiftwork’, ‘Occupational Pain (RSI)’, ‘The Preventions and Management of RSI’, ‘Managing Shiftwork,’ and ‘The Pros and Cons of 12 Hour Shifts.’ The seminars have been well supported by the community and, in some cases, attendances have exceeded 200. Many thousands of copies of the printed proceedings of these seminars have been distributed world wide.

Neuroimmunology and Multiple Sclerosis

Matters of community health, this time relating to the particularly debilitating illness of multiple sclerosis, bring us to Dr Claude C.A. Bernard. He was a joint-appointment to the School of Agriculture and the Department of Psychology in 1979 as the first La Trobe Univer-
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University Research Fellow, having come from the Basel Institute of Immunology, in Switzerland. Upon his appointment as a Senior Research Fellow of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NH & MRC) in 1981, his major goal was to establish a Neuroimmunology Laboratory devoted to the study, in humans and experimental animals, of facets of immunology, biochemistry, microbiology and behaviour relating to the cause of various acute, progressive and destructive diseases.

Support for this came from the NH & MRC, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society of Australia, the University, the School of Agriculture, the School of Behavioural Sciences and, in particular, the Department of Psychology which provided the equipment, facilities, postgraduate students and a limited backup staff. From the outset, the thrust of the Neuroimmunology Laboratory has been broad and multidisciplinary. The purpose of these wide interests has been to dissect the development of Multiple Sclerosis (MS), taking several approaches and with as many modern techniques as feasible. Fundamentally, they have all addressed the same question but from different perspectives.

These studies have now established that one of the characteristics of MS is the presence in the cerebrospinal fluid of an elevated level of compounds known as immunoglobulins. While most of a particular immunoglobulin (IgG) in the cerebrospinal fluid of patients with neurological infections represents antibodies directed against the infectious agent, the nature of the process leading to the increased levels of these immunoglobulins in MS remains unknown. To try to find out what role these 'anti-neural antibodies' play in MS, new assays were developed to detect antibodies to myelin. Myelin is a fatty substance that acts as an insulating sheath around nerve fibres in the brain, and its breakdown causes the neural 'short-circuiting' reflected by the disease's progressively crippling symptoms. Applied to the cerebrospinal fluid, these assays indicated that small amounts of anti-myelin antibodies were present in some MS patients. When used to test extracts of brain from patients diagnosed with definite MS, they also revealed the presence of significant levels of anti-myelin activity. Analysis of brain extracts indicated that this activity was specifically mediated by IgG. As a consequence, a study was undertaken to assess whether the increased level of both anti-viral and anti-brain antibody in MS patients was the result of common features shared by certain viral proteins (e.g. measles antigens) and brain antigens. This important issue was tackled by testing the anti-myelin base protein and anti-viral antibody activities of immunoglobulins (purified from sufferers of MS and other neurological disorders and from healthy subjects) and checking whether they reacted against viruses which have been incriminated in MS. The results revealed no evidence for shared determinants between myelin basic protein and viral antigens, including measles. This helped to dispel a long-held theory by showing that the reduced immunological responses to measles virus in MS patients could be the result of a sequestration due to cross-reactivity with a myelin antigen.

A further study, carried out to assess the degradation of myelin in the brain of an MS patient, showed that one form of the myelin basic protein was degraded at a faster rate than in the control brain. This indicated that certain enzymes may be involved in the rapid degradation of myelin base protein. However, studies undertaken to assess such a possibility have revealed no significant differences in the extent of degradation in myelin isolated from MS or control brains in the presence of calcium.

Immunogenetic studies of MS designed to identify genetic links between immune capacity and the disease process are continuing. One series of investigations is concentrating on the immune response of patients with MS to a number of antigens, including myelin basic protein and synthetic peptides, in order to assess if these responses depend upon the interactive effects of certain genetic coding. The results obtained so far indicate that in MS, immunoglobulins present in the brain have a specificity which is not found in patients with other neurological diseases or in healthy subjects. Work carried out to assess the possible pathogenic role of the MS immunoglobulins has identified a new and as yet undescribed mechanism by which myelin damage may occur. To further characterise the specificity of the MS immuno-
globulins and to assess how they are synthesised, antibodies specifically directed against certain regions of MS immunoglobulins have been prepared.

More recently, molecular biology techniques have been set up in the Neuroimmunology Laboratory to further investigate the possible role of immunoglobulin gene products in causing, or making people susceptible to contracting MS.

As well, lymphocytes called T-cells, have been shown to be present in the vicinity of the breakdown of myelin and these, too, are the subject of genetic studies in Dr Bernard's laboratory. The results demonstrated a clear association between a T-cell receptor genetic marker and MS. These findings are considered to be of great importance because the identification of a T-cell receptor gene that contributes to autoimmune diseases may make it possible to design immunotherapeutic reagents which could block the autoimmune T-cell response.

As a parallel study to the MS investigation, experiments have been performed to assess the peripheral nervous disease, Guillain Barre Syndrome. Also, research is being carried out on animal disease models of MS such as Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis (EAE), to try to help our understanding of the mechanisms involved in the origin of these diseases and their clinical-pathological correlations.

Finally, major initiatives have been taken by Dr Bernard's laboratory with the development of new assays. One enables the measurement of antibodies to neural antigens involved in experimentally induced and naturally occurring demyelinating diseases. A second allows us to measure antigenic fragments released from the whole central nervous tissue as a consequence of inflammatory processes. In addition, a new method for raising monoclonal antibodies to selected proteins and their fragments, which either exist in small quantities or are difficult to purify on large scale, has been developed.

Twenty-Five Years On

La Trobe now has an international reputation for research across a wide range of areas. The stories and people introduced in these pages provide only a brief overview. Statistics, likewise, can only illustrate part of the total picture: for example, in 1987, research in science produced eight books, forty-one chapters in other books, four edited books and no less than 364 papers in scholarly journals, apart from many other miscellaneous publications. More than $5 million in research funds came from outside grants. Much other excellent work, in areas such as botany, chemistry, electronics, genetics, geology and microbiology, to mention just some areas that come readily to mind, would fill this entire volume.

As I have tried to show by the approach taken in this chapter, research is basically about people. People with ideas and with the extraordinary talent and tenacity required to follow those ideas to their conclusion. They do this for their own personal and professional satisfaction — and very often the whole community benefits, sometimes greatly.

Of the science professors who took up duty in 1966-1967, only three are likely to remain into the 1990s. These are Professor Keith Cole, of Physics, Professor Ian Thornton, of Zoology and Professor Ron Topsom, of Chemistry. Others have either retired or moved on to positions elsewhere. However, the appointment of first class researchers to replacement chairs offers great confidence that scientific research at La Trobe will build on the firm foundations laid in the first twenty-five years and go on to develop greater strength and diversity in the years to come.
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In a short essay it is impossible to do justice to the variety and extent of the research done in the four Schools of Humanities, Social Sciences, Education and Economics over the past twenty-five years. Instead of trying to catalogue every piece of research published over that period, this essay will focus primarily on books, rather than articles, and only those books which were based on research done mainly while the author was a member of staff at La Trobe University. Some additional criteria of selection have also been applied: books that have had a very significant professional impact, those which are based on research which is unique in Australia, and those which have had some impact on the Australian community have been emphasised where possible. Obviously, any selection is to some degree arbitrary and the books mentioned below do not exhaust the number of monographs published by members of the four schools. In a few departments, for example the Department of Music, books are an inappropriate measure of research achievement and different criteria have been used. It is hoped that the essay gives an indication of the range of significant research done and points to some of the areas of research strength that have been developed at La Trobe in the Arts-based schools over the past quarter century.

In the three Departments which comprise the School of Social Sciences, namely Legal Studies, Sociology, and Political Science, the research accomplishment has been very diverse. In Legal Studies, which has from the beginning adopted a multidisciplinary approach to the study of the law, the main thrust of the research done to date has fallen into a broad socio-legal category. Within this category, a number of research areas have developed: one important project, directed by Professor Kit Carson, has analysed the operation of the Victorian Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1985, and constitutes an important benchmark study of administrative regulation of the law; another area of research has been in law and animal justice where the work of Peter Sallmann and John Willis, Criminal justice in Australia (Sydney: Oxford University Press, 1984) and the related work by Peter Sallmann, Review on Criminal Trials (Canberra: Australian Institute of Judicial Administration, 1985), have both called for reform in legal procedures.

An important cluster of research has focussed on the relationship between law and the state. In this area, Dr Christopher Tomlins has published The state and the unions: labor relations, law, and the organised labor movement in America, 1880-1960 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). In that book, Tomlins examined the development of modern American labour law and industrial relations policy from the late 19th century to the Kennedy era. The main focus of the book is the great change in industrial relations brought about by the New Deal of the 1930s when the federal government legislated to guarantee labour's right to organise and bargain collectively. Through a detailed analysis of the workings of the National Labor Relations Board, which was established in 1935 to implement the new government policy, Tomlins concluded that, despite the vast increase in membership and visibility, the American labour unions were caught in a web of administrative rules and decisions which emphasised order and stability at the expense of industrial democracy. The new system protected the union movement but at a price. Another publication in this field is Dr Patrick O'Malley's Law, capital-
ism and democracy: a sociology of Australian legal order. (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1983) an examination, from a broadly Marxist position, of the operation of the legal order in Australia. In the related field of law and social structures, Dr Martin Channock's work has received wide acclaim. His Law, custom and social order: the colonial experience in Malawi and Zambia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) analysed the historical interaction between Western law and African societies using anthropological and legal perspectives. The book focuses on the historical development of that part of African law known as customary law and outlines the ways in which this changed in both form and content during the colonial period. Channock argues that customary law was used defensively by Africans both against the British and against those Africans wishing to adopt non-traditional interpretations of obligations and property rights.

In the Department of Sociology, there have been three or four important clusters of research. Professor Yoshio Sugimoto has published widely on comparative sociology and particularly on the comparative study of Japanese society. He has recently written, with Dr Ross Mouer of Griffith University, Images of Japanese society: a study of the social construction of reality (London: Kegan Paul, 1984) and various articles relating to that theme. Another research area in the department that dates back to its founding professor, Jean I. Martin, is in immigration studies: Professor Martin published extensively in that field and completed several reports for the federal government including Welfare of migrants: the role of ethnic groups in migrant welfare (1975) for the Australian Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, and A decade of immigrant settlement: report on the 1973 immigration survey (1976) for the Australian Population and Immigration Council. The late Professor Jean Martin's interest in this field is being carried forward by Dr Fiona Mackie whose recent report for the Commonwealth Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on Muslim settlers in Melbourne, Structure, culture, religion in the welfare of Muslim families: a study of immigrant Turkish and Lebanese men and women and their families living in Melbourne (Canberra: AGPS, 1983) was based on detailed interviews with fifty Turkish and fifty Lebanese migrants living in Melbourne covering religious and cultural values, family structure, welfare needs, network patterns, and social and economic background in both the homeland and in Australia.

The research clusters that attract the largest interest in the Sociology Department are those related to community studies and to the sociology of culture. Among the wider public interested in community studies research, the names of Dr Kenneth Dempsey and Lyn Richards will be familiar. In 1983, Dr Dempsey published his community study titled Conflict and decline: ministers and laymen in an Australian country town (North Ryde: Methuen Australia, 1983), a study of conflict within the Methodist church in a rural community. However, perhaps the most ambitious community study undertaken in the department is the Mill Park Project, a detailed study of a new housing project designed for 22,000 people in a suburb north of La Trobe University. This project enabled Lyn Richards to mesh her interest in family life with a broader study of family in community. Her research interest in the family in Australia is reflected in her report for the Royal Commission on Human Relationships in October 1976 which formed the basis for her book, Having families: marriage, parenthood and social pressure in Australia (Ringwood: Penguin, 1978). In that study, which analysed the social processes involved in fertility decisions within the family, she concluded that there is no simple answer to explain why couples are limiting the size of their families. This was followed by Mothers and working mothers (Ringwood: Penguin, 1978), co-authored with Jan Harper of the University of Melbourne, which probed reasons given by married women for their decisions to go to work or to stay at home with the children. One strong theme of the book was that most women, in fact, had little choice in this area. The Mill Park research project has allowed Lyn Richards to continue and to expand her interest in the sociology of the family through the ongoing study of developments in a specific neighbourhood. The project, which was initially conceived as purely sociological research, has expanded into an interdisciplinary study involving staff from the School of Education and the Department of Social Work as well as the Department of Sociology.
Another major research area in the Sociology Department has been the sociology of culture. Professor Claudio Veliz has published a study of transplanted Iberian culture, *The centralist tradition of Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980) in which he argues that the dominant cultural tradition, inherited from Spain, was monarchical and therefore centralist and that this tradition has survived wars of independence, republicanism, populist surges, and the rise of industrialism with remarkably little change. He argues that this centralist tradition is a cultural not a political phenomenon and fundamentally shapes all political regimes regardless of ideology. Dr John B. Carroll has also published extensively on the sociology of modern culture: he is concerned with culture and authority, with the way in which society imposes norms which constrain the egoistic impulses of individuals and maintain social stability. His abiding interest is in the historical decline of the authority of the individual in Western culture. In 1974 he published the controversial *Break-out from the Crystal Palace: the anarcho-psychological critique: Stirner, Nietzsche, Dostoevsky* (London: Routledge, 1974) which he followed, three years later, with *Puritan, paranoid, remissive: A sociology of modern culture* (London: Routledge, 1977). However, his most significant book to date is *Guilt: the Grey Eminence behind character, history and culture* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985) which explores, by way of an analysis of literature, philosophy and psychology, the way in which culture deals with guilt. This process is, Carroll argues, one of the most central characteristics of modern western societies and of fundamental importance to an understanding of modern culture.

Dr Agnes Helier, who was born and educated in Hungary, came to La Trobe in 1978 after she had been forced out of academic life in her native country. She accepted a position at the New School for Social Research in New York City in 1987. In Budapest she had studied under the noted Marxist philosopher Georg Lukacs. Her main field is in theoretical sociology in which she has a worldwide reputation and a formidable publishing record. In 1983, with Ferenc Feher and Gyorgy Markus, two other Lukacs students in political exile in Australia, she published *Dictatorship over needs* (London: St. Martins Press, 1983), a highly critical analysis of the nature and functioning of Soviet-type societies in Eastern Europe. She followed up this theme in 1987, with Feher, in *Eastern left, Western left: totalitarianism, freedom, and democracy* (London: Humanities Press International, 1987). In 1983 she also published, again with Feher, *Hungary 1956 revisited: the message of a revolution — a quarter of a century after* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983), an analysis of the international and domestic implications of the 1956 Hungarian uprising.

The third department in the School of Social Sciences is the Department of Politics. Although a relatively small department, it has achieved some renown for research done in three areas: Australian politics, labour movements, and international relations. In the field of Australian politics, Dr Leon Glezer published *Tariff politics: Australian policy-making 1960-1980* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1982) which focussed on the role of the Tariff Board and its successor, the Industries Assistance Commission, in the historic shift away from an ideology that supported tariffs as the path of economic development, to the economising and corporatist approach which emphasises the need for change on efficiency grounds. More recently, Robert Manne has produced an important book on the famous spy case of the 1950s, *The Petrov affair: politics and espionage* (Rushcutters Bay, NSW: Pergamon Press, 1987). Based largely on the records of the Petrov Royal Commission, on recently released ASIO archives, and on interviews with surviving participants, the book carefully documents the defection, in April 1954, of Vladimir Petrov, an MVD official attached to the Soviet Embassy in Canberra, the subsequent investigation held by the Royal Commission, and the repercussions of the events in Australian politics. The book describes one of the most important upheavals of modern Australian politics with great skill. Professor Joan Rydon, the first woman appointed to a chair of political science in Australia, has written widely on Australian elections, voting methods, political parties, federalism, and constitutional questions. She is perhaps best known for her analysis of the careers and social backgrounds of the 1033 Australians, who have served in the federal parliament over the past eighty years. This study, which traces the increasing
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Interesting work has been published by members of the political science department in two other fields. In international relations, Dr Joseph A. Camilleri has published a number of studies on Australian foreign policy the most recent being ANZUS: Australia's predicament in the nuclear age (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1987) which renews his call for the dismantling of that treaty and for the development of a completely independent Australian foreign policy. Professor Ross M. Martin has published on trade unions both in Australia and in Britain; in 1975 he published Trade Unions in Australia: who runs them, who belongs — their politics, their power (Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1975), a review of the history, organisation, leadership, and operation of contemporary Australian trade unions. In 1989, he published a major work on the British Trades Union Congress titled TUC: the growth of a pressure group, 1868-1976 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980). In this historical study, Martin analyzes the nature and process of institutional change in the TUC while tracing its changing political role over the past one hundred years. His most recent publication is Trade Unionism: Purposes and Forms (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

In the School of Economics, perhaps the most important single research achievement in its first twenty-five years was the development of the ORANI model for simulating the behaviour of the Australian economy. This model was the outcome of a co-operative research endeavour sponsored by several departments of the Australian Government in the 1970s (the IMPACT Project) with which Professor Peter B. Dixon was associated. Dixon, a graduate of Monash who did postgraduate work at Harvard University under Wassily Leontief, the father of input-output analysis, was appointed to the chair of economic theory at La Trobe University in 1977, and subsequently became Dean of the School of Economics in 1981-82. Since 1975 he has been associated with the IMPACT Project which allowed him to develop his interest in general equilibrium modelling as applied to the Australian economy. In 1977, he published, with B.R. Parmenter, G.J. Ryland and J. Sutton, ORANI, a general equilibrium model of the Australian economy: current specification and illustrations of use for policy analysis (Canberra: AGPS, 1977). This was followed, two years later, by Structural adaptation in an ailing macroeconomy (Parkville: Melbourne University Press, 1979) co-authored with A.A. Powell and B.R. Parmenter, which used the ORANI model to analyse the effects on the structure of the Australian economy of various alternative policies for combatting unemployment. In 1982, Dixon published ORANI: a multisectional model of the Australian economy in association with B.R. Parmenter, John Sutton and D.P. Vincent (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982). The ORANI model is a landmark in the history of applied economic research in Australia and, indeed, the degree of detail involved and the careful estimation of its various components make it internationally unique. In 1984, Professor Dixon took up an appointment as Director of the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research at the University of Melbourne.

The use of sophisticated computer programs to solve complex economic problems is also reflected, on a lesser scale, in the work of Dr John O.S. Kennedy, another member of the School of Economics, who, in Dynamic programming: applications to agriculture and natural resources (London: Elsevier, 1986), developed a computer program which allowed a technique, first developed in the 1950s and used in industry and business, to be applied to forecast optimal management strategies for agricultural and natural resources. Unlike industrial problems, which can be characterised as predominantly linear and deterministic, problems in agricultural and natural resource management, tend to be primarily dynamic and stochastic and hence much more intractable.

Professor Eric L. Jones, an economic historian in the School of Economics, who is interested in long-run economic development, has published two books, exploring aspects of economic development from a comparative perspective. In the first, The European miracle: environments, economies, and geopolitics in the history of Europe and Asia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), he compares the history of Europe and Asia in an attempt to isolate those factors promoting growth in Europe but not in Asia. Concentrating on the period 1400-1800,
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the book offers a detailed comparison of Europe, and the Ottoman Empire, the Mughal Empire, and the Ming and Manchu Empires. Those centuries witnessed, in Europe, the emergence of the market economy, the nation state, the states system, and an extraordinary expansion overseas. These developments, he believes, set the stage for the elimination of the obstacles to economic growth in Europe. Jones takes up this theme of the elimination of obstacles to growth in his second book, *Growth recurring — economic change in world history* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988). Rather than concentrate on what was peculiar to European economic development, the book analyses economic growth and obstacles to growth in other parts of the world. Sung Dynasty China and Tokugawa Japan were, he believes, examples of sustained economic growth prior to the European 'take-off' in the 18th century. Economic growth, in other words, was neither peculiarly European nor tied to industrialisation. The essential prerequisites, Jones believes, for economic growth in the past have been the acceptance of a diffusion of power throughout the community and a willingness to accept wide variations in levels of income which has enabled those who earned wealth to reinvest it and thus continue to contribute to economic growth.

Another important research field in the field of educational psychology, Ronald Goldman, the foundation professor of Economics, in June, 1980 at the age of forty-nine, robbed the University of one of its leading economic thinkers in the field of macro-economics and wages policy. An economic consultant to both state and federal governments, he had been, in the 1960s, a key figure in the acceptance of productivity-related award increases in the national wage cases. In 1973, he published *Stagflation and wages policy in Australia* (Camberwell: Longman, 1973), a sustained argument in favor of restructuring wages policy in Australia, in co-operation with the unions, to achieve a more productivity-related outcome.

The School of Education offers a diverse mixture of research interests ranging through educational policy, multiculturalism and education, the psychology of learning, cooperative aspects of education, language teaching, and women in education. Among research done on educational policy, the work of Professor Brian Crittenden has been pre-eminent. In 1981, he published *Education for national understanding: philosophical perspectives on the study and practice of education* (Hawthorn: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1981), a collection of ten essays addressing major issues in the study of education including moral values, quality, personal autonomy, the curriculum, social reform, and equality. His most recent publication, *Parents, the state, and the right to educate* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1988) is a detailed analysis of how far the state’s authority should extend over educational practice and particularly over the right of the parent to induct a child into a particular way of life. While recognising the existence of various philosophical, moral and political constraints, Crittenden defends the right of parents to induct their children into a specific way of life and argues that they should be free to choose among various types of schooling.

In the field of educational psychology, Ronald Goldman, the foundation professor of education at La Trobe University, whose major research field was developmental psychology, created considerable controversy in the early 1980s when, with his wife Juliette, he published *Children’s sexual thinking: a comparative study of children aged 5 to 15 and fifteen years in Australia,*
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North America, Britain and Sweden (London: Routledge, 1982). The book was based on 838 personal clinical interviews with young people aged between five and fifteen years, in four different countries. The interviews were designed to measure the extent of children's sexual knowledge, to see if there were detectable sequences and stages in their sexual thinking, and what processes of thought they used to describe the biological functions of their bodies. One important result of the research was to suggest certain sequences upon which to base educational programs for children relating to sex and sexuality. Professor Goldman retired in 1987. Also in the area of educational psychology, the work of Dr Peter Langford in concept development in the primary and secondary school has been important: he has published two companion volumes, Concept development in the primary school (London: Croom Helm, 1987) and Concept development in the secondary school (London: Croom Helm, 1987), which explore the question of how children learn concepts in different subjects.

Dr Ronald Price's serious interest in comparative education began in the mid-1960s, before he came to La Trobe University, when he had the opportunity to go to China for two years as a teacher of English in the Foreign Languages Institute in Peking. He has returned on a number of occasions. A direct result of that work was his Education in Communist China (London: Routledge, 1970) which became a standard reference on the subject. He subsequently published Marx and education in Russia and China (London: Croom Helm, 1977) comparing educational developments in the USSR and China. Price concluded that the ideal of the free, classless man as the goal of education held by Marx had degenerated into bureaucratic formalism in both countries although China, under Mao, had continued to experiment with ways to overcome this.

The first text to be published on the sociology of Australian education which relied primarily on Australian materials was Dr Lois E. Foster's Australian Education: A sociological perspective (Melbourne: Prentice-Hall, 1981; second ed., 1987). Using a number of sociological approaches the book examines Australian society and education and the linkages between the two. The book offers a detailed analysis of social structures (including stratification, family, and industry), social organisation of the school, and issues of social control and social change relating to education. On the related issue of multiculturalism and education, Dr Foster and Dr David Stockley, another member of the School of Education, wrote Multiculturalism: the changing Australian paradigm (Clevedon, Avon: Multicultural Matters, 1984), a critical analysis of the early ideology of multiculturalism, widely accepted in Australia in the 1970s, which, they argue, undervalued ethnicity and minimised class differences. Dr Bob Bessant has published a number of studies in Australian educational history and politics which complement the work done in the sociology of education.

The School of Humanities is the largest and most diverse of the arts-based schools at La Trobe University. With fourteen different departments and divisions, the School boasts a bewildering array of research interests. Among the smaller and newer departments, Art History, Religious Studies, Archaeology, and Linguistics have begun to establish research reputations. In the Art History Department, Richard Haese's Rebels and precursors: The revolutionary years of Australian art (Ringwood, Vic.: Allen Lane, 1982), details the development of an important group of Australian artists in the 1930s and 1940s which included Sidney Nolan, Albert Tucker, Arthur Boyd, and John Perceval. Haese identifies this group with modernism and sees the culturally radical magazine Angry Penguins, which was edited by John Reed and Max Harris, as their mouthpiece. The book is based on interviews with some sixty people including the artists, their friends and enemies, as well as contemporary written records.

The work of Dr Ian McPhee, another member of the Art History Department, is in classical archaeology. His main area of research has been in Greek red-figured vase-painting, particularly of the fourth century BC, and, among other works, he has published, with A.D. Trendall, Greek red-figured fish-plates (Antike Kunst, Beiheft 14, Basel, 1987). Part of the reason for Dr McPhee's coming to La Trobe in 1974 was the presence on the campus of Professor A.D. Trendall who was professor of Greek and Archaeology at the University of Sydney until 1954 when he moved to the then recently established Australian National University to become...
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Master of University House and later Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Upon his retirement from the ANU in 1969 he accepted an offer from La Trobe University to live on the campus as the University's only resident fellow. In his apartment at the top of the south wing of Menzies College he works, surrounded by the best private library in Australia on ancient pottery.

Since coming to La Trobe in 1969, Professor Trendall has completed, in collaboration with Professor Alexander Cambitoglou, Professor of Classical Archaeology at the University of Sydney, a major three-volume work entitled The red-figured vases of Apulia (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-1982). This work complements both The red-figured vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967; with three supplements published by the Institute of Classical Studies, London, in 1970, 1973, and 1983) and The red-figured vases of Paestum (London: British School at Rome, 1987), a greatly expanded and up-dated version of his Paestan Pottery, originally published in 1936. Together, they constitute the full cycle of Professor Trendall's major studies of South Italian, red-figure, vase-painting begun over fifty years ago. His recent work, Red-figured vases of South Italy and Sicily (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), is a brief, comprehensive survey of the whole subject. A scholar with an established world-wide reputation, he has made a distinguished contribution to the research done on the Bundoora campus.

The Archaeology Department has specialised in the archaeology of Australia and the Pacific region. A small and relatively new department which grew out of the History Department, it has already begun to establish its reputation for field research. A co-ordinated series of excavations in limestone caves in South Australia, directed by Dr David Frankel has to date produced evidence both of human occupation up to 10,000 years ago and of the early use of stone tools which became widespread across Australia between 5-6,000 years ago. The Lapita Homeland Project, directed by Professor F. (Jim) Allen, the foundation professor of archaeology, and Dr Chris Gosden, is exploring whether or not the Bismarck Archipelago area of Papua New Guinea may have been the ancestral homeland for the groups of people who first settled the oceanic parts of the south Pacific, now called Eastern Melanesia and Polynesia. So far, the findings from cave excavations on New Ireland suggest an initial occupation around 32,000 years ago and evidence of the introduction of a range of animals on the island, the use of horticulture around 9,000 years ago, and a long-distance trade in the valuable volcanic glass obsidian which indicates a level of tribal organisation and technology normally associated with a later period.

Two other small and relatively new disciplines are Linguistics and Religious Studies. Like Archaeology, Religious Studies originated in the History Department and only became a separate division in 1984. It has adopted a self-consciously interdisciplinary approach to religious studies emphasising history, sociology, philosophy and, to some extent, anthropology. In both its origin and approach it is very different from the Religious Studies departments found in the Universities of Queensland and Sydney which had their origins in more directly religious, denominational colleges. Dr John Painter has published widely in Johannine Christianity, although his latest book Theology as hermeneutics: Rudolf Bultmann's interpretation of the history of Jesus (Sheffield: Almond, 1987) offers an interpretation of the work of the important 20th century German Protestant theologian whose reinterpretation of the Bible has had major Jesuit interpretation of Confucianism (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986), a case study of a major cultural confrontation between East and West in which Jesuit missionaries, the first intermediaries in that confrontation, struggled to understand the value system and beliefs of a totally alien culture and to relay this interpretation back to Europe. Dr Greg Bailey's work on Indian religious thought, particularly The mythology of Brahma (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983) discusses the role of the god Brahma as reflected in Indian literature dating from 400 BC to 400 AD.

In Linguistics, Dr David Bradley's research focuses on the linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan region and on migrant English. Among other works, he has published, with Dr Marta Rado (now retired) and Dr Lois Foster of the School of Education, a two-volume study titled English language needs of migrant and refugee youth (Canberra: AGFS, 1984-86). Dr Peter K. Austin's work, on the other hand, has focussed on Aboriginal languages in the southern Pilbara region.
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of Western Australia and on typographical studies of case-marking and complex sentences.

The Music Department was established in the School of Humanities in 1974. It was consciously designed to complement rather than duplicate existing Victorian tertiary music courses. As a consequence of that orientation it has, in its teaching and research, developed a very strong emphasis on the theory and analytical understanding of musical composition rather than musical performance. Almost all the members of the Department are themselves composers; moreover, in their compositions, they are consciously attempting to integrate the new technology, based on the microprocessor.

Keith Humble, the foundation professor of music, is well known both in Australia and overseas for his compositions, his talents as a pianist, and his abilities as a conductor. He was the moving spirit behind the establishment of the Australian Contemporary Music Ensemble in the 1970s and was its first musical director: the ensemble draws on a national pool of almost forty top Australian contemporary musicians, has toured overseas, and has released its own recordings. Professor Humble retired in April 1989. Lawrence Whiffin has written music for the Astra Chamber Music Society, the Australian Contemporary Music Ensemble, the Melbourne International Festival of Organ and Harpsichord, the Flederman Ensemble, Pipeline, and Australia Felix. In 1986, he edited, with Haydn Reeder, another composer and pianist in the Department, Contemporary Australian music: twelve compositions for piano solo (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1986). One of the leading exponents of jazz music in the Department is Jeff Pressing, who is himself a composer and performer (keyboard and percussion) of both contemporary and jazz music. Pressing has recorded three albums of his own compositions for the Los Angeles Discovery label. He is particularly interested in digital keyboard synthesis and is the founder of the repertoire synthesiser orchestra OZDIMO.

The Music Department has also nurtured an unusual research project in historical musicology under the direction of John A. Stinson. The project has been designed to recover, edit, and record French and Italian music from the 14th century, the age of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Chaucer. A broadly representative selection of this music is to be made available in a series of seven compact discs, several of which are already available. It is an inter-university project: John Stinson of La Trobe and Dr John Griffith of the Faculty of Music at the University of Melbourne are the joint-directors. Most of the music has been recovered from 366 parchment and paper manuscripts which comprise a complete catalogue of the known, surviving manuscripts of 14th century music. Professor Giovanni Carsaniga, of Italian Studies, has translated the Italian texts. The manuscripts contained 2937 musical compositions by approximately 450 composers. The music is performed by The Ensemble of the Fourteenth Century, a special group of twelve singers and instrumentalists, who use musical instruments that have been specially made to conform to surviving archival descriptions and pictorial representations of late medieval instruments. The project is making available to a world market authentic 14th century music which has not been heard for five centuries.

