

PERSPECTIVES ON THE AUSTRALIAN RADICAL LEFT  
STUDENT MOVEMENT 1966 - 1975

Brian Pola  
B.A., Dip.Ed., B.Ed., (La Trobe)

Thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements  
of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
School of Education,  
La Trobe University.

October, 1988

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	vii
Introduction	ix
Chapter One: The Radical Students of 1920 to the mid 1960s; a Foundation for Historical Comparison.	1
(i) The 1920s.	3
(ii) The 1930s.	7
(iii) The 1940s.	12
(iv) 1950 to 1966.	18
Chapter Two: La Trobe University, 1967-1973.	39
Chapter Three: Precedents and Comparisons; Student and Related Activism from 1960-1975, in Australia and Elsewhere.	141
(i) International Aspects of the Student Movement.	142
(ii) Some Suggested Causes.	151
(iii) The Student Movement in a Capitalist State.	156
(iv) The Changing Role of Universities.	172
(v) Student Government.	184

(vi)	Disillusionment With Institutionalised Politics.	185
(vii)	The Activists: Their Formation, Motivation and Issues.	192
(viii)	The Socio-economic Background of Students.	208
(ix)	Research and Literature on Secondary Students.	212
(x)	The Counter Culture and the New Left.	215
(xi)	The Passing of the Menzies Era.	221
(xii)	The Impact of Changing Social Mores.	223
(xiii)	Conscription.	229
(xiv)	The Student Movement and the Media.	233
(xv)	The Unexpected Student Movement.	237
(xvi)	Student Radicalism and the Role of Intellectuals in Society	239
(xvii)	Conclusion.	251
Chapter Four: Interpretation of Rise and Decline.		272
(i)	The Australian Union of Students.	273
(ii)	The Activists of 1966-1972.	283
(iii)	Conclusions.	298
Bibliography		315

## ABSTRACT

The thesis deals with the emergence and decline of the radical Left student movement in Australia, and concentrates on the period 1966-1975.

The underlying interpretation of the thesis is that the student movement was one of liberation rather than any particular ideology, and that this was a cause for the emergence and decline of the movement: the movement lacked a clearly defined idea of itself. The thesis also supports the argument that the student movement was itself part of the social system it sought to change, a part of the capitalist mode of the production of knowledge, its uses and functions. In particular, the production of mass intellectual labour for technology.

Overall therefore, the thesis has a strongly interpretative flavour.

The general hypothesis of the thesis is that the emergence and decline of the Australian radical Left student movement, 1966-1975, was due to complex international and local social, economic, political, and historical factors.

Throughout the thesis reference is made to a wide variety of primary sources, and prominent are interviews with activists of the times.

The thesis is organised into four chapters.

Chapter One takes an historical view of radical student activism from the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, up until 1966. The argument here is that radical Left student activity has a sound tradition in Australia.

Chapter Two is a case study of radical Left student politics at one university, La Trobe University, Melbourne, and deals with the period 1967-1972.

Chapter Three provides an overall study of student radicalism. Sections include: international influences; the role of capitalism in education; the Vietnam War and conscription; socio-economic factors; the media; and, the changing role of universities, and the role of intellectuals in society.

Chapter Four provides an account of the Australian Union of Students during the period, and analyses its fall in 1985. Following this account is an outline of what happened to the many activists of the period 1966-1972.

The conclusions to the thesis draw together the main arguments, and separate the fact from the speculation.

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text of this thesis.

Brian Pola

Brian Pola

October, 1988

DEDICATION

To those who were part of the student movement and so generously gave their time, conversation, commitment and best of all, their friendship. This thesis is theirs as much as it is mine.

## PREFACE

In Pentridge prison in May 1972 the idea occurred to me that an account of what was happening should be written. Since then I have been gathering pamphlets, newspaper cuttings, and recording conversations for the time when I would write it up.

Some may say that a person who was so closely involved in the student movement might not be a credible historian. I believe history is best written by those who participated in it, and although objectivity is occasionally the price to be paid, it is important that such accounts are written for the benefit of future research. Even so, I have throughout the writing been continually aware of accuracy and perspective.

I express appreciation to the staff of La Trobe University, in particular: Patricia Clarke (Legal Officer); David Neilson (Registrar); Howard Dossor (Council Secretariat); the Borchardt Library staff; and my two supervisors Bob Bessant and Doug White, and the staff at the Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne. I also take this opportunity to express deep appreciation to my parents, Bob and Marge Pola.

One naturally wishes that the resources to enable research of a more thorough nature were available.

This lack is particularly seen in the structure of Chapters One, Two and Three, where reliance is placed on interviews with political activists of the 1960s and early 1970s, which I conducted. This research was enabled solely by provision of a grant from Film Victoria to research a documentary script on the radical students of the period. Indeed, the first draft of the thesis had no inclusion of any interview material at all, and virtually ignored the 1930s and late 1940s. It was the film research conducted later that made the inclusion of interview material possible. When it became apparent that the earlier decades



warranted some expansion in order to gain historical perspective, ideally it would have been desirable to then proceed to interview relevant student activists. However, I could only do the next best thing by carefully evaluating a limited range of primary and secondary published material.

At one stage, because of the above difficulties, I thought to jettison Chapter One altogether. I am now pleased I did not.

One reason for this pleasure is that on closer examination of my own recollections, I first became aware of a Left tradition emanating from the University of Melbourne when, in the late 1960s and early 1970s I attended State Conferences of the Victorian ALP. I was very impressed with Professor Ian Turner's forays into debate on the Conference floor. Turner in those days often spoke with the Socialist Left of the ALP, although he had previously been a member of the CPA. Professor Turner impressed not only by his class analysis of Australian society but by his hospitality at his home in Melbourne. He was a legend in his own life-time amongst the student Left of my day, as others were to be, such as Dr. James Ford Cairns, future Treasurer and Deputy Prime Minister in the Whitlam Government.

## INTRODUCTION

La Trobe University was a centre of upheaval and student protest in the early 1970s, particularly 1970-71-72. It was not alone in this. Universities throughout Australia and many other parts of the world became arenas of activism and dissent, sometimes of violence, at the time. La Trobe was a little later than most other institutions in the activities, which spanned the period from 1964 (the Berkeley, California student activism around Freedom Under Clark Kerr) to around 1973. 1968 was the world high point, when at one time it appeared possible that a student and worker coalition of activism could topple the French government. The shootings at Kent State (1970) and Jackson State (1970) universities signalled the end; love, peace and radicalism were no match for the armed state. Gradually the universities settled into quiescence; the radical cultural innovations which the student movement heralded and propagated continue in some way in feminism, the black movement, gay liberation and the environment movement. To some extent, this life-style radicalism and personal autonomy have become mainstream. The activists of the student movement did not have this outcome in mind, but it may be argued that their activism, though complex in its sources, offered no clear programme for a different end.

This thesis has two related themes and purposes. One is to describe in narrative form, from the perspective of one - the author - who was involved in the activism, what happened in the history of La Trobe in those years. In part this can be documented, and the events and statements made are documented as fully as can be managed in this thesis. But no documentation will give the full flavour of these times, nor an account of the perceptions and experiences of those who were active. Hence the narrative of this thesis includes recollections and reflections of years of involvement as well as the documentation of an historical period.

The second theme is interpretative, and in making interpretations some historical and comparative material is drawn upon. The reader will find that all four Chapters freely mix fact and interpretation. Indeed, the student movement itself was like that. Students lived in a new age of mass and instant communication where history and the now merged together in the 'global village'. Hopefully, the reader will find this approach to the topic both lively and useful. Briefly, the argument of this thesis is that the student activism of the period is not, at La Trobe or elsewhere, rightly characterized as a socialist, revolutionary movement, whatever the rhetoric and beliefs of those involved.

The argument here is that the student activists fought for liberation, not socialism. Che Guevera and Fidel Castro, bearded young men without ties to institutionalised revolutionary parties were their first heroes; and when the activists became Left it was anarchist - like Cohn-Bendit arguing against Obsolete Communism; or Maoist - it was the Mao of Dare to Struggle, Dare to Win, the Single Spark That Started the Prairie Fire, rather than Lenin or Stalin to whom they turned. La Trobe activists also followed this path.

This much can be said without deep interpretation; it, as will be argued, is a view that adheres closely to observation of incidents. It does, however, require attention to some incidents more than others.

One of the reasons why the student movement did not go in for interpretation was that the issues were clear. Australia supported the United States in an immoral war, and young men were press-ganged into taking part in this war - by the arbitrary and unfair means of a ballot, an arbitrariness which seemed to characterise capitalist society. While the slogan of anti-imperialism was much used, it was a slogan, not an analysis. A deeper interpretation requires going beyond the statements made by the activists. This has all the dangers of theorizing of motives unknown to the actors. Nevertheless one will be attempted in this thesis. Intellectuals were a special, and major, part of a youth culture created by capitalism but not part of a class in the old sense.

As a youth culture they belonged neither to the bourgeoisie nor the proletariat.

They were part of the reproduction of capitalism, but not directly of its structures. As part of its production they had notions of individualism, its patterns of consumption, and its division of mental and manual labour. At the same time they carried a moral opposition, notions of universality and fairness which represent the best of bourgeois morality. The student movement was thus contradictory, and unable to achieve its best side, for autonomy and morality alone could not find nor build a social structure in opposition.

This interpretation, elaborated, allows an explanation of why the student movement came to its end. Capitalism, in short, won out over radical culture, and the activists of the student revolt have followed their personal interests - at the best becoming an injection of radical liberal thought in the pores of a bourgeois society which can contain radical autonomy, but cannot of course easily allow a genuine revolutionary opposition.

These are the hopes of the thesis; in the first place to set out clearly the events and character of the times, and in the second to develop an interpretation which explains its rise and decline.

Following this introduction, is a comparatively brief and integral first chapter which studies the foundation of student radicalism in 1920s Melbourne, through to the early 1960s. Chapter Two forms the next and major period of study, 1966-1975, which is a detailed account of the La Trobe events of the years of activism. Chapter Three provides a general interpretative study of student radicalism, related to the themes of the first two chapters. Chapter Four is an epilogue and conclusion and is somewhat speculative. In the 1980s, it is still early to be sure of the significance and meaning of the activism. Later historians of educational and social movements will have a broader perspective, but will lose the advantages of first hand knowledge.

The epilogue provides a brief account of the involvement and decline of the Australian Union of Students. It precedes the conclusion, which attempts to distinguish between what is certain and what is speculation in the account.

That the emergence of  
movement of the late 1960s  
complex set of international  
historical factors

## HYPOTHESIS

That the emergence and decline of the Australian radical student movement of the late 1960s, early 1970s, was the product of a highly complex set of international and local social, political, economic and historical factors.

NOTE

Labor Club and Labour Club

There is a dispute as to where either spelling should be used. Monash and La Trobe Universities preferred Labor Club, though not always. The University of Melbourne invariably preferred Labour Club.

For the Australian Labor Party, sic.

For the labour movement, sic.

Abbreviations used in thesis

ALP	Australian Labor Party
AUS	Australian Union of Students
ANZUS	Australia, New Zealand, United States
ALR	Australian Left Review
ABC	Australian Broadcasting Corporation
ABC	American Broadcasting Corporation
ASIO	Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation
ACT	Australian Capital Territory
ACTS	Australian Council of Tertiary Students
ANU	Australian National University
AICD	Association for International Co-operation and Disarmament
BLF	Builders' Labourers' Federation
BP	British Petroleum
CPA	Communist Party of Australia
CPA M/L	Communist Party of Australia, Marxist-Leninist
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CICD	Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CBC	Columbia Broadcasting Corporation
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific, Investigation and Research Organisation
CALPS	Council of Australian Labor Party Students
DLP	Democratic Labor Party
EEC	European Economic Community
GMS	General Meeting of Students
HSC	Higher School Certificate
HART	Halt All Racial Tours
ILO	International Labor Organisation
IUS	International Union of Students
IPC	International Preparatory Committee
ISC	International Student Conference
ICI	Imperial Chemical Industries
IBM	International Business Machines



IRA	Irish Republican Army
JIO	Joint Intelligence Organisation
LTU	La Trobe University
LBJ	Lyndon Baines Johnson
MLA	Member, Legislative Assembly
MHR	Member, House of Representatives
MUM	Melbourne University Magazine
NBC	National Broadcasting Corporation
NCC	National Civic Council
NSW	New South Wales
NLF	National Liberation Front
NY	New York
NUAUS	National Union of Australian University Students
OUP	Oxford University Press
OSS	Overseas Student Service
QC	Queen's Counsel
RSM	Radical Student Movement
RSL	Returned Servicemen's League
SEATO	South East Asian Treaty Organisation
SRC	Students' Representative Council
SDA	Students for Democratic Action
SDS	Students for a Democratic Society
WSA	Worker-Student Alliance
USSR	United Socialist Soviet Republics
UofM	University of Melbourne
USNSA	United States National Students' Association
USAR	United States Air Force
USA	United States of America
UK	United Kingdom
VC	Vice-Chancellor
VPD	Victorian Parliamentary Debates
VSU	Victorian Students' Union
YCL	Young Communist League
YCAC	Youth Campaign Against Conscription

CHAPTER ONE

THE RADICAL STUDENTS OF THE 1920s - MID 1960s;  
A FOUNDATION FOR HISTORICAL COMPARISON

Chapter One is integral to this thesis in that it points to a history of radical Left student thought in Melbourne that had existed since the 1930s. The Chapter supports a view that various generations of students expressed their politics as a continuing and developing tradition that also reflected the political climate of the times. The Chapter draws on a limited range of primary sources, including Farrago, Melbourne University Magazine and articles written by students of the times. Secondary sources include those of Hume Dow, Geoffrey Blainey, Patrick O'Brien, R. A. Gollan, James Spigelman and Ken Gott, though some of these authors provide both primary and secondary sources. This thesis is consistent in providing its material from the underground literature of the day. In the case of La Trobe University for example, in Chapter Two, a considerable reliance is placed on Rabelais.

However, whilst Chapter One does not pretend to provide a comprehensive account of these decades, it does enable some insight into the formation and passing on of political ideas during these times and how this process might be interpreted today as being part of a tradition that forms part of the 'Left Establishment' in Australia.

Chapter One also forms part of the structure on which the hypothesis of this thesis rests, as this Chapter will emphasise the hypothesis' statement that 'historical factors' were associated with the emergence of the student movement.

The Chapter begins with the early 1920s and follows a logical chronology through to the early 1960s.

A conclusion to the four sections is at the end of the chapter. From the 1920s to the 1950s there was only one university in Victoria, the University of Melbourne, and there were seven Australian universities, one for each of the nation's States, including the Australian National University in Canberra (1946). The University of New England was established in 1938 as a University College of the

University of Sydney, and was enacted as the University of New England in 1953.

(i) The 1920s

To the misinformed, the 1960s period of student protests was the first and only period in Australia's history where students were politically active. However, this is historically incorrect. The protests of some years ago were in fact reflective of a tradition of student activism. This tradition goes some way towards accounting for the events of the sixties and early seventies. It was during and after the Great War that the foundations for an expanded student interest in political affairs were laid. Geoffrey Blainey (1) outlined the difficulties associated with this process at the University of Melbourne.

To this period (during and after the Great War) we can trace the origin of that strong interest in current political and international affairs which has become a feature of the less apathetic section of the university. But the right to discuss current affairs in public was not conceded willingly. When the Public Questions Society was formed in 1918, the Professorial Board immediately intervened by demanding the right to nominate two members to the general committee and to sanction the subjects of study in all discussion groups. In July 1919 a meeting of the Society which was to have been addressed by a Labour politician on the subject of 'One Big Union' was cancelled after the vice-chancellor had protested that it would be injurious to the university. Despite the protests the professorial board went a step further on 16th September 1919 by ruling that a person who was neither a graduate councillor nor teacher of the university could not address any society without the approval of the president of the professorial board. Perhaps the zeal with which the university stifled public discussions of a radical nature was a reflection of its fear that the government might not pass the vital University Reform Bill if public opinion turned against the University. Once the bill was passed the censorship wilted. In August 1925 the university council granted students permission to form Labour and Liberal Clubs, merely describing as 'undesirable' the

aim of the Labour Club to affiliate with the Australian Labour Party. (2)

Even at this stage the vice-chancellor, Sir John Monash, opposed proposals for political clubs and drew attention to the grave dangers of rival factions disrupting the peace of the university. (3)

From a reading of both Farrago and the Melbourne University Magazine for the 1920s, it becomes clear that there is little evidence to support a description of the University as having a widespread politically radical student membership. For example, Guido Baracchi, a student at the University during the Great War and a person who maintained close contacts with it during the 1920s, gives the impression that there was little political activity. (4) Generally the 1920s saw the University as a quiet and pleasant arcadia. (5) Although Farrago and the Labour Club had been established in 1925, Patrick O'Brien (6) concluded that

Perusing the memories of Baracchi and Fitzpatrick and in discussing the times with those who remember them, it becomes clear that there was very little in the way of rigorous and analytical intellectual life on the campus until the 1930s, when the social and economic conditions turned students' minds to radical literature in search of solutions to the world economic crisis.(7)

Nevertheless, it will be suggested here that by the mid-1920s a degree of political consciousness existed regarding such realities as the growth of Fascism in Europe and the dangers of war-mongering. Hume Dow hints that an anti-war sentiment may be traced to the experiences of ex-servicemen and women of the Great War and their arrival at the University of Melbourne in 1919. (8)

However, of the Great War itself, Vera Jennings, a student at Janet Clarke Hall, recalled that those who had opposed the war and conscription were often looked on with suspicion: 'We're not having much to do with him: he's anti-con'. (9)

One who did protest against Australia's involvement in the Great War was Guido Baracchi, and Jennings tells of Baracchi being thrown into the University lake and later, gaoled. (10)

Frank McManus (a former DLP Senator), who graduated from the University in 1927, mentions that the 'apostles of the changes' came to the University from 1923 to 1926, and that the First Chief of Staff for Farrago was the radical writer Brian Fitzpatrick, in 1925. McManus also stated that

For the first time there was a well supported student agitation - against higher fees. (11)

Two founding members of the University of Melbourne Labour Club were Brian Fitzpatrick and W. Macmahon Ball who was later a consultant to the Chifley Labor government and a distinguished academic. (12) Students were to play the political field, so that Brian Fitzpatrick, for example, avoided being tied to a political machine whilst in England by simultaneously joining the British Communist Party, Labour Party and Independent Labour Party. Refusal to adhere to a 'party line' is a common aspect for other periods of student activity, as in the 1930s, later 1940s, and the late 1960s, early 1970s, in Melbourne. There appears to have only been a small group of communist students at the University in the 1920s, amongst whom were Lloyd Ross and Ralph Gibson, both of whom went from the Labour Club to the CPA. Gibson's father had been Professor of Philosophy at the University and Ross' father was a prominent ALP member. (13)

Another aspect common to the 1920s and later, even through to the early 1970s, was the prominence in university debate and literature of anti-Fascism and the fostering of world peace. In 1924, the University's Historical Society was addressed concerning the dangers of Mussolini's Fascist Italy, and MUM carried anti-war articles. (14) Midst many articles about life in the English and North American universities, particularly England's Oxford and Cambridge, there

occasionally appear articles about student protests internationally. For example, an article 'The Chinese Situation' regarding student demonstrations in Shanghai against foreign capitalist intervention in China in 1925. (15)

Dow observed of the 1920s that

Looking at the contrast of generations in another way, political dissent seems to have had little bite in it in the 1920s, at any rate in the later sense of 'student protest': the Public Questions Society may have created a mild stir in 1918 but it hardly suggests protest, nor, even, did the foundation of the Labor Club - though their very existence did constitute some questioning of authority. The politicization of the student body (or of a significant part of it) did not really begin until well into the 1930s and the subsequent post-war arrival of ex-servicemen. (16)

Dow also saw the 1950s as a period of quiescence relative to the 1960s, early 1970s. (17)

The philosophical impetus behind groups such as the Labour Club had come from a variety of sources. There would doubtless have been a general awareness of the vast economic distress induced by the Wall Street 'Crash' of 1929 that plunged the world's commodity market - and Australia's wheat and wool export prices - into downward spiral. However, throughout 1929, the University of Melbourne SRC seemed preoccupied with matters of a more internal nature than world economics. Perhaps the effects took a while to take hold. During 1929, the SRC debated at length whether a 'club of a political nature' namely the Labour Club, should be granted funds by the SRC so that the club could operate more effectively. (18) Comparisons were drawn with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge where radical political clubs were encouraged, yet clubs of similar ideological hue were repressed in Australia, supposedly a young nation of free and fresh ideas. (19) One finds the comparison wry, with a view to the period of the 1960s in Melbourne when it was supposed that Australia was, after all, just

following an 'overseas' trend. During October 1929, the Labour Club gained affiliation to the SRC, thus paving the way for the club to be granted funds. Prior to this time, the first four years of the Labour Club's history appeared to be ones of financial hardship. (20) The Labour Club's two programs became apparent: the advancement of student debate on issues of public interest; and, on the shoulders of the first, the control of the SRC and Farrago. (21) It needed finance to mount campaigns, and having obtained SRC funding, prepared the way for the SRC election campaigns of the early 1930s.

The important contribution of the 1920s to the student movements of later years, was that at least some students had got together who recognisably began a tradition of radical political thought at the University of Melbourne.

#### The 1930s:

When one speaks of a 'tradition' of Left activity in the University of Melbourne, one means that tradition to have been established by the 1930s, perhaps earlier.

James Spigelman, (22) in a history of student activism in Australia, wrote of the University of Melbourne of the 1930s that a small Left-wing minority had consolidated itself and had derived support from certain organised Christian groups concerned with problems relating to the economic Depression ravaging the Western nations, and the rumblings of National Socialism (Nazism) in Europe. (23) Spigelman also drew attention to a continuous history of Leftist political clubs at the University which were active during the 1930s and 1940s. (24)

The conservatives meanwhile were not idle. A Conservative Club was formed in 1930 as an opposition to the Labour Club with a former University of Melbourne SRC President Mr. R. G. Menzies being a key-note speaker at the inaugural meeting. (25)



By 1930, the economic effects of the Depression were being felt. The SRC established an SRC Unemployment Relief Fund and a large number of University and public debates were organised by the Labour Club to address students and the Melbourne public on Socialism, Fascism emerging in Europe, and the nature of Capitalism. (26) The SRC elections were approaching too. Mr. W.M. Hughes, MHR, visited the campus late in the year to oversee the establishment of the Australian Party Club (MUAPC), a predecessor of the University of Melbourne A.L.P. Club. (27)

In 1931 it became clear that the University's student population at least were becoming increasingly divided over ideological matters related to world economics and Nazism in Europe. At a rowdy public meeting on the campus addressed by Mr. Guido Baracchi, there was a concerted attempt by Right-wing elements to prevent Baracchi, a Communist, from speaking. (28) Disillusionment within the Right-wing of intolerant elements within itself, was expressed by Mr. A.G. Rylah, Mr. M.V. McInerney and Mr. F. Shann. (29) The splitting of the conservative elements on campus in the face of a united Left, meant that by 1931, the Left had control of Farrago and were an influential force on the SRC. Indeed there is evidence that such control existed by October 1930. (30) There is some difficulty in ascertaining which SRC members belonged in certain political clubs as elections were organised on the basis of Mens, Womens and Faculty representatives, and more research is needed to gain a keener picture of the exact political structure. However, the general picture is reasonably clear. Due either to embarrassment at the reception given to Mr. Baracchi or to a greater preparedness to at least listen, Professor Anderson of the University of Sydney Philosophy Department provided a lengthy address to a large meeting on 'Communism' in June 1931, and it was very well received. (31)

The philosophical impetus behind Left of centre political groups had come in part from the Philosophy Department at the University of Sydney, and its head, Professor John Anderson. For a short interlude, Anderson had been a member of the Communist Party. However, he reacted against Communism and became the founder of a Sydney school of

philosophical libertarianism, which influenced several generations of Sydney students. Anderson's libertarianism in philosophy centered on his opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. He promoted free thought; argued religion ought not be taught in state schools, and caused a furore of debate in the press and New South Wales Parliament. (32) Anderson provoked strong antipathy from the Communist Party, especially from its leader Mr. Lance Sharkey, itself committed to total defence of the USSR; anti-Trotskyite in the 30s, pro Zhdanovite in the late 40s. (33) Proletariat, the student publication of the University of Melbourne Labour Club, carried much of this debate during 1932-1935. Other contributors included Anderson himself, Geoffrey Sawyer, Alan Nicholls, Katherine Susannah Prichard, Guido Baracchi and John Strachy. (34) According to O'Brien, Proletariat

brought the values of the Soviet organised United Front Against War and Fascism to the campus, popularised the image of the U.S.S.R., called for worker-student alliances, criticised the traditional academic disciplines for their irrelevance to social and political questions of the day and flirted with Trotskyism. (35)

The name 'Proletariat' evokes the link between the intellectual and industrial worker.

The above political values strike a chord with those of the 1960s: anti-fascism; worker-student alliances; academic irrelevance to contemporary realities. If one seeks a sense of Left continuity between the radical students of the 1930s and 1960s, there is evidence.

Throughout the 1930s at the University of Melbourne, there continued to be indication of a concerted student campaign for international peace. For example, the International Peace Campaign organised through the SRC and Labour Club. (36) As Nazism grew more strident in Europe and war loomed closer, the prominence given to the peace campaign grew, as exemplified by the large number of anti-war articles given over to Farrago. (37) During the period 1936-1938, some

student political interests closely followed the course of the Spanish Civil War, as it was seen as a war between Fascism and Socialism. Farrago of this period is over-whelmingly sympathetic to the Socialist government. (38) An appeal for funds from the students of the University, from the University peace Group (UPG), was launched, 'in order to provide support to fight the Spanish Fascists'. (39) Not all students were united against the Fascists however. It becomes clear that Right-wing student groups were apologists for the Roman Catholic Church's support of Franco's renegade Fascist regime based in Madrid. At a general meeting of over 700 students in October 1936 on the University campus, deep division of opinion appears over the role of the Church in the Spanish Civil War, and which side it was on. (40) One is reminded of the role the National Civic Council played in Melbourne on Melbourne's three campuses during the Vietnam War. The Spanish Civil War seemed to be cast in a one way or the other commitment: either one supported the Fascists or one supported the Socialists. Several members of the Labour Club actually joined up with the Government forces in Spain, one of whom was Miss Aileen Palmer who joined the International Red Cross and went to Spain. (41) There is a definite international and socialist flavour to the 1930s at the University, with well-known socialists such as Ralph Gibson being prominent. A representative from the Labour Club was sent to the international conference of the Federation of Socialist Students, held at the University of Oxford in 1936. This conference, according to the delegate's report (Mr. Quentin Gibson) was primarily concerned with the rise of Fascism in Germany, Italy and Spain, and the Spanish Civil War. Farrago editorials generally followed a line supportive to the Spanish Socialist government forces, which was a continuing ideological tradition that had its roots in the consciousness raised during the period of the Great Depression earlier. (42)

Organisation of a political nature was not confined to campus boundaries. Throughout 1936 and 1937, the nation's six universities, particularly Melbourne, Sydney, Tasmania and Adelaide, were preparing the way for Australia's first national student organisation. At an

Australian Students' Congress, held to establish the constitutional framework for the unfolding of the National Union of Australian University Students (NUAUS), the first motion passed seemed to express what was on their minds:

This conference of delegates of the six governing student organisations of the six Australian Universities hereby resolves that students should be given complete autonomy in the government of their own affairs. (43)

A following motion called for greater student representation on University bodies. It seems that the concerns of students during the 1930s were not much different to those of the 1960s in some respects, such as student autonomy and student representation.

As the Second World War loomed closer, so the theatres of its operation came nearer. Farrago articles analysing the rise of Japanese militarism appeared in the late 1930s, with a warning that Australia may well have to defend the ideal of freedom closer to home than the bloodied trenches of Spain and Europe. (44)

As with a later student generation's criticism of Australian involvement in Vietnam, some students of the late 1930s expressed opposition to Australian subservience to interests abroad. The arrival of the Second World War in September 1939 sparked the following response:

And now it seems that once more Australia, with her usual altruism, is to be with Britain "to the last man, and the last shilling." It is an altruism the wisdom of which I very much doubt...  
The sensible thing for Australia to do is to keep out of this European dog-fight and put our own house in order; unfortunately, it is too well known that Australia has not the guts to be neutral. (45)

The 1930s represents a decade at the University of Melbourne where important ideas were promoted which were to be both a continuation of the ideas of the 1920s and an example to future decades. These ideas had to do with the critique of the economic effects of capitalism and the emergence of Fascism. Important organisational moves had also been made; for example, Farrago had come under the aegis of the Labour Club; Proletariat appeared; and N.U.A.U.S. was established. Perhaps most importantly, there is evidence of an identification by some students with the industrial proletariat, an aspect of the Worker-Student Alliance (W.S.A.) of the early 1970s in Melbourne.

### The 1940s

During the war years at Melbourne, the strong pro-Socialist, anti-Fascist tradition was continued, and by the time of the mass-demobilisation, 1945-1947, the University geared itself for an influx of ex-servicemen the like of which it has not seen before or since.

One of these ex-servicemen was Stephen Murray-Smith, who had served in an Australian commando unit during the war and had been in signals (cipher). He was to found the literary magazine Overland in 1954 and later joined the staff of the School of Education at the University of Melbourne in 1966 where he became Reader in Education.

Although Murray-Smith was to become disenchanted with political parties, after the Second World War he and his comrades were to continue a tradition of socialist and communist anti-fascism that had its roots in the 1920s.

Of his arrival at the University in 1945 Murray Smith wrote that midst the ebullience there was

some minor consciousness that people like Brian Fitzpatrick and Ralph Gibson had been at the University before us ... We didn't really want to know, nor did we need to know, that there had been a vigorous student life in the 1920s and

1930s, that there had been a gifted generation of student leaders, many or most of them women, during the war years, and that we were flourishing on ancestral honour. (46)

Murray-Smith acknowledged the influence of Geoffrey Serle, a fellow student, in his joining the University Labour Club and the ALP, and of others such as Ian Turner, to join the CPA.

Geoffrey Serle disapproved of the effect of his over-successful conversion, and so he should have. (47)

Serle and Murray-Smith first met at the University in 1941 and both served in Cipher during the war.

In all of this, of course, we were far more derivative than we thought we were. We were building on, and helping to extend, an anti-fascist myth, and we were doing this because we needed to ... I use 'myth' in the sense of the coalescence of real and supposed events to create a new reality...

In the Marxist sense, we were no doubt 'typical', indicative of dynamic and successful forces in existence and coming into being. (48)

Murray-Smith recalls how Ian Turner, Arthur Boyd, Tim Burstall and himself were snowed in at a hut on Mount Buller, and were visited by some Catholic student leaders

who when we sang the 'Internationale' responded with the Fascist youth song, "Giovanezza", which startled me somewhat! (49)

According to Murray-Smith, at its peak around 1947 members of the Labour Club numbered around 450, while within those figures was a tightly-knit Communist Party branch, including some staff members, of over one hundred. (50)

As far as the independence of the CPA branch was concerned, it was apparent that the existence of the branch presented problems for the CPA itself, but 'we were soon pulled into line and given an early lesson in 'democratic centralism' '. (51) In Murray-Smith's view the CPA was 'completely servile to Soviet interests, and by extension so were the rest of us...'

It is reasonable to give considerable attention to the above evidence, as it is of one activist of the period. In addition, Murray-Smith held executive positions in the CPA branch, was President of the Labour Club and Secretary of the Australian Student Labour Federation. (52)

There can be little doubt that persons such as Murray-Smith, Ian Turner, Noel Ebbels, Dick Love and Rex Mortimer, played a significant role in the re-vitalisation of the communist student Left in Melbourne and Australia after the Second World War. Of the harvest of this period, he reflected in 1983 that

No, it has not all gone away with the lager beer, away in *der Ewigkeit*. Ian Turner and Noel Ebbels and Dick Love and Rex Mortimer have gone. Some illusions were exorcised, with much pain. What remains is what was taught: the diversity of minds, the goodness of people, the exchange of love, the delight of life, the inexhaustibility of art, the worthwhileness of trying. (53)

During the post war years, an international and socialist flavour prevailed on campus. These seemed to be special years, with the euphoria of the end of conflict and excitement of re-construction, combined with the fact that the impact of the Cold War had not taken hold, and would not fully take hold until 1950.

There appeared to be close ties between the ex-servicemen and the NUAUS, with the NUAUS 1948 conference being held at the RAAF camp at Somers, Victoria. (54)

At the Eleventh Annual Council of the NUAUS, 1948, the Union decided to affiliate with the International Union of Students (the IUS), based in Prague, and to continue affiliation with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, both of which were Socialist student organisations. (55) The NUAUS sent a delegate, Mr. John Redrup, to the IUS 1947 Council, and a delegate was also sent to the World Youth Festival, 1947, in Prague. (56)

The NUAUS was not the only national student organisation of Leftist tendencies. The Australian Student Labour Federation (of which the Labour Clubs at the universities of Melbourne and Sydney were part), held regular conferences. For example, over one hundred attended a conference of the Federation at Camp Eureka, Yarra Junction, over the Summer vacation, 1947-1948. Prominent in its organisation were Mr. S. Murray-Smith and Mr. Ian Turner. (57) Support was expressed for the Eureka Youth League and co-operation urged with working class youth organisations. As the 1947-8 conference was organised by the University of Melbourne Labour Club, organisation for next year's conference was handed over to the University of Sydney Labour Club. (58)

Activities were not confined to the campuses and Camp Eureka however. A demonstration of Labour Club members and supporters, and members of the Eureka Youth League, was held in Bourke Street, City of Melbourne, in March 1948, to protest against rising food prices. According to the Farrago report, the demonstration was 'broken up by the police using unnecessary force'. (59)

The period 1946-1948 seems to have been a post-war halcyon period for the radical student Left at the University of Melbourne. In 1948, the SRC, Farrago and Melbourne University Magazine (Rex Mortimer, editor), were dominated by the student Left. Throughout 1948, the SRC rejected motions put up by the student Right, particularly by Mr. Ivor Greenwood, against the Labour Club. (60) Farrago seemed to enjoy a wide variety of correspondence and review, with its chief sub-editor Mr. Bob Bessant. Articles analysing the writings of Aldous Huxley, and others, begging the question 'Is Banning the Communist Party Democratic?' were part of a popular Leftist theme. (61)



Perhaps disconcerted at the Left tendency amongst students, the Victorian ALP patronised the establishment of the Australian Labor Party Club in June 1949, with its opening address being provided by Mr. John Cain, former Labor Premier of Victoria. It is also possible that the ALP were sensing the winds of change, and wished to collect student political support that by 1949, had definitely swung to the Right.

The ex-servicemen and women continued a Left tradition at Melbourne which lay in its Humanities schools. This tradition lay in a Left progressive direction, drawing from secular and Christian humanist sources, Fabianism, Marxism and European forms of social democracy. O'Brien believed this to be due in part to the commitment of the Liberal/Conservative establishment to 'careers and ruling society at large, whilst members of the Left came to rule within universities and a great variety of cultural organisations'. (62) O'Brien uses an extensive list of distinguished names who have been or remain associated with the Left at the University of Melbourne as evidence for his argument. (63)

Whilst the Great Depression and the Spanish Civil War had provided 'a cathartic outlet' for idealism and ideology during the 1930s, (64) there had been other influences to shape the University's nationally dominant Left establishment. For example, the influence of Margaret Paul and her founding of the Australian Student Labour Federation in 1941; (65) and the influence of George Paul in the Philosophy Department at the University of Melbourne. (66) In the estimation of Ken Gott, the 1940s were the high point of the Left at the University. (67) The Labour Club, Gott explained, patronised by academics of the Left, had several hundred members who had close ties with the Victorian Branch of the CPA, and there was very little conservative opposition. Accompanying the development of an intellectual and political orthodoxy around the University of Melbourne was the birth of a bohemian community, which served to strengthen that orthodoxy by spreading it beyond the University and into Parkville, Carlton, and into the pubs and cafes. (68) This sub-culture was partly inspired by the presence of ex-servicemen and Women who had been radicalised by years of fighting Fascism and who possessed a political maturity that did much to shape the political

consciousness of students on and off campus. (69) R.A. Gollan in his Revolutionaries and Reformists: Communism and the Australian Labour Movement, 1920-1955 (70), wrote:

Melbourne was the centre of the post-war intellectual radicalism which spread wide across the borders of party. Until the cold war threw up barriers between the communists and others, built by adherence of the communists to the Soviet Union, there was a left community whose ideology comprised an amalgam of socialism and radical nationalism. While there were differences of method and emphasis, these were less important than the areas of agreement. One of the main centres of this community was the U of M. (71)

The tradition had continued when large numbers of academics signed petitions in support of Labor at the 1972, 1974 and 1975 federal elections, while comparable activity for the Liberals was negligible. For example, 1650 Australian academics' names appeared in most Australian states' newspapers on 2 December 1975, the third anniversary of Labor's election to power, and supporting another Labor victory.

The Melbourne Left establishment does not appear to have as strong a counterpart at the University of Sydney. This may be attributable to the philosophical libertarianism of Professor John Anderson which tended to shun orthodoxies. (72)

It was in 1948-1949 that a battle for control of the SRC-Farrago group began in earnest, and it was the Right-wing that won. This was on the wave of anti-Labor sentiment nationally, against the Chifley Labor Government, and the emergence of the Cold War. It appears that the Left lost effective control of the SRC as early as 1948, so that the SRC positions for 1949 were: Alan Jarman, Secretary; Ivor Greenwood, President; Lindsay Thompson and Alan Hunt were also elected. (73) The battle between Left and Right was dominated by verbal clashes between Ivor Greenwood and Ian Turner (himself the immediate-past SRC President). The collapse of the Left was complete, even to the national level. The NUAUS withdrew its membership of the IUS in April 1949. At

a meeting of over one thousand students to debate a motion of no-confidence in the SRC, in June 1949, the motion, put by the Labour Club's Ian Turner, was lost 2-1. (74) An era had closed, a new one began.

Just as the student leaders of the Left had gone on in later life to become academics, school principals, teachers, union leaders, journalists, newspaper editors and politicians, the new set of student leaders were to also follow on with successful careers.

Lindsay Thompson entered the Parliament of Victoria, where he was to become Minister for Education (1967-1979) and Premier of Victoria (1981-1982). (75) Alan Hunt was appointed Minister for Education in Victoria (1979-1982) and led the Liberal Party Opposition in the Victorian Legislative Council (1982- ). (76) Ivor Greenwood entered the Australian Senate and was Attorney General (1971-1972). (77) Alan Jarman entered the House of Representatives in 1966.

#### 1950 - 1966

From 1950 on, stories of disillusionment with Communism began appearing in Farrago, and articles depicting Communism as a threat rather than a possible solution appeared, under a guise of objectivity. (78) Reportage of the activities of the Communist and Labour Clubs waned, and the legitimacy of the student Left retreated to a revitalised ALP Club.

Political activity itself did not die, it changed. Geoffrey Blainey was elected to the editorship of Farrago in 1950, and the Labour Club broadsheet Shop expressed frustration at being denied proper freedom of expression in Farrago, and complained of the 'dictatorship of the SRC/Farrago Liberal bloc'. (79)

The year 1950 saw anti-Communist paranoia reach new heights. Alan Jarman assumed the SRC Presidency, supported by Ivor Greenwood, Lindsay

Thompson and Alan Hunt of the University's Liberal Club. (80) Rowdy student meetings pivoted on 'Communists-under-the-bed', 'Better Dead Than Red' fanaticism. The student-Right was truly cock of the roost. Even to speak in opposition invited enraged reaction. A Dr. Kaiser came to the campus and warned against victimisation of progressive scientists in an address to a meeting of the Labour Club. (81) Dr. Kaiser stated that Australia was heading towards the same witch-hunting popular in the United States, where the Navy, Army and Air Force were gaining a tight grip on the direction of research, but he found it difficult to be heard above interjections. (82)

Two issues arose that captured student political interest. Mr. R.G. Menzies had come to power in 1949 and when he announced the Communist Party Dissolution Bill in late April 1950, there was a general University reaction against it, by academics and students. Professor of Public Law at the University, Professor Freidmann, and four Professors from the University's Political Science Society (Professors Maxwell, Oeser, Wright and Macmahon-Ball) objected to the Bill. (83)

Opposition, with various degrees of sincerity, spread across the Labour, ALP and Liberal Clubs. Farrago, under Geoffrey Blainey's editorship, pointedly remarked in a March 1950 editorial that

The banning of a political party is a shocking betrayal of democratic principles. The time has come to oppose the vicious machinations of the Liberal gang. (84)

In the same month, Manning Clark and Alan Marshall spoke to campus meetings against the Bill in the following terms:

One thing I am certain of - truth and justice are on your side (Manning Clark);  
Ideas cannot be banned. You cannot suppress the thoughts of the people (Allan Marshall). (85)

The Liberal Club was itself split on the Bill, tossing between pragmatism and democracy, so the SRC eventually took a position in May, 1950, after several hours of debate, to the extent that 'a letter be sent to Mr. Menzies that this SRC opposes the Communist Party Dissolution Bill because it would restrict academic freedom of enquiry'.  
(86)

A sign of the times had been the folding (or withdrawal into secrecy) of the University of Melbourne Branch of the CPA in 1949. A Royal Commission into Communist activities in Victoria reported to the Victorian Government in May, 1950. The Commissioner, Sir Charles Lowe, exonerated the University of Melbourne 'from charges made from time to time since the war by politicians and journalists that it was a hot bed of Communism'; (87) further, 'There is no evidence before me whatsoever of any teaching or indoctrination of youth by Communism at the University of Melbourne'. (88) The radical student Left was under attack, and forced to retreat.

The extent to which the Liberals controlled Farrago and the SRC was displayed in the Liberal's reportage of the Labour Club's attitude to the Dissolution Bill. That the Labour Club would oppose the Bill may be taken for granted, at least at first examination; however, the Labour Club reaction was put under the head-line 'Labour Club Impotent', a statement attributed to Alan Jarman, SRC President, who went on to say:

Few people other than Labour Club members will deny that the Labour Club policy in this University has been closely akin to that of the Communist Party. However, despite the fact that Mr. Menzies branded it as Communist during his visit last year, I do not think the government will waste its time or energy endeavoring to ban such an impotent organisation. Two years ago the Communists controlled the SRC. When it became apparent they were using their position to further their political aims, students voted them out.  
(89)

Apparently, even if Jarman was correct, Communists are not allowed to further their political aims in a 'democracy'. A meeting of three hundred students, addressed by Vincent Buckley, strongly opposed the Bill, (90) and other than a general meeting to protest rising cafeteria prices, a meeting roused by the oratory of George Lees, the year seemed relatively quiet, except for one other issue, also initiated by the Menzies government.

A second string to the Menzies anti-Communist campaign was the re-direction of student activities, not only towards the Liberal Club and away from the Labour Club, but out of student politics altogether and into military training with the Menzies Training Scheme. Conscription in other words.

The way had seemed well prepared. The student Left was out of power; the Dissolution Bill, whilst not being as successful as the Government might have hoped, had certainly raised a rabid anti-Communist paranoia of very satisfying dimensions; and best of all, possible opposition was unlikely to be strong from an ALP being torn apart by Groupers and the road to the split of 1955. But the influence of the one remaining Left movement, the peace movement, was, if not growing, at least intact. At a packed peace rally in Wilson Hall, University of Melbourne, Professor Fletcher of Cambridge, Mass., told his audience that those who pressed for continuation of the Cold War argued that arms production ensures full production and employment. The Professor was critical of this argument, stressing that important housing, education and welfare programs had been put into second place due to the above argument, and economic prosperity could be just as well achieved and improved by a re-direction of defence and economic policy. (91)

Whether it was because of Professor Fletcher's analysis or simply that students preferred to prepare for less myopic careers, remains unclear, but what is clear is that there was all-around opposition to the Menzies Training Scheme from the Liberal, Labour and ALP clubs. President of the Labour Club, John Clendinnen asserted that

There is only one line of aggression we must fear and that is economic aggression by the U.S.A. (92)

Opposition also came from the five other states' university student bodies. (93) But national service did come in, and when it did it was not opposed in principle, only in its interference with study.

Throughout the 1950s, with immigration high on the national political agenda, student journalists took to their pens with longish articles condemning the bi-partisan 'White Australia Policy', and efforts were made to use NUAUS to destroy the policy. (94) Consistent support was also evident throughout the 1950s to recognise the Aborigines as citizens and to improve the lot of Aboriginal education with programs for scholarships. It was to be a long battle. Abschol only took off in the 1960s and Aborigines had to wait until 1967 to be fully recognised as citizens.

Even so, the issues of the early 1950s were issues that the radical students of the late 1960s were themselves to take up: racism, militarist aggression, conscription. The 1950s, if quiet, were not dead.

By 1955, Peter Costigan and Leonard Radic, co-Farrago editors, editorialised on the mediocrity of the SRC, and that it debated unimportant issues:

The SRC, this nation, is slowly dying in a grip of mediocrity. The SRC has fallen into a sad state of lethargy and disrepair. (95)

The same issue of Farrago carried a large article on the importance of Moral Re-armament. Conservatism reigned.

Nevertheless, during the 1950s it was more active politically than is often thought, even though relatively quiet. Students at the Universities of Melbourne and Sydney had been very active in defeating

the Menzies inspired anti-Communist Party measures. There was also the constant struggle against compulsory military training. (96)

In 1953, Farrago had caused a stir in the army and daily press by criticising national service training programs in which University of Melbourne students were involved, as a waste of time. (97)

A successful campaign against the 'Two wongs don't make a white' mentality of both major political parties, also raised student political awareness. In 1955 when the 'White Australia' debate was at its height, the University of Melbourne SRC took a firm stand against the policy which was based on an assumption of racial inferiority and employed a colour bar. (98)

An attitude of 1955 was revealed by the frustrated and unsuccessful efforts of the editors of the Melbourne University Magazine, Brian Buckley and Evan Jones, for a 'political article'. This was the period of 'The Split' within the ALP (with Dr. H. V. Evatt, the Federal ALP leader; the breakaways, the Democratic Labor Party), precipitated by 'the Movement', a Roman Catholic-based anti-Communist organisation led by B.A. Santamaria under the patronage of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. Daniel Mannix.

The editors revealed some of the deep division between students, and

had foreseen the probability of some unfriendliness amongst the Australian Labor Party fraternity. (99)

As 'a last resort' the editors had approached Bill Ginnane of Catholic Action (a University of Melbourne student group), who had

also decided that the recent political issues could not be relevantly or conveniently discussed in his contribution.  
(100)



The intense bitterness between student Leftists of the late 1960s, early 1970s, and campus DLP oriented student Clubs, has its origins in the student political life of the mid-1950s.

The concerns of the editors did not only relate to the political tensions between students that resulted from 'The Split' of 1955. There emerges an attitude of discomfort concerning the place of the University in society generally and the rift between the Arts and Sciences, a problem of curriculum surely, and one which has been constantly addressed through to the present day. (101)

Just as students of the 1980s looked back to the 1960s as watershed years of student involvement, students of the 1950s referred to earlier years in an effort to explain the relative quietude of their own era.

