Qui cherche, trouve: 
*n 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 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, 2205 (16 per cent) were postgraduate or higher degree candidates and 4195 (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 commu-
nity 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 af-
fluent, 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 pros-
perous 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 Cambewell 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, Lillydale, 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 Bergère 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 connote 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 practicality 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'être 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
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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:
### Occupation of head of family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, administrative, executive, managerial</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and sales</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, craft and process workers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-
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 of ICI 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
Qui Cherche, Trouve

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
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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 associ­
ation with universities and some colleges of advanced education. The La Trobe estate is plan­
ned 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 man­
agement. 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 Aus­
tralia 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 gov­
ernment. 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 universi­
ties, 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
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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', Vestes, 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. Vervoon, Access to Privilege (ANU Press, 1983), p. 170.