The largest departments in the School of Humanities are English, Philosophy, and History and they have developed research strengths in a variety of fields. In the Philosophy Department, for example, the major thrust of the research done to date falls into two broad areas: logic, epistemology, and metaphysics on the one hand, and social ethics and political philosophy on the other. The leading figure in the area of social issues is Professor John McCloskey whose work has focussed on human ethics and rights and on the environment. In 1983 McCloskey published Ecological ethics and politics (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1983), which critically examined the philosophical foundations underpinning the arguments advanced for an 'ecological crisis,' outlined the dimensions of the crisis, and analysed possible courses of action. In the book, McCloskey warned against over-reaction to ecological issues and argued that the case for conservation and preservation needed to adopt a more 'human centred' approach. This work represents an expansion of themes present in his first major publication, Meta-ethics and normative ethics (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1969). Peter Singer, who subsequently accepted a chair at Monash University, published Animal liberation: a new ethics for our treatment of animals (New York: New York Review Book, 1975), a critical discussion of the
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raising of animals for food and their use for scientific experiments, in which he argued that it was only morally justifiable to kill animals if it was necessary and demonstrated that much of the present killing is for trivial and unnecessary reasons. Dr Michael Stocker has explored the concept of values in his Plural and Conflicting Values (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

In the field of logic, epistemology, and metaphysics Brian Ellis, the foundation professor of philosophy at La Trobe, has published Rational belief systems (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), an attempt to develop a scientific epistemology compatible with a physicalist view of man which posits that man is a physical organism reacting in various ways to his environment. Hence, from a physicalist's standpoint, man's beliefs and his reasoning are acquired by physical, causal processes. Ellis argues that the laws governing the structure and dynamics of rational belief systems, consistent with the physicalist view of man, are the laws of logic. In a somewhat different vein within the physicalist tradition, Dr John C. Bigelow has published The reality of numbers: a physicalist's philosophy of mathematics (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) in which he challenges the metaphysical doctrine of nominalism with a realist theory of universals, arguing that numbers are real, non-linguistic, physical properties or relations. Two former members of the Philosophy Department, Dr Robert Pargetter and Dr Frank C. Jackson who accepted professorships at Monash (Jackson later moved to the ANU), published in the field of logic and epistemology: Jackson is well known for his book titled Perception: a representative theory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), a case for a Lockean representative theory of visual perception.

Dr Robert Young bridges both streams of research in the Philosophy Department: he has written extensively on both metaphysics and political philosophy. In 1975, he published Freedom, responsibility and god (London: Macmillan Press, 1975), a consideration of whether there are any obstacles, natural or theological, to individuals behaving freely. In 1986, he followed this with, Personal autonomy: beyond negative and positive liberty (London: Croom Helm, 1986), an analysis of the notion of personal autonomy arguing that the conventional emphasis on freedom from constraint is too narrow because it concentrates too much on external obstacles and neglects internal obstacles to autonomy. Young explores the limits that need to be placed on personal autonomy in order to promote a similar autonomy in others. Dr C. Behan McCullagh's research, on the other hand, does not fit into either major field of research in the department; in 1984, he published Justifying historical descriptions (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), a contribution to a long-standing debate among philosophers about the nature of historical explanation.

The Department of English has developed research strengths in early modern literature, in Australian Studies, and in creative writing. Professor Derick R.C. Marsh, who retired early in 1989, was appointed to the foundation chair of English at La Trobe University and is one of the leading Shakespeare scholars in Australia. While at La Trobe, he published Shakespeare's Hamlet (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1970), an account of the play and its critical reception throughout the 19th and 20th centuries: Marsh suggests that the play makes sense only if understood as Hamlet's agonising struggle to find a basis for moral action in the morass of corruption he saw pervading Denmark. Six years later, Professor Marsh published Passion lends them power: a study of Shakespeare's love tragedies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), which is primarily an exploration of the way in which Shakespeare deals with the theme of love in the great love tragedies of Romeo and Juliet, Othello, and Antony and Cleopatra. Marsh argues that these tragedies, like the Shakespearean romances, all share a common concern with establishing a value for love and, hence, for life itself in the face of the inevitability of death. In this work, Professor Marsh elaborates on a theme first developed in 1962 in his first major work, The recurring miracle: a study of Cymbeline and the last plays (3rd reprint, Sydney: University of Sydney, 1982), a study of the way in which Shakespeare portrayed the power of destructive self-centredness as contrasted with the role of love as the regenerative force of life itself.

Another member of the Department with a research interest in Shakespeare is A.L. French who, in 1972, published Shakespeare and the critics (Cambridge: Cambridge University
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Press, 1972), an analysis of four major Shakespearian tragedies which attempts to unravel the various anomalies in each of the plays. Dr Gregory C. Kratzmann, another member of the English Department who is working in the late medieval and early modern field has published Anglo-Scottish Literary Relations, 1430-1550 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), an exploration of the way in which Scottish poets drew on English literature, particularly Chaucer, in the 15th century, to enrich their own work and by the early 16th century, that work had begun to influence English poets. Kratzmann has also edited two late medieval, Scottish, narrative poems, which were probably influenced by Chaucer, in Colkeldie sow and the tales of the four beasts (New York: Garland, 1983).

In the field of Australian Studies, R. John Barnes has edited the works of Joseph Furphy (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1981), a collection of short stories by Australian writers. An Australian selection: short stories by Lawson, Palmer, Porter, White, and Cuvcon (Melbourne: Angus & Robertson, 1974), and a collection of essays dealing with the situation of the creative writer in Australia, The writer in Australia: a collection of literary documents, 1856 to 1964 (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1969). He is also the foundation editor of Meridian, a journal published by the Department of English dealing with literary, cultural and media criticism from an Australian standpoint. Dr Lucy Frost has published No place for a nervous lady: voices from the Australian bush (Fitzroy: McPhee Gribble/Penguin, 1984), an edited collection of the unpublished diaries and letters of a dozen women who lived in the Australian bush between the 1840s and the 1880s, and Dr David J. Tacey has recently published a psychological study of the contemporary Australian novelist, Patrick White, under the title Patrick White: fiction and the unconscious (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988).

The Department of English has also nurtured some creative writers: Judith Rodriguez, the well-known poet, published a number of collections of verse during the seventeen years she taught at La Trobe, and Laurie Clancy, in addition to studies of Christina Stead, Xavier Herbert and Vladimir Nabokov, is also recognised for his novels and short stories particularly A collapsible man (Fitzroy: Outback Press, 1975), The wife specialist (Melbourne: Hyland House, 1979), and Perfect love (Melbourne: Hyland House, 1983).

The History Department is the largest department in the School of Humanities and one of the most productive in terms of research. It has developed research strengths in a wide variety of fields among which Australian history is one of the most renowned. Dr Alan Frost is well known for his work in early Australian history: he is perhaps best known for his Convicts and empire: a naval question, 1776-1811 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980) a study which argues that the primary purpose of the British settlement of Australia was not the removal of convicts from overflowing gaols and hulks but the larger strategic aim of protecting British colonial possessions in the East from French, Dutch and Spanish incursions. Related to that strategic objective was the expectation of obtaining a more certain source of naval stores for British fleets in eastern waters. His subsequent biography of the first governor of the colony of New South Wales, Arthur Phillip, 1738-1814: his voyaging (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), is an elegantly written and beautifully illustrated panorama of the life and times of the man who successfully established the infant colony of New South Wales against daunting odds. As a captain in the Royal Navy, Phillip had voyaged throughout most of the world and the book is based on research in five continents made necessary by the absence of private papers left by a man who, as a contemporary observed, had 'been longer on the seas than on the land.'

Dr John B. Hirst has taken the story of the New South Wales settlement forward in his Convict society and its enemies: a history of early New South Wales (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1983), a study which critically examines the workings of the convict system in that colony in the light of the claims that it was, in reality, a debased slave society composed of corrupt masters and brutalised convicts. Through a detailed examination both of the operation of the convict system and its influence on the wider society, Hirst demonstrates that the image of a slave society was quite inappropriate to describe the young colony, and shows how the attempt to revive transportation to New South Wales in the 1840s spawned a political movement which fastened this false image of the early years of the colony onto the popular (and historical) imagination.
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In a subsequent study of New South Wales in the middle decades of the 19th century, *The Strange Birth of Colonial Democracy: New South Wales, 1848-1884* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988), Dr Hirst analyses how the forces of democracy triumphed over what appeared to be a well-entrenched, conservative, land-owning class and goes on to examine the nature of the new democratic order they established.

Dr John Barrett has written two books exploring aspects of the influence of the military in twentieth century Australian history. *Falling in: Australians and boy conscription 1911-1915* (Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1979) demolished the common misconception of compulsory military training in the early 20th century as an unpopular scheme that was doomed to failure and demonstrated that most Australians, including the boys who were forced to do the training, went along, willingly enough, with the initial experiment. Barrett is perhaps better known for his study of the 2nd AIF, *We were there: Australian soldiers of World War II* (Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1987), a book based on the written responses to a lengthy questionnaire from 3700 former members of the Australian army during World War II. Information was sought on the experiences of the men prior to joining up, while in the army, and after the war. It is a major study of the lives and attitudes of ordinary Australian soldiers and an important contribution to Australian social history. The book is dedicated to Professor Roger B. Joyce, another member of the History Department who was to be a co-author with Dr Barrett. Unfortunately, Professor Joyce died suddenly of a heart attack in the early stages of the project. An Australian historian, Joyce is best remembered for his biography of the barrister who became premier and, later, Chief Justice of Queensland and eventually the founding Chief Justice of the Commonwealth, *Samuel Walker Griffith* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984).


The history of race relations in the Antipodes over the past two centuries has been discussed in Dr Alan Ward's study of Maori-Pakeha relations in 19th century New Zealand, *A Shaw of Justice: racial amalgamation in nineteenth century New Zealand* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974). Ward, who has since become professor of history at the University of Newcastle, used the records of the old Native Department to focus on the effort to bring the Maori people into a central state, under the rule of law, on the basis of 'amalgamation' with the white settlers, and detailed Maori responses to that effort. Like Dr Ward with the Maoris, Dr Richard Broome has tried to capture the response of the first Australians to the white settlers in his synthesis titled *Aboriginal Australians: black response to white dominance, 1788-1980* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1982) which was the first overview of the history of Aboriginal-European relations in Australia to be published.

The most acclaimed book written by a member of the History Department is undoubtedly Professor Rhys Isaac's *The transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture) which won the Pulitzer Prize in History, the first time that particular award has been won by an Australian scholar, and only the second time that an Australian has received a Pulitzer prize, the highest US award for achievement in journalism and the arts. The book analyses the effect of religious revival and political revolution on Virginian society in the second half of the 18th century. Using the approach of an ethnographer and the concept of dramaturgy borrowed from the
Building La Trobe University

teatre. Professor Isaac has imaginatively reconstructed Virginian society focusing on the themes of religion, learning, and authority. A series of detailed reconstructions of particular events explores not just the written word but the way in which gesture, demeanour, dress, architecture, and other paralinguistic forms of expression were used to convey meanings and significance in that society. The transformation of Virginia is a beautifully produced book and a vivid and moving recreation of a world far distant from our own.

Inga Clendinnen, another social historian, in Ambivalent conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) has recreated the world of the conquering Spaniards, both military and religious, and of the Maya Indians during the first fifty years of the Spanish occupation of the Yucatan peninsula. The book offers a fresh interpretation of the meaning of that interaction and elucidates the profoundly distorted way in which both sides came to see each other and interpret each other's actions. In 1988 the book was awarded the prestigious Bolton Prize of the Conference on Latin American History. Dr Dale Kent, who has recently accepted a professorship at the University of California at Riverside, is a Renaissance scholar who is also interested in social history. While at La Trobe, she published two books on fifteenth century Florence: The rise of the Medici: faction in Florence, 1426-1434 (London: Oxford University Press, 1978) and, with F.W. Kent, Neighbours and neighbourhood in Renaissance Florence: the district of the Red Lion in the fifteenth century (Locust Valley, New York: J.J. Augustin, 1982, for the Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies). Both books have provided new insights into the political and social structure of fifteenth century Florence.

In the study of North America, Professor Isaac's interest in 18th century Virginia is matched by Professor John A. Salmond's research into the history of the 20th century American South. In a series of biographies, he has explored different aspects of Southern liberalism in the 20th century. A Southern rebel: the life and times of Aubrey Willis Williams, 1890-1965 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983) captures the life of a liberal Southerner who was caught up in the ferment of the New Deal in the 1930s and eventually became the executive director of the National Youth Administration. His concern for blacks and for civil rights made him a target for right-wing political groups and he was eventually forced out of the federal administration. Returning to his native Alabama shortly after World War II, he became one of the lonely band of Southern liberals who, in the years of segregation before the civil rights revolution of the 1960s, worked for justice for black southerners. In Miss Lucy of the CIO: the life and times of Lucy Ravdolph Mason, 1882-1959 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1968), Salmond tells the story of the gentle daughter of an Episcopal clergyman in Virginia who, from her youth, became involved in social causes, including social feminism and civil rights, and the promotion of social justice particularly in her native South. In the 1930s and 1940s she became a key union organiser in the largely unsuccessful attempt to unionise the South, a task that was both challenging and physically dangerous. Professor Salmond's latest biography, Conscience of a lawyer: the life and times of Clifford J. Durr, 1899-1975 (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1989) explores the life of a Southern lawyer who, like Aubrey Williams, was involved in the New Deal and emerged in the 1940s and 1950s as an important advocate of justice for black Americans in the South. Dr William J. Breen's research has concentrated on the early 20th century United States. His major work to date is a study of the homefront mobilisation during World War I, Uncle Sam at home: civilian mobilisation, wartime federalism, and the Council of National Defense, 1917-1919 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984).

Other members of the History Department have published significant books ranging from Dr A.W. Disney's Twilight of the pepper empire: Portuguese trade in Southeast India in the early seventeenth century (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1978) to Dr A. James Hammerton's Emigrant gentlemen: gentled poverty and female emigration, 1830-1914 (London: Croom Helm, 1979) and Alex Tyrrell's Joseph Sturge and the Moral Radical Party in early Victorian Britain (London: Christopher Helm, 1987). Dr Richard Stremski and Dr Bill Murray, who have both published monographs in European history, have recently published serious studies in sports history. In addition to The Right-Wing Press in the French Revolution: 1789-92 (London: 108
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Royal Historical Society, 1986), Murray has published The old firm: sectarianism, sport and society in Scotland (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1984), a study of the way in which the religious division in Scottish society was reflected in the famous rivalry between the (Catholic) Celtic and (Protestant) Rangers football teams of Glasgow from the late 19th century down to the present day. Closer to home, in 1986, Stremski published Kill for Collingwood (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986), the first serious history of the Collingwood Football Club, a team that has inspired both fanatical devotion and rabid detestation among followers of Australian Rules Football for one hundred years.

An account of research in the Arts-based schools at La Trobe would, of course, be incomplete without some acknowledgement of the contribution made by postgraduate students. To the end of 1988, those four Schools had graduated a total of 560 postgraduate degrees, 384 MAs and 175 PhDs. Of the 175 PhDs, Humanities and Social Sciences graduated the largest group with 55 and 57 degrees respectively. Education graduated 39 and Economics 24 in that period. Many of these higher degrees were of a sufficient quality to be published subsequently in article or book form. Examples of dissertations subsequently published as books cover a wide variety of topics ranging from culture contact in the Pacific in Ron H. Adams, In the land of strangers: a century of European contact with Tanna, 1774-1874 (Canberra: Australian National University, 1984), to Robert K. Haldane, The people’s force: a history of the Victoria Police (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1986), Leonie J. Foster, High hopes: the men and motives of the Australian Round Table (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1986), Ann McGrath, Born in the cattle: Aborigines in the cattle country (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987), and Kerreen Reiger, The disenchantedment of the home: modernising Australian domestic life (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1985), among others. The Arts-based schools have provided a supportive environment for postgraduate research over the past twenty-five years.

The research record of the Arts-based schools at La Trobe University over the past quarter-century is impressive both in the broad range of interests pursued and in the extent of scholarly publication that has resulted. For reasons of space, the above discussion has not included all the books published, has not attempted to deal with journal publications, and has tried to avoid reference to edited works. Although still a relatively new University, it could not be said that the Arts-based schools at La Trobe have neglected the fundamental role of a genuine university, which is not just to pass on existing knowledge but to expand the boundaries of what we already know. Over the past quarter-century, although much energy has, necessarily, been channelled into the exhausting task of building a new and complex institution, research in the Arts-based schools has been valued and nurtured. The resulting research output is now contributing to the growing reputation, both national and international, of La Trobe University.
This page has been intentionally left blank
THE UNIVERSITY
AND ITS
STUDENTS
There are many ways of tracing a path through the twenty-five year history of an institution such as La Trobe: by sounding the memories of the founders and first staff members; by matching the construction of the buildings and the development of the landscape with the planners' dreams; by measuring the increasing intellectual range and depth of the courses offered and research undertaken. But the meaning of the University's history seems to me to be crystallised in the pages of student statistics that have been compiled annually by the administration in compliance with government directives. These pages evoke an image of a series of processions of women and men, of different ages and backgrounds, of different dreams and desires, who responded to the promise of the University's motto, 'Qui cherche, trouve'. Read in the light of other evidence, the statistics reveal La Trobe's part in the larger social changes of the quarter century: changes in the roles of men and women, in the Australian educational system, in the workforce, and in the interrelationships between all of these.

It was a small procession of students who enrolled in the first year — 329 men and 223 women. Slightly more than half of them (297 — 141 men and 156 women) had enrolled for the BA degree, 101 enrolled in science and 96 in economics. The other 48 were enrolled for higher degrees, including 2 men in the PhD course. In 1968, twice as many students enrolled (1163) and the number doubled again in 1969 (2052). Figure 1 shows the pattern of growth in total student numbers from 1967 to 1988 — the annual increase reversed in 1978 and growth did not recommence until 1984. The sudden leap in 1988 from 10,002 to 13,165 students resulted largely from the amalgamation with the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences, although there was also some increase in enrolments in the pre-existing La Trobe Schools. La Trobe retains its status as the third largest university in terms of student numbers, but is now shadowing Monash very closely. The University of Melbourne in 1988 had 16,733 students and Monash 14,768.

Figure 1: Total Student Enrolments 1967-88 at La Trobe University

---

The Students

Margaret James
These three universities have shared, along with other universities and the colleges of advanced education, in the Australia-wide expansion of higher education enrolments over the last three decades. Much of this expansion took place in the colleges of advanced education, but the universities doubled their enrolments between 1967 (when La Trobe first opened to students) and 1988. Characteristics of this growth include an increase in the number and proportion of part-time students, many of them mature-age students, and in the number of postgraduate degree and diploma enrolments. The extent to which universities perpetuate social privilege by providing education for the offspring of the middle class has been much debated, but even though the children of certain managerial and professional occupations are represented in university enrolments in greater proportion than in the population at large, there is evidence of some change over time in the socio-economic composition of the student population. Women, mature-age people, and Aborigines have all gained significantly greater access to higher education, along with students from rural areas and families in the lower socio-economic groups.

This chapter shows the extent to which La Trobe's experience both reflected and varied from the state and national pattern.

Participation of Women and Men

The growth in La Trobe's student population in its first decades was contingent on the success of the secondary schools in retaining their students through to year twelve and on the success of those students in the university entrance examinations. In 1966, the year before La Trobe opened, 21.2 per cent of seventeen-year old males were still at school, but only 13.4 per cent of females of the same age. This disparity was reflected in university enrolments: in the same year, women comprised only slightly more than a quarter (26.4 per cent) of all university enrolments. The formal barriers to the equal participation of women in university education had been overthrown in the nineteenth century but the invisible barriers of stereotyped assumptions about women's ability and the seeming inevitability of their domestic role remained formidable. When the foundation of La Trobe University was being discussed in Parliament in 1964, the Member for Benambra expressed a common attitude of the period towards women preparing for a professional career by undertaking higher education: 'A doctor friend of mine, in advising my niece not to take up medicine, said that in most cases medicine for a girl is an expensive way to the washtub'. But women (and their parents and teachers on their behalf) were even then beginning to expect a destiny other than — or in addition to — the washtub and expressed it by staying on at school in greater numbers. By 1977 participation rates for seventeen year old girls exceeded those for boys and in consequence (albeit not immediately) university enrolments of women increased steadily until by

FIGURE 2: MALE AND FEMALE ENROLMENTS 1967-88 AT LA TROBE UNIVERSITY
The Student Population

1988 slightly more women than men commenced university courses (36,272 women and 35,470 men).

La Trobe's share in the process of increased female participation in university education can be seen in Figure 2 — the line representing the number of women enrolling moves steadily up the graph, although the rate of increase slowed from 1977 to 1982. Amalgamation with Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences was responsible for the sharp increase in female enrolment in 1988. Enrolments of men, on the other hand, peaked in 1977 and then declined. Since 1983, they have begun to recover a little.

What the figure does not show is that in almost every year since its foundation, La Trobe has enrolled a higher proportion of women than any other Australian university and showed itself well ahead of the national average in higher education by passing the halfway point for female enrolments in 1981. The percentage of women enrolling at La Trobe since 1967 and the percentage enrolled at all Australian universities are shown in Figure 3. (As these figures are based on total numbers, the percentage for all universities is still slightly under fifty.)

FIGURE 3: PERCENTAGE FEMALE STUDENTS — LA TROBE UNIVERSITY AND AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

As well as encouraging women to enter higher education, La Trobe has adopted an innovative program which, it is believed, will assist them to progress with their academic careers. A Working Party appointed by Council to examine the status of women at La Trobe University concluded from its examination of the academic progress of male and female students at La Trobe that additional encouragement was needed to assist students to undertake the fourth year of study which leads to an Honours degree and provides the qualification for entry to higher degree study. In 1987, the Honours Year Grants Scheme was adopted to provide grants for students who are eligible to proceed to fourth year, but whose progress is hindered by non-academic considerations. The grants are available to both men and women and are awarded primarily according to individual need, though an attempt is made to give a reasonable share to all schools. So far grants have been made to twenty-six men and fifty-six women. A small increase has been noted in Honours enrolments since the start of the scheme.

Social and Educational Background

The pages of statistics on student enrolments can tell us much about the student population, but more detailed information is needed for planning an educational policy matched to the students' capacities and characteristics. Beginning in 1985, new first-year undergraduate students have been asked to fill in a survey form when they enrol, answering questions about their educational background, their families, their mode of financial support and their attitudes to their university courses. The discussion below draws mainly on the results of the survey in
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1987, the last year before amalgamation. The survey in 1988 included students enrolling in the Lincoln School of Health Sciences, but as the response rate from this group of students was fairly low, it will be desirable to wait another year before drawing comparisons between students in the new school and the 'traditional' La Trobe students. There have been very few significant changes in the major characteristics of new students from 1985 to 1987. It is only possible to guess at the nature of the student population before 1985, but it is reasonable to surmise that some aspects of its nature were established early in the institution's history.

The first questions asked of the undergraduate intake in 1987 related to the disparate routes which brought them to the University. About two-thirds entered via the conventional route provided by the Victorian HSC (since replaced by the VCE). The number of students entering through less conventional routes was lower in 1987 than in 1985 (660 compared with 840). Of these, about 5.8 per cent had completed the Tertiary Orientation Program (also since replaced by the VCE). The group which achieved Special Entry through the early leavers' scheme amounted to 7.7 per cent of the total. About another one-tenth came to La Trobe after undertaking some other form of tertiary study in addition to HSC. As Table 1 below indicates, women were rather more likely to come in through Special Entry; men were slightly more likely to have undertaken other study in addition to the HSC.

| Proportion of male and female new first year undergraduate students by type of application, 1987 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Male | Female |
| N = 934 | N = 1200 |
| % | % |
| Less than three attempts at full-time HSC | 68.4 | 62.0 |
| Vic. HSC plus other study | 9.0 | 8.4 |
| Special entry | 6.2 | 8.3 |
| Tertiary Orientation Program | 3.8 | 6.8 |
| Overseas and interstate qualifications | 4.6 | 4.4 |
| Mature age HSC | 1.3 | 1.8 |
| Other | 6.6 | 8.3 |
| 100 | 100 |

A range of educational backgrounds among the students is also apparent from the survey. Tables 2 below shows the proportion of men and women coming from each of the major school systems — government, high school, Catholic, and independent, together with a miscellaneous category called 'other'. It will be seen that the women entering La Trobe are much less likely than the men to have received their secondary education at independent schools.

This table includes students who had just finished their secondary schooling as well as those who left school many years earlier, but it is still interesting to compare these figures with the distribution of the secondary school student population. In Victoria in 1986, 56.8 per cent of Year 12 students were attending government schools, 23.7 per cent Catholic schools and another 19.6 per cent were at the independent schools. While it appears in general that students from government schools are less likely to attend university than those from the independent schools, La Trobe's students are more representative than the Monash population — this can be seen from Table 3 below. In 1986, 29.4 per cent of new Monash students came from independent schools, compared with 19.2 per cent of La Trobe's. (The Monash information comes from a similar survey conducted at Monash every two years.)

Students were also asked in the survey to provide some information about their parents'
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TABLE 2
Type of school attended for most of secondary education by new first-year undergraduate students, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Male N = 912</th>
<th>Female N = 1150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State high or technical</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Type of school attended for most of secondary education by new first-year undergraduate students, La Trobe and Monash, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>La Trobe N = 2153</th>
<th>Monash N = 2334</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Monash figures exclude those on student visas

education and occupations. The answers revealed that nearly all students belonged to the first generation in their families to receive a university education and that more than one-third had already received more secondary education than their parents when they entered La Trobe. Fewer fathers of female students at La Trobe have reached high educational levels. This is shown in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4
Educational level of fathers of new first-year undergraduate students, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male N = 888</th>
<th>Female N = 1131</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/higher degree</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma, teaching or other professional qualification</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special training</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary five to six years</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary less than five years</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or less</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mothers of La Trobe students are less highly educated than the fathers, which reflects the lack of opportunity for women in past generations. (See Table 5). Women seem to have less highly educated mothers than the male students.
TABLE 5
Educational level of mothers of new first-year undergraduate students, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 888</td>
<td>N = 1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/higher degree</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma, teaching or other professional qualification</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special training</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary five to six years</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary less than five years</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or less</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mothers of La Trobe students are less likely to have received high levels of education than their counterparts at Monash. (See Table 6 below.)

TABLE 6
Educational level of mothers of new first-year undergraduate students, La Trobe and Monash, 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>La Trobe N = 2185</th>
<th>Monash N = 2334</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree higher degree</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma, teaching or other professional qualification</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special training</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary five to six years</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary less than five years</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or less</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Monash figures exclude those on student visas

The answers that students gave to the questions about their parents' occupations are rather difficult to interpret, although this material is crucial to resolving the question of the extent to which the universities are perpetuating social privilege or opening up new opportunities for disadvantaged social groups. The material can, however, be used with more confidence for comparing groups within the La Trobe student population and here we find that lower proportions of female students at La Trobe come from the higher socio-economic groups. This finding complements the finding on the educational background of parents of female students. Most studies undertaken in other Australian universities and in industrialised countries overseas show the reverse — that is, that female students tend to come from higher socio-economic backgrounds than male students. For example, D.S. Anderson and A.E. Vervoorn point out in their 1983 study of Australian students in higher education, titled Access to Privilege: patterns of participation in Australian post-secondary education, (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1983) that 'Studies dealing specifically with the social background of female university students have emphasised their relatively high status family origins.' Table 7 below shows the occupational distribution of the fathers of new La Trobe students in 1987.
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Note that fathers who are unemployed or retired or otherwise not in the workforce are not included in the calculations.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 726</td>
<td>N = 952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper professional</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower professional</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger employer/managerial</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employer/managerial</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman/skilled manual</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled/farm worker</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occupational pattern of students' mothers is rather different from that of the fathers, again reflecting the educational and workforce participation of older generations of women. Table 8 shows that only a small proportion belong to the upper professional and managerial group of occupations, although about one-quarter are counted in the 'lower professional' occupations, which include teaching and nursing, and another one-quarter are engaged in 'white collar' occupations, such as clerical and secretarial work. The table excludes a large number, amounting to just over one-third of the total (697 out of 1910) whose occupation fitted the description 'home duties'.

**TABLE 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 726</td>
<td>N = 952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper professional</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower professional</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger employer/managerial</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employer/managerial</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman/skilled manual</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled/farm worker</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The socio-economic status of parents affects the type of financial support that students draw on during their studies. Over the three years of the survey, there has been a small decline in the proportion of students relying on TEAS or AUSTUDY for financial support (from 27.7 per cent to 24.8 per cent), but as this is matched by a comparable decline in the proportion depending on parents or relatives for support, (from 41.1 per cent to 38.6 per cent), it suggests more stringent means-testing rather than an increase in the affluence of the students' families. As many as 32.5 per cent of 1987 students (compared with 27.5 per cent in 1985) expected to support themselves from full- or part-time work or from their own savings.
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This evidence from the student survey reinforces the claim that La Trobe is a university which is expanding opportunity rather than perpetuating privilege.

Cultural and National Background

La Trobe’s claim to be ‘an equal opportunity’ university rests not only on the numbers of students it enrolls from less privileged backgrounds and on the high ratio of female to male students, but on the multicultural nature of its student population. This claim can be supported, even though there has been a reduction in the proportion of students born overseas since 1985 (23 per cent of new first-year undergraduates, down to 17 per cent in 1987) and a corresponding reduction in the proportion of students whose first language is not English (32 per cent in 1985, 26 per cent in 1987). More than half of La Trobe’s students come from migrant backgrounds, the women slightly more so than the men. This can be seen in Table 9 below. The table does not indicate the number of Aboriginal students, which is so far very tiny. In 1987, only six women and seven men indicated that they were Aborigines or Torres Straits Islanders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace of fathers of new first-year undergraduate students, 1987</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the student survey, three groups were identified for more detailed analysis: these were the students of Asian, European and Australian background.

The students of Asian origin form a significant but not very large group — 167 or 7 per cent of all new undergraduates in 1987, a rather smaller number than in 1985 when there were 207 Asian students or 9 per cent of the total. About half of them are female. These students show a preference for courses in Economics (29 per cent) and Mathematics and Information Science (28 per cent). Very few (8 per cent) study part-time. Half of them live with their parents and slightly less than half are dependent on their parents for financial support. Increasing proportions (11 per cent in 1985, 22 per cent in 1987) expected to gain an income from AUSTUDY during their period of enrolment. About 40 per cent of their parents have not received more than four years of secondary education. For a high (and increasing) proportion of this group, English is not their first language (87 per cent in 1987). Thirty-nine per cent of these students hold Australian citizenship.

The students of European background are quite different. To begin with, the proportion of women at 61 per cent is much higher than for the Asian group (and higher than the ratio for the total student population). Their major preference is for courses in Humanities (35 per cent) and Social Sciences (17 per cent). As many as 86 per cent live with their parents and 44 per cent are dependent on their parents for financial support, with another 29 per cent receiving AUSTUDY. A big majority (70 per cent) of the parents of these students have not received more than four years secondary education. Although most of these students are Australian-born (83
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per cent), for two-thirds of them English was not their first language. Nearly all (97 per cent) hold Australian citizenship.

Different again are the Australian-background students, of whom 54 per cent are women. Their course preferences are for Humanities (33 per cent), followed by Mathematics and Information Science (18 per cent) and Economics (15 per cent). As they are likely to be older than the European or Asian-background students, they are less likely to live with their parents (56 per cent) or to be dependent on them for financial support. A declining proportion of them receive AUSTUDY (27 per cent in 1985, 22 per cent in 1987). This group therefore includes a high proportion of the self-supporting. The parents of these students are more highly-educated than the parents of the students from European backgrounds (60 per cent have received more than four years of secondary education).

As suggested earlier, an understanding of the characteristics of the student population can assist in the formulation of educational policy and practice. This is more than ever needed, now that the government is requiring institutions to articulate more clearly and confidently their mission and to accept responsibility for improving equity of access to higher education for underprivileged groups, such as Aborigines, rural students, and students from lower socio-economic backgrounds. La Trobe is very well-placed to meet this demand, both from the nature of its existing clientele and from the philosophy of caring for the welfare of the student which has existed since its foundation.

Any discussion of the rise in female participation in higher education usually includes expressions of concern over their continued over-representation in arts courses and their under-representation in science and technology. One explanation of the high proportion of women at La Trobe is simply the absence of the prestigious professional schools — law, medicine and engineering — which have tended in the past to attract ambitious male students with high marks in university entrance examinations. Women undertaking higher education have traditionally preferred arts to science subjects and have tended to work in the caring professions, such as teaching, nursing and social work — the courses in which La Trobe excels. The enrolments at La Trobe have never been evenly distributed across the schools, although all have experienced a considerable increase in the proportion of women students, particularly at the undergraduate level. The variation and growth in female enrolments in the different schools can be gauged from Figure 4.