When one comes to examine the problem, one finds that implicit in all the recent cries of apathy is a comparison of today with the immediate post-war period, probably the University's most brilliant episode.

It must be remembered, however, that this was an abnormal period and it produced unusual personalities and events. The immediate pre-war period was also one of brilliance, chiefly because students had to make decisions of belief - Fascism was on the march, Spain was overcome, the Jews were being hounded, democracy was crumbling. The post-war period was, on the other hand, one of hope - Fascism had been destroyed and ex-servicemen flocked to the University; there was a breath of a brave new world being built.

Since then, conditions have become more normal. Many of the post-war generations have built their little private brave new nests - a home, a family life in a peaceful community without the fearsome stench of battle. (102)

As if to put into practice the ideal of a 'peaceful community', constructive efforts were made to reduce the realities of the Cold War and national xenophobia. Professor Wright (Physiology, University of Melbourne) made a practical suggestion whilst visiting Moscow in 1955 by proposing one per cent reduction in global defence spending to fund international exchange visits to promote understanding. (103) The NUAUS also organised a

delegation of students to South East Asian nations in 1956, in order to enhance good-will. (104) The consistent line of the MUM throughout the Cold War period was one of 'peaceful coexistence', though readers may have been relieved to analyse the end of the Cold War in a MUM article in 1956. (105) The student politics of the period often revolved around electorate politics engaged in by the University's recent graduates, for example Phillip Lynch (Liberal Party), Barry Jones (ALP) and Austin Dowling (ALP) (106), and conjecture on the future of the ALP and DLP.

From a reading of MUM for the period 1955-1960s, it is apparent that those sentiments of students that appeared a little oppressed by the period found outlet in the pages of MUM, and other magazines.

We "dips our lid" to three struggling Australian publications, "Meanjin", "Voice", and "Overland", all of which are slowly triumphing over depressed popular literary standards and community apathy.

All three have been accused of left-wing bias. But in the face of the normal intellectual sterility from the conservative elements in the community, the only alternative to magazines with a left-wing bias is no magazines at all. (107)

The literature of the mid-1950s is outstanding. For example, the MUM of 1957 (Graeme Kemelfield, Chris Wallace-Crabbe, eds.) contains well-researched and reflective articles on the 'Let A Hundred Flowers Bloom' movement in China and a provocative analysis of racism in the United States, alongside an anthropological study of the Aboriginal Australians of Central Australia. This pleasing trend continued into the late 1950s. In 1957, a MUM Editorial reflected on how the history of that magazine mirrored the nature of the student population:

In fact, by 1940, and livened with the return of ex-servicemen to the Shop a few years later, M.U.M. began to assume a decidedly cosmopolitan air. The issues which appeared between 1944 and 1950 attained Olympian heights in comparison with their predecessors ... In addition, such famous personalities as George Orwell and Bertrand Russell

were guest contributors to the pages of M.U.M. during these years.

Gradually the ferment died down, and M.U.M. entered upon quieter, more reflective waters. If we have lost, to a degree, the distinctive sharp edge of social criticism, and the intellectual enthusiasm which characterised the editions of the immediate post-war years, we trust that we are not altogether becalmed. (108)

There is evidence that the 1950s was a period of relative quiet, and the following brief story is quite suited to the Cold War flavour of the period:

#### Pinnacle of Achievement:

Without doubt the outstanding academic event of the past year has been the brilliantly conceived and executed coup at Russell Street. Even for the unfortunate majority of us who were unable to see the Soviet flag flying on the Police Headquarters radio tower, having to rely on reports in Farrago, The Sun News Pictorial and such publications, the memory lingers deliciously: a red-letter day for University prestige and an act delightful in its implications. After all, it is our duty to uphold iconoclasm while we may, before we too are caught in the sluggish tide. There is plenty of room for clowning. (109)

And so whilst important shifts signalled the end of what was, in the main, the morally based reformism of the 1950s and early 1960s, and heralded a more militant approach to public student politics, we may reasonably conclude that at the University of Melbourne, student activists had created a strong tradition of political activism by the 1920s, and this is evident for the entire period, the 1920s to the 1960s. This activism expressed itself in a variety of ways, with the public political climate being a crucial factor in determining the nature of the activism. In so many ways, the 1950s and early 1960s represent a bridge to the period of the mid 1960s to the early 1970s. After all, in the 1950s, in the climate of the Cold War, to even oppose the Communist Party Dissolution Bill could be seen as good as labelling oneself a 'Red'; to oppose the Bill and other programs, such as conscription, was to adopt a politically activist stance. Whether

one terms such a stance as 'radical' is debatable. Ian Turner's position was radical, but how representative was he? We may conclude from this Chapter that the 1950s was an active period in student politics in Melbourne, but that due to a rapidly changing world political and tertiary education scene, the 1950s may now be seen as a relatively quiet period, and could not, in the general sense, be regarded as a widespread, radically activist period, when compared to the late 1960s.

In Australia the break-down of the cold war consensus had not come until the sixties. Australia had had its Petrov affair as America had had its Rosenbergs, but there was no ameliorative Bertrand Russell for Australia as in Britain. The Communist Party of Australia seemed to resist the winds of change that blew from 1956 on, implacable behind its trade union bulwarks.

Nevertheless, the early sixties saw issues such as those above gain increased support from a rapidly expanding tertiary student population. The formation of 'Student Action' at the University of Melbourne in 1961 was an expression of preparedness to take independent initiatives in the national and international political arena. The assumption made was that students had a special role in society as a social conscience. This was shown when, at the election campaign meetings of Calwell and Menzies, students were urged to form picket lines and organise demonstrations 'to force politicians to act like statesmen'. (110) Such self-perceptions of the early sixties survived over the years and served to self-enfranchise students to use demonstrations as a political weapon. (111) Peter Wilenski (President, University of Sydney SRC, 1962) commented at the time that there was a trend towards politicisation which was inevitable and that NUAUS should pursue this course. (112) The trend was instanced in Sydney in March 1960. The day after the Sharpville massacre in South Africa, 1960, a large demonstration of unionists and students occurred which was broken up by police. A week later another demonstration resulted in nine arrests.

By 1962, students' activities were being described in The Bulletin as representing the 'end of apathy' of Australian tertiary students. (113)

Student leaders on the Left at Melbourne throughout 1960-1 reinforced opposition to racism, resulting in demonstrations against South Africa and Portugal. 'Student Action' brought racial questions, especially the white Australia policy, before the public eye at the Federal elections of 1961. (114)

In July 1964, well before student protests really got active in Melbourne, traditional differences continued to be clear. For example, in July 1964, B.A. Santamaria (President of the National Civic Council) attacked Farrago on his Sunday television program Point of View as being 'depraved' but did not specify what was depraved. John Delmer, Farrago editor, replied that 'This wouldn't be the first time that Mr. Santamaria has labelled those views with which he disagrees as depraved'. (115)

The greatest changes were to come later that year, with the announcement in November 1964 of the Australian Government's intention to introduce a selective conscription system, and the April 1965 announcement that Australia would send a battalion of troops to Vietnam. The Communist Party came out of its isolation. A broadly-based movement developed through youth-based groups such as Youth Campaign Against Conscription (YCAC), and the Vietnam Action Committee (VAC). A coalition of women's groups, youth groups, businessmen and the established 'peace' movement, which was a coalition of communists and Leftist ALP members, blended into a very confident movement leading up to the November 1966 elections. The student Left had looked forward to a Labor victory very much and had worked incredibly hard for it. The defeat of the ALP led by Arthur Calwell signified a new phase in the growth of student radicalism because, after a period of close co-operation with the old Left, student and youth groups made a decisive break with the older groupings as a result of the failure to win the election. The defeat either shocked politically active students into apathy or pushed them towards militancy. (116)

The disillusionment of many Melbourne students with the institutionalised processes of change may therefore be traced to the defeat of the Calwell election campaign in 1966. This defeat produced a

disillusionment amongst students active in the campaign, especially regarding parliamentary channels for change. (117) Students who formed hard core groups such as SDS and Labor clubs experienced a radicalisation both organisational and ideological. Organisationally, there was a tendency towards illegal and non-compliant attitudes towards civil and military authorities. Michael Hamel-Green, a Melbourne SDS leader, pinpointed the change:

That same qualitative change that had already taken place in the oppositional movements of Europe and America had begun to take place in Australia too: a change from a politics of harmless and impotent dissent that merely serves to give false credibility to the purely formal nature of our democracy...to active resistance that really begins to threaten the Government's hegemony. (118)

A radicalisation of ideology was epitomised by the Monash and La Trobe Labor Clubs, which were identified with a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology and confrontationist strategies.

The growth in militancy was also hardened by experiences in demonstrations. The violence at the anti-LBJ demonstrations in 1966 came as a shock to students' sense of earnestness as the 'conscience of society' and as citizens whose voice would be respected. A new militant style on a large scale had begun. (119) Police-student violence revealed to students the costs of attacking deep-rooted social institutions. The following extract from a pamphlet produced after the anti-LBJ demonstrations by Monash University students summarised the experiences of many active student activists.

While I was in the cell a policeman - wearing plain clothes - came into the cell. He pushed me away from the door further into the cell. He held me against the wall and asked me what I was studying. I didn't reply. He then bashed my head against the wall of the cell. He asked me again. Before I had a chance to reply he bashed my head against the wall even harder. I then said I was studying for a science degree. Then he pushed me away, saying if I had said I was studying to

be an idiot he would have knocked me unconscious...  
(120)

Although the all too few seasoned student campaigners were deeply sceptical of the baton-on-the-head-become-a-revolutionary perception of a radical student's ideological maturation, the fact was that it occasionally worked, but only as a starting point. Violent experiences had to be either preceded or proceeded by study, reflection and discussion, if a student was to become an effective activist.

Even though it was obvious to all but the most naive that confrontation with mounted, foot and plain clothed police was going to be initiated by one side or the other, when it did occur, there was always horror and dismay that it should have. The result was always a self-justification and reinforcement of radical convictions. After all, the defeat of Calwell had also represented a lesson: the defeat of a form of protest politics which was not adequate to rid Australian society of a political problem so deep and fundamental as Vietnam and conscription. The defeat may have been an indication that the majority of Australian people were so insecure, that they were easy objects for cynical Liberal politicians' cries of 'defence of our security', the 'threat from the North' and the 'Red Menace'. The question suggested itself to some students: what kind of a society, what quality of social existence, made such aggressive and imperialistic forms of 'national defence' such a necessity? The asking of such a fundamental question by many Australian students, initiated by the frustration of electoral defeat, split students away from the more established peace movement and the ALP.

In tying the essential elements of this Chapter together, what do we have?

The Chapter set out to establish the identity of a tradition of radical politics amongst the students of the University of Melbourne, from generation to generation. We saw the influence of Ralph Gibson,

Guido Baracchi and Brian Fitzpatrick during the 1920s and 1930s, and their passing on of a radical tradition to students of the late 1940s, students such as Ian Turner, Ken Gott and Stephen Murray-Smith, who themselves appeared to take on the task of passing on the Leftist tradition. This thesis is, in some ways, itself an expression of the ideological tradition. The issues also appear to have a common theme: opposition to conscription; anti-Fascism; anti-racism; freedom of political expression; and, eventually, disillusion with an orthodox Communist 'party-line'.

The student Left at the University of Melbourne in the 1930s, late 1940s and early 1950s, defined itself to the Australian working class in a certain way. The decline in the percentage of the Australian workforce engaged in manufacturing had not yet taken hold by the late 1940s and 1950s and there was a sizable working class, an industrial proletariat!

We may see also however, that the early 1950s were a quieter period, but were continuous with, the late 1940s. The mid 1950s were a point of break for the Left generally. In 1955 had come the DLP Split, a break for the Social Democrats and for the Irish-Australian working class. In 1956 had come the invasion of Hungary by the USSR, and disillusionment within the CPA and elements within the student Left regarding an orthodox 'party line'. There began too, the years of electoral wilderness for the ALP.

By the early 1960s it was clear that student political life was coming to have a higher public profile. The Cold war was drawing to a close, and throughout the early 1960s, the student Left was to slowly become more significant, particularly by 1964, with conscription in the air. This growth became part of a movement of student activism around this issue, based around a loose organisational structure which came to be called the New Left, made up of numerous youth, worker and student organisations. It reached its height of power in 1971-1972 with the arrival of the Whitlam Government in December 1972.



There are obvious differences between the student political activity of the 1920s-1966 and that represented by the period roughly beginning in 1966, the year of departure for many activists in trying to change political reality through the ALP. For a start, to compare the student politics of the 1920s and 1966 introduces the aspect of scale. As seen, the 1920s' student activists were a small group of students of radical socialist orientation who established a tradition of Leftist ideology that continued on a somewhat larger scale during the 1930s, and which had grown for reasons already outlined in this Chapter. The post-Second World War period of communist and socialist student political activity was much larger, unusual, unexpected and short-lived, characteristics of the period of activism 1966-1972.

Due to the transitory nature of student life and other factors outlined above, the 1950s and early 1960s were comparatively quiet compared to the late 1940s, although Chapter One was able to evidence quite a strong student political life during the 1950s. By 1966, with the expansion of tertiary education well under way (see Chapter Three); important shifts in student political strategy mentioned above; and the emergence of highly controversial issues such as conscription and the Vietnam War, the sheer numerical scale of the radical student political movement of 1966-1972 was set to put into stark contrast previous periods of student radicalism.

Chapter One has been able to show that historical factors were an important influence on the emergence of the 1966-1972 period of student radicalism in Australia, and this has further supported the hypothesis of this thesis.

Footnotes for Chapter One

1. Geoffrey Blainey, A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1957.
2. Ibid., p. 171.
3. Alan Hunt, 'Political Clubs in the University', Melbourne University Magazine, University of Melbourne SRC, 1949, p. 54.
4. G. Baracchi, 'What's New Professor Derham?', MUM, 1970, pp. 66-71.
5. Ibid., Also, MUM 1920-1929, LTU Borchardt Library, passim; B. Fitzpatrick, 'Student Life: The Twenties', MUM, Spring, mcmlxi, pp. 10-16.
6. P. O'Brien, The Saviours: An Intellectual History of the Left in Australia, Primary Education Publishing Pty. Ltd., 41 Rowena Parade, Richmond, 1977.
7. Ibid., p. 74.
8. H. Dow (ed.), Memories of Melbourne University: Undergraduate Life in the Years Since 1917, Hutchinson Group, Richmond, Victoria, 1983, p. xiii.
9. Ibid., p. 8.
10. Ibid, p. 9.
11. Ibid., pp. 50-51.
12. Ibid., p. 12.
13. Ibid., p. 54.
14. MUM, V 18, no. 2, August 1924, p. 147, pp. 180-182, pp. 210-211.
15. MUM, V. 19, no. 2, September 1925, p. 81.
16. Dow, op.cit., p. xiii.
17. Ibid., p. xvi.
18. Farrago, University of Melbourne SRC, 17 September 1929.
19. Ibid.
20. Farrago, 1925-1929 passim.
21. Ibid.

22. J. Spigelman, 'Student Activism in Australia', Vestes, Vol. 11, 1968.
23. Ibid., p. 112.
24. Ibid.
25. Farrago, 1 July 1930.
26. Ibid., 8 July 1930, 15 July 1930, 29 July 1930.
27. Farrago, 9 September 1930.
28. Farrago, 21 May 1931.
29. Ibid.
30. Farrago, 28 October 1930.
31. Farrago, 11 June 1931.
32. P. O'Brien, op.cit., pp. 51-54.
33. Ibid.; Proletariat, Organ of University of Melbourne Labour Club, 1932 - October, 1935.
34. Proletariat, University of Melbourne Archives and Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne.
35. O'Brien, op.cit., p.98.
36. Farrago, 21 September 1937.
37. Ibid.; also 30 July 1936.
38. Ibid.; also 13 August 1936.
39. Farrago, 22 October 1936.
40. Farrago, 13 October 1936.
41. Farrago, 22 October 1936.
42. Ibid.; also 23 March 1927.
43. Farrago, 17 March 1937.
44. Farrago, 2 August 1938.
45. D. B. Pitt, 'Australia and Neutrality', MUM, Vol. 32, September 1939, p. 15.
46. Dow, op.cit., p. 121.

47. Ibid., p. 122
48. Ibid., p. 123
49. Ibid., p. 124
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., p. 131.
53. Ibid., p. 136.
54. Farrago, 5 March 1948.
55. Ibid.; also 16 March 1948.
56. Ibid.
57. Dow, op.cit., p. 136.
58. Farrago, 16 March 1948.
59. Ibid.; also 20 April 1948; 23 March 1948.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. O'Brien, ibid., p.67.
63. Ibid.
64. A. Nichollas, 'Student Life: The Thirties (...And in these Days too)', MUM, pp.9-22.
65. O'Brien, op.cit., pp.77-79.
66. Ibid.
67. K. Gott, 'Student Life: The Forties...That Other R.S.L.', MUM, pp.23-27.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. R.A. Gollan, Revolutionaries and Reformists: Communism and the Australian Labour Movement, 1920-1955, ANU Press, Canberra, 1975.
71. Ibid., p.196.

72. D. Horne, The Education of Young Donald, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1967, pp.199-233. J.C.C. Smart, 'The Philosophical Andersonians', Quadrant, Vol.20, Jan. 1976, pp.6-10.
73. Farrago, 22 June 1949.
74. Ibid., 29 June 1949.
75. Who's Who In Australia, Herald and Weekly Times, Melbourne, 1983, p. 838.
76. Ibid., p. 438.
77. Who's Who In Australia, Herald and Weekly Times, Melbourne, 1974, p. 442.
78. Farrago, 6 July 1949, 14 March 1950, 22 March 1950.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid.
81. Farrago, 15 March 1950.
82. Ibid.
83. Farrago, 17 May 1950, 3 May 1950.
84. Farrago, 29 March 1950.
85. Farrago, 22 March 1950.
86. Farrago, 29 March 1950, 10 May 1950.
87. A Royal Commission into Communist Activities in Victoria, 1950. Extracts of Report as reported in Farrago 10 May 1950.
88. Ibid.
89. Farrago, 3 May 1950.
90. Ibid.
91. Farrago, 26 April 1950.
92. Farrago, 5 April 1950.
93. Ibid.
94. Farrago, 10 May 1955.
95. Farrago, 29 March 1955.

96. These same students were often also associated with the post-war radicalism of the returned soldiers. See Blainey, op.cit., pp 181-183, 198-199.
97. Farrago, 24 June 1953.
98. Farrago, 10 May 1955
99. MUM, 1955, pp. 5-6.
100. Ibid.
101. MUM, 1956 p. 6.
102. Ibid., p. 8.
103. Ibid., pp. 27-29.
104. Ibid., pp. 41-45.
105. Ibid., pp. 78-84.
106. Ibid., p. 9.
107. Ibid., p. 11.
108. MUM, 1957, p. 6.
109. Ibid., p. 10.
110. Farrago, 6 October 1961, p. 2.
111. Honi Soit (University of Sydney SRC), 13 March 1962, suggested that only sensational activity could capture the necessary attention in the press.
112. Peter Wilenski, in Honi Soit, 6 March 1962; 17 April 1962; 11 September 1962; 5 March 1965.
113. Peter Coleman, 'The Student Generation', The Bulletin, 11 August 1962.
114. J. Spigelman, op.cit., p. 112.
115. Farrago, 27 July 1964.
116. For an analysis of this period, R. Gordon and W. Osmond, The Australian New Left, Heinemann, Australia, 1970, p. 25.
117. Michael Hamel-Green, 'The Resisters: A History of the Anti-Conscription Movement', in Peter King (ed.), Australia's Vietnam: Australia in the Second Indo-China War, George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983, pp. 106-117. R. Gordon and W. Osmond, 'An Overview

of the Australian New Left', in R. Gordon (ed.), The Australian New Left: Critical Essays and Strategy, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970, pp. 25-6.

118. Michael Hamel-Green, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
119. LBJ Lyndon Baines Johnson visited Australia at the request of Prime Minister Harold Holt in October 1966.
120. From a statement by Albert Langer, 'Facts about the Anti-LBJ Demonstration', pamphlet, November 1966, authorised by Monash University SRC, p. 3.

CHAPTER TWO

LA TROBE UNIVERSITY, 1967-1973

Chapter Two represents a departure from Chapters One and Three in that it is not divided into sections. This is because the Chapter is written as a continuous narrative, with a strong interpretative flavour throughout. There are no formal conclusions at the end of the Chapter. Formal conclusions that relate to Chapter Two will be found in Chapter Four where the thesis' conclusions are brought together.

The intention of Chapter Two is to tell the story of one Australian university as a typical example of the growth and decline of a campus radical student movement of the period under discussion.



From its inception in 1967, La Trobe University had student debate and political action. In 1967, the main debate was the organisation of the university itself. The University had been conceptualised around ten colleges, each with their own resident academics, students and facilities, as at the 'new' English universities such as Sussex, Lancaster and Warwick. (1) Those against this concept preferred centralised student facilities and fewer college restrictions. Though debate was lively it was peaceful, and the 'college concept' was eventually abandoned. This change was regarded by students as a victory against a conservative plan for Victoria's third university.

The history of the conflict over the two concepts for the University has been well documented. Marshall's thesis 'La Trobe University: The Vision and the Reality', concluded that:

In a nation which historically viewed the university as a vocational training institution and little else, the setting up of a conservative interpretation of the collegiate philosophy was bound to attract an apathetic if not hostile response. (2)

At La Trobe, because of its initial student enrolment (about 500) there was a closeness and camaraderie amongst students and many staff that lasted into the 1970s. This close-knittedness within the new University's community was also a product of the isolation of the campus from the cultural and intellectual life of Carlton and Parkville. As a result, students at La Trobe had to generate their own amusements, such as the extra special 'Smoke Nights' organised by Christopher Oates, Michael Gay and others. These functions comprised the presentation of satirical sketches on religion, politics, sex, and academic life. Seats were always highly sought.

The first edition of Rabelais, the student newspaper, came off the press in June 1967, and this gave an idea of the student mind at that time. The editors brought to the attention of undergraduates the presence of Nationwide Food Services on campus, a subsidiary company of

the vast North American based company, the International Telephone and Telegraph Company. (3) The publication of this presence was a criticism of the company and an appeal to students not to support Nationwide remaining on campus. The criticism of Nationwide was on the basis of poor quality food, but the real effort of a small group of students to have Nationwide removed was because it was viewed as representative of insupportable, exploitative, multi-national capitalism.

Due to student action, including a mass refusal to eat the food, students won the struggle against Nationwide and Glenn College provided its own catering when Nationwide did not have its contract renewed.

Another early issue for students interested in the governance of the University was the composition of the La Trobe University Council, the supreme governing body of the University, of which the Vice-Chancellor was the chief-executive officer. As early as July 1967, scarcely four months into the University's first year, Rabelais was making public the close relationship between the world of 'big business' and the governance of La Trobe by the Council. (4) Rabelais carried a front page title 'This edition was sponsored by ICIANZ', a reference to the then Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn. Glenn was chairman of ICIANZ and a pillar of Melbourne's business world. This association, and the positions of other Council members on company boards of management, were to become corner-stones of radical students' protests at the University.

By early third term other aspects were occurring to students. There was the identification of retired military personnel in high administrative positions at La Trobe. Students were asking 'why?'. The most obvious presence was that of Major-General T.S. Taylor (Ret.) the then Registrar of the University. Students generally found the Registrar to be kindly and capable. Still, it was wondered why an ex-military person was thought to be the best person for the job. Universities were, after all, (or so students were told), seats of learning in the best liberal-humanist tradition; places of tranquil reflection and objective debate.

The administrative staff at LTU who impinge on this thesis were: Dr. David Myers (Vice-Chancellor); Major-General Thomas Sydney Taylor (Ret.), Registrar; Mr. D. A. C. Griffiths (Academic Registrar); Mr. Frank Barnes (Business Manager); Mr. Borchardt (Chief Librarian), and Mr. D. N. Kennard (Assistant Registrar).

Myers' background was in engineering. Educated at Sydney Church of England Grammar School, the University of Sydney and New College, University of Oxford, Myers held a string of senior engineering and academic positions prior to successfully applying for the Vice-Chancellorship at the yet to be built La Trobe University. These included: Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, University of British Columbia, Canada; Professor and Dean of Electrical Engineering, University of Sydney; President of Australian Institute of Engineers; and Chief of the Division of Electrotechnology, CSIRO. Just the person to build a new university, and also a member of the Melbourne Club. (5) Probably not, however, the most ideal person to understand the vast social and political causes and implications of the student protests of the late 1960s.

Major General Thomas Sydney Taylor (Ret.) was raised in England where he attended the Bournemouth School and later, the Royal Military College, Sandhurst. Taylor had a distinguished military career, serving as a senior officer in India, Malaya, Assam and Japan, being decorated with the M.V.O. and M.C. In Australia, Taylor became the Deputy Chief of General Staff 1960-1964; he was appointed Commandant of the Australian Staff College, Victoria (1957-1960), and Director of Military Training in 1960. Taylor was made a Commander of the British Empire in 1963 and his preferred club was the Naval and Military. (6)

With such a background, the Registrar's Department was assured of being well run in terms of being, well, well run. However, the appointment of this distinguished officer may seem out of place in a university. Or, considering the changing roles of universities and

their intimacy with the technology of capitalism, perhaps the appointment was thought a necessity.

Others, senior in the administrative hierarchy, also had important roles to play.

Mr. David Griffith (Academic Registrar) was also of military background, although details were difficult to unearth. A quiet man, his exact role was a source of mystery to La Trobe activist students, and this was an aspect of the administration staff that presented itself often: for all the student allegations against the administration, students were often lacking in a detailed understanding of who was who in the administration, and what precise functions the staff performed. For example, Ms Donne Sherwin, assistant to the Vice-Chancellor, was thought by the Maoists to double as an intelligence operative, but there was never any evidence available. However, Sherwin, as well as others in the Registrar's Department such as Mr. Ralph Gallagher and Mr. Desmond Kennard, were invariably well primed with prepared statements at disciplinary hearings of the Proctorial Board during 1971 and 1972, and at related sittings of the Heidelberg Magistrate's Court and the Supreme Court of Victoria. This, however, on reflection, may be seen as officials merely 'doing their jobs'.

Most administrators managed to stay in the shadows however. Mr. Frank Barnes, as Business Manager, an important post in a growing university, succeeded in remaining on excellent terms with just about everyone and perhaps this factor assisted him when he was appointed Manager of the Sydney Opera House in 1973. Another such person who was able to relate to students was Mr. Bob Seagrave from the Publications Department. Not all were so lucky. For example, Mr. Dietrich Borchardt, who left Germany in the late 1930s and worked his way up from farm labourer in New Zealand to be Chief Librarian of what was then, and is now, quite a fine library, was briefly tagged as a 'fascist'. Whether this was because of student xenophobia remains unclear but the tag, on reflection, was inappropriate. (7)

Some of the literature on modern university administration helps to explain the administration of LTU during this period.

In a recent book by Peter Scott (Editor, Times Higher Education Supplement 1984), The Crisis of the University (8) details the history of the university from the middle ages through to the 'liberal universities' of today. Scott depicted the change as a gradual whittling away of the democratic independence of universities, or, as Scott puts it, 'the separation of intellectual authority from the political power on which this depended'. (9)

That quality of standing apart from society, of transcendence in both time and space ... in the cause of a universal intellectual tradition, which had been an important feature of the liberal university, was very much eroded in the 30 years of explosive university growth after 1945. Universities became almost entirely instrumental institutions, losing their semi-spiritual quality ... The preoccupations of the university came to be directly influenced by the state, the economy and civil society ... The basis for the intellectual independence and authority of the university was undermined by the imperialism of the state. (10)

In the middle ages it was the students who hired and fired the teachers. In the twentieth century it was the State, one consequence being that the modern university became a bureaucratic institution constructed of rules and procedures. The university has long ceased to be an academic community, except in vacuous rhetoric, and instead is a shared bureaucratic environment, where democratic principles such as 'academic freedom' are circumscribed by the demand of a global political economy for hermetically sealed vocational specialisations.

The implications of these important shifts have been felt in Australian universities and are reflected in their distribution of power. Australian academic Dr. Grant Harman has observed of Australian universities that since 1969 changes in the distribution of effective

power in the university system have had noticeable effects on university operations and academic decision-making. Harman concluded the

These trends work to increase the size and importance of central administrations and, since the central bodies are increasingly held responsible for the activities of component units, they respond by claiming and exercising greater control over them. (11)

It is useful to keep these trends in mind when considering the role of the administration at LTU from 1967 - 1972.

It is hardly surprising that it was to be the LTU academics' positions on the LTU Council that proved to be significant during the crisis of 1972, rather than their role on the LTU Academic Board.

For the academics at LTU, there were a selection who came in for special attention from Leftist students. Some of these academics sat on the LTU Council during the period 1967 - 1972.

Professors Wolfsohn (Politics), Goldman (Education), Topsom (Organic Chemistry), Thornton (Zoology), Burley (Economics), Whitehead (Economics), Veliz (Sociology), and Rydon (Politics), were all viewed as being 'conservative' by the Maoists, and all came in for criticism for being reactionary, or were quite inappropriately labelled as 'fascists'. Of this group most or all were members of a group called the Society of Professors, a self-styled organisation that set itself apart from the run-of-the-mill academic roll call. It was Professors Wolfsohn, Goldman, Topsom and Thornton who served on the LTU Council during 1967 and 1972, and their political strategy was consistently not to give an inch away to the radical students.

Essentially, the University Council was concerned with administrative, financial and political matters. The Academic Board naturally concentrated on academic matters. Although on all matters the

Council had the final say, in practice Council would rarely query an academic decision of the Academic Board.

La Trobe had been built largely as a result of recommendations in the Martin Report of 1964. (12) One conclusion of the report was that 'it was both realistic and useful to regard education as a form of national investment in human capital'. (13) The chairman, Leslie Martin, was appropriately chosen. Professor Sir Leslie Martin held the following positions at the time:

Chairman, Australian Universities Commission, 1958-1966.

Commissioner, Atomic Energy Commission, 1958-1968.

Chairman, Defence Department's Defence Research and Development Policy Committee, 1964-1968.

Director, I.B.M. (Aust.) Ltd. (14)

Such interests probably would not have greatly endeared Sir Leslie in student Leftist circles. As for La Trobe, the following breakdown of councillors presents a similar picture. The majority were careerists in consultant engineering, architecture, accountancy and law, ideally positioned to be influential in the planning and building of a multi-million dollar expense such as a new University. Most belonged to Melbourne's top three Clubs: the Melbourne, Australia, and Athaeneum. Most had common public school backgrounds such as Scotch, Melbourne Grammar and Geelong Grammar. (15)

Profile of some La Trobe University Councillors 1967-1972. (16)

Sir Archibald Glenn (Chancellor): 1967 - 1972

Chairman and Managing Director I.C.I. (A.N.Z.) and Director of ICI (London) and ICI (Far East).

Chairman, Catoleum Ltd.; Balm Paints; Fibremakers Ltd.

Chairman, Scotch College Board of Management.

Director, Bank of New South Wales (which happened to be La Trobe's official bank).

Member, Australian-Japan Business Co-operation Committee.

Australian Club (Melbourne, Sydney).

Melbourne Club.

Royal Melbourne Golf Club.

Knighted 1966: Order of British Empire.

Kenneth Vial (Deputy Chancellor): 1967 - 1971

Companion of the British Empire.

Athaeneum Club.

Naval and Military Club.

Member, Melbourne Underground Rail Loop Authority.

Director, North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. of Aust. Ltd.

Chairman, Yarra Falls Ltd. (a construction company).

Chairman, Michaelis Bayley Ltd. (Business consultants).

Chairman, Australian Services Canteens Organization.

Others' interests included:

Sir John Buchan: 1967 - 1972

Chairman, Hobart Manufacturing Co.

President, Liberal Party of Victoria (1958 - 1962).

Treasurer, Liberal Party of Victoria (1962 - 1967).

Director, Nabisco.

Melbourne Club.

Athaeneum Club.

President, Australian-American Association.

Knighted in 1971.

Sir Keith Aickin Q.C.: 1967 - 1972

Director, Mayne Nickless.

Director, Broken Hill Proprietary Co. P/L.

Director, P. and O. Australian Holdings Ltd.

Melbourne Club

Mr. J. Rafferty: 1967 - 1970

Minister, Labour and Industry, Victoria.

President, Melbourne Chamber of Commerce.

Director, Australian Inhibitor Paper P/L.

Director, Yorkshire Dyeware and Chemical Co.

MLA (Liberal).

Athaeneum Club.



Mr. A. Sheldon: 1967

Managing Director, Alcoa (Aust.).

Sir B.J. Callinan: 1967 - 1971

Director, Lower Yarra Crossing Authority (at the base of which was the B.P. refinery).

Director, B.P. Oil.

Senior partner in consultative engineers Gutteridge, Haskins and Davy.

Chairman, La Trobe University Building Committee.

Melbourne Club.

Australian Club.

Naval and Military Club.

Companion of the British Empire.

Dr. Phillip Law : 1967 - 1972

Companion of the British Empire.

Royal Society.

Melbourne Club.

Rev. Davis McCaughey: 1967 - 1972

Melbourne Club.

Mr. P. Thwaites: 1967 - 1972

Melbourne Club.

Prof. Selby-Smith: 1967 - 1969

Principal, Scotch College, Melbourne 1953 - 1964.

Melbourne Club.

Mr. J. Greig: 1969 - 1972

Melbourne Club.

Australian Club.

Royal Society.

Royal Melbourne Golf Club.

Mr. W. Houghton: 1970

MLC (Liberal).

Melbourne Club.

Naval and Military Club.

Mr. C. Trumble: 1970

Australian Club.

Melbourne Club.

Royal Melbourne Gold Club.

Mr. Justice Smithers: 1972

Judge, Commonwealth Industrial Court.

Melbourne Club.

Mr. (later Sir) John Norgard: 1967 - 1972

Executive General Manager, Broken Hill P/L.

Director, Mount Newman Mining Co.

Australian Club

A complete list of LTU Council members is provided in (17).

The above listing, by no means exhaustive, clearly displays that the LTU Council composition (which was typical of Australian university councils), represented a contradiction to radical students of what a university ought to be and whom it should serve. Of course, a 'radical student' of 1970 might have been surprised, but there was no need to be. After all, university councils are at the administrative apex of a class-based system of education.

In 1971, the following situation existed in regards to interlocking directorships in one major company, ICI.

At La Trobe, the Managing Director of ICI (ANZ) was also the Chancellor; the Deputy Chancellor at Melbourne University (Mr. L. Weickhardt) was a director of ICI (ANZ); the Chancellor of the University of Tasmania, Sir Henry Somerset, was a director of ICI; Sir Roland Wilson of the ANU was a director of ICI; the Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales, Sir Phillip Baxter, was an ex-director of research for ICI (UK). (18) A broadsheet from the La Trobe Left appeared in the cafeterias in April 1971, and it had further interesting relationships to publicise to students:

Today in 1971, in Australia, ICI (ANZ) is the 15th largest contractor with the Defence Department. It has just won an 800,000 dollar one year contract to produce trichlorenethylene, defence group nitric acid, seismic

explosives, herbicide, and ammunition, all for the war in Vietnam.

ICI recently announced its intention to form a partnership with Dow Chemical Corporation, which produces napalm and white phosphorus bombs for use against the Indo-Chinese people. ICI also partnered with Du Pont Chemicals (Canada) in contracts with the Atomic Energy Commission to produce nuclear weapons, and with De Beers (South Africa) to dominate the chemical and explosives industry in South Africa. (19)

This is one example of the information put before students that served to initiate debate and radicalisation. Another example was the La Trobe Left's rather bizarre laying at the feet of Sir Bernard Callinan (of the Lower Yarra Crossing Authority), the deaths of the thirty-five workers who died as a result of the bridge's collapse during construction. (20)

It would be fair to add that the above break-down would have been similar on Victoria's Monash University Council and the Council of the University of Melbourne. There was nothing essentially different about the La Trobe University Council. University councils in Melbourne, and Australia generally, are the governing councils of the universities. Their membership, historically, has been dictated by the State Governments of the time, (who make Governor-in-council appointments), and by the senior and powerful elements of the universities' academic community. This mix means a typical council would comprise business persons, academics, politicians and significant community leaders. This apparently representative structure often revealed itself as being less so when analysing the backgrounds of individual council members more closely, as may be seen at La Trobe University in the late 1960s. Whilst university councils generally do not play a significant role in the day to day operation of a university, the role is nevertheless important. The Councils usually meet monthly, as do Council Committees, and it is in these Committees, such as the Executive Council Committee and the Finance Committee, where the important decisions are made for referral and approval of Council. It would be an error to dismiss Councils as 'rubber stamps'. Whilst membership is impermanent and

honorary, members may and do exert real power, as Academic Boards and student representative bodies well know. University councils are not controlled by the universities in that often, the majority of Council members come from 'outside' the universities, hopefully from all walks of life, in order to provide universities with wise counsel from the wider community.

Whilst the Vice-Chancellor performed the day to day executive functions, the LTU Council Executive Committee was called together from time to time on matters of urgency, and often the mornings immediately preceeding LTU Council monthly meetings were a suitable time to meet. The Executive Committee in 1972 comprised the Chancellor (Sir Archibald Glenn), the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. D. M. Myers, who was also Chairperson of the Academic Board), the Deputy Chancellor (Kenneth Vial, who was also Chairperson of the LTU Council Finance Committee), the Deputy Chairperson of the Academic Board (Professor Alan Wardrop), the Chairperson of the Building Committee (Sir B. J. Callinan, who also served as Chairperson of the LTU Council Executive Committee), and Sir John Buchan (Deputy Chairperson, LTU Council Executive Committee).

This concludes the discussion of the breakdown of the administration at LTU.

The attention of some students had been brought to the presence of prominent, conservative, anti-communist academics on campus. The most well-known of these was the late Professor Hugo Wolfsohn. (21) Wolfsohn maintained a powerful public and private struggle against the radicals. In two interviews with Wolfsohn he maintained a consistent position as a conservative social-democrat, and having fled the Nazis in Europe, the Maoist tag 'fascist' was totally inapplicable. (22) Wolfsohn's anti-communist position doubtless resulted from an antipathy towards all forms of totalitarianism as he assessed them. (23) Wolfsohn's opposition to student radicals however, and that of his University of Melbourne colleague, Professor Frank Knopfelmacher, had passion beyond being merely academically critical.

The de-mystifying of academics was one aspect of the student critique of university life at La Trobe. A further introduction to political life in 1967 was provided by the presentation to students of a representative system of student government. This was the first Students' Representative Council (S.R.C.) and the constitution was presented to students by Paul Reid who was to be the first S.R.C. President. This constitution was the first of three to be put to students interested in student politics between 1967-1972. Interested students never did totally agree on the form that their student government ought to adopt. Proposals to change from an elected representative method (as the 1967 constitution proposed), to an 'association of students' (based on general meetings as at Monash University) caused keen debate amongst students. Such debate provided an awakening of political consciousness amongst small but influential groups of students.

The LTU Act originally made no mention of an SRC. By as late as August 1970, the SRC was still regarded as 'unofficial' by the LTU Council, pending approval to an amendment of the LTU Act by the Governor-in-Council. (24

A further noticeable element of student discourse at La Trobe was an irresistible urge to scepticism and rejection of orthodox Christianity, particularly the Roman Catholic Church. A significance of this was the shedding of the indoctrination (or what was viewed as such), that many students underwent at secondary schools. A number of students embraced for the first time a libertarian socialist perspective. That 'lapsed' Roman Catholics made good recruits for student radicalism was an observed phenomenon of campus life. Students questioned and rejected the existence of 'God' as portrayed by dogma, and the legitimacy of orthodox Christianity, because there had emerged still irresolvable contradictions regarding such issues as: abortion v poverty; contraception v sexual freedom; homosexuality v 'natural' sexuality; drugs v personal consciousness; and the condemnation of the Vietnam war v the history of Church militarism.

If the intensity of the student protests at La Trobe is any indication, more Catholic students turned from Catholicism than continued with it. Indeed, the fight between the Catholic-based DLP Club and the Labor Club can, to a limited extent, be seen as a struggle between continuing and lapsed Catholics. Terry Monagle, prominent DLP Club member, and Ian MacDonald, of La Trobe SDS, would be examples. For many, including myself, Jesus Christ was just another political revolutionary who got caught. The failure of Christianity and Catholicism in particular, to meet an important ideological and ethical debate on issues of contemporary importance inevitably resulted in students' rejection of organised religion as a viable expression of personal philosophy and spirituality. The consequential vacuum presented a need to find and adopt a new philosophy of life, and the way was open for new, radical perspectives. These perspectives placed up front savage criticisms of social structures and policies.

Rabelais observed that

The claims of Christianity go beyond not only scientific method but common sense. Christ defying the law of gravity and drifting up to Heaven, dead men coming to life, a virgin giving birth, goes against scientific and common sense knowledge. (25)

Generally, La Trobe's first year was one in which the climate for radical student action was being created. This impression comes from reading Rabelais and recollections of conversations with undergraduates who were still at the university when I enrolled in 1969. In particular, conversations I had with Paul Reid and Ian MacDonald.

During 1968 I had been a seminarian at Corpus Christi College, Werribee, a Roman Catholic seminary for diocesan priests conducted by the Jesuits. I had come to Corpus Christi from Saint Patrick's College, Ballarat, where I had boarded at this rather spartan school, watched over by the Christian Brothers. The world of the monstrance, Gregorian chant, noli me tangere, and magnum silencium was not to be my calling

however. It was in 1969 that I was relieved to accept an offer from La Trobe to begin studies in Social Sciences, and so became resident in newly finished Menzies College. Mr. Lewis, ever-vigilant on matters of sexual morality, was Master of the College.

By 1968, La Trobe students had had some time to absorb what was happening on other Victorian campuses and 'overseas'. There was at La Trobe a sense of unease as its radically disposed students looked to larger, older, more politically active campuses. La Trobe student leaders were well aware of events at Monash University and California's Berkeley. By 1968, students with leadership qualities at La Trobe had emerged. Grant Evans, Demos Krouskos, Ian MacDonald, David Mueller, and Robert Watts were amongst others who co-operated in the Labor Club and SDS to form a united front on topical issues such as conscription and the Vietnam War. An opportunity also existed to quickly achieve a position of bargaining with University officials for greater participation, and there was a desire to explore and advertise the contradictions in the University and society; a desire to give society something to think about. La Trobe presented itself to these students as a weak link in the chain of institutions that made up society, a link that could be used to pose to the majority of politically inert students, questions concerning the uses to which knowledge is put, in what was considered to be a class-structured and exploitative economic system. A leading article in the La Trobe Orientation 1968 Rabelais reveals some of the thinking of the time:

The public and society at large love us when we leave university as graduates but while we are at university there seems to be more dislike if not hatred for us. We are, as it were, till we graduate, semi-outcasts of society, the rat-bags, dirty, filthy but always rough and ready. This ambivalence of love-hate is ever with us, as, it is up to each one of us to challenge society with our ideals and enthusiasm of youth. Each generation provides its angry young men and this, in the modern conformist society, falls on the shoulders of we students - others would lose their jobs if they were too outspoken. (26)

There was a wish to actually do something:

In Queensland, the students were out on the streets to protest against the power of the police. Students at Monash, Melbourne, ANU are actively concerned about the suffering of the Vietnamese. But from La Trobe... nothing. (27)

La Trobe in its second year had a student enrolment of 1100 students, still a small University by any standard. Yet the wish to be part of national student life was strong and grew as the year progressed. Students were told that just because La Trobe was small and new was

...no reason to withdraw into ourselves; present a mediocre face to the world and to all intents and purposes appear comatose. La Trobe should have something to contribute socially (as well as intellectually) to the tertiary scene but is failing to produce...students were made to revolt. Get to it. (28)

The majority of La Trobe students were politically and socially conservative (despite or perhaps because, over 50 per cent voted ALP) and a difficulty for them was how to throw off all of the Cold War, kick-the Commo-can propoganda that the Menzies era and the Victorian education system had saturated students' minds with since primary school. To suddenly turn around and condemn the national government's foreign policy, contravene the National Service Act and confront a conformist society, was to present to these students a difficult decision. In time however, the weight of anti-war data was to make this decision easier for waiverers. Such data, for example, as a lengthy statement by a First Lieutenant Lofline (U.S.A.F.) that appeared in Rabelais, related to the slaughter of Vietnamese civilians for sport by U.S. helicopter pilots, (29) and a moving explanation of an ex-Australian national serviceman, Neville White, as to why he came to conscientiously object to the Vietnam war. (30)



It was not surprising that on 19 May 1968 a small group of La Trobe Labor Club students would travel to Canberra to sit outside the Prime Minister's Lodge, demanding the government cease imprisoning conscientious objectors. They would demand that amendments to the National Service Act requiring parents and university authorities to inform on drafted men, be repealed, and that the Act be abolished altogether. One of the principles of the demonstration was based on the duty of civil disobedience, as iterated in Rabelais: 'Under a government that imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is in prison'. (31) The demonstration was clearly not solely based on the ideology of Marx, Lenin or Mao Tse-tung, but also on the principles of civil liberty that arose from classical definitions of political freedom that echoed Greece and Republican Rome. Two other University organisations, the SRC and the Staff Association, were also outspoken regarding the National Service Act Amendment Bill which would have imposed an obligation on officers of educational institutions to disclose information meant for internal purposes only. The La Trobe Staff Association sent telegrams to this effect to the Prime Minister, John Gorton, and Leader of the Opposition, Gough Whitlam. (32) At a general meeting of students on 17 May, 1968 the SRC approved policies expressing similar sentiments, in addition to declaring the campus a place of refuge for a growing number of draft-evaders. (33)

The up-shot of the Canberra demonstration was that eight of the fourteen La Trobe students attending were fined ten dollars each. It was a noteworthy event, not only because it was La Trobe Labor Club's first significant political action interstate, but because the convicted decided to go to prison rather than pay the fine, and in so doing established a tradition at La Trobe amongst radical students that prison was the only acceptable alternative if the other is compliance with an unacceptable law. The following letter appeared in Rabelais on 17 June:

Canberra Jail  
May 20, 1968.

Communique from La Trobe Labor Club to students of La Trobe University.

We have chosen civil disobedience because it is a symbolic gesture of defiance against repressive legislation and expresses solidarity with those conscientious objectors imprisoned because of their consciences. We realize also, that by foregoing our civil liberties at this time by going to jail, we make a sincere and convinced expression of belief. Let us unite in our efforts to end this war and hope we have taken a step forward in this instance.

Signed: Robert Watts, Peter Dan, David Mueller, Grant Evans, Fiona Lindsay, Beryl Consland, Michael Constable. (34)

The Labor Club had a turbulent ideological history at La Trobe. Originally it had been called the Democratic Socialist Club, then the Socialist Club and efforts were made to name it the Communist Club. In fact, from 1969 until 1972 the Clubs and Societies Council registered separate Left clubs as: Communist Club, Labor Club, Worker-Student Alliance, Anarchist Club, and SDS. Occasionally, members belonged to several of these Clubs, one consideration being that budget allocations were related to strength of numbers.

Late in 1968 conservative forces on campus organised into the Democratic Club, publishing a broadsheet entitled Liberty, a publication similar to sheets published off-campus by the Democratic Labor Party-National Civic Council finances and distributed at Monash and Melbourne universities. The NCC was keen to gain an influence on students in 1968 just as it is today. A Liberal Club was founded by Mr. Terry Moran, an undergraduate. (In 1987 Moran became a principal advisor to the Premier John Cain.)

A development in 1968 that doubtless both the NCC and ASIO noted was that the rapid growth of the Australian Union of Students was further strengthened by the affiliation of La Trobe University. The La Trobe delegates took their seats at the August Council, held at the Prince of Wales Hotel, St. Kilda. The affiliation was a vital one in

that it brought an added national and international perspective to the political orientation of La Trobe activists.

In 1968 it was international events themselves and the May uprising in France that particularly served to heighten consciousness at La Trobe and amongst Melbourne's radicals generally. Michel Lawrence, writing in her column 'Broadsides' enjoined that

'Vive La France' must be the cry of students everywhere. Again the French lead the revolution. Student power is being discussed incessantly by various La Trobe junior hot-air revolutionaries. Perhaps they could take a lead from their French brothers: less talk and more action. (35)

Not only France. The realities of the military junta in Greece were brought home to La Trobe students, just as the realities of Chile, Argentina, Turkey and South Africa were also brought home in the late 1970s. Some would-be Leftists may have shuddered to think how many active sympathisers would remain committed at La Trobe if the Greek situation were to be transplanted to Melbourne. There was reason to believe such a situation would not happen in Australia; but then, if an Australian government was prepared to send conscripts, uninvited and under pressure from the United States, to die in an unwinnable, genocidal war, and imprison those who refused to fight in an undeclared war, who was to know what the future held?

The Greek students' plight in fighting the regime of the colonels was all the more notable because of Melbourne's large Greek population. The effect on La Trobe's student Leftists on being informed of the torture and murder of students in other parts of the world was considerable. The Melbourne based Australian Union of Students sent its vice-president John Vines to Greece to report on the situation. Greece interested Australian students in that it was not directly involved in the Vietnam war but represented a national movement against military dictatorship and American neo-colonialism. Australian and La Trobe

student leaders wondered at how their own movement could continue to grow into a more widely supported revolutionary movement, fearing the movement may subside when America and Australia left Vietnam. Nevertheless, it was appeals such as that which appeared in Rabelais in November 1968, from the Greek student organisation Rigas Feraios, that served to heighten La Trobe students' awareness. (36)

This thesis makes the point that the La Trobe University protests were the localisation of a world-wide phenomenon. Peter Cochrane and a former Maoist radical at La Trobe, was interviewed in Sydney in 1986 as part of a documentary film about the student protests in Melbourne. Cochrane suggested that

One of the problems that students of the student revolution have had to deal with is why there were so many simultaneous rebellions around the world. There is a fairly simplistic way of dealing with it and that's to start with the post war expansion of American capitalism which did have a certain unifying impact on the international scene, and this brought about two phenomena that were closely related and emerged in the form of rebellion at La Trobe. One was the production and commodification of youth culture, a lot of which had a rebellious content. It played up to the liberated life-styles associated with the emergence of an affluent and, more than ever before, independent strata of people between 13-19.

It took up much of the economic slack of that market, and gave rein to all sorts of potentially dissident inclinations in that strata. This fed into the universities because the universities had also grown enormously, again in association with the expansion of western capitalism.

Secondly, we had the Western media reporting on the Third World.

So the two things ran together, and understood this way makes plausible why so many student rebellions around the world occurred at the same time. That kind of student was going to university who was potentially part of a student movement. Also, that kind of student was able to view events in the Third World in a graphic and devastating way on TV. It's certainly a true argument that the media was a catalyst. The photograph

that really shocked me was of Guevara dead with the bullet holes in his body. A decade before we wouldn't have seen that sort of thing, but expansion of the technical capacity of the media enabled instant communications. (37)

This was the nature of the situation at La Trobe in 1968, at once internationalist and yet very local, very suburban Melbourne. The themes, the motives, the reasons and protests, intertwined.

The La Trobe colleges had been integrated into the master plan of the University as it was thought they would reduce the student alienation evident at many new large campuses. The plan was for ten colleges encircling the academic and administrative hub of the university. Each college would have ninety to a hundred resident students of both sexes and about four hundred non-resident members. Every student of the University was to be enrolled as a member of a college (so planners envisaged), with some 40 per cent of all students as resident members. This 'radical' use of colleges would have meant the absence of a central student union as Melbourne and Monash Universities had. (38) The disadvantage of the college system, eventually to be only partly implemented with Glenn, Menzies and Chisholm Colleges, was that it tended to foster the 'old school tie', swinging-chaps style of college that appeared boring, self-centred and in-bred.

Paul Reid, first SRC President, had voiced students' concern:

In deciding that Colleges are to be like mini-union houses did anyone really think what this meant? Did anyone realize for example, that the unions in other universities provide much more than a cafeteria? They also provide a theatre, a coffee-shop, committee rooms for clubs and most important, they are run by students and Boards of Management with a majority of student representatives.

The results of giving students some authority would improve the morale of students as more responsibility in government was given them. The place would no

longer seem the glorified high-school it now is. Also, boards controlled by students would operate on fees students can afford, not the iniquitous \$72 general services fee now demanded, the highest of any Victorian University. (Rabelais, 17 June 1968)

Reid's attitudes were often echoed during 1968. Letters to the editors of Rabelais clearly reveal widespread student discontent with the plans for the University. One student, a C.W. Moss, expressed this under-current of dissatisfaction:

The College system, we are told, is a brilliant new innovation, but the basic reason that brought the system into being is that it's possible to administer the students very closely. Student administration planned for La Trobe 1978 - completion year - is one administrator for 16 students, 2.1 times more than Melbourne, 1.7 times more than Monash.

Students will consequently be herded like sheep by high officials. Protest will be smothered. (39)

Whether Moss' 1978 prediction eventuated would itself be the subject of a deliciously amusing thesis. However, La Trobe, in the mid 80s is still not completed, a decade after the original target completion date. These factors aside, the fears of students were quite evident. By the end of 1968, the word 'administration' had come to have a variety of meanings to students; to some it denoted the bureaucratic machinery necessary to the functioning of any university; to others it was synonymous with paternalistic rule likenable to the experiences of indigenous peoples of nineteenth century British colonies; to others it was a term nothing short of a death warrant to student democracy. Students began enquiring into the nature of and justification for, administration, and its lack-lustre performance at La Trobe.

Just such an enquiry into La Trobe's administration took place by student investigation in June 1968. Under the head-line 'To Serve or Dominate', an important criticism was made in a follow-up analysis in Rabelais. Pointing out that the La Trobe University Act provided for

the general election of two student representatives to the University Council 'if it thinks fit', and that after eighteen months of operation the Council had not implemented this option, the analysis concluded that:

This army of clerics (the administration) has shown a convenient amnesia that masks the wariness on the part of the Council when delegating responsibility to students. This xenophobic attitude towards students is obvious in the administration's tight-lipped attitude when approached on matters of official policy. (40)

Nor were the colleges left unscathed. The college system had been designed to cater for students' psychological needs in confronting the reality of the megaversity. Unfortunately, this altruistic aim could not be realised while the Masters of the colleges remained in absolute control, dictating the moral and social tone. The analysis concluded that:

The question still remains whether the administration of colleges and the University will continue to espouse a form of academic feudalism or whether they will help students by their service rather than hinder by their domination. (41)

In interviews with the two college Masters, Mr. Lewis from Menzies College and Mr. Meredith from Glenn, conducted in August 1968, it was concluded that

neither of them, obviously, thought that they were in any way running a policed college, though some residents might disagree with this. (42)

My own experience of Mr. Lewis' Mastership in 1968 resulted in serious doubts about the lengths to which in loco parentis should go. Mr. Lewis believed it went into matters of the bedroom, which was an intrusion not welcomed by fellow collegians or myself.

Upon further attempts to plumb the depths of the Masters' attitudes on student involvement in University life, the Masters were asked whether they had any objection to a majority of students on the college governing boards (as is happily the case now in the three colleges and the Union). Both answered with a definite 'no' to a majority of students. Mr. Meredith did not think students had the necessary experience; Mr. Lewis thought it 'pointless' for others to be on the body if students were to be on it! (43)

The reality of conservative administrators and young, exuberant students was made more obvious to students with visits to the campus by leading political figures, who threw light on an emerging line-up of forces in wider society. On 3 July 1968, Dr. Jim Cairns spoke to a large gathering of students at La Trobe. Cairns was by this time the leading figure in the discussion of socialist ideology with student politicians. As reported, he

Emphasised that as a matter of socialist principle, students, not the academics or administrators, should run the University, and that this should come as a positive plan by the students. (44)

It was unfortunate that ameliorative action was not taken by the University's administration soon enough however. Because calls for change by student representatives went unheeded, students opted for an alternative approach: demonstration in the form of peaceful occupation of administration offices, in order to achieve satisfactory participation in the University's government. This pattern emerged in 1969 just two years after the University opened, at a University that was supposed to be innovative and a show-piece of Australian tertiary education. One could argue that students and officials such as Myers, Taylor and Glenn were all partly the prisoners of historical circumstance and no-one was to blame because everything was unpredictable yet inevitable. Events outside the University environment were part and parcel of student life. Nevertheless, an apparent fear of students, and a patronising attitude on the part of University



officials, were difficult to excuse on grounds of 'historical circumstance' alone. Clearly, with the benefit of hindsight history provides, an involvement of students in management at an earlier stage would have done much to reduce the crisis that was to occur. There was only one elected student representative on the Council from the University's first intake in 1967 up until 20 April 1970, when the SRC President was also made a member, *ex officio*.

During 1968 other events served to alert and heighten a hard core of fifty to sixty activist radical students at La Trobe. In May 1968 an SRC backed boycott of Cheshire's Bookshop, the campus' only bookshop, began a campaign for a University owned and managed bookshop. (45) The successful boycott related to the shop's exorbitant prices, and brought the nature of capitalist economics home to students in a practical way. Other incidents included that of 1 May, when a La Trobe contingent of students attended the annual May Day celebration. On 4 July several La Trobe demonstrators were arrested at a violent confrontation with police outside the United States Consulate in Commercial Road, Prahran. (46) La Trobe radicals were thus making their presence felt in wider Melbourne. Experience of police violence was in itself radicalising those students who were otherwise more moderate. Meeting students of similar political persuasion from Monash and Melbourne Universities gave participants a stronger sense of belonging, of power and comradeship, and a desire to radicalise further.

A lively debate at La Trobe centered on the nature of the movement and the emergence of radical political activism. As student ideologues, we often interchanged the terms New Left, Radical Student Movement, Student Power, Students for a Democratic Society, the Hippies, the Counter Culture, the Peace Movement, rather freely, whilst continuously endeavouring to delineate and define. This debate was itself causal to events, as actions at La Trobe were only embarked on after intense discussion on tactics and strategy, with many different views conflicting and converging according to ideological stance, degree of conviction, depth of reading and degree of understanding.

The ideology however, of the Melbourne, La Trobe and Monash radicals, whilst clearly radical socialist and/or communist, was never able to be clearly defined, which was precisely why the debate about motivation, goals and methods raged, and probably still would if the movement still existed. Ideas being tossed around were at once simplistic and complex, and not always cohesive; yet, on issues, students held together in a unique, remarkable way, despite ideological differences. There were Trotskyists, Maoists, Marxists, Spartacists, Moscow-liners, Peking-liners, followers of Stalin, Bakunin and Kropotkin, ALP types, Castroites, Fabians, and Benthamites. But there were more common factors than different. Students were the products of a society that bred the atom bomb and the cold war. It was understandable that some of the city's university students often felt theirs might be the last generation in humanity's experiment with living. Student radicalism was partly motivated by a fear of the annihilation of human kind by nuclear holocaust. Opposition to American bases at Pine Gap, North West Cape and Nurrungar was related to this fear. There was an atmosphere of urgency amongst students at La Trobe in relation to American bases and nuclear holocaust. 'Social Responsibility in Science', a LTU student group, published a regular leaflet called 'Fire' which high-lighted these issues.

The debate in more general terms was about whether people should be less dependent on technology, image-making and popularity, and the importance of finding a meaning to life that was personally authentic rather than merely socially acceptable.

I have strong recollections that La Trobe radicals often considered it unjust that Third World peoples remained powerless, and that people in industrialised nations such as Australia remained supine in the face of disparate distribution of resources. Students thus sought to impress upon an often unsympathetic Melbourne public that the real controllers and manipulators of social thought - the owners of media, politicians, church leaders, academics - should either change or be changed. Midst the ideological rhetoric, the debate, if it centered on any one point at

all, urged workers and students in Melbourne to think and act for themselves, for only in so doing would the contradictions and anomalies be seen. The hoped for last act was that workers and students would then take action. The nature of the student New Left was a massive consciousness raising exercise on political and social issues, expressed in action and idea.

The New Left's view of Australia's predicament was both optimistic and pessimistic. In the factories and office blocks of Melbourne and Sydney lay, it seemed, loneliness, estrangement, isolation between worker and worker in an industrial waste-land where money and profit, not people, was god. In the world of Australian capitalism, radical students often believed that the first law of a new society based on socialism would be a care for working people and the poor that overcame the idolatrous worship of consumer and luxury commodities and balance sheets. It was thought that only by ripping down the curtain of materialist-minded Australia could a new Jerusalem be built; and certainly, many students had a new utopia in mind. In seeing the potentiality, students of New Left persuasion saw the possible reality, the future. Unfulfilled capacity for reason, freedom and decency, were seen as indestructible against a society where the ethos was of persons as things to be manipulated, governed, exploited and killed on the altars of profit, status and prestige.

Romantic stuff to be sure, but fiery too. And in the institutions that this student idealism supposedly lived in? What were these institutions like? One powerful document that precursed Australian radicalism by some five years and influenced some Australian students, was drawn up by Tom Hayden from the SDS convention at Port Huron, Michigan, in 1962. La Trobe had its own chapter of SDS and prominent in its leadership was Ian MacDonald, who re-produced in Rabelais extracts of Hayden's document.

Our professors and administrators sacrifice  
controversy to public relations; their curriculums  
change more slowly than the living events of the world;

their skills and silence are purchased by investors in the arms race; passion is called unscholastic. The questions we might want raised - what is really important? Can we live in a different and better way? If we wanted to change society, how would we do it? - are not thought to be questions of a 'fruitful, empirical nature, and thus are brushed aside. (47)

(In relation to 'curriculum change' one recalls the continuing political economy dispute which raged at the University of Sydney after fifteen or more years of effort by students to have the course expanded.)

A major part of the debate about what the Melbourne student New Left was about centered on whether it was anything more than an anti-Vietnam war, pro-Civil Rights, sit-in phenomenon, with the drugs, sex, rock n' roll as draw-cards. Was there a deeper, more lasting sophistication operating?

Some at La Trobe for example, felt that the individual New Leftist was a Holden Caulfield, Andy Warhol, Bob Dylan and Che Guevara rolled up as romantic revolutionary extraordinaire.

The rank and file New Leftist is a phoney, a bright-eyed culture assaulter with an NLF badge, a Simon and Garfunkel record under one arm and two dollars in the pocket for a chance excursion into an hallucinatory drug-world. He cries support for his heroes and revolutionary idols, hasn't actually got a clue what is going on himself until he's eventually absorbed into the managerial elite or into the white, air-conditioned public-service office. (48)

Rabelais of July 1969 revealed the lines drawn up. The Editorial:

Recently, the Vice-Chancellor, the Business Manager, the Registrar and others have been trying to find out 'what students think'. The conflict is not one of closed minds but one of lack of comprehension. Universities are for the education of students, not administrators. The students' thoughts should be considered and acted upon instead of being dismissed through a lack of understanding. The students want

more involvement in everything. The fragmented nature of the V.C.'s plans and the bureaucratic structure of the Council has denied the involvement of the students. The Council's College system has split the University, yet the members will not act on the dissent and one can only assume it is born from a Victorian idea of not losing face. One doesn't wait for the war to be over before trying to stop it.

All western societies are the politics of elites. If a governing elite fails to take notice of the SRC's legitimate demands, elements will become frustrated. Frustration leads to the by-passing of normal channels and violence is the result. (49)

By 1969, the hard core of La Trobe's Labor Club and SDS were asserting themselves in a public and active way. In March, La Trobe students Rob Mathews, Chris Bridley, Rod Parker and Ian MacDonald were arrested for protesting against City of Melbourne by-law 418, which prohibited the distribution of leaflets. (50) The leaflets were 'Don't Register' pamphlets, and stemmed from a combined SDS - Draft Resisters Conference in Carlton, 28-29 December 1968. (51) On 25 March La Trobe radicals participated in an inter-varsity march against the by-law. (52) La Trobe students' names were becoming more plentiful: Gail Rockman, Jan Mueller, Ian Coulter, Bryan Boyd, Rod Taylor, Sharon Conroy, Peter Cochrane, Brian Pola, Shane Breen, Ken White, Wes Arnott, Judy Blood, Maggie Grant, John Redenbach, Ross Laird, Robert Matthews, Michael Maher, Peter Dowling, Tom Brennan, David Ko and Chris Charnes, to name but some.

Just as for the radicals of the late 1940s, these La Trobe radicals of the late 1960s - early 1970s have gone into diverse occupations, but mainly into teaching, academic, and union organiser activity. (53)

By May Day 1969, 1 May had become recognised as an occasion for a mass demonstration of unionists and students to the United States Consulate in Commercial Road, and La Trobe radicals were among those who marched down St. Kilda Road to meet the expected confrontation with mounted, uniformed and plainclothed police. (54)

On campus, a mass boycott of Glenn College cafeteria occurred on 24 April, protesting over poor quality food and high costs; (55) on 18 June an SRC general meeting of students was held with representatives of Nationwide Food Service, a meeting this multi-national off-shoot could not win. (56) The real battle was over the presence of Nationwide, not quality and cost. Besides, mass refusals to eat did not make profits.

On the conscription issue, a forum was organised for 12 July at which draft notices were burnt (57) and on 4 July, three thousand workers and students marched down St. Kilda Road, again to the United States Consulate, where a demonstration erupted into violence between mounted police and flag-pole carrying students. (58) Fire-crackers caused the horses to rear in the surging crowd around the barricades. (59) On 17 July, an SRC general meeting voted to declare La Trobe a sanctuary for draft resisters. (60) An SRC referendum voted overwhelmingly to oppose a CMF unit on campus, in response to University Council discussions suggesting such a unit. (61)

The first of a long series of sit-ins at Council meetings occurred on 18 August 1969 when fifteen students sat-in to demand student observers at Council meetings. Council had thus far refused to allow the presence of observers despite frequent attempts by the SRC to redress this situation. At this stage, there was one student representative on the Council, and he was Mr. Des Kelly. At its August meeting Council proposed that in addition to a student member of Council, the President of the SRC ought to be ex officio; it was also suggested that a post-graduate representative be elected by post-graduates. It was odd that the University Act had not made better provision for student representation, and very frustrating for students.

The meeting of 18 August having being forced to an adjournment, resumed off-campus, in the Library of the Royal Society of Victoria, on 21 August, at 9.00 a.m. Council considered that the substance of the SRC request regarding observers would be much better met by increasing student representation on Council rather than admitting observers. The

request for observers would present Councillors with risk of being 'quoted out of context'. (62) Nevertheless, upon a further request from the SRC, Council at its 15 September meeting set up a committee to investigate the matter of observers. (63)

1969 was my first year at La Trobe and I was resident in Menzies College. The previous year had been for me a searching one; a rather directionless nineteen year old who had thrown in the seminary but still clung to Mother Church, not having yet learnt how to dispense with it. It was from this sheltered environment that I suddenly found myself in residence at Menzies College. The atmosphere was very ocker amongst the residents, which was evidenced when I was elected to the Menzies College General Committee, and Ken White (a fellow resident) and I conducted very beery student nights as officials of the College Social Committee. After one particularly riotous night, full of political discussion and after thousands of dollars had been lavished on the ferrying of 'niners' from the Summerhill Hotel to Menzies, White and I were quietly advised to resign from the 'Social Committee'. (64) There was a pronounced ocker element in the two residential Colleges, and heavy drinking was imbued with all-night discussions about conscription, the Vietnam War, demonstrations and campus and national student politics. Beer, Para Port and marijuana were amiable facilitators for free flowing political debate.

Whilst a resident in Menzies however, I began to read Dr. Jim Cairns' analysis of Australia's involvement in Vietnam and I related what was happening there to what I was learning about social structure and the history of revolutions and politics, through the University lectures and tutorials. I began reading Marx, Fanon, Guevara, Bakunin, Lenin, Trotsky, Gramsci, quite beyond my academic commitments and purely out of interest. I went through an intense religious crisis in which I believed I had to completely reject Christianity and Roman Catholicism, but was tormented by visions of Hell for eternity and nagging scepticism. I eventually came to believe that I had rationalised away the power of the Church and its recriminations, although one never can

remove the scars. The humorous novels and plays that have of late come from those experiencing a Catholic upbringing hide the real truth: there is nothing comical about fear. Soon I was able to plunge into a guilt-free life-style which had a lot to do with what my religious crisis was about: freedom. Some weeks after, I bought my first match-box of marijuana and rolled the first of countless joints and began deeply experimenting with LSD and mescaline.

It was in 1969 that I met Ian MacDonald, by this time a leading SDS activist, and he encouraged me to become involved in student politics. For my reading, I preferred the original Marx, Hegel and Engels rather than their overly academic analyses by numerous theorists. I was also very interested in popular radical literature. The names are well known: Angela Davis, Bobby Seale, Jerry Rubin, Timothy Leary, Abbie Hoffman, Malcolm X, C. Wright Mills. Whilst having a solid but general understanding of Marxism, I preferred to build on that by reading about what was actually happening, rather than analysing the umpteenth variation on why Stalinism was bad.

As part of my new found freedom I left Menzies in 1970 to live in a communal house in Sydney Road, Coburg, in the shadow of Pentridge prison. On 8 May, in my first political action, I marched as part of the 100,000 on Moratorium Day under the banner of the La Trobe Labor Club.

It would be incorrect to believe that Leftist students at La Trobe were totally united. They were not, and sharp divisions existed.

Differences of opinion between students were clearly seen at the February 1969 conference of the NUAUS. (65) Two of the La Trobe delegates, Bob Broadbent and Terry Monagle (both affiliated with the Democratic Club), accused people with sympathies to the left of the ALP of using NUAUS to exert pressure in national politics. NUAUS, they felt, ought to be a non-political service-oriented body. Andy Rodger, SRC Secretary, responded with a condemnation of the accusation. (66)



There began a concerted campaign to rid the SRC of the Democratic Club's interests and remove it from NUAUS affairs.

The campus was relatively quiet until June however. On the 16 June 1970, radical students took action against the presence of Defence Department recruitment officials. (67) A meeting of about 70 students, in view of past motions on the military and conscription, moved over to the Careers and Appointments office, hoping to find the officials and present opinions. (68) Mr. Waterhouse, the Careers and Appointments officer became agitated. (69) Since the officials were not actually present, the resolutions were given to Waterhouse who left to see the Registrar. The students waited. When he returned and refused to implement the resolution, the students decided to remain until he did. Waterhouse eventually left, followed by students, who circled the University once, not having made contact with the Defence officials. The two officials were later found in Cheshires' Bookshop and escorted to their Mercedes. (70)

The next morning Liberty appeared, demanding the expulsion of all concerned and declared 'lack of confidence' in the V.C. (71) It is worthwhile to look at what ensued though I will not give a blow by blow description of the many occupations over the next two years; but once is both useful and enough.

By the 19 June, Philip Matthews (SRC Vice-President), Jan Kearney (SRC member), Grant Evans (Rabelais editor), Fergus Robinson (Labor Club), Peter Zumpe (President of the Anarchists), Andrew Giles-Peters and Ian MacDonald (both SRC members), had received telegrams directing them to attend the Registrar's office that morning at 11.00 a.m. (72) They and their friends went to the administration building to find it locked and guarded. As they waited, students who were locked out of student administration joined them. (73)

Because the incident was more or less frivolous and referred to a time when several of those charged had actually been off-campus, there

was a feeling the penalties would be determined according to the people charged rather than to evidence. The Registrar had, after all, refused to discuss the question of witnesses. It was decided by the seven to ask for a postponement and a collective hearing.

At Menzies College a discussion was growing into a meeting. Staff from the dining room started coming into the meeting. A motion was put demanding open and collective hearings to be deferred until Wednesday, 24 June. (74) If these demands were refused, the administration would be occupied. After debate the motion was carried, 168 to 118. The meeting adjourned to the administration block where, after some time, the Chairperson was allowed to enter the quickly unlocked and guarded doors. The Chairperson soon returned and stated that all demands were refused. Students discussed whether to blockade or occupy. Scuffles began with security guards and a student up above turned a fire hose on to the crowd. The glass doors were smashed in and students made their way to the V.C.'s office. The V.C. refused to address the meeting and offered to speak to one representative. The offer was refused. The V.C. was later asked again to speak to the 130 or so students in the corridor but refused, and left his office with a security guard. The students stayed for about an hour then left en masse about 6 o'clock. (75)

Over the weekend those charged met to decide their course of action. Newsheets were written and run-off. On the Monday, a lunch-time meeting of about 300 students and staff discussed the issues arising from Friday's action. On Tuesday two of the students concerned saw the V.C., only to discover that they had been excluded from the University, and others received letters carrying the same news. A lunch-time Menzies meeting of about 500 gathered to hear the V.C. attempt to explain his conduct. In the end, Politics tutor Reg. Henry moved no confidence in the V.C., which was carried overwhelmingly. (76)

That night, the seven announced that there would be no appeal to the Proctorial Board: it would, they believed, only legitimise the V.C.'s actions.

Some days later the SRC organised a meeting over the matter. (77) The 150 or so present heard Christina Bell (SRC President) read a letter from the V.C. from which it was concluded that the suspended students had had their suspensions lifted - for the time being. (78) Democratic Club member and SRC Treasurer, Terry Monagle, then argued that the three suspended SRC members not be accepted as SRC members. Should this ploy have succeeded, the Democratic Club (a DLP-NCC front) would have dominated the SRC, but Monagle's effort failed. The real defeat for the right-wing in student government at La Trobe came when Ross Laird, an anarchist, successfully moved

That this SRC declare that it has no confidence in the SRC Executive resulting from its action over the suspension of 7 students from La Trobe. (79)

One by one the Executive members resigned (Bell, Monagle, Jan Sullivan and Andy Rodger). (80) The way was now open for the radical students to assume control of the SRC and they did this in the ensuing election for the Fourth SRC, conducted on 8-10 September 1970.

The militancy of students generally increased in August and September.

Late in August, Ian MacDonald (SRC Secretary), Michael Hamel-Green (Monash Labor Club), John Landau (Sydney University SDS) and Peter Dowling (La Trobe Labor Club), were arrested in Sydney and lodged at Long Bay Gaol, charged with 'the invasion of private places'; that is, the home of the Federal Attorney-General Tom Hughes. (81) Hughes' reaction had been to take to the protestors with a cricket bat. In a letter from prison written to Hughes, much of the essence of the New Left was expressed.

Central Industrial Prison  
Long Bay Gaol.  
28 August 1970

Mr. Tom Hughes,  
Federal Attorney-General,  
Canberra.

Dear Tom,

Sorry we didn't have the chance for a full discussion when we dropped around to your pad last week. There was much we would have liked to talk to you about, but obviously you were short of time, and wanted to get back to playing cricket. We regret any minor inconvenience to you and your family's week-end leisure, but we were sure that, had we been able to talk to you, you would have been prepared to suffer such inconvenience, particularly if you had paused to reflect on the personal inconvenience suffered by the Vietnamese people, and the personal inconvenience caused to over 500 young Australians who have died in the performance of such killing; and the personal inconvenience caused to young people, including ourselves, who are harassed and eventually gaoled for two years for refusing to become accomplices in such killing.

...Until such time as you decide to apply the law impartially, we are bound by our solidarity with the Vietnamese people and oppressed peoples everywhere, to defy and resist laws designed to repress the growing inter-national movement for justice and human liberation... (82)

These were the salad days of the Labor Club and SDS. But a stricter ideology was emerging. Maoism, under-pinned by Marxist-Leninist thought, had led the way at Monash, and whilst never taking a grip at the University of Melbourne, it took to La Trobe as a new wave of Left-adventurism. Even Albert Langer regarded La Trobe Maoists as 'over the top, a bit crazy'. (83) Peter Cochrane observed in 1986 that

By the time we were half-way through 1970 we had a hard core of students who were interested in Marx, Mao and Guevara, about 20 or 30 of us. We were starting to wonder about the question of how one builds a student movement. We tackled it directly. We raised the question and thought about it. The capacity of the La

Trobe movement to creatively adapt events to their cause was great. No problem, because such events simply reinforced the nature of the capitalist state and its university. Maoists had a holistic worldview.

One comparison between La Trobe and Monash was that there seemed to be more police confrontation and violence at La Trobe. There was very little police confrontation at Monash. I think the reason for this was that the Maoists' attitude at La Trobe to dealing with the establishment at any level, including its police force, was they didn't talk to anybody, so the possibility of some half-way house or mediation, didn't exist. This was a principal feature of the Maoist position. There was to be no compromise between two separate visions of society. Also, the La Trobe administration and the police were both novices at dealing with this new phenomenon, so they made terrible mistakes. If they (admin.) hadn't made them it probably would've defused a lot of the activity, but instead it grew and grew. When you add these things together one begins to understand why La Trobe was much more violent. There's no doubt about that in my opinion. Then you had peripheral questions such as whether the West Heidelberg police were tougher than the Croydon (Monash) police. And such factors might well be relevant, after all, La Trobe ended up with Inspector Platfuss at the first Waterdale Road demo. who said 'They got some baton today and they'll get some more tomorrow', which was like red rag to a bull and 'proved' the Maoist theory of the State yet again. (84)

On 7 September, the eve of the La Trobe SRC election, a meeting of 200 students proposed a 'pre-moratorium march' up Waterdale Road, a major road leading into the University. (85) (The famous 18 September moratorium of 100,000.)

Barry York, a Maoist student activist at LTU in 1970, related a significant development that occurred on 9 September. A group of LTU students who had been painting slogans on walls in the West Heidelberg area had been assaulted and shot at by security guards.

The use of guns by those in authority reverberated throughout the student body, as the echoes of Kent

State a few months earlier were revived. The Anti-Imperialist Week commenced the following day, and was thus assured of widespread participation. (86)

On the 10 September, Ted Hill, Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), came and addressed the opening of an 'anti-imperialist week' on campus. (87) The following day was 'pre-memoratorium march' day. To the surprise of the seventy or so students, as the marchers swung into Waterdale Road from Murray Road, they were violently attacked by police wielding batons. (88) Most of the students scattered and re-grouped, making our way back to campus. Naturally enough, most of the next four days was devoted to preparing another Waterdale Road march, as news of the police attack spread quickly and students were incensed at the unprovoked attack. (89) I had recently been nominated for SRC President and took advantage of this position to encourage uncertain students to join with the radical Left, and march from Northland shopping centre, along Waterdale Road and back to campus. (The SRC election resulted in a narrow victory for the radical Left. Ian MacDonald retained the Secretaryship, but there was a Democratic Club group among whom were Jan Sullivan, Sue Uniake and Campbell Gordon, which meant SRC decisions were narrowly balanced.) The 16 September march is remembered by many former La Trobe students as it became something of a cause celebre to have been present. (90)

On Wednesday 16 September, about 270 La Trobe students gathered at Northland shopping centre for a 45 minute peace rally in the Northland plaza, after which began the five kilometre march, chanting anti-war slogans, singing peace songs and distributing leaflets. The procession moved in this fashion without incident until the factory area of Waterdale Road, about 400 metres from the University. Here the factories crowded close to the road, and the students spilled a little more onto the roadway. Factory workers watched the marchers go by. At this point a carload of police drove alongside the head of the column, police got out and pushed and shoved at students to get onto the footpath. There was no call by police from loud hailers, no time interval, just the starting of shoving. For most students the first

sign of police dissatisfaction was this pushing and shoving, when we were already in sight of the campus. Irritated, we continued to move around the police cars and continued marching. Without warning, several more police cars pulled up, police disembarked and immediately attacked the side of the column with batons. I saw police beating students and making arrests as the column struggled towards the University. The final beatings and arrests took place within campus grounds at the Kingsbury Drive, Waterdale Road intersection. It was a repulsive and a sickening use of force. The police seemed to be enjoying beating defenceless men and women. I was knocked senseless to the gutter by batons and lay stunned for some seconds and was helped up by students, only to be grabbed by three plainclothed police and bundled into a police car. From the car I saw students and police punching and kicking and wrestling on the ground. Eighteen students were arrested and spent three hours in the Heidelberg cells before being released on bail. Police drew guns on campus and one student was arrested at gun-point. The officer in charge of the operation, Inspector K. Platfuss, claimed that 'they' (the students) 'needed what they got. They got some baton today and they'll get a lot more in the future'. (91) Dr. Alan Ward, Senior Lecturer in History at La Trobe, observed of the march

I am deeply concerned that these events are the result of political pressure by the D.L.P. and other conservative political groups to enforce 'law and order' against student demonstrations. If they are, I believe it necessary the Australian public may learn from the ugly consequences of such pressure which causes suffering to moderate young people, and are conducive to depraved conduct by the police. (92)

Several hundred students and staff massed in the Agora to debate what action to take. Yet another demonstration was then planned - for 23 September, as the Vietnam moratorium was scheduled for 18 September. The third Waterdale Road march of about 1000 was entirely peaceful. It had to be. The events of the 16th were plastered over the front pages of the Sun, the Age and the Herald, with pictures of a policeman swinging a female student by the hair. Television cameras whirred from

the backs of station wagons to show Victorians that the state really was democratic and its police were not really 'depraved'. The police behaved impeccably. Even for the moratorium on the 18th, there was no resistance from police when Monash and La Trobe students refused to be diverted by police at William and La Trobe Streets, City, when about 300 of us pushed through the barricades and marched at will around the City.

The absence of a violent police reaction on the 23 September confirmed to many that the violence of 11 and 16 September was intended to deter students from attending the 18 September Moratorium. Gordon Bryant, M.H.R., had suggested as much when he condemned the police attack on the 16 September march:

Somehow, just at this magic moment, violence has occurred to people who are basically non-violent. (93)

On 17 September, Dr. Myers (Vice-Chancellor), wrote to Sir Henry Bolte (Premier) seeking an inquiry into the events of the 11th and 16th, (94) as evidence had been given to the V.C. that undue police violence may have been used. (95) The University Council endorsed the V.C.'s action at its August meeting and students and administration joined in a rare common grievance. (96) The Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn, informed Council that the Premier had written him on 23 September, stating that a preliminary police enquiry had begun and evidence was being sent to the Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Rylah. (97) Council noted that the SRC itself was considering laying charges against police.

Meantime, the events of Waterdale Road were causing uproar in the Victorian Parliament.

On 23 September, State Parliament rejected a Labor call for an all-party select committee to probe the student-police clashes. Government and Country Party members combined in the Assembly to defeat Labor 41 votes to 19. (98)



Labor's motion was put by Clyde Holding as Leader of the Opposition. The Premier accused Holding of 'trying to put the Victoria Police Force on trial'. In a heated debate, Holding was continually halted by points of order from the Premier and the Chief Secretary, who tried to have the motion ruled out of order. The Speaker, Sir Vernon Christie, called for order as Rylah and Holding shouted at each other. (99) Holding maintained that if Rylah was at all concerned with the reputation of the police force he would welcome an independent inquiry into Myers' allegation.

The allegations have been made on hearsay, interjected Bolte.

It is not a question of hearsay, replied Holding, the fact is that senior university officials witnessed the incident. (100)

Bolte stated it was correct he had received a letter from the Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe and he had immediately contacted Chief Commissioner of Police, Wilby, and had a police report within hours. (101)

The Age observed of Rylah, who, as Chief Secretary, had responsibility for the police, that it was 'an absurdity' that a superintendent of police has been asked to interview Myers and academics, who have made complaints about police behaviour. (102)

Despite the fact that the V.C. had written to the Premier on 17 September, (103) no reply had arrived by the 23rd, the day of the Parliamentary debate. Myers had addressed a meeting of 1500 students and staff (about half the University community) on Thursday 17th, and it was as a result of comments made there that Myers wrote to the Chancellor in the following terms. (The Premier was not to reply to Myers' letter until 30 September.) Dated 1 October, 1970, Myers expressed to Glenn an awareness of estrangement between the University and the Government:

I enclose a copy of a letter which I have just received from the Premier, and also a draft of a letter which I would consider sending if I were to reply. However, I believe that an exchange of letters at this stage would not serve a very useful purpose...I cannot help feeling that the main complaint of the Government results from the publicity that attended my statement to the meeting of students on 17 September, and as you are aware, the reason for my making this statement was to avoid what appeared likely to be a major confrontation between members of the university and the police. (104)

The La Trobe radicals were making their presence felt in all sorts of places but the very place their ideology dictated: the working class people of Heidelberg and Preston. It was an irony addressed by Peter Cochrane:

The crucial form and content of the demos themselves, the three of them, was that the first had about 50 or 100 and was very small, but the point was even that was stopped by the police who lined up across the road, much to the consternation of workers coming out of factories with spanners in their hands, limply looking on, with all these feeble students hoping they'd join in. When students went back to get eye-witness statements from workers, workers knew nothing, saw nothing, despite the fact many had seen everything. On the first demo the police furiously attacked with batons. Platfuss wasn't somebody to be toyed with and he wanted the streets clear. He'd already had problems in the area with students distributing leaflets in places like the Northland shopping centre and proprietors trying to get students to go away and they wouldn't and police were called, so there was some suburban background to it. The police hoed into students and really harried them back to campus, whereupon once on campus students got a little more courage and began to throw rocks. After the first demo there was a meeting at which it was so clear to everybody that the police had behaved outrageously that even the V.C. made a statement in support of the students, and immediately there were plans afoot for a second demo. In between that meeting and the second demo there was enormous propagandising, leaflets, meetings, that you'd never dream of doing in a university today, which is just a measure of how the universities have changed. (105)

Barry York has written of the three Waterdale Road demonstrations that they were 'the turning point in the development of the LTU student movement' because they would 'enable a Maoist hegemony' independent of the LTU Labor Club, then strongly influenced by Grant Evans (p. 196)

York wrote in 1983 that

The demonstrations also moved some in the Evans' camp toward the Maoist position. Demos Krouskos, who had previously attacked the Maoists in his 'Z Column' in Rabelais, became a staunch Maoist as a result of the Waterdale Road events and became a leading figure during 1971. Krouskos' position was typical of others in the Labor Club who were moved far Leftward. Indeed, the list of the 19 arrested on 16 September includes many who went on to play leading or very important roles during the 1971 campus conflict: Fergus Robinson, Bromley King, David Grumont, Ian Coulter, Tom Brennan, Ken Rushgrove, John Ebel, Stephen Warne, Sharon Conroy and Peter Cochrane. (106)

By October 1970, relations were strained in several directions. The University and the police had differences; the chief executives of the State government and the University were not getting along as well as one might expect; entrenched tensions still lay between students and administration; and the radical students and the police were far apart. Indeed, from a memorandum of this time, the Deputy Registrar (D.A.C. Griffith) noted an interesting conversation he had had with the Secretary to the Premier's Department (Coulthard). (107) It may be reasonably concluded from the memorandum that the police officer assigned to the investigation, a Superintendent McLeod, was instructed by the Premier, the Chief Secretary and the Chief-Commissioner, not to conduct any enquiry at all. Instead, 'his visit to the Vice-Chancellor on Friday, 18 September, had been represented as being a discussion of means by which relationships between police and the University could be improved'. (108)

In the end there was no investigation whatsoever into the Waterdale Road incidents. The eighteen students, variously charged with assault,

insulting language, offensive behaviour, escape from lawful custody and resisting arrest, either had charges dismissed at Heidelberg Magistrate's Court or at worst, small fines imposed. Inspector Platfuss broke down into tears in the witness-box under scathing cross-examination from Phillip Cummins, QC, who had been retained by the SRC. Both Rylah and Bolte expressed disapproval of the University, and particularly of Myers being involved in incidents off-campus, and in daring to criticize the police. (109)

Simultaneously, midst all this activity, debate was in full-swing regarding the 'College system'.

A special meeting of the Council had been called for 30 October to discuss the embattled 'College system' which was coming under increasing criticism from students and staff. A request that this meeting be open to observers was once again denied to students. (110) On the question of Colleges, Council received a report prepared by Dr. John Jenkin (a former Head of Glenn College), and Professor Warren Ewens (Chairman of Menzies College). A system of College Committee government had been introduced within which students had a majority of elected members; generally, the system had been well received by students but the SRC was not satisfied and was adamant that the College system was a failure, and pressed for a centrally-located student union which would provide:

1. Central catering facilities.
2. Recreational facilities for general cultural activities and recreational sport.
3. Administrative facilities for central student organizations except the Sports Union.
4. Service facilities for the above.

The SRC suggested to the Council that Glenn and Menzies be converted to serve only resident members, and that non-college students be permitted to join a college union. (111)

The debate between students and the Council/administration was to struggle on for another two years before the concept of a central union

was accepted by the University planners. (112) The building was completed in 1974, although students were generally unhappy over the siting - so far from the library, Agora and administration. Politically minded students believed that the siting was because it divided students on either side of the moat, and was thus a preventative measure against student gatherings, and possible occupations of the administration building.

It was not surprising that the University architect and Building Branch might have taken this attitude, as 1971-72 represents the height of the student radical movement at La Trobe and nationally. As soon as the University returned in March 1971, students from the Labor Club, Communist Club and the newly formed Worker-Student Alliance (WSA) began to organise for actions on and off-campus. The key to the events of 1971-1972 lies in the nature of the Maoists. The Waterdale Road demonstrations the previous year had been designed to propagate anti-war information amongst the working class people of Heidelberg-Preston. They were also anti-police, because one of the chants on the marches was 'Who killed Collingburn. The pigs killed Collingburn.' Collingburn was a local Heidelberg man who had been bashed to death at Russell Street a few weeks previously. It was this hatred and distrust of the police that drove the La Trobe Maoists to a paranoid inflexibility of amazing proportions:

The single-mindedness of the Maoists didn't allow for compromise. We were fanatics. The absence of book reading, of open-mindedness, meant that Maoists had a no-lose analysis. No matter which way the ruling class went they were going to make mistakes and we were going to expose them in our leaflets, and we always won, even if it was defeat, because it was defeat with potential to win, or exposed ruling class weakness. The best example is the 'baton on the head become a radical' theory, where the more they pummel you, the more obvious it is that the police are the violent arm of the capitalist state. QED. It was a very unimaginative and unsophisticated analysis but it worked because it was what carried the Maoists through.

(113)

What had been building up for several years now came out into the open. In tutorials, Rabelais, pamphlets and meetings, the nature of the academic curriculum at La Trobe was publicly criticised. The social sciences, economics, sociology, physics, chemistry, all came in for criticism. An 'alternative hand-book' was published by progressive students through the SRC. One of the leaders of the curriculum debate was Andrew Campbell a politics student. In July, 1970, in 'Academic Vandalism and Social Responsibility', Campbell asserted that

In the Social Sciences, in particular, students are in the vexed position of being constantly admonished to separate value judgements from analysis, whilst they witness teaching staff who flaunt this principle with immunity...

Frustration, cynicism and alienation from the learning process are the result of tenth rate courses taught by twentieth rate teachers, who perpetrate courses that can only be described as rationalised idiocy...

The worst features of academic life are related to the maldistribution of power within the University...

Pandering to the personality characteristics of academic staff and personality judgements of students at the expense of students' intellectual ability... combine to produce the compulsive conformity that pervades the educational system at all levels... (114)

Campbell warned that should 'revolutionary confrontation' occur at La Trobe it would have been caused by a refusal to initiate meaningful course and structural reform. Campbell was possibly an agent provocateur. In many discussions with student leftists and myself during the years 1975 to the present (Ian MacDonald, Sandy Doull, Geoff Lazarus, Barry York) it has been firmly believed that Campbell was an intelligence operative on campus during the early 1970s, probably for ASIO.

The keenly debated question was 'whom should knowledge serve?'. Radicals believed that knowledge should serve everyone, and everyone be given an equal chance to be educated.

The debate on curriculum and access to education simmered continually, continues today, and hopefully will continue to do so.

The relationship of 'whom should knowledge serve?' to the administrative structures of the University came to a head on 19 April 1971. At an historic mass meeting of over 1000 students, students called for the resignation of the Chancellor (Sir Archibald Glenn), Sir Bernard Callinan (a member of the Council), and an end to the 'exclusion policy'. (115) This policy, then under review, allowed exclusion of persons enrolling at the University on the basis of political or criminal records. It was clearly directed by administrations at radical students expelled from Monash and other Universities, that is Albert Langer and Michael Hyde.

At the Council meeting the same day, Council received a delegation of eight students who presented three motions passed at the mass meeting:

That this general meeting of the La Trobe students condemn the exclusion of students from other universities from gaining admittance to La Trobe as the result of political repression and calls on Council to rescind the 'exclusion' regulation;  
demands that all correspondence and communication between La Trobe and the Joint Intelligence Organisation be made public;  
demands the resignation of Glenn and B.J. Callinan and all other members of Council. (116)

At its 5 May 1971 meeting, Council approved the decision of the Academic Board not to alter the policy regarding admissions. (117) On matters concerning admissions and indeed on most other matters, the Council, although the supreme governing body, demurred to the Academic Board. As is often the case however, there was a back-door escape for the Council. The Board gave the Vice-Chancellor, in consultation with the Deans, leave to depart from this stand if 'there are exceptional circumstances which justify a departure from this rule'. Because of tensions between Academic Board and Council, it was not to be until November 1971 that

Council finally decided not to endorse the Academic Board's decision after all. (118) As a result of this protracted stand-off, the period between April and November was a very volatile one.

Not having received the desired responses from Council, the Labor Club called a rally for 19 July, attended by about 250 students. The meeting condemned Council's failure to meet student demands for rescission of the exclusions policy, and called for Glenn's, Callinan's and others' resignations. The meeting also decided to amass outside the Council room in Glenn College at 2.00 p.m. where an elected five person delegation would proceed to inform Council that if the demands were not met immediately then Council will be blockaded indefinitely. (119) When, not surprisingly, the Council rejected the demands, all exits to the Council room were chained then blockaded with chairs and tables. At 4.15 p.m. two Councillors tried to leave and were physically obstructed. A large contingent of an estimated two hundred police in twenty-six police cars and four riot wagons assembled near Glenn College Drive at about 6.00 p.m. Barricades were removed by students involved at about 6.15 p.m. to prevent a confrontation with police. It was said to have been the first time such a police operation had occurred on an Australian campus.