The schools which began with high female enrolments — Behavioural Science and Humanities — have experienced considerable increases over the past twenty-five years. Humanities began with a fifty-fifty male-female ratio, but is now two-thirds female; Behavioural Science, formerly two-thirds female, now enrols nearly four times as many women as men. But there have also been marked changes in the sex ratios of schools which were heavily male-dominated at their inception, such as Agriculture, Economics, and Physical Sciences, with Economics, now forty per cent female, most closely approaching parity. The new School of Mathematics and Information Sciences is also relatively attractive to women; 40.9 per cent of the students enrolled for undergraduate bachelor degrees in this School were female in 1988. Social Sciences and Biological Sciences have changed over the years from Schools in which women were in a minority to Schools with a majority of female students, although that majority is much greater in the case of Social Sciences. The Lincoln School of Health Sciences is the most female-dominated, with an 81.6 per cent female undergraduate bachelor enrolment in 1988.

Conclusions about changes in the preference of women for university courses and hence for their entrance to the full range of professional occupations should be tempered by reference to Figure 5, which shows that, despite the increase in female enrolments in non-traditional fields, a large majority of women still prefer the traditional ones.

In 1975, 82 per cent of women enrolling in undergraduate bachelor degrees chose the female-dominated Schools of Behavioural Science, Humanities and Social Sciences; by 1985,
this had dropped to 73 per cent. Over the same ten-year period, male students, however, scarcely changed their preferences: Figure 6 shows that just under half of the men were enrolled in the Schools of Behavioural Science, Humanities and Social Science both in 1975 and in 1985.
There are other ways in which the participation of women at La Trobe has differed from that of men. The strong female enrolment in undergraduate courses has not been equalled in higher degree enrolments, although there has been some improvement in recent years. The proportion of women enrolled for PhD and Masters degrees over the period is shown in Figure 7. Women now comprise over half of the enrolments for Masters degrees, but there is a difference between the research degrees and the coursework degrees. While female enrolment in Masters Research courses stood at just under half (47.2 per cent) in 1988, women formed a substantial majority of the students for the Masters by Coursework degree (68.8 per cent). However, PhD enrolments in 1988 were slightly more than one-third female. This is a reflection of a national trend, which is receiving attention at government level.

FIGURE 7: PERCENTAGE FEMALE ENROLMENTS IN MASTERS AND PhD DEGREES, 1967-88

Although there are continuing concerns about the under-representation of women in PhD courses, the trend is certainly in the upward direction and in other ways women students at La Trobe have shown a strong commitment to their careers and to their own continuing education and development. Diploma and postgraduate bachelor courses (including those offered in the Lincoln School of Health Sciences) have proved particularly attractive to women. Enrolment for the Diploma of Education is more than two-thirds female and likewise the Bachelor of Social Work.

There are two other important characteristics of La Trobe's students (especially female students) which deserve some mention here. The first is the growth in part-time enrolments since 1967, when less than one-fifth of students enrolled on a part-time basis. The proportion of part-time students peaked at 41.2 per cent of the total in 1979 (3413 out of a total of 8524 students). Part-time enrolments by men then declined until 1987; 1988 seemed to bring a reversal of the trend. For women, part-time enrolment has continued to grow. In 1988, women comprised 64.3 per cent of the part-time enrolments, compared with 61.5 per cent of the full-time enrolments. The need to combine study with employment or family responsibilities has led to a high proportion of part-time enrolments in postgraduate courses, particularly those in the School of Education.

A related trend is the increase in the average age of university students partly a result of the enrolments of adults seeking to make up for opportunities absent or foregone during their youth and partly from the desire of many to extend their qualifications beyond the first degree. The age distribution of the full-time students in 1988 is shown in Figure 8 below.

For part-time students, on the other hand, the age profile is different, as Figure 9 shows. The presence of older students, especially older women, is strongly marked.
In fact, both these trends have particularly benefitted women, who were more likely in the past to have been excluded from higher education for social or family reasons. La Trobe has also adopted policies which, although designed to benefit both men and women, have in practice tended to encourage the participation of women — for example, the special entry scheme for mature-age students who had not been able to complete their secondary education has enabled many women to gain a university education. The academic success of such students and the gain to the university have been commented on elsewhere.
The first meeting of the Interim Council of La Trobe University, on 22 December 1964, decided to set up a Residences Committee (subsequently re-named the Colleges Committee). Members elected to form the committee were: Mrs Whitney King; the Hon. J.W. Galbally; Rev. Professor J.D. McCaughey (Chairman). Later, Mr C.E. Newman and the Hon. M.A. Clarke were added to the Committee. The initial meeting of the Colleges Committee, held on 15 February 1965, noted that the La Trobe University Act stated among the objects of the University that it was, in particular, 'to foster the general welfare and development of all enrolled students' and that the University shall be 'an institution in which all enrolled students will have the opportunity of fitting themselves for life as well as becoming learned in a particular branch or branches of learning.' This was to become an important guiding principle for the Committee.

The Colleges Committee took the view that residence had an essential part to play in the creation and development of the University as an academic community. Members of the Committee felt that residence should be thought of as part of the educational and cultural services of the University and not merely as a welfare service for students.

Guided by these general principles, the Colleges Committee at its meeting on 29 March 1965, was able to agree on the following recommendations to the Interim Council concerning the development of colleges at La Trobe:

1. That a number of colleges should be established in which the domestic, social, cultural and some of the academic life of students would be centred. Every member of the University, both student and staff, should be attached to a college.

2. Colleges should ultimately be 600-1000 strong with at least forty per cent of that number in residence. (This target was subsequently reduced to twenty per cent in residence to comply with government funding requirements.) The colleges should be designed to provide academic, cultural and recreational facilities for both resident and non-resident students.

3. Each college would cater for both men and women students. Although sharing eating and other facilities in common, men and women in residence would have their rooms in separate wings.

4. Council should plan to complete one college by the beginning of 1967 in order to accommodate students in the first intake.

5. The initial stage of the first college should, in addition to accommodation for about 200 students in residence, provide accommodation for a Master and between two and four resident tutors who might be married.

6. The kitchen should be large enough to cater for the total number of students expected in that college, but should be so designed that at least half of its space could be used temporarily as a science laboratory.

7. From the beginning, some study facilities and areas should be available within the college. Since, in the long run, some large classes such as first year subjects in some Arts subjects were likely to be taught on closed circuit TV, the colleges should be equipped to be centres of reception of such teaching, in classrooms designed to hold, say 100 students. Seminar and tutorial rooms would also be needed.
8. The residential block should be designed so as to provide rooms of different sizes, to cater for the needs of students of different faculties, of varying seniority and especially to provide more space for graduates. In due course, but not in the first instance, accommodation should be provided for married students.

9. It should be possible for meals to be eaten both informally and, on occasion, more formally.

10. Offices for some members of academic staff should be located within the colleges. Not all should be located in departments.

11. Lockers and changing rooms should be provided for the use of non-residents of each college.

12. While the main University ovals were to be located elsewhere, some provision for sport, for example squash and tennis courts, should be made near the colleges.

13. In the development of the colleges, it was desirable that there should be diversity of ethos, and even of interests. This would require a degree of autonomy, even though the University would lay down the main outline of what the colleges should be and do.

14. It was expected that Masters would be senior academics of some distinction. If appointed much in advance of the opening of the college, the first Master would be consulted about the design and development of the college, even though he had not yet taken up duty on the staff of the University.

It is clear from these recommendations that the Colleges Committee was heavily influenced by the ideas of the Sub-Committee on Residential Accommodation of the Third University Committee. Further, from their reading, discussions, visits and personal experience, the members of that Committee were aware of a unanimity of opinion on the need to provide residential accommodation for a higher percentage of students than was generally provided at most universities at that time. There was also the strong view that far better facilities should be provided for non-residential students than most universities offered. The recommendation that individual members of staff be closely associated with an individual college, have an office there, and so some of their regular teaching in that college, was a quite revolutionary suggestion.

At that stage, the Colleges Committee could see no reason why certain colleges should not be sponsored, or even built by churches. From discussions between the Colleges Committee and the Churches' Committee on Tertiary Education, it was apparent that the churches held the view that it was no longer practicable, or even desirable, for them to found denominational colleges on the traditional lines. The churches, however, welcomed the fact that in the proposed Master Plan a place had been allocated for a chapel.

The management of what were known as college unions was a matter to which the Colleges Committee gave much attention. They supported the view that the Master of a college should be an academic of some standing, who would be free of day-to-day administrative and disciplinary matters and thus be able to continue to do some academic work. There should be a Vice-Master, who would primarily have oversight of the residential students. There would also be need for a person whose primary responsibility was the integration of non-resident students into the college and the encouragement of extracurricular activities. This function might be provided by a senior tutor. It was proposed that at least two other senior tutors should be resident—one a man and the other a woman. Property and financial matters should be under the control of a Bursar responsible to the Master, while yet another officer should be responsible for household management and catering.

It was agreed that the exact place of the colleges in the overall structure of the University government needed clarification. The Chairman, with the support of the Committee, drew attention to the need for a degree of autonomy in the colleges. He felt this was necessary particularly in the selection of students and the management of finance and discipline. In the selection of students, for example, it would be self-defeating to allow all Arts or all Science students to gravitate to one college. While giving every student the opportunity to apply for
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colleges in order of preference, the college concerned should have the right to make its own selection. A considerable degree of autonomy in financial matters would, it was believed, allow the different colleges to develop different characteristics — a highly desirable feature. Further, if the University allowed the colleges a high degree of autonomy in government, they might be able, over time, to attract endowment funds.

On the matter of discipline, the view was put that ‘the curse of University discipline is democracy run wild.’ From almost any disciplinary action in a university there is almost always an appeal. The Committee felt that any appeal from the disciplinary action of the Head of a college, which should be an exceptional occurrence, should be direct to the Vice-Chancellor and not to a committee. If the right to admit was given to a college, the right to dismiss must also be given.

Much thought was also given to the nature of the governing body of a college. The Chairman on behalf of the Committee, put the view that while he agreed with the theory of academic government by academic people, his experience led him to fear complete and direct control of the colleges by the normal machinery of university government. He proposed that each college should be governed by a council consisting in part of representatives of the senior academics, who were members of that college and in part by laymen, who might eventually be drawn in part or whole from the ranks of the alumni of that college. While the terms on which they governed should be laid down by the University, the strictly academic activities of the colleges should be controlled in large measure by the various schools of the University.

The first college to be built was designed by the architectural firm of Hassell, McConnell and Partners and named after Archibald Glenn (later Sir Archibald Glenn), the first Chancellor of the University. When the position of Master was advertised, it attracted twenty-nine applications. In March, 1966, the position was offered to Mr B. (Ben) C.J. Meredith, who was, at the time, Master of Robb College, University of New England. The second college, designed by the noted Australian architect Robin Boyd, was named after Sir Robert Menzies, a native of Victoria and Australia’s longest-serving Prime Minister. In June, 1967, Mr R. (Bob) B. Lewis, then Master of St Marks College at the University of Adelaide, was appointed Master of Menzies College.

The first of what was to be many attempts to draw up a satisfactory and workable statute governing the colleges was made in 1966. This first statute stated that the function of a college was to provide for its members and other approved persons residential accommodation, lecture, tutorial and study facilities, a union, a library and recreational facilities. It was also laid down that membership of a college was to be open to both resident and non-resident graduates and to undergraduates who had been allocated to membership of that college by the University, and to academic staff appointed to the college by the University. The statute also proposed that each college would be governed by a Board, known as the Governing Fellows, composed of the Vice-Chancellor, the Master of the college, two Fellows appointed by Council from time to time and up to twelve other Fellows appointed from the academic staff; students and members of the non-academic staff. In line with the chequered history of the colleges, many of these proposals were to change and, eventually, nine drafts of the statute were drawn up in the period up to 1970.

In late 1967, the Colleges Committee (now renamed the Colleges and Housing Committee) had a look at the history and development of the ‘college concept’ at La Trobe University. By this time college committees had been established not only for Glenn and Menzies Colleges but also for the projected third, fourth and fifth colleges. The Committee emphasised in particular the desire of the University that each college should develop along its own lines, building up an individual ethos. With this consideration in mind, the Colleges and Housing Committee took the view that it should not accept responsibility for the planning of future colleges which should, instead, be undertaken primarily by individual college committees, whose members in due course would form the nucleus of the Board of Governing Fellows of each college. In October 1967, the committees for Menzies College, and for the Third, Fourth and
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Fifth Colleges presented their submissions and notional drawings for their colleges. The total submission to the Australian Universities Commission (AUC) for college construction amounted to some $6,000,000.

On 29-30 November 1968, a seminar on the colleges and the 'college concept' was held at the University. It consisted of three sessions: the first, titled 'The aims of the college system: an appraisal of its operation to date,' was chaired by the Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn; the second, chaired by a student, was titled 'Aspects of college life: academic, social, recreation and residential'; the third, 'Planning a new college,' was chaired by Mrs Whitney King, a member of Council and of the Colleges and Housing Committee. There were 109 participants and all three sessions, particularly the first on the aims of the college system, produced lively discussion and an atmosphere, which at times was turbulent and charged with emotion. The issues discussed included the role of the colleges in the academic life of the University, the extent to which academic staff and student members of colleges should participate in the government and management of the colleges, and the provision of amenities, including working space for non-resident members, in the colleges.

Many complaints were expressed by student representatives at the seminar. Students wanted a much greater degree of responsibility for the management of union facilities in the colleges, and they also felt that college fees were excessive due to the high cost of administration in both existing colleges. They felt they would get better value if there was a central student union of the traditional kind. A strong feeling was also expressed that the college system militated against the successful operation of student clubs and societies many of which required a university-wide rather than a college-based membership.

Perhaps the decision to hold a seminar on the college system so early in the history of the colleges was a fundamental mistake. Only one college, Glenn, had been in full operation for a year and it acted not only as a college, but, also, in effect, as the University because academic and administrative staff had offices there while they waited for other buildings on campus to be completed. Menzies College was only operating out of one wing with no dining facilities or common rooms. Furthermore, the attitude of the AUC was not conducive to creating confidence in the college system: there was, in particular, limitation on financial assistance for the provision of student working space in the colleges and an apparent indifference to the provision of amenities for non-resident members. There were, moreover, frustrating delays in the approval of important facilities for the colleges by the AUC, for example, the Menzies College Stage II Building Program and the dining hall and kitchen block.

The seminar clearly indicated that there was a need for the University Council to return to first principles and to re-examine the function of the colleges in the light of the aims of the University as laid down in the Act. A vital question was whether the colleges could contribute to the academic life of the University; if they could not then the name 'college' was inappropriate and perhaps should be changed to something more descriptive of their actual functions. The view of the two college Masters was that it was crucial in the development of a college to have the active support of those academic staff who were intimately concerned with the college itself. The apathetic attitude and in some case the active opposition of the great majority of the academic staff militated against the success of the 'college concept.' The seminar had made clear that the colleges did not have adequate support within the University and that the stated aims, as laid down in the Act for the colleges, would be difficult to pursue.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons for the lack of support for the college system by a majority of academic staff and students. It may be that the college system, the first attempt in Australia to develop a collegiate system within a university, occurred at the wrong time. The late 1960s was a period of great turmoil in the universities: the political consequence of the Vietnam war had spread into the campuses; there was opposition in the student body to anything that appeared to represent the Establishment. This included the University itself and the colleges which, to many, appeared to be acting in loco parentis for both resident and non-resident students. Furthermore, the majority of academic staff had no experience of a college
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system themselves and had little interest in experimenting with it and the University did little to inform them on the aims and aspirations of the college concept. It could be claimed that the college concept was not given a fair chance.

In any case, by the end of 1968 the colleges and the Colleges and Housing Committee were confused concerning the long term prospects for the college system and were awaiting definite decisions from the University Council. Many associated with the colleges, including both students and interested academic staff, feared that the loss of an academic role would result in the colleges becoming simply halls of residence (which might not need a Master) combined with small student unions.

The Students' Representative Council (SRC), as a representative body of students, was strong in its criticism of the college system. It was their view that, if the colleges were to continue they must be organised as residential and union institutions, with a strict division between the two, maximum participation by members in decision-making, and the rejection of college academic aspirations. On the basis of surveys of student housing needs, they claimed that there was a demand for a diversity of styles of accommodation, which the colleges could not provide.

A special meeting of the University Council was held on 16 December 1968, to discuss the future of the college system. At this meeting, Council resolved to adhere to the college concept as a basis for future planning but, recognising that some modifications might be required, it also established a special committee to investigate the implementation of the concept. The Vice-Chancellor emphasised the need for patience and tolerance by staff and committee members in the matter of the development and operation of the colleges, particularly when the two existing colleges were having to work under great difficulties in many areas.

In August 1969, the Special Council Committee on the College Concept made its recommendations. The committee believed that the college concept created, through decentralisation, an environment in which students were likely to have more sense of involvement in the University as a whole and in which better opportunities existed for their participation in University affairs than was possible in the traditional, centralised university. It was of the view that the college concept could not be fully effective while the University was small. The committee believed that the college contribution to academic life should, in the early stages, be spontaneous and should not be directly related to scheduled courses of study. In due course, colleges could develop areas of academic interest which might well be integrated into undergraduate and graduate courses.

It appeared to the committee that the colleges suffered from too much control, being responsible to college committees (serving as interim substitutes for the proposed Boards of Governing Fellows), the Colleges and Housing Committee and, finally, Council. It recommended that the colleges should become largely self-governing, with final responsibility to Council, from which it followed that the Colleges and Housing Committee should be freed from the individual concerns of existing colleges and should concentrate its attention on the overall planning of future colleges and other housing projects. Other recommendations were that the Master should be referred to as the Head of College, and that each college should appoint Fellows, whose duties would relate to academic matters only, and who would be members of academic staff, at least of lecturer grade, or be other persons of distinction. The committee also recommended that Council should ensure that, in accordance with its original concept, non-resident students would have access to as many as possible of the amenities enjoyed by residents and, to this end, should provide adequate study space for non-residents. Finally, the committee felt that whatever the amenities provided by the colleges for clubs, societies and like activities, there was also a need for some central facilities for the SRC, for student publications and for university societies.

Despite the recommendations proposed by the Special Committee, it is difficult to see, in view of the recommendation to proceed with the college concept, how the proposed recom-
mendations even, if fully implemented, would meet the strong objections voiced at the seminar on the college concept.

While deliberations on Council’s plan for the college system were under consideration, the Colleges and Housing Committee and the individual college committees proceeded with their planning. The AUC was urged to treat the granting of approval of Stage II plans for Menzies College as a matter of high priority and to approve the Third College as a 'green light' project for the next triennium. The College and Housing Committee approved a proposal for the construction on campus of a group of flats for students and staff and recommended the formal establishment of the Third College on 1 January 1970.

Throughout 1969, indecision by the University on the future of the colleges continued, so much so that in November 1969, Colleges and Housing Committee requested Council to make a clear decision, without further delay, and provide clear guidance to the colleges on the way in which they should be developing. Further, Council was requested to make a clear decision either to continue with the planning of colleges along the lines originally laid down, namely as college-unions for about 1250 staff and students, both resident and non-resident, or to turn the colleges into primarily residential halls.

Many now began to believe that the college concept was dead and awaited the last rites from Council. It might be claimed that those last rites were administered in December 1969, when Council adopted a new guiding philosophy for the organisation and government of the colleges, effective from the beginning of 1970. There were three basic principles: college government was to be substantially in the hands of college members through the election of representative committees; the administration of the residential and union components within each college was to be separated; and, finally, full-time Masters were to be replaced by part-time academic Heads. In due course, yet another College statute was enacted to give effect to the new guiding principles.

On 1 January 1970, the third college was established and named Chisholm College after Caroline Chisholm, who was well-known for her work with women. The Colleges and Housing Committee was of the opinion that Australian women in general had not received sufficient recognition for the part they had played in the development of the nation. Subsequently, Professor J.D. Morrison, of the School of Physical Sciences, was appointed Head of the College.

During 1970, Council turned its attention to other forms of accommodation on campus and approved the registration of La Trobe University Housing Limited, which would manage the provision of student and staff housing within and outside the grounds of the University. However, much of 1970 and 1971 was spent in discussions with the AUC over the development of the colleges, student housing, and union facilities. It is clear that the AUC had little sympathy for the college concept and appeared reluctant to approve building plans. During this period, the University accepted that the fourth college, or indeed any further colleges, were unlikely to proceed.

Protracted discussions between the AUC and the University continued through 1970 and 1971 on matters relating to the future of the existing college system at La Trobe University. However, the focus of attention centred more and more on whether Chisholm College would be constructed as a college-union project. There was sharp division in the University over the college concept in general and the question of Chisholm College as a college union in particular. There were still loyal supporters of the college concept who put up strong resistance to abandoning it. However, they were in the minority. The majority of staff and students opposed the continuation of the whole concept. Such was the opposition that even meetings of Council were disrupted when the matter was under discussion. Furthermore, even within the colleges themselves there was opposition. Professor W.J. Ewens, of the Department of Mathematics, who had taken over the Chairmanship of Menzies College after the resignation of the foundation Master, Bob Lewis, wrote to the Colleges and Housing Committee, July 1971 stating that, from his experience as Chairman of Menzies College he felt that the concept was
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fundamentally unsound and should be abandoned.

The fate of the college concept was finally sealed at a meeting of Council on 26 July 1971, when it was decided that
(a) without prejudice to the future of Glenn and Menzies Colleges, the college-concept be not applied in the design of future colleges.
(b) the building designed as Chisholm College Union be now adapted as a general union building and other construction proceed.
This meant that the proposed Chisholm College Union building would now become the General Union Building. This had the strong support of the SRC. While Council re-affirmed a previous decision to adapt the building designed as the Chisholm College Union for use as the General Union, this was not acceptable to the AUC. Finally, a new site for the General Union was selected nearby and adopted by all concerned.

While Council at its meeting on 26 July 1971 had decided that ‘without prejudice to the future of Glenn and Menzies Colleges’, the college concept would not apply to future colleges, it was difficult to see how these two colleges could continue as college-unions. Perhaps the final indication that La Trobe University’s experiment was over came at the March 1972 meeting of the Colleges and Housing Committee. In discussing the future, the Committee agreed that it no longer had responsibility for all aspects of the operation of the colleges. The college-union system had been abandoned in favour of the provision of a general students’ union. The role and responsibilities of the Committee had, therefore, become emasculated to the point where its remaining areas of responsibility should be assumed by a body of a rather different kind.

Thus, post-1971 brought in a new era for the colleges, an era in which they could develop along their own lines. However, while assuming more the role of halls of residence, there was the possibility still available that some academic content, and some social and recreational activity could be developed by the existing colleges. Council’s decision had left these possibilities open.

GLENN COLLEGE

Unlike Menzies College which has had a large number of people serve as Head, Glenn College has been fortunate in having relatively few which has contributed to greater stability within it. After the unexpected death of Ben Meredith, the first Master, in early 1970, Professor D. Elwyn Davies of the Department of Physics who was serving as chairman of the Glenn College committee became acting Head for some months before Dr John G. Jenkin, also of the Department of Physics, was appointed. After a year, Dr Jenkin resigned and was replaced by Mr Stan Oates of the School of Education who served in the position for ten years. At the beginning of 1980, Mr Oates resigned from the position and Dr Richard Luke of the School of Agriculture took over as Head and continues to serve in that role.

In 1970, a major change in the government of the colleges was instituted. For the first time, college government was to be shared with elected student representatives. The idea had been proposed the previous year but had met some opposition. Under the new scheme, each college was to be run by a College General Committee of about twelve members which included the Head of the college as the chairman, and was composed of representatives of the resident students, the non-resident students, and the University Council. The Head of the college retained responsibility for the operation of the college, for discipline, and was responsible for reporting to the Vice-Chancellor. In Glenn College the system worked extremely well: Stan Oates recalled with pleasure both the responsibility shown by the elected student representatives and the fact that he never had to veto what the committee wanted to do while he was Head of Glenn during the 1970s. It was an experiment with student government which was well ahead of developments in other colleges around Australia.

The only major addition to Glenn College, the East Wing, was completed in 1974. In terms of college buildings in Australia it marked a significant new development. Instead of
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college rooms being built off long corridors, the East Wing was designed to provide clusters of six individual rooms built around small, individual common rooms. Each of these clusters had its own bath and toilet facilities. The East Wing was reserved for more senior members of the College and the novel design permitted the development of a mutually supportive, small group, style of college life. This design concept was followed in the extensions built by Menzies College in the late 1970s.

Because it is the oldest college, the design reflects the early concept of the role of the college in the University. This is particularly obvious in the dining facilities at Glenn College which are the largest and the most formal.

Modelled on English college precedents, Glenn College in the late 1960s held a weekly, formal high table dinner with invited guests. Although drastically modified, that tradition has survived in a less formal way down to the present. Even the design of the East Wing reflected a consensus among Glenn College students that they did not want to shift to complete self-catering but wished to retain central catering within the college. This view was shared by Stan Oates who, throughout the 1970s, was determined to preserve the tradition of eating in common which he felt was an essential ingredient in developing a corporate, college spirit. The concept that members of the college ought to dine together at least some of the time has remained part of the philosophy of Glenn College and has contributed to Glenn’s reputation as the most traditional of the three colleges.

Catering remained one of the major problems facing the colleges throughout the decade. Following the decision to abandon outside contract catering in 1970, a joint catering committee was established to oversee catering arrangements in both Glenn and Menzies Colleges. After deliberation, the committee decided to establish full kitchen catering facilities in Menzies College to enable it to hire its own separate caterer. This duplication of service between the two colleges, coupled with the subsequent decision of the University to establish a separate central Union with its own catering facilities, meant that catering was a losing proposition for the colleges throughout the 1970s. In Glenn College, it was only the profit made on conferences in the university vacations that enabled the College to keep the catering facility available. In 1975, the Staff Club was built on land immediately adjacent to Glenn College in order to utilise the college catering service which, in turn, helped to make that service viable. At the end of the decade, in 1980, the wheel came full circle when Glenn College decided to shift the catering service back to a private contract basis to ease the financial burden on the college. It has remained on a private contract basis to this day. Menzies College, after experimenting with providing catering service during the 1970s, abandoned it altogether in 1980: Chisholm College was initially designed for self-catering but also has a limited canteen.

The late 1970s were difficult times for Glenn College and, indeed, for all residential colleges both at La Trobe and throughout Australia. The number of students living in college dropped, rooms were empty, and desperate efforts were made to cut costs. It was in this environment that Menzies decided to abandon catering altogether and that Chisholm was designed on a primarily self-catering model. The University also steadily cut what limited support it gave to the colleges for the maintenance of the buildings. For Glenn College this was a serious problem as the college had been built with extensive lecture and tutorial facilities which required upkeep but which were not needed by the College itself. The availability of these teaching rooms led to a long-term relationship with the Music Department, the Language Centre, and the Sociology Department. An area of the Undercroft of the College was enclosed in 1981 to provide space for an anthropology museum to house a collection of visual art and material culture mainly from Aboriginal Australia and Papua New Guinea. Opened in the same year the University Museum, which now operates under the auspices of the Department of Sociology, provides a valuable resource for teaching and research.

The philosophy of Glenn College was also reflected in the early decision to provide tutors within the college for all residents. From the earliest days, a conscious effort was made to provide tutors, who were mainly postgraduate students, in most subjects offered at the Uni-
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Glenn College was a leader in this area and throughout the 1970s provided more tutors than either of the other colleges and this, undoubtedly, contributed to its reputation as the academic college. Tutors were selected on academic grounds but also had to be friendly and approachable and become involved in the organisation of the college. This no doubt contributed to its reputation as a caring college as did the effort made to encourage a doctor or nurse from one of the nearby hospitals to live in the college to provide some emergency medical service after hours if required.

Glenn College was established as a traditional style of university college although one which incorporated the very novel idea of having non-resident members. However, for various reasons, the attempt to graft a very traditional university college onto the Bundoora campus failed. Yet, traces of the experiment are still clearly visible on the campus: the physical layout of Glenn College, particularly the dining hall, reflect that experiment as does the operation and self-perception of the College itself which remains the most traditional of the three La Trobe colleges.

MENZIES COLLEGE

The confusion surrounding the future role of the colleges in 1971 continued to some degree almost throughout the 1970s. This was reflected in the case of Menzies College by the number of Heads of the College up to 1980; all of whom remained for relatively short periods. After the resignation of Bob Lewis, the foundation Master, during the 'troubles', Professor W.J. Ewens of the Department of Mathematics was appointed Chairman of the College. He was succeeded, in turn by Dr Anthony Hayden, of the History Department, Dr Malcolm Lovegrove, of the School of Education, and Dr Kevin Collins, also of the School of Education. Mr Ralph Gallagher, from central administration, assumed the responsibility, in an acting capacity, in 1979 during Dr Collins' absence. In 1980, this rapid turnover came to an end when Mrs C.M.G. (Katy) Richmond, of the Department of Sociology was appointed. She remained in the position for seven years and reverted to the title of Head of College, dropping the title Chairman. Since then the term Head of College has been used.

The most important event in the development of Menzies College in the 1970s was the building of the annexes in 1973. This greatly expanded the College and provided 120 excellent rooms and large well-equipped kitchen/common rooms. This was the first time that college accommodation on campus had been built to provide self-catering facilities.

However, during the period, the provision of meals for the college residents was an enormous problem. For the first few years, residents of Menzies College dined upstairs in Toad Hall (so-called because of Wind in the Willows), then, later, in what turned out to be an unprofitable bistro downstairs. For some years, Glenn College and Menzies attempted joint-catering, but this was abandoned owing to heavy catering losses. Subsequently, Menzies College contracted with external caterers to provide students with lunch and dinner on a meal-by-meal basis. However, this was scarcely a successful business venture.

During the period 1980-86, Menzies College stabilised: a number of developments took place and the College began to find a role for itself and develop a philosophy. To provide better service to students, the number of tutors were increased from twelve to nineteen. The increased number of tutors allowed a program of tutor orientation to be set up over three days in February with on-going weekly discussions with the tutors. The large influx of Asian students in the early 1980s prompted the development of a program of social integration which focussed on the development of 'floor functions' and a more carefully designed program of social functions.

External contract catering continued to be a problem and, in 1983, was completely abandoned and the college moved to self-catering at a cost of approximately $263,000. Menzies College was thus one of the first colleges in Australia to make the change to self-catering (apart from the purpose-built Chisholm College, which had kitchens for every twelve students). A major refurbishing program after 1983 created seven kitchen commonrooms on the main floors.
of the college. This changed the social structure of the college, making social integration much more easily attainable and markedly reduced student turnover. Toad Tavern was renovated over the next few years with a view to making the area attractive for conferences while providing suitable facilities for student activities.

In February 1987, the Reverend John Patton was appointed as Head of Menzies College. Under his leadership, the College has continued to develop. Extensive maintenance work was carried out with re-painting of the main wings, some areas were re-configured, and new computer, television, and video rooms were established. The tutorial system was retained and expanded with the addition of five postgraduate academic assistants.

In 1988/89, the College expanded its co-operation with the University Language Centre by creating, in addition to the four rooms regularly used by the Centre, an additional five new teaching rooms. The College also co-operates with the ‘Friends of La Trobe University’, providing a meeting place for that organisation. The College has also re-modelled and renovated a flat in the Annexes to provide complete accommodation for a disabled person.

The Head of College, Reverend John Patton believes that Menzies has developed a philosophy as a growth centre for students socially, academically and personally with growth coming through community interactions in a college which houses students from a wide range of nations and cultures. He feels that Menzies is developing a community in which residents help each other socially, academically and personally and which creates an awareness of the principle that to teach is to learn.

CHISHOLM COLLEGE

Chisholm was the last college in the aborted college system to be built and was the centre of much controversy over the vexed question of a college-union system. It opened in 1972 and consisted of eight tower blocks housing 240 residents. During the 1970s the College continued to develop steadily and was spared much of the campus disturbances which affected the other colleges. Overseas residents increased and plans were drawn up for the establishment of a computer terminal room, library and quiet reading room; the annual magazine first appeared in 1978.