Another issue that had been raised at student meetings related to assertions in the Communist Club's broadsheet Red Moat of 15 April 1971, that the Joint Intelligence Organisation of the Australian Defence Department had made overtures to the La Trobe administration to set up institutional ties between itself and La Trobe for the purpose of co-ordinating activities in the gathering of information about 'subversive revolutionary movements'. How closely academics such as Professor of Politics Hugo Wolfsohn and Claudio Veliz (Professor of Sociology) and others as was believed by the Maoists, might have been involved in such activities is difficult to determine, but it was supposed that academics and administrators were involved in informing Australian intelligence personnel. An official high in the administration hierarchy at La Trobe informed me in 1985 that he 'would be very surprised indeed if Veliz did



not have close ties with the CIA'. Andrew Campbell, whose mentor was Professor Hugo Wolfsohn, and who supervised Campbell's Honors thesis on the Communist Party of Australia, later joined the Office of National Assessments under Fraser's regime, and had close ties to ASIO. The late Senator Ivor Greenwood, who, as Attorney-General, protected the Ustasha military training camps in Australia, and whose portfolio retained ASIO, was a friend and associate of Professor Veliz. Campbell's expertise was international terrorism. Veliz' expertise was guerilla movements. I have been informed of the presence of ASIO operatives on La Trobe campus during this period, by a former Australian Vietnam serviceman retained by ASIO in 1970-1972 to report on the La Trobe situation. It would be surprising if there was not some truth in the communist students' assertions, but how much is conjecture.

As for the University Council itself, the possibilities for 'tying-in' were endless:

As for Callinan, once you get to that point and grasp the international context and put La Trobe within it, you've already arrived at a position where the student movement at La Trobe was more sophisticated than in 1970; like sitting down and doing a socio-economic examination of the University Council, and typing in the university establishment with the capitalist system in general. And once that was done, any bridge that fell down or tree that fell down or anyone run over by a GMH car, was immediately a martyr that could be connected to someone on the University Council. The question of whether or not Callinan was culpably responsible for the collapse of the West Gate Bridge is mind boggling. (120)

It was a busy time indeed for student activists in Melbourne. On 3 July 1971 the South African Rugby team visit to Olympic Park sparked off a violent police-student/worker clash at which some La Trobe radicals (including La Trobe politics student Bill Hartley) were arrested. (121) The 4 July realised another confrontation outside the United States consulate, (122) and then came the 19 July blockade at La Trobe. (123) On 24 August, the University Proctorial Board heard charges against ten

students relating to the 'blockade', (124) considerable emotion having been whipped up in the Melbourne press with a front page photograph of Dr. Phillip Law being physically confronted by students. (125) Dr. Phillip Law was one of the most distinguished persons to sit on the LTU Council. He was Vice-President of the Victorian Institute of Colleges (since 1966), a famous Antarctic explorer, and respected academic. The hearings were in a closed court-room, off campus, in the Old Licensing Court, City. Eight students were expelled for periods of one to three years. (126) During the remainder of the year the Left repeatedly demanded their re-instatement and that no police be called onto campus; also, the rescission of the 'exclusion policy' and the resignation of Glenn and Callinan.

On 26 July the Council had again been blockaded by students demanding the 19 July charges be dropped. On 30 September the administration offices were occupied and police entered the building. Further occupations occurred on 4 and 6 October. (127) Again police entered the building but few confrontations occurred as students vacated before the police arrived. Twenty-five students faced charges on 22 October in relation to occupations. Hearings were held 'in camera', off-campus, under heavy security and students were denied the right to cross-examine informants. The predictable outcome was that five more students were excluded, including myself, who was SRC President. Exclusions were for one to three years and fines totalling \$3175 were imposed on twenty-four students. (128) There was no right of appeal. Twelve students had been excluded in all and it was believed to be the first time an SRC President had been excluded from an Australian University.

The SRC and University reaction to these events will be discussed later. I wish however to continue to develop the matter of the presence of police on campus.

Their presence was not unplanned. On 19 July 1971, when students blockaded Council members, one Council member (Dr. P.G. Law) telephoned

the police alleging that he had been assaulted. (129) When, in the darkness of that evening, students still maintaining the blockade saw the flashing blue lights of about 20 police vehicles (from Heidelberg and Russell Street stations) enter the campus, it was thought obvious that elements within Council and the administration had a working relationship with the Victorian police, one more intimate than just the formal right of a citizen to call the police. On 26 July up to 200 police in 17 cars, 4 unmarked cars, 4 divisional vans and riot wagons entered campus. (130) On two other occasions in October 1971 the Vice-Chancellor caused police to enter the campus, on one of which about a hundred police arrived within an hour and a half of the occupation beginning. To muster such numbers probably involved prior consultation. (131) News Weekly, whose sources, whilst anti-Left, were usually factually accurate, wrote that

Myers had a long standing arrangement with local police that they were not to enter the campus under any circumstances until he called them personally. (132)

During the occupations in 1971 and 1972, filing cabinets were broken open and correspondence of a confidential nature was retrieved. Letters between the Registrar, Vice-Chancellor, Assistant Commissioner of Police (Mr. Braybrook) and Acting Under-Secretary (Mr. Dillon), and other documents taken, contained statements from various professors and senior administrative staff reporting to the Vice-Chancellor the names of students who had participated in protests. To this day the report of Mr. Justice Kaye (Chairman of Proctorial Board 1970-1972) remains strictly confidential.

The documents revealed that La Trobe authorities had been in contact with their counterparts in Japan and the United States and that preparations were being made for the use of gas and other weapons. One such document gives some insight into the political orientation of senior officials. It began with the note:

The events that shook the university in the 1960s have to date only raised a mild ripple on the academic backwaters of Australia. It is conceivable that soon a storm of protests may rock Australian academics and then again, it is possible that the sluggish minds of Australian students will not even rise to attack a genuine grievance. (133)

A list of possible threats to the Library discussed by the anonymous writer included fire, gases, bomb-planting, destruction of files, picketing, blockades, and hostage-taking. The document referred to the 'Japanese student riots' and the use of gas at La Trobe to clear occupations from sensitive areas such as the library. Understanding of the internationalisation of student rebellion was also evident, and mentioned student tactics in the United States and Japan in occupations. The documents also enabled the Maoists to home in on the Chief Librarian, D. H. Borchardt, as a reactionary. Another document dealt with five principles to deal with 'insurgents' during occupations, and copies were given to carefully selected La Trobe academics in card form. Example: 'Observe actions consciously, concentrating on a few only - who does what, where, when, take notes'. Other documents conclusively dispelled any notions that police entered campus merely in response to a call. Instead, correspondence showed that very senior police and administration officials must be contacted before police could act. Documents also revealed that university authorities were not reluctant in providing student identification cards to police or others in order to identify political students. Dr. Law had photos to assist him in his court action. Significantly, all student cards of excluded and expelled students were placed on one sheet of paper and photostated, to enable easy identification in Proctorial Board hearings, court cases and intelligence gathering. (134)

When the University Council froze student funds in March 1972, evidence was obtained to prove it was not an unplanned step. A letter to the Business Manager (Mr. Barnes) from Blake and Riggall (the University's solicitors) showed that Council had been conscious of, and was preparing to, halt or redirect the progressive orientation of

student spending as early as August 1971, three months before the SRC decision of 2 November to pay the \$3175 student fines. The letter of August 1971 stated that:

It is not possible to draw up a general list of matters on which the SRC can spend the money granted to it by Council. Rather, each situation must be viewed separately in order to decide whether it is closely enough related to the general welfare and development of all enrolled students. It is our opinion that neither the bail fund for Draft Resisters nor contribution to the NLF can be so classified. (135)

It is reasonable to assume that the University authorities had asked for such legal opinion in the first place. It was made crystal clear from Council's subsequent actions that the nature of student spending deeply concerned University Councils, and the Victorian and Federal Liberal Governments. No amount of student funds poured into dances, bands and folk nights could arouse such sensitivity. The University also had in its possession a copy of the Defence Force Protection Prohibited Acts. These Acts (No. 57 of 1967, 3(1)) laid down restrictions on collaboration with the Government and Communist Party of North Vietnam and the NLF. In the light of the University's investigation into student spending, it is probable the authorities sought to bring La Trobe student 'donations' to the NLF into line with the Defence Force Protection Act. One document procured at the March 1972 occupation contained policy statements from every Australian University about the registration of students for National Service. Only Melbourne and Tasmania Universities were prepared to supply the Department of National Service with a list of eligible students. One policy however, was missing: La Trobe's.

As far as the police were concerned, they appeared determined to pursue the laying of their own charges against students in relation to the events of 1971. During the Christmas holiday period there was police surveillance and arrest of seven students on civil charges, despite a long letter from the Vice-Chancellor written confidentially to

the Under-Secretary (Mr. Dillon) on 8 November 1971. The reasons for Dr. Myers' letter become clear in these extracts:

Arising out of a blockade of the Council of the University on July 19, 1971, and the stoning of a police car on 29 July, 1971, the Proctorial Board heard charges against a number of students and imposed... penalties of exclusion...the University provided, through its solicitors, information on which the police might take such action as they thought fit. Your department and the police were good enough to withhold action until the university disciplinary hearings had been completed. I understand that charges have now been laid by the police... The students concerned are: T.A. Brennan, P. Dowling, D. Krouskos, R.H. Mathews, F.J. Robinson, K.H. White and B. York... (136)

The Vice-Chancellor then specifically requested police not to pursue charging B.W. Pola (SRC President) on a charge of besetting. No appeal was made on behalf of the above seven. Myers went on:

I am therefore rather embarrassed in making this suggestion...I believe now that any further action... might well have an adverse effect on future discipline within the university...that any further action would be an indication of vindictiveness...It is only recently that we have been able to show that the university disciplinary penalties can be effectively applied and it seems to me that our position may well be weakened if in this case they are not allowed to stand alone without being supplemented by action through the courts. (137)

Myers was concerned to show the Victorian Government (particularly Premier Bolte) that the University could be managed by the University. He was also concerned that a martyr not be made of some students, particularly the SRC President. His efforts were to fail however, and police pursued their two charges: Besetting premises and possession of an offensive weapon. The SRC President was the only person to have these charges laid against him. It is my view that the Vice-Chancellor went to some lengths to prevent my prosecution, not because of factors of guilt or innocence but because the ramifications of the possible

conviction of an elected SRC President on charges that the Proctorial Board itself had found to be insubstantive, would have been embarrassing to the University. Especially as the University itself had provided the police with the disproved information.

I was able to prove I was at work in a factory in Preston with Ian MacDonald. That evening my car had run out of petrol and I carried a can of petrol by a short cut past the blockade. The next day, Professor Wolfsohn accused a student of carrying petrol around at the blockade and this was fed to the Herald (20 July 1971).

In researching Registry archives I was able to peruse correspondence between D.A.C. Griffith (Assistant Registrar) and R.M. Braybrook (Assistant Commissioner of Police). (138) Dated 24-2-71, it related to the forwarding of 'excellent plans of the University in the event that you require our services'. Further letters regarding meetings and discussions between senior Russell Street officers, T.S. Taylor (Registrar), the Premier, Police Superintendent Delaney (Heidelberg), Mr. Dillon (Under-Secretary), Mr. A.T.J. Bell (Registrar, University of Melbourne), reveal a well organised level of co-operation in the event of student protests. La Trobe authorities, it transpired, also considered it politic to inform Dr. Watson (Principal of La Trobe Secondary Teachers' College), of the exclusion of Education Department studentship holders as a result of Proctorial Board hearings. This information appeared in a letter from the Registrar to Dr. Watson on 26 August 1971. Finally, in letters dated 30 August and 22 October 1971, it is clear that considerable co-operation existed between the Academic Registrar at Monash University and the Registrars at La Trobe and Melbourne Universities. (139) This co-operation related to the passing on of information regarding students excluded from Victoria's three Universities for political and/or criminal reasons.

That such discussions occurred is not so strange, despite administrative regulations regarding confidentiality of student records. On the contrary, it was to be expected that in a time when institutions

such as Universities, the Courts, the Police and Governments saw themselves as being threatened, the senior bureaucrats in those organisations planned tactics and strategies to contain and subdue the crises. The surprise was that radical students would have thought it surprising.

At La Trobe, activism did not express itself solely in blockades and occupations. Just as the authorities formalised a formidable array of retaliatory tactics, the students and some academics fought out another kind of battle - the propaganda battle. This battle was carried on through countless pamphlets and in the pages of Rabelais. For example, Barry York (a Maoist member of the Labor Club) engaged in a fiery debate with Professor Ronald Goldman over the justifications for the blockade of 19 July. Goldman maintained that

The only benefactors of turbulence on the campus are the Maoists which, of course, is why they create it. They provide no alternative but chaos and have no clear idea how a university is or should be governed. Their views are negative and destructive. Who would replace Glenn, Callinan and their alleged stooges on Council? A student soviet? Ted Hill and a Maoist committee? They provide no alternative because they have not got one. The only aim is to confuse, subvert and overthrow, which they haven't a hope of doing despite all the threats, brave talk and fiery oratory. (140)

Goldman was not without critics. In what was to become a bitter personal battle, Doug White (lecturer in education) extensively criticised Goldman's views and echoed the sentiments of many student Leftists. Ultimately, the debate got down to whether one accepted society's established means of reform or believed that a total structural change was the only answer. White declared that

to talk about rational discussion, divorced from action and within the framework of existing legality is to be either myopic or dishonest. (141)



There were a number of conservative students who argued against participation by students in, for example, academic decision making. Andrew Campbell, a brilliant mind, maintained a radical conservatism against student involvement, believing it led to bureaucratisation and entrenchment of academic mediocrity. (142) Campbell's views were in the minority but seriously considered.

Academics did not only engage in debate in Rabelais. The Council meeting of 26 July 1971 discussed an incident which occurred during a Politics I lecture on 28 June, delivered by Professor Wolfsohn. Council expressed grave concern at the disruption of the lecture by Labor Club activists, and at a subsequent incident when Professor Getzler was threatened with violence. (143)

University Councillors remained in a state of tense indecision regarding a number of issues. On 26 July for example, as students chanted slogans and blockaded Council, Councillors were discussing the need for greater student participation in University affairs and whether student observers should be allowed to attend Boards of Studies, the Academic Board and Council. Council however, deferred consideration of this matter until a later meeting. (144) It was not to be until 1979 that observers were permitted at Council, and not until 1987 that student representatives were to sit on the Academic Board. (145)

By December 1971 the public standing of the University had taken something of a battering. No longer prominent were the Age, Sun and Herald articles concerned with new university buildings and photos of ducks on the lake. Instead, from the time of the Waterdale Road marches, the press had been carrying head-lines troublesome to the publicity-minded administration. The stage for the events of 1972 had already been set by the end of 1971, and the public image of the University as 'Australia's most radical campus' was established.

Considerable responsibility for this situation lay with the various student clubs: Communist Club, Anarchists Club, WSA and the Labor Club.

The SRC however, played a crucial role too. The SRC September elections saw the radicals make some gains. Of the 19 SRC members elected, a radical left caucus of eight could be relied on. (Judy Blood, Nan Chelsworth, Ross Laird, John Davies, Ray Cloonan, Brian Pola, Ian MacDonald and Peter Taylor.) (146) Numbers, depending on the issue, were often tight.

The first meeting of the Fifth SRC was held on 11 October 1971. Brian Pola was elected President, and Ian MacDonald, Secretary. (147) From its first meeting this SRC pursued what it believed to be its charter: the protection of student services and rights. For example, the University's Buildings' Branch had embarked upon an 'Agora Development Program' whereby the entire Agora (the main meeting place for the University), was to be concreted. The SRC decided promptly to take whatever steps necessary to delay the work, to approach the unions concerned with a request to black-ban the project, and be available at 7.30 next morning for direct action if necessary. (148) This threat was put into practice at 7.30 the next morning, and University architects were obliged to re-plan the area as it is today, with four plane trees and central lawn.

Other policy decisions were made that placed the SRC and the University in a delicate relationship. The Proctorial Board hearings were declared an 'infringement of individual rights' and it was agreed that the SRC would pay the legal fees of students involved. (149) At subsequent meetings, a permanent bail fund of \$1000 was established; the legal fees for Ken White, a La Trobe student, were paid; and \$300 was donated to Pentridge Prison for educational purposes. White, a friend from the early beery days of Menzies College, had been convicted of involvement in the molotov cocktail and shot-gun attack on Honeywell, the computer company, in St. Kilda. (150) The Pentridge donation was made at the request of in-mate draft resisters Bob Scates and Ken MacClelland, who quickly tired of Pentridge's lack of reasonable literature.

These expenditures came on top of a decision earlier in the year, on 5 May, at an SRC general meeting, when \$200 was donated to the NLF. (151) This decision caused an outcry from the Democratic Club and received the condemnation of the RSL. (152) Letters from Australians serving in Vietnam calling students traitors and cowards appeared in the daily mail. (153) News Weekly, the NCC weekly, had a field-day on Communist manipulators, and B.A. Santamaria on his Point of View TV program made much of his bitterness against Leftist 'thugs'. (154)

But the greater the outrage of conservative reactionaries, the more the student Left seemed to take to promoting controversial causes. Reaction was a barometer of success.

Reaction was, in fact, the name of the game. Five months before the Fifth SRC took over, the Fourth SRC had decided to withdraw all student representatives on University committees, relationships between the Council and administrators having reached an all time low. (155) The decision was in response to the admissions policy of the Academic Board, a policy supported by the University Council. The so-called 'exclusions policy' related to students excluded from other universities (for reasons other than academic) not being permitted to enrol at La Trobe. The SRC decision exempted the General Facilities Planning Committee and the Colleges and Housing Committee, as the presence of student representatives was necessary there in order to successfully conclude negotiations for a central student union. (156)

During 1971 the SRC leadership firmed links with the Socialist Left of the Victorian ALP. Individual SRC members such as Ian MacDonald and Brian Pola, became members of the ALP. The then recently deposed State ALP Secretary Bill Hartley became heavily involved in student political affairs and was valuable in providing support from the ALP machine and Unions. Hartley often took a more radical line than the so-called radical students. For example, when it came to actual occupations 'Left' SRC members were rather thin on the ground. A direct request from me to Ian MacDonald to join the March 1972 occupations met with a

firm refusal. In addition, with Pentridge his home for but a few hours in 1972, MacDonald, an avowed 'Marxist', decided to gain release on 'religious grounds'. Opportunism posing as radicalism was not absent at La Trobe.

Links were strengthened with the '27 rebel unions' who were undergoing disputation with the entrenched conservative Trades Hall Council leadership. Particularly helpful were Unionists such as Ken Carr, Wally Curran, George Crawford. Hartley became an elected student member of Council in 1971 and participated in the occupations. The other main Left student grouping was the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) group. It was led by Barry York, Fergus Robinson and John Redenbach, and developed close ties with that Party, particularly its National Secretary Ted Hill. Prominent in the Party were Ted Bull (Waterside Workers' Federation of Australia) and Norm Gallagher (Builders' Labourers' Federation), both of whom maintained contact with LTU Maoists. Important links were also established with the Aboriginal movement, largely through the Australian Union of Students. Through the perspectives of Aboriginal leaders such as Gary Foley, Cheryl Buchanan, Bobbi Sykes, Ambrose Golden-Brown and Denis Walker, radical La Trobe students gradually became more politically aware.

There were differences of opinion, however, between the ALP Victorian Parliamentary Caucus and the State Council of the ALP, on such significant matters as the presence of police on Melbourne university campuses. Whilst the performance of ALP Opposition Leader Clyde Holding had been praiseworthy over the Waterdale Road incidents, (157) the SRC President and Secretary were critical of the 'Centre Unity' line on police on campus. In a letter written to all Australian universities and CAEs and Institutions in October 1971, the SRC executive drew attention to a perennial problem that progressive Labor Party students have with more conservative wings of the ALP, such as Centre Unity, which dominated the Parliamentary wing.

...there is a contradiction between the Parliamentary Labor Party caucus and the State Council on the question of direct action. It follows from the line that the Labour caucus pursues that direct action is always legitimately liable to police intervention, since direct action contravenes the present interpretation of the law. Hence, this view necessarily involves an acceptance of political repression. We consider that this view is contradictory to the sentiments expressed by students, especially in recent years, and to the view stated by the State Council in August. (158)

The letter, an important statement, drew ALP and Australian student attention to the involvement of the Victorian Special Branch (now disbanded) at La Trobe, and urged the assistance of the ALP in trying to resolve a 'vicious circle of events' where flat refusals by the Vice-Chancellor to negotiate on re-instatement of expelled students had led to a non-negotiable situation for students, where direct action was the only recourse. On one side, twelve students had been suspended or expelled, including the SRC President, and \$3175 in fines imposed on 24 students. At any time hundreds of students could be called on to occupy, blockage or disrupt the University. On the other side, academics such as Wolfsohn stoutly affirmed to the press: 'If the University administration were to discuss the student demands it would appear weak and ridiculous'. (159)

It was the fines issue that was to be the front runner when the University resumed in early March 1972. This had been made inevitable because of an SRC decision at its 2 November 1971 meeting when it was agreed that the SRC pay the \$3175, but that the motion should first go to a General Meeting of students called for 7 March 1972. (160) Until 7 March the decision was not final.

It was this motion that caused the administration so much discomfort. Administration tacticians had to decide which way to jump, in a situation of quite delicate police/government and University relations. Well before the final decision was put before students on 7 March, the Vice-Chancellor saw an opportunity for the decision to be

made for him. At the 21 February 1972 meeting of Council, the Vice-Chancellor referred to a letter he had received from Ms. J. Sullivan, an elected undergraduate representative on Council and member of the Democratic Club faction of the SRC. The letter referred to certain transactions of the SRC and in the light of these Council decided, unanimously 'it will not recognise any purported decision of the SRC in which the vote of a person who has ceased to be a member of the SRC has been taken into account'. (161) This decision referred to the SRC President who, in accordance with SRC approval, continued to vote in SRC meetings whilst a suspended student. The Council approved the request of Ms. Sullivan that she be reimbursed for legal costs incurred by her or any other SRC members she may nominate, in applying to the Supreme Court for an injunction, in order to establish the right of a person who had ceased to be a student to act as a member of the SRC. Council did this, as it said, 'to assist the SRC to manage its affairs effectively'! (162) Pending the result of these proceedings, Council agreed that all payments from the University to the SRC be withheld. It suited the Council not to co-join Sullivan at this stage as co-plaintiff. Sullivan, later joined by Ms. S. Uniake and the Council itself, were only interested 'in seeking to assist the SRC in managing its affairs effectively' in accordance with a determination to have the SRC budget allocated to strictly non-political areas. (163) The length to which the Council and NCC/DLP elements on campus (who manipulated students such as Sullivan and Uniake), were prepared to go to defeat the SRC, were extraordinary. The more so since Sullivan and Uniake were themselves SRC members. The willingness of Council was especially seen in the 'open cheque' decision regarding legal action. (Sir Bernard Callinan, a prominent Catholic layman and NCC sympathiser, was a member of the University Council's powerful Executive Committee.)

Myers believed that the University Discipline Statute (8.1) would be rendered ineffective if the SRC paid the fines. However, the SRC had not finally decided to pay the fines, as it awaited a decision that was five weeks away. The V.C. and the Councillors decision centred on preventing a decision of a future meeting of students to pay the fines.

The fines had to be paid by 13 March if any of the fined students were to re-enrol in 1972. Therefore, even if the general meeting on 7 March agreed to pay the fines, the SRC would be prevented from doing so, since SRC finances were frozen. The pretext for the freezing was the SRC President's student status, but the SRC could not fight this either, because there was no money to mount a challenge. Because the students could not afford to pay the fines from their own resources, it looked as if most of them would be excluded, which, naturally enough, was probably the intention of Dr. Myers, the Government, the Council, the NCC/DLP and the police.

Council's interest in student spending had come about, after years of indifference, because of efforts by a number of Councillors, academics and industrialists, who sought investigation into SRC spending. (164) This was prompted by their awareness of expenditure items such as the SRC Bail Fund, Pentridge Prison donation and aid to the NLF. These expenditures related to the Vietnam War, a war supported by the Liberal-Country Party Coalition and the DLP/NCC group. Multi-nationals such as ICI, BHP and BP, which had inter-locking relationships with La Trobe Council, stood to gain financially from the war.

The entirety of the SRC's expenditure was however, in conformity with SRC policy, general meeting decisions and the SRC constitution. The Council attempted to use the University Act, (165) which stated that the University was responsible for all monies collected by the University, including the General Service Fee (GSF) which the University collected from every student and handed over to the SRC and Sports Union. (166) The SRC leadership regarded Council's use of the Act as an abuse of the spirit of the Act, and a denial of SRC financial autonomy, since the money was in fact student money and the University was merely the collector. (167) The SRC 'leadership' comprised Brian Pola (President), Ian MacDonald (Secretary), Ross Laird, Peter Taylor, Judy Blood, John Davies, Nan Chelsworth and Ray Cloonan. This group operated as a very tight caucus prior to meetings of the Fifth SRC.

Due to these developments, it was obvious that the senior University officers and the Council were nervous of an SRC that also had behind it a high level of political involvement by students other than SRC members, and who were committed to opposing any decisions not in student interests as students themselves saw them. A majority of SRC members were intent on furthering the SRC along the lines of a student union, as clearly, since the mid-sixties, the nature of SRCs had changed in Australia and elsewhere, due to political urgencies and new concepts as to the role of the student in the University and the community. Unfortunately, University administrations did not respond to these changes as one would wish. In Victoria, the conservative Bolte government inhibited moves to evolve a coherent policy of tertiary education based on the needs of students themselves. At La Trobe, the administration was over-burdened with extremely conservative appointments at best paternalistic towards student initiatives, at worst, hostile.

So it was then, that student governments could not, through pressure of events, remain a passive debating society confined to a small social circle. At La Trobe, it was in pressing for policies supported by the majority of students, that the SRC came into a direct conflict with a politically conservative Council and administration. (168) For example, a typical medium sized SRC General Meeting of Students was one held on 22 June 1971. 400 students were present. Motions passed unanimously included support for 4 July demonstration, the 3 July South African Rugby Tour demonstration, \$400 for bail associated with predicted arrests at these demonstrations, and a one week student-staff strike to support the anti-war, anti-apartheid week, 28 June-2 July. Council concern at such expenditures is evidenced in Council Minutes. (169) The dichotomy between student and administrator had become an Australian-wide reality, to the extent that University administrations found it necessary to use overt coercion to enforce decisions on student organisations.



During the 1971-72 summer vacation, the SRC met on 17 February. The Left dominated the proceedings, during which the SRC Administrative Secretary, Mrs. J. Matison, was pressed to offer her resignation, as she was not trusted by the Left as far as political neutrality was concerned. The Proctorial Board hearings were then discussed. The SRC believed that this Board ought only hear cases related to academic matters, that is examination cheating, and that in other cases students should be in the majority on the Board. The SRC, considering the uses to which the Board had been put, declined to nominate a representative to the Board and refused to recognise its decisions; it deplored the expulsions and fines and demanded re-instatement of excluded students. (170) Further 'until such time as the administration re-instates all expelled students, this SRC refuses to recognise the administration'. These resolutions were presented to the University Council meeting on 21 February and Council refused to accept the SRC report 'in view of the unconstitutional nature of the meeting'. (171) With the support of the SRC, I attended that Council meeting of 21 February as SRC President, although an excluded student. Council had been seated for some twenty to thirty minutes before the V.C. drew Sir Archibald Glenn's attention to the fact that I was present, and he as Chairman requested I leave, which I refused to do. Complete silence reigned for a minute after which I was advised by Glenn that the meeting would adjourn until such time as I left. Deciding to remain, impatience got the better of some and I was informed by the V.C. he would call the police, which he did. I waited for a few minutes then excused myself and left. (172)

On 23 February the news reached the press that the La Trobe Council had cut-off funds to the SRC and was refusing to recognise SRC decisions. (173) Sir Henry Winneke, Chief Justice (and whose son prosecuted the University's case at the Proctorial Board hearings) granted an interim injunction to this effect, citing SRC members as defendants. (174) The solicitors acting for Sullivan and Uniake were Gaynor and Co., the NCC solicitors, one of whose counsel was Dr. Spry, son of the Founding Director-General of ASIO. (175)

The University was embarrassed that such programs as Orientation would now not eventuate, being SRC funded, so the University Finance Branch arranged to 'lend' student money to the SRC for such purposes. (176) Mr. D. Griffith, Acting Registrar, was able to arrange this with Mr. Norbert Ryan (Orientation Chairman and member of the Democratic Club). Obviously, the administration was keen to see the SRC finance service functions only. Political functions were not to be financed.

Alongside the issue of 'student autonomy' the matter of the 'exclusions policy' was still controversial. On 28 February, blows were struck at the University of Melbourne as a group of thirty students tried to force their way into the administration building. (177) I had been accepted as a student in the education faculty at Melbourne but on information supplied by La Trobe University to A.T.J. Bell (Registrar, Melbourne University), I had been asked to appear before the Victorian Universities' Admissions Committee in order to assure of my 'good behaviour' if I were to be admitted by the University. (178) Such a precaution was quite rare, and since I considered the suggestion that I had not been of good behaviour objectionable, I declined the offer to appear and returned to La Trobe as an 'excluded student'.

The La Trobe SRC, straitened for cash to fund its campaigns, began to approach student organisations around Australia for aid. Letters signed by Ian MacDonald and Ross Laird were sent to all Australian Universities. (179) The SRC meeting of 6 March erupted into violence over disagreements regarding the propriety of such a letter, but money began to come in, kept in a separate account controlled by MacDonald and myself. (180)

Eight of the nineteen SRC members were to defend themselves against the injunction. (181) The legal representatives of the eight (solicitors, barristers and a Queen's Counsel empathetic to progressive student unionism), provided their services free of charge, and called for a settlement by negotiation, the terms of which would allow the eight's court costs not to include the costs of Sullivan and Uniacke.

(182) This proposal was suggested to the University on the understanding that the eight would vote not to pay the student fines even if directed by the student body to do so. (183) Such a proposal was seen as a sell-out by the eight and was rejected by them. Even so, the University Council barristers also rejected any compromise along these lines. The eight SRC members thus stood to be in contempt of the Supreme Court should the SRC pay the fines, and would face an indefinite prison sentence.

On 8 March over 1000 students met on the Menzies College centre lawn. Geoff Walsh was in the Chair. Decisions either reached or reiterated related to:

- (a) dropping of fines,
- (b) re-instatement of students,
- (c) the Council withdrawing its resolution regarding SRC funds,
- (d) demanding Uniake's and Sullivan's resignations from the SRC and Sullivan's from Council,
- (e) the V.C. being invited to address a rally to be held the next day and a delegation present these decisions to the V.C. (184)

The V.C. was presented with the decisions by a small delegation. No response was forthcoming from the V.C. however. Indeed, the only development was that the University itself had decided to assume responsibility as co-plaintiff, eclipsing Sullivan and Uniake. (185) The summons for the interlocutory injunction came on for hearing on 10 March, and the University and the Victorian Attorney-General became co-plaintiffs on 15 March. (186) The case was of interest to Australian University administrations generally, as other student unions, such as Monash, had also engaged in expenditure of a political nature. (187) As a method of stemming the wave of student protest, the La Trobe University case was being watched with interest, and that the University decided to become the plaintiff added significance to the case. The hearing was adjourned until 22 March, so Ian MacDonald and I travelled interstate seeking financial support. We travelled to the Universities of Sydney, Macquarie, New South Wales, New England, ANU and Queensland. At open air meetings of hundreds of students, motions expressing support

for the La Trobe SRC in its struggle against the administration and the Council were passed. (188) Particularly supportive were Adrian Shackley (President SRC New England); Chris Sidoti (President Sydney University SRC) and Chris Joyce (President Macquarie Student Council). At Macquarie, the student council decided to give \$700 to La Trobe but on 17 March two students with NCC affiliations (Stephen Harrison and James Gerard Soorley) successfully applied to the New South Wales Equity Court for an injunction to stop payment. (189) The grounds provided to Mr. Justice Hope were similar to those being used by the La Trobe Council; that is, that the money would not be used for the welfare of Macquarie students. An appeal to the New South Wales Supreme Court, however, was successful, and the money was paid over on 22 March. (190)

At its meeting of 20 March the La Trobe Council was notified by Mr. Kaye QC that he would be unable to resume chairmanship of the Proctorial Board, owing to his recent elevation to the bench of the Supreme Court. (191) It was understandably assumed that Kaye had received the Judgeship as a reward for his controversial decisions at the 1971 Board hearings. Certainly his chairmanship would have been able to be reported on by Mr. John Winneke QC, son of the Chief Justice and the University's prosecutor at the hearings. The Council appointed Professor Kingston Braybrooke to the vacant position.

On 21 March, the Executive Council at La Trobe was called together to discuss settlement proposals tentatively put before them through Holding, Ryan and Redlich (the eight SRC defendants' legal counsel). The Executive Council present at this meeting were: Mr. K. Vial (Deputy Chancellor); Dr. D.M. Myers (Vice-Chancellor); Sir Bernard Callinan and Professor Wardrop (Deputy Vice-Chancellor). Determination to subdue the direction of student political activities was clearly revealed at this meeting. (192) The eight defendants' proposals and Executive Committee responses were as follows.

One: The defendant Pola agrees that he will not take part in the business of the SRC as a member thereof unless and until re-elected to the said SRC in accordance with the Statutes of the

La Trobe University and the SRC Constitution after the period of his exclusion.

The response of the Committee was that this should extend to his attendance at SRC meetings.

Two: The defendants (other than Pola) agree to call a meeting of the SRC and at that meeting vote in favour of motions which will

- (a) rescind any previous resolutions which authorised that fines imposed by the Proctorial Board be paid out of SRC funds;
- (b) direct that no fine imposed by the Proctorial Board in October 1971 be paid out of SRC funds.

The response of the Committee was that these terms were not acceptable, 'as it considered that a declaration by the court is essential to the proper settlement of the issue'.

It was this uncompromising attitude of the Executive Committee deciding to proceed in the Supreme Court after the defendants had offered terms amounting to capitulation, that drove an implacable wedge between La Trobe students en masse, and the University-Government authorities who relentlessly pursued the case.

The SRC defendants had in effect offered to completely surrender over the issue of payment of the fines, which had been the original issue raised to Council by Ms. Sullivan. Now, with SRC funds frozen and facing costs of two to three thousand dollars a day in the Supreme Court, the SRC defendants had their backs to the wall. Despite having been offered victory on the issue, the University proceeded to grind the SRC into complete and ignominious submission through the Courts.

Point four of the Settlement Proposals had asked (in view of the generosity of point two above), the University to discontinue the action, not to finance its continuation through Sullivan and Uniake, and

that the University pay its own costs. This proposal had, in effect, also been rejected.

Point six had sought an extension of time (to the end of Term One) to pay the fines. This suggestion was also rejected. (One week after final judgement was the University's final date for payment of fines.) In a last twist, the Executive Committee resolved that it would not object to the SRC itself paying defendants' costs from SRC funds. The funds, of course, were frozen by the University.

The following morning in the Supreme Court, the Barrister for six of the defendants, Mr. Ken Marks QC, told the Court that as the University had rejected the settlement proposals, he and the defendants were withdrawing from the case. (193) A few minutes later the defendants, Judy Blood, Ray Cloonan, Nan Chelworth, Ian MacDonald, Peter Taylor and Ross Laird, together with Marks, strode out of the court for good. (194)

After they left, the Barristers for Sullivan, Uniake, the University and the Victorian Attorney-General, sought to further extend the effect of the injunctions to:

- (a) completely freeze SRC bank accounts, preventing students from using their own monies for any purpose at all;
- (b) prevent the former defendants from meeting any of their legal costs from SRC funds. (195)

This would have meant that SRC funds would be frozen completely for an indefinite period until the injunction was heard. It also meant that the plaintiffs believed it was proper to sue members of the SRC, then prevent the SRC from making funds available to defend the action. No attempt was made by the University or Attorney-General to amend the original writs which claimed costs and damages against the defendants.

- As it transpired, Mr. Justice Newton the same day granted orders
1. Forbidding the use of SRC funds for payment of Proctorial Board fines.

2. Preventing excluded student Brian Pola continuing as an SRC member. (196)

The V.C., doubtless assuming that the orders would be obeyed and that would be that, then instructed that funds payable to the SRC be released

to enable the SRC to proceed with its activities in the normal way. (197)

But the V.C.'s action had come too late. A general meeting of students had been scheduled for the 23 March - the same day. The meeting began at 1.00 with 574 students present. Brian Pola was in the Chair. (198) The Judge's orders had been already made and the V.C. had released SRC funds.

The meeting decided to defy the Judge's orders. Motions formulated by Bill Hartley were passed:

1. That this General Meeting of students demands full autonomy for students in the management of their finances and in the management of their own affairs; this meeting thus requests Brian Pola to resume full duties as President of the SRC irrespective of any court injunction to the contrary.
2. That the SRC be directed to pay the fines of the fined students tomorrow.
3. Failing this, that direct action be taken against the University to secure its release; that if the administration insists that the SRC is not able to pay the fines and if there is not a clear statement from the administration concerning (2) that there be direct action against the University to secure these two things.
- (4) That if these two demands are not met in 3 days then motion (3) be implemented.
- (5) That these demands be presented by delegation to the Vice-Chancellor. (199)

About 30 students did so and Myers' response, according to the Age on 24 March, was 'This is out of our hands now. The court has made certain orders and I presume it will take any action it feels necessary. Any payment by the SRC of the fines would be in contempt of the court order'. (200)

Many students had come to believe that the issues were now larger than those confined to the La Trobe campus. It was considered that the political implications of student financial autonomy were more widespread than those confined to local student political groups. These sentiments were expressed in an SRC pamphlet prior to the 23 March meeting. It observed that

The SRC has obviously won the support of a majority of the student body and from more than a dozen trade unions and from most Universities in Australia.

It concluded

Council would rather see students running more dances and pouring more booze than getting entangled in issues put up by 'radical ratbags'. (201)

Understandably so. The three days passed by and on 28 March a general meeting of about nine hundred students narrowly voted to occupy the administration building. The occupation lasted three days and two nights, with about four hundred students at the beginning and 150 at any one time. Throughout, the propaganda war raged on. The Worker-Student Alliance printed leaflets drawing students' attention to Councillors such as Norgard, Callinan, Vial and Aickin and their directorships of companies allegedly involved in exploitative practices around the world. (202) It is relevant to recall some of this literature. For example, the newsheet of the La Trobe Marxist-Leninists entitled Vanguard; and Red Moat, the sheet of the WSA



La Trobe students often hear the phrase that the University is or should be, a place of free enquiry and discussion, and how the University is set up to serve the interests of Australian society. But more and more students are realising that the University should be run in the interests of those who build and staff it. Without the plumbers, carpenters, brickies and labourers there wouldn't be a University. Without the maintenance men, cleaners, gardeners, and kitchen staff the University wouldn't function. Despite this, only one in ten students come from working class families. (203)

And:

Norgard, Aickin and Vial are involved in the maintenance of a regime of repression and terror which has killed thousands of innocent Africans and Vietnamese. Degrees of involvement are irrelevant. These men are the enemies, not only of progressive students at La Trobe but of freedom loving people everywhere. They can be called nothing but dirty murderers who must, and will, face the people to receive their due reward. When the courts of this country are run by the people to serve them, it is hoped that Norgard, Aickin and Vial will be on trial, like the Nazi war criminals, and their fate should be the same. (204)

This is strongly worded stuff, in the mould of Mao and Che, although the analysis of capitalism is superficial and simplistic. Many such leaflets, hundreds, appeared during 1969-1972. Though plagued by emotional hype they had, I contend, the seeds of truth, crudely sown, regarding the exact nature of Australian society, and had substantial impact on the ideological formation of student politics. Certainly the literature told no lies about what its authors were on about. The issues of fines, exclusions and occupations were the reflection of deep ideological and philosophical differences between an important and active minority of committed students able to commandeer mass support, and institutions such as university administrations, law courts and governments. Put bluntly, the propaganda war was part of that larger battlefield: the seemingly never-ending struggle between capital and

labour, between capitalism and communism, or, as many radicals such as myself saw it, between bankruptcy and idealism.

Despite obvious disruption to the normal administration of the University, the police were not called in. The occupiers themselves had agreed that they would leave the building if the police came and passive resistance was the students' tactic. The three day occupation was raised in State Parliament on 29 March and Minister for Education Lindsay Thompson, claimed that 'the administration has the situation well in hand'. (205)

And so it had. On 30 March, the University successfully applied for an injunction barring four suspended students from entering the campus. Three were prominent in the WSA and Communist Clubs (Fergus Robinson, Barry York and Rod Taylor). The fourth was myself, who, although suspended, had been endorsed by mass meetings to continue as SRC President. In this capacity I had recommended to the general meeting on 28 March that the administration be occupied and all four students were involved in the occupation. Robinson, York and myself were recognised as being amongst the leaders.

As the four injuncted students continued to enter La Trobe and speak at meetings after 30 March, the University, on 7 April, successfully applied to Mr. Justice Anderson for writs of attachment to be issued against two of the students for alleged breach of the Supreme Court order. (206) At the hearing on 7 April, York, Robinson and Taylor and about thirty students were present in Court when Counsel for La Trobe University, John Winneke, asked for a summons for the arrest of Robinson and Pola. (A writ of attachment only calls upon a person to show why one should not be gaoled for contempt of court.) York was then forcibly removed from the witness box after stating that

This is a political trial from beginning to end. We have no illusions as to why we are here today. We hold this court in utter contempt. (207)

Sensing imminent arrest, Robinson quickly left the court. On 11 April, Blake and Riggall (the University solicitors) obtained writs for the arrest of Robinson and Pola, and the Sheriff of the Supreme Court, Mr. James Mulvey, was ordered to arrest the two for alleged contempt of court. (208)

On 12 April, a Sheriff's officer and four police arrived to arrest Pola, who was blockaded in the SRC offices with SRC Secretary Ian MacDonald. About fifty students prevented police entering the offices and the officers left. Robinson however, was arrested at Heidelberg Court the same day, where he was facing civil charges, and taken into custody by the Sheriff's Bailiff, and lodged in Pentridge.

The response of students came at 1.00 p.m. when at a meeting of over a thousand students, students voted on a motion moved by Pola to take over the administration building again. Security guards were unable to prevent the consequent crush by two to three hundred students, and the plate glass doors were smashed. Anticipating the action, administration officials had previously carried away files and valuables. (209) The vote at the student meeting was 562 for, 508 against. (210)

By mid-afternoon, the Victorian Parliament was again being informed of events at La Trobe. In a 'dorothy-dixer', a member drew the attention of the Minister of Education

to a matter which must concern every honourable member regardless of his political party. I refer to the undesirable and, indeed, untenable situation now applying at La Trobe University. One of the most valuable educational assets in this State is being endangered by the activities of what appears to be a small minority of students at this magnificent education facility. What has happened this afternoon with this further occupation...has resulted in damage by students forcibly entering the building by smashing glass doors, and I, and no doubt every other responsible person, am wondering how long the State must put up with this type of occurrence. It is fair

to say that the rank and file population of the State who are not blessed with an opportunity to attend a University are wondering what type of person... (211)

Mr. Thompson (Minister of Education) intended asking the Vice-Chancellor for a report; and gave full support to the University Council in any action it cared to take

to ensure that the university fulfills its function as a place of learning and is not used for sieges or militant-type manoeuvres. (212)

The same day, Sir Henry Bolte took the University to task through the press

We rely on the University Council to take some firm action. Only the Vice-Chancellor has the authority to handle this situation. This kind of behaviour would make one wonder who wants a fourth university in Victoria. (213)

Not to be left out, the Federal Attorney-General, Senator Ivor Greenwood condemned

arrogant minority groups within Universities claiming privileges and rights to lawlessness. (214)

The students remained over-night and left the following afternoon. The degree of paranoia amongst the protesting students was high, and had been for some weeks. Peter Cochrane remembered

meetings where the necessity for security and secrecy, a necessity that arose from our perception of the oppressive character of the state, was debated against the necessity for publicity and propaganda. The Maoists were paranoid about security and La Trobe Maoists tended to make a virtue of security. This was inspired by Ted Hill's influence. Some were almost totally paranoid. John Redenbach for example combined total dedication with paranoia about secrecy, a rather

formidable cocktail. There were extraordinary cases of people not talking in their houses or on the phone, not being able to discuss anything unless you were walking in a park. There was acute sensitiveness to the ubiquitous A.S.I.O. Special back-shed centres were set up for planning and printing. (215)

I am able to support Cochrane's view. In March 1972 John Redenbach and I discussed various ways that the University could be disrupted and a meeting was arranged to enable further discussion. Redenbach and another Maoist, Tom Griffiths, blindfolded me and drove me to Glenroy, where I was led to a backyard caravan. I was sat down and the blindfold removed and before me was a complete layout of the La Trobe University underground tunnel system and telephone cable junctions, the cutting of which comprised the evening's whispered discussion.

Cochrane asserts that

once that commitment to secrecy was made, the Maoists became even more secretive. They believed that a central feature of communist theory was a secret revolutionary party, the membership of which was known to no-one other than the leadership figures. A Leninist model. At La Trobe we had a parody of the Marxist-Leninist model, a small group, forming in 1970, to make revolution. It wasn't the Communist Club, although it was indirectly linked. It was a forerunner to W.S.A. but was a group that didn't have a name until W.S.A. was formed. Some members were also members of the Young Communist League (Y.C.L.) which was the youth section of the C.P.A.M./L. (216)

From 11 April until 1 May 1972, with a warrant out for my arrest, I was either in hiding or physically prevented by students from being carted away. The perimeters of the campus were constantly being patrolled by police cars, and students being sought by police were smuggled into the campus on a regular basis. Addresses were changed every few days; occasionally it would be a room in College or a farmhouse or somewhere in Carlton. An underground network of safe-houses was developed. As the de-facto President of the SRC, it must

have been uneasy for the University to be seeking my incarceration, and there was no historical precedent in Australia. They were dangerous weeks and exciting, although at times I was scared for my life. Being spied on by ASIO, Bolte's Special Branch and the Commonwealth Police meant that I couldn't trust anyone. Eventually I did however, which was to be my undoing. Meanwhile, on campus, those opposed to direct action had organised what came to be called 'The La Trobe Declaration', a petition compiled by the Democratic Club members Uniake, Sullivan, Monagle and Curtis. (217) The petition had purportedly been signed by twelve hundred students and staff by 14 April. It condemned the occupation of 12 April, deplored the use of violence by any group and declared such conduct had no place at a university. (218) The press eagerly took up their call, as La Trobe Leftists also wondered about the violence of imprisonment of students and the Federal-Attorney General's 'lawlessness' in aiding the Australian war effort in an undeclared war in Vietnam.

Several days later the La Trobe crisis was raised in Federal Parliament by Minister for Education, Malcolm Fraser. In an unusually detailed response, Fraser re-counted to the House a history of the incidents at La Trobe. As to strategies, Fraser observed that

One might have been able to argue that it would have been better to call in the police immediately...but the University thought it had been firm and believed it best to let the invasion die away... (219)

There can be no doubt about the intense political pressure brought to bear on the Vice-Chancellor and the University Council to adopt a tough-line on student protests, but this only made matters worse, because students reacted more manifestly. It could also be that politicians such as Greenwood, Fraser, Thompson and Bolte wished to ripen a law and order issue for the Federal election that was to bring the ALP to power on 2 December 1972. If so, it never got off the ground. Nevertheless, the Houses of Parliament were used to 'slinging mud' for political gain.

In the Senate for example, ALP Senators were doubtless most attentive when a Liberal Senator asked whether the

...Minister's attention has been drawn to Press reports that among the students lying in occupying the administration rooms and corridors of La Trobe University and discussing further action was a so-called student named William Hartley, former Secretary of the Victorian Branch of the ALP and a branch which will be remembered? Is this the same Mr. Hartley who is presently a member of the Federal Executive and Federal Conference of the ALP and Chairman of the Federal ALP Education Policy Committee?

The question, another dorothy-dixer, received this reply:

...The reports were to the effect that the aforesaid William Hartley was one of the students and this discarded official of the ALP now occupies the role of pseudo student, and that in the interests of a subversive minority group he is now carrying on the left-wing Labor policy of preventing...the great body of purposeful students from getting the instruction to which they are entitled... (220)

Such mud-slinging did minimal damage however, although concern about La Trobe was becoming more widespread. The imprisonment of Robinson in Pentridge had driven the University community even further apart, and student awareness that Pola was literally on the run and changing addresses daily created considerable empathy for the radicals' cause.

At its 17 March meeting, the University Council deplored the events of the last two terms, and welcomed the following motion passed by students and staff on 17 April, even though the shadow of Pentridge spiced the words with irony:

That this meeting of staff and students recognises that the pursuit of political goals and the coexistence of widely differing beliefs on a University campus depends upon a basic respect for human individuals... (221)

Council did, however, decide to establish a Working Party to discuss control of student funds and discipline within the University. The Working Party was to consist of two persons from each of: Academic Board; Staff Association and General Staff Association; and four students nominated by the SRC. It was a rare positive step from Council. In regards to Robinson and Pola, Council instructed the Vice-Chancellor to continue actions against them in the Supreme Court, understanding that the way was open to persons to purge their contempt of court by making apology to the court, and giving an undertaking to comply with the injunctions. The only recorded opposition to these tactics came from Mr. Chris Starrs, a philosophy tutor. (222)

Early on Sunday morning, 1 May, I was arrested at Nhill, 230 miles west of Melbourne, by five officers of the Victorian Special Branch (the State political squad now disbanded). It may seem odd to some that I was arrested at my parents' home but I had driven there after some weeks spent eluding the police. I had told only one person and intended staying just a few days to rest, then return to Melbourne. I managed to conclude my breakfast of bacon and eggs, surrounded by the ever watchful Special Branch, as my mother packed the obligatory over-night bag preparatory to departure. Because of the company, my own thoughts and fears accompanied me for a long five hour trip to Melbourne. At Russell Street I was interrogated for an hour or so with a long list of questions to which I could only say 'no comment', then I was lodged in the City Watchhouse. At about 2.00 a.m. the keys jangled and I was roused up to be taken to Pentridge. The timing was a security measure, as was the additional car of police following the van. The bluestone walls, security lights and armed guards of Pentridge are unforgettable, especially at night.

In addition to the contempt of court, I was charged on five counts of besetting premises at La Trobe, the informants being senior officers of the University: David Myers (V.C.), Desmond Kennard (Deputy Registrar), Ralph Gallagher and Thomas Taylor (Registrar). At a hearing at the Heidelberg Court, to which I was taken from Pentridge continually



hand-cuffed, head shaven and under heavy guard, Myers was asked whether or not he thought he had acted vindictively in pressing the besetting charges when Pola was the only one charged, and was already lodged in Pentridge on an indefinite prison sentence. Myers was quoted as responding:

I have known him for a long time. Nothing grieves me more than having him appear in this capacity in court.  
(223)

Grieved or not, the charges were pressed and I was sentenced on 25 May to one month imprisonment on each of the five charges, three to be served concurrently. The charges were the first to be laid under laws then recently included in the Summary Offences Act, and were designed specifically for demonstrations at universities. (224)

The 'in this capacity' referred to by Myers related to my physical appearance. My long hair was closely shorn to the scalp. This was done despite my protest that the nature of my sentence did not necessitate a prison hair cut. A prisoner had been ordered by a warder to do it and I was told I would have my throat cut if I refused. I had lost considerable weight (from eleven to eight stone) and looked and felt unwell. Yet I was hand-cuffed at all times and continually surrounded by six or more warders and police. I told the court that the occupations had occurred in an effort to remedy a complete break-down in communication between students and the administration.

Myers knew what he was doing. In 1969 he had visited United States' universities such as Columbia which had undergone student disturbances and where injunctions had been used. (225) Myers had first raised the prospect of injunctions against students at a Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee meeting on 7 October 1971. (226) Moreover, none of the administration officials' affidavits seeking the writs of attachment, mentioned disruption by Robinson, York or Pola.

Rod Taylor was the only one mentioned as being involved in an occupation. Yet Taylor was not arrested. Myers' position was, as he put it on 14 April, 'The demands, by their very nature, are unnegotiable'. (227)

York's view of the situation during May and June 1972, as a person still on 'the outside', was that 'had the gaoling not occurred, the movement would almost certainly have dissipated after the 28 March occupation'. (228) York refers to the issues of Pola's status and SRC financial autonomy as being 'non-issues' from May on. (229) This is a partially correct assessment. The continued imprisonments had become related to a deep ideological stand-off. However, the matter of student autonomy remained important throughout the period of the gaolings and thereafter. It is always a contentious issue where vested interests are at stake.

York also indicates that after the arrests of Robinson and Pola, the La Trobe movement became demoralised and confused, waging a purely defensive battle out of moral obligation rather than fervent desire. (230) The movement had dwindled to an activist core, no longer successful in mobilising large numbers. (231) I also believed this to be so, which caused me some concern, with an indefinite prison sentence, no trial and no right of appeal.

In the interim, on 9 May, the V.C. had received a deputation from thirteen Trade Unions led by Ted Bull, Secretary of the Waterside Workers, who sought to have the injunctions removed. (232) The building program at the University that required unionised labour was under threat. Sixteen Trade Unions gave full support to the La Trobe students: Federated Ships' Painters' and Dockers Union; Furniture Trades Society; Seamen's Union; Shipwrights' Union; Waterside Workers' Federation of Australia; Plumbers and Gasfitters' Society; Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees' Association; Australian Railways Union; Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union; Amalgamated Engineering Union; Boilermakers' and Blacksmiths' Union; Sheet Metal Working Agricultural

Implement and Stovemaking Union; Australian Building and Construction Workers' Union; Painters' Union; Australian Federated Butchers' Union; Amalgamated Postal Workers' Union.

The SRC at this time was conducting a referendum regarding the injunctions. Polling took place from 10-12 May and before it began, radical students pledged they would abide by its results and the Vice-Chancellor was asked to do the same, but declined. The results were 592 students in favour of injunctions and 1005 against. (233) Majorities were recorded for other issues:

	Yes	No
No injunction against SRC funds	988	613
Immediate reinstatement	806	750
Drop all fines	824	751
No more disciplinary or civil action	963	613

Approximately 1700 students of a 4300 enrolment voted, which was a reasonable turnout. (234) The result of the referendum had the effect of dividing the hitherto monolithic University Council. The failure of the University to force the gaoled students to apologise to the court was a continual source of despair for Council, and Council had to face the problem of how best to retreat without appearing to have backed down. To some Councillors agreement with the proposal to abide by the results of the referendum was a face-saving way out. The Vice-Chancellor decided however to 'last out' the student movement, hoping that the failure of the referendum to achieve its aims would disillusion the movement, and so rejected an opportunity to display acknowledgement of what the majority of students wanted. The Council's decision on 15 May to reject the results had quite the reverse effect. (235) It angered students and broadened student opposition to the Council and administration. On 15 May a meeting of over seven hundred students overwhelmingly condemned the Council's rejection of the referendum and 'adjourned' to the brand new administration building to seek an explanation from Acting Vice-Chancellor Professor Wardrop. (236) Amassed students demanded that Wardrop act within twenty-four hours to convene the five person Council Executive Committee, and initiate

negotiations between the imprisoned radicals and the University. Prior to leaving for Edinburgh for a Commonwealth Universities' Conference, Myers visited me in Pentridge on 16 May and urged me to 'purge my contempt'. However, the matter was not so simple. Robinson and I wrote from prison that

The real situation is not that we have been imprisoned but in a manner of speaking, La Trobe students have been imprisoned. We only embody the oppression. It is absolutely absurd to think that we will be personally humiliated by apologising and purging our contempt. After all, we have spent a number of months sticking to our principles. Rather, it should be the La Trobe Council that is humiliated. (237)

On 17 May, in what was to become an often repeated ritual, I was brought before the Supreme Court and asked to 'purge my contempt'. I refused, stating that 'I do not want to purge my contempt before a court which, to my mind, is not a court at all'. (238) My position was that I had not been charged, I had not been given a trial, and yet I had an 'indefinite' sentence; that is, I might still be imprisoned. Despite this ideological stand, Robinson and I appealed against our continued imprisonment at hearings on 26 and 29 May. The appeal was primarily on the grounds that the indefinite imprisonment was a 'cruel and unusual punishment', and the defendants' Counsel, Peter Faris and John Little, referred to test cases at the Star Chamber in an endeavour to prove their case. Once again, John Winneke, instructed by Blake and Riggall, acted for the University. Mr. Justice McInerney dismissed the appeal on 2 June. (239)

Throughout June and July student militantism continued both on and off the campus. On the night of 19 June one of the security guard stations was petrol-bombed and burnt out. (240) On June 20, 22, 26 and 28 there were mass meetings of students, delegations to the Acting Vice-Chancellor and occupations of administration offices and Council chambers. (241) On 22 June, a Judge involved in the Supreme Court hearings had his car burnt out and destroyed. University officials and

academics were being assaulted; others assailed by abusive and threatening phone calls. (242)

At the meeting of Council on 19 June, the Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn, resigned, citing 'pressing outside commitments'. Students understandably claimed the six months premature resignation was due to the intense student campaign against him. Whatever the reason, Glenn's resignation was to be effective from 16 July, only a month away, and a committee was quickly convened to select a new Chancellor. The next Chancellor, Mr. (now Sir) Justice Reginald Smithers of the Federal Industrial Court, was a careful selection. Jovial, learned and shrewd, he was to preside over the remainder of the University's roughest year. (243) At the same meeting and after lengthy discussion, Council expressed concern at the continued imprisonment of Robinson and Pola but again asserted that the initiative for their release lay with the students themselves. (244) Two days later Barry York was arrested and taken to Pentridge on 21 June. Early negotiations by the Reverend Davis McCaughey (later Governor of Victoria), Dr. W.A. Sinclair and Mr. Ray Cloonan (all members of Council) were cut short when the Minister for Social Welfare refused to allow Cloonan to enter Pentridge on 22 June, apparently because of his student status. The Liberal government was quite paranoid about radical students.

Two important campus elections were being held about this time - the SRC elections (30 June - 2 July), and election for an undergraduate student to the University Council. The SRC election was a tight finish, with the Left winning nine, the Right eight, and there were two Independents. It had been a bitter campaign between the Liberal-Democratic Clubs on one side and the well-organised Left. The wide political differences between the two camps were reflected in the flood of political manifestos, and related to the causes of the local, national and international crises associated with the radical student movement. During the preceding two months the SRC had not been able to function, and SRC Secretary Ian MacDonald drew attention to vast differences between SRC members' views on the nature of the University

that stemmed from differing concepts of society as a whole. He alluded to the Vietnam War being supported by right-wing SRC members; NCC associates (such as Chris Curtis, Terry Monagle, Ian Blandthorn, Jan Sullivan and Sue Uniake) being 'inhumane', and who revealed their political methods by prosecuting radical students in the courts rather than resolving antagonisms within the University. (245)

The Council election was fought out between Jan Sullivan and Bill Hartley, and Hartley won convincingly with a campaign that laid the blame for the troubles at La Trobe squarely with the University Council. (246) Hartley stated in his manifesto that the actions of the Council had caused shock and dismay to University administrations around Australia, and that

The instability and insecurity which is undermining the morale of the University is essentially a reaction to the intransigence and provocations of the Council which has repeatedly rejected reasonable bases for settlement and dialogue. (247)

One week later, doubtless buoyed by the election results, about 150 La Trobe students marched down Sydney Road Coburg to Pentridge, and kicked and hammered on the steel gates near A Division. The gathering was addressed by George Crawford (President of the Victorian ALP). At one stage the heavy gates threatened to give way, which would have met with an interesting response as I had observed prison officers breaking open the armoury. 'No-one could agree that breaking the injunction deserves an indefinite sentence,' said Crawford, as trams banked up Sydney Road for half a mile. (248)

The Council met again on 17 July. (249) Four hours was taken up with submissions and statements from the Staff Association, Administrative Committee of the Victorian ALP, the Vice-Chancellor, the SRC and students' parents. Divisions within Council were clearly seen at this meeting. Mr. Aickin was reported as stating that the tactic of injunctions had failed to stop 'the trouble', and Professor Wolfsohn

admitted that 'we have lost the propaganda war'. (250) A motion put by student representatives was lost 8:12. Among those supporting the motion were Professor Goldman and Dr. Shears (Director-General of Education, Victoria). As a fall-back, Mr. Norgard proposed that the gaoled students be approached in Pentridge by the Vice-Chancellor and offered a set of conditions which would eventuate their release and their return to the campus. This suggestion was generally supported, as it was Council's method of resolving the impasse without conceding defeat, and a method of resolving a situation in which Amnesty International was by this stage taking a strong interest. (251)

Council offered the following conditions to the three students. Jean MacLean from 'Save Our Sons' also telegraphed the conditions through to Pentridge, observing that they were essentially the same as for the re-admittance of Albert Langer and Michael Hyde at Monash University in 1971.

Dear Vice-Chancellor

I undertake to repudiate any form of violence on campus,  
any form of destruction to property  
any form of obstruction to the lawful pursuits by officers of university business or  
any form of obstruction to the academic functions of the institution.

I understand that having received these assurances from me you will approach the Supreme Court and ask that I be released from gaol.

Yours Sincerely,

All that was required was a signature. However, the three of us objected to the morally-charged nature of the conditions as they were premised on an assumption that we had in the past breached these conditions. We therefore insisted that Dr. Myers and the University Council also undertake to abide by the conditions. Dr. Myers sought legal advice, returned again to Pentridge and agreed. The conditions

originally offered were intended to be directed against the student movement and were self-incriminating. Now the amended agreement was neutral. It read

Dear Vice-Chancellor,

I , join with the University Council to undertake to repudiate... (252)

On the evening of 3 August the keys jangled in my cell door in A Division. I jumped to my feet, but it was not to be another visit from the H Division strip-search squad. An officer told me I would be taken into the Supreme Court the next day. At roll-call in the wind-swept exercise yard early next morning, I said good-bye to the prisoners, who doubtless wished they could sign their way out too. There were special words for draft-resisters such as Ken McClelland and Bob Scates, and for Don Thompson, a convicted armed hold-up man who had spent a life-time in institutions and who brought me extras from the kitchen to help keep my body and spirit together. I needed it. Over three months I had lost over three stone and was very thin. Those three months had been spent reflecting, fearing, reading, writing and discussing. It was a fascinating if dangerous experience. I remember the IRA man I befriended who had escaped from Dartmoor Prison, England, in 1971. He had an M.A. from Trinity College, Dublin, and knew the IRA leadership well. He had been arrested when several bodies were found in the boot of his car, in Ireland, and after escaping from Dartmoor, had found his way to Australia posing as an international correspondent for the Sunday Times. I got to know him when we led a prisoners strike in D Division over poor conditions. The last I heard was in 1982 when I read he had been arrested at Heathrow airport in a lorry carrying one million dollars in stolen gold bullion.

On 4 August, Fergus Robinson, Brian Pola and Barry York were ordered before the Supreme Court where the Vice-Chancellor and Council appealed to the Court for their release, having originally issued the very writs for their imprisonment. (253) It was a well-rehearsed scene.



The judge said that we had 'served our debt to society' but I for one did not believe I had owed to society, and wondered what had happened to the sacrosanct 'purgings of contempt' that was never given. That afternoon about 400 students gathered at La Trobe to hear speeches from the released students, and a chapter in the history of Australian student politics drew to a close.

The issues associated with the story of La Trobe University were obviously highly complex, and reflect aspects of a social, political, economic and historical nature. This provides support for the hypothesis of the thesis.

Footnotes for Chapter Two

1. La Trobe University Master Plan Revision 1977, LTU Borchardt Library.
2. N. Marshall, 'La Trobe University: The Vision and the Reality', M.Ed. Thesis, La Trobe University, 1979, p.303.
3. Rabelais, LTU SRC, V.1, No.1, 1967, p.1.
4. Rabelais, 24 July 1967, p.1.
5. Who's Who In Australia, Herald and Weekly Times, Melbourne, XXed., 1971.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid. Interview, Professor Hugo Wolfsohn, LTU 1974, unrecorded.
8. P. Scott, The Crisis of the University, Croom Helm Australia P/L, Sydney, 1984.
9. Ibid., p. 26.
10. Ibid.
11. G. Harman, in J. E. Anwy (ed.), Occasional Papers, Proceedings of the Conference of University Governing Bodies, August 1982, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, Churchill House, A.C.T., No. 5, 1983, p. 53.
12. Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia. (Martin Report). 3 Vs., Government Printer, Melbourne, 1964-5.
13. Ibid., V.1, p. 4.
14. Who's Who In Australia, Herald and Weekly Times, Melbourne, XXed., 1971.
15. Ibid.
16. Who's Who In Australia, op.cit.
17. MEMBERS OF COUNCIL  
(as at October 1971)  
Sir Archibald Glenn, OBE Chancellor  
Dr D. M. Myers Vice-Chancellor  
K. A. Aickin, Esq.; QC  
Sir John Buchan, CMG  
B. J. Callinan, Esq. CBE, DSO, MC  
Professor C. J. Eliezer  
The Hon. J. W. Galbally, QC, MLC

Professor R. J. Goldman  
J. L. Greig, Esq.  
The Hon. W. V. Houghton  
Dr J. G. Jenkin  
Mrs Whitney King, CBE  
Dr P.G. Law, CBE  
The Rev. Dr. J. D. McCaughey  
Professor J. D. Morrison  
J. D. Norgard, Esq.  
W. G. Philip, Esq.  
Dr. L. W. Shears  
Dr W. A. Sinclair  
C. D. Starrs, Esq.  
Miss J. P. Sullivan  
P. N. Thwaites, Esq.  
Professor R. D. Topsom  
C. C. Trumble, Esq.  
K. H. Vial, Esq. CBE (Deputy Chancellor)  
Professor D. H. Whitehead  
M. S. Whiting, Esq. MLA  
Professor H. A. Wolfsohn  
(LTU Handbook 1972, p.1.)

18. Broadsheet, LTU, April 1971. Who's Who in Australia, op.cit.
19. Broadsheet, LTU, April 1971.
20. Ibid.
21. Foundation Professor of Politics, LTU.
22. Two interviews, each of about one hour, early July 1980, LTU.
23. Inference from Wolfsohn's comments.
24. LTU Council Minutes, C 70/42, 17 August 1970.
25. Rabelais, 4 September 1967, p.15.
26. Rabelais, 11 May 1968, p.5.
27. Ibid.
28. Rabelais, 1 April 1968, p.2.
29. Rabelais, 11 March 1968, p.5.
30. Rabelais, 1 April 1968, pp.4-5.
31. Rabelais, 13 May 1968, p.2.
32. Rabelais, 17 June 1968, p.2.

33. Ibid.
34. Ibid. Letters to the Editor.
35. Rabelais, 17 June 1968, p.12.
36. Rabelais, 28 November 1968, p.7.
37. P. Cochrane, Interview, tape, University of Sydney, September 1986.
38. Marshall, op.cit. Rabelais, 20 October 1968; 17 June 1968, p.9; 13 May 1968, p.16.
39. Rabelais, 13 May 1968, p.8.
40. Rabelais, 17 June 1968, p.3.
41. Ibid.
42. Rabelais, 5 July 1968.
43. Rabelais, 5 August 1968.
44. Rabelais, 8 July 1968, p.12.
45. Rabelais, 13 May 1968, 17 June 1968.
46. Rabelais, 11, 15 May 1968.
47. Rabelais, 20 March 1969, p.12.
48. Rabelais, 20 March 1969, p.4.
49. Rabelais, 31 July 1969, p.3.
50. Rabelais, 21 April 1969.
51. M. Hamel-Green, in P. King (ed.), Australia's Vietnam: Australia in the Second Indo-China War, George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983, p. 114.
52. Ibid., pp.114-125. D. Horne, Time of Hope: Australia 1966-1972, op.cit., pp.51-60. M. Quirk, Rabelais, 31 July 1969, p.2.
53. For information regarding what became of some LTU activists, see Chapter Four.
54. P. King (ed.), op.cit., pp. 114-125. D. Horne, op.cit., pp. 51-60.
55. Rabelais, 15 May 1968, p.14.
56. Minutes, GMS, 18 June 1969, SRC LTU.

57. Wall, (LTU SDS), V.1. No.1.
58. Rabelais, 31 July 1969, p.4.
59. Personal recollection.
60. Minutes, LTU SRC GMS, 29 July 1969.
61. Letter, LTU Council to SRC, 9 July 1969. SRC files.
62. Minutes, LTU Council, C69/46, 15 August 1969.
63. Minutes, LTU Council, C69/52, 15 September 1969.
64. Verbal request, General Committee members of Menzies College.
65. National Union of Australian University Students; later, the Australian Union of Students, the AUS.
66. Rabelais, 11 March 1969, p.5.
67. Since 1965, the Army had sought a LTU site. LTU Record, LTU Publications Branch, V.3, No.8, September 1969. I. Robinson, 'What happened at La Trobe?', National U, 6 July 1970, pp.1-3.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. Rabelais, 26 June, 1970, p.2.
71. Liberty, LTU Democratic Club, 17 June 1970, p.1.
72. Robinson, op.cit.
73. Rabelais, 26 June 1970, p.2.
74. Black Barb, Vo.2, No.7, 22 June 1970. (LTU pamphlet)
75. Rabelais, 26 June 1970, p.2.
76. Ibid.
77. Rabelais, 26 June 1970, p.5.
78. The LTU Legal Advisor, M. Lavoipierre, provided this advice. Rabelais, ibid. p.5.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid. Motion moved Ross Laird, Sec. Gerry Gill, carried overwhelmingly.

81. Letter from the four to Rabelais, 1 September 1970, p.4.
82. Rabelais, 1 September 1970, p.4.
83. A. Langer, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
84. P. Cochrane, op.cit.
85. LTU SRC GMS, 7 September 1970.
86. B. York, Sources of Student Unrest in Australia. With Particular reference to La Trobe University, 1967-1972. Master of Arts, University of Sydney, 1983, p. 195.
87. Red Moat, V.3, No.32, September 1970.
88. 'A Christian Statement for September 11' (LTU student leaflet), September 1970.
89. Age, 22 September 1970, p.9. Moderate Student Alliance (leaflet), September 1970, LTU. Probe (LTU Postgraduates Assn.), V.2, No.7, September 1970.
90. Rabelais, 25 September 1970, pp.2-4.
91. Sydney Morning Herald, 17 September 1970, p.5.
92. Rabelais, 25 September 1970. Letters to Editor.
93. Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, House of Representative, V. 69, 1970-71, p. 1360.
94. Minutes, LTU Council, C70/52, 19 October 1970; Letter, Myers to Bolte, 17 September 1970, LTU Registry Archives, 225/1/1(4).
95. Statements by D.A.C. Griffiths, R. Seagrave, A.D. Ward, LTU Registry Archives 225/1/1/(2)(4).
96. Minutes, LTU Council, C70/52, 19 October 1970.
97. Minutes, LTU Council, C70/52; 4 letters, LTU Registry Archives, 225/1/1(4).
98. Age, 24 September 1970, p.1.
99. Victorian Parliamentary Debates (V.P.D.), V.299 (1970), pp.307-327.
100. Ibid., p.315
101. Ibid.
102. Age, Editorial, 24 September 1970.

103. Letters, 1 October 1970; 30 October 1970, LTU Registry Archives, 225/1/1(4).
104. Letter, 1 October 1970, LTU Registry Archives, 225/1/1(4).
105. P. Cochrane, op.cit.
106. B. York, op.cit., p.200.
107. Memo, 23 September 1970, Griffith to Coulthard, LTU Registry Archives, 225/1/1(4).
108. Ibid.
109. V.P.D., op.cit.; the Age, 24 September 1970.
110. Minutes, LTU Council, C70/52, 19 October, 1972.
111. Report, SRC to LTU Council, 16 November 1970, C70/63.
112. Refers to Marshall's thesis, op.cit.
113. P. Cochrane, op.cit.
114. Rabelais, 15 July 1970, p.9.
115. Unofficial GMS. See LTU Council Minutes, C71/16, 19 April; pamphlet, 'Submission of April 19th Committee', sigd. Ross Laird and Andrew Giles-Peters; two Labor Club pamphlets advertising of meeting.
116. Minutes, LTU Council, C71/16, 19 April 1971.
117. Minutes, LTU Council, C71/24, 17 May 1971.
118. Minutes, LTU Council, C71/73, 15 November 1971.
119. LTU SRC Statement, 19 July 1971.
120. P. Cochrane, op.cit.
121. Herald, 3 July 1971, p.1.
122. Sun, 5 July 1971, p.1.
123. Sun, 20 July 1971, p.1.
124. Report, LTU Proctorial Board to LTU Council, C71/56, Minutes LTU Council, C71/65, 18 October 1971.
125. Sun, 20 July 1971, p. 1.
126. Report, op.cit.

127. Rabelais, 28 July 1971, p.1; 'Letter from La Trobe' to Australian student organisations. Ian MacDonald, Brian Pola, Nan Chelsworth, October 1971.
128. Individual defendants' typed statements, October 1971.
129. Rabelais, 28 July 1971, p.1; LTU Council Minutes, C71/42, 19 July 1971.
130. Red Moat, LTU Communists, undated, 1971; Rabelais, 28 July 1971.
131. P. Cochrane, op.cit.; Letters re-printed in August Fourth Victory Commemoration. La Trobe Marxist-Leninists, 1973; eye-witness, occupations, LTU, 1971-1972.
132. News Weekly, Freedom Publication, Melb., 28 July 1971, p.3.
133. Draft, La Trobe University Library Emergency Situations. Retrieved from LTU Administration files, March 1972.
134. Retrieved during occupation, March 1972. Photostat avail.
135. August Fourth Victory Commemoration, op.cit., App.D.
136. Letter, VC to Dillon, LTU Registry Archives, 448/1/4.
137. Ibid.
138. Correspondents use Christian names. Also, LTU Registry Archives, 448/1/4.
139. LTU Registry Archives, 448/1/1.
140. R. Goldman, in Rabelais, 9 September 1971, p.3.
141. D. White, in Rabelais, 9 October 1971.
142. A. Campbell, in Rabelais, 19 April 1971.
143. LTU Council Minutes, C71/42, 26 July 1971.
144. Ibid.
145. Rabelais, V.20, No.13, 1986, p.9 (undated).
146. LTU SRC Minutes, first meeting, Fifth SRC, 11 October 1971.
147. Ibid.
148. LTU SRC Minutes, 5/1/12.
149. LTU SRC Minutes, 5/1/16.



150. LTU SRC News, May 1971; Beginnings, documentary film, Dir. R. Bishop, G. Glenn, 1971, LTU SRC.
151. LTU SRC GMS, Minutes, 5 May 1971.
152. News Weekly, Freedom Publication, Melbourne, 10 May 1971, p.4.
153. Letters from anonymous persons to myself, 1971-1972.
154. News Weekly, *ibid.*, 7 January 1970; 1 September 1971; 25 August 1971, p.1; 11 August 1971, p.1; 28 July 1971, p.1; 15 September 1971, p.5.
155. Minutes, LTU SRC GMS, 12 May 1971.
156. *Ibid.*
157. V.P.D., V.299 (1970), pp.307-327.
158. 'Letter from La Trobe' to Australian student organisations. Ian MacDonald, Brian Pola, Nan Chelsworth, October 1971.
159. Herald, 28 July 1971, p.3.
160. LTU SRC Minutes, 2 November 1971.
161. LTU Bulletin, Publications Branch, LTU, V.3, No.3.
162. *Ibid.*
163. *Ibid.*
164. Minutes LTU Council, C71/50, 16 August 1971; 'Meet Council's Fascist Threat', La Trobe Labour Club, 15 March 1971; 'Whose University?', WSA, March 1972; Vanguard, La Trobe Marxist-Leninists, March 1972; LTU SRC Minutes, Fifth SRC, 7 December 1971, 5/5/26.
165. La Trobe University Act No.7189, Parliament of Victoria, 1964.
166. *Ibid.*
167. LTU SRC Minutes, Fifth SRC, 11 October 1971. *Passim.* Minutes, LTU Council, C71/83, 20 December 1971; SRC Reports to LTU Council, SRC 71/2, SRC 71/1.
168. SRC election manifestos, SRC election 1971, Rabelais, 1971.
169. LTU Council Minutes, C71/50, 16 August 1971; C71/83; LTU SRC GMS, 22 June 1971.
170. Minutes, LTU SRC, 17 February 1972; 5/6/22; 5/6/22-28.

171. LTU Council Minutes, C71/50, 16 August, 1971; C71/83, 20 December 1971; C72/8, 21 February 1972.
172. LTU Council Minutes, C72/8, 21 February 1972.
173. Age, 23 February 1972; LTU Council Minutes, C72/8, 21 February 1972.
174. Writ No. 743, 23 February 1972, Supreme Court of Victoria.
175. Red Moat, LTU Communists, 29 March 1972; LTU Bullit, student pamphlet, V.1, No.2; LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.14; Sun, 8 April 1972, p.16.
176. LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.5.
177. Age, 1 March 1972.
178. Letter, A.T.J. Bell to Pola, 20 February 1972.
179. Minutes LTU SRC, 6 March 1972, 5/8/10; 5/8/11. Copies of motions passed at University of Sydney, Macquarie University, University of N.S.W., University of New England and University of Queensland, priv. avail.
180. Student leaflets, March 1972.
181. La Trobe University Bullit, pamphlet, V.1, No.1.
182. Ken Marks QC, Peter Faris; Solicitors: Holding, Ryan and Redlich; J.N. Zigouras and Co.
183. Settlement Proposals, March 1972.
184. LTU SRC GMS, 8 March 1972.
185. LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.9; LTU Council Minutes, C72/18, 21 March 1972.
186. LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.9; V.3, No.13.
187. For example, Monash students donation to NLF of Vietnam. See M. Hyde, (ed.), It Is Right to Rebel, op.cit.
188. Copies of motions.
189. Sun, 18 March 1972, p.3.
190. Age, 23 March 1972, p.4.
191. LTU Council Minutes, C72/17, 21 March 1972.
192. Minutes, LTU Executive Council, C72/18, 23 March 1972.

193. Transcript of Proceedings, LTU and Attorney-General of Victoria V LTU SRC, Supreme Court of Victoria, 22 March 1972; LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.14.
194. 'La Trobe University Bulet...Special Extra', pamphlet, 22 March 1972; see footnote 202.
195. Age, 24 March 1972, p.3; see footnotes 193, 194.
196. LTU Bulletin, V.3, No.14.
197. LTU Bulletin, V.3. No.13.
198. LTU SRC GMS Minutes, 23 March 1972.
199. Ibid.
200. Age, 24 March 1972, p.3.
201. LTU SRC Newsletter, 20 March 1972, p.3.
202. Two pamphlets, pub. LTU WSA, March 1972.
203. Vanguard, LTU Marxist-Leninist, March 1972.
204. Red Moat, LTU WSA, March 1972.
205. V.P.D., V.306 (1972), p.4574.
206. Age, 8 April 1972, p.16; Herald, 11 April 1972, p.1.
207. Sun, 8 April 1972, p.16.
208. Herald, 11 April 1972, p.1.
209. Herald, 12 April 1972, p.3.
210. LTU SRC GMS, 12 April 1972.
211. V.P.D., V.306 (1972), pp.4924-5.
212. Ibid.
213. Ibid.
214. Herald, 13 April 1972; Sun, 14 April 1972.
215. P. Cochrane, op.cit.
216. Ibid.
217. 'The La Trobe Declaration', student poster, 14 April 1972.

218. Ibid.
219. Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8, H. of R., 1972, p.1686.
220. Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 51, Senate, 1972, p.1214.
221. LTU Council Minutes, C72/26, 17 April 1972.
222. LTU Council Minutes, C72/26, 17 April 1972.
223. Age, 12 May 1972, p.4.
224. Summary Offences Act 7405 52(1A), as amended by Act 8055 Sec. 3(2), Parl. of Vict.
225. B. York, 'Sources of Student Unrest in Australia with particular reference to La Trobe University, 1967-1972', University of Sydney (History Department), Master of Arts thesis, 1984, pp.305-6.
226. Minutes, LTU VCAC, 7 October 1971 (18/1971).
227. Message from the Vice-Chancellor, V.1, No.1, 14 April 1972.
228. B. York, op.cit., p.320.
229. Ibid., p.326.
230. Ibid., p.327.
231. Ibid.
232. August Fourth Victory Commemoration, op.cit.
233. LTU SRC 'Result of Referendum', May 1972.
234. Ibid.
235. LTU Council Minutes, C72/33, 15 May 1972.
236. Red Moat, WSA pamphlet, 16 May 1972.
237. Ibid.
238. Age, 18 May 1972, p.4.
239. Reasons for Judgement, Supreme Court of Victoria, 1972, No.1504, Mr. Justice McInerney.
240. Message from the Vice-Chancellor, V.3, No.8.
241. Ibid.

242. Liberty, Democratic Club pamphlet, Vol.V, No.7. Sun, 23 June 1972, p.7. Age, 23 June 1972, p.3.
243. LTU Council Minutes, C72/43, 19 June 1972.
244. Ibid.
245. 'Red Ned', pamphlet, No.2, June 1972.
246. Election pamphlet for LTU Council election, July 4-6, 1972.
247. Ibid.
248. Age, 14 July 1972, p.3; Sun, 14 July 1972, p.15.
249. LTU Council Minutes, C72/50, 17 July 1972.
250. Ibid.
251. Ibid.
252. Conditions agreed between LTU Council and students, dated and signed 1 August 1972.
253. Herald, 4 August 1972, p.1.

CHAPTER THREE

PRECEDENTS AND COMPARISONS: STUDENT AND RELATED

ACTIVISM FROM 1960 - 1975, IN

AUSTRALIA AND ELSEWHERE

(i) International Aspects of the Student Movement

As the Introduction has pointed out, there is a strong interpretative flavour to this thesis and to Chapter Three in particular.

Chapter Three is divided into sections, and each contains a brief summary at its end. Conclusions (XVII) brings all major elements of the sections together to differentiate fact from speculation and relates the conclusions to the thesis' Introduction and hypothesis.

To see why the student movement arose in Australia involves studying the localisation of a world-wide phenomenon. Although the events that precipitated student activism varied from country to country, and the targets of student protests differed, there are more common themes than different ones when comparing the movements.

To understand why a relatively passive post-Second World War generation was replaced by one that was militantly active, it is useful to reflect on the extent to which conditions internationally had dampened ideological controversy amongst intellectuals during the fifties. Although there was plenty of controversy, essentially the politics of the fifties had been dominated by the cold war. (See Chapter One) The fading of the cold war in the mid to late 1950s was reflected in the break-down of monolithic communism, induced by the rise of liberal opposition tendencies in some Eastern-bloc countries and the intensifying of the Sino-Soviet split. Such factors tended to undermine the conviction held by Western intellectuals that peoples of non-communist nations such as Australians must unite to fight totalitarian communism. Certainly by the late fifties, intellectuals in the West were generally of the view that the cold war was at an end. This shift in international ideological climate coincided with and enabled the birth of a movement for civil liberties within Western nations, as attention could be diverted from external to internal problems.

For example, from the early 1960s in North America, black students were a major influence in initiating sit-ins at universities such as Cornell, Columbia, Boston and San Francisco State College. (1) The background to the American blacks' struggles, emerging years before the white students' protests, have been revealed in the writings of Che Guevara, Regis Debray, Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver, Bobby Seale, Angela Davis and Stokeley Carmichael. (2) Australian black leaders such as Denis Walker, Bobbi Sykes and Gary Foley learned from such American actions and writings, and freely adapted them to the Australian situation. The arrival of 'Black Power' in Australia and the formation of a North American styled Black Panther Party had its effects on campuses. There were demands for ownership of reserves and claims to land rights. The work of Gary Foley, Cheryl Buchanan and Denis Walker, who often operated through the Australian Union of Students, was pioneering in raising the consciousness of Aboriginal people and white students. (3) The symbol of Aboriginal dissent became the Aboriginal Embassy, tents set up on the lawns opposite the national parliament in 1972. The campaign against racism came of age when students, Aborigines, unionists and thousands of concerned people marched in 1971 for the campaign against apartheid in South Africa, given local meaning when the all-white Springbok football team played in Australian capital cities.

Along with these developments was the success of the Castro revolution in Cuba 1959, dominated by men such as Fidel Castro and Che Guevara who later became cult heroes. The Cubans, in standing up to the United States of America by defeating the American sponsored Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961, showed the world that big powers could be defeated. Cuba was an example of a revolution seemingly uncontaminated by the greyness of Stalinism, and created a belief that revolution was possible and desirable in other capitalist societies as a method of curing social evils. However, such simplistic faith was not held by all involved in the Left, especially not by the older generation of Leftist. There were generational differences in Western liberal-left communities, for the older generation knew from the Russian experience that revolution could



lead to totalitarian regimes, new forms of exploitation and cynical betrayals of popular will. To many of the post-cold war students however, raising such matters seemed only an attempt to justify past inactivity, and was hence reprehensible.

It is useful then to study the student movement of the 1960s and 1970s in the context of previous movements for change. To further elucidate reasons for the peculiarly confrontationist character of this recent and first student international, it is necessary to relate it to tactical lessons derived from previous movements; movements such as the Australian anti-conscription campaign in the Great War. For example, the passion unleashed by the anti-Vietnam war movement may be related to basic aspects of the Australian value system. After all, to decry wars, to refuse to go, was, and is, as Australian as the kangaroo; just as was susceptibility to jingoism and Empire.

One might also consider that traditionally, students at universities have invariably been responsive to international political trends and opportunities for social change, more so than some other social groups. (4) As a result, students have played major roles in stimulating unrest in order to engineer constructive changes to policy and social organization. In North America for example, there was significant opposition to wars:

In 1917, the New York Herald reported that in New York City ninety out of the first hundred draftees claimed exemption. The war department listed 337,649 draft resisters in World War I. The anti-war Socialist Party secured its largest vote in history in many cities in the 1917 municipal elections. Our entry into World War I was strongly opposed by an extensive mass movement. Had the United States entered World War II in any way other than through having been attacked, it is clear that a large segment of the country would have continued its opposition to the war after Congress had declared it. Opinion surveys taken during the Korean war reported significant majority opposition to it among the population and among college students within two years of its beginning. (5)

The above is quoted because it helps to place in historical context the growth of student opposition to the Vietnam War from a global perspective. It also highlights the Australian experience where there was also such a history, with the anti-conscription movement in 1917. The student movements in both nations also came to share strikingly similar characteristics fifty years later.

Some explanation for the rise of student opposition during the 1960s must lie primarily in political events: the emergence of civil rights issues and the Vietnam war, in a more liberal, post-Stalinist international setting. The climate was established by the 1960s to give more radically disposed students the issues; their social situation gave students the stimulus, and the campus situation furnished the means to build a movement.

The building of international student opposition since the end of the Second World War had been more extensive and significant than in earlier periods. However, students played a larger role during the 1950s than is generally recognised today, in overthrowing or weakening regimes in, for example, the 'third world' and Communist countries. Student movements were influential in revolts as diverse as against Peron in Argentina in 1955; against Perez Jimenez in Venezuela in 1958; in protest movements in South Korea and South Vietnam during the 1950s; in India, and Japan. Students fought for liberalisation in Poland, Hungary, the Soviet Union and The Peoples' Republic of China during 1955-1956. (6) Then, during the 1960s, student protests spread to the developed countries of Europe, the United States and Australia.

These movements had something in common on tactics and political style. Student culture and political ideas are highly communicable; the mood and mode translated readily from one country to another. However, it would not be correct to interpret the world-wide activism of recent times as a response to common social conditions entirely, or as an effort to secure one common objective. Nevertheless, much of the protest was a response to oppressive social conditions and efforts to

secure improved lives. In other words, the sources of student protest must be differentiated when studying international societies: pre-industrial; capitalist; post-industrial; authoritarian; democratic. In third world nations the origins of student protest are to be found in the wide gap between the social outlook of the educated student strata and the more traditional, less educated older groups who hold economic and political power. The hiatus between the social and political expectations of students in a nation such as the Phillipines, and the reality, has motivated students and intellectuals to adopt ideologies which define the status quo as unacceptable, and students seek major institutional change as a consequence. Divisions are exacerbated by the fact that the very logic of university education encourages the values of achievement, perspicacity and honesty.

But to reiterate, leftist student groups differ from country to country. In the 1960s there was a rapid growth of revolutionary organisations which were anti-American and anti-Soviet. These organisations in Western bloc nations took various lines of Marxist thought as their ideological base. Some tended to be Maoist influenced, such as the Red Brigade in Italy. Others identified loosely with Trotskyism, and a few were explicitly anarchist, such as the Baader-Meinhof group in West Germany. There was a tendency to take on variants of what came to be called New Left ideology, often involving opposition to orthodox-Left ideologies. Regardless of such differences, the focus of attention in international political terms was the United States. In America itself the waves of student protest arose largely as a response to race relations and the Vietnam war. Previous to the emergence of the North American student protests, the largest post-Second World War upheaval in the Western world had been occasioned by French student support for the liberation movement in Algeria 1957-1962. The protest against the Algerian war involved thousands of students engaged in quite radical measures to sabotage the French war effort. (7)

One could provide numerous examples of international student action in history. Students have often been active in support of civil

liberties and oppressed people, and in the 1960s the movement had a new quality of students for themselves as well as for others. Possibly too, the movement may be seen as a reaction against the paranoia of the 'cold war' of the 1950s, itself a product of the partitioning of Europe at the end of the Second World War.

As suggested above, Third World nations played a role in the development of the student movement in Western nations. Western students identified with the struggles of Third World peoples, and drew strength from their histories. And this did not stop at eulogising Che Guevara.

In 1964 Bolivian students rebelled against the government of President Paz Estondorso, and troops fired on the students. Six hundred armed students then occupied the university in the capital, La Paz. (8)

In Indonesia, prior to and during the killing of hundreds of thousands in the anti-communist executions of 1965, students were highly active. (9)

In Mexico, April 1966, students resisted the authoritarian policies of the university's Dean, and a strike brought out 70,000 students at the National University who occupied buildings and forced the resignation of officials. (10)

On January 9, 1964, rioting Panamanian students invaded the American occupied canal zone. (11)

Student demonstrations have occurred during the last twenty years in countries such as Argentina, South Africa, Peru, Venezuela, Philippines, South Korea, China, Chile, France. (12)

In Japan an early action of students occurred in 1960 against the renewal of a security treaty between Japan and the United States. Eight years later in 1968, violent new conflicts erupted over the issue of

foreign bases, an issue by which time was also on the Australian political agenda. (13) Massive Japanese student demonstrations against the Vietnam war clashed continually with Japanese police, and students maintained momentum because of unprecedentedly solid, technical, military style preparation. La Trobe and Monash Maoists endeavoured to train students on similar military lines and were partially successful. (14) Students in Japan came to demonstrations wearing helmets, carrying shields and javelins, and hand to hand combat often ensued. In 1968 a dramatic wave of attacks was launched against United States' air bases and air-craft carriers at harbour in Susebo. (15) From a global perspective the Japanese movement played a historic role because it pioneered mass revolutionary action by students in a modern industrialised state, some years before it was to occur elsewhere in North America, Europe and Australia.

In mentioning Maoism, events associated with the Cultural Revolution in China in the mid-sixties were significant in developing the ideology of the student movement internationally, particularly the personality cult surrounding Mao Tse-tung and the enshrinement of his writings on revolutionary theory and practice. Maoist styled students emerged in most Western nations, and in Australia perhaps three hundred students were quite committed to it, and many more influenced. My estimate of the number of Maoists at LTU is that they were 35 to 40 at its peak. The number at other newer universities appears to have been similar. The numbers at the older universities was much fewer. Given the total number of universities, the total number is unlikely to have been more than 300.

Maoist oriented student organisations were not alone as examples of the international flavour of the student movement.

The Students for a Democratic Society was another internationally styled organisation.

The West German Sozialistische Deutsche Studentbund (SDS) was formed in 1960, and quickly spread to North America. (16) It also formed groups on Sydney and Melbourne campuses, including La Trobe University. At Melbourne University, Harry van Moorst and Michael Hamel-Green were founding members; at La Trobe, Ian MacDonald. (17) SDS was formed in West Germany when the German Social-Democratic Party adopted a neo-conservatist program and in the process expelled its more progressive student organisation. (18) SDS had its base in the Free University of West Berlin and its most well-known founding member was Rudi Dutschke. Dutschke was never to recover from an assassination attempt, a shot to the head, and died in 1981. (19)

SDS was something of an umbrella group on campuses. Its members could have been anarchists, Maoists, Leninists, socialists, reformists, militant radicals or theoretical Marxists. Its hard-line against 'the establishment' sprang in part from an incident in 1967 when the late Shah of Iran visited West Germany and SDS organised a protest at which police shot and killed a student. (20)

The growth of militancy in West Germany was to culminate in the Baader-Meinhof group which concentrated on terrorism as a weapon against capitalism. The Weathermen in the United States were a similar outgrowth, emerging as activists became disillusioned with the usual protest forms of marches and occupations. SDS had a short history. As early as 1970 it was organising its own disbandment in America, although still active in Sydney and Melbourne.

It was not strange that groups such as SDS should have emerged from West Germany. It was here that the tensions of the cold war were most felt, and the country was, after all, an occupied territory with American troops and bases. Also, the philosophical history of Germany, as well as France and Italy, had a strong tradition of Marxist analysis, more so than America and Australia. As such, European academe and students found readily available schools of thought on Marx, Gramsci and Lenin, that were just developing in America and Australia.

The American philosopher Ayn Rand believed that a philosophical 'lacking' enabled the student New Left on American campuses to fill an ideological vacuum, because of the philosophical impotence of the older generation. Rand cast this as the reason why there was 'no rational answer' to the student rebellion, for to have had one would have required a 'total philosophical re-evaluation down to basic premises, which the older generation would not dare attempt'. (21) The amorality, moral bankruptcy of the older generation - fact or fiction - could have been another thread in the development of student radicalism.