Professor Morrison who had been chairman of the Chisholm College Committee since its inception in 1970 was appointed Head when the College opened in 1972. He resigned in 1977 and Mr N.M. (Mike) Tolhurst, the Deputy Head of College was appointed Head in 1978. Under Mike Tolhurst, Chisholm College provided and maintained an environment in which all residents, especially first year students, could form friendships and find outlets for their talents. The College recognised the desire of its residents to master their academic programs and provided internal tutorials and academic counselling. In 1979, the first Caroline Chisholm Lecture took place; in 1980, the Art collection was founded; and in 1983 the Care Group was established. Concern for the disadvantaged was recognised with the introduction of the first free places. Mike Tolhurst retired at the end of 1984 after thirteen years of valuable service to the college as Deputy Head and Head.

John O’Malley, a science graduate and chiropractor, became the new Head. At twenty-five, he was the youngest person ever to become Head of a college in Australia. He continued and expanded his predecessors’ commitment to support for disadvantaged students, for affirmative action for women, for rural and overseas students, and for low-rent accommodation. Chisholm College, even now has the lowest rent of any residential college in Australia. By 1986, the college became fully computerised enabling it to provide efficient and economic services to its residents, despite the withdrawal of Government assistance.

By the mid-1980s, the College had become economically self-reliant and increasingly adopted a model that could be best characterised as self-management. Deputy Heads were elected from amongst the resident body and there were more elected residents on the General Committee than in any comparable body in the country.

In cultural affairs, Chisholm College has always fostered an appreciation of the arts
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amongst its residents. The College’s specialist collection of painting and sketches of Australian plants and animals contains many notable works including some by Charles McCubbin and Russell Drysdale. This collection has been enriched with donations from a succession of visiting artists and Artists-in-Residence, such as Ignacio Marmol, Zhang Jian Zhang, Robert Ulmann, Irene Crusca, Margaret Connell and Gareth Jones-Roberts.

An artistic, pioneering venture of the College was the Artists Exchange agreement with the Painting Academy of Yunnan Province in the Peoples Republic of China. The exchange began in 1987 when, for the first time since the Chinese Revolution, a delegation of five Chinese artists visited Australia and exhibited their works in the Chisholm College Art Centre. A return visit to the Peoples Republic by the College’s Artist-in-Residence took place in 1989 at the invitation and as the guest of the Chinese Academy.

Another tradition which the College has established is the annual Caroline Chisholm Dinner and Lecture. Speakers are notable women on issues affecting women. The series began in 1979, when Senator Susan Ryan was the speaker. Other speakers have been Jill Wran (1980), Deidre Fitzgerald (1981), Anne Deveson (1982), Gil Appleton (1983), Anne Summers (1984) and Dianne Yerbury (1985). In 1986, Julietta Sison, a former political prisoner and founding member of the Communist Party of the Philippines, was the first international speaker. The following year Irene Bolger was the speaker and, in 1988, Kim Evans from the National Union of Students.

John O’Malley’s second term as Head of College expired in 1988. From the beginning of 1989, the Headship of the College has been jointly shared by John O’Malley and Phillip Ablett. Phillip is a tutor in both the College and the Department of Sociology. He is the first graduate of La Trobe University to become Head of College. Recently, John and Phillip have co-authored *The Chisholm College Ethos*, which has been adopted by the College as its philosophical charter. It characterises Chisholm College as ‘an accessible, diverse, democratic and international community of scholars within La Trobe University’ and it lists the six college values as equality, multiculturalism, participating democracy, academic achievement, personal development, and social responsibility.¹

During 1989, the Heads, with the assistance of the new Deputy Head, Christine Griffiths, initiated the ‘Academic Program’. This is a voluntary, educational assistance program, whereby each first-year student is given the opportunity of having an Academic Assistant for each subject of study. Academic Assistants are normally second or third year students, who have already completed the subject the previous year: they, in turn, report to the college’s tutors, who are thus able to ascertain the progress of students and provide further assistance, as required.

This latest program, like many other activities at Chisholm College, is premised on the belief that ‘genuine education is best served through the dialogue and co-operation of individuals in the context of a community which compensates for the inequality and discrimination which persist in our society.’²

POSTSCRIPT

Following the decisions of 1971, the colleges were left without much guidance from the University on how they should develop. However, on the positive side, Council left them with the possibility of being more than halls of residence: there was the opportunity of developing some academic content, social and recreational activity in the colleges. The challenge was there and, in looking back over the years, it would be fair to say that the colleges did take up the challenge. In its own way, each college has slowly and steadily developed its own traditions and undoubtedly makes a contribution to University life.

Many associated with the University in its early days believed that the college system was launched at an unfortunate period of Australian university history. In the late 1960s and early 1970s dissent on the campuses nationally and locally was at its peak and the college system at La Trobe was a ‘soft’ target. The ‘college concept’ was tried but never given a fair go. It was a
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brave and worthwhile attempt to bring something new and significant to Australian universities and deserved stronger support by La Trobe University and its Council.

The proposed involvement of the colleges in the academic role of the University was one of the major criticisms raised by those determined to see the abandonment of the college system. It is, therefore, interesting to note, in conclusion, that in a report to the University Council in December 1987, the following comment on student performance was made by Ralph Gallagher, Director of Planning and Development: ‘An examination of the effective pass rate achieved ...... shows that College residents, as a group, generally achieved better results than the University as a whole by an average of nine percentage points ......’.

ENDNOTES
2. *Ibid*.
Student services were established early at La Trobe University at a time when universities in this country were going through a rapid expansionary phase, and the concept of 'welfarism' was at its height. The sympathetic and unfailing enthusiasm of the then Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar, and the Business Manager, with the support of most of the senior academics, prevailed against those who thought many of the activities of such services to be beyond the responsibility of the University and a needless expense when the academic departments were themselves merely in the establishment stage.

A committee had been appointed in 1966 to advise the then Interim Council. It included experienced and imaginative student service officers from the University of Melbourne and Monash University, academics, and skilled administrators and recommended a comprehensive and co-ordinated series of services 'which should contribute to the entire social process whereby students adjust themselves to the demands of the university, and the university adjusts itself to the needs of the students'. Council adopted the recommendations in full and in the next few years provided funds for their implementation more generously than was customary at Australian universities. It was realised that the allocation for support services would not need to continue to grow at the same rate as the student population once the establishment period had passed; but nevertheless Council has continued to give sympathetic support to that early vision in spite of more recent financial hard times for universities and changes in senior administrative leadership.

It was suggested from the start that the services should be available to staff as well as to students, and that they should have an institutional role as well as a personal one; an early result of which was that they became known as university advisory services rather than student services, although students remained their chief concern. The guide has continually been the preamble to the Final Report of the Student Services Committee in September 1967, which among other things, stated — 'for students with any kind of difficulty — settling into university life; establishing independent study habits; in conflict with parents; over-anxiety about sexual matters; or being in the throes of any of the problems that beset human-beings of an undergraduate age, a little expert help at the critical time can well mean the difference between academic catastrophe and graduation. For the comparatively few who are sick, physically or psychologically, this is even more true'.

Several factors combined to give the first decade its distinctive character. The widespread acceptance of the contraceptive pill altered the relationship of young people to each other and to their families. It altered accommodation needs. Secondly, free education and the granting of living allowances to many students helped them to an increased sense of independence and promoted the demand for students' rights. Thirdly, the demands of an unpopular conscription selectively imposed on young men for war service in Vietnam, augmented a widespread opposition to authority which afforded many senior staff members who were presiding benevolently over more comprehensive support services than were ever supplied to Australian students in former generations.

It was in such a paradoxical context that student services were established and developed in the sixties and seventies.
The Housing Service
The Housing Service was established in 1966 before students were enrolled, in order to accumulate a list of prospective landladies, and the addresses of flats and houses for renting; to foster a co-operative interest between campus and neighbourhood; to advise and place students wanting other than college accommodation and to help new staff and their families as they took up appointments. Student choices were influenced by such things as the greater cost of college residence; the semi-rural isolation of La Trobe campus; the deficiencies of public transport (no trams reached the campus until nearly twenty years later); the large number of students from distant suburbs and country districts; and the significant number of overseas students — some nine per cent of the total even in the early years. In 1970, forty per cent of all students enrolled at La Trobe were living away from home.

The first appointees, Mrs Denise Lee and Mrs Betty Collings, accomplished so much, and formed such good relations on and off campus, that the later tasks of establishing the other services were greatly eased. They initiated the custom of bringing interested householders and estate agents to the University and did much to promote a better understanding for students, who were regarded as privileged, by the local community.

To gauge and advise on the changing accommodation needs of a developing community was an especially valuable function, and supplied the Business Manager with information which helped in the devising of a company, La Trobe University Housing Limited, to buy, build and to manage flats for the accommodation of staff and students. To meet the emerging needs for independent, non-collegiate living, it was decided to build flats on an area of the campus deemed appropriate for a small village. The first block of flats in the cluster at the corner of Waterdale Road and Kingsbury Drive was developed by the University in cooperation with a city building firm. For the second group, architecture students at the University of Melbourne were invited to submit designs, and a panel of judges, including both distinguished architects and La Trobe students, selected a design for a cluster of single and double-storied buildings in a garden setting — an ingenious and seemingly successful way of meeting contemporary demand.

In the early years, staff and student housing were managed by two separate officers working in close co-operation: in 1974 those separate functions were combined in the one University Housing Service.

The Chaplaincy
The Chaplaincy was approved by the Interim Council in August 1966 and in March 1967, three chaplains were formally recognised. It had been decided by the founding fathers that the University was to be a secular institution; that the colleges should not represent religious denominations; and that the University would not pay the salaries of chaplains nominated by churches and working among and for the campus population. Nevertheless accommodation, however inadequate, has been provided for Chaplaincy staff and for religious observances. The initial trio, an Anglican, a Catholic and a Methodist, have now been superseded by a team which ministers to the various groups — Catholic, Protestant, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Lutheran, and Moslem. Apart from one or two challenges on philosophical grounds, this development has been encouraged by the Council and supported by the other services since much of the conflict for young adults is philosophical or spiritual rather than psychological or physical. It seems a far cry now from 1967 when the two chaplains were housed in a cubby-hole next to the broom-cupboard in Glenn College, and the Catholic chaplain was provoked to observe that cleanliness was indeed next to godliness.

There is no chapel on the University grounds, so various rooms in the Union building and the colleges have been adapted for occasional religious services. In 1988, largely as a result of the interest of and representation by the Health Service, a prayer-room and an ablution room have been set aside for Moslem worship. An informal group also provides a focus for Buddhists.
Student Advisory Services

The religious activities have been remarkable for their degree of ecumenicalism, a position not always appreciated in the churches of origin. As the 1968, Australia-wide, Yolton Report on Chaplaincy put it—'some churches expect the chaplain to conserve the faith of denominational students, but he has no way to find out who they are. There is some naive expectation by church people that he will evangelise the University, a notion that is frowned upon by the university authorities'. Twenty years later, the annual report of the chaplains for 1988 maintained that 'ecumenical activities assist in bringing together students of different cultural backgrounds and of different religious traditions'. Working as a team the chaplains have conducted ecumenical retreats; they have visited Catholic and non-Catholic schools to speak with year twelve students on the transition from school to university life, and from 1989 they will be visiting churches and schools on a more regular basis to continue this work of preparation of young people.

The functions of the Chaplaincy are described in a 1989 publication by the Council for Chaplaincies in Tertiary Institutions, a body composed of representatives of the Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Uniting Churches, the Churches of Christ, and the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation of Victoria: 'The chaplaincy services are provided by both ordained and lay women and men. They have a variety of backgrounds including parish and religious life, industry, the academic and welfare sectors.' The tertiary chaplaincy is described as: providing a focus for the community's spiritual life; helping to nurture the faith of those who are believers; being available to those seeking meaning and purpose in their lives; supporting students and staff in times of personal crisis; providing eucharistic and other services of worship; preparing people for the sacraments, including baptism and marriage; leading study groups in scripture, prayer and meditation; being active in relation to immediate issues of justice and peace; liaising with Student Services; and, finally, embodying ecumenical vision in day to day co-operation.

The field of activity has been expanded to cover the southern campuses since the merger with the Lincoln Institute.

It should not be thought that young people are the only ones needing the support and encouragement of the Chaplaincy. As with the other University services, with which they liaise closely, the chaplains find calls for assistance from staff members quite as demanding as those from students. That they have brought comfort to so many who are at the disturbing stage of re-examining family faiths and societal values says a great deal for the devotion and sympathetic understanding of those men and women from different areas of religious life who have worked patiently under sometimes difficult conditions.

The University Health Service

The University Health Service too had humble beginnings; but from voluntary staffing of one half-day per week in a borrowed room in 1967, it has now grown to a considerable size with several physicians—some of whom have been postgraduate students funded by medical postgraduate bodies—nurses and secretaries, working together as a team and all contributing to the therapeutic functions of the centre. It is housed with the other services in a beautiful building in a splendidly accessible central location.

It has seen itself as an occupational health unit serving a population whose industry is tertiary education, an occupation that has its hazards and casualties like any other industry, and where the breakdowns can be just as grave, just as distressing, and just as disabling as those in manual or mechanical occupations. The nature of that industry and its effect on individuals in the diverse University community has been its prime concern. Its distinctive character has been maintained against the critics who have questioned the use of University funds to provide a free health service for students, and against those who said 'the ability to present oneself fit and well at an examination is one of the things to be tested'.

To set up a comprehensive service which, obviously, could not be responsible twenty-four hours a day for people whose places of residence might be anywhere in the metropolitan area, it was essential to gain the approval of the Australian Medical Association, local doctors,
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and adjacent public hospitals — in other words, the approval of all those who might be requested to provide continuation of professional care 'after-hours' and 'off-campus'. This was done, and the outside connections have been maintained carefully. Local practitioners are invited to weekly professional seminars in the Health Service rooms, the staff of the Health Service visit La Trobe members in the public hospitals, and have at times served on the sessional staff of public hospitals. In return the local medical practitioners have provided continuity of support for off-campus residents and for campus residents at night and over weekends. The Austin and Veterans' Hospitals in Heidelberg and the Fairfield Hospital for Communicable Diseases have provided invaluable laboratory investigative help, and inpatient care when needed.

This then was the basis on which an elaborate structure was built, with the unfailing encouragement of the first Vice-Chancellor, Dr David Myers, and the administrative skills of the supportive Registrar, Mayor-General T.S. Taylor. Gradually, over the ensuing twenty years, a medical service, specialising in medical counselling and information-giving has been developed which is designed to assist students to overcome problems, and to avoid the consequences of temporary failure. The academic departments have co-operated in this development, a co-operation more readily gained because of the use that staff members themselves made of the service. Examples which illustrate the results of this co-operative approach are the scores of academic examinations conducted each year in the Health Service area for permanently handicapped or temporarily disabled students under special conditions supervised by Health Service staff; the special course work and the devising of special methods of examination to fit the needs of individuals with particular handicaps; and the participation of Health Service staff in academic research projects.

The assistance offered by the administrative staff was exemplified in 1974 in the development for the first time in Australia of a student-run, student-funded dental service. The first Assistant Registrar of Student Affairs, Mr Des N. Kennard, who was then Chairman of the Executive Committee of the General Union, attended the early exploratory talks in 1972 between the Health Service and Professor Elsdon Storey of the Dental Faculty of the University of Melbourne. Mr Kennard's deftly applied energies were invaluable in giving form to nebulous ideas and in finding ways to enlist the interest and assistance of student representatives to implement the proposals. The result was the appointment of a dentist by that Dental Faculty to provide free dental care to La Trobe students. The salaries of dentist and nurse were paid by the dental school which was largely re-imbursed by a subvention from the funds of the La Trobe University Students' Representative Council. With minor modifications the scheme continues today, and has been copied by many other institutions in Victoria and in other states. A nominal charge now has to be made for each dental consultation.

The range of help, available at the Health Service was increased for several years by the generous and regular donation of time and skills by two specialists — Mr Howard Toyne, an orthopaedist who attended sports meetings on Saturdays and subsequently patched up injuries in his rooms or in the medical centre; and the late Dr Terry Pearce, psychiatrist-superintendent of Mont Park Hospital. Bruised bodies and bruised spirits are both common among intelligent people undergoing the stresses of the undergraduate condition, and their help was a great comfort to many.

Another innovation, later copied on other campuses, was the rostering of postgraduate medical students to the La Trobe Service for periods varying from three months to one year as part of their experiential coursework. Three organisations participated: the Victorian Postgraduate Medical Foundation; the Victorian Academy for General Practice; and the Family Medicine Program. The Department of Community Medicine at the University of Melbourne too, from 1976 to 1986, posted fifth-year students to the La Trobe Health Service for short periods of clinical experience. Changes in funding, coupled with changes in postgraduate training programs, have now brought most of these programs to an end. At various times, too, young doctors studying elsewhere for postgraduate degrees were attracted to live in one
or other of the colleges to provide a supportive presence particularly at night and on weekends in return for reduced accommodation charges.

Membership of the University's Safety Committee, and the Ethics Committee to monitor biological research, are part of the institutional role played by the Health Service. An interest in the well-being of overseas students of different cultures has always been a feature of its activities, and officers of the Australian Development Assistance Bureau have worked helpfully and patiently with both the Counselling and the Health Services in this work. Dr Champak Rana, the present physician-in-charge, has taken a particular interest in it.

No account could be complete without mention of the major influence on the services of the female staff members. From the earliest days attempts have been made to engage the services of women at least in proportion to the number of women among the campus population, and special mention must be made of Dr Ruth Williams' contribution.

The Counselling Service

The Counselling Service under its foundation director, Mr C. F. Bailey, was given several tasks. Helping students with problems of studying — the reading and learning and remembering which were their reasons for being at university, was the prime one; but a population largely of young adults introduced abruptly to a mixed bed-sitting room culture without the customary balance of older people, is bound to throw up various personal difficulties of growth and adjustment, and like the Health Service, the Counselling Service inevitably found much of its time taken up in helping individuals to cope. Personal problems almost always have an adverse effect on studies and performance of class-work, and liaison with academic departments has been close and rewarding.

The undergraduate body has changed over the years. The average age is greater; more than fifty per cent are women; and many who are returning to studies and careers need help in the difficult process of 'academic rehabilitation'. For these varied tasks an experienced team has employed both individual and group counselling methods. It was foreseen by the initial planning committee that there would be 'overlap between the functions of the Counselling Service, all other support services, masters of colleges, and academic staff', and many of the areas of interest already mentioned under other headings apply also to the counselling service. Nevertheless one area deserving of particular mention is that of provisions for handicapped people to which Elizabeth Hastings of Counselling and Dr Rana of Health have devoted much energy. The architects at La Trobe had taken care to make most parts of most buildings accessible to those with physical disabilities and there was already a small committee to look after their interests. Perceived financial restrictions, oversight, and custom, had led to some omissions however, some of which have been overcome through the exertions of the committee established to care for the handicapped and to which they both belong.

The Counselling Service has coped with an ever increasing work load by providing supervised work experience in return for professional assistance from selected psychology graduates.

The Careers and Appointments Service

As with the other services, in establishing a Careers and Appointments Service, La Trobe was following leads from overseas universities. It was a recognition that the University has a responsibility 'to assist a student to develop realistic and informed vocational goals and to implement these'. It therefore had to 'provide a channel of communication between the University and the business community', and it was hoped that 'it should also be the effective link between the University and secondary schools'. Part-time and vacation jobs for students were related concerns.

The task of establishing these activities was given to the kindly and ebullient John Waterhouse who set about the task with his usual genial energy. It was ironic then that his office
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should have been the scene of an unpleasant confrontation in 1970 during the 'Vietnam years' when a group of students protested noisily against the presence on campus of representatives of the Defence Department who, among other potential employers, visited the University to give information to prospective job-seekers. It is said that no objection has been raised since, and that current students seem more career-oriented and less moved by political ideology than in earlier years.

Research is always a major function of this service. What are the community needs for trained personnel? What are the occupations subsequently filled by university graduates? What are the consequences of course and subject choice? And what is the reason for a significant minority of students dropping-out of course-work each year? Questions like these are of perennial concern.

In this regard, the activities of the Careers and Appointments Service at La Trobe have special characteristics. La Trobe does not produce lawyers, architects, dentists, or doctors. Nevertheless it provides a generalist foundation on which a thoughtful student can build a chosen career. To help students to develop the idea of career direction and to use their degree as a base from which to achieve their goal is seen as a major function of the service.

Conclusion

Looking back over the first twenty-five years, three features of the Advisory Services strike me as outstanding: first, the care and ingenuity with which the architects and planners devised the series of 'chess moves' which enabled the Advisory Services unit to be set up in temporary quarters, and moved progressively through part occupation to full occupation of the intended final building alongside related colleagues; second, the wide range of activities in the larger Australian community in which staff members of the various services are actively involved; and finally and chiefly, the profound humanity which informed the minds of the founding fathers that, from the very outset, they should have devoted so much attention, and so many resources, to the well-being of the La Trobe community.

ENDNOTES
1. 'Final Report of the Student Services Committee' [chaired by Mr (now Sir John) Buchan], September, 1967.
2. Ibid.
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STUDENT REACTIONS
Unsettled, Panicky, Astray

Don Watson

On my eighteenth birthday, in 1967, I acquired a driver’s licence and, by courtesy of a recently deceased great aunt, a third-hand Volkswagen. To prove my competence with the car the local policeman told me to drive down to the railway station and back. My father told the policeman he had a bag of new potatoes in the boot for him. I do not believe there was any intention to corrupt.

The next day I drove the Volkswagen the seventy miles from Poowong to La Trobe University. I will never know how. I moved my belongings into a room in Glenn College, closed the door and became a smoker. I remember little of the succeeding hours or indeed the next four days. I think I waited for the bell to ring. When, by the end of the week, it hadn’t, I ventured out, and drove the Volkswagen back to the family farm. Here I exhibited signs of anomie and depression but, as ever, these were interpreted as self-pity. I returned to the University, this time by a new route through Glen Waverley, Mitcham and Doncaster which were at that stage, like me, undergoing that trauma in the march of progress — the transition from rural to urban.

It is as well to concede now that my car should have been confiscated. I was quite capable at the wheel of a tractor. I could ride a bicycle and, after a fashion, a horse. But I was inept with a Volkswagen. Within six weeks of my second arrival the vehicle was sitting like a punctured football in the car park, and the Master of Glenn College, Ben Meredith, was demanding that I have the wreckage towed away. The six of us who had been in the accident in the grounds of Mont Park Mental Hospital all emerged without a scratch; although I displayed insufferable symptoms of guilt for a while and a passenger, Ken Bishop, with the greatest respect, was paranoid in a motor car for at least two years. I don’t blame him. In fact there are times when one simply cannot apologise enough.

To me, now, the miracle seems not that we survived the awful prang but that within those six weeks I had made friends with the five others in the car. I remember them — Ken Bishop, Demos Krouskos, Leo Ryan, Judy McPherson and Liz Astbury — with inexpressible fondness and gratitude. The poky confines of my rural Calvinist heart called out for punishment, but chastisement was not forthcoming. And what in retrospect was even more heart-warming — they forgave my demonstrations of guilt. They even consented to ride with me again — in a Rover, a Vanguard and a Vauxhall.

La Trobe University was a blob of gentility fallen on a Fred Williams landscape. It was a wilderness out there. The region was largely unexplored. Friends went missing in ones and twos and sometimes larger numbers for whole days; lost between La Trobe and Northland, La Trobe and the Summerhill Hotel, La Trobe and Preston Cemetery, La Trobe and Larundel. Like Seamus Heaney’s Sweeney, ‘unsettled, panicky, astray’, they roamed about in the dark, sat in red gums, in piles of pipes and on great ghostly pieces of earthmoving equipment. Life stories were told in the long grass. Shadowy figures from Sale or Wycheproof would emerge from the dark speckled with paspalum seeds. Everyone knew someone who had gone out at night and not come back.
I had been disoriented by orientation week. I forgive myself for this. There was nothing to which one might be oriented. There was a college, a moat, a library and a thing named the Agora which comprised a barber shop, a pharmacy and a coffee house called The Plaka where pallid cappucini were sold by a Greek with an early hair transplant. These facilities were all splendid and necessary prerequisites of a civilisation, but they were hardly a substitute for a way of life. Habits and tradition had to be invented, which is something the students, having no fixed ideas on the matter, came to understand rather more quickly than the planners and managers.

It became a habit to frequent the Summerhill Hotel in Plenty Road, one of the early modern beer barns-cum-bloodhouses of outer suburban Melbourne. Even though beer was only twelve cents a pot and porterhouse and salad a mere forty cents, the place was considered an abomination by and large; at least until the Bundoora Hotel was built. The Bundoora was worse. Mature taste drifted towards the Old England in Heidelberg, and even as far as the pub at South Morang. If La Trobe was not well-served by hotels, the hamburgers from the shop in Bell Street near the corner of Heidelberg Road were superior to anything I have tasted since and the service, by a strapping youth who kept an iron bar beside the pre-cooked onions under the counter, always pleasant. So was the grilled flake from the place at the top of the hill just up from Ron Davies Caltex Service Station. Ron Davies was a large and hard Welshman, an ex-Barbarian by repute, who did mechanical repairs at a discount. Ron regularly attended social functions at La Trobe, as did the young bloke who made the hamburgers. La Trobe was incorrigibly democratic.

The statistics might show something else to be the case, but it was my impression that La Trobe’s student population was comprised primarily of the sons and daughters of farmers and the north suburban, lower-middle and working classes. An unusually large percentage (was it sixty per cent?) were Catholic. St Pats, Ballarat, and Assumption College, Kilmore, had distinguished representations, among them Martin Stanley O’Hehir, big Darby Munro and lithe Leo Ryan. Our lumpen congregation was leavened by some bright young bohemian things from University High, a sprinkling of chaps with good teeth from Scotch, and a galaxy of shudderingly beautiful private school girls the pursuit of whom consumed most of the energy of the mass.

I have spoken to lecturers from those days residing now in places as distant as Cork and Islington and it is these women they invariably recalled. They did not remember Bill Kelty, Gus Weaven, Ian Court, John Cummins or any of the other trade unionists La Trobe produced. The faces of David Morgan, the child film star, footballer and economist; Barry York, the rangy revolutionary from Brunswick; Bill Frew, the well-known weightlifter — all these needed prompting to recall. The day that Noddy Baker sat on Professor Donald Whitehead was all but forgotten. It was the women. The daughters of the rural gentry. The ones from Merton Hall, Firbank, Strathemer, St Catherine’s, St Leonard’s, Sacre Coeur! The ones who smoked Lark and drank brandy lime and soda, and who kept among their toiletries the aerosol, Femfresh, which is now accorded in history the same rank as foot-binding. The eyes of these ex-lecturers glazed at the mention of the names. The fragrance of tutorials wafted back and up their leathery noses. The mini-skirt. The attempts to talk about Cervantes and Voltaire. They reached for whisky. They spoke in tones inaudible to their wives and children. One became quite catatonic for an hour or more: another’s teeth began to chatter uncontrollably and he left the room complaining lamely of a fever.

Were there not fifty or sixty of these women? Did not Otis Redding and the Drifters write songs about them? Specifically about them? Were we not propelled through life by nothing more than a series of libidinous explosions, set to the music of the Beatles, the Stones and the Spencer Davis Trio? There was nothing the wise councillors and learned gentlemen could do to stop it. Guards on the female wing of Glenn College were lured away or bribed. All night, pebbles dinked on windows and fell back on lovelorn howling youths standing in the melaleucas round the back.
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You cannot turn a Preston sharpie into a gentleman by calling him 'mister' and placing an academic gown on his shoulders. Putting a decanter of sherry under the nose of a country bumpkin will not convert him to scholasticism — in all likelihood it won't convert him to sherry either. There is little you can do, of course, with the hormonally deranged. Expert as they might have been in commerce, law and society, the planners of La Trobe were feckless in the ways of the world they had let in. They had opened the gate to a new paddock and admitted everything from water buffalo to goats. This is not to call them feather-brained. You could hardly expect them to succeed in their dream of building a new institution of learning, a Harvard-on-Plenty, on the sociology of the farm-yard.

For a year or more Ben Meredith and others of his worldly ilk and influence never stopped trying to show us what the whole thing was about. Here in Bundoora the ancient traditions of university life would be combined with modern furniture and modern catering: the Library in the centre, the colleges round the fringe, each with a dining hall, each with a high table, each soul in a gown. It was a splendid concept. All it needed to work were penal sanctions and more gentlemen of the type often employed on the door of the Library — a hundred or so more and expert with the rifle butt.

It was the habit of very few La Trobe students I knew to tug the forelock very often. They tended to trample on tradition not for the sake of offending so much as for want of noticing it was there. Going the knuckle was by no means a foreign instinct. This sort of common behaviour was not unknown at other more established universities, I'm sure. But I think it is true to say that La Trobe in the first couple of years was a more physical place than the others. I seem to remember a social football match between the Melbourne University English Department and a scratch team of academics and students from La Trobe in which an unmuscled minor poet from Parkville was laid out by a highly educated forearm. The visitors and half of our side were paralysed by shock and disgust. The culprit was unrepentant. Brian Manison was a vigorous scholar. He was nobly-jawed and swarthy and, being descended from the serving classes of the Western District, entirely masterless. He always insisted that he majored in English Literature by reading nothing but the despised Monarch Guide Notes — to Coriolanus, to Emma, to Moby Dick, Hard Times, you name it. The claim may not have been entirely truthful, but truth was not the point of it. The point was to wound and infuriate members of the English Department who always declared that success by this means was quite impossible — quite.

Brian Manison also featured prominently in a notorious brawl during a ball at Glenn College. I believe he had a modicum of justice on his side that night, although the authorities believed otherwise. As the only one hospitalised — when a piece of modern furniture and various ancient Preston traditions intersected with my skull — I am not necessarily a reliable witness.

Although it was later to develop a reputation as a revolutionary socialist campus, the ethos in those first couple of years was rugged individualism. There were bitter contests for power and funds. In a callous coup, Mr Ken Bishop, a trumpeter and Machiavellian *bon vivant* from Moe, formed a secret alliance with the University High aesthetes to snatch the presidency of the SRC from the hirsute and worthy Mr Paul Reid who had every reason to believe he was a moral certainty. Mr Bishop giggled for months — years. He was still giggling when I saw him two years ago on his farm in Gippsland. Mr Reid took some time to recover. Bishop and Manison later went into partnership to form the Beaker Society — a drinking club which lauded beer but which sold scrumpy cider in the main. The commercial principles on which it ran were proto-Thatcherite, shall we say, although in the overview they did no harm to anyone. Bishop and Manison were among the first socialists I met in life. They lived in unspeakable squalor as if to prove it.

Not that the Beaker Society was the only direction to take. Film was the great thing. Phillippe Mora, a La Trobe student for part of 1967, came with a frightening reputation for intelligence and very soon had a dedicated band of film buffs following him around. A film
society was formed. Cinematheque Discotheques were staged. Phillipe made underground films. Soon we all seemed to be making underground films — all the men at least. Peter Beilby, Rod Bishop, Ken Carter, Howard Willis, Scott Murray, Alan Street, Demos Krouskos, Gordon Glenn, me — all these people made films or thought about making them I'm sure. Once a week in the Glenn College lecture theatre a Truffaut, a Goddard, an Antonioni or a Resnais was projected with inspired cunnudgeonliness by Andrew Pecze, late of Sale. Later, when most of them had drifted into Carlton, they produced Cinema Papers which is still going. Ken Carter made a film with me in it. I had to take all my clothes off. The film was so overexposed I was all but invisible. Ken was far more distressed than I.

I never met anyone like Ken Carter. He was the quintessential La Trobe student, being completely foreign to the customs of its founders. Legend had it he raised himself in a room above a Sydney Road shop. Ken was the son of a sailor. He himself sailed very close to the wind. On some days Ken wore his pyjamas. He would walk into the academic common room, say to the professors, 'Good evening', and take sherry from their cupboard. Sherry with their names on the bottle. Hairy, near scrofulous sometimes and with the smile of a baby looking up from the breast, Ken frightened people. You never knew what he was going to do — put a headlock on you or recite a poem of his own composition. The last time I saw Ken he bought me a milk shake in Fortnum and Mason's. He had just bought a house in St John's Wood with money he made from his Mayfair advertising agency.

My room in Glenn College was on the same floor as the History Department. It was furnished with a turntable, a record of Judy Henschke, an ash tray and a copy of Modern Philosophy by Edwards and Pap. From his room around the corner Ken Bishop played trumpet voluntaries in an effort to interrupt proceedings in the lecture theatre across the way. I walked to the shower through the staff Common Room where at ten o'clock every day, John O'Brien and Israel Getzler, two members of the History Department, had an argument about the relative importance of the Russian Revolution and the Irish Rebellion. I am now aware that John O'Brien had a few things in common with Ken Carter, strange as it may seem. A pervasive scruffiness was only one of them — John O'Brien's car was two feet deep in Craven A packets. They laughed in the same way, high-pitched and as if they had just done or were about to do a mischief. It would not have surprised to see John in his pyjama shirt one day. He introduced me to civilisation I think. Not that I recognised it then, any more than I recognised that I might one day be as excited by history as he was.

John lived among the bellbirds at Monsalvat with the Englishman, Mike Hodd, who taught economics. I'll never forgive Mike for making me act in The Brig, a play he produced in the Agora. After the first performance he probably couldn't forgive himself. I was never offered a part in his Smoking Concerts which probably introduced civilisation to La Trobe. Where Mike Hodd taught economics, John O'Brien practised them. Their place grew daffodils in profusion. John generously allowed Rod Bishop and me to harvest and sell them on the Eltham Road. He would take a thirty per cent cut, he said. He did — from the seven dollars and fifty cents we managed to sell them for.

I remember little of an academic nature from that first year save the lectures of Israel Getzler and John O'Brien. The Getzler lectures were majestic. He filled our heads with revolutionary music, revolutionary images, revolutionary slogans. The revolutionary idea did not, at that stage, take hold. But to his increasing horror I'm sure, he had a subversive influence in the long run. Like all good lecturers his intention was to open our minds. He meant to transport us to revolutionary Russia, but only in the figurative sense. He could never have imagined that his students might very soon be using Bolshevism — or even Menshevism — as a model for Bundoora.

If I was less inspired by other lectures it was largely because I rarely went to them. Not that I wasn't interested. In fact, by the end of the year I had become aware that there was nothing I wanted to do so much as the courses La Trobe offered in Humanities. But, constitutionally, there was nothing I was less capable of doing.
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I cannot describe the delights or the agitation of that first year, 1967. Nor can I describe the callowness. I was like an escaped hamster. I lived by uncomprehended instincts, fell down holes, followed scents up blind tunnels and panicked, got myself and others into desperate predicaments which even now are excruciating to recall — and yet — I was always meeting other hamsters with whom it was possible to sit down, compare experience and conjure worldliness. There were also kind counselling souls, well-chosen by the authorities, like Dr Kel Semmens who was in charge of the University Health Service and Mrs Betty Collings, the Student Housing Officer, who I'm quite sure saved a few lives.

The world of La Trobe in 1967 was decidedly not political. I can scarcely remember a political conversation from the first day to the last of that year. Who knows what we talked about? Football, films which I didn't understand until years later, beer, oysters, sex. I think we talked about religion. I met Catholics for the first time. We compared experience. I ate a great many tinned anchovies and became, for all intents and purposes, an atheist. But politics was not, as they now say, on the agenda. There was a good deal of talk about cars and motor bikes.

Nevertheless I remember two moments in the first year or so which now seem significant. They were remarks overheard, not conversations with which I was engaged. They were big remarks. They had the sort of ring to them which Israel Getzler evoked when he talked about momentous events. In a Glenn College corridor I heard Gershon Weiler of the Philosophy Department say something along the lines of — if they wanted a civil war in the United States they were going the right way about it. It might have been the day Martin Luther King was assassinated. And I recall, in the summer between the first year and the second, a conversation between several students and Professor Wally Thompson of the Spanish Department. It was about the Tet Offensive then taking place in Vietnam. The North Vietnamese were in Saigon. The Americans might lose. I now think that it was on this afternoon that I was first able to imagine the world turned upside down.

The north wind blew all summer. A ghost drove us out of our house in Reservoir. I put paid to all my Presbyterian precedents by working in a pub in Malvern. We moved to accommodation in East Melbourne. I deigned to go home and cart the hay. My parents noted that I had gone pretty thoroughly to the pack. We were kicked out of East Melbourne by the one-armed landlord. We moved to Ivanhoe. Demos Krouskos and I worked in a foolscap factory where the women who were three times more efficient were paid two thirds of our wages. A Dutchman who had been bent double by the operation of a 'safety device' on his antiquated guillotine was given a 'send off' at the end of thirty years service in the factory. They gave him a four dollar dock. I'm reluctant to say that seeing the work-face of capitalism changed my politics. But I had a glimpse of the world's underside. And politics itself changed that year. Harold Holt disappeared at Portsea and Australian conservatism began to fall into disarray.

Not that 1968 began as a political year for me. I had merely grown from hamster to goat. In June, in the middle of the Paris riots, I was playing intervarsity football in Brisbane. Brian Manison was our strongman, David Morgan our goal-kicker, the present member for Northcote, Tony 'Red' Sheehan, our nick-rover, and Pasquale Sgro, now a member of the Economics Department, our rover. In the hotel room next to me slept La Trobe's representative in the shot-put. His name was Fergus Robinson. 'Ah Fergus, Comrade Robinson, who then would ever have guessed?' I went to Russia at the end of 1968 — my grand tour, with the intensely dry David Loh, a fellow student in Humanities, one Dr Jane Leonard, an American from the History Department, and others. Jane was a JFK product. She had worked in the Peace Corps and believed in the revised version of her country's manifest destiny. We were joined by her cousin in Hong Kong: he was a 'hippy', a real one, from California. He had thought a great deal about the world but never really picked up where we were in it relative to anywhere else. Despite the efforts of Senator McCarthy and others he was not aware that Russia was a communist society.

I had simply borrowed the money and gone: not like a hamster or a goat, nor even as a
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scholar. I went Candide-like: across Siberia, up to Leningrad, down to the Black Sea, out through Turkey, on to Paris and London. It was not a political pilgrimage in the manner of Bernard Shaw's, Lincoln Steffens', John Reed's or even, I suspect, David Loh's. Nor was it a spiritual excursion. It was primarily a geographical experience. It expanded the map of my brain and coloured some parts in.

In Paris, students were still dodging batons with great panache in the streets around the Sorbonne. David Loh and I watched. From here I could begin my own left testament I suppose. How I had seen oppression in east and west and where they meet in Turkey. But the fact is that being witness to these places and events made hardly a scratch on my political consciousness. The effect of it all constituted everything but ideology. I hitch-hiked hungry and alone through Europe for five weeks with nothing on my mind but going home.

It seems to have been shortly after getting back that Malcolm Muggeridge came to La Trobe. He strode on to the stage in Glenn College, took off his coat and revealed a pair of bright red braces. It was a class act. In that moment he held the audience in his hand. Very shortly after that they had escaped.

Albert Langer was on the stage. And Hugo Wolfsohn — or Frank Knopfelmacher — I can't remember which and I'm not sure that it matters greatly. The debate I think was about the 'Role of the University'. Half way through it, Albert Langer held up to the audience a note he had written in large print. It said — what am I doing here?, or something like that. The mob roared. The mob's position was that the role of the University was never to be that of an ivory tower isolated from the rest of society. At La Trobe the University never had been an ivory tower. It had never been a university. It had been a paddock isolated from the rest of society. It is futile to deny the truth, however — the founders of La Trobe University had an ivory tower in mind. They were interested in form. Good form. It was a mistake. It was like trying to run the Derby with a field of improvers. It was folly, even if it's true to say that like most follies the spirit was exceedingly generous. After all, they brought Malcolm Muggeridge to address the likes of us!

Malcolm Muggeridge left the stage declaring that he had never addressed a more crass and vulgar audience. Never in his life, anywhere in the world. This was a generous curse. Muggeridge had been addressing rowdies for fifty years. I'm sure his estimation gave a lot of people heart. I've wondered since if La Trobe did not help drive him into the arms of the Church of England.

I went to see a man named John Waterhouse one day. It was an official matter: he was Careers Advisor I think, and I was interested at last in a career. The meeting was amicable. As I left I walked into an horde of students intent on occupying his office. They had come to demand that the Australian Army be prevented from recruiting on the campus. Later that day I bumped into John Waterhouse again, outside the Library. He was puce. He told me that he remembered my face, that I had been in his office, that he would get my name from Student Records. That I was in deep trouble. Well, of course, I was innocent, but two years later as I walked down the aisle of Glenn College Dining Hall, clutching the degree Sir Archibald Glenn had just given me, with my parents still applauding, and old comrades from the Labor Oub in the melaleuca patches outside still shouting that Sir Archibald Glenn was a fascist pig, I heard a voice saying with great sincerity — 'well done'. It was John Waterhouse and he looked at me in a way which plainly said — 'you have departed from the mongrel path and are forgiven for occupying my office that day. Good boy'.

With David Loh I edited Rabelais. Rabelais had been founded by Michel Lawrence who chose the name because it suggested bawd, which he liked. I took to writing portentous editorialis and ill-conceived film reviews. There were long articles on McLuhan and Marx and Marcuse. Marxist attacks on the English Department — it was a difficult age for F.R. Leavis. As editor of Rabelais one almost imagined that one was at the centre of things. I rang up a girl whose looks I adored and introduced myself: 'I'm the editor of Rabelais', I said. 'Of what?', she said.
I gave up cricket and football. I got stomach cramps when I ate. It was believed to be an ulcer. I failed some exams and got miserable marks for others. I got married. I ceased to have stomach cramps. My marks improved.

I found that I was a variety of Marxist. This I would attribute largely to Doug White, Peter Cook, David Johanson and Ken Good, but there were also those who led one there by negative example. I thank the former. Marxism is a big idea. It is a claw on the universe. It turns the brain into a world processor. Viewed from La Trobe in 1970 society seemed to be having a perpetual fire-sale. It was dosing down. Everything had to go.

We moved to Carlton, which of course offered the very things La Trobe never could — a community of sorts. The watering holes now became Naughtons and the Mayfair in Parkville, where I fell in with Laurie Clancy, a lecturer in the English Department, and his brothers and the management and labour of an international weighing company. I remember a summer spent entirely and gloriously in the Prince Alfred Hotel. Nothing can resist suburbia. If you put a university in the suburbs it is a suburban university. It is a hostile environment for exotic thought. The Labor Club was never going to forge an alliance with the panel beaters of Waterdale Road. One only needed to play football in the region to know the sort of regard in which university students were held — even students who came from the same suburbs. They loathed us. They passionately clobbered us.

In those last two years at La Trobe I discovered, or should have, that revolutionary politics required a capacity for conviction that I do not have. It requires more courage than I have and certainly more decisiveness. For a while it seemed a person was required to confront his conscience, his mind and his friends and vote every day. We had a regular little revolutionary parliament out there, in the same Glenn College Dining Hall where two years before we sat about in gowns and ate Nationwide hot pot and diced carrot. That's where it all started of course, with the catering. Nationwide was boycotted. It was exploitative, after all, and in all likelihood a multinational.

Those meetings were a wonder. We came armed with pamphlets from the left, the right and the centre and variants of all of them. There were some who did not come: I now suspect that those who came from active Labor backgrounds were less inclined to radical student politics than those whose households had been conservative or apolitical. There were mavericks, like Andrew Campbell who often spoke with his eyes closed. It's possible he did not want people to see the tears behind them. Andrew lectured us all on things he knew from books he kept in a large black bag — he could speak both Weber and Joyce. He was an intellectual terrorist. And an incomparable companion. He took me for a fool at first but like a cornered rat I argued my way out of that. We went for a walk around Melbourne University one day. 'This is a real university', Andrew said. He liked the anonymity. I now know why.

Both Bob Santamaria and Ted Hill were at work at La Trobe — Santamaria in the Moderate Students Alliance whose members certainly looked moderate and were indeed quite extreme in their modernity; Hill, among the Maoists who gradually took control of the Labor Club. Atrocities ancient and modern were compared. Nicely dressed 'moderates', in whose mouths butter would not have melted, spoke of massacres in Hue. Hairy radicals pointed to My Lai. The Chinese Cultural Revolution was a pre-eminent sticking point — it was to this generation what the Spanish Civil War had been to an earlier one. The 'moderates' identified 'radical junior staffers': the bearded philosophy lecturer, John Fox, was a favourite target. The left identified crypto, proto, quasi and neo fascists. In between stood commonsensical, somewhat avuncular types of Irish extraction — Terry Moran, Paul Reid, Des Kelly. Then there was Al Watson of Carlton. Older and more hip, a jazz freak and bohemian, Al implored these meetings to 'cool it', but it was the radical inclination to heat it up. And to think I could have been reading Aubrey's Brief Lives or joining the Labor Party.

At a meeting of the Labor Club Comrade F. put it to us that we must be prepared to make sacrifices. We had to be prepared to go to gaol. Certain comrades examined their shoelaces. We had to be prepared to risk our lives. Certain comrades remembered classes they hadn't
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attended for months. Comrade R. rose. He had a friend undergoing military training in Queensland who was prepared to deliver up to a revolutionary courier quantities of automatic weapons and ammunition for them. Comrade R. was going to Queensland. He sought comrades' approval to act as courier. His courage and largesse were acknowledged from the chair. One or two comrades opened their mouths and forgot to close them. ‘How was Comrade R. intending to travel?’ asked Comrade Y. ‘Hitch-hiking’, said Comrade R. At this point of the debate several incipient revisionists exposed their true colours and conducted a very timely self-imposed purge. The chair thought with the greatest fraternal respect and admiration for Comrade R. that drivers, particularly Queensland drivers, might be less than willing to offer a ride to a man carrying large numbers of M16s and ammunition boxes. Democratic centralism was thus achieved amidst a fit of the giggles. I myself have ever since been grateful to Comrades F., Y., and R. for helping me to recognise my limitations and find the shade of political opinion with which I am most at home.

In one issue of their broadsheet, Red Moot, La Trobe’s Marxist-Leninists, outlined the ‘Revisionism of Bob Dylan’. Soon after, Grant Evans, just a year or two out of Mildura, was called to defend himself against similar charges. While some of us talked about the prospects of achieving ‘socialism on one campus’, we also talked about how certain of our old friends had lost their sense of humour and how we could imagine one or two of them ever so sadly putting a pistol in your ear. But new La Trobe Soviet Man was still Homo Ludens. There was a fair amount of unconscious or half-conscious play acting. The crucial difference between Grant Evans and Bukharin was that Grant had the option of not turning up for his trial. It was a show trial.

So La Trobe became a political battleground. After students demonstrating against the war in Vietnam were assaulted by police in Waterdale Road, another, much larger, demonstration was held to assert the right of public assembly. It became known as the Waterdale Road Massacre, our own Peterloo, our own Bloody Sunday; our own proof, as if we needed it, that liberalism was a fallacy. This was living history. It was praxis, or very nearly. Those who had asserted that the state, even Dick Hamer’s state, was by nature violent and repressive were right: the exquisitely named Inspector Platfuss and his band of thugs proved them to be so. The attack was wanton, indiscriminate and vicious. Waterdale Road was very bad news for the liberal argument. From our purview it was a stage in the revolutionary struggle. It was a splendid consciousness-raiser. When, during the great Vietnam Moratorium marches, the less politically-developed middle class demonstrators chanted to office workers—‘join us, join us’—La Trobe cadres shouted—‘jump you bastards’. The revolutionary sense of humour had not yet been annihilated. A film was made about the radical life of La Trobe. Called ‘Beginnings’, it featured Demos Krouskos, the gentlest of men, demonstrating on a blackboard the history of the Molotov Cocktail.

Events everywhere conspired to keep the revolution going in our minds. In Vietnam of course and in the demonstrations against the war in the United States. In the civil rights movement in the US (I had an affair with Angela Davis for years before her picture faded on the wall). The clenched-fist salute became a popular form of greeting. South Africa was an issue. South America was an issue. Peace was less and less an issue. Feminism meant nothing: women were running organisations like Save Our Sons. It was a great time to be male.

The draft resistance movement was at the centre of everything. I had registered as a conscientious objector but in any event escaped the ballot. I now felt a little guilty about both these things. Far better to resist the draft directly. We needed experience to match our ideas. Neville White had been to Vietnam, yet as a student at La Trobe he marched against the war. He was a student of the physical sciences which made him all the more a treasure. Dennis O’Donnell had been drafted and gone AWOL after which they sent him to Holdsworthy Military Prison. He kept a low political profile at La Trobe. He was sardonic, ambivalent. Yet he inspired in those of us who got to know him a degree of moral certitude which he would never have claimed himself and probably found repugnant. But Nick White and Dennis O’Donnell had
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been there and we hadn't. When it was all said and done, we hadn't been anywhere.

It must have all seemed like so much ingratitude. No generation in Australia's history had been better off — few generations in the history of the world for that matter. We were there on Menzies scholarships and Bolte studentships. There was no doubt we would find employment when we left, in fact we'd have a choice of jobs. We had comforts and prospects our parents never dreamed of: not for themselves at any rate — only for us. So what did we say? We said, 'Your society stinks.' We weren't altogether wrong, though it seems truer now than it was then. The rebellion was as much against the dying order of Australian conservatism as anything else. If capitalist democracy was not, as we maintained, burnt out, the old Liberal-Country Party-RSL political order was. Their complacency was surpassed only by their supineness, their arrogance, their Anglophilia, their politics of infinite pragmatism, their deadly greyness. We wanted to blow marijuana up their noses and make them laugh, helplessly. To our parents we said, 'If the depression was so bad and your lives so circumscribed, why didn't you do something about it?' And when they said their lives were not circumscribed, we said angrily, 'Oh yes they are! Compare them with ours.' We rested our case.

The right has always insisted that we were politically subverted by our lecturers in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Now, putting aside the fact that this particular student had been thoroughly subverted by conservatives for his entire natural life, and the other fact that most of his lecturers at La Trobe would have been hard put in conscience to make a dog bark, the truth of the matter is that he was not so much subverted as inverted. By establishing La Trobe for people like ourselves the founding fathers had turned the world on its head and from this unaccustomed vantage point, once our heads stopped spinning, it was possible to imagine anything.

And in the end it was no longer possible to resist study. My two great teachers, were in fact subversives. David Johanson subverted my anti-intellectual rusticity. Peter Cook subverted my anti-rustic intellectualism. David Johanson introduced me to the tragic romance of European socialism. Peter Cook committed the ultimate act of sedition — he introduced me to the tragic romance of Australian socialism, and in so doing made me as excited by the history of this country as John O'Brien had been about the history of Ireland. Peter Cook, in other words, showed me, as Manning Clark, Ian Turner and Hugh Stretton had shown him, that the history of Australia was not merely a respectable interest but the most privileged of all vocations for an Australian. It took me a long time to appreciate the heritage these people had bequeathed me, but then I had been unconscionably slow to realise what was on offer.

There were other teachers. Greg Dening and Rhys Isaac confused me for an entire (fourth) year. I learnt only slowly that it was creative confusion. And that, by my own lights, is the best summary of La Trobe's achievements. In the areas which really counted it was a generous and forebearing place. It may have been less kind to others — in fact I have no doubt that it was. But the guiding principle, albeit of necessity, was tolerance. As much as an experiment in education it was an experiment in democracy — it was a brave place. I saw the difference when I taught at the University of Melbourne a few years later.

A fortnight or so before I sat my final year exams, I went to a party in the La Trobe staff-student flats. Israel Getzler danced some kind of frenetic dance. John Salmond and numerous historians were there together with Bill Hartley and other students of all persuasions. Driving home along Waterdale Road I was apprehended by a Constable Alcott who had been a conspicuous presence in the fray on the same road a year or so before. I spent the night with a man who had stabbed his wife and a youth who had stolen a car. There were revolutionary slogans on the walls. They had been put there by La Trobe students. But they were of little comfort to me, and of none at all to my north suburban companions. I was a hamster recaptured — and to think I was in there for a non-political offence! I think now that it would have been appropriate to have spent that time in the Heidelberg lock-up deep in the more orthodox, deeply conservative, unreconstructed thought that it was a penance: not for my obvious and unmistakable sins but for ingratitude towards that great benevolent zoo, La Trobe. Next morn-
ing I was bailed out by a member of the History Department.

ENDNOTES
1. Fergus James Robinson, a freshman in Humanities in 1968, subsequently became one of the leading figures in the student 'troubles' in the early 1970s. (Ed.)

2. Dr Doug C. White, School of Education; Dr Peter S. Cook, Department of History; Mr David F.C. Johanson, Department of History (died 1985); Mr Kenneth A. Good, Department of Politics. (Ed.)

3. G.M. Dening, a joint-appointment in History and Sociology, taught at La Trobe from 1969 to 1971 when he was appointed to the Max Crawford Chair of History at Melbourne University. Rhys Isaac was subsequently appointed Professor of History at La Trobe University in 1986. (Ed.)
In 1973, Julia applied to La Trobe University for entry under the 'Mature-aged Students' Scheme'.

'Write us an essay', the University advised. 'About your life. Tell us what education means to you'.

Julia bought a flagon of wine for company and wrote into the wee hours of two mornings.

I have never been educated yet I have been in schools, in desks, squeezed between the 'big girls' since I am eight. Dad (or Sir as we called him in the classroom) strode the platform, teaching the entire school while keeping an eye on his plump red-headed daughter. This gave Mum a chance to cope with the baby. (One born every year for four years and three more to follow.) We followed 'Sir' from school to school: Rushworth, Balmattum, Bowhard, Elingamite North, back to Balmattum. All before I was eight. Times when the school and the 'school residence' were separated only by a wall, when promotion meant shifting, change, when good-byes were followed by moving vans packed to brimming with furniture, teachests, cardboard boxes, cots, mattresses, squashed bears and the worn-faced favourite doll, I called Connie. ('Short for Continuity', Dad used to joke.)

We children rarely grieved for what we were leaving. We were too excited by the prospect of change. Sure we howled— but only when we had to throw out broken toys, or when Dad wouldn't stop on those packed journeys for ice-cream or lollies, or when a brother or a sister spread limbs into your space, or farted, or sweated beside you in the increasingly cramped back-seats of the Essex, the Chevvy, the Morris, or finally, the F.J. Holden. We worried about change only when, spruced up and scared, we were taken to our 'new schools'.

The city for me, was a strange world of anger and violence. Our West Heidelberg Housing Commission home wasn’t ready for us when we moved from the country and we were forced to live in Camp Pell, discarded Nissen huts, discarded by the army after the war, homes for displaced persons. The first morning we set off from Camp Pell, in Royal Park, across Flemington Road to St Michael's — Mum with the four of us, the baby in the pusher — a group of jeering women linked arms and barred our path. Grim-faced and clutching at us, Mum paid them the two shillings they demanded to let us pass. Seeing St Michael’s for the first time, I was privately convinced that city kids had sinned seriously and were being punished for it. Why else would they be dressed the same and crammed behind a tin fence so high it made it impossible to see the grass of the park, let alone play in its space?

I stayed at my next school, West Heidelberg State, for only one month. I was perfectly happy there until a dreadful thing happened. I was swinging across the monkey-bar above a group of boys. I was halfway across when they began hooting with laughter and pointing up my dress. With my boot I hooked one of them under the chin before I dropped to the ground and fled the schoolyard. My underpants were old and grubby. And worse. They had a big rip in them.

Dad got a night job as a barman and sent my sister Susan and me to Our Lady's College,
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Heidelberg. There life revolved around pressed pleats, finding gloves, and waiting for the world to end, as the mission priests promised it would. I outgrew my next school, Lavers Hill Consolidated, set in the mist of the Otways, and stayed at home to do my Sub-Intermediate by correspondence. Back in the city again, I passed my Intermediate at a private school in North Melbourne and the nuns sent for Dad and told him I was bright but wayward.

A seasoned eavesdropper, I listened while my parents spoke about my future.

Dad said, 'I want them all to be educated ... even the girls'.

Mum wasn't a dreamer.

'It's the boys who'll be breadwinners and there are four of them'.

'The girls should have something to fall back on'.

'Four boys to put through the Brothers, Bill. Imagine the cost'.

'She's not taking her studies seriously apparently'.

'Besides, she'll be married by the time she's twenty-one, and a mother shortly after, and it'll be wasted. All that money spent on education. Mothering is dedication, not education. You've told me that often enough'.

I could hear her beer glass thud on the green velvet card table.

'If we educate one of the girls Bill, we'll have to educate the others. All three of them...'

Dad was silent a long time, thinking about costs probably.

Mum would be waiting, watching him. 'Besides, you've said yourself, experience is the greatest educator'.

Through the tear-shaped keyhold I saw them kiss. A quick kiss, I remember thinking, with a sound like a full stop.

At fourteen I was employed by the Commonwealth Bank in Elizabeth Street. A teller's runner. Navy-blue skirts and white blouses. Every evening I ate a Violet Crumble bar on the Princes Bridge tram to Burwood. A whole purple papered Crumble to myself. Shared, it would be severed into seven with the big knife that cut the Sunday roast. Within a year I was bored. I knew, because I was plump and freckled, that no one would every marry me. I saw myself at twenty, a long-legged spinster, still rushing along the raised, polished ledger platform checking bank-balances. Terrified, I studied three subjects towards my Leaving at Taylor's Night school, poured my soul out to a priest and was accepted into the Catholic Education Department.

'One more subject, Julia, and you could train with the state system'.

'One more subject is one more year', I told my father. 'I could be dead by then'.

At eighteen I stood before one hundred grade one children at Corpus Christi, Glenroy. No aisles except entrance and exit. Four books of the roll to fill in every day. School money to collect, four shillings per family per week. To pay for the teacher's wage. The concept of grouping so many children according to their abilities was, I decided, impossible. In order to survive, I grouped according to bowel habits. Weak bladders and troublesome bowels were placed against the only aisle and as close to the door as possible.

Teaching was as impossible as discipline. Except, I decided, through song. Song. When the chatter rose to the level of a din I could sometimes ward off chaos by whamming the blackboard ruler on the ledge, dancing the platform I polished of a Saturday, and launching them into song. Song after song after song. A day long song-and-dance act. Thumbkin and Rodolf and Twinkle and hymns, of course, hymns. But pub songs worked best in desperate situations, songs like 'Knees up Mother Brown' (with actions) 'Chattanooga Choo Choo', 'Blue Suede Shoes', 'Irene Goodnight', 'You are My Sunshine' and because it was my father's favourite 'Love's Old Sweet Song'.

And Mother? Was she right? To within a year. At twenty-two I was 'in love', pregnant and married (in that order) and still travelling with a man, this time my husband, from drilling
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site to drilling site, including a remote town in Tasmania, until with three small children we settled here, in suburban Greensborough.

••••

'Outside a wind is blowing', Julia wrote in her diary.
'Inside — where I am — nothing is moving, shifting, changing'.

••••

The pile of mail is beside the flagon of riesling and the bag of groceries on the white laminex bench. The letter on the top is from La Trobe University. Marked confidential.

There is nothing personal about the letter. Hundreds of them with names in their windows wait in letter-boxes, on tables, pillows, or benches, wait, Julia thinks, to open like doors to change, or to slam shut — in a hard wind — to continuity.

Before she opens her letter, Julia will unpack the groceries, clear some space for thinking. Moisture has shaped a weeping pattern down the frosted glass of the flagon and the Women's Weekly on which it sits is rimmed damp. Beneath the wine the Queen's smile is quivering. Perhaps the Queen, like God, already knows the outcome. Julia, looking for a better omen, settles on the wind. 'Change and continuity, that's what the wind represents', she thinks. Julia pours a wine from the flagon. A toast to change.

The only person Julia knows who has attended a university is her cousin, Richard McArthur. University education was never considered an option by Julia's family, nor by the families of anyone Julia knew. Universities were for other people. The wealthy and the brilliant. The Duffys were neither. The McArthurs however, had money and one only had to look at Richard's pale prince-like features to know he was brilliant.

The house, this day, is unusually quiet. Julia's husband Kevin, has taken the children to the creek to catch yabbies. They will return soon covered in mud, swinging their plastic bucket and squealing with excitement about the amber claws groping desperately above the murky water. Julia will rail — again — about changing any creature's environment when the result can only be destruction. Certain destruction. Change is fine, Julia will argue, as long as there is no risk to health or happiness. No risk at all.

'Education changes people, Jule', Kevin said last night.

'Look at Bill Darcy. He was an ordinary, friendly kind of fellow before he went to that engineering school. Look at him now! A bloody snob!'

Julia agreed. Bill was unbearable.

'But I'm too old to change', Julia reassured. 'Too set in my ways'. She laughed. 'Can you imagine your wine-drinking, ex-pub singer wife becoming an intellectual snob?'

They both laughed.

In bed Kevin held her and said, 'Maybe I won't be good enough for you when you are educated, Jule'.

Julia kissed him passionately. 'Experience', she quoted to him, 'Is the greatest educator'.

Like Julia, Kevin had left school when he was fourteen. He'd spent the next ten years on drilling rigs in Australia's outback. When Julia first met him he was full of whisky and draped over a bar. He proposed that same night. Walking home from Julia's house he had to take off his thongs. To get a better grip, not on life, he'd said, but on the bloody bridge.

Julia opens the letter. It is a rejection. Computerised. When Kevin comes home with the children Julia is tipsy.

'There's no need for you to worry', Julia tells him. 'I won't be crossing a bridge. I'll be staying on this road. With you'.

Kevin is sympathetic. The children have flooded the bathroom floor. Julia has let the potatoes burn. The humidity has got to the wine.

'We didn't get any yabbies', the children tell her.
‘You weren’t meant to’, Julia says. ‘Today is a stay put day. For everyone. Look! Even the stars are in their place’.

Kevin hadn’t realized that it meant so much to her.

‘God has done the dirty on me’, Julia told him.

Kevin sifts through the mail. Most are bills.

‘Maybe it’s for the best’, he says. ‘We need your wage. At least for a while’.

Julia has opened a different letter. She passes him the rejection slip.

This one is for a children’s book about pegs. Two pegs. Percival and Penelope. Born to a specific task. While Percival, the ‘man of the house’ gripped heavy navy overalls, even blankets, with enthusiasm and a sense of purpose, Penelope continually loses lighter items to the wind through dreaming. Julia led her wayward peg through many exciting adventures, Penelope the Princess, the Pirate, the Prime Minister... until she had Penelope realize the inevitable. Her place is with Percival, as a peg. As in all the books for children that Julia writes, (the ones that keep coming back from publishing houses) the moral is explicit, and the ending always happy.

Penelope accepts her role in life and lives joyously ever after. As Julia will. As Julia will have to.

Kevin passes her two letters. The first is from the Catholic Education Department offering her a position as principal of a Catholic school. The second is from La Trobe University. Asking her to ignore the computerised letter. She has been selected in the second round of offers. Selected under the ‘Mature-age Students’ Scheme’. ‘I won’t take it up’. Julia reassures Kevin. ‘I’ll end up like the yabbies. Struggling desperately to survive in an environment that isn’t meant for me’.

La Trobe University was once a sacred site for ancient winds. Undisturbed for centuries, in their landscape of flat brush between Heidelberg and Preston, winds bred winds, mature winds mastered the art of seeding, spreading, cycloning while younger winds with hilarious abandon curled and lurched and lashed.

Then man invaded in the name of education. Outraged, the winds dedicated themselves to the annihilation of all breathing and non-breathing invaders. Day in, day out, they rushed, chillingly angry, through the grey spaces, squares, columns and corridors left for them between the encroaching buildings; they hurled gravel into the sky, pushed skirts into buttocks, sent papers flying and brought stinging tears to the eyes.

Of those who battled with the wind, most were young, most wore jeans and tatty shirts and boasted wild unkempt hair. They carried canvas bags of books, looked as poor as possible and spent great spaces of time stirring sugar into coffee in the cafeterias or floating paper planes through lecture theatres.

Julia wore pleated skirts and orange lipstick.

‘I feel the freak!’ she told Kevin, ‘Yet one of them in the Greensborough complex would turn a hundred heads’.