The feeling of the times was well summed up in the words of Mario Savio, the charismatic student leader at Berkeley, California. In one of his fervent speeches in 1965 he stated that

There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even tacitly take part, and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machines will be prevented from working. (22)

The Dr. Jim Cairns' inspired sit-downs in Bourke Street Melbourne, 1970 and 1971, epitomised this very strategy, as did the numerous occupations and blockades of the city's university buildings.

To summarise: the international aspects of the student movement were reflected in Australia through the adaptation of Maoism, the North American civil rights movement, and such organisations as Students for a Democratic Society. The emergence of such movements was preceded by the break-down of the cold war and the example of successful revolutions and movements such as in Cuba, and previous anti-conscription campaigns associated with foreign wars. This section also drew attention to a history of student political activity, particularly in Third World

nations, and to socio-economic differences between student movements in those nations and the Western industrialised world.

The first section sets the scene for a consideration of some suggested causes of the student movement.

(ii) Some Suggested Causes

Various explanations have been advanced over the years to account for the student movement, its sudden rise and brief life. One such suggestion is that the movement was the consequence of a process set in motion by rapid rates of social change, by events which created a sharp discrepancy between the formative experiences of parental generations and those of a given generation of students. In other words, the 'generation gap'. Kingsley Davis' proposition almost fifty years ago was that

rapid social change...has crowded historical meaning into the family time span, and has thereby given the off-spring a different social content from that which the parent acquired, and consequently has added to the already intrinsic differences between parent and youth additional ones which double the chance of alienation.  
(23)

Davis' observation seems just as applicable today as an explanation for the student movement. However, although apparently plausible, it would be lazy thinking to accept it as a primary source of the motivation behind the student movement. It would be correct to observe though, how an older generation, through some historical failure to perform as expected by a younger generation of youth and students, becomes de-authorised. As a result, the younger generation rises up on a platform of propitious circumstances and precipitates a crisis in the legitimacy of institutions. Such a crisis would have been initiated by a massive loss of generational confidence, thus impelling students to resentment and reaction.



It will be seen that this thesis does not give much currency to the above idea and suggests rather more complex conflicts were involved.

Whilst not suggesting that Marxist interpretations are necessarily more complex, it has nevertheless been suggested by Marxist theorists that the student movement reflected the reality that the student role in capitalist societies had, by the 1960s, become that of a worker, intellectual labourer or apprentice; a lowly-paid member of a new stratum of professionals which formed an exploited, alienated and powerless mass coerced by powerful elites. An excellent round-up of orthodox Marxist, neo-Marxist, quasi-Marxist, non-Marxist but non-functional approaches, may be found in Gianni Statera, Death of a Utopia: The Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe.

(24) A popular debate, and there were many, amongst Marxists, was where students fitted into the class model of society and what was their role in relationship to the traditional industrial proletariat. (25)

Marxists (26) expressed the view that student life by the mid 1960s had lost much of the self-directed activity that it may once have had. If, for example, a student asked why one was studying, the student would honestly respond with answers that had little to do with personal development and growth. Students, as labourers, were viewed in Marxist analyses as being alienated in the same sense that the product was for the assembly line worker. Since, in the case of students, the products were embodied in the skills of the students, the students were, in reality, alienated from themselves. Few would argue against there being considerable merit in advancing the above view, but as with most if not all social movements of human beings, there is no single explanation.

The 'no single explanation' is itself a popular 'explanation'. Gianni Statera in Death of a Utopia: Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe summed up after surveying various Marxist approaches:

Neither the generational conflict theory nor the orthodox Marxist, nor the neo-Marxist approach can provide us with a universal key to student unrest all over the world. Also, it seems that the most valuable analyses of this phenomenon are those which do not claim to draw long-range generalisations but dwell rather on the national context within which student movements develop and student masses mobilise. (27)

Yet another suggestion has been made, that the 'idealism of youth' was the real cause of the student rebellion in Western nations. There was, after all, a social expectation that youth should be radical and be the bearers of progressive ideas that will dominate the future. That they tend to be committed to ideals rather than institutions, to strive for futuristic goals rather than accept reality, naturally stimulates students to action. It is true that in the case of the student movement in Australia, the opportunities that corporate capitalism provided did not present, at that time, sufficient to satisfy students' achieved level of social and political consciousness. To take the reverse side of the same coin, one could just as well point out that amongst radical students there was frustration in having to live in a state of social limbo for three or four years, being dependant on families or inadequate allowances, whilst a society that stressed achievement and success in material matters passed them by. Given the targets of student protests however, this last 'origin' of student discontent is little credited here.

Worthy of attention is the view that the movement was an expression of a historical need for the development of a distinct youth-student cultural and political consciousness. In regards to 'culture', British sociologist Donald McRae suggested

Adolescent rebellion is older than the universities of the middle ages. It has constantly presented a pattern of temporary bohemianism and a defined and legitimised license of behaviour. Since 1789 it has also involved experiment with radical politics - left and right, nationalist and internationalist... (28)

One should be careful of the use of the word 'adolescent'. University students are young men and women, not adolescents. Other sociologists, for example, Walter Laqueur, have written of the recent student movement in the context of previous European movements such as those of Germany before and after the 1914-1918 war. Laqueur wrote of one movement, the German Neue Schar (New Troops) that they were the original hippies:

long-haired, sandaled, unwashed, they castigated urban civilisation, read Hermann Hesse and Indian philosophy, practiced free love, and distributed in their meetings thousands of asters and chrysanthemums. (29)

There is a danger, however, of interpreting the protests of recent times in purely cultural reaction terms. Certainly there were new and exciting cultural expressions, but one should ask 'expressions' of what? The answer lies in the development of political consciousness amongst students, a consciousness that was seen by the radical students themselves in both pluralist and class terms. In turn, one asks why was political awareness heightened, and this thesis provides some pointers to the answers.

A popular commentator on American society, Theodore Roszak, whose opinions contributed to President Richard Nixon's 'Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest', emphasised in his causal analysis the formation of a new culture, a youth culture that was also a 'counter-culture'; that defined itself through a passionate attachment to principle and an opposition to the larger society. At the centre of this counter culture, believed Roszak, was a romantic celebration of human life, of the unencumbered individual; of the senses, of nature. (30) The first few pages of his Preface (X-XIV) set the parameters of what is meant by 'youth culture' and 'counter culture'. In Roszak's Chapter 1, 'Technology's Children', he outlines a case as to why American, indeed Western youth, especially students, rejected institutionalised modes of social change and adopted a comparatively unique, independent and celebratory style. It is interesting to read

back on Roszak's famous work if only to be bemused at how rapidly historical circumstances have effected the abandonment of the counter culture as a mass movement of the 1980s. (31)

Others also suggested in 1970 that the youth movement, spearheaded by the students, would endure and endure until a final, glorious destiny. For example, Charles Reich in his The Greening of America.

There is a revolution coming. It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act ... It is now spreading with amazing rapidity, and already our laws, institutions and social structure are changing in consequence. It promises a higher reason, a more human community, and a new and liberated individual. Its ultimate creation will be a new and enduring wholeness and beauty...

This is the revolution of the new generation. Their protest and rebellion ... are not a passing fad ... the whole emerging pattern from ideals to campus demonstrations to beads and bell bottoms to the Woodstock Festival, makes sense, as is part of a consistent philosophy. It is both necessary and inevitable and in time it will include not only youth, but all people in America. (32)

In 1970, it appears that idealistic optimism was more evident than the pragmatic pessimism of the 1980s.

In Melbourne there were other views of the origins of the student movement. For example, that its causes lay buried deep in conspiratorial clubs of subversives. News Weekly, the National Civic Council magazine published weekly exposes, and analyses placed great emphasis on the existence of a small group of dedicated leaders manipulating the students, and dedicated to transforming the nation's universities into the spearhead of a revolution by mobilising moderate and liberal students. (33) Such conspiratorial theories doubtless provided all sorts of emotional satisfaction and religious justification for those writers of News Weekly who advanced them, but they were

insufficient explanations for the events. To see student unrest as a product of a small cadre group has about the same relation to reality as would a claim that the Russian Revolution was brought about purely by Bolshevik intrigue.

To summarise: rapid rates of social change and consequential alienation between parental and student generations in the mid 1960s may have contributed to the disaffection of this generation of students. However, greater credence is given to Marxist interpretations, whilst affirming that there is no single explanation for the emergence of the student movement. Chapter Three elaborates on the Marxist oriented explanation in the next section, in 'The Student Movement in a Capitalist State'. Other explanations have been that students are traditionally radical and progressive, and that the movement was the result of an 'historical need' for a distinct student political consciousness. Analyses provided by Charles Reich and Theodore Roszak also point to the emergence of an independent and unique 'counter-culture' as a result of student rejection of institutionalised modes of social change. One other explanation, that the student movement was the result of conspiratorial groups of student subversives, is not given much credence.

The following section provides a more developed analysis of economic aspects of the causes of the student movement.

(iii) The Student Movement in a Capitalist State

This section explores changes in the processes of production that impinged on the growth of the student movement, and thus forms an important part of a consideration of why the movement emerged when it did. The argument here is that radical students came to form a necessary and inevitable part of the capitalist production of technology and knowledge as a factor of production, and that radical students recognised this and reacted. The discussion suggests that radicals

viewed universities as integral to the production of technological skills in an unjust socio-economic system. Further, it is argued that radical students reacted by trying to build links between Left Trade Unions and political parties in an effort to identify with the working class and influence social realities, and that these efforts may be seen as part of a continuing history of popular movements of people in human history.

The student movement was not just a grab-bag of the sixties. The roots of the rebellion were to be found in the evolution of advanced industrialised societies since the beginning of the industrial revolution itself, right up to the sixties when society was producing its own revolutionaries, its own negation. The revolution of production took a new turn in the mid twentieth century, as intellectually-trained workers were required. Students now were in opposition just as the workers were earlier, although, their revolution had different characteristics.

In reality, students were not yet in the strategic position of having directly linked to the labour movement in the sense of being linked to the production processes. However, the relationship of students to the production process was quite crucial to Australian capitalism. Because of this degree of independence from the system, an important minority of students were able to reject the future roles they were being trained to fulfill. Those who strove to totally reject the system felt more free from the pressures of conformity that weighed on those who valued and strove for privileged social and economic positions. As Melbourne's universities played a significant part in reinforcing the dominant culture, radical students were in the position of being able to undermine social control by exposing the ways in which the rulers of the community transmitted the values which served to legitimise their own position. (34) What this really meant was the bringing about of 'class consciousness' for students.

Dan O'Neill, in 1969 an academic at the University of Queensland and member of Society for Democratic Action, put the frank view that

...capitalism was being revealed as an increasingly wasteful and unjust system that to continue actually had to suppress human needs and hold back the productive capacity of its citizens distorting them psychologically and morally while doing so. (35)

Such contradictions as these that O'Neill and others presented were translated into the student radicals' view that capitalism was ideologically and morally insupportable. It was natural that educational institutions became theatres in which this unacceptability was acted out.

One obvious contradiction that created tensions was that students, the technologists to be, wanted to be more critical and creative personalities than society thought allowable. Warren Osmond (36) suggested that

A reason for student power getting off the ground is that the ideals of liberal and humanistic education are in themselves democratic and radical, especially in Australia. When people say that the aims of education are to produce critical, thinking, independent citizens, they are saying something which is a basic democratic assumption, and in conflict with the actual reality of the Australian condition, thus giving rise to dissatisfaction and a basis for political action. (37)

Alongside this consideration, concepts such as self-government, grass-roots democracy, collectives, communes and participatory democracy, may have been easier to apply to Australian universities than to Australian work-places such as factories and corporate office blocks.

At an average student political club meeting on a university campus in Australia in 1970 one would hear attacks on capitalist values and romantic appeals to the working class as the liberating force to be. It

is fair to observe however that the working class was hard of hearing or had its mind on other things. This is not to say that working people did not participate in protests or at some time in the future they would not take a lead; but on the whole the protests were the efforts of the middle class intelligentsia and students, and represented a crisis of power and values within the middle class itself. Looked at closely, during the protest period, there were few serious challenges to real symbols of power: for example, Governors-General. 1975 had not yet happened, and even when it did 'rage' was muted and not maintained, though memories are long. From 1966-1975 many middle-class students found that radical ideas and symbolic actions were more realistic than other ideas and actions. They were students who wanted specific social changes, and although they may not have had philosophically complete theories about 'restructuring the whole system' they nevertheless wanted radical results, and were thus prepared to use unusual and direct methods.

What lay behind the protests were impulses as old as the political and romantic moods of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; they were impulses of libertarian, democratic and socialist aspiration as old as those of Demosthenes. Paris, a city with a fine revolutionary tradition, had its turn in May 1968; the Paris and Berkeley, California events were seen by many Australian student leaders as an indication that 'student power' could be used as a revolutionary weapon in which universities could be the vanguard. Marxism was revived and dusted down and re-vamped as the analytical and revolutionary tool for forging a new ideology in the context of Australia as a modern industrial state. This was done in order to provide an analysis of a middle range capitalist nation that would lead to a strategy for an Australian socialist revolution.

In spite of increasing publicity in Australia, particularly as a result of the reportage of the May-June 1968 Paris uprising, the Australian student movement was not overwhelmingly successful in building a new movement that would heavily involve the industrial



proletariat in a Socialist revolution outside the campuses. Such alliances were only partly successful in Australia, as with the Melbourne-based Worker-Student Alliance (W.S.A.). (38) Students at Monash and La Trobe who saw themselves as Maoists were indirectly influenced by the C.P.A.(M-L). As a Maoist myself in 1971-72, it was thought that Maoist student leaders were actual members of the C.P.A.(M-L), and I assumed they were. Certainly there was a close association with that party by figures such as Albert Langer, Barry York, Fergus Robinson, Darce Cassidy, Ken White, Michael Hyde and many others, but doubtless for reasons of security, membership and allegiances were kept vague. Whilst Maoists were very active on both campuses, they were few in numbers, though significantly it was the Maoists who were usually the first to take 'direct action'. Their slogan 'dare to struggle' and their willingness to actually 'dare' captured the support of other students in larger numbers. A number of sources verify these aspects. (39) The W.S.A. first appeared publicly in 1970 and was organised and funded as a student political club. Its members were adherents of a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology and its links reached off-campus to the C.P.A.(M-L) and the small group of militant Left unions that Party dominated; these unions were the Waterside Workers Federation (Melb. branch), and the Builders' Labourers' Federation. In a strange twist of irony, in 1984, as a result of national industrial disputes between the Builders' Labourers' Federation and the Federal Government over the Prices and Incomes Accord, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (A.S.I.O.) took an active interest in approaching former Maoist students such as Fergus Robinson and myself for information regarding Norm Gallagher of the B.L.F., former Maoists, and the C.P.A.(M-L). In the early 70s, A.S.I.O. had been hunting us down, but in 1984, we were expected to be a fountain of knowledge to help preserve the Hawke Government which itself, together with the Victorian Government under the A.L.P.'s John Cain, had been instrumental in the deregulation of the B.L.F.

The link between the student movement and the Trade Union movement was more than organisational. It involved the very use of knowledge in

the context of technology and the capitalist state. Some examination of this aspect is important in clarifying factors associated with the rise of the student movement at that particular time in history.

In the ruthless scrutiny of historical perspective, it may be seen that the student movement was a reaction against a fear that twentieth century technology had rendered much of the value of a liberal education obsolete. There appear to be two groups of protagonists in the analysis of student revolt. On the one hand are the 'counter-revolutionary' theorists, those who see the student revolutionaries as counter-revolutionary to the inevitability of the growth of technology. Among these theorists are Zbigniew Brzezinski, Lewis Feuer, Daniel Bell, Alvin Toffler, Bruno Bettelheim and Herman Kahn. (40) On the other hand, the student protests have been portrayed as youth being a revolutionary force. Theorists such as Charles Reich, and Theodore Roszak, and the populist memoirs of Abbie Hoffman, Tom Hayden and Jerry Rubin, represent the view of student protest as historically regenerative, and the views of those who oppose it as counter-revolutionary. (41)

Brzezinski, for example, wrote in Between Two Ages:

The Luddites were threatened by economic obsolescence and reacted against it. Today the militant leaders of the student reaction, as well as their ideologues, frequently come from those branches of learning which are more sensitive to the threat of social irrelevance. Their political activism is thus only a reaction to the more basic fear that the times are against them, that a new world is emerging without either their assistance or their leadership. (42)

Historical inevitability was also claimed by supporters of the student counter culture revolutionaries. Reich was very explicit about this in The Greening of America:

[The revolution] will originate with the individual and with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require

violence to succeed, and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. It is now spreading with amazing rapidity...It is both necessary and inevitable, and in time it will include not only youth, but all people in America. (43)

Perhaps the student revolt was the embodiment of a realisation amongst activists that as revolutionaries they were themselves part of the theatre of ideas slipping into historical obscurity, and were battling the new technocrats and war-bureaucrats for a foothold on the stage of modern history.

This thesis does not support the above idea, for there is an assumption that the shape of the future is already technologically determined. It is not. There is continuing debate about the application of technology to human enhancement, and no sign of that debate receding. Quite the contrary.

More than this, however, is the stark political reality of the economic context of the 1960s. Neil McLean, a Melbourne activist, saw it this way (1986):

In the 40s in Western bourgeois democracies you had an enormous arousal of expectations. People sacrificed so much because they thought that with the war finally over everything would be different and better. Instead, what you had after the war in Australia and in all Western capitalist countries was a period of oppressive McCarthyism, the Petrov Affair and attempts to ban the C.P.A. This was the Cold War. It worked on the younger generation because economically the period had a certain legitimacy. The ruling forces were able to ascribe a legitimacy to their actions after the war, largely because of the economic prosperity. There weren't the kinds of contradictions as in kids today; but it only lasted so long. They were able to paper things over for 15 years but then it burst out. (44)

That Australian tertiary students, in the process of bursting out, invoked old but tried and true humanistic and romantic ideas such as 'freedom' and 'democracy' and 'peace', in no way suggests that the

protests were a 'last-gasp' of a dying order. Quite the opposite. All revolutions draw on older values and visions. Many of the ideals of the French Revolution of 1789 originated in Periclean Athens. (45)

Revolutions and mass movements do not occur because new ideas develop mysteriously and suddenly. They occur because succeeding generations take up old ideas under new guises, as a response to a changing relationship to the forces of production; ideas such as classical democracy and Marxism; students took up established ideas not as interesting theoretical playthings but as a basis for political action.

Indeed, the pursuit of change by active participation in influencing relationships between the forces of production is history itself. In Norman Cohn's The Pursuit of the Millenium (46) he concludes his study of messianism in the peasant and religious revolts of the middle ages by observing

On the one hand working people have in certain parts of the world been able to improve their lot out of all recognition, through the agency of trade unions, co-operatives and parliamentary parties. On the other hand during the half-century since 1917 there has been a constant repetition, and on an ever-increasing scale, of the socio-psychological process which once joined the Taborite priests or Thomas Muntzer with the most disoriented and desperate of the poor, in phantasies of a final, exterminatory struggle against 'the great ones'; and of a perfect world from which self-seeking would be for ever banished.

And if one looks in a somewhat different direction, one can even find an up-to-date version of that alternative route to the Millennium, the cult of the Free Spirit. For the ideal of a total emancipation of the individual from society, even from external reality itself - the ideal, if one will, of self-divinization - which some nowadays try to realize with the help of psychedelic drugs, can be recognized already in that deviant form of medieval mysticism.

The old religious idiom has been replaced by a secular one, and this tends to obscure what otherwise would be obvious. For it is the simple truth that, stripped of their original supernatural sanction, revolutionary

millenarianism and mystical anarchism are with us still. (47)

For this thesis, revolution and social movement in history are seen as part of the total human condition; a condition subject to constant re-definition, for to each historian a different reality reveals itself. For example, in recent times, the writings of French Marxist George Rudé have examined the role of protests in The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in England and France 1730-1848 (48) and Ideology and Popular Protest (49). Rudé, unlike some earlier Marxists, gives the people a more direct role in history; they are not merely depicted as a mystified 'factor of production'.

Writing of popular movements and crowds, Rudé observed that

Sociologists, on the whole, having learned from Marx and Weber, have seen the crowd not as a merely generalised abstraction: they have tended to break it down and classify it according to its goals, behavior or underlying beliefs ... that is, we should attempt from the start to place the event in which the crowd participates in its proper historical context; for, without this, how can we hope to get beyond the stereotypes and probe into the crowd's outlook, objects, behavior, social origins, and the historical significance of events. And so, having done this, we return to the question from which we started - what is the nature and importance of an event in history? (50)

It is in such a context of history as Cohn and Rudé outline that this thesis views the student movement and its relationship to the forces of production.

An example of how the Melbourne student radicals regarded the technology revolution in history was when opposition was declared against Honeywell, an American multinational company that supplied computers to aid the American war effort in Vietnam. A La Trobe student, Ken White, a member of the La Trobe Labor Club, was sentenced

to twelve months imprisonment for involvement in a shot-gun and molotov-cocktail attack on Honeywell in St. Kilda, in 1970. Honeywell was not attacked because of its technology but because of its uses. (51)

In Australia, the economic successes and moral failures of a post-Second World War industrial society made possible a new kind of consciousness. There were new values, new aspirations, new life-styles. The pre-war Australian industrial state was premised on an assumption of scarcity of production, and the cogs of industry were geared to reduction of poverty alongside maximised profit. By 1970, the Australian scene was quite altered. Australians had partly succeeded in the race for material gratification, and a new generation of Australians was launched into newly built universities as a generation freed of repressive admonitions induced by the scarcity culture. In an era of abundance on the crest of which the A.L.P. came to office on 13 December 1972, the niggardly and inhibited psychology of frugality was no longer necessary. The world-wide recession from 1975 to the present was not imagined in 1972, or 1970. Alienated relationships between Australians who viewed each other as commodities, as 'human capital' (as the Martin Report (52) into Australian education referred to students) were not tenable in progressive student circles. Supposedly objective, asocial academe, by scientist or technician, was thought a kind of obscenity, by many radical students.

The new political culture of the student scene in Melbourne was neither atavistic nor irrational in its reaction against the old Australian culture, epitomised by the relatively dull, uninspiring fifties, but was a logical outgrowth of it - an expression of possibilities and a rational effort to remedy failings. Just as the central goal of the two decades 1945-1965 was to overcome want, by the late sixties that goal had largely been achieved and a new intelligentsia was on the shoulders of the old culture, as an historical vanguard.

Insofar as the Australian capitalist system needed a better educated professional class to manage advances in technology, the new intelligentsia was also an historical necessity and inevitability. Whilst it may have been consistent with Australia's philosophical liberalism to create the student movement, it is sobering to keep in mind that higher education was and is organised specifically to provide Australia with its future management for those same state institutions that create the status quo. Alexander Cockburn observed of this process that

Before they [the students] can perform their allotted tasks the manipulators have to be manipulated. This is a dangerous process. The future manipulator needs to be fairly lucid - even have his own share of selective cynicism - about how the system operates. The student who might become a political commentator or an industrial relations expert must know a little bit about Marx and the reasons why workers go on strike, qualifications which have not been necessary in the past. Such students must be taught their own role in a particular confidence trick: but not enough to rumble the whole game. Similarly, the future fashion designer must be capable of creativity without resenting his subordination to the market and the rules of the spectacle. (53)

The process Cockburn described was historically necessary and inevitable, as Western capitalist economies required a new intelligentsia to meet new demands in industry and government. The process also lies at the heart of the evolution of the student movement, since those students who were required to achieve some insight into the operations of social systems were likely to be the very ones to justify a rebellion against it. Not surprisingly, those students whose studies invited them to perceive the 'whole game' were in the fore-front of the student revolt, and they began by rejecting the passivity the system sought to impose on them. As Karl Marx said in the Communist Manifesto, at times of social upheaval, a section of the bourgeoisie, particularly the intellectuals who see the process as a whole, go over to the cause of revolution.

The rejection of passivity by students gave coinage to the phrase 'student power', and to thousands of Australian students, 'student power' meant the power of students to determine the structure and content of their social situation. The stated aim of many radical Left students was the construction of a revolutionary front with the Australian industrial proletariat; but immediate student power lay in the universities where students worked and where critical institutions were vulnerable:

Many students now take the stand that their struggles are struggles in common with those of the working class against exploitation. (54)

Nevertheless, student activists often gained support from subjectively based acts against authority. Activists concerned themselves with collective action on their own ground, the campuses. Students could not and did not occupy the factories in Australia. Instead, it was thought that by engaging in struggles against university authorities students could make inroads into the socio-economic construction of the nation:

It is from these conflicts with the administration at Monash that students have come to analyse the role of the university in society. They have concluded that it exists to perpetuate a class society in which the vast majority of the population is exploited by a wealthy minority. (55)

Activists in Melbourne and elsewhere did not see tertiary education as deservedly 'a world of its own', and believed in the necessity of breaking down the isolation which society imposed on students in the form of privilege. Activist students therefore reached out to progressive labour organisations outside of universities, such as the progressive wings of political parties, some unions, peace and anti-war organisations and community action groups. For example, during 1966-1972, the Socialist Left of the Victorian A.L.P.; progressive elements in the Sydney and Melbourne branches of the C.P.A.; the Draft Resisters'



Union; the Australian Union of Students and its Aquarius Foundation; progressively minded unions of the time such as the B.L.F.; Save Our Sons; Left Parliamentarians such as Senator George Georges, Mr. George Petersen M.L.C. and Mr. Tom Uren.

An example from La Trobe University arose in 1971 when the La Trobe Labor Club organised a demonstration from Myer Northland to travel along Murray Road, Waterdale Road and back to campus. One repeated slogan of the marchers was, 'Who killed Collingburn? The pigs kills Collingburn'. Collingburn had been a resident of Heidelberg, a worker, who had died at Russell Street police headquarters whilst being interrogated by police, some days prior to the La Trobe students' march. Other than his working class origins and nearby residency, Collingburn had no connection with La Trobe. The students made an effort to identify with the Australian working class, not conspicuously successfully, but with ideological conviction and sincerity.

The universities, historically necessary to modern capitalist management, were to be the first base from which student revolutionaries intended to turn the tables on the Australian socio-economic system; from the universities, to proceed to other key socialising institutions: schools, churches, parliaments, public services, unions.

Worker-control of factories is in every way the essential for socialism... 'Socialism in one university' could act as a catalyst, if not a model, for the more conscious elements of the working class... (56)

Actions were designed to expose the repressive and mystifying structures of institutions, and exposing them above all, to the inmates themselves. Hence, the showering of fake money bills over the public gallery of the Melbourne Stock Exchange onto the trading floor in 1970, publicised the question: Who were the real power-brokers in Australia? The mock crucifixion at Monash University in 1967 was designed to strip away the dogmatic hegemony of orthodox Christianity. To challenge Christianity

was to challenge ideological hegemony and definitions of 'knowledge', one of the forces of production:

The most interesting aspect of 1968s celebrated Mock Crucifixion was the reaction to it...The political importance of this otherwise trivial issue lay in the close, immediate cooperation between the University and the State. (57)

Student activists, whether at 'The Bakery' in Greville Street, Prahran, or the SDS headquarters in Palmerston Street, Carlton, believed they had a special responsibility to develop revolutionary consciousness and culture in order to guarantee continuing revolutionary practice. 'The Bakery', in Prahran, was the communal headquarters of the Monash Labor Club, which by 1967, was dominated by Maoist Marxist-Leninists.

One of the remarkable features of political life, in Victoria at least, is the success of the communists (Marxist-Leninist) in establishing hegemony over the active Socialist movement. Among students, industrial workers, in the peace movement, in particular campaigns...the student movement has been the first sign of this revolution of the new proletarians and clearly the emphasis in maoism on daring, personal involvement, on the self-made communist society, have appeal. (58)

The 1972 Aquarius Festival at Nimbin, N.S.W., underwritten by the Australian Union of Students, was more than a celebration of alternative life-styles. As a participant in workshops at the Festival, I recollect many discussions of revolutionary theory with the writings of 1960s 'cult figures' as backdrops: Marcuse, C. Wright Mills, Ginsberg, Leary, Rubin, Davis, Watts, to name a few. (59) Such discussions served to re-define 'knowledge' for individual students.

The actual historical context of Melbourne's university students is traditionally that of an elite group, comfortable in the academic play-pen, on the borders of the real world. This image was quickly shattered

in the late sixties, when students were less readily identifiable with the Melbourne and Geelong Grammars' 'on to university to finish off' attitude of previous generations. However, Melbourne's tertiary students still were unable to be readily identifiable with the city's working class as far as socio-economic status was concerned. University students seemed to comprise a separate group in Melbourne, and this separateness produced distinctive forms of radical activity; nevertheless, I suggest that the student troubles at Melbourne's three universities were much more than the mere acting-out of apprentices to the ruling class.

Those students who regarded themselves as 'radical' and 'revolutionaries' saw the historical context of the student movement as residing in a critical period in the decline and eventual collapse of the capitalist system. Perception of this decline closely related itself to the key role of universities. Industrial societies such as Australia's, at the time of the establishment of the 'cream brick' universities such as Monash and La Trobe, had an imperative need for large numbers of highly trained professional and technical personnel. Industry, government, communications and education had a rapidly expanding demand for an intellectually skilled workforce. Evidence, in addition to the Martin Report has been provided by Spigelman (60).

It must be accepted that the idea of a 'community of scholars' has almost completely disappeared. Nor can it possibly return. Knowledge has expanded and requires bigger laboratories, more and more research, larger libraries and wider culture. The knowledge explosion has scattered the self-contained community of scholars. (61)

Also, Abbey and Catley

It is perfectly clear that during the last twenty years crucial changes in the technological nature of the economic base, in the agencies of production, communication and devastation, have impinged heavily on the universities of capitalist societies, altering the nature of their activities. (62)

The rapid rate of technical and scientific advance in the previous two decades had created for the first time in Australian history the beginnings of mass intellectual labour.

Ernest Mandel had written that

What the student revolt represents on a much broader and social and historic scale is the colossal transformation of the productive forces which Marx foresaw in his Grundrisse: the reintegration of intellectual labour into productive labour, men's intellectual capacities becoming the prime productive force in society. (63)

We may now proceed from Mandel's observation to a summary of this discussion.

Basically, the section set out to show that the need of capitalism for an intellectually trained labour force was recognised by some students who saw this process as supportive of an unjust economic system. This recognition served to politicize and radicalise these students. Various sources were drawn on to support this view. The radicalised students endeavoured to build links with the more militant tendencies in the labour movement in a partially successful effort to identify with the working class and to restructure the social system. The discussion suggested that these efforts may be viewed as a continuation of the role that popular movements have played in shaping history, and that the views of writers such as Norman Cohn, George Rudé, and Charles Reich seemed to support this view. The view that the radical students were counter-revolutionary in opposing the advance of technology was rejected in the discussion. The economic boom that preceded and was part of the emergence of the student movement was here considered as important in providing the circumstances for a radical movement that questioned the very system that provided such circumstances, and the observations of Neil McLean, and Alexander Cockburn are useful here. Generally, the necessity for the provision of 'mass intellectual labour' as observed by James Spigelman, Ernest Mandel

and others, provided the human resource needed for the development of this social movement.

(iv) The Changing Role of Universities

We have discussed in general terms above the emergence of the student movement as part of the changing needs of the capitalist mode of production. The following discussion is closely linked to this theme but deserves special consideration because it studies several aspects of the changing role of universities in more detail. The discussion introduces a consideration of university curricula; it provides statistical information relating to structural changes in the workforce and schooling that affected the growth of tertiary education and its content. Conflicts over the traditional and contemporary ideas of what a university should be are also discussed, and the true significance of the role of the intellectually trained as 'human capital' is considered.

The discussion then proceeds to a deliberation of the role of university administrations in the context of student inspired moves for change. The importance of the physical situation of universities, and the unique social situation of students is a final consideration of this section.

The new sense of ease was, however, affronted for some students by the disciplines of university life, where regular quantitative assessments meant that what was being learned at universities were techniques in regularly getting good grades in examinations and tests. One of the campaigns of the Australian Union of Students was the abandonment of exams in favour of qualitative and cumulative assessment. An Australian university could seem as much a rat race as office life. Greater and greater specialisation in the Social Sciences, accompanied by protective jargons, meant a narrowing and dryness in language. Talcott Parsons immediately comes to mind. This sometimes meant that academics regarded with suspicion attempts at general intellectual

discourse. Attempts by the SRC at La Trobe University to establish joint student-staff committees to discuss course content were successful in Sociology, but in Politics and English less so. Student protest at La Trobe was in part a manifestation of this disappointment.

Popular texts at the time included Ivan Illich's De-schooling Society (64) and Richard Neville's Play-Power. (65) Neville's work rejected both the old society and the new revolutionaries, and presented the gospel of work as the prime evil of modern society.

In Arts, the study of social sciences, as isolated fields of expertise, tended to undermine the role of the humanist intellectual who, after all, claimed the right to comment on and influence public policy in the wider community. This contributed to the development on Australian campuses of a reaction against quantitative research that did not concern itself with ethical and political contexts. At La Trobe University, students in the Science schools formed 'Social Responsibility in Science' and regularly published a newsletter called 'Fire' from 1970-1972. 'Fire' underlined the relationship between the nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons industries, and university research, particularly in the U.S.A. and was edited by Julian Shaw.

The debate over curriculum gained prominence as the role of tertiary education itself gained prominence.

The tertiary education explosion in Australia was part reflection in the early to mid 1960s, of a high birth rate after the Second World War. (66) Employment in farming in Australia had decreased from 9.4 per cent to 7.4 per cent from 1966 to 1972, and employment in manufacturing was flattening out. (67) Proportions in the service industries were rising. (68) The expansion in tertiary education in Australia in the early to mid 1960s was a function of the need for a much larger intellectually trained section of the work-force, one of specialists and administrators. The increases in employment in Australia were taking place in the big bureaucracies in industry and government, amongst

professionals and technicians, the educationists, publicists, data providers and public administrators of utilities. (69) This was the scene too in France, Japan, North America, England, Italy and West Germany and Canada. Education was a growth industry in itself, with fifteen universities with 128,000 students in 1972 in Australia. (70) The growth of the education industry attended the cult of economic growth and the bureaucratisation necessary to manage it. The student movement may thus also be viewed as a product of economic and demographic determinism.

The above changes were reflected in a debate about the changing nature of the university itself, which also related to the structure of curriculum.

In Autumn 1964, the late Professor Ian Turner had early commented on conflicting perceptions of the university beginning to publicly appear. The traditional idea of a 'community of scholars was being challenged by an industrialised society increasingly interested in new and more technical skills'. (71) Turner pointed out that for the individual student the interests of the community may involve a contradiction between the pursuit of learning and the need to equip for a career. The context of this contradiction in 1964 was the Victorian Education Department's 'bond system' wherein students were bonded to teach for three years in return for financial provision whilst at university. This scheme tended to force students of the humanities and sciences into a narrow career mould and prompted Ian Turner to a caution:

Thus, the conflict between the traditional conception of the university as a centre of learning and critical enquiry, and the present demand that the universities serve as technical training institutes for modern industrial society, is paralleled by the intellectual struggle of those who profess a radical critique. It is in the nature of present society that these pressures will increase, but it is in the nature of universities that such pressures will create their own response. (72)

Ian Turner lived to see that response at his own Monash University in its radical student period 1967-1970.

Further research from the early sixties drew attention to the disparity between the 'community of scholars' perception and the less palatable reality. In 1964 two Australian social scientists published a detailed list of the corporate backgrounds of many Australian university administration officials and academics. (73) The research showed that the tertiary scene in Australia lay towards an intimate relationship between universities and industry. The data provided some early ammunition for future accusations from radical students at Monash, Melbourne and La Trobe universities regarding questionable university-industry links. Information related to biographical data on: industrialist members of university Councils; Vice-Chancellors involved in company directorships; academics involved in off-campus research with rival companies; and use by academics of publicly funded university equipment for private enterprise research. The research aids an understanding of why the sixties produced a generation of students disillusioned with the official university rhetoric of universities being sanctuaries of objectivity, independent of those institutions that compromised neutrality and free enquiry.

It was predictable that with the growth of secondary and tertiary education during the fifties and sixties that the very size of the education industry would reveal instances of power centres of influential vested interests manipulating the education apparatus. The increased numerical strength of tertiary students on Australian campuses assisted the development of a variety of views and beliefs necessary to the nurturing of a student political-cultural environment and movement. Early indication of the trend towards longer stints of education in secondary schools and increasing pressure of numbers eligible for tertiary education, can be seen from the Victorian Government's Ramsay Report into Victorian education. (74) In the decade 1948-1958 the percentage of children remaining at school beyond the age of 14 had risen from 50 per cent to 80 per cent; the percentage of any particular



age group remaining at school for the full six years to matriculation (H.S.C.) had doubled from 4.5 per cent to 9.0 per cent. (75) A higher level of education had become a social reality, led to the creation of Monash and La Trobe universities, and to the development of a more educated type of working class. In Victoria then, a feature of the sixties compared with, say, the 1930s, was an enormous growth in the comparative weight of the intelligentsia, and the younger generation naturally were the most heavily involved. This new stratum acquired the capacity to influence the course of events in social, political and moral questions, and played a decisive role in the proselytizing of new ideas. One question was posed in the following terms:

It has to be recognised that higher education is both the bridge into and at the basis of the new society. In the past the intelligentsia have been given their distinctive cast in the universities...Is the production of human capital now to be their goal? (76)

A major thrust of the Melbourne movement's energies centred on this very crisis of direction. No longer was the role of higher education thought to be primarily that of developing persons who could act as independent professionals. Instead, the educated were to be at the service of industry and government, carrying out tasks determined by others, in a position analogous to that of an industrial worker. Modern methods of production and administration in Australia required intellectual skills, but the educated had to gain these skills in the narrow instrumental role ordained, without the generalised culture which the education process may in the past have provided. It was this unrealistic expectation of senior managements that fed disillusionment, alienation and outright antagonism between students and administrative structures.

The true significance of the role of the intellectually trained in Melbourne was that radical students were impelled by their social situation and cultural values to initiate an attack on the power structure at its source. With respect to the decisions incorporating the scientific revolution, student activists were encouraged to ask not

just how the effects of this revolution might be best used, but how the revolution itself might be carried out in a different way altogether. Since the machinery of Australian pluralist democracy was largely impotent of revolutionary participators at the decisive level, activist students were impelled to develop their own organisations and political style. It was a 'mass style' because student leaders sought the entry of the State's citizenry into decision-making at a new level - the level then monopolised by the industrialist and administrator.

Australia's universities mirrored the conflict in its sharpest forms. Surges of student radicalism were induced by the crisis in the universities themselves, the universities being part of the wider social transformation of society. As the 'social transformation' was believed incipient, half formed, and ill-defined, so too was the character of the student movement often largely one of reaction against forces only generally discerned.

Ever since the industrial revolution there had been a growing tension between the universalistic intellectual values of the university and the instrumental functions it was called upon to perform by the State. So long as the products of the university were comparatively few in number, attached to the upper classes and only marginally relevant to the industrial process, this tension could be maintained. But by the mid-sixties the situation was different. Australian universities had become industries in themselves, producing valuable capital for the scientific revolution - knowledge itself - for which the demand was voracious and overwhelming. And, like any other industry, the university had to be governed by those good old standards of utilitarianism-efficiency, discipline, uniformity and co-ordination. One observer of the student scene in Melbourne 1968 saw the causes of student unrest this way:

The student in particular becomes the object of all the pressures towards industrial-type efficiency, mass-production and conformity. The students feel their displacement, the decline in respect for their

personalities, the inability of even the most liberally-minded staff to observe the classical terms of university education. A growing number of them are in reactive revolt of various kinds against what they perceive as the norms of a hostile society - its behaviour, its dress, its morality, its politics. They are becoming practitioners of 'mass politics' because they do not regard the established institutions as receptive to their concerns. Out of their ferment has come a demand about which we will be hearing more in the future - the demand for student power. Like the demands of teachers and other professional groups, this is at heart a demand for participatory democracy - democracy extended to the areas which most determine the roles they are called upon to play in society. (77)

I suspect the universities become the point of fracture for many reasons, only one of which was a need for power. Among these reasons were: students saw that some element still persisted of the relative autonomy granted in times when universities served other needs; students were drawn into a common situation in large numbers and once there, they experienced the bureaucratic degeneration of the university; because, as yet, they had not moved within the suffocating structures of the Australian public services. And, preceding university, there was that diffuse state of disorientation, the crisis of identity, which tended to beset students whenever social relations had been set in ferment by basic revolutions in the sphere of production.

The fact that the initiative in Melbourne came from students in its three universities was the consequence of a minority of students' grasp of the revolutionary role of education itself in our society, and the belief that this role could not be properly fulfilled without changes in the structure, not only of the education system, but of the State itself.

The initiatives taken on Melbourne campuses were an attempt to breakdown the whole concept of the separation of education and work; to replace the idea of education as a 'preparation' or 'qualification' with the concept of a perpetual renewal and interchange between education and the working world. (78)

Confronted with a movement led by activist students of absolutist ideas, Melbourne's three universities were faced with the problem of how to deal with a rival ideology, aiming to control crucial institutions such as the universities. Confronted, authorities reacted as any other political power by trying to repress the opposition. The three Melbourne universities possessed considerable machinery to deal with claims for minor reforms within the framework of the university system of government, but manoeuvrability was difficult when faced with a pressure group that denied the legitimacy of the authority of the machinery itself.

A factor which could be said to have favoured the development of political involvement by Australian students was the physical situation of universities, which made it relatively easy to mobilise students disposed to act politically. The inability of universities' authorities to handle such situations except by relying on outside force (the police and courts) often brought to the support of demonstrators the majority of the campus population, both student and academic. For example, the 'Waterdale Road' demonstrations by La Trobe University students in 1971, where, after unprovoked attacks by police on students, the Staff Association and the administrators including the Vice-Chancellor, supported the students' criticism of the Victorian police. (79)

Indeed, in studying the issues, activists, and the political climate of the times, it is the attitude of Australian university administrations that often becomes central to an analysis of reactions to the growth of the student movement. The events at La Trobe university portrayed in Chapter Two revealed aspects of university administration during the period, where it became plain that a more skillful handling of student complaints would have lessened antagonism. This would have involved more open channels of communication between student leaders and academic and administration personnel. It would also have involved a greater willingness to resist public and political pressures, and the taking up of a leading role in changing public opinion rather than simply reacting defensively. Such measures would

have minimised the occurrence of organised protests on Melbourne's campuses. Naturally, if an administration showed itself to be unduly sensitive to politicians and arrogant or inept in handling students, students would be encouraged to demonstrate against it. Clever management of student protest by administrations, even in the absence of genuine concern for students' problems, may, in more recent times, have served to dissipate the potentialities for student protest.

Some interesting observations on the nature of student political activity were made by Professor David Derham on his retirement as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne in 1982, after 14 years as Vice-Chancellor. Asked if another major issue like Vietnam or conscription arose, would the protests all happen again, Derham replied

Yes - if it could attract the emotional attention of the young generally. But circumstances would be a little different. One of the propositions they (the 1960s activists) managed to sell, not only to the young, was the theory of activism, which says that if I see something that is wrong, I am morally bound to do something about it. And if I can't see anything else to do I must register my protest, even if it means breaking a window. The logic of that is patently ridiculous. I don't think undergraduates would fall for it today. Students today are less obsessed with the belief that they can change the world by demonstrating. Perhaps they are a little more cynical. But certainly they are not apathetic. They have simply grown interested in other things. (80)

Professor Derham's observations notwithstanding, as far as La Trobe University is concerned, I have discussed the administration of the University with several SRC Presidents (Graham Proctor, Angela Pitts, John Banks, and Greg Davis) and all are agreed that minor problems aside, relationships today between the Vice-Chancellor (Professor John Scott) and the Registrar (Mr. David Neilson) are co-operative, and based on continuous consultation where respective interests are at stake. (81)

Whilst Derham's observations cast student activities of the sixties as rather more simplistic than they were, there are yet other possible explanations.

There are practical considerations to keep in mind regarding the potential of students to engage in social movements. One contributing factor in the development of the movement may have been that students do tend to be more available for new political movements than do other occupational groups in society. As new citizens entering the political arena, students may tend to be less committed to existing ideologies, have fewer explicit political commitments, and fewer personal positions to defend. They may be less identified with the personnel and institutions responsible for the status quo. (82) At the same time students were and are more available because of fewer time commitments in their occupational roles compared to older persons. To some extent, political activity is a function of the degree to which job requirements are dispensable. That is, those who can take time off work without suffering severe economic consequences are more likely to be active politically than those who have to punch a time-clock. Students have the most dispensable job requirements of all. Linked with these admittedly general observations is the factor of responsibility. Compared to other groups students simply have fewer responsibilities in the form of commitments to families and jobs. Thus, the existence of punitive sanctions against political activism is less likely to affect students than those with greater responsibilities to others or to a career ladder. Unfortunately though, tertiary students are regarded as sociologically juvenile at universities and tend to be treated as such. In Melbourne, for example, a number of radical students, some of whom were the children of well-to-do families, faced authorities at universities who were not at all eager to punish them. Universities in Australia are usually administered by liberally-minded individuals not inclined to severe sanctions against students. Dr. Myers, the Vice-Chancellor at La Trobe University during the troublesome years 1969-1972 was a liberal. His punitive actions were due more to intense pressure from the Bolte state government than the actions of students themselves.

As with most liberals, however, in a crisis one had to opt for one side or the other and Dr. Myers certainly was not able to be an exception.

Students, as Daniel Cohn-Bendit pointed out, are under less pressure to conform than are other groups:

The student, at least, in the modern system of higher education still preserves a considerable degree of personal freedom, if he chooses to exercise it...He can, if he so chooses, take extreme political positions without any personal danger; in general, he is not subjected to formal sanctions or even reprimands. (83)

To summarise the above discussion, it is suggested that important changes in the structure of the workforce were reflected in the presentation of university curricula as over-specialised and inadequate to the requirements of a new generation of students, who perceived the role of the university and the intellectually trained differently to that of many academics and administrators. The debate mirrored these differences in various ways, but most significantly manifested itself as a disagreement between university representatives of State and industry who saw the role of the intellectually trained in purely instrumental terms, and many radical students who saw their own role in more universalistic, classical liberal terms. This divergence resulted in disillusionment and alienation for some students, and promoted the establishment of a radical reaction against the power structures of the universities. An important point of difference was disagreement over the definition of work itself, with many students rejecting the ideological framework within which the definitions and uses of work were placed by those university administrators and academics who represented the requirements of State and industry.

The resultant conflict was often expressed in radical student political activities that reflected a rejection of being regarded as purely functional 'human capital'.

Rather, the above discussion points to a minority of students, 'radicals', who came to see education as having a 'revolutionary role', and 'a belief that this role could not be properly fulfilled without changes in the structure, not only of the education system, but of the State itself'.

The discussion then went on to briefly study the role of university administration in this changing climate, and the difficulty of dealing with a student movement, elements of which denied the legitimacy of the authority of the university itself. Some criticism of administration processes is outlined here, though this aspect is given more thorough treatment in Chapter Two.

The physical situation of universities, it was revealed above, also facilitated the growth of student activities, alongside the unique situation of students who seemed to allow for time to be made for participation in political activities.

Overall, the above discussion suggests that the changing and special role of universities was expressed in sharply divergent expectations about the nature and function of mass intellectual labour in a particular type of economic system. Some tertiary education planners saw the university as merely fulfilling the requirements of industry and State for intellectually skilled and functional workers. Some students, on the other hand, saw their own role as being in a unique situation to use education as a means to achieve revolutionary change in that economic system.

Such differing perceptions of the uses of knowledge served to precipitate a crisis in a physical situation uniquely suited to the development of confrontation.



(v) Student Government

The thesis now considers, briefly, the role of student government in an international setting.

In Australia, the myth of student government and derision of its token nature, was part of the social critique mounted by some radical students. Student governments around Australia varied in form but the effective reason for their existence then and now often appeared to be the containment, pacification and manipulation of the student body. At Monash University, disillusionment reached the extent of abandoning the representative council system altogether in favour of a student association based on general meetings. (84) Constitutional changes at La Trobe also reflected an emphasis on general meetings. (85) The University of Melbourne eventually established an Assembly. Nevertheless, no student government in Australia has been autonomously incorporated or has any rights apart from those sanctioned by university councils, senates or governing bodies. Furthermore, most Australian university administrations hold veto power over student governments with cover-all clauses such as those relating to the general interest of the university, or matters of finance. This was and still is the case at La Trobe University, with its SRC and Union Board. Perhaps the worst aspect of such paternalism is not that it exists, so much as the potential for manipulative practices by students of students, condoned by administrations. Unfortunately, some student politicians/administrators themselves embrace the mechanisms of the administrative handbook for opportunistic purposes.

Internationally, there had been compelling reasons for student activists to be drawn away from institutionalised student government. Revelations associated student organisations with the Central Intelligence Agency, through the United States National Students' Association (USNSA) and the International Student Conference (ISC). The American West coast student magazine Ramparts exposed the links in its March 1967 issue and the consequent explosive impact was instrumental in

American students seceding from the ISC at the 1967 conference. The National Student Association from February 1952 to 1967 received more than 3.3 million dollars as an intelligence and operations off-shoot of the CIA. (86) The ISC had been established in Stockholm in 1950 as a counterbalance to the International Union of Students (IUS), established in Prague in August 1946 under the aegis of the Soviet Union. (87) During the fifties the ISC grew rapidly, having eighty member nations, mainly Western, European and South American, by 1962. Through the CIA, the ISC provided the United States government with a reliable, well-equipped, anti-communist voice in international student forums. The ground-swell of student opinion gradually moved away from McCarthyist inspired organisations during the early sixties. The Australian Union of Students did not sit easily with the ISC prior to the CIA revelations, or with the IUS, and this reflected Australian student activists' disillusionment with monolithic structures backed by the super-powers. In 1973 I was a delegate of the Australian Union of Students to the IUS conference in East Berlin and witnessed the heavy-handedness of the IUS Preparatory Committee. The AUS decided to withdraw from the IUS the same year.

The reader would also have seen in Chapter Two from a detailed study of La Trobe University, that the LTU SRC was itself occasionally found wanting when it came to actually putting rhetoric into practice. To summarise, the above section provided a background that enabled an understanding of why radical students became disenchanted with institutionalised student government. It is to radical students' disillusionment with institutionalised politics generally that this thesis now turns.

(vi) Disillusionment With Institutionalised Politics

Unlike the left-oriented student activities of the 1930s and 1940s in Australia, (see Chapter One) which were closely linked to the established political parties such as the Labor and Communist Parties,

the movement of the 1960s constituted a genuine rebellion of youth, as students, against society; levelled, in part, against the major parties, though mainly against the moderate-conservative parties, that is the Liberal Party, Democratic Labor Party and the then Country Party.

Because Australian students lacked formalised involvement in the established political parties there was a propensity for students generally to adhere to absolutist principles, undiluted by the pragmatism of electorate-oriented politics. Related to this was the New-Left-styled student movement which appeared ready to protest against most existing structures, including the universities, even using tactics that could alienate other students, to show rejection of what were believed to be intolerable realities.

To the small bands of romantic student revolutionaries, street clashes caused by confronting the police served to raise political consciousness. The majority of anti-war protesters disapproved. On organizing committees, the communists often voted with the Labor Party and independent peace activists, against the so-called 'adventurism' of student maoists and anarchists. Undoubtedly what united many students was opposition to the Vietnam war. As they marched, it may have been like a journey into a world that could seem like history. Their comradeship was likely to live on in their memories as memories of Anzacs had lived on in an earlier generation.

There were other issues that drew radical students away from electoral politics. One was the so-called slum reclamation program of the Victorian Liberal government through the Housing Commission. Students living in inner-city areas of Carlton and Fitzroy often joined with residents to provide a united front with local Councils, the Trades Hall Council, Builders Labourers' Federation and Carlton Association. It was the age of the Green Ban when residents in Sydney's Rocks area also fought private developers; people such as the journalist-protester Juanita Neilsen who disappeared, assumed murdered.

Protest by Australian students on and off campus developed because in various ways the existing power set-up had not reacted quickly enough to changing circumstances and demands: the media, parliaments and political parties did not provide an adequate arena for debate on issues as complex as Vietnam. When communication broke down, students theatricalised their new causes in new forms, such as street theatre, radical stage presentations, demonstrations. The lack of communication and response had some basis in Australian history. Labor voters had not had much belief in representative institutions during the Menzies era, and a high percentage of Labor voters were students. Labor voters saw themselves being cheated by the system with the arrangement of electorates favouring the Liberal and National Parties. Time and again, federally, the Democratic Labor Party had kept Labor from the Treasury benches through second preferences ever since the split of 1955. Street marches and demonstrations were a way to balance out the democracy equation, a way of evening things up. When one looks back, compared with the killings and bombings in the U.S.A. and West Germany and Italy, there was actually no blood shed in Australia. Beyond an occasional campus rough-up and minor street skirmishes there was nothing to compare with the tear-gas, water cannon and Kent State killings of the U.S.A.

However, one important distinction should be made. In a nation such as Australia where memories of the tradition of protest had been weakened or suppressed, and where the prevailing culture had no strong strand of belief that political freedom was gained only by struggle, even a peaceful march or a slogan, even a leaflet distribution could seem 'violent'. After all, a faith was questioned that had rarely been questioned. The protests and rallies over conscription during the Great War were about one issue, and the Eureka Rebellion was touched off in response to unscrupulous collection of gold licence fees. The period 1966-1975 was a period in which long-standing myths were being cracked, such as 'progress at all costs' and the need for international alliances. For example, some of the energy of the student protests was used to dramatise the recognition that many natural resources would some day run out, and to sustain economic growth statistics would mean

poisoning the air, water and soil, increasing the earth's temperature and perhaps destroying the thin layers of gases that protected life on the planet. So the students of the middle class were in crisis: in the midst of ease and comfort there was doubt, anger and deep disquiet. Institutionalised political processes could not contain this crisis.

It is not surprising then that the student Left of Western nations rejected much of the conservative political parties, and in Australia was very sceptical of the Australian Labor Party. The Maoist students at Monash and La Trobe Universities preferred close ties with the Communist Party of Australia, Marxist-Leninist (C.P.A.M/L) the Pekingline party. The university communist clubs were also associated with the Communist Party of Australia; for example, Mark Taft and Mark Aarons were active on Australian campuses and had close affiliation to the C.P.A. The La Trobe University A.L.P. Club itself had ties with the Socialist Left of the Victorian A.L.P. Despite such links there was suspicion amongst the student New Left that the socialist and communist parties of Australia were parties of the political establishment. Students identified the 'old left' with reformism and did not see the C.P.A. or the A.L.P. as genuinely revolutionary or effectively resistant to the policies and structures that many students opposed. (88)

A number of sources aver to the suspicion of the Australian student New Left of established political parties. Some of this was represented by disillusionment with the A.L.P. after the defeat of the Calwell election campaign in 1966. (89) Gordon and Osmond also point to the adoption of a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology by students, and a confrontationist strategy against police by students; for example, the Monash University Labor club. (90) Albert Langer, prominent Monash activist, reflected when interviewed in 1986:

In those days there was a new spirit and attitude that people had towards left activity that they don't have now. It was a more confrontationist approach to politics. I was involved in politics early, and I was expelled from the A.L.P. when I was 15, so I saw labour

politics as being pointless. Hopeless and pointless to be doing anything through the Labor Party. (91)

Mike Hyde, another Monash activist, reflected in 1986 that

...there was a demonstration outside the Assembly Hall in Collins Street in 1966 and we wanted to burn our registration cards for National Service and we did. Then there were discussions with the peace movement which said 'oh no, you don't want to do that, it's too militant'. (92)

Dave Nadel, a Monash University activist in the late 1960s, recalled the disillusionment with the A.L.P. after the 1966 elections:

Probably the only people in Australia in 1966 who believed that Labor would win the election apart from Calwell himself, were the Youth Campaign Against Conscription and we really did believe it, we all worked our guts out. You could tell when everyone had their last exams because they would be over at Trevor Ashton's sticking up posters saying 'Shouldn't we ask Australians if they want to go all the way?' leaflets. Then of course Labor took the biggest hiding since 1931. That led to people saying parliamentary politics wasn't the answer. (93)

As a result of this perception of society the student radicals in Melbourne tended to have a revolutionary outlook towards society generally, and did not confine protests to the universities. Reforms were not ruled out, but beyond stated and immediate aims were elaborated strategies that would radically restructure Australia. 'Workers' participation' was taken further by adopting a policy of 'workers' control' in work places.

Not only was there disillusionment with the A.L.P. and traditional peace movement such as C.I.C.D. (94) but also with established theoreticians. Dave Nadel recalled that

When I was elected as president of the Labour Club in May '66 it was a left-wing coup with Darcy Cassidy and myself. The Communist Party had been most unimpressive at the time and political theory had been discredited because the C.P.A. fellow travellers, the people who wrote articles for Arena and spoke in advanced sociologies, were unable to express themselves in English. People who in the late sixties were quoting from Marcuse and in the late seventies from Althusser-theorists. Theory was used as an excuse to do nothing. There was a joke that if a problem arose on a campus the Melbourne S.D.S. would immediately hold a demonstration. The Monash Labour Club would hold a meeting to plan a demonstration and the Melbourne Labour Club would schedule a seminar. (95)

The split between the established Left and the New Left is partly explained by the Communist Party not being a party that had fully recovered from the embarrassments of Hungary 1956 (and confirmed by Czechoslovakia 1968) (96) and the revelations by Krushchev of the Stalinist purges within the CPSU, a party to which the CPA, until comparatively late, held close fraternal ties. O'Brien in The Saviours: An Intellectual History of the Left in Australia (97) goes a long way towards explaining why the student New Left would be reluctant to form more than a broad-left front on common issues, with the C.P.A. and A.L.P. (98) Other commentators such as Rex Mortimer and Humphrey McQueen, recognised the split. (99) A clash of views between the Sydney based A.I.C.D. and radical students, resulted in the A.I.C.D. on 19 June 1967 being labelled 'too respectable and bureaucratic'. (100) Similar divisions occurred in Melbourne. (101)

One development of such splits was S.D.S. (Students for a Democratic Society). Harry van Moorst played a leading role in its formation:

There was incredible dissatisfaction within our generation who for the first time had an independent identity at an early age, not associated with simply going out to work. You can't ignore the development of youth culture. The record industry was booming: James Dean, The Stones, The Beatles. But capitalism was coming to a crisis and this crisis was obvious to young

people who felt comfortable dealing with crisis because they were educated and aware. We set S.D.S. up at Melbourne, on campus, because we had the old Labour Clubs and Socialist Clubs but they were basically debating societies. This reflects the campuses of the 1950s. There was a strong Left mythology at Melbourne and it wasn't so elitist, though the University was as staid as old boots. I joined the Labour Club committee in 1968 to organise the anti-conscription mobilisation to Canberra, 10 May 1968, from all Australian campuses, and we couldn't get the Labour Club to do anything decent about it. The Club became a chain around our necks so we set up S.D.S., the most successful at the University - different styles for different campuses, so S.D.S. was set up against academic opposition and turned into an activist organisation. We got away from traditional top-down heavy structures. We said if a decision affects you, you have a right in making it. It was an attractive ideology and S.D.S. was very effective from 1968-1971. (102)

Van Moorst expressed the feelings of many. The Old Left was unable to comprehend the feeling of the new generation of students. Thus, one better comprehends the development of the Australian student movement by understanding that conventional political parties and practices were regarded by student leaders as too innocuous, and this factor occasioned development of a relatively unadulterated form of activism free of party political constraints. (103) The activist based movement that developed was comparatively uninhibited, utopian and anarchic. As there were few organisational constraints or party commitments there was little interest in adhering to strict discipline or necessity for compromise. (104) There was, partly as a result of such political freedom, a self-confidence in the ideals and aims of the movement, though this confidence was not always strong. By the end of the 1960s for example, cracks were appearing in what was hoped to be a united student front that would involve industrial workers in a revolutionary movement in Australia.

This section suggested that many radical students had become disenchanted with the mainstream political parties, the A.L.P., the Liberal Party and the Country Party. There was also disenchantment with



the C.P.A. Reasons for this included some students' adherence to 'absolutist principles'; student New Leftists' attitude of total social change; and the urgency of such issues as Vietnam, the environment and inner-urban conservation. The defeat of the A.L.P. in 1966 was important in the development of disillusionment with institutionalised electoral politics, partly because of the perceived role of the D.L.P. Disenchantment also emerged regarding the established and somewhat conservative peace movement. The development of more militant organisations such as S.D.S. and Maoist styled student clubs was a result of this disillusionment.

(vii) The Activists: Their Formation, Motivation and Issues

One task of this thesis is to suggest why a comparatively privileged sector of Australian society - one of the most privileged on earth - rose up against the very society that spawned it. It would already have been seen that many of the revolutionary ideas and practices that permeated student circles in France, North America, West Germany and Japan, also filtered to Australia. Whilst this observation aids us, an answer might well lie in seeing what it really meant to be well-educated, idealistic and aware, and living in the autumn years of the twentieth century in a country such as Australia. At the outset, I made it clear that no single factor sufficed to explain the unexpected eruption of student opposition in the late 1960s.

In this section of my study, I take a closer look at the activists themselves, the formation of their views, the motivation behind their actions and the issues that served to highlight the activists' activities.

Some understanding of the above would already have been gained from Chapters One and Two, as clearly, it has not been possible to consider aspects of the student movement in isolation from each other. The movement itself was not like that and neither is this thesis, as many

aspects of the movement were inter-dependent and simultaneous. This is also why this thesis, as explained in the Introduction, freely mixes fact and interpretation.

This section opens with an examination of the work of Kenneth Keniston, and Keniston's work is raised at various times throughout. Keniston's method and conclusions will be shown to be compatible with my own interview method and conclusions. Throughout the discussion, interview material gathered from Melbourne activists such as Neil McLean, Michael Hyde, Albert Langer and myself is used to background the politicisation of the activists and their methods of activism. A great deal of the following will rely on my own evaluation and recollection, but proper emphasis is also placed on documentation and additional evidence. I contend that only such an analysis that deals simultaneously with psychological, institutional, economic, cultural, historical and political considerations, and their interaction, could adequately explain the true meaning of the waves of student dissent, and why such dissent occurred at that particular point in Western history.

A starting point is to look at some of the general characteristics of student activists and the kinds of issues they were interested in. Probably the best-known empirical analyst of the North American student protests was Kenneth Keniston. (105) Keniston tended to take a sociological view in arguing against those who saw in student dissent nothing but Oedipal rebellion or adolescent acting out; yet he was also critical of those who saw the movement solely as a reflection of the economic, social and cultural forces that motivate history. (106) Keniston's empiricist approach is similar to this thesis in placing an emphasis on personalised interviews with activists.

Keniston's research came in two publications, in addition to many articles. These two were: Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth, and Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition. (107) Keniston's involvement initially came through a request from the National Steering Committee of Vietnam Summer, a New Left organisation based in Cambridge

(Mass.), which established a nationwide program from June to September 1967 dedicated to building up opposition to the Vietnam War. (108) Essentially non-doctrinal and issue oriented, Vietnam Summer had approximately two hundred activists at its National Headquarters in the summer of 1967, and Keniston's research model was built with these activists in mind.

I gradually developed a plan of research. I would undertake the study of the process of "politicization" as it had occurred in the "leaders" of Vietnam Summer - specifically, in the young men and women who constituted the "political staff" of the National Headquarters of Vietnam Summer in Cambridge, Massachusetts. This topic attracted me because of a long-standing interest in the psychological, social, and historical forces that lead to political action, commitment, and alienation. It was relevant to those I interviewed partly because of their interest in "recruiting" - an interest that involved learning how to identify and "bring along" those who might provide the basis for a politically viable New Left in American society. (109)

A psychologist by profession, Keniston's method was to conduct a series of three lengthy interviews totalling six to eight hours, with each activist. Keniston underlined some of the problems, such as the fact that he himself believed in most of the objectives of the radicals he was interviewing and thus in no way could the research be termed 'value free'. (110) But then, Keniston never pretended otherwise, and neither does this thesis, which also uses a similar research method.

Neil McLean, President of the Australian Union of Students (the A.U.S.) 1973-4, saw his radicalisation this way when interviewed in 1986:

I came from a small farming background. Neither of my parents had a particular background in politics, they probably voted Country Party. I went to a private school and had elitist values. However, at school I questioned the headmaster and had doubts by about 15. My parents were very upright and had a sense of justice

about right and wrong. I internalised that and took it to Uni. Then I got involved in the student movement. In a couple of years my thinking had radicalised, thinking for a better society and an end to Vietnam and Apartheid. (111)

Mike Hyde of Monash University initially had become involved whilst in America:

When I arrived at Monash I was 21. I had already lived in America and then came here in 66/67. I was involved in S.D.S. in the States and fighting my own little draft thing over there. My parents and I used to talk about social justice and politics, changing society and turning things on their heads. I wasn't new to all that. When I joined at Monash I still only had a vague idea of Socialism. Socialism to me was doctors and garbos should get the same wage - very basic - so I joined the Labour Club, the New Left club. Shortly after, 1968, there was the aid to the N.L.F. issue and things really exploded. (112)

When interviewed for a film script in 1986, I also looked back at significant influences:

When I was 16 I objected to joining the cadets at Saint Patrick's College, Ballarat. Objecting to anything the Christian Brothers planned was rather risky in 1965, but I got away with it. Conscription had just been brought in by Menzies and cadets was like toy soldiers learning for the real thing in Vietnam. I knew that Vietnam was senseless slaughter and I rejected that fatalism. When I got to university I had to join the fight against the Government, the Church and the National Civic Council because all three supported the war. I had to go through a de-toxification process of all the religious and political bull-dust I'd been fed for 20 years. The literature I read shook me to my foundations. Political discussions made my blood run fast. I was hooked. (113)

The defining characteristic of the typical student activist (if there is or was such a person) was participation in student demonstrations concerned with political, social or ethical principles.

Some of the interviewees above have revealed this in their statements and a number of studies support this. Lipset (114) in his chapter 'Who Are The Activists?' tabled research into causal factors such as parents' background, family politics, and socio-economic determinants, (115) and his research approach was premised on an assumption that historically, student activism implies participation in demonstrations of some kind. (116) A definitive statement may be found in Keniston:

The defining characteristic of the 'new' activist is his participation in a student demonstration or group activity that concerns itself with some matter of general political, social, or ethical principle. Characteristically, the activist feels that some injustice has been done and attempts to...express his convictions. (117)

If one needed proof of the street or campus demonstration as being the trademark of the typical student activist, the best sources would be the student pamphlets of the time, in addition to book sources located in this thesis. In Australia, the student university papers and pamphlets clearly revealed the militant and demonstrative nature of activism. (118)

Characteristically, activists felt an injustice of some kind had been done and attempted to 'take a stand' by way of redressing injustice. Specific issues ranged from protest against paternalistic university administrations, to disagreement over North America's and Australia's Vietnam involvement. The student unrest at Melbourne's Monash and La Trobe Universities epitomises this diversity. Mike Hyde said of Monash that

One thing sparked off another. We looked at everything from racism, to Vietnam, foreign ownership of Australia, class differences to where you park your car at the University. We even had a fight over the admin putting up signs that said 'Professors here, student shit-kickers there'. What you did about it was where you came in. We had to do something. It was an international duty. (119)

Albert Langer, regarded as 'the worst student radical at Monash, maybe Australia' as he himself put it in 1986 (120) looked back on those evenings outside the U.S. Consulate:

The July 4 demonstration was important as a tradition. They were usually militant, confrontationist, often becoming violent. The Monash Labour Club were in a revolutionary alliance with students, builders labourers and wharfies. They put me on trial for inciting to riot. July 4, 1968 was really exciting. We set up large para military groups - a Monash people's militia, which only surfaced publicly at demonstrations. They were totally opposed to pacifism. We weren't for peace, we were there to win and we didn't believe we could win without violence. If they used guns, we'd use guns. We wanted a revolution. A general political revolution. (121)

Essentially, in Melbourne during the period 1966-1972, there were two approaches to street politics, and these were best expressed as

'2468 the U.S. must negotiate'

'10,12,14,16 smash the U.S. Consul's windscreen'

The slogans illustrated the two approaches of negotiation and conflict, the radical students and workers versus the peace movement.

Many issues were related to freedom of speech, dress, sexual lifestyles, feminism and racism. Barry York and myself, contemporaries at La Trobe University 1969-72, have addressed these themes in two recent articles. (122) The initial protests of students were often ad hoc and confined to the campus when the radicalisation process was in its early stages. Several sources throw light on the radicalisation of student activists in addition to those already cited. (123) For a general understanding of the Australian social changes during this period see Donald Horne, Time of Hope: 1966-1972. (124) Useful insight into the thinking of the more 'way out' radical scene and the derivation of its ideology can be also had from international sources. (125) Campaigning on campus in Melbourne presented itself as a political art form involving group organisation, media, theatre, propaganda, security,

supplies and communication. A useful list of references on this aspect is provided in (126).

At La Trobe, the first notable protest was in 1969, over the presence of Nationwide Food Service on campus. (127) At La Trobe, this initial protest was then broadened to a general attack against multi-national corporations and their relationship to the Vietnam war and foreign ownership of Australian resources. (128) A student who protested about one issue was likely to demonstrate on other issues, once the consciousness of the student was raised to the level where inter-relationships in economic, class and political structures were made of Australian society. (129) The same names arose for Monash, Melbourne and La Trobe activists in the lists of arrests and court appearances: Hyde, Langer, van Moorst, Hamel-Green, York, Pola, Robinson, Cassidy to name a few. La Trobe University was a case in point, with the same names appearing at the following events: 1968-9 student protests against by-law 418 (a Melbourne City Council by-law prohibiting distribution of pamphlets in public); protests against La Trobe University administration; public opposition to the National Service Act; arrests at July 4 demonstrations at the United State Consulate. Names which appear in Rabelais and in student political pamphlets such as Red Moat, Enrages, Liberty, included: Robert Matthews, Fergus Robinson, Barry York, Brian Pola, Maggi Grant, Sandy Doull, Ken White, Ian Coulter, Bryan Boyd, Jan Mueller, David Mueller, Mary Stewart, Phillipa and Jan Schapper, Sharon Conroy, Linda Hymes, John Redenbach, and Ian MacDonald. A reading of the daily press of these times reveals that prominent activists such as Albert Langer, Michael Hyde, Michael Hamel-Green (Monash University) and Harry van Moorst (Melbourne University) attended campus based and off-campus demonstrations associated with the above issues; and more, such as the HART (Halt All Racial Tours) demonstrations against the all-white South African Rugby tour in 1972. (130)

A student activist in Melbourne in the late 1960s and early 1970s could, over a few days, attend a demonstration against the National

Service Act, another against the Vietnam war, then attend an occupation of a university administration building and be certain of meeting some of the same activists. (131) In the 1980s, at anti-nuclear demonstrations, I still see a few of the same faces, and find it a useful occasion to revive networks and catch up on comrades and friends. One reason why we continue to march is that, whatever the issue, the Melbourne protester rarely demonstrated because one's own interests were jeopardised. Rather, one perceived that injustices were being done to others less fortunate than oneself. An apparent paradox about protest against the National Service Act was that protesting students were usually from the age group most likely to receive deferments as full-time students. With conscription, the basis of student protests was that the selection process and the Vietnam war were unjust to those with whom the student was identified and yet whose fate one was not obliged to share. These were the working class youth of Australia, engaged in 'non-essential' jobs, and the Vietnamese people themselves. Perusal of the issues taken up by Australian activists of the period reveals that rarely were demonstrations directed at improving the lot of the protesters; identification with the oppressed or persecuted was a more important motivating factor than personal oppression. (132) Yet, it was at the same time all very personal.

The formation and motivation of activists tended to involve distrust of institutional structures by New Left students in Australia, and went hand in hand with a scepticism of formal ideologies, though there was acceptance of dogma; for example, the La Trobe and Monash Maoists tended to dogmatise the 'thought of Mao Tse-tung'. Distrust of structures was revealed in Melbourne when Maoists protested at careerism in the Australian Union of Students' Presidential election at the George Hotel, St. Kilda, in 1974. A sizable contingent of La Trobe and Monash Maoists erected a large banner which read 'Oppose Opportunism in A.U.S.', directed at Ian MacDonald, the successful candidate. In so far as student activists rejected self-aggrandizement and powerful elites, it was because the political realities of the day fell far short of the ideals of what a truly democratic, communalistic society ought to be



like. In so far as such practices as careerism were rejected, it was because Melbourne activists, for example, conceived of an alternative society where career patterns did not exist in the sense that most Australians understand the 'career ladder', aggressive ambition and materialistic 'success'. The alienation of Australian activists from such orientations highlighted a new allegiance to more traditional values: justice, egalitarianism and anti-authoritarianism. The enactment of these newly adopted values, captured in mass-circulation films such as 'Zabriskie Point' (133) and 'The Graduate' (134) helped to ask questions that indirectly led to affirmative political action. 'The Graduate' (1968) portrayed Dustin Hoffman as the laconic disaffection of the Vietnam generation from the empty materialism of parents' lives. Zefferelli's 'Zabriskie Point' (1969) ran a west coast student revolutionary condemning the timidity of would-be revolutionaries. The film culminated in a series of massive explosions of consumer junk across the screen. 'Easy Rider' (1969), depicted an epic journey by two hippies on gleaming motor bikes across vast American vistas, in which, in pursuit of freedom, they were persecuted and destroyed by embittered small-mindedness. (135) The influence of these films, and others such as 'Woodstock' (1969), on student consciousness is incalculable and probably very deep.

Barry York, an activist of the time at La Trobe University, has correctly highlighted the significance for capitalist production and profit making, of the 'Teen Market' in music, film and clothes. York evidences the close relationship between the demographic implications of a rapidly expanding 'teen' age-group and the potential for commerce and profit. (136)

York develops this theme of the influence of culture in his Chapter Three, 'The Teen Market, Youth Culture and Political Dissent', by a detailed analysis of the lyrics of the popular (and profitable) folk and rock music of the 1960s and early 1970s.

The raising of Australian student political consciousness was multi-faceted, and the student protester was usually convinced that demonstrations were effective in mobilising public opinion, by bringing moral pressure to bear or 'bringing the machine to a halt'. Horne commented of Australia that

...for most students and other young people who saw themselves as activists, it was the ease of affluence and simple optimism that gave them vision. They joined protests because they believed that demonstrations of popular feeling could make the authorities change their minds and could impress voters so that they would change their governments. Protest and politics were meant to be easy. The use of metaphors such as 'power structure' and 'social structure' reinforced the idea that change was simple. All one had to do was 'change the structure'. It sounded as easy as building a new house. (137)

The activist was basically a political optimist who, with minimal organisation, had confidence that protest and demonstration were the correct strategy. (138) A study of student pamphlets reveals the simplistic analyses of society that went hand in hand with this strategy. For example: 'Meet Council's Fascist Threat' (La Trobe Labor Club, 15 March 1972); Vanguard (La Trobe Marxist-Leninists, 1972); Red Moat (Worker Student Alliance, 29 March 1972). This is not to suggest that the authors' personal analyses were superficial and sloganistic, although some were. On the contrary. The sloganeering and crudity were addressed to a majority of students at Melbourne universities who remained unpoliticised, so the strategy was one of repetitive propagation of a few themes, such as the 'fascist' nature of a University Council. More succinct evaluations of the Melbourne New Left were made. At La Trobe University for example, those of Bishop, MacDonald, Campbell, York, and Evans. (139)

We have been looking at general characteristics of Australian student protesters, and have concentrated on political activists. There was however another style of protest, the dissent of those students who

were irretrievably alienated, so pessimistic about and opposed to Australian society that organised public demonstration of the political-activist type seemed to them pointless. The demonstrations of these students were personal. Through non-conformity of behaviour, dress and intensive personal experimentation, they displayed a lack of interest in the implementation of radical politics. There were hundreds, perhaps thousands of such students in inner-suburban Sydney and Melbourne and elsewhere. The hippie-phenomenon was the 'school of the absurd' for the politically active student Left, and serious activists indulged only on the fringes, having more serious pursuits to engage in. For the truly alienated Australian hippie, our society was beyond redemption and not worth trying to redeem. The activist on the other hand, no matter how intense the rejection of Australian policies, retained a conviction that society can and should be changed. These student activists, such as Harry van Moorst, Neil McLean (President of A.U.S. 1973-4) and Albert Langer, are active in various ways in Melbourne today. Other former students, such as Peter Steedman, Wendy Bacon, Franz Timmermann, Bill Hartley (La Trobe 1971-72) and Cheryl Buchanan, have continued to provide an alternative perspective in the context of continually changing social issues. The hippies however, have been and gone, as very few wished to work themselves into the labour movement of Australia in the 1980s.

One supposes that there could be a popular stereotype of the Melbourne professional demonstrator of the 1960s. Albert Langer does not fit as a caricature, neither does Harry van Moorst. Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman are not representative of the protesters of the American movement. In short, there is no one picture of an Australian student protester that is a composite, or a stereotype, and to attempt such a construction would be an over-simplification and an error.

Keniston concluded of North America that

A large and growing number of studies, conducted under different auspices, at different times, and about different students, presents a remarkably consistent

picture of the protest-prone individual. For one, student protesters are generally outstanding students; the higher the students' grade average, the more outstanding his academic achievements, the more likely it is he will become involved in any given political demonstration. Similarly, student activists come from families with liberal political values: a disproportionate number report that their parents hold views essentially similar to their own, and accept and support their activities. (140)

Usually, the Melbourne experience was that activists were not drawn from disadvantaged or under-privileged groups in the city. On the contrary, more often than not student activists were Australians who had had socially fortunate upbringings. Albert Langer, whilst a good example, was not an exception.

The basic value commitments of leading activists in Melbourne's student gatherings often tended towards the academic rather than the purely vocational. Activists were rarely found among the engineering, medicine, accountancy, architecture, or chemistry students of the three universities. Activist students often tended to opt for an over-all education experience; of a liberal education for its own sake, rather than a specifically technical, vocational or professional preparation. In place of careerist goals were humanitarian, libertarian, self-actualising ones. The La Trobe University group 'Strawberry' was an excellent example of such attitudes. Its members were culturally anarchic, sceptical yet critically constructive. 'Strawberry' philosophy was revealed in a Rabelais article entitled 'Stuffed Strawberries', and was highly critical of the LTU Labor Club's activities:

They (the Labor Club) make their own ideologies arid and oppressive by the fanaticism with which they want to instruct the world in their dogmas, with grotesque rigidity. Missionaries without mercy. (141)

Strawberry's philosophy centered on the cultural anarchism of Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, the founders of the Yippies (Youth International Party, U.S. of A.). (142)

At La Trobe University, Andrew Stein, David Lowe, Peter Gavin, Steve Skok and Andrew Giles-Peters formed the main force of Strawberry. (143)

However one analyses the student activists, students on a majority of Australia's seventeen campuses organised themselves into groups that reached important conclusions about the society in which they lived, and this was done on the basis of rejection and acceptance of certain ideological premises. (144) Rejected ideology included liberalism, capitalism, fascism; accepted ideology encompassed communism, socialism, anarchism. Issues were interpreted on these bases. How institutions reacted to such interpretations became the paramount consideration for the Australian public. The institutions in question were the universities themselves, and the reaction of their administrative apparatus.

Sustained by its own cultural forms, Australian student protest became a way of life. Often the right to protest became the issue, just as it is in Queensland in the 1980s. In Brisbane there were many demonstrations against regulations requiring application for a procession permit to be submitted fourteen days before the event, and both a permit and fee to carry a placard; in Adelaide, a royal commission sat for months investigating the events of the second moratorium in 1971; in Melbourne, by-law 418 against distributing pamphlets in public places became the issue.

In August 1968 the Australian Left Review (145) sought from seven prominent student activists their views of the strengths, causes and motivations of the movement. The activists were: Doug Kirsner (Monash University); Grant Hannan (Monash University); Rex Mortimer (Monash University); Rowan Cahill (Sydney campuses); Brian Aarons (University of

New South Wales); Peter Duncan (University of Adelaide); Brian Laver (University of Queensland).

Generally, their view was that the numerical strength of the movement was, for any one campus, some 50-300 hard core activists who were the centre of often much larger groups, depending on the issues and events. All agreed that the most significant cause was Vietnam. Doug Kirsner (Melbourne University Labor Club):

The most important issue has been the Vietnam war which has provided a tangible rallying point for radicals. It constituted a symbol of all that is bad in our society - deceit, violence, coercion, interference with other people's lives. Moreover, the Vietnam war is basically a moral issue for radicals.(146)

The activists were asked about the extent to which the Australian movement had derived from student actions overseas. All felt that the general upsurge in revolutionary activity throughout the world had provided a great deal of inspiration to Australian student radicals, particularly to the hard core. They believed, however, that radicalism in Australia was not simply a transplantation of overseas events. Rather, that a long tradition of a dissenting and revolutionary spirit existed amongst students aligned with the labour movement.

To what extent parents influenced the growth of radical ideas in the minds of future student activists is debatable. However, there appear to have been generational differences over the issue of Australia's association with the United States. Parents often represented that part of a generation who reacted radically to the events of the Depression and the anti-fascist conflict of the 1940s. Radical students themselves, however, reacted adversely to the United States as saviour, seen by many Australian radicals as a world power anxious to maintain an exploitative international economic empire at almost any cost. Hence, the Australian student Left became sharply anti-American and antagonistic to American alliances such as ANZUS and

SEATO that compromised Australian neutrality. The Vietnam conflict, in which America and Australia were militarily committed, simply increased student opposition to the United States and the Liberal/Country Party Government in Canberra. The fact that the cold war had declined meant to students that the basis for the 1950s system of military alliances no longer existed.

The above discussion has helped to further clarify why the student movement emerged at this time by studying the formation and motivation of the activists and the issues involved. The discussion was premised on the view that a complex set of factors was involved in the development of student activists, evidenced by the research of Keniston and my own material.

Generally, however, we may conclude that the evidence supports the view that student activists were motivated by a strong sense of justice and consequent identification with the oppressed, in particular, the Vietnamese people. Student opposition to conscription was closely linked to this motivation. One aspect of the activists brought out above was students' overt expression by way of demonstration on the streets and campuses, on a wide range of issues associated with activists 'taking a stand' and 'redressing injustice'. We may also have discerned that many students would begin their radicalisation on the campus and as political consciousness deepened, would spread their activism to the outside community, with the same students being involved in many different issues and styles of protest.

One factor evidenced was that many students were prepared to sacrifice career prospects in order to be involved in political activism.

The formation of activists' views was also probably influenced by various popular films and music of the period, though it is difficult to discern which came first, the consumer product or the student

radicalisation. After all, as suggested, there was money to be made from the disaffection of youth.

Whilst a stereotype of the student activist is not possible to be drawn, we may infer from the above discussion that an idealistic political optimism played an important part in motivating activists around various issues. An aspect of this idealism was a reliance on sloganising, though rejection of ideological dogma was conversely evident.

The section also observed that the 'hippie phenomenon' appeared to have had minimal influence on student political radicalism.

The discussion suggested that activists tended to be academically capable students from Arts faculties, came from families of liberal political views, and had had 'socially fortunate upbringings'. Chapter One's 'Socio-economic Background of Students' and 'Research on Secondary School Students' which follows, will throw further light on this aspect of the activists.

The discussion drew to a close by referring to interviews of seven Australian activists conducted in 1968 which suggests that the war in Vietnam was a major motivating issue behind the radicalisation of student activists, and that Australian student opposition to the war reflected a tradition of such dissent in Australian history.

The section closed by speculating on the extent to which parents may have influenced the growth of radical ideas in future student activists and this aspect remains a matter of some conjecture. It is fair to assume however that there were differences of opinion within families, particularly regarding the role of the United States.



(viii) The Socio-economic Background of Students

The following discussion follows from our previous study of 'The Activists: Formation, Motivation and Issues'.

One factor associated with the development of radicalism amongst students has been said to have been the backgrounds of many student radicals, particularly the leaders. (147) Much of the literature on student politics of the 1960s reveals research to show that student radicals tended to be the children of relatively affluent, liberal or 'left-wing' parents. Donald Horne's Time of Hope: Australia 1966-72 also conveyed the view that the protest period 1966-72 was spearheaded by tertiary students of whom many had affluent family backgrounds. (148)

It now seems appropriate to mention research of a quantitative nature in universities. There is some statistical data to help explain the high degree of student political activity at the time. For example, the work of Bob Birrell in 1970 at Monash University. (149) There was no such research at La Trobe University. Birrell's data derived from two surveys administered in July and September, 1970. (150) In order to determine students' general political orientation, students were asked the following questions.

Which of the following categories would best describe your political position?

- (a) Those who complain they don't know how lucky they are?
- (b) Australian society is basically OK but minor reforms are necessary.
- (c) Extensive reform is necessary, but we should work through existing institutions.
- (d) Meaningful change can only be achieved with a radical transformation of the existing system.

Defining those choosing (d) as radicals, (c) as liberals, and (a) or (b) as conservatives, Birrell obtained these results.

Political Attitudes

Department	No. of Questionnaires Administered	Total No. of Respondents	Radical	Liberal	Conservative
			%	%	%
Medicine	120	87	10	57	33
Law	40	17	12	53	35
Geography	100	49	10	45	45
Classics	35	14	29	64	7
Sociology	120	85	45	44	11

---

Birrell concluded that the very high percentage of radicals (nearly half) among the sociologists was suggestive of a trend towards radicalism at least in the Arts faculty (which was the largest faculty at Monash University, with just over one third of undergraduate enrolments). A further conclusion was that 'non-vocational' subjects (that is, Humanities, Arts) attracted the radical students. (151)

To assess attitudes towards careers and education students were asked: 'Which of the following statements most closely represents your view as to the purpose of university training?'

- (a) For me university is mainly a practical matter. With a university education I can earn more money, have a more interesting career and enjoy a better position in society.
- (b) I'm not really so concerned with the practical benefits of university. For me university means something more intangible, perhaps the opportunity to change things rather than succeed in the existing system.

Defining those who chose (a) as vocationals, and (b) as non-vocationals, we found the following results.

Orientation Towards Education

	Vocational	Non-Vocational
Department	%	%
Medicine	75	25
Law	75	25
Geography	66	34
Classics	33	67
Sociology	22	78 (152)

The above data indicated a similar career pattern for the radicals as was thought to be the case in the United States. That is, the more non-vocational the student body the more radical it became. (153)

Regarding the social background of students, Birrell concluded that it was similar to that which would be predicted from the American experience. That is, they came disproportionately from the upper middle class and in particular from the professional intelligentsia. He could identify only 11 per cent as coming from working class backgrounds, while 60 per cent indicated their fathers' occupations as professional, intelligentsia or managerial. Comparative figures for Monash were not available, but for the University of Melbourne in 1968 at least 16 per cent of all its students came from working class families and 49 per cent from professional and managerial homes. (154) Put another way, there was certainly no evidence of a significant number of radicals coming from relatively deprived material backgrounds.

As regards reaction by students to parents' political views, Birrell found that (of 96 surveys analysed), 50 per cent of the radicals had described their parents' political views as being slightly to the right of their own; another 20 per cent was similar to their own, and only 30 per cent as sharply to the right of their own. (155) Given the radical views of these students, this result appears consistent with the generally accepted view that most students had moved to the left of liberally minded parents, and that they were reared in progressive

households to accept the ideology of equality, democracy and helping the poor.

The belief that many radicals were nurtured in the Arts faculties of Melbourne's universities was supported in Birrell's survey. (156) Of 35 radical sociology students answering, 91 per cent believed that 'the individual always had the right to disobey a law he considers immoral'. (157)

It can be inferred from the Monash surveys that radical students did not want existing society transformed because they considered themselves a group actually or potentially deprived of the system's rewards. On the contrary, they came from favoured social backgrounds giving them effective access to these rewards should they desire them. Instead they seemed to have rejected the system's rewards because they considered them demeaning or unsatisfying. This was inferred from lack of evident interest in conventional careers, and a belief that the system did not offer the chance for an individual to reach full potential.

A Master of Arts thesis by J.D.G. Goldman (La Trobe University) was completed on student political activists of the late 1970s in the U.S.A., England and Australia. (158) The late 1970s, in contrast to the late 1960s, displayed a low level of political activism. The portraits compiled revealed quite distinct differences between politically Left and Right student activists. The Left activists of the late 1970s appeared to come from families with Left fathers whose level of education and family income were lower in comparison to their Right counterparts. The Right came from families with Right fathers whose level of education and family income was by comparison higher. Such results are a marked reversal from those of the 1960s as revealed in Keniston's and Birrell's research, where Left students tended to come from well-to-do social strata. These differences may be a reflection of tighter economic times during the late 70s, with reduced preparedness by

students to participate in inter-class political activism. That is, political conservatism.

In summary, we may conclude that radical students tended to come from Arts faculties, particularly those faculties that provided liberal, non-vocational type studies such as Sociology. This was also true of the North American experience. Also, radical students tended to come from families whose livelihoods were in professional or managerial occupations, and whose political views tended to be liberal. This was also true of North American studies.

(ix) Research and Literature on Secondary Students

Birrell's Monash surveys did not reveal anything about what had actually prompted radical students to question the social system in the first place, or at what point they came to develop their critical values. Only by moving into the secondary schools to Matriculation (HSC) students could this be done and a team of Monash researchers did this in 1971. Their survey covered 732 sixth formers in eleven high and grammar schools. (159)

As far as class background of radical secondary students was concerned, the study seemed to confirm the results of the Monash survey in that such students were more likely to come from professional or intelligentsia based families, especially those families with leftish political sympathies. The data indicated that a substantial number of sixth form students were disillusioned with their society and a solid core (16 per cent) indicated they believed a fundamental transformation was necessary. Analysis of this disillusionment revealed that it resulted from students' own assessments that Australian society did not measure up to expectations. Most of the students were aware of problems like pollution, poverty, inequality and war, and a significant number seemed to have absorbed a set of ideals sufficiently in contrast to their image of social reality to arouse their indignation or concern. (160)

It was apparent by 1968 that students in Melbourne secondary schools were not as a body contented with the structures and policies of the State education system shaping their lives. In 1968, Michael Eidelson became the official martyr of the State's secondary students when he was expelled from elite Melbourne High School for belonging to a secondary students' organization called Students in Dissent. (161) The issue was 'freedom of expression' naturally enough, just as it was at other places, such as Berkeley in 1964. In the local case it took the form of freedom to pamphleteer. Tabloid Underground, the official paper of Students in Dissent, had this to say in its October 1968 issue:

Underground news-sheets began with one question in mind. Is Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Opinion desirable in a democratic society? In Victorian High Schools at present, the only 'legitimate' means of student expression available is through the media of 'official school newspapers'. We have found through experience that some articles just don't get in. These newspapers in fact are heavily censored - before printing has begun - by the Principals of the respective High Schools. (162)

Letters to the Age fanned the Eidelson controversy. (163) The debate was about issues considerably deeper than freedom of expression however. Ubique Underground, a news-sheet produced by University High School students themselves, put some of their assessments of Melbourne society on the line in an article 'What Does School Give You?':

Contrary to some opinions we think that a school should give more to its students than a ticket to go out into the 'Great Society' and produce more goods and services to sustain the system. The rigid body of knowledge fed us in school is not the only thing we need to equip us in this world more fruitfully. What about all those questions on human existence? Does school 'life' help us to reach any conclusions? Do we emerge from our years at school as thinking, critical people, or as apathetic robots ready to fit in a slot and begin performing...the education system is more interested in producing unthinking servants of society, than creative, critical and probably rebellious, human beings. (164)

Ubique Underground went on to criticise the 'prefect system' saying that it only developed 'servile tendencies' in the rest of the student body, which was what society wanted since its power rested on persuading the majority to follow behind a few leaders. (165) These sentiments beg comparison with tertiary students' disillusionment with established channels of communication, such as SRCs. Pravda, another student news-sheet, suggested that student SRCs were Big Brother's method of fooling the student body:

Students remain slaves to the system, having no say in matters which are of central importance to them. Assemblies, school uniforms, school excursions, rules and regulations are all decisions on which the student can't participate. SRCs should be seen in their real light - as a farce. (166)

What the secondary students were attacking fundamentally was authority's legitimacy and the assumption of the omnipotence of authority in educational institutions such as Victoria's schools. Students believed that the mere fact that school existed was not proof of its value and legitimacy. The king was naked. Having taught in Victorian secondary schools both private and state in the fifteen years since Ubique Underground and Pravda appeared and disappeared, I cannot say that a great deal has changed in regards to participatory democracy in schools. There are different forces operating on teachers and students in the 1980s, but in political terms little has altered.

In 1968 there were twelve papers being produced by students attending schools in metropolitan Melbourne, in addition to the combined Tabloid Underground. Around this time an organisation called the Secondary Students Association of Victoria was formed, which had close ties with the Australian Union of Students, and was a prominent participator in the Moratoriums against the Vietnam war in 1970 and 1971, and in 4 July demonstrations outside the United States consulate. There was also an organisation called Students in Dissent (SID Kids),

which was Maoist, and the Secondary Students for Democratic Action (SSDA) fostered by Harry van Moorst.

Today, the secondary student scene is relatively quiet. One supposes today's secondary students would be surprised that such organisations once existed.

In summary, radical secondary school students tended to come from professional or managerial family backgrounds of liberal political persuasion. A high level of awareness regarding controversial social issues was apparent, and resultant disillusionment with formal social processes was reflected in a belief that 'a fundamental transformation was necessary'. These attitudes were expressed in radical literature and the development of political organisations.

(x) The Counter Culture and the New Left

There are two important elements that thread this Chapter and much of the thesis that require a special consideration. These are the 'Counter Culture' and the 'New Left'. Because of the very nature of this thesis, it simply has not been possible to restrict consideration of these aspects to a particular section at all times. The following discussion tries to redress any confusion.