In tutorials Julia said nothing while the young ones voiced their opinions confidently. Unashamedly they called their tutors by their first names. Other mature-aged students like Julia had read almost everything ever written. Julia hunched silent and despairing over her note book and wrote at fever pitch, not only every word the tutor said, but every word everyone said and every book anyone mentioned. Six pages she wrote per tutorial barely readable, to be deciphered later in private. And the list of books she’d never heard of, yet determined to read, grew despairingly longer. She prepared for her tutorials with meticulous care, reading, re-reading and reading again. Ideas, links, comparisons, came to her now and then, but never did she dare to voice them for fear others would discover what Julia had come to know with certainty; that she’d got into this place through some shocking bureaucratic error.
She wrote an essay on John Donne's poem, 'The Apparition'. She laboured over her sentences, her discoveries. Every word of over six letters she checked and re-checked in her dictionary. She handed her paper in on time in a manila folder. Mr Clancy smiled and said, 'I'll be very interested to at least read your opinions'. His words had a double meaning but Julia wasn't sure what it was. She dreaded the day the essay would be returned. Sure enough, on the day, Mr Clancy asked if she would stay back to discuss the essay after the tutorial. The others suspected what Julia knew instantly — that she'd failed. Mr Clancy said he thought her essay was very competent indeed but he couldn't — for the life of him — see any reference to the Blessed Trinity. And more importantly, would she please, please, call him Laurie.

'I will, since he's asked', Julia told Kevin.

'What mark did you get?' Kevin asked. Julia grinned. Kevin snatched the folder. 'An A-Jule'. The kids started screaming, 'Mummy got a aay. Mummy got a aaaaay!' Julia jumped with the lot of them over the chairs, over the furniture, around the room. 'Your mother is brilliant', she told the children. She looked in the mirror to see it was her. She told Kevin. 'With what I'm learning about poetry and novels and plays, the one thing I know for sure is that I'll never make a writer'. She wished the flagon wasn't empty. She could go on for hours. 'The tragedies and the passions of their lives, Kevin!' she said as she donned her bri-nylon nightdress. 'I could never do it. The way they put the images together to make the whole. Each a perfect ingredient. Every image an enhancement of the one before'.

Kevin buried his head in The Sun. 'You're changing, Jule. You should hear yourself. The way you carry on these days'.

'A wind never dies', Julia tells her children, 'it is perennial until the season calls it up or it is disturbed by unnatural forces'.

'Mum talks weird now she goes to the Bersity'. Julia's children said. 'She surely does', Kevin complained. With the wind in her soul Julia raged in Philosophy tutorials.

'Imagine!' Julia tells Kevin. 'We're to prove whether or not God exists'

Once, in primary school Julia had asked a nun, 'Since we can't St. Him, or hear Him, how can we know for sure?' The nun took Julia aside and promised to pray for her. If a holy person prayed for you when a relative wasn't dying or drifting from the path of Faith, then obviously the devil had wormed his way into your soul without your knowing. Julia spent a year in a state of repentance, praying for God's Grace and preparing her soul for death. She waited for the Blessed Virgin to appear and direct her. And appear the Virgin did. To both Julia and her sister Susan. Kneeling before their luminous vision, they confessed, each hearing the other, their sins. For two days they were both too hysterical to attend school. The Virgin had warned that the world was full of sinners and the most serious of all sins was, of course, disbelief. Susan wouldn't stop praying for Julia's soul. Julia said if Susan didn't stop she'd tell Dad the things she'd been doing with boys.

'You're going to end up a prostitute!' Julia warned. Susan tried to pull Julia's hair out. 'Kissing's nothing compared to drinking sacristy wine', Susan screamed. 'It becomes Christ's blood, that wine, Julia and you've been vomiting it down the girl's toilets'.

In her entire life Julia had never met, let alone spoken to, an Atheist.

'The University is full of them', she told Kevin. 'They admit it openly'. Julia consulted a parish priest. 'Be careful', he warned. 'Faith is the most delicate of all relationships. It must be nurtured, protected'.

Julia felt sorry for the Atheists. 'They have nothing to fall back on', she said. 'Nothing to comfort them. This life, for them, is all there is. Imagine. No reward for a 'good life', no explanation for pain and suffering'.

For thirty years Julia had believed that the existence of God could be proved. It was merely a matter of coming to terms with the various arguments for His existence and presenting them rationally and intellectually. She found the tutorial discussion on this topic disturbing yet stimulating. Afterwards, however, she prayed for these people.
'They're so sure they're right', she told Kevin. 'They believe everything they've been taught. Unquestioningly'. Fifteen attempts at an essay, a disappointing 'D' and Julia was devastated. She had written that God existed because she believed he did. But her faith was taking a beating. She'd tried desperately to justify cyclones and fires as the work of a loving God. Explain sickness and pain. She was horrified to discover the atrocities committed by the Catholic Church in the French Revolution. There could be no denying it, the church was a political power, a corrupt political power, dedicated to maintaining the gap between the rich and the poor, far removed from what Christ and St Peter had intended it to be. And Julia had been an instrument of this same institution. And worse, she had taught its values, its beliefs to hundreds and hundreds of children. Julia was angry. She'd been hoodwinked and cheated and indoctrinated. Her world was shattering before her eyes. The war in Vietnam was a travesty, father figure Menzies was a fraud. The Liberal party was dedicated to incentive before equality. Socialists weren't Communists.

Communists weren't evil. Communist policies had merit. A capitalist society was a consumer society. She was a consumer, a bourgeoise, a capitalist. A suburban middle-class woman with suburban middle-class values. There was no hope for her. Change was impossible.

In coffee shops and in the Agora, Julia argued with strangers about God, about politics, and about morality. 'Why not', she told Kevin, 'they don't consider such topics bad manners'.

'There's nothing like a good philosophical debate', Julia would tell her dinner party guests. And afterwards she would say to Kevin, 'They're so complacent. They never think, or doubt, or question'.

Kevin said he found her approach aggressive. 'Why shouldn't they be shocked?' Julia would reply. 'They're like I was, cloistered, brain-washed'.

She instigated many an emotive argument with family and friends, saw many a wine glass stem crack in anger, many a tablecloth stain red with outrage.

'You rave on and on', Kevin said. 'People are either bored or furious. At this rate we'll have very few friends left'.

'No one ever taught me to think. No one'.

'Now you want everyone to think the way you do'.

'That can't be', Julia replied, 'because I don't know what I think'.

There were times, though, when Julia's head ached with thinking, when all she wanted to do was return to the old safe path. Given the chance again, she would take a different, safer turn-off. Keep well away from cyclones and tidal waves of air.

Julia was at the clothes-line when her mother called to visit. The two women stood in the wind, the wet washing flapping into their faces. In silence they filled a rotary clothes line to brimming.

'It's too much for you Julia. Trying to run a family and studying at the same time. A job I can understand. If it has to be'.

'I write my essays at night, Mum. I try to see no one is neglected. I'll admit it's much harder in third year. And now with the baby'.

'How does Kevin feel about all this?'

'He helps me, when he can. Gives me support'.

Julia's mother is silent. The word neglect hangs between them and the wind can't shift it.

'I was talking to Mary Delaney yesterday Julie and she tells me that you don't see your old friends so much ..'

'Don't start Mum'.

'She says you vote for the Labor Party and that Kevin feels leftout of your life. It's embarrassing having everyone praying for you'.
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'God Bless them'.
'These new friends, Julia, they're not communists are they?'
'I've got to shop yet Mum and go to 'parent-teacher' interviews. And then there's dinner'.
Julia's mother smiles.
'We'll cook chops for dinner, shall we? Kevin's favourite?'
'Why not', Julia grins. 'But Kevin will be late home tonight'.
'Oh!' Julia's mother hides her 'knowing look' in the clothes basket.
'He's going out drinking with our new friends. From the University'.
'You mean he...?'
'Yes', Julia is laughing. 'And they like him too'.

Early in 1975 Julia wrote an entry in her diary. She called it,

'My Fellow-students;

'We are a mixture of ages and maturity and our backgrounds are so diverse that the
chances of our knowing, let alone liking each other, outside of the university experience would
be remote. But like each other we do. Learn from each other we do. Enjoy each other's
company. Certainly. We drink, we debate, we dance and we dine. And what's more we sing.
And we sing. And the more we sing the more singers we collect along the way'.

Professor Derick Marsh had a grey-blue room. He was tired and it was the end of a long
day, when Julia and three other students, Tony James, Murray Gemmell and Margaret Stref­
ford, visited him with wine, cheese, biscuits and a plea. 'A room of our own? Tony had
tried for years to be a Jesuit priest. He had a great sense of fun and a natural charm. He
spoke persuasively about the need for a place for discussion and debate. He mentioned the
four empty rooms along the lower corridor. 'Such a waste', he said. Murray poured the wine
and said they were representing the majority of third year honours students. Julia had been in
love with Derick since his lectures on Macbeth and John Donne's love poetry. She was content
to watch, listen, and leave the talking to Tony and the others.

Derick had produced another bottle of wine by the time Professor John Salmond (then the
Dean) joined them. Dr Lucy Frost whose passion for Virginia Woolf's A Room of One's Own
was well known, called in and was invited to stay.

'A delegation', Derick told them, laughing. Within an hour his room was crowded with
staff members and students. Derick spoke about his life, the pain of being an exile from South
Africa, his place of birth. John Salmond about his experiences as a meat worker and his love of
fifties Rock and Roll. Lucy, of her childhood in Texas as a daughter of a Presbyterian Minister.
Murray told the story of why the PMG sacked him. Margaret (or Streff as she was called), one
of her wild travel adventures that had everyone hooting. Tony, his cause stated, sat back,
served the biscuits and cheese and beamed. Julia could no longer remain silent. Full of wine,
the winds of change and sentiment, she sang a love song for Derick.

'There is a ship and it sails the sea.
It's laden deep as deep can be.
But not as deep as the love I'm in...
I know not ere. I'll sink or swim.'

We'll have a 'room warming' and ask you all', she said as she left.

Driving home she said to Kevin, 'They're people just like us really, Underneath it all'.

Kevin gave her one of his are-you-never-going-to-grow-up looks. Julia tried to explain.
'It's the same thing as never contemplating a nun weeing', Kevin, she said.

How the refrigerator got into The Room late at night is a story that cannot be told. Not
without involving a boom-gate man, a secretary, two night guards, and the blind eye of tutors
conducting late night tutorials on the ground floor. As posters, ornaments, glasses, plates,
cutlery, books, and radio moved in, so the initial rule of silence moved out. There was a library for silence and Julia and her friends needed to talk about their lives, enthuse over books not on the syllabus, debate the books that were, listen to poems still warm from last night’s page, argue about politics, morality and religion.

On the night they warmed the room they opened a Pandora’s box of song. As a group they had previously been to the Ivanhoe Coffee Lounge where Adrian Colette, a fellow-student, was employed as a folk singer. For the night of the room warming they persuaded him to bring his guitar and he led them in song after song. Anne Bellew (not the Baillieu, darling!) told the first of many tales of her astonishing life. (Julia’s favourite was ‘The groped-after-governess-on-outback-cattle-station-escape-impossible-tale’). She also performed a rendition of a Chinese Opera accompanying herself with spoon on bottle, her voice harmonizing hilariously with the chime. Did they sing duet that night? Anne B and Jean Dawson? Was that the night Bruce Williams sang ‘My Old Dutch’? Nati Sangau a Spanish ditty? Streff, ‘Sweet Bonny Boat’? Did Julia and Kevin perform their party number ‘Patrick McGuinty’s Goat’? Julia isn’t sure. The afternoons and evenings of that amazing year have merged in her memory into times of wine and song.

Julia’s fourth child, Timothy, was born while she was a student at the University. The doctor who delivered him was drunk and when he needed to stitch her, had to borrow a nurse-sister’s glasses. Julia had taught four of his sons.

‘How about a song’, he slurred, passing her the baby.
‘After all it’s a joyous occasion’.

One night, after Kevin had picked their precious ‘last child’ up from the University creche, Julia was nowhere to be seen. She could be heard though, singing ‘Blue Suede Shoes’ with John Salmond. Kevin traced the sound to John’s office in the History Department where yet another great party was underway. Kevin stayed and joined in the singing. Everyone remembers the highlight of that evening. John Salmond, clunking his large knees together, singing ‘Heartbreak Hotel’. Before they left that evening, Kevin invited everyone to a party at their Greensborough home. It was to be the first of many.

There wasn’t a week of Julia’s life that she wasn’t in love again. Professor Marsh. Lucy Frost. John Donne. ‘I wonder by my troth what thou and I did till we loved...’

And of course, Gough Whitlam.

Professor AD. Hope was to visit the University. Julia and her friends were excited. In their room, they read and re-read his poems. The Professor was to read in the English Department, visit the Music Department, dine with staff members. ‘And we students. How do we get to meet him?’ Julia and her friends asked. They approached Derick again, this time for permission to have the poet to themselves for a meal. Derick wavered, murmuring about their reputation for long lunches. In the end he compromised. Jerry and Ray, two fourth year students, would join the third year group for lunch and make sure that the professor was returned on time.

They hired a back room at their favourite hotel, ‘The Rose, Shamrock and Thistle’. They ate, drank, talked, in the great man’s company. And then the inevitable. Someone started singing: Duets. Solos. Sad, lyrical ballads. The Professor joined in the choruses. They bought another round and drank it quickly because time had run out on them. But so, it seemed, had the Professor. The men checked the toilet. Maybe he’d had too much to drink. Maybe he was ill. He wasn’t exactly young anymore. They should have been more thoughtful, more responsible. The search was about to start in earnest when the Professor walked through the doors of the bar. Behind him was a waitress carrying a tray of drinks, jugs of beer, carafes of wine. And then he sang solo for them. A plaintive song, it was about a baby sliding down a plug hole.
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Not only was he late back to the English Department, he missed his flight to Canberra and had to stay the night with Derick in Melbourne. Julia and her friends said, we loved him for his spontaneity and because he wanted to be with us. Derick said he'd never trust them again. They were, he said, all of them, mature-aged adolescents.

Lucy Frost introduced Julia to feminism and Julia adopted it with passion. Lucy also introduced Julia to magazines such as Meanjin, Overland, Westerly and to living writers. Julia felt as if landscapes were opening up before her, as if she were travelling.

It was in the purple-chained lounge of the Bundoora Pub that Julia and some other Mature-Aged Adolescents (reduced now to MAA's) lunched with Dorothy Hewett and her husband Merve. Julia can't remember ever asking so many questions. About Dorothy's life. About her writing. About mothering and writing. About starting to write late in life, about finding time to write.

'Dorothy Hewett has given me hope', Julia's diaries read. 'As soon as I finish this degree, I'm going to write in earnest'. And singing? Was there singing? Of course. That day Merve sang hillbillies.

Julia managed to get herself a minor part in a play called The Waltz of the Toreadors. She played Mme Dupont-Fredaine. The director, Bob Tuttleby, tried desperately to tone down Julia's seductive hip-swing action. 'It's not a bloody pub performance', he would say. On opening night, Professor John Salmond and Professor Peter Tomory were in the audience. For moral support. Julia's performance was a disaster. John only stopped laughing about it when he reached the car-park. His car had been stolen and with it the manuscript he had been working on for three years. In the weeks that followed, bits of the manuscript were found by police in lane ways in the inner city.

It was Bruce Williams, a lecturer in the English Department, who decided to do something about the singing. Channel the talents, he said. And so it was formed. La Trobe University's Old Sweet Song; LUV'S Old Sweet Song. Adrian Collette sang baritone, Jean Dawson sang solos with grace and richness. The duet Jean sang with Anne B was wondrous. Tessa Jones sang comedy, Bruce Williams gave a moving rendition of 'My Old Dutch'. Julia sang with her past in her bones, her new learning in her soul. Her kids knew every verse of 'Daisy, Daisy', 'Hold your Hand out you Naughty Boy' and the one Julia sang with a feather in her hat, 'Down at the Old Bull and Bush'. As a group they harmonised 'Love's Old Sweet Song', the audiences joining them in the songs their grandparents had loved.

Julia was heady about the change of Government. There was hope, hope for Australia, for humanity. She would laugh and say how astonishing it was that her own time of change had coincided with the Australian people's decision that it was time for change. She sat her last exam, English Lit 3 B in November 1975 and drove to the hotel to meet her friends for drinks. The place looked like a funeral parlor. Faces had the pallor of smoke and the silence was thick and grey. Surely the exam hadn't been that bad. The question on King Lear had been a gift. Its theme, betrayal. 'What's wrong?' They were staring at her. 'You haven't heard?' Julia was close to screaming. Someone said the words. Quietly. 'Whitlam has been sacked'. It was too ridiculous. Julia laughed with relief. 'You had me fooled all of you, she said. 'For a moment...'

Eyes met and shifted before Julia's mind and body numbed too, into the shared silence.

'Education', Julia decided, 'is the wind of change and the wind of change brings disillusionment'.

Long after she had graduated, Julia was asked to write an essay about her experiences as a mature aged student. She wasn't sure how to go about this. It had been ten years since then. Much had changed. She had changed. She and Kevin had separated. Her education and her writing had reared their heads like snakes in the affidavit Kevin had served on her. She was
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forty-six. With an Honours Degree. Her family had grown up, well almost, and her first book of fiction was about to be published. She had no job, no religion, no intention of ever marrying again, no superannuation fund to secure her old age.

****

'It will be difficult', Julia told the editor. 'For the me of now to write about the me of then'.

'In a word what did your experience at University mean to you'?

'Change'. Julia answered and then she grinned. 'Change and song'.
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THE UNIVERSITY, THE COMMUNITY AND THE FUTURE
The University and the Community

John Nicholson

The idea of a university being involved in the community in which it exists is neither new nor innovative. From the earliest days at Bologna and Paris the university was perceived as an active participant in the society in which it lived, breathed and had its being. In other places, regrettably, the expression 'town and gown' signalled a division that was non-productive then and certainly unacceptable now. In 1964 the establishing Act of La Trobe University called upon the University to serve the community and this directive has been acted upon in many ways.

The Sixth Report of the Australian Universities Commission observed that one of the purposes for which universities are founded was: 'the critical evaluation of the society in which we live... One of the roles of a university in a free society is to be the conscience and critic of that society'. Throughout the years staff of La Trobe have endeavoured to carry out this role and where they had expertise to offer constructive criticism related to the major problems confronting Australian society. This has been done through media appearances, public lectures, conferences and seminars to which the public and the media have been invited.

Two of the most successful exercises were the seminars on Human Rights and on Social Justice conducted by the Department of Legal Studies in 1985 and 1986. The presence at La Trobe of two international specialists in human rights, Professor Kevin Boyle from Ireland and Lord Tony Gifford from England, facilitated the organisation of the series on Human Rights and six public seminars were conducted at Glenn College in July and August 1985. The topics ranged over South Africa, Ireland, the rights of women, and aboriginal rights, with members of the public and scholars from around Australia attending. The series, chaired by Professor Kit Carson of the Department of Legal Studies, was so successful that the ABC played and replayed them for a total of twenty-four hours on National Radio. The following year a similar format was adopted for the theme of Social Justice and again the ABC broadcast the series nationally. After the Human Rights seminars Professor Carson observed that 'one of the important roles of a university is to sensitize the community to the important issues of the day'.

La Trobe's public lecture program, since the early seventies, has proved to be relevant, widely popular and often provocative. The University's principal public lecture is the C.J. La Trobe Memorial Lecture and since its inauguration in 1975 has featured outstanding speakers both from Australia and overseas. Sir Laurence Hartnet (1976) and Sir Mark Oliphant (1977) directed our attention to Australia's role in science and technology while the Canadian economist, Professor R.G. Lipsey (1979), warned of world inflation. In 1981 a Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting was held in Melbourne and an invitation was forwarded to Hon. Robert Mugabe, the newly elected Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, to deliver the C.J. La Trobe lecture for that year. On 7 October he addressed a most enthusiastic audience of some sixteen hundred people on the African Revolution. Other speakers throughout the eighties included Emeritus Professor Manning Clark (1982), aboriginal author Mrs Kath Walker (1983), the Hon. John Cain, Premier of Victoria (1986), and Emeritus Professor Charles Birch, formerly Challis Professor of Biology at the University of Sydney (1987).

The other two public lecture series, the Meredith Lectures, named after Mr Ben Meredith
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OBE, the first Head of Glenn College, and the Caroline Chisholm lectures have also attracted wide public interest since they were inaugurated in 1972 and 1979 respectively. In 1978 the Meredith Lectures dealt with Australia’s multicultural society and the published transcripts have proved to be a best seller to educational institutions throughout Australia and, along with the lecture on immigration (1984) by Hon. Franca Arena, M.L.C. for New South Wales and a former member of the Federal Immigration Task Force, were a major contribution to the continuing debate on multiculturalism and immigration. The Chisholm lectures have dealt with the role of women in Australian society and have regularly attracted wide public attention.

Apart from these regularly organised public lectures the University has also arranged quite outstanding occasional lectures which have attracted the largest audiences seen on campus. In 1984, Patrick White, the Nobel Prize-winning novelist, gave a public lecture and four years later he also participated in the Meredith Lectures. In 1987, both Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress (ANC), spoke at La Trobe. Archbishop Tutu spoke in the overflowing Union Hall to an audience of five thousand and afterwards moved outside to address the thousand or more who were unable to get into the building. Oliver Tambo also spoke to a crowded Union Hall as he related the seventy-five year history of the ANC. Despite disappointing attendances at some public lectures over the years the general community has demonstrated that it will grasp the opportunity to hear a prominent person address a subject that is meaningful in today’s society.

It is not, however, only lectures that have attracted wide attention to La Trobe’s community involvement. The University’s Research Institutes, perhaps most particularly the Brain-Behaviour Research Institute, have attracted wide attention over the years through the medium of conferences and seminars. Some of the most notable have been Migrants and the Economy (1981), First Australian Screen Studies Conference (1982), Shiftwork (1983) and Occupational Health (1984), World Conference on Distance Education (1985), Teaching of Italian Language and Culture in Australia (1985), National Conference of Japanese Studies (1985) and the First National Convention of the Indonesian Cultural and Educational Institute (1985). Professor Keith Cole, Physics Department, has also attracted many distinguished visitors and conferences to La Trobe, one of the most important being the Space Science and Remote Sensing Conference of 1988.

In August 1967, an important meeting was held on campus. It was to influence the future development of the campus and to help forge links with the local community and other bodies. It was the foundation meeting of the La Trobe University Conservation Society attended by a small group of staff and students. The declared aim of the Society was to conserve the flora, fauna and habitat of Australia in general and of La Trobe University in particular through the creation on the campus of special areas reserved for native flora and fauna. Those first hesitant steps of the fledgling Conservation Society eventually led to the creation of La Trobe’s Wildlife Reserve. Recent visitors to the Reserve have included renowned English environmentalist, Professor David Bellamy and Australia’s best known conservationist, Dr Bob Brown.

The on-campus reserve now stretches over twenty-eight hectares and together with off-campus Gresswell Forest, developed with the co-operation of local government, comprises wildlife reserves of seventy-eight hectares. The University’s publication for visitors, Introduction to La Trobe, describes the Wildlife Reserve:

The reserves encompass a variety of heathland, grassland, woodland and wetland habitats. The wetlands function as a pollution treatment system using urban waste and stormwater as its water source. Bird observers find the area particularly interesting as around 175 species have been observed making the Reserves the most species-rich, per unit area, avian habitats in the Melbourne area. Gresswell Forest supports the last remaining stand of River Red Gum woodland in the Lower Yarra Valley. With the accompanying understorey of herbs, lilies, orchids and grasses, this ‘museum’ is much valued by ecologists and residents alike and is home to native reptiles and animals which were once common in the area.
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Professor R.W. (Wally) Thompson, formerly of the Spanish Department, who was the first president of the Conservation Society, later recalled that in the early years the chief interest of members was the listing of on-campus flora and fauna. The Society disintegrated in the early 1970s when some of its members adopted a confrontationist approach to industry but the work was then carried on by the Wildlife Committee. From those early days in 1967 Professor Thompson maintained active support of the reserves and after his retirement in 1987 the University named part of the moat after him.

One of the academics who assisted the Conservation Society in its early days was Peter Rawlinson of Zoology. As one contemporary remarked, he was 'usually around to reassure us about the venomous snakes which were common in the area and to warn us about the harm we were all doing to the environment'. Rawlinson did not confine his interests and environmental activities to the La Trobe campus but rather they have extended throughout Australia and, at times, have brought him into conflict with government agencies and a variety of lobbying bodies. In 1971 he conducted a campaign that led to the abandonment of an aerial baiting program directed against the dingo population in Victoria's north-east high plains by the Vermin and Noxious Weeds Destruction Board. He argued that the technique to be used had not proven effective against dingoes and was more than likely to prove fatal to other wildlife across the plains. While Rawlinson was frustrated in his representations to the Board he was more successful in a direct approach to the responsible Minister. The aerial baiting program was abandoned.

Peter Rawlinson has continued his struggles to protect the environment and in more recent years has become well known for his involvement in the protection of kangaroos. He has not, among La Trobe staff, stood alone in such endeavours. A later history of the University will acknowledge the continuing involvement of many members of the staff, particularly those in the sciences, in the wider community's striving to preserve the nation's natural heritage.

For the past twenty years the world of art has played a significant role in the development of the University and these days the University Gallery in the David Myers building attracts large numbers of visitors to the campus. The first art exhibition was held in the council room of Menzies College from 22 October to 1 November 1968. It was organised by Mrs R.B. Lewis, Mr F. Barnes and Dr K. Semmens. Many exhibitions were mounted over the years but it was not until 1983 that the largely unused space behind the Undercroft bus shelter was refurbished and opened as the University Gallery. The Gallery has proved to be an excellent venue to display the slowly expanding University collection, provide an outlet for the artwork of students as well as established artists and, in collaboration with the Anthropology Museum in Glenn College, is capable of mounting a major exhibition such as the Yoruba Exhibition of the art and craft of Nigeria, held in August-September 1988. Artists who have exhibited individually at the Gallery include Noel Counihan, Lawrence Daws, Gareth Jones-Roberts, Victor Cobb, Murray Griffin and John Farmer. Some of the more significant group exhibitions at the Gallery have been Australian Surrealism 1930s-1950s, Romanticism and Classicism in Contemporary Australian Painting, The Eighteenth Century Print, and a most important historical photographic exhibition, Early Italian Migration to Australia.

Both the Gallery and the Anthropology Museum have played a vital role in reaching out to the community and have served as a focus for community interest. The Museum began as a small teaching collection in the then Division of Prehistory. In 1981 it moved into Glenn College, which was able to provide better facilities for display and storage, and since that time has been able to accommodate visits from school groups and other organisations. Its contribution to Victoria and Australia was recognised in March 1982 when it was officially commended for its quality in the form of an award in the Museum of the Year awards.

With such a large and splendid campus it was inevitable, given a commitment to community involvement, that the grounds would be used by the wider community. In May, 1970 the Sixth Australian Paraplegic Games were held on La Trobe's campus. Teams of paraplegic
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and quadraplegic athletes from five states competed and both athletes and officials stayed in Glenn and Menzies Colleges. Basketball, table tennis, snooker, weightlifting and fencing events were held in the indoor sports centre; field events, including archery, shot put, javelin, discus and club throwing, took place on the sports ovals while car parks and roads were used for wheelchair races. A number of La Trobe students, including representatives of the SRC and the Sports Union, freely gave of their time to help the Paraplegics Association prepare for the Games and also assisted with transport and the judging of events. The Games were officially opened on 18 May by the Governor of Victoria, Sir Rohan Delacombe and the University Registrar, Major-General T.S. Taylor, was appointed Chief Judge of the Games. It was appropriate, after the United Nations declared 1981 as the International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP), that the National Paraplegic and Quadraplegic Games should return to La Trobe in November and December of that year.

It was not only through these games that La Trobe was involved in the IYDP. In 1973 the University established the Committee on Facilities for the Handicapped with Professor John Salmond of the History Department as chairman. One of the reasons why the campus had been chosen as a suitable venue for the 1981 Games relates to the original planning and the many improvements that had been introduced by this committee. The policy of the committee was not to achieve total conformity with handicap design requirements in all respects as such conformity was considered impracticable and unnecessary. Instead, it aimed to establish particular entrances and specific routes within and between buildings which would make all parts of the University accessible to the handicapped.

In the early days of the University the Bank of New South Wales, later to become Westpac, instituted an annual award to be granted to a La Trobe undergraduate who had carried out the most selfless community work either within or outside the University. In 1971 the recipient was Brian Lennon, a student in the School of Physical Sciences. Brian had been elected to the Fitzroy City Council in August 1970 and was extremely active in community work, particularly as a member of the Fitzroy Community Youth Centre Project. He was also the co-ordinator of an education group which arranged free tuition for disadvantaged children in the inner city area. Brian was one of a large number of students who, over the years, have quite selflessly given of themselves to assist these many underprivileged in our society.

It was in 1971 that the University's Academic Board took decisive action to extend opportunity for further education to a much wider spectrum of the community. The Board accepted a recommendation from the School of Humanities that twenty unmatriculated students be admitted to that School in 1972. The Dean of Humanities at the time, Professor A.W. Martin, explained that the success of a similar scheme at the University of Sussex had led to the suggestion that carefully chosen students who had left school before matriculating be admitted to La Trobe in 1972:

What research we have makes it clear that in Australia inequalities of opportunity exist similar to those which the Sussex scheme hoped to ameliorate in Britain and that, despite notable recent growth in the secondary school population, it is still the case that much wastage of potential university talent occurs because promising students do not stay on to take the higher school certificate examinations. Even within the framework of the present quota system, it seems both just and desirable that students of this type should be given the fullest opportunity of undertaking university studies. And given a situation in which the School faces in 1972 a heavy intake of first-year students, we may be additionally glad to have a group of unmatriculated entrants if they are of high intellectual calibre. As selection committee members will ruefully testify, mere possession of the higher school certificate is not necessarily a guarantee of intellectual excellence.

This very successful La Trobe University initiative was subsequently taken up by other Victorian and Australian universities. La Trobe can claim to have been in the forefront of the drive to make university education more accessible to those formerly confronted with forbidden admission and a wall of indifference.
A year after the special entry scheme was introduced La Trobe staff were involved in the experimental Diamond Valley Learning Centre. Professor Glenn Evans, the then Chairman of the School of Education’s Centre for the Study of Innovation in Education, saw the Learning Centre as ‘enabling people to gain increasing control over their own lives through knowledge and participation’. The Centre’s activities were principally located in the Shires of Diamond Valley and Eltham and in its newsheet was described as:

‘a group of people who talk to each other, find common interests and worries, organise situations and ways in which people who want to get together to learn or discuss something or find information they need, can do so. The group is not a restricted one; anyone who wants to find others with common interests, or is worried about their own or their children’s education, can be part of the Learning Centre’.

There were, of course, direct advantages to La Trobe’s educationists in their association with this Learning Centre. They were able to study initiatives and developments promoted by the existence of such a centre within a particular community. Many of the classes at the Centre were taught by La Trobe Diploma of Education students. Rather than impose preconceived ideas the Centre set out to establish what people in the area responded to and identifying those groups most in need of guidance.

It was important to keep members of the community aware of the available resources. One lecturer at the Centre commented: ‘It doesn’t provide things so much as opportunity for initiatives, for people to find out the things they want to know. It provides a non-bureaucratic education’.

In 1975 Gwen Wesson, a lecturer in the School of Education, was awarded one of eleven grants made by the Australian Government for International Women’s Year. The grant was to cover the cost of publishing a collection of the writings — poems, essays and short stories — of suburban housewives. The contributors to the book, fourteen of them, aged thirty to sixty, were all students in the Learning Centre’s HSC classes. The book, Brian’s Wife — Jenny’s Mum, was the result of Gwen Wesson encouraging the women ‘to write and talk about the way they felt about themselves.’ It was an unusual experiment and offered an insight into the self-perception of these suburban women. La Trobe’s involvement in this Centre must be considered as one of the most significant and productive contributions the University has made to the community.

When the Learning Centre opened, staff of La Trobe’s Department of Philosophy had already been involved in a voluntary teaching program at Pentridge prison for two years. This program had been initiated by Professor Allan Martin in co-operation with the Principal of the Pentridge Education Centre following discussions in 1971. Ray Pinkerton, then a Lecturer in Philosophy, became the program co-ordinator and five other members of the Department, including postgraduate student John Briton, were involved. The classes were conducted in A Division which held long-term first offenders, and were perceived to play an important role in the rehabilitative process. The La Trobe staff were able to provide an invaluable link, intellectual and emotional, between the prisoners and the wider community from which the prisoners were alienated by more than stone walls. While it was generally agreed that the greatest educational need for most prisoners was tuition at a primary level there were others to be encouraged to aspire to higher education.

La Trobe staff have responded over the years not only to the needs of the local community, and to state and national needs, but also to international calls for assistance. In September 1974, Dr Robin Burns, of the School of Education, returned to La Trobe. She had been contracted by the United Nation’s Food and Agricultural Organisation (Action for Development Section) to carry out a survey and evaluation of development education in Europe and North America. This project was designed to assess how institutions of higher education were helping to rouse public awareness of the conditions prevalent in countries receiving development aid and one of her roles in the School of Education’s Comparative Centre was to devise ways of introducing such a subject into Australian curricula. She had long been associated with the World University Service, stressing its commitment to the social role of the university. Such a commitment was perceived variously as sensitising students to development issues by teach-
ing them at the university and devising support structures to enable school teachers to introduce the subject as normal class room teaching. All this activity was reinforced by her involvement with the Council for Overseas Aid, on which body she served as an executive member.

There were throughout the seventies, and are to this day, many members of the La Trobe staff who are actively involved in offering expert advice to governments. In 1973 Dr Alan Ward of the History Department, now Professor of History at the University of Newcastle, was given leave-of-absence to work as a full-time consultant to Papua New Guinea's commission of enquiry into land matters and was author of a series of cabinet submissions suggesting the best way of implementing the commission's recommendations. Assisting the commission, he sought out the cultural and social importance of land to Papuans and New Guineans through discussions at village level, and through an analysis of the existing structure of land ownership was able to pinpoint areas of contention. He also compared the experience of other recently independent countries in relation to land transfer.

Upon his return to La Trobe he delivered a lecture 'Some more equal than others? The land question and egalitarianism in independent Papua New Guinea', one of a series of Department of History lectures which illustrated the many practical and topical applications of historical studies. He pointed out that the guiding philosophy adopted by the Papuans and New Guineans depended, more than anything else, on land laws. He felt the big test for independent Papua New Guinea will be whether, unlike other recently independent nations, it will be able to overcome the problem of alienating people from their land. Ten years later Dr Ward spent eighteen months in Vanuatu advising the government on similar issues.

Dr Robert Newton of the School of Education was another member of the staff to lend his expertise to Papua New Guinea. Dr Newton returned to La Trobe in 1975 from his fifth assignment with the new nation's Office of Information where he had concentrated on decentralising and simplifying communications throughout that geographically and linguistically disparate nation. Working out of Goroka and Rabaul, Newton led teams of the local residents in a project that was to spread information at a local level by providing simple equipment which could produce material of local interest and which was readily intelligible. This was then used by the Office of Information, other government departments, local councils, and various community groups to convey information on specific subjects or, more generally, to help foster a greater sense of national awareness.

Dr W.R. (Bill) Stent, formerly of the School of Economics, also worked in the Third World environment. In 1979 he was chosen as one of the two Australians for a Commonwealth reconstruction mission to Uganda. The aim of the mission, sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation, was to determine ways in which the Commonwealth could assist in the economic rehabilitation of Uganda. An expert in the economies of developing countries, Dr Stent had previously worked in Trinidad, Ghana, Nigeria, Sudan, Kenya and what was then Rhodesia. This involvement in international consultancy and support has continued over the years and today many staff are committed, including Professor Bruce Stone of Biochemistry and Dr John Quilkey of Agriculture who, through the International Development Program, are involved in the Philippines and Indonesia respectively.

At its March meeting in 1977, the La Trobe University Council resolved that the University would hold a Community Week Festival in September of that year. It was perceived as a progressive and desirable move to invite more people onto the campus as part of an on-going strategy to publicise the contributions La Trobe was making to the community. The designated theme, Your University — a Growing Place, highlighted the intent. This first Community Week ran from 15-21 September and was opened by the then Commissioner for Community Relations, the Hon. A.J. Grassby. The Week comprised lectures, seminars, departmental displays, a wide-ranging presentation of theatrical and musical offerings and, on Sunday, 18 September, La Trobe's Open Day. The Community Week and the Open Day of 1977 were an important stage in the University's growing awareness of the need for community involvement. For the
first time the entire University had been on show, accessible to the community and the public responded with some 7000 people attending the campus on Open Day alone. By 1981 it was becoming apparent that a one-day display was a more effective means of reaching the public. As a consequence, the Community Week was dropped and since that time La Trobe has presented itself through the medium of an annual Open Day.

In 1978 the University, through the Department of Legal Studies, embarked upon one of its most socially significant endeavours. Philip Molan, a lecturer in Legal Studies, was given the responsibility to initiate and supervise a legal aid clinic attached to the West Heidelberg Community Centre. Mr Molan, a former senior tutor in the department, had been a foundation member of the Fitzroy legal service and the first lawyer employed by the Victorian Aboriginal Legal Service. At the time of the inauguration of the clinic he commented that the philosophy behind the clinic was that it should help local people start thinking about legal problems and even to train some to act as para-legal community workers. It was designed essentially as a self-help scheme rather than one which merely provided 'experts.' However expert advice was available from the staff of the Legal Studies Department and this could be called upon, if the need arose, to fight test cases in those areas of the law which disadvantaged the underprivileged of our society. Additionally, the service provided by the clinic would enable the West Heidelberg community to have access to the University as a wider resource centre, particularly in such areas as Sociology and Social Work.

Eight years later, in 1987, La Trobe staff and students made another major contribution to the local community when the Preston-Heidelberg Neighbourhood Mediation Centre was established. The Centre's first Co-ordinator was Marie Bird, a 1979 graduate of La Trobe's Department of Sociology. This Centre was one of four in Victoria to be funded by the Legal Aid Commission as part of a three-year pilot project. The project was introduced following recommendations made by the Commission's Dispute Resolution Project Committee which had drawn heavily on the research and recommendations of former La Trobe Legal Studies Senior Lecturer, Dr Jeff Fitzgerald. The Centre was established to deal with those local disputes not well served by the current system of legal justice. The Neighbourhood Mediation was designed to be voluntary, free of charge, and covered by special enabling legislation to keep proceedings confidential and non-enforceable in courts of law. The mediators were to be perceived to be 'ordinary' community members selected to mirror some of the demographic characteristics of the Preston-Heidelberg area. The La Trobe mediators were: Dr Tom Fisher, Senior Lecturer in History; Terry Lee, student in Legal Studies; Sandra Ferguson, a public accountant and student in philosophy: John Danicic, student in Sociology; and Sally Stockman, student in Legal Studies and Sociology.

The seventies also saw the establishment of two other centres which, over the years, have demonstrated a potential to reach out and serve the wider community. They were the Language Centre and the Human Resource Centre. The Language Centre began full-time operation in January 1975 under the direction of Robert Hooke, formerly a senior lecturer with the French Department. The teaching of English as a second language quickly became the major single activity of the Centre and continues to be so to this day. Initially there were four categories of students to be catered for: overseas students under the Special English Fellowship (SELF) part of the Colombo Plan; overseas students under the Special English Language program (SEL); private overseas students required to undertake a certain amount of English before being allowed to proceed to Australian secondary or tertiary institutions; and members of Melbourne's migrant community sponsored under the NEAT scheme.

From its inception the Centre was intent on being community-oriented. It was involved with the private sector enabling management to attain greater understanding and communication with immigrant workers; it responded to a request from a prison education officer to conduct language classes at Fairlea Women's Prison; it has provided language courses for government officers, including diplomats, industry personnel and members of the general public. La Trobe's Language Centre has continued to grow and flourish over the years and
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today is one of the most respected centres for language tuition in Australia.

Another University institution that has proved an invaluable resource to the wider community has been the Human Resource Centre. Established in 1978 by the Department of Social Work it was co-sponsored by the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences from 1982-1987. The Centre was designed to develop links between the community, health and welfare practitioners and academia by providing an educational, training, and research resource.

In February 1978 Eva Learner was appointed the first Director of the Human Resource Centre which was established by the Department of Social Work in the School of Behavioural Sciences. She held this position until her resignation from La Trobe in November, 1983. Prior to her appointment she had been in Canberra working for the Social Welfare Commission and, after its abolition, the Department of Social Security. While with the Department she completed an extensive study of the wide range of education and training for social welfare personnel in Australia. That experience alerted her 'to the major educational gaps in social work and the massive gaps between the theorists and those who work in the field'. Eva believed ‘the [Human Resource] Centre can break down the barriers between academia and the practice field and bring together the resources of both'. Over the past eleven years the Centre has provided an invaluable resource to community service practitioners. The Centre's objectives have been best illustrated by its activities: service in selected areas to individuals, groups and organisations to test a range of practice methods, techniques and strategies used in human services; consultation services to agencies and other organisations, both from the Centre and the Department of Social Work staff; the development of educational packages, workshops and seminars, independently and jointly with other departments, agencies and institutions and the encouragement of activities using multidisciplinary approaches to investigate common problems and to provide joint services.

In 1982 Eva Learner was appointed a member of the Committee of Inquiry into In-Vitro Fertilisation, established by the State Government and chaired by Professor Louis Waller of Monash University. This type of wider involvement has typified the activities of many La Trobe staff since the University's inception. To name just a few: Professor Tony Blackshield, of the Department of Legal Studies, (now at Macquarie University), was appointed a consultant to the Federal Government's Human Rights Task Force; Dr Jeff Fitzgerald, also of Legal Studies, accepted a secondment to the post of Senior Policy Adviser in the Justice Section of the Premier's Department; Professor John W. Freebaim of the School of Agriculture (now at Monash University), was seconded to the role of Director of Economic Research with the Business Council of Australia; Mr Peter Rawlinson of the Department of Zoology was elected to the Council and to the office of Vice-President of the Australian Conservation Foundation; Dr Don MacPhee, of the Department of Microbiology, was appointed as a specialist adviser to the House of Representatives' Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation; Professor John Scott, Vice-Chancellor, chaired a working party for the Ministerial Review of Postcompulsory Schooling (Blackburn Report); former Vice-Chancellor, Dr David Myers, was chairman of the Federal Committee on Professional Qualifications; Emeritus Professor R.J. Magee for long played a formative role in the development of the Phillip Institute of Technology being both a long-time member of its Council and President between 1976-80, and Dr Alan Frost, History Department, was seconded as organising secretary of the Australian Bicentennial History Conference, 'Terra Australis to Australia.'

The role of the media should never be under-estimated when considering the relationship of the staff of the University with the wider community. Large numbers of the staff from many disciplines have regularly appeared in both print and electronic media since the University's inception and continue to do so to this day. To name just a few: Professor Tony Blackshield on law, Mr Bill Horrigan on economics, Dr Barry Carr, Dr Steve Niblo and Dr Rowan Ireland on Latin America, Professor Brian Crittenden on education, Dr John Jenkin on science, Dr Peter White on media, Professor John Salmond on the USA, Mr Peter Rawlinson on the environment and Dr Rick Thompson on cinema.
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In 1982 the Australian Broadcasting Corporation presented one of its most ambitious television productions — *GENESIS*. This seven-part series, written and presented by the former La Trobe molecular biologist, Dr Daryl Reanney, was two years in the making and surveyed the story of human evolution. Dr Reanney travelled the world with the ABC production team examining the origins of some of the important mechanisms of evolution: natural selection; the notion of the selfish gene; the idea that all life forms, humans included, are merely packages for the survival of the gene; death and sex as strategies in evolution. This series, brilliantly conceived and presented, was a premier example of how the University's research and achievements can be communicated to the public and it brought great credit to La Trobe.

Another example of the sharing and dissemination of news of La Trobe can be found in the University's regular publications, the *Bulletin* and *Record*. Some two hundred and fifty copies of the *Bulletin* are mailed each fortnight to schools, other bodies, and individuals while several thousand copies of the *Record* are distributed each quarter. These publications receive extensive media coverage and are received by politicians and business houses and play an important role in reaching out to the community.

The *Record* regularly features articles on and information for members of Convocation. This association of graduates and diplomates has played a significant role in keeping its members informed of University progress and activities. The development of Convocation has been somewhat spasmodic but the University is well aware of the critical role that its graduates can play in La Trobe's further development. The organisation's enthusiastic Steering Committee has contributed to the success of Open Day, lecture series, support for the library and many other University activities.

Another organisation that has, in recent years, dedicated itself to the continuing development and welfare of the University is Friends of La Trobe. The first chairman of Friends was Dr Roy Simpson, the Master Planner of the La Trobe campus, and the Committee has, since its inception, organised programs to attract support for the University. Two notable features of the Bundoora campus, the statue *Sophia* located in the Undercroft of the David Myers Building and the Agora clocktower which was generously supported by Westpac Bank, were projects of this valued organisation.

Research in the University is dealt with in another chapter but, at a time when Government priorities are attempting to direct applied research, it is a salutary and encouraging exercise to note the very substantial volume of community-oriented research that is carried on at La Trobe. There have been scholars in practically every academic department involved in such research, from the Brain-Behaviour Research Institute to Legal Studies with its work on the protection of juveniles in the legal system; from Psychology's Professor Margot Prior with her work with children, to scientists and philosophers protecting the environment; community studies such as the Mill Park project, multiculturalism and immigration; consultancy aid for overseas universities and bilingual education for aborigines; pollution monitoring, extensive agricultural research and Dr Harvey Cohen's help for the disabled. The list could go on and the cumulative effect indicates a very substantial contribution by this University to the common wealth and health of the community.

Little has been said of the extensive use of the campus made by members of the wider community. The sports centre is available to the public as is the cinema and the Agora Theatre has long been used by schools and other bodies. The ring road is a favourite venue for cycling organisations, the colleges are booked for conferences and seminars during the vacations as is the Union which also plays host to those attending social functions and leisure classes. The open campus policy has proved to be a success over the years and will continue to present La Trobe as a university for and of the people.

We are witnessing radical changes, both political and economic, in the educational environment. La Trobe, while it has responded well to change over the past twenty-five years, will be required to continue to adapt to that changing environment. The introduction of technology precincts, science parks, amalgamations and a host of other foreshadowed and still
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unknown developments will oblige the University to extend its vision. Yet the young University can claim major involvement with the wider community throughout its short history and there is every confidence, given the good will and dedication of staff and students, that that involvement will develop and flourish. It is essential that it do so.
There are similarities between universities and a five day cricket test match. To the uninformed observer, nothing exciting happens in either for long periods. The players are more interested in their own game than entertaining spectators. There is an air of timelessness over the proceedings. The controls over the performance are not obvious, the rules are obscure. The games are played by performers expected to behave like gentlemen.

If there is any truth in this comparison, then La Trobe University has only just started its first innings: one wicket down and a fair sized total of runs on the board. Universities are institutions whose lives are measured in hundreds of years (a view spectators at test matches sometimes share) and twenty-five years is a short period. As I write, I am about to travel overseas and during the trip will spend a few days at the University of Bologna to join the celebrations for its nine hundredth anniversary. La Trobe is still young!

In 1977, when I succeeded Dr David Myers as Vice-Chancellor, I gave an inaugural lecture entitled 'A View from the Bridge'. Twelve years on, it is worth recalling some of the content of that address. The title was intended to be a reference both to the Captain's role on the bridge of a ship and to the commanding physical view from the Vice-Chancellor's office.

How do those remarks look now? How much of that vision for the future of La Trobe University has been achieved during my custodianship? I talked about research and its vital importance to a university. I emphasised the importance of the teaching role of the university and of our graduates, together with the significance of the relationship between teaching and research. There were some observations about morale of staff and students, and of relationships with Government. Finally I stressed the importance of building a bridge between the University and the local community.

The purpose of this essay is not to provide a coherent history of the second half of the past twenty-five years. Instead, it will aim at some snapshots of the highlights and an overview of our achievements in the light of that 'View from the Bridge'.

The main characteristic of a university that distinguishes it from other institutions of higher education is the capacity to conduct research at a high level in a wide range of disciplines. Elsewhere in this volume are detailed accounts of our achievements. They are considerable and not fully recognised by the general public. Let it suffice to point out that La Trobe University now has a Special Research Centre, one Key Centre for Teaching and Research and a share in a second, all located here after intense competition between all Australian institutions of higher education. The gradual accumulation of these very visible centres over the last five years is a great tribute to the quality of the University's research.

But that is just the visible tip of our efforts. The very readable annual Research Report gives more details of the wide range covered; from herbicide performance on wheat to children's acquisition of aboriginal languages; from the detection of phenols in waste waters to Japanese economic and social change. The expenditure on research has mounted as the University has grown. In 1987, the University appointed a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) to promote and coordinate its research effort. Increasingly we have been co-operating with industry and commerce, and obtaining substantial grants from them. This was an aspect of Australian academic life which barely existed in 1977 and whose absence I deplored. The University has a significant number of patents, and some are earning money for us.

With the growth of the University, so has grown the number of postgraduate students.
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Again, this illustrates the maturity of La Trobe, as well as the importance of the link between teaching and research. Browsing through the Calendars of other Australian universities, one increasingly sees staff with a first or second degree from La Trobe.

There is still one sad failure in our development that I view with dismay. In 1977, I pointed out that we were one of the few Australian universities with no central unit to promote teaching and learning skills. That is still the case. As always, the establishment of such a unit is currently being discussed and perhaps the situation is about to change.

The range of subjects taught at the University has widened considerably during the past twelve years. There have been two new schools, four new departments and three new divisions. Some have grown from earlier seeds, some planted from outside. For example, Italian was being taught in a relatively minor way in 1977, with considerable help from the University of Melbourne. The authorities in Canberra were none too keen to see another department of Italian in the Melbourne metropolitan area, yet it was obvious that there was an increasing demand from students of Italian background, let alone others. It was at this stage that the Vaccari Foundation wrote round to all the universities offering a prize for the best student of Italian origin. In common with the other universities, we were not much enthused by this somewhat discriminatory suggestion, but came back with some proposals to help students and staff study Italy and its culture through travel grants, gifts to the Library and so on. These were accepted by the Foundation.

So developed a growing relationship with the Vaccari Foundation and the Vaccari family, leading to modest but helpful research grants. It was at a dinner to express our thanks for their help that the possibility of founding a Chair was put to Signora Vaccari, next to whom I was sitting. In due course, the University received one of its largest ever grants to create the Vaccari Chair of Italian Studies and so form the Department of Italian Studies.

The Department of Computer Science started as an initiative by Dr David Woodhouse and his colleagues who had the foresight to realise that this discipline was not going to be contained as a part of Mathematics in the future. The Department was started without a professor by staff transferring from other departments. It was stated, although I am sure that no one believed it even at the time, that it would cost no extra money, but it was obvious that most of the University realised that some such move was an essential step. Of course, the Department quickly attracted students in large numbers. Very soon, it bid for a Chair of Computer Science. This was at a time when funds were very scarce and it became clear that the University had to decide on the priorities of founding this Chair or refilling the then vacant Tad Szental Chair of Electronic and Communication Science. Contrary recommendations rebounded from the School to Academic Board to Council where they were contested and bounced back. It was not, in fact, until 1986 that the Chair of Computer Science was filled.

These two examples illustrate the different ways in which universities expand into new areas. The Departments of Archaeology (1985) and Linguistics developed more conventionally from a few staff with a common interest to a division and thence to a full department with a professor. There was some argument as to whether the Department of Archaeology should be in the School of Humanities or Social Sciences but that was resolved relatively easily. During the same period, Divisions of Drama, Cinema Studies and Greek Studies have been established.

The creation of new schools is a more difficult process. During this period the addition of the School of Mathematical and Information Sciences and the Lincoln School of Health Sciences have brought the number of schools of the University to ten. Each in its way has a story behind its creation and each is indicative of the considerable indirect influence a Vice-Chancellor can have on the development of a university.

When the University was considering its triennial submission for 1985-87 to the Universities Council in 1982, I was perturbed by what seemed to be a rather unimaginative draft document. The University seemed to be asking for funding only for more of the same or for some rather exotic research centres which were unlikely to be successful in a bid for funding. In addition, the Science Schools had proportionately declined from the parity with the rest of the University envisaged in the early years. It seemed worthwhile to pursue a new initiative based on some of our strengths.

The Department of Computer Science was increasingly uneasy at being part of the School of Physical Sciences, feeling, rightly or wrongly, that it was not getting its fair share of funds.
Linguistics, Logic, Psychology, Mathematics were all strong areas of the University. There did seem a possibility of proposing an exciting new area of say, Cognitive and Information Sciences which could be very attractive to students. With a little encouragement, a group of academics in these areas prepared a proposal which was put in our submission at a late stage.

At about the same time, the Report of the Strategic Planning Committee for the School of Physical Sciences recommended that the University should consider splitting the School into two. The two ideas came together and resulted in the formation of the School of Mathematical and Information Sciences in 1985 with Departments of Computer Science, Mathematics and Statistics. This was not exactly what the earlier group had contemplated, but it does provide a base from which exciting developments can take off in future years. One such recent development is the joint degree program between the old rival Departments of Electronics and Computer Science. This attracts students of very high quality and is well regarded by future employers.

The School of Health Sciences became the tenth school of the University as a result of the amalgamation with the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences on 1 January, 1988. That decision really deserves a whole book to itself and probably represents the biggest change to the University since the abolition of the college concept. Again the initiative was a personal one and originated around a dinner table in 1981. An apparently casual remark by Dr Jim Watson, then deputy chairman of the Victorian Post-Secondary Education Commission, whom I was entertaining to dinner, suggested that La Trobe should consider amalgamating with Lincoln. This was before forced amalgamations, let alone voluntary ones, became the vogue and really was a revolutionary suggestion. Certainly any preliminary moves had to be made with discretion. It became apparent, somewhat to my surprise, that the Director of the Institute was also interested and we initiated some early discussions. Within a few months, the era of forced amalgamations proposed by the 'razor gang' was with us and Colleges of Advanced Education were running in all directions.

We continued talking, however, and shared the proposal, in confidence, with the Chairman of VPSEC and the Universities Council. The former was enthusiastic, the latter unsupportive. We were told that the Council did not support mergers between colleges and universities in metropolitan areas. How times change! At this stage, we informed our Councils of our discussions and obtained approval to take them further.

However, they then foundered. Increasingly Canberra was indicating a lack of enthusiasm, any threat of forced amalgamation for Lincoln receded with a change of Government and the Institute became increasingly concerned in promoting development on its new site at Abbotsford.

In 1986, with the approval of the Academic Board and Council, discussions re-opened. It was timely for both institutions: it was apparent to Lincoln that the Abbotsford site was too small and capital funding was not forthcoming, while the paucity of professional courses at La Trobe was increasingly a matter of concern. There followed two years of discussion and negotiations, often heated and always protracted. Discussions at academic levels, at emotional levels, at political levels; of funding and economic arguments, of research and teaching considerations, of legal and constitutional problems; negotiations with Lincoln bodies, Unions and Staff Associations, La Trobe organisations, State and Commonwealth authorities. No sooner had one apparently satisfied the demand for an educational rationale than the argument would be transferred to financial grounds and thence to the most difficult area of all: titles. Department or division; Reader or Associate Professor; Lincoln School or just School?

However, on 1 January 1988, the two institutions became one by Act of the Victorian Parliament and the University had its tenth school. I have no doubts whatsoever that the decision will be seen as a major and successful step for La Trobe University. It will however be some time before the School of Health Sciences is fully integrated and accommodated at Bundoora in the main, if not completely.

In the development of relations with the community and the expansion of the cultural
activities of the University, we have achieved much. In the past twelve years, the University has opened an Art Gallery and a Museum, both of which have regular exhibitions. It has acquired the magnificent Four Seasons glass panels by Leonard French, installed under the David Myers Building, and accommodated the Dante Sculpture donated to Victoria as a 150th anniversary gift from the Italian community. The grounds are used for picnics, cycle races, bicentennial bonfires, paraplegic games. Our public lectures are regularly sponsored by the Cities of Preston and Heidelberg. We discussed with the City of Preston the possibility of a joint Performing Arts Centre and Great Hall on campus. The talks failed, but the seed is still there.

In my view, one of the great features of La Trobe University is its ability to consider change and adapt to changing circumstances. Dr David Myers and the early staff certainly displayed these attributes and it is still a strong characteristic. It is not true of all universities and it admittedly has its dangers. As a colleague once said at another university, 'How can you expect a plant to grow when you keep on pulling it up to examine its roots?' Nevertheless, it certainly makes for an active and exciting environment and it will be a sad day for the University if it becomes a staid old maid.

That environment has made the task of the Vice-Chancellor both easier and more difficult. Let me quote from the 1977 inaugural lecture. There are many tasks and problems for the Vice-Chancellor. The burden of solving the day-to-day smooth running, the responsibility of ensuring that our teaching is of the highest standard, the need to see that our scholarship and research is equally high, all constitute a formidable demand of which I am well aware. The Vice-Chancellor must provide leadership and guidance, but perhaps his most difficult role is to provide the atmosphere of trust and concern in which these delicate plants can root and grow.

This role of the Vice-Chancellor is to my mind one of the two most important that the office has. I shall come to the second shortly. In an academic community, this is what leadership is all about. There is no way in which one individual can personally ensure the development of the multitude of teaching and research enterprises throughout a university. What can be done is to provide the right atmosphere and to wander in the garden, providing a little shelter for this special very delicate plant, obtaining a few seeds from elsewhere, realising that another plant will thrive on its own and discouraging (or occasionally, rooting out) weeds. In induction courses for new staff, I have regularly made the point that La Trobe University should be a place where new ideas do not receive the answer 'no, we cannot consider that' but at least 'yes, let's look at it'. I believe the developments that have been described indicate that there has been some progress towards that atmosphere.

The second vital role for a Vice-Chancellor is in the appointment of professors. I have chaired every professorial selection committee in the last twelve years and have been intimately involved in their processes. My contribution has ranged from a casting vote on one committee to telephoning someone who had not applied for the Chair to offer the appointment. The professors are the academic leaders of a university. In passing, let me make clear that I am using the Australian system of nomenclature, derived from the British, where the title is used only for a full, tenured professor, possibly only one in a department, but at most only a handful.

That brings me to another significant episode of the past twelve years: The 'Reid' Committee of Inquiry into University Government and its report. The committee had been established before I arrived and reported soon after. Professor Salmond in his article has given a detailed account of its recommendations, but it provided a major controversy during 1978 and 1979.

One of the major and most controversial recommendations was to remove professors from being automatic heads of departments. Chairpersons, of senior academic rank, were to be elected unless the department decided otherwise. For some professors, this was an anathema; for others it represented liberation from irksome routine toils. The Academic Board spent hours debating this issue, sometimes with considerable acrimony. The debate had its lighter moments, although I did not appreciate it at the time. During one discussion, when the
The Open Door

composition of the electorate for choosing chairpersons was being considered, a proposal that technical and secretarial staff should be included was put forward. Members of the Board were tired, tempers were frayed and in a moment of pique a member proposed that the University hairdresser, Renato of Venice, should be a member of all electorates. The mood was such that the motion might well have been passed, but it was fortunately time for an adjournment and the moment passed. Renato of Venice might have succeeded to the glories of the Doges.

In the event, this recommendation of the Reid Report was basically accepted by the University. Safeguards were built into the legislation to protect the leadership role of professors and to ensure that they were properly consulted. La Trobe University was one of the later universities to move to elected departmental chairpersons. The system works, it removed a number of very tense situations in some departments which were impeding academic work and gave some excellent younger staff administrative experience. It was right for the times, but it is not necessarily the ideal system. I am convinced that in no way does this system minimise the importance of the professoriate for the future of the University. As for heads of departments, there will be good and bad ones under either system, probably in about the same proportion. At least under an elective system, the bad ones do not last long.

Morale and image are two words that constantly occur in internal discussions and have been regularly brought to my attention over the past twelve years. Morale is virtually impossible to measure and is very subjective. Also what may be good times for academic staff may be bad for administrative staff. High morale is not necessarily associated with abundant resources and may not be at its lowest when funding is tight. Probably it is something that does not affect the majority of academic staff who pursue their teaching and research regardless. Nevertheless, good morale is essential in attempting to unify an institution like a university. On the whole, in my judgment, the morale of the University has been high during this period.

The image of the University is another difficult area which must remain subjective in the absence of large scale surveys. La Trobe University as the newest in the metropolitan area has had an uphill battle to establish itself in the public’s eye. In addition to its newness, the University has had to struggle with two additional liabilities. The absence of both medical and engineering faculties has deprived it of the breakthroughs in research that are most likely to attract public attention. Before La Trobe University had been fully established, it was torn apart by the student troubles of the Vietnam period, a reputation that remained with it for a long time. These past failings are being shaken off. I was delighted at yet another dinner party to sit next to a lady who said ‘Oh, La Trobe University. That’s quite a sensible university, not like Monash’. We are realising that it may yet be to our advantage that we do not have the slightly old-fashioned and expensive disciplines of medicine and engineering but the new and exciting areas of health sciences and computer science.

It is good for the image of the University that some of our senior staff are very conscious of the media and their research is regularly reported. Although there is an understandable reluctance by many staff to popularise their discipline and become media performers, it is now a very necessary process in order to inform the public and the politicians, and to educate them in the essential purposes of a university. I believe my period of two and a half years as Chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee has been beneficial in the publicity it has brought to La Trobe, if not in any other way. I have often heard complaints about the lack of publicity the University receives, but these are usually ill-founded. A few years ago, the then Vice-Chancellors of Melbourne and Monash told me, independently, that they were envious of the amount of favourable media attention we attracted. Nevertheless the image of the University is a very important factor and difficult to change in the short term.

One development over the past ten years which has altered our reputation overseas is the increasingly strong relationship with the Peoples’ Republic of China. We were one of the first Australian universities to accept official exchange students under the Australian-Chinese
educational program, and our academic and administrative staff took great pains to make their stay profitable and interesting. Since then we have had a large number of staff and students from China and have sent staff and students there in modest numbers. The University has exchange agreements or relations with about a dozen Chinese universities and institutes. In connection with these agreements, I have now been to China four times and am always proud to hear La Trobe mentioned as the best-known Australian university. It is exciting that in 1989 we shall start teaching Chinese as a language. I believe all this to be a far-sighted policy on behalf of the University.

There is probably not much a Vice-Chancellor can do in persuading the Federal Government to provide more funding for an individual university, although a willingness to be cooperative has apparently often paid dividends. This has certainly been the case with capital grants. La Trobe University quickly built up a reputation for speedy and efficient use of building grants, which has stood it in good stead. As recently as 1987, we were able to respond to an invitation as to whether we could spend a capital grant of $100,000 for teaching accommodation in a few months. We were able to respond positively within days, to our considerable advantage.

At La Trobe the Vice-Chancellor is personally responsible for recommending to Finance Committee and Council the budget for the next year. Of course, this is formulated after intense consultation with the Deans and other Heads. It is a protracted process and is likely to result in inefficient compromise or stalemate unless the Vice-Chancellor takes a leading role. During the years of steady state or contraction (1977-83), the only way in which to achieve the essential redistribution of resources to developing parts of the University was by harsh cutbacks in other areas. That this was accomplished without extreme bitterness is a tribute to the good sense of those involved.

However, good sense is not always the hallmark of a university in handling its internal affairs. Those who have never worked in a university will not believe the amount of academic politics that occurs, although some recent novels give a very reasonable flavour. At La Trobe, I have seen irate academics come to blows, others have been sent to Coventry and not spoken to for perceived academic misbehavior, an administrator has been spat at, while libel suits, threatened or actual, between staff members have become increasingly common. I hasten to add that I know from my own experience that La Trobe is no worse than any other university. Academics have a single-minded passion for their discipline that is unsuspected outside universities and sometimes leads them into unfortunate actions. In such an atmosphere, the role of a Vice-Chancellor intent on providing leadership is difficult. I happen to believe in the collegial tradition that the academic staff of a university all have a part to play in determining policy, yet in the hard world outside, decisions are required speedily and responsibly. How to balance participation in decision making and authoritative quick responses is a major problem and is an increasing challenge to modern Vice-Chancellors. I can only suggest that diplomacy, cajoling and occasional firmness are necessary ingredients and that it is an exciting process. I can only recall two or three occasions when I did not eventually get my own way.

I would like to pay a tribute to the two Chancellors under whom I have served, the Honourable Sir Reginald Smithers and the Honourable Mr Justice McGarvie, the second and third Chancellors of the University. The role of Chancellor is a difficult one: to find the right compromise between always being available for independent advice when needed and yet not interfering unnecessarily in the day-to-day running of the University: to occupy a full-time demanding position outside the University and still fulfill the expectations of the University to chair Council meetings, preside at graduation ceremonies and speak or be present at numerous exhibitions, public lectures and other functions. As the first Chancellor of La Trobe University fulfilled these duties with quiet charm and efficiency, so have his successors. It was a proud moment when at the installation of Mr Justice McGarvie, the University presented honorary degrees to his predecessors, Sir Archibald Glenn and Sir Reginald Smithers.

The last twelve years have been interspersed with some magnificent moments of spark-
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ling sunlight as well as the more solemn or sombre periods. Let me share some with my readers.

There was the occasion when I was entertaining some distinguished Chinese visitors to lunch in the anteroom to the Council Chamber. As so often happens, I had dashed in a little late and immediately felt obliged to fulfill my responsibilities as host. Seeing, in a flustered and short-sighted state, what appeared to be an elegant dish of butterfly prawns, and silently congratulating my staff on their foresight in providing such suitable food, I passed them to the impassive President on my right, who equally politely declined them. A few minutes later I tried again with the same result, amid a certain inexplicable muttering from the assembled La Trobe academic staff. Finally, I attempted a third time to persuade the President to take some prawns. A hoarse voice from a Dean cried 'No, you fool. They're flowers! The staff had decided to decorate the table with some orchid flowers floating in water, which I had mistaken for prawns. No doubt the Chinese thought that eating flowers for lunch is an old Australian custom.

One of the most memorable evenings was the public lecture by Archbishop Desmond Tutu in 1987. The Union Hall was overflowing, far beyond its legal capacity; there was a crowd outside of over a thousand watching on TV monitors. Everyone was overwhelmed by the quiet but passionate address by the Archbishop. After the lecture, I persuaded him to say a few words in person to the overflow crowd, who were enthralled by the gesture. It was then arranged that I should drive him round the inner campus while the crowd dispersed.

Now I rarely drive a car round the inner ring road, but set off resolutely with the Archbishop and his wife, followed in turn by the then Registrar in his car and then a police car. We first ended up at the Boiler House, where some efficient reversing soon lost the police car, but the Registrar hung grimly on. A slow but steady pace past Glenn College and over the Moat soon found us in the Agora, on the pedestrian walkway, squeezing past the Library with an inch to spare on both sides. It was there that we lost the Registrar. Out of the Agora, over a ridge and there we were on Science Drive. The Archbishop loved every moment.

I suppose one of the most farcical episodes is connected with a piece of angle iron in my office. I hope my successors will guard it zealously because it played an unusual part in the history of the University. From 28 February until 12 April 1981 the University, in collaboration with Preston Institute of Technology, accommodated the Australian Sculpture Triennial. It was an exciting event with many remarkable sculptures placed all over the campus. One was by a leading Australian sculptor, consisting of angle-iron welded into an expressive shape. Unfortunately, the night before the exhibition opened, someone pushed the work over, so that it toppled down a hill and into some bushes. The next morning, one of the gardener's trailers collapsed near the spot. It needed a piece of angle-iron to repair it, and the workshop had none. 'Oh', said the gardener, 'I know where there's a heap of old iron down there in the bushes.' So they cut a piece off, mended the trailer and proceeded happily on their way.

Later the sculptor arrived and created hell because his work was not on display. After a search, it was found in the bushes but with a piece missing. He threatened to sue the University, it offered to put the piece back, he said that would destroy the integrity of the work. The situation began to move towards the legal case of the century, but the insurers eventually paid up the full value of the work, some thousands of dollars. I must admit to a slight sadness that the case never reached the courts. The Whistler-Ruskin case would have paled into insignificance. I can imagine our learned counsel arguing that if the man-in-the-street (or a gardener) did not even know that it was a work of art, it could not be of any great value. Alas, we shall never know what damages, if any, would have been awarded.

There are moments of complete indecision. How do you cut off a graduation occasional speaker who has already talked for thirty-five minutes when asked to speak for ten minutes? Should a senior professor who has had a little too much to drink be tactfully removed from a committee meeting?

And there are moments of joy. Academic Board voting by an overwhelming majority that
the Vice-Chancellor should continue ex officio to chair is meetings. Having a shouting match with a senior professor that could be heard down the corridor and still remaining friends. A very solemn academic procession at graduation splitting in three directions as it enters the hall and wandering aimlessly to the dais.

It will not be long before this particular captain says farewell to his crew and the passing passengers with all their joys and sadness. Perhaps from the bridge I might point the telescope ahead to see what the future holds.

It is certainly foggy and the waters nearby are turbulent. As I write, the Federal Government's White Paper on Higher Education is in the process of being implemented and the future is more difficult to predict than ever before. I see La Trobe growing by a process of amalgamation with other institutions, a process that will cause much heart-searching and take a long time before stability is reached.

This large University will then have to consider very carefully its activities. I foreshadow ten years of consolidation and of difficult decisions. Some areas will close down or become only teaching departments, new areas will be created. There will be a need to identify the mission of the University. I would hope we have the foresight to get in at the beginning of some new areas of learning. I would still bet on cognitive studies; computer aided design looks a possibility and biomedical engineering looks promising. The University will have seriously to look at some courses that at the moment would cause raised eyebrows in universities such as tourism, banking and insurance studies.

What I am certain will prevail at the La Trobe of the future is the mission to provide a caring and supportive institution, particularly for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. We should be proud that we have provided the people of Victoria with a university that is different, sensitive and excellent.

In my inaugural lecture, I ended with a quotation from Arthur Miller's play A View from the Bridge. This essay I end with a sequel to the motto of La Trobe University 'Qui cherche trouve'. After the words in St Matthew's Gospel 'Seek and ye shall find' comes 'knock and it shall be opened to you'. I have a feeling that the next twenty-five years are going to demand a lot of knocking, but I am confident that La Trobe will find the doors opening for it.
Chronology

Summary of principal events in the foundation and development of La Trobe University by years, 1964-88.

1964  La Trobe University Act proclaimed on 9 December
      First meeting of Interim Council held on 22 December
      Appointment of Master Planner by Interim Council

1965  Foundation Vice-Chancellor and Chief Librarian appointed in March
      University administration set up in St Kilda Road
      Library moved into temporary premises in West Heidelberg
      Interim Council accepted final Master Plan report for development of University campus in July

1966  Glenn College established in July as first ‘college-union’
      First Council constituted and at first meeting on 19 December Council elected as Chancellor Sir Archibald Glenn
      Business Manager’s Department moved to premises on Bundoora site

1967  Central administration (other than Business Manager’s Department) moved into Glenn College
      On 8 March Sir Archibald Glenn installed as Chancellor by The Visitor and University formally opened
      On 13 March lectures commenced for over 500 students enrolled in four Foundation Schools of Biological Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences and Social Sciences
      Academic Board superseded Academic Planning Board

1968  Menzies College opened
      School of Agriculture established as fifth School
      First student representative elected to Council
      Colleges Seminar held in November

1969  First graduation ceremony held in Glenn College Dining Hall on 18 December

1970  Chisholm College formally established on 1 January with premises yet to be built
      School of Education established as sixth School
      University Act amended to increase size of Council from twenty-nine to thirty-two
      including increase in student membership
      La Trobe University Housing Ltd, registered as a company responsible to Council for management of non-collegiate University housing

1971  Council resolved that the ‘college concept’ be not adhered to in design of future colleges, which would therefore become essentially residential without provision for non-resident members

1972  The Hon. Mr (now Sir Reginald) Smithers was elected Chancellor in succession to Sir Archibald Glenn who resigned in July
      Department of Psychology (which was initially not attached to any School) began teaching
      First experimental group of unmatriculated students admitted to School of Humanities under ‘Early Leavers Scheme’
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1973 School of Behavioural Sciences established as seventh School, with Psychology as core discipline
Language Centre established with effect from January 1974
Central Student Union opened in March

1974 Following review, Council reaffirmed the original University concept of an ultimate enrolment of 10,000 undergraduates together with a significant number of postgraduate students
First Research Report published
Staff Club opened 19 March

1975 Dr Myers retired on 31 December and Professor E.K. Braybrooke appointed Acting Vice-Chancellor from 1 January until 15 July 1977, on which date Professor J.F. Scott took up the appointment as Vice-Chancellor

1976 Separate School of Economics, based on Department of Economics which had hitherto been part of the School of Social Sciences, established on 1 January as eighth School

1977 Professor Scott assumed the Vice-Chancellorship on 15 July
Community Week held in September to commemorate ten years of teaching
Council established 'Reid' Committee of Inquiry into University Government chaired by Professor R.L. Reid, formerly of School of Agriculture

1978 Report of 'Reid' Committee submitted to Academic Board in the first instance for consideration prior to discussion by Council
In accordance with University Act and necessary legislation, Convocation established and elected four representatives to Council

1979 University's first group of three postdoctoral Research Fellows took up appointments
First Emeritus Professor created — R.L. Reid (Agriculture)
In November, Library received its 500,000th item

1980 Special Council meeting to consider the 'Reid' Report which resulted in adoption of changes to many facets of University structure
Gualtiero Vaccari Foundation funded establishment of a Chair in Italian Studies with a view to an appointment in 1982
Second Chancellor, the Hon. Sir Reginald Smithers, retired in December and Council appointed as next Chancellor the Hon. Mr Justice R.E. McGarvie

1981 Installation of Chancellor took place in February
New composition for Academic Board approved by Council

1982 Council approved student representation on Academic Board
University Gallery established and formally opened in May

1983 Pulitzer Prize awarded to Rhys Isaac (History) for his book The Transformation of Virginia
University Union successfully applied to the Liquor Control Board for a liquor licence, the first such licence granted to a Victorian university

1984 Council accepted and initiated implementation of far-reaching recommendations in Report of the Strategic Planning Committee for the School of Physical Sciences. The Committee of four members, which included three from outside the University, was the first such body appointed by Council to undertake a review of an academic unit
University accepted the gift of Mrs Iris Manton of her property at Tolmie, Victoria for use for University purposes, both academic and social

1985 As a result of Strategic Planning Committee recommendations, a School of Mathematical and Information Sciences came into being on 1 January as the ninth School based on division of the School of Physical Sciences into two parts
Adoption by Council of formal policies on equal opportunity and sexual harassment
Professor Scott re-appointed as Vice-Chancellor for a further four years
Council resolved to pursue prospects of a liaison with the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences
Chronology

Council established 'Friends of La Trobe University', officially launched on 9 December, being twenty-first anniversary of proclamation of University Act

MMBW tramway extension along Plenty Road completed

La Trobe, jointly with University of Melbourne, Monash University and RMIT, successfully applied for Federal Government funds to launch Key Centre in Statistical Science

1986

Approval in principle of amalgamation between La Trobe and Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences

Completion of major extension to Borchardt Library

Initial moves made to establish Research and Development Parks, both on and off campus

Two Pro-Vice-Chancellors appointed (the first in La Trobe's history), one concerned with research, the other deputising for Vice-Chancellor and with special responsibility in area of long-term, academic planning

1987

In view of formal agreement to amalgamate with Lincoln Institute in 1988, University undertook restructuring of central administration through adoption of a unitary system headed by a Vice-Principal with five area managers in place of existing division into Registrar’s and Business Manager’s area. Both those positions abolished.

After protracted negotiations begun almost twenty years earlier, University granted formal title to the Bundoora campus (Crown land).

1988

On 1 January Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences was incorporated as tenth School of La Trobe University as a result of the coming into operation of the La Trobe University (Amendment) Act 1987

University formally agreed to join the Unified National System

University decided to proceed with negotiations with Bendigo College of Advanced Education with a view to affiliation between the two institutions

Federal Government approved funding for minimum period of six years of a Research Centre for Protein and Enzyme Technology and, for a minimum of three years, a Gerontology Centre for Education and special research associated with the Lincoln School of Health Sciences.

La Trobe University and its Research and Development Park and Estate form the nucleus of one of six high technology precincts established in Victoria by State Government to assist development of scientific and technological base of the State
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Appendix A

Membership of Third University Committee (1964), and of Interim Council (1964-66) and first Council (established December 1966) of La Trobe University.

Note: Except where otherwise indicated, personal details of members are as at date of original appointment.

Third University Committee (appointed May 1964)
J.R.A. (later Sir Archbald) GLENN, OBE, BCE, AMIE Aust., M I Chem.E, AMP (Harvard), Chairman and Managing Director, ICI Australia Ltd, Chairman
F.H. BROOKES, MSc, DipEd, Assistant Director of Education, Victoria
J. (later Sir John) BUCHAN, CMG, Architect and Chairman, Buchan, Laird & Buchan
Sir Michael CHAMBERLIN, OBE, Deputy Chancellor, Monash University
*Professor Emeritus T M (later Sir Thomas) CHERRY, BA, PhD, ScD, Hon. DSc, FRS, FAA, President, Australian Academy of Science 1961-65
Mrs Kathleen FITZPATRICK, MA, formerly Associate Professor of History, University of Melbourne
J.A. HEPBURN, Chief Planner, Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works
Mrs WHITNEY KING, CBE, BA, LLB, President of the Free Kindergarten Union and former President of the National Council of Women
Dr P.G. LAW, CBW, MSc, DAppSc, Director of the Antarctic Division, Department of External Affairs
C.E. NEWMAN, MC, LLB, Solicitor, Numurkah, Victoria
J.D. NORGARD, BE, General Manager (Operations), BHP Co. Ltd
Dr W.C. RADFORD, MBE, MA, MEd, PhD, Director, Australian Council for Educational Research
Professor R. SELBY SMITH, MA, AM, Professor of Education, Monash University, and Principal of Scotch College, Melbourne, 1953-64
Mr Russell G. FRENCH was Secretary of the Committee

Interim Council (established December 1964)
With the exceptions of Sir Michael Chamberlin and Mrs Kathleen Fitzpatrick, who signified they were not available, all members of the Third University Committee were appointed to the Interim Council, of which Mr Glenn was named Chairman. The other members of the Interim Council were:
K.A. (later Sir Keith) AICKIN, QC, LLM, Barrister
Professor Sir Macfarlane BURNET, OM, MD, PhD, Hon.ScD, DSc & LLD, FRACP, FRCP London & Edinburgh, FAA, FRS, Nobel Prize for Medicine, 1960, Professor of Experimental Medicine and Director of the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute, University of Melbourne, President, Australian Academy of Science 1965-69
Professor J. ANDREWS, BA, PhD, Professor of Geography, University of Melbourne (appointed to Interim Council in May 1965)
B.J. (later Sir Bernard) CALLINAN, DSO, MC, BCE, MICE, MIEAust., Consulting Engineer and Commissioner of the SEC
The Hon M.A. CLARKE, MLC, MA, BCL, representing Northern Province, Victorian Legislative Council
The Hon J.W. GALBALLY, MLC, LLB, Barrister, representing Melbourne North and Opposition Leader, Victorian Legislative Council
The Reverend Professor J.D. McCaughey, MA, Hon.DD, Master of Ormond College, University of Melbourne
J.A. RAFFERTY, MLA, BA, representing Ormond, Victorian Legislative Assembly
P.N. THWAITES, MA, BEd, Principal of Geelong College
K.H. (later Sir Kenneth) VIAL, Chartered Accountant, Partner, Arthur Andersen and Company and Vice-Chairman, Australian National Airlines Commission
Dr D.M. MYERS, DSc (Eng), MIEE, MIEAust., FInstP, Vice-Chancellor (ex officio) (became a member on taking up appointment on 1 September 1965)

*Professor Sir Thomas Cherry died late in 1966, just prior to the final meeting of the Interim Council

Council (established December 1966)
All members of the Interim Council (other than the late Sir Thomas Cherry) automatically became members of Council upon its establishment. At the first meeting held on 19 December 1966 Sir Archibald Glenn was elected as Chancellor of the University and Mr B.J. Callinan as Deputy Chancellor.
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LA TROBE UNIVERSITY: Membership of first Committees established by Interim Council at
its inaugural meeting in December 1964.

Academic Planning Board
Ex officio: The Vice-Chancellor (Chairman, from 1.9.65)

The Chairman of Interim Council
Professor Sir Thomas Cherry, Professor J. Andrews, Dr D.H. Borchardt, Sir Macfarlane
Burnet, Professor R.M. Crawford (Melbourne), Professor R.I. Downing (Melbourne), Dr W.C.
Radford (ACER), Professor R. Selby Smith (Monash), Professor W.A.G. Scott (Monash),
Professor R. Street (Monash), Professor Hugh Stretton (Adelaide), Professor J.S. Turner
(Melbourne)

During 1966, the following newly-appointed La Trobe academics were added to the Board:
Professor B.D. Ellis, Professor R.D. Topsom, Professor A.D. Wardrop, Professor D.H.
Whitehead.

Building Committee
Ex officio: (as for Academic Planning Board)
Mr B.J. Callinan (chairman), Mr John Buchan, Mr J.A. Hepburn, Mr J.D. Norgard

Finance and Administration Committee (initially designated as Finance Committee)
Ex officio: (as for Academic Planning Board)
Mr K.H. Vial (chairman), Dr P.G. Law, Mr C.E. Newman, Mr J.A. Rafferty

Legislation Committee
Ex officio: (as for Academic Planning Board)
Mr K.A. Aickin (chairman), Professor J. Andrews, Professor Sir Thomas Cherry, Mr C.E.
Newman, Professor R. Selby Smith

Colleges and Housing Committee (originally the Residences Committee, changed to Colleges
Committee in April 1965 and again to C&HC in October 1965
Ex officio: as for Academic Planning Board
Rev Professor J.D. McLaughey (chairman), Hon M.A. Clarke, Hon J.W. Galbally, Mrs Whit-
ney King, Mr C.E. Newman
During 1966, Dr J. McDonnell (Monash) and Mr P.N. Thwaites (Geelong) were added to this
committee.

Academic Board came into being early in 1967 and, as at 31 December 1967 its members were:
The Deans of the four Schools, Professors A.B. Wardrop, B.D. Ellis, R.D. Topsom and D.H.
Whitehead, the Chief Librarian, D.H. Borchardt, and Professors W.J. Ewens, D.R.C. Marsh,
P.A. Parsons, H.A. Wolsohn, together with Drs D.J. Griffith, J.V. Kingston and B.R. Steward-
sen, and Mr G. Weiler (all being academic members of La Trobe staff). The Chairman, ex officio,
remained the Vice-Chancellor, Dr D.M. Myers.
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Appendix to essay: ‘The Master Plan’

As Master Planner of the Bundoora campus I was privileged to lead a specially assembled team of planners, architects and administrative staff within my own office, and a select group of outside professional consultants. Without their skills, enthusiasm and loyalty to a common goal, my task would have been impossible. The purpose of this appendix is to acknowledge their contributions, and to pay tribute to all who participated, during the early months of the University’s existence, in the absorbing task of shaping the Master Plan. It also records the architects responsible for designing the buildings constructed during the first wave of development which, together with the associated landscaping and engineering projects, translated paper dreams into a living reality.

None of this would have been practicable without the guidance and inspiration of those members of the University’s Interim Council and its committees who, with the Vice-Chancellor and foundation members of the University staff, provided our immediate reference points and, in a philosophical sense, are the real creators of the University. I refer particularly to the first Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn, and Vice-Chancellor, Dr David Myers, whose vision and drive underpinned all our efforts; and Sir Bernard Callinan, to whom, as first chairman of the Building Committee, we were immediately responsible. I am deeply indebted also to Sir Macfarlane Burnet and Sir Thomas Cherry (both, alas, deceased), Dr Davis McCaughey, Professors Hugh Stretton and John Turner and Dr Phillip Law for their stimulating perceptions and their ability to convey them to us in practical terms.

Of the early staff appointees most closely involved with the master planning, I must refer particularly to the Business Manager, Frank Barnes; the Chief Librarian, Dietrich Borchardt; the Co-ordinator of Works and Buildings, Stewart Morton; and Frank Saul, the Head Gardener (later Curator), all of whom, in their respective roles, were major contributors to the team effort. It is also gratifying that Trevor Russell, who succeeded Morton, and the University’s present Manager (Buildings and Grounds), Denis Stephenson, have maintained the spirit of the Master Plan during the years that followed the establishment period.

Last, but by no means least, I acknowledge with gratitude the support and encouragement of my partners in Yuncken Freeman Architects Pty Ltd, who provided administrative support, staff and facilities and enabled me to concentrate exclusively on La Trobe affairs throughout the intensive planning stages. It has not been practicable, over a gap of twenty-five years, to list all those who made significant contributions to this remarkable team effort. Those unnamed will undoubtedly recall the excitement of participating and will, I trust, accept my assurances of appreciation.

Roy Simpson

The First Building Committee

Mr B.J. (later Sir Bernard) Callinan (Chairman), Mr J. (later Sir John) Buchan, Mr J. Alistair Hepburn, Mr John D. Norgard. (Ex-officio members were the Vice-Chancellor and the chairman of the Interim Council)
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The Planning Team

YUNCKEN FREEMAN ARCHITECTS PTY LTD (Master planning and co-ordination of consultant services): B.R. Dowling; R. Falkinger; J.C. Learmonth; A. McArdle; K. McAvoy; R. McC. Simpson; G.A. Whitelaw

L.T. FRAZER AND ASSOCIATES, CONSULTING ENGINEERS (Site preparation including earthworks, flood control, traffic engineering, roads, weirs, bridges and hydraulic services): Len T. Frazer; D. Emery, J. Chamberlain

W.E. BASSETT AND PARTNERS, CONSULTING ENGINEERS (Energy sources and reticulation, including electrical and communications services, high pressure hot water generation and distribution, tunnel system, etc.): Alan Tweddell; J. Harding; J. Thalassinos

W L IRWIN, JOHNSTON AND BREEDON PTY LTD, CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS: V.R. Johnston; R.S. Thyer

LANDSCAPE PLANNING CONSULTANT: Professor L.D. Pryor

Building Design

Architects for major building projects constructed between 1965 and 1976:

GARNET ALSOP AND PARTNERS (Physical Sciences 2)

BATES SMART AND McCUTCHEON (Humanities/Education Complex)

CHANCELLOR AND PATRICK (Chisholm College; Union Building; Chisholm College)

Student Facilities Centre*)

BRYAN DOWLING (Indoor Swimming Pool)

EGGLESTON, MCDONALD AND SECOMB (Thomas Cherry Building; Physical Sciences 1; Physical Sciences 3; Physical Sciences 4; Maintenance Depot)

ROY GROUNDS AND COMPANY (East Lecture Theatre Complex; Agora Theatre)

HASSELL AND McCONNELL (Glenn College Stage 1)

J.H. McCONNELL (Glenn College, Stage 2*; Staff Club*)

MOCKRIDGE, STAHL AND MITCHELL (Humanities 3; Economics)

MONTGOMERY, KING AND ASSOCIATES PTY LTD, (Menzies College Annexo)

BEST OVEREND (Indoor Sports Centre, Stage 1; Sports Pavilion)

FERROT, LYON, TIMLOCK AND KESA (Social Sciences)

ROMBERG AND BOYD (Menzies College)

LA TROBE UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS BRANCH: T.C.C. Russell, Deputy Business Manager, Physical Planning. (Indoors Sports Centre Stages 2 and 3; Menzies College Stage 4; Non-collegiate housing project Stages 1-3; Agora South Stage 2 and Agora West, level 2; Moat Theatre)

STEPHENSON AND TURNER (Agriculture/Biochemistry; Biological Sciences 1 and 2; Behavioural Sciences; Animal and Glasshouse complex)

YUNCKEN FREEMAN ARCHITECTS PTY LTD (Library Stages 1 and 2; The Agora; Boiler House; David Myers Building; The Peribolos)

NOTE: A more detailed account was published in Architecture Australia, official journal of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, September 1978

* In association with La Trobe University Buildings Branch

# In association with Stephenson and Turner
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DIETRICH H. BORCHARDT, AM, Hon. DSoCSc (RMIT), was Chief Librarian of La Trobe University from 1965 until his retirement in 1981. A graduate of the University of New Zealand and diplomate of the New Zealand Library School, his career in professional librarianship began at the University of Otago in New Zealand and continued at the University of Tasmania where he served as University Librarian from 1953 until his departure for Melbourne in 1965. Mr Borchardt was the first person appointed by the Interim Council to the staff of La Trobe University, and on retirement was honoured by the University in having the Library named 'The Borchardt Library'.

DR WILLIAM J. BREEN
Dr William J. Breen is a Senior Lecturer in History at La Trobe University with special interests in modern American history. After graduating at the University of Melbourne he undertook doctoral studies at Duke University, North Carolina, and was appointed to the La Trobe History Department in 1969. He is Editor of this volume published by the University to mark the 25th anniversary of its establishment by Act of the Victorian Parliament in 1964.

JUDY DUFFY left school when she was fourteen to go to work. She was a bank clerk, a waitress, and a pub singer while attending night school and enrolling in correspondence courses in an effort to complete her secondary education. She then became a primary teacher in the Catholic school system and after fifteen years, in the early 1970s, came to La Trobe University as one of the first students in the School of Humanities to enter under the Early Leavers' Special Entrants Scheme. By that time she was married with three children and her fourth was born while she was a student. She completed an honours degree majoring in English and, since that time, has established a reputation as a writer. She has published a collection of short stories and has won a number of awards from the Fellowship of Australian Writers and has received a Fellowship B grant from the Literature Board of the Australia Council. She is currently working on a novel and tutoring part-time at the TAFE branch of the RMIT.

SIR ARCHIBALD GLENN
Sir Archibald Glenn, OBE, Hon. DUniv (La Trobe) was foundation Chancellor of La Trobe University from December 1966 until July 1972. In May 1964 he had been appointed by the Premier of Victoria to head the Third University Committee, and he became Chairman of the Interim Council of La Trobe which was established in December of the same year. An engineer and company director, Sir Archibald was Chairman of ICI Australia Ltd from 1963 until his retirement in 1973.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR JOHN S. GREGORY
Emeritus Professor Jack Gregory was educated at the University of Melbourne and the University of London where he undertook graduate studies. At the time of his initial appointment as Reader in History at La Trobe in 1968 he held a similar post at the University of Melbourne. His appointment to a Chair of History at La Trobe followed in 1973, and he retired from the
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University early in 1985. His special interests lie in the areas of 19th and 20th century Chinese history and Church-State relations in Victoria.

DR MARGARET E. JAMES
Dr Margaret E. James has been Equal Opportunity Co-ordinator at Monash University in Melbourne since 1987. Her association with La Trobe University began in 1971 as a Tutor — and later Senior Tutor — in History, and from 1984 until 1987 she held the position of University Research Fellow — Status of Women. A graduate of the University of Melbourne, Dr James was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by La Trobe in 1985.

DR JOHN G. JENKIN
Dr John G. Jenkin has been Reader in Physics at La Trobe since 1976. Educated at the University of Adelaide and, as a graduate student, at the Australian National University, he subsequently worked at the Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell. Prior to his appointment to a Senior Lectureship in Physics at La Trobe in 1966 he held a research post at the University of Minnesota. Dr Jenkin has served as Head of the Division of Electron Physics and, is currently the chair of the Physics Department.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR ROBERT J. MAGEE
Emeritus Professor Robert J. Magee was educated at The Queen's University of Belfast and the University of Edinburgh and held academic positions in both universities prior to moving to Australia in 1966 on appointment as a foundation Professor of Chemistry at La Trobe University. This position he held until his retirement in 1988. Professor Magee served as Dean of the University's School of Physical Sciences from 1973 to 1976 and, for some years, as Chairman of the Department of Inorganic and Analytical Chemistry.

DR DAVID MYERS
Dr David M. Myers, CMG, Hon. DUniv (La Trobe) was foundation Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe University from 1965 until he retired in 1976. A graduate of the University of Sydney, he returned to that University in 1949 as P N Russell Professor of Electrical Engineering after serving as Chief of the CSIRO Division of Electro-technology. In 1959 he moved to Canada on appointment as Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science at the University of British Columbia, a post he held until returning to Australia as Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe.

JOHN H. NICHOLSON
John H. Nicholson is La Trobe University's Public Relations Officer. As a young man he entered the Franciscan Order but left just prior to Ordination. He later worked for the Australian Broadcasting Commission in various Australian centres and in Papua-New Guinea. At the time of his appointment to La Trobe in 1981 he was a program executive with the ABC. After joining the University staff he enrolled as a part-time student and, in 1988, graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Education.

JUDITH M. RICHARDS
Judith M. Richards is Senior Lecturer in History at La Trobe University. A graduate of the University of Auckland in New Zealand, Mrs Richards was a Tutor in History at that University before her appointment to a similar post at La Trobe in 1969. She joined the permanent staff of the Department of History as a Lecturer in 1972, and was promoted to a Senior Lectureship ten years later. Her special academic interests lie in 17th century British history and in New Zealand history.

PROFESSOR JOHN A. SALMOND
Professor John A. Salmond has been Professor of American History at La Trobe University since 1969. Educated at the University of Otago in New Zealand and, as a graduate student, at Duke University, North Carolina, he was Senior Lecturer in History at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, at the time of his initial appointment to a similar post at La Trobe in 1968. He served as Dean of the School of Humanities in 1974-75 and has been Chairman of
the Department of History. He has also served as Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University during the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, and chaired the 25 Year History Committee.

PROFESSOR JOHN F. SCOTT
Professor John F. Scott took up his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe University in July 1977 and recently announced his intention to retire in January 1990. He was educated at the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and after holding a series of academic posts in several British universities became Professor of Applied Statistics at the University of Sussex in 1967. Four years later he was appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Science) at Sussex and served in both capacities until resigning on appointment to La Trobe.

DR KELMAN SEMMENS
Dr Kel. Semmens completed medical studies at the University of Melbourne and later undertook a postgraduate course at the London School of Tropical Medicine. He came to La Trobe from private practice in 1967 — for the first few months part-time — as Physician-in-Charge, University Health Service, with responsibility for establishing and developing this service to meet the needs of the new and rapidly growing University. He fulfilled this role until his resignation early in 1979 when he resumed private practice and also undertook some academic teaching at the University of Melbourne.

ROY McC. SIMPSON
Roy McC. Simpson, AO, Hon DUniv (La Trobe) was appointed Master Planner of La Trobe University at the first meeting of the Interim Council in December 1964. He studied architecture at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and became a partner in the firm of Yuncken Freeman Architects in 1945. He also served as Site Planner of the Australian National University in Canberra from 1968 until his retirement from active professional practice in 1980. He is a Life Fellow of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects.

PROFESSOR RONALD D. TOPSOM
Professor Ronald D. Topsom, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), was appointed to a foundation Chair of Chemistry at La Trobe University in 1966. A graduate of the University of Canterbury in New Zealand and of the University of London where he undertook doctoral studies, Professor Topsom worked initially at the University of Canterbury as Lecturer and later Senior Lecturer. When appointed to La Trobe he was on leave at the University of East Anglia in England as the holder of a Nuffield Travelling Fellowship. He served twice as Dean of the University’s School of Physical Sciences (1966-69 and 1978-79) and was appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) on a half-time basis in 1987. Two years later the post was converted to full-time.

DR DON WATSON
Don Watson grew up on a farm in Gippsland and came to La Trobe in the first intake of students in 1967. He later enrolled for postgraduate work, first at the Australian National University and then at Monash where he completed his PhD in 1976. He taught history and politics at Monash and Melbourne Universities, RMIT and, for seven years, Footscray Institute of Technology. He is the author of three books: Brian Fitzpatrick. A Radical Life (1979), Catalonia Australis (1984) and The Story of Australia (1984). Since 1983 he has been a freelance, combining comedy, politics and history in works for television, stage, radio and films. He was a co-author of the musical adaptation of Manning Clark’s History of Australia, and in recent years has been a speechwriter for the Premier of Victoria.
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Numbers in italics refer to illustrations. These are on unnumbered pages following the page number shown; for example 52 refers to the illustrations following page 52.
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see Advisory Committee on Academic Developments
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see Australian Universities Commission
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