The local student movement was not only motivated by ideological commitments but by what came to be called the 'counter-culture'. The drawing of the counter-culture in Australia, especially Melbourne and Sydney, made student culture something rather special in Australian history; a revolt of the favoured against the very system that was designed to favour them. Yet the paradox makes sense. The error of the purveyors of the new technology was their assumption that technological progress had to bring with it greater, tighter, more oppressive bureaucracy, and greater order. Students argued the opposite: that with technological advance there was an ever-increasing range of



options, and far from post-industrial society being the end of ideology, it opened up possibilities for clashes on values and new beginnings.

The local student movement in this country did appear to be an assertion of a new set of values against the prevailing ones. This appeared where there had emerged the pre-condition for these new values - and affluence may have been the key. The values born of scarcity and the requirements of capitalist-industrialist society, such as competition, frugality, diligence and continence, no longer seemed necessary, and from this lack of necessity developed a new culture.

The counter-culture was a pivotal part of the Melbourne-Sydney student revolt because it involved a mobilisation of humanistic and hedonistic values against the more materialistic and puritanical ones espoused by the advocates of the new technology. (167)

The Melbourne students who rebelled or 'dropped out' in their many hundreds had been raised, by and large, by parents committed to the rhetoric of the Australian Dream, and came from affluent homes. Strongly imbued with the values of the status quo, many students were particularly angered by discovery of the gap between these values and the stark reality. Their protest often took the form of turning society's own rhetoric against society. The student movement was thus sub-consciously both a reaffirmation of certain Christian, radical and liberal doctrines, and an attempt to give them new life and form in the context of a different society, a counter-cultural society.

Many counter-cultural students stressed the importance of the individual; the need for co-operation rather than competition; objected to manipulation of human beings and stressed the need for universal trust and love, all of which in fact, if not in rhetoric, were opposed to the sanitised controls of the technocrats. There was, nevertheless, a pre-occupation with non-violence and some older Australians viewed this as a form of cowardice, not realizing that they were thinking in terms that the student counter-culture saw itself as having superceded.

In particular, many radical students felt that aggrandizement had led inevitably to the violence of Vietnam and to earlier wars such as the vain-gloriousness of Gallipoli.

On the campuses of Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, the tenements of Glebe, Paddington, Darlinghurst, Carlton, Brunswick, Fitzroy and Parkville, the new student sub-culture reflected its rejection of the old in forms beyond new music, dress and drugs. The fact that long hair and marijuana usage were persecuted served to legitimise them, thus having a snowball effect on the burgeoning cultural development of an underground student scene. Increasing interest in multi-sensory perception, in existential, phenomenological, intuitive perceptions of reality, were a rejection of established definitions of reality, particularly of that presented by orthodox Christian, specifically Roman Catholic, dogma. Berger and Luckmann's Social Construction of Reality and The Sacred Canopy; C. Wright Mills' The Sociological Imagination, and Theodore Roszak's The Making of a Counter Culture were path-finders to radical students in the late 1960s. The interest in Zen and Oriental religions and philosophies was a rejection of Protestantism and Catholicism. Indeed, the counter-culture, although properly distinguished from the radical politics of students, was still a very large part of the movement both ideologically and actively. The counter-culture can be portrayed as post-protestant in its rejection of the traditional moral strictures that provided a base for both the feudal-Catholic and capitalist-protestant derivations of the Australian social structure.

The rise of the counter-culture may also be associated with the decline of other Australian institutional structures. Just as the extended family in Australia declined with the transition from agricultural to industrial society, so the transition to post-industrial society seemed to lead to a decline in the nuclear family. The culture of the student New Left, particularly its underground, meant involvement in a much greater diversity of arrangements in living styles. Culturally much of it was post-liberal in the sense that it rejected

many assumptions about state and society that characterised the liberalism of earlier times, such as Australia in the 1880s and 1920s, before the 'busts'. The cultural attack of students was aimed not so much against the philosophical under-pinnings of liberalism, some of which radical students were themselves quick to claim. It was rather against its implications in a time of rapid change when the liberals' concern with procedure appeared to wed them to an inflexible defence of the status quo. Thus, the new student counter-culture was in part a result of contempt for cautious and protracted debate that postponed action.

The enculturation of students in the late 1960s did not necessarily posit a total ideology such as Marxism, but more often an eclectic anti-ideology, one that shared many of the values of liberalism while opposing its institutionalised methods of operation. It drew from a vast variety of political and social thinkers, such as Marcuse, Laing, Jung, Sartre, Allan Watts, Roszak, Reich, C. Wright Mills, Marx, Lenin, Mao, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Jerry Rubin, Bobby Seale, Angela Davis and many others. So, in Australia, whilst there was a rejection of institutionalised ideologies, at the same time there was a reversion to the ideals of these ideologies, hence the interest in the early Marx and the writings of the anarchist Bakunin. In practice, this interest was reflected in Australian radicals' idolisation of the Third World revolutions, expressed in support of Cuba, the Viet Cong, the Palestine Liberation Organisation and African liberation movements.

From my own perspective, the counter-culture of radical studenthood in Melbourne was, if it was anything at all, a search for new community. The commune had appeared in Paris, Berlin, the University of Columbia and Berkeley. In 1963, Hannah Arendt had insisted on the commune as the only true form of revolution. The idea of the commune contained the genesis, the first feeble beginnings, a new type of political organization of a system which would permit students to become participators in government and thus the direct contradiction of the modern party system. (168)

The counter-culture movement in Melbourne around 1970 was very much tied in with what was known as the New Left and I have used this term throughout this thesis. It would be just as well to clear up what I have meant by the term. By 'Old Left' I mean that movement which had as its predominant goal the pursuit of materialistic ends for the Australian working class, and sought to gain this goal by overthrowing the existing capitalist system through the agency of a disciplined political party based within the working class. This roughly describes the organised Left, particularly the Communist Party, during the 1930s and 1940s when the Soviet oriented Communist Party dominated radical left politics, especially in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane.

By 'New Left' I mean something more than those elements of the Left which since the 1940s had broken away from the established Communist Party. I have in mind that movement which sought primarily non-materialistic goals; namely, creation of a community that facilitated autonomy, creativity, and the opportunity to maximise human communication and enjoyment. It led to a sharp break with the Old Left organizationally for a time, and in political goals and tactics.

The New Left really developed around the needs of the new Australian intelligentsia, one which in size dwarfed anything in our brief history, and as such could be called a mass intelligentsia. As members, or aspiring members of a new Australian intelligentsia, students were motivated to achieve the restructuring of society consistent with intelligentsia ideals. This put them in conflict with the highly materialistic dynamic of Australian consumerist acquisitiveness. However, given the competitive, technocratic structures predominating in Australian universities, much of the movement's energies went into the reform of higher education. Thus there was the campaign at La Trobe University for 'course critiques' by students; and freeing courses from narrow vocationalism; also, the campaigns to rid the campus of any formal contracts with the armed forces, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, and the Joint Intelligence Organisation. The difference between the 'New Left' and

the 'Old Left' were especially seen when Australian activists travelled overseas. Susan Burgoyne, a participant in the International Preparatory Committee for the Ninth World Youth Festival in Sofia, Yugoslavia, 1968, found that the IPC was intent on protecting the Festival, not from the right but from the New Left students from West Germany, Australia and the U.S. (169) When I was in Singapore, en route to East Berlin as Australian Union of Students' delegate to the International Festival of Youth and Students, 1973, the Socialist Party of Australia (breakaway Soviet Union oriented party) tried very hard to have me stranded in Singapore. I was a New Leftist. Only a visit to the Russian Ambassador there enabled my journey to continue, in the company of Brian McGahen (Sydney C.P.A.) and Neil McLean (A.U.S.).

In all, although easily aroused by material injustices (such as the plight of Aborigines), the typical New Left activist had little interest in material goals for oneself. The activist was often disappointed with the contemporary working class when that class appeared uninterested in anything but further increases in income through the advocacy of middle-of-the-road unions. Perhaps through lack of experience the student New Leftist saw the Australian worker as already relatively affluent because of the considerable increases in per capita income since the Second World War, and material problems seemed essentially solved. Somewhat lacking in appeal was the Old Left strategy of complete reliance on the working class as the focal point of radical politics. The working class no longer seemed so significant as a vanguard, especially in light of the growth of student numbers in the decade 1957-1967, and a student population in which the percentage which considered itself radical also increased. The middle class had become the decisive factor in Australian politics.

In summary, the counter-culture represented a rejection of the idea that greater technological progress meant a creation of tighter, more oppressive bureaucracy. Many student radicals argued that the technological advances and affluences of the 1950s and 1960s opened up new possibilities and new beginnings. The materialistic/puritanical

ideology of parents was confronted by the humanistic/hedonistic ideology of their children. The confrontation over values was reflected in increased student interest in Oriental religion and the displacement of feudal-Catholic, capitalist-Protestant beliefs. The adoption of alternative living arrangements and impatience with reformist-liberal modes of change were also aspects of the student counter culture. A rejection of institutionalised ideologies was replaced by a return to the ideals of ideologies that parents seemed to have lost. The idea of a new community, best expressed in the commune, was popular amongst many students.

The New Left seemed to be the political wing of the counter culture. The above discussion brought out the difference between the New and Old Left, based on two different perceptions of what constituted economic necessity and political organisation. The emergence of 'the new Australian intelligentsia' during the 1960s, on the shoulders of an economic boom that appeared to signal the end of material scarcity, drove a wedge between the New and Old Left that had formed economic and political philosophy in two epochs: the Great Depression and the 1960s.

(xi) The Passing of the Menzies Era

On 26 January, 1966, R.G. Menzies announced his retirement. As a politician Menzies was known to the electorate as a leader who relied on the use of comfortable British symbols that concealed the reality of Australia moving into the 'sphere of influence' of the United States. Menzies' years of office also witnessed a change in the ideals of the middle class culture from the prosaic puritan work ethic to the libertarian ethic of a more educated, wealthier society.

This new ethic travelled with the new intellectuals of Melbourne and Sydney, the products of the universities Menzies had helped to create. Menzies, for his part, probably disliked the new intellectuals, for he seemed to have had a disdain for an Australian intellectual

excellence: to assert the possibility of a distinctive Australian excellence may have been, for Menzies, anti-British. In any case, since Menzies occasionally preferred to be protected by a 'fire-break of mediocrity', it probably suited him that the nation should seem intellectually mediocre. (170)

Despite or because of Menzies, one of the major significances of this period was that it was a time of challenge to some of the dominant values and repositories of knowledge in Australia. The seven years between Menzies and Whitlam were a period when some of the established practices were being upset. Menzies had lasted for so long (from 1949 to 1966) that younger Australians, or older Australians who had forgotten the past, had assumed that Australians were incapable of change. It seemed that way to me in 1966. Whilst the changing climate in Australia was partly a response to reverberations in other parts of the world, nevertheless, as new fashions of protest reached Australia, there were sometimes distinctive Australian variations. Indeed, some changes were specifically Australian reactions to specifically Australian challenges.

For most of the twentieth century the prevailing culture in Australia included racist, Anglo-imperialist, puritan, sexist, politically quiescent, capitalist, bureaucratic and developmentalist strains. In official symbolism and rhetoric, elite-forming institutions, the mass media, and the way things were done in the bureaucracies, it was supposed that white Anglo-Saxon protestants were 'better' than blacks, and that among the whites the British were better than 'Continental' migrants. It was thought that men were stronger, more practical-minded, less emotional, more able to run things than women. In a world of big threats Australia, it was believed, was but a little nation that needed a big imperial friend to hold its hand, and that capitalism worked better than any other imaginable system; some, however, preferred capitalism in its liberal form. It was believed that only a fool would have denied that Australia had to be constantly 'developed' in grandiose economic programs, such as the Ord River Scheme

and Soldier Settlement Scheme, which, whilst initially strongly supported, later proved economically disastrous.

In Australia, an issue of the 1960s was the liberty to publish and distribute radical and reformist literature, free of censorship. There was also the issue of the rights of Aboriginal Australians. Both were pivotal issues around which were created activist movements by the mid 1960s. Both causes engaged the principal platforms of Australian social organization: democracy and egalitarianism. The reality of Sir Arthur Rylah's (171) censorship, and the lack of basic rights for Aborigines, flew in the face of a professed creed of national political freedom.

Generally, the passing of the Menzies era seemed to represent a less stodgy, more liberal social climate midst the self-confidence of a time of economic prosperity. The many expressions of this period, some of which have been briefly mentioned above, were simultaneous with the emergence of a much more strident, politically independent, often radical, student voice that pushed for re-examination of the accepted through a process of radical social critique and activism.

(xii) The Impact of Changing Social Mores

The passing of the Menzies era heralded great changes in the presentation of the arts that flowed through to social mores. No institution was unaffected, be it the Roman Catholic Church or the C.P.A. Students, be it as disillusioned Catholics about to become radical students, or a New Left struggling against a C.P.A. old guard, were also affected.

The following pages try to both capture the mood of and explain, some of these changes that were closely associated with the development of the radical student movement in Australia.



One of the major contrasts to the Menzies era was that between 1966 and 1972, the greatest theatrical events were not Hair or The Removalists (although these had political importance) but events such as the Vietnam marches and the green bans of the Builders Labourers' Federation - dramatisations of social change by the people. In 1965, discussion on foreign investment would be how to get more of it, but by 1972 it was how to control it. In 1965 people spoke of symbolic ties with Britain, but by 1972 Britain had withdrawn 'west of Suez' and was going into the EEC. Between 1965 and 1972, the phrase 'environmental impact statement' had been coined and pollution had become a new big issue. One of many. In September 1965, if one looked among the editorials for debates on change, the best that could be found were debates on whether boys with long hair should be forced to wear hair nets in factories or whether Lady Chatterley's Lover should be allowed onto the Victorian Matriculation syllabus. By 1972 the discussion was on sex shops, do-it-yourself divorce kits, draft-resisters, and the behaviour of high school students at street demonstrations.

A symbolic breakthrough had come in June 1969 at the Metro Theatre in Kings Cross, when at the end of the first act of Hair, with police sirens blaring and red lights flashing, the cast had come out from under their blanket naked and stood for half a minute in front of a bizarrely dressed first night audience. What appealed most to me about Hair was its abandonment to rock music, lighting technology and communality, and the sense of historic occasion that it had been put on in a country like Australia at all.

There was also the underground press, such as Oz magazine from Richard Walsh and Richard Neville, and the sensational eruptions surrounding Wendy Bacon, who produced the Sydney publications Thor-out, Tharunka and Thor. The most publicised exploit was the printing in Tharunka (University of New South Wales student paper) of all 49 bawdy verses of Eskimo Nell, a 'dirty song', (172) Its concentration on sex was based on the belief that the sexual structure of society upheld the establishment. The censoring of obscene and erotic material was

therefore held to be political and upholding taboos necessary to the State and the Australian way of life. In one court case (173) involving alleged distribution of a poem about a nun's sexual relationship with God, Wendy Bacon was found not guilty, and police had to be content with the \$100 fine and good behaviour bond she received for wearing, outside the court, a nun's habit adorned with a line from the poem: 'I was fucked by God's steel prick'. (174) Such attrition wore out the nerves of the authorities.

In the dramas accompanying the crumbling of censorship the arguments ranged from liberal hopes for free expression to anarchist expressions of distrust of the state. For many students however, the debate revolved around relief from old moral restraints and a new legitimation of sexual enjoyment. (175) The restrictions imposed in the Papal Encyclical *Humanae Vitae* in 1968 by Pope Paul VI were the final straw for many Roman Catholic students. They defied the ruling banning all but natural contraception, and saw the chance to throw off other Church taboos as well; for example, the traditional anti-homosexuality of the Church. (176)

Considerable damage was being done to the forces of wowsersism. On the Left, the Communist Party was shedding its puritan wing (which had regarded personal libertarianism as bourgeois diversion). The Catholic Church, which in Australia had been based on an Irish priesthood and its grim fear of sexuality, seemed to be crumbling. The lack of a Catholic University in Australia had deprived the Church of an opportunity to mount an effective counter-attack against student Leftists, except for campus groupings of National Civic Council operatives who were relatively easily isolated. The Church was in crisis. A fumbling with folk guitar masses failed to win over campus Catholics who were finding alternative philosophies or at least searching for them. Fewer of the Catholic intelligentsia were entering the seminaries. In 1967 I was one of 52 first year seminarians at Corpus Christi College, Werribee; 28 including myself, left at the end of the first year of a six year training period. Only a handful were finally ordained and quite a few

left the Church altogether. One of the most fiercely disciplined institutions in the Australian social order was found wanting.

The Communist Party of Australia began to tune itself to changing times. A Melbourne-based faction of hard line Leninists aligned to Peking (later joined by Trade Union and student Maoists) had split off in 1963 under the leadership of Ted Hill. Ted Hill, a long standing leader of the older C.P.A., was a Melbourne lawyer specialising in workers' compensation cases. The new party called itself the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist). Union leaders such as Ted Bull from the Melbourne branch of the Waterside Workers Federation, and student leaders such as Albert Langer, Michael Hyde, Fergus Robinson and Barry York were later closely aligned with this Party. In fact, Ted Hill made a lengthy visit to Pentridge prison in July 1972 to discuss tactics with York, Robinson and myself when we were imprisoned over incidents discussed in Chapter Two. The Communist Party itself, in 1967 still a much larger group than the CPA(M-L), had itself rejected the hegemony of Peking and Moscow, and at its 21st national congress in 1967 affirmed itself as a Party more Australian in character.

Social control underwent relaxation because of new movements in feminism which received literary expression in the American Kate Millet's Sexual Politics (177) in 1970, and the Australian Germaine Greer's The Female Eunuch in 1971. (178) Women came to see the existing distributions of power in Australian families, workplaces, politics and society generally as dominated by males and agreed that the prevailing culture, which supported this power and justified it, must be challenged. This attitude was especially felt on the campuses with the establishment of women's consciousness raising groups and meetings for gay women students. In every state, women's groups took up the causes of equal pay, abortion law reform and birth control clinics. One issue, the demand for access to legal abortion on request, was particularly significant, and was highlighted by the work of Dr. Bertram Wainer in Melbourne.

In dress, irrespective of sex, students seemed to be seeking in the symbolism of clothing a sense of common ordinariness of humanity that was denied by political and social systems. In our jeans and paramilitary gear, we could be sisters and brothers. Mike Hyde (1986):

With the 60s there's lots of things you could point at, the fact that we were boom babies - boom, boom - we were brought up differently, most of my friends are like that, there was a loosening of the reins. You can nearly always tell a person just out of the 60s, there's something about them you can tell. (179)

Students lost their short-back-and-sides and sober school puritanism which for three generations was a symbol of manliness, in a country where long hair symbolised an impractical intellectuality, bohemian artiness or cissiness. What had changed, at least marginally, were definitions of what being male and female might mean. This was also a period when student homosexuals 'came out' announcing their homosexuality, and the word 'gay' began to replace the word 'camp'. Much of the stepping out of the closet occurred on campuses with the establishment of gay clubs and societies. In the 1972 election, CAMP (Campaign Against Moral Persecution) ran a candidate against Prime Minister McMahon. Like Germaine Greer, Dennis Altman through his book Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation, achieved considerable media attention. A lecturer in politics and government, Altman was recognised in student and academic circles as having one of the sharpest wits in the country. A campaign is still running from the early 70s - the Greg Weir campaign. The Queensland Education Department refused to appoint Weir, a bonded student, to a Queensland school, on the ground of his homosexuality. (180)

A great deal of publicity was attached to all these changes. Some explanation for the growth of media coverage of student protests and wider social changes in Australia was that there was money to be made from student and youth disaffection. Much of the box-office sales went to the 16-24 age group, and movie makers suddenly found the youth market

with films such as Easyrider, Woodstock, The Graduate and Zabriskie Point, which costing thousands, made millions.

What had been happening in Australia was that after the end of the Second World War, there had been increasing challenge to the idea that tertiary students were part of a long trial period of powerlessness ('adolescence') which necessarily fell between childhood and adulthood. Students as youth's spokespersons were seen as about to take over. This powerful expression came from a confident generation that had grown up not in an age of economic depression or war, but in a period of previously unimaginable material prosperity whose cult of materialism could seem rather crass but easy to change, particularly on campuses. With the new prosperity, the provision of more and more education and more variety in jobs was taken for granted: there was plenty of safety in risk.

To many Australian students one of the obvious hypocrisies was of a society that spent so much imagination on the evils of marijuana and imposed such penalties against its use, and yet so little about nicotine and alcohol and imposed few penalties against those who used or sold them.

To summarise, the period 1966-1972 represented a change of philosophical orientation in the Australian social scene. There was less emphasis on acquisitive materialistic concerns and greater consideration given to the physical environment. There was a relaxation in controls over censorship in literature, and the performing arts. An age of sexual liberation was perceived to have arrived. Much of the above was directed at questioning the structure and role of social institutions that had been unquestioned for generations, such as the Roman Catholic Church. Much of the change was a reflection of important shifts abroad, such as in the Peoples' Republic of China and the development of 'Maoism' and the C.P.A. (Marxist-Leninist) and Australian student Maoism. Important and pioneering books were published, particularly those on women's liberation, which opened up debates about

contraception, abortion and homo-sexuality. Much of the above was surrounded by an enormous media coverage. The generation perhaps most affected was the student generation of 1966-1972, a generation that had grown up 'not in an age of economic depression or war, but in a period of unimaginable material prosperity'. A previous generation's 'cult of materialism' could now seem rather 'crass' when many radicalised students now saw no limit to the possibilities for a more idealised and visionary future.

(xiii) Conscription

Conscription had been introduced in 1964, and only during 1916-17 and 1964-72 did conscription arouse such great controversy, widespread opposition and resistance in Australia. (181) There is evidence that anti-Vietnam War protests, the war itself being the 'cause' of the conscription, were part of the student political scene as early as August 1964. On 9 August, 1964, the first specifically anti-Vietnam War protests occurred, with 2000 workers and students marching in Sydney, and 200 demonstrating outside the U.S. Consulate in Melbourne. (182) The first actual anti-conscription meeting convened to protest the new measure appears to have been organised by the University of Sydney's Labor, Liberal and ALP Clubs on 11 November 1964. (183) At a consequential 29 November meeting, Y.C.A.C. (Youth Campaign Against Conscription) was formed from a gathering of 600. (184) Y.C.A.C. campaigned heavily for a Labor federal victory in 1966 and, shell-shocked by the defeat, quickly disintegrated in the wash-up. Re-organisation began. The short-lived (1967-1972) but inspiring DRU (Draft Resisters' Union) sprang up in Melbourne in 1967, a much more militant entity than its predecessor. (185)

An Anti-War Activists Conference was convened in Sydney in January 1967, which strove to develop a program for organising on campuses, in the community and, for the first time, high school students. (186) Late in 1967, the Draft Resisters' Union began to organise acts of militant

non-compliance with the National Service Act. (187) In 1971 the ABC program Four Corners was putting a program together on draft resisters. With three other student resisters and the TV crew, we met at a secretively arranged motel in Lygon Street, Carlton, had the interview, and separately and surreptitiously departed. On another occasion in 1971 I was one of several to address a meeting of students in the Union Lounge, Monash University. Speakers were first shown how to use obscure corridors and stairways in order to escape should the Commonwealth Police decide to raid the well-publicised appearances. It was all part of a massive offensive against the Act and more pertinently, meant as an attack on the institutions of the police and media as guardians of the status quo, that is, the maintainers of social inequalities.

The hundreds of cat-and-mouse games being played out across the country were not without wryly humorous moments.

I recall as a student at St. Patrick's College, Ballarat, I was 'called up' in 1968, but deferred enlistment because of my studies. Caught up with in May 1972 because of non-student status as an excluded student at La Trobe University, I was faced with an amusing Magistrate's Court appearance, occasioned by failure to attend a compulsory medical. The notice to attend medical was addressed to B.W. Pola, 15 Church Street, Horsham. My address as given in court by the Commonwealth Police prosecutor was correct, except that the town was wrong: it should have been Nhill, not Horsham. Seizing on this fact I asserted that I was unlikely to have received a notice since it was addressed incorrectly. (I had in fact received medical notices at other addresses, but that was not the point at the time.) The magistrate, colloquially known as Dismissal Smith because of his reputation for dismissing cases on the slightest doubt, dismissed the charge. The Commonwealth Police were red-faced and I had a quiet smile to myself as I was led hand-cuffed back to Pentridge prison where I was residing at the time in relation to other matters. I should add that because my sentence in Pentridge was 'indefinite', the 'failure to attend medical'

charge was actually an attempt by the Commonwealth to render my residence in Pentridge of a more definite nature.

On another occasion I attended Heidelberg Magistrate's Court on a charge of 'besetting the premises' of La Trobe University in 1972. Rather unnecessarily, being pacifist by nature and conviction, I was brought hand-cuffed and guarded by six armed warders from Pentridge. The court appearance over, I waited in the caged yard to be escorted back to Pentridge in what was to be a four car convoy of police cars. One can only suppose such restraints were induced by police paranoia associated with the then recent Soledad prison escape attempt in America, led by Angela Davis, in which George Jackson died. The thought crossed my mind at the time that perhaps the prison and police authorities wildly imagined a similar attempt would be made on my behalf. I am pleased my comrades did not, as one prison warder had told me that he would like nothing better than to shoot me. I was not anticipating such an attempt however, so the convoy was melodramatic. However, as I was waiting in my Heidelberg enclosure, I was visited by the Secretary of the La Trobe SRC, Ian MacDonald, also a draft resister, for a brief conversation on developments in student politics. As we were snatching a few words between the bars, seemingly from no-where came two Commonwealth policemen who fronted MacDonald on National Service Act matters, and led him away. We had just been reflecting on how long I might have to stay in prison. That was the last I thought of it until a few hours later when I was taken into the City Watchhouse where I was to stay over-night. Upon arrival there was Ian MacDonald behind bars to greet me, and we finished up being in the same cell. 'Have to stop meeting like this comrade!'

The challenge to conscription took a highly controversial form. An important decision, and one that reflected the breaking away of the students from the established peace groups, had been the action of the Monash Labor Club. There they had developed a Maoist oriented collective based on Marxism-Leninism, as a response to the election defeat and an anti-imperialist analysis of the war itself. They had



decided to send money to the North Vietnam National Liberation Front (NLF) in July 1967, thus sparking off a major national political issue, eventually forcing the Government to introduce special legislation to prevent their actions being successful. (188) Around this time, a group of Sydney and Melbourne students had decided to form a radical action group Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) based on militant tactics, anti-conscription and a commitment to transforming the value-system of society at large. (189) Melbourne, Sydney and La Trobe Universities established chapters of SDS, and drew much from the West German and North American SDS groups. In Brisbane, Students for Democratic Action (SDA) was formed on a radical, activist oriented program and developed a sizable following on the issues of civil liberties, conscription and the Vietnam war. Brian Laver and Dick Shearman at the University of Queensland were prominent in its leadership. SDA was probably the first genuinely radical student group to develop out of the disillusionment of 1966. In an SDA leaflet, c. April 1967, SDA members were distinguished by their

...concern for the future of humanity because of the danger of nuclear war, axiomatic acceptance of the sanctity of human life, revulsion at the ready use of force as an instrument of international policy, concern for degrading poverty of two out of every three in a world of potential plenty, and belief that the individual should be free from unwarranted interference from the State... (190)

The radicalisation of Australian student politics involved the realisation that such realities as Vietnam and conscription were not simple policy errors, but policies pre-determined by deeply ingrained value-systems (racism, nationalism, cultural chauvinism and xenophobia) which resulted in an inhumane set of social and economic policies at home; hence, it was believed that only a student and worker movement aimed at combating such ideological structures could prevent wars of aggression against Third World liberation movements. It was realised that the universities themselves had to be politicised and turned into centres of radical criticism, on issues such as conscription, for

universities were to be the initial arenas for a mass social critique. This stratagem was expressed differently at different universities. By 1967 on most university campuses, the energies of a diverse student sub-culture began to turn to a consideration of the role of the university in a society from whose internal decision-making processes regarding conscription some students discerned they had been obviously excluded.

To summarise, conscription and its associated issue, the war in Vietnam, appears to have been the most important single factor associated with the development of the radical student movement in Australia. This may have already become apparent through reading interviews with student activists in Chapter Three. Many student activists transposed opposition to conscription and the war, to the streets and campuses; on the campus, connections between the university and the war and conscription were drawn, and this aspect has been expanded in Chapter Two.

(xiv) The Student Movement and the Media

The previous section has mentioned the significant role that the media played in changes of thought and life-styles during the late 1960s, early 1970s.

The media now requires closer examination in the context of the radical student movement itself.

It had been the taunt of Victorian politicians of the day such as Sir Henry Bolte and Sir Arthur Rylah that the demonstrators were just 'a few stirrers', 'a few rat-bags', and the suggestion of the media that student protests were the result of a few 'rabble-rousers'. In a fascinating book from North America entitled The Whole World is Watching, (191) the relationship between the nation's student radicals and the media is revealed in detail. What emerges is that the vested economic and socialisation interests of the corporate media (such as

N.B.C. and C.B.C.), dictated to a considerable extent the facticity or otherwise of events as portrayed to the public. Author Todd Gitlin showed how prominent leaders of the American movement such as Mario Savio and Jerry Rubin assumed a super-star status and became media events in themselves, snow-balling the public impact of the movement in what they did. In Australia this did not occur to the same extent, but there was a kind of personality cult around two Melbourne student activists: Albert Langer from Monash University and Harry van Moorst from Melbourne University. With Langer, the Melbourne media was responsible for much of the sensationalisation.

Langer observed of himself in 1986 that

I was initially in the background. I was the only Marxist-Leninist at Monash and was Vice-President of the Labor Club - nothing very public, even during the N.L.F. issue, as the public leadership was mainly elsewhere. I was in the background. After things shifted on campus, I was the most effective speaker and the press centered on me as being the student leader at Monash. I was the main political leader throughout. I wasn't the public leader until after the N.L.F. issue, but I was seen as the worst student radical at Monash, maybe Australia. The whole thing was a combination of media-hype. They didn't pick me by mistake. I was always speaking at meetings. The power of the PA was important. He who had the megaphone had the power.  
(192)

An internationally famous student activist of the time, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, also became a victim of media hype, and noted in the introduction to his classic account of the French student-worker rebellion of May 1968, some aspects suggestive of Melbourne student leaders:

Such was the impact of the events of May and June and so wildly has the name of Cohn-Bendit been bandied about that, far from my having to go down on my knees to them, the publishers now come chasing after me, begging me to write about anything I choose, good or bad, exciting or dull; all they want is something they

can sell - a revolutionary gadget with marketable qualities...Strange that a movement opposed to all leaders should have ended up with one all the same, that those who shun the limelight should be singled out for the full glare of publicity. (193)

The legendary figures of Langer and van Moorst in Melbourne from 1967 to 1972 had partly to do with the press' appetite for a leader; a cult figure; someone to look to as the cause of the disturbances; someone to castigate and profit from simultaneously.

Some Victorians may have preferred to agree with the State's Liberal Party politicians that it was just a few stirrers, and so the answers were simple and intellectually undemanding. Victoria's former Premier Sir Henry Bolte (1955-1972) is a good example of anti-intellectualism within the Liberal Party, although the A.L.P. is no stranger to this either. (194) Precisely why some did not understand was due in part to the media, which did not treat radical students sympathetically.

The sensationalist Sunday Press began an anti La Trobe campaign in July 1971 with headlines such as 'Standover Tactics at University' and 'Extremists in Secret Moves' (Melbourne Observer, 4 July, p.3). The La Trobe Worker-Student Alliance was incorrectly described as 'terrorist' and 'secret' and as being behind the La Trobe crisis ('120 scheme against Unis', Sunday Observer, 12 September, pp.1,2). The 'terror' theme was joined by the more reputable press in 1972. Headlines included: 'Terror Claim at La Trobe' (Age, 28 June, p.5); 'Campus Terror Campaign' (Australian, 28 June). The Melbourne Herald devoted an editorial to the 'astonishing campaign of psychological terror' (28 June, p.4). The only evidence of campus 'terrorism' centered on a few threatening telephone calls which had been received by the careers officer (Mr. Waterhouse). Professor Wolfsohn, the most vocal opponent of the 'telephone terror campaign' (Sun, 28 June), had not received any calls! (Herald, 27 June, p.7). Efforts by student leaders to correct misrepresentation were rarely printed. La Trobe SRC President, 1972, Ed

Lagdzin, came to the Maoists' defence. 'They have always worked in the open,' he insisted. 'They do not use terror tactics. WSA have used democratic tactics by calling student meetings - the Right have never done this' (Sun, 29 June, 1972, p.25).

Apart from trade unionists, it is difficult to identify an activist minority which has been subjected to greater negative stereotyping in the press than students. This reality goes a long way to explaining the apathetic and/or antagonistic attitude of the media-besotted populace. Interestingly, Halloran and Elliot reached the same conclusion concerning the Vietnam protest movement in London, as did Windschuttle in Australia. (195) Halloran and Elliot concluded that the media invariably emphasised any incident of violence, in order to show students in the worst possible light. Windschuttle revealed a similar emphasis in Australia. (196)

Horne, in seeking to find why so many Australians switched their votes in the 1975 Federal election, had this offering on the effects of the media:

For working people of this conservative kind, discontented middle-class ideas about how things should be run could seem mere trendiness, at the best irrelevant and, at worst, threatening - and unspeakable when accompanied by maoists, trotskyists or anarchists who mocked the very idea of jobs and families and homes. These kinds of working people were not interested in fancy theories about new kinds of decisions. Decision making was not their business. Their business was what happened to their jobs and their families and their homes. (197)

That is, many did not understand because they could not afford to know. I suggest similar reasons lie behind public antipathy to the student protests.

In summary, the historical and social context of the student movement had been one of the rapid expansion of capitalism,

which included the growth of education as a necessary adjunct to the efficient and effective economic management of the capitalist mode of production. As may be seen above, this process included the manipulation of student activists and/or their views, by the media, so that student activism itself became a source of exploitation, part of the production of news as a consumer product and the formation of student stereotypes in public opinion.

(xv) The Unexpected Student Movement

By the early 1970s, the North American, European and Australian student organisations that sponsored home-grown revolution, were declining. The German S.D.S. dissolved as a national organisation in 1970 (198) and the American S.D.S. survived into the early 1970s a shadow of its former self and torn by factional splits, one being the Maoist oriented Progressive Labor Party. The American based Young Socialist Alliance, affiliated to the Trotskyist Socialist Workers' Party was generally recognised by the end of 1971 to be the largest Left-student group in America but had only a few thousand members. (199) The Socialist Youth Alliance is still active in Melbourne however, as is the Socialist Workers' Party.

One of the effects of the decline of radical student organisations such as S.D.S. was the creation of much more desperate terrorist groups such as the Weathermen in the United States. (200) By the early 1970s, the bulk of students however, turned to the most progressive wings of established leftist parties: the Democrats in North America; the Communist Parties in France and Italy; the Italian Radical Party; in Germany the Social Democrats and the Green Party; in the early 1970s in Australia, to the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers' Party and the Socialist Left of the A.L.P.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, Australians seemed to be shocked at the activities of its radical students. Generally though, no society

should have found it remarkable that part of its student population was involved in activist student politics militantly directed against the status quo. C. Wright Mills, the American neo-Marxist, argued that students are the one group who will continue to supply the involvement for political action. (201) Indeed, a completely inactive student body is a much more curious phenomenon historically than one involved in political activism. Despite this compatibility of student activism with history, the emergence of the dissenting order of Australian students was totally unexpected. In 1960, the 'silence' of students during the previous decade was understood by Australian authorities to be evidence that advanced industrial societies such as Australia's had effectively socialised the students to their purposes. Yet by 1970 such assessments had been abandoned. Australian campus unrest was a matter of bitter Parliamentary debates and law and order campaigns used by the Bolte, Gorton and McMahon administrations in anti-Left propaganda particularly around election times.

A much vaster impact and significance was true of the North American scene. The events of the Spring of 1970 - the bombing of Cambodia, the Kent State killings, Jackson State - brought out 1.5 million students in demonstrations throughout the country, a number and a proportion never before seen in American history. A few weeks later Americans deemed 'campus unrest' the nation's number one problem. And, in the Congressional election campaign of November 1970, the Republican Party, led by Vice President Agnew and President Nixon, made the issue of campus violence a prime campaign issue and held their losses to a minimum. By 1970, the student opposition in all its forms was the centre of the political arena in North America and Australia.

A clearer if general explanation that does hold water as to answering the 'why then' question, is that the movement was a response to particular Australian historical conditions in the 1960s. It is obvious from the grandstand of today that it was amongst students that the strains of contemporary developed societies such as Australia most

revealed themselves. It is in this context that the Australian student movement acted as a barometer of wider social change.

(xvi) Student Radicalism and the Role of Intellectuals in Society

It remains to write some generalised interpretative overview of the nature of student radicalism of the early seventies, within the comparative perspective that an earlier radicalism described in Chapter One allows. Whether or not these two periods of radicalism have the same genesis is a matter of judgement. Freudian revolt-against-the-father interpretations may point to similarities, although the problem remains of explaining the episodic nature of student radicalism. In any case this thesis is oriented towards an analysis of social process, and psychological interpretations are of secondary value here.

Much of the analysis of the social process associated with the emergence and decline of the two periods of student radicalism relies on studying the words and actions of the radical students themselves. Chapter One and Chapter Two have adopted this approach when analysing the radical student emergence at the University of Melbourne after the Second World War, and the radicalisation of students at Monash University, the University of Melbourne, and La Trobe University during the late 1960s. This methodology, one may ask, has conveyed what impressions of both periods? The study of La Trobe University in Chapter Two revealed radical students as being militantly against authority; against the police ('Who killed Collingburn?'); against the Vice-Chancellor and University authorities; against the political structure of the State; and against the distribution of the economic power as then assembled. Often, these attitudes were expressed in class terms, as there was a group of committed Maoists at La Trobe and Monash universities who adhered to a Marxist-Leninist class analysis of society. However, like their forerunners in the Cultural Revolution in China, the La Trobe and Monash Maoists were also against the cultural authority of Western civilisation as well as class authority.



In contrast, the students of the 1930s and late 1940s at the University of Melbourne, whilst also speaking in class terms, were also sure of their knowledge of history and that they could bring this knowledge to the working class. The difference was Maoism itself, which, as a political and cultural strategy/philosophy, had not passed through sufficient years to enable an objective analysis of its value and impact by the Australian working class. Marxism-Leninism was common to both periods of student radicalism. Maoism was not. Maoism, in addition to presenting a class analysis of the social process, was also, for La Trobe and Monash Maoists, an inherent and direct challenge to the cultural hegemony of Western culture, of which Melbourne city was an excellent example. This differing emphasis represents a distinction between the student radicalism of an earlier period, and that of the late 1960s and early 1970s. The words and actions of the 1960s radicals do tell us a great deal, but these same words and actions are themselves limited by an experiential gap between the speakers and actors on the one hand, and a Cultural Revolution, as Maoism, on the other.

In addition, during the period 1966-1972, other radicalised students at Victoria's three universities were influenced politically and culturally by the literature and practice of a kind of libertarian anarchism, European and North American in origin, which has already been considered in Chapter Two and Chapter Three. This development affords another contrast to earlier periods of radicalism, which, whilst not devoid of the political philosophy of Bakunin for example, tended to draw on Marx, Lenin, and although he was not a well-known figure at the time, some themes taken up by Gramsci.

The above paragraphs are not an attempt to 'explain away' the actions of the Maoists and other radicals of the 1960s, but simply an attempt to consider and place them in the context of the social processes of the times. After all, reductive explanations are not appropriate to this thesis, and no attempt is made here to offer a 'grand theory' that explains it all. Neither, however, is it intended here to portray the radical students of any twentieth century period of

student radicalism as mere ventriloquist's dolls for the really active sociological or historical agent, or for their unconscious psyches.

With these limitations upon explanation, the aim here is for speculative and reflective interpretation, which, in a sense, is scarcely explanation at all. This type of interpretation was outlined in the Introduction.

Whilst Chapter One and Chapter Two have speculated and reflected to some extent on the origins of student radicalism, both chapters concentrated on the actions of particular periods, and the reflections of activists on the causes of radicalism. Chapter Three, in its various sections, is an attempt to organise the reflection and speculation into more specific areas of discussion.

This Section (xvi) of the discussion concentrates on student radicalism and the role of intellectuals in society, and through research of this aspect it was found that three major lines of interpretation are worth considering.

Sociological researches inclined towards socio-economic categorisation have sometimes found an interpretation in terms of middle class radicalism. The term 'middle class radicalism' was used by Frank Parkin in a discussion of the class background of participants in a social movement in England during the 1950s and early 1960s, in this case the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. (202) Parkin was interested in the extent to which features of middle class radicalism might serve to distinguish it from the radicalism characteristic of the working class. Parkin was able to suggest that

... whereas working class radicalism could be said to be geared largely to reforms of an economic or material kind, the radicalism of the middle class is directed mainly to social reforms which are basically moral in content. (203)

The radicalism at the University of Melbourne in the late 1940s and at Australian universities generally during 1966-1972 could also be said to have been 'basically moral in content', evidenced by the anti-Fascist stance of the late 1940s and the anti-war position of 1966-1972. Previous discussion in this Chapter regarding the socio-economic background of students (Section viii) may lead to the reasonable conjecture that students of a radical disposition in both periods were less interested in their own economic or material welfare than in promoting such issues as international peace and economic re-structuring pertaining to the global economic order.

That is, whether middle class radicalism was expressed by participation in the C.N.D. in the 1950s, or by student anti-Fascist euphoria in the late 1940s, or the anti-war movement of the 1960s, could be less significant than these simply being 'capsule statements' of a distinctive moral and political outlook.

The significance of high socio-economic status and left-wing political commitment were also of interest to Parkin, and of relevance here. Professor Ian Turner, for example, made a point of working on the Victorian railways during the 1950s after a major contribution to radicalism at the University of Melbourne during the late 1940s. Also, the Worker-Student Alliance of the early 1970s in Melbourne was born of a similar political disposition to accept the 'leading role of the working class'.

Of added interest is that Parkin's research was able to show that the middle class radical shared

a tension in so far as his political sympathies do not lie with his own class and the parties of the right which politically represent it, but with the parties of the left which cater largely for the interests of those of a different class from himself. (204)

Some parallel consideration of this aspect may be obtained by recognising the comparatively large student membership of the C.P.A. University of Melbourne Branch during the late 1940s, and commitment of later student radicals to the C.P.A. M/L, the C.P.A. and the A.L.P. Socialist Left during 1966-1972.

However, it is with radical students as intellectuals in society that is of concern here. Parkin observed that the C.N.D. empathies were particularly strong among the new generation of post-war intellectual (205), and in seeking explanation for this supported the view that

Those who live by the exercise of intellect are felt to be less able or willing than others automatically to endorse existing values and the status quo... only by remaining detached and critical of things as they are, is creativity at all possible, and that the intellectual who fails to act as a social critic is not discharging his proper role. (206).

...As with their counterparts in the thirties, these new recruits to radicalism were heavily drawn from the ranks of the 'socially unattached intelligentsia' rather than from those in established cultural and educational institutions. (207)

Radical students of 1966-1972 and the late 1940s may also be said to have been similarly positioned as a 'socially unattached intelligentsia'. There is a need, however, at this stage, to explain a relationship between the term 'intellectual' and radical students.

This thesis is in empathy with the view of Gramsci (208) upon which is based the second major line of interpretation. Put simply, Gramsci's view was that non-intellectuals do not exist, and that when we distinguish intellectuals and non-intellectuals we are in fact referring only to the immediate social function of professional intellectuals. Gramsci maintained that the relationship between an effort of cerebral elaboration and 'muscular-nervous' effort is not always the same, but that there was always a relationship, so that

if we speak of intellectuals, we cannot speak of non-intellectuals, because non-intellectuals do not exist.  
(209)

There were then, different levels or kinds of intellectual activity, and no kind of human activity from which all intellectual activity can be excluded.

Gramsci also believed that every person, outside of or in addition to his or her occupation, developed some kind of intellectual activity,

and so contributes towards maintaining or changing a conception of the world, that is, towards encouraging new modes of thought. (210)

It was from this idea that Gramsci developed the relationship between the role of the intellectual and the historically revolutionary task of the proletariat, with the intellectual both coming from and leading the working class.

The radical students of the 1930s, late 1940s at the University of Melbourne were acutely aware of the role of intellectuals in leading the industrial proletariat, but it was, by and large, a realisation as middle class radicals themselves, though undoubtedly, some would either remember or have been told of their families' working class origins. Very few of the radical students of the late 1940s and 1960s came from families that were actually working class. It was as middle class radicals offering or trying to lead what they interpreted as an Australian industrial proletariat that student radicalism for both periods may be more accurately viewed. In this analysis then, the Gramscian analysis of the role of the intellectual is of considerable value, but requires to be placed in a context of different periods of student radicalism.

Broadly, Gramsci also attempted to locate the political function of intellectuals through an analysis of the role of conservative and

radical intellectuals. Conservative 'organic' intellectuals provided the dominant class with forms of moral and intellectual leadership, and identified with the dominant relations of power. Organic intellectuals were to be found in all strata of society, in areas such as industrial specialists, in universities, journalists, the arts, and various levels of management.

Gramsci's analysis helped to shatter the myth that the nature of intellectual work was determined by one's class position. Aronowitz and Giroux (211) support this view, adding that

...there is no immediate correspondence between class location and consciousness; but there is a correspondence between the social function of one's intellectual work and the particular relationship it has to modifying, challenging, or reproducing the dominant society. In other words, it is the political nature of intellectual work that is the issue at hand.  
(212)

It is in this Gramscian context then that the role of the intellectual as radical student is depicted in this thesis.

Taking account of the University of Melbourne radicalism described in Chapter One, and that of La Trobe University described in Chapter Two, there is some support for such an approach, in the tendency of radical students to identify with the working class of both periods, irrespective of their own socio-economic background. We have noted that the student radicals of the late 1940s were not, by and large, from or of the working class, but that they sought to identify with it as youthful, traditional intellectuals from an interest in the social process as a whole. The student radicals at La Trobe University in a later period also sought to so identify, through the Worker-Student Alliance, by concentrating politicisation in local working class areas of Heidelberg and Preston, and by identifying with the difficulties of working class people. In both cases however, it was as middle class radicals with, if one may put it this way, working class aspirations.

Karl Marx had stated that it did not require deep intuition to comprehend that human consciousness changes with every change in the conditions of material existence, social relations and social life. (213)

Of considerable implication regarding the above discussion of middle class radicalism was a further observation of Marx that

finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands ... and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole. (214)

The radical students at the University of Melbourne during the late 1940s sought an identity or unity with the working class because of their political and social analysis and the existence of a party (the C.P.A.) which had support and organisation in both the working class and among students, and which believed and practised the 'leading role of the working class'. The radicals of 1966-1972 might be seen in a similar light as there was certainly a faction among the radicals which took that view. But their practice, as described in Chapter Two, was as often individualistic and anarchistic as solidaristic. In the case of the Maoists, the party was the C.P.A. M/L. Important differences lay in the political and cultural orientation of both parties, the former more 'Moscow line' and the latter more 'Peking line', and this had implications for both periods of student radicalism. In any case, the manifest function of intellectuals in modern society had greatly changed even during the comparatively short time between the late 1940s and 1966-1972, and especially since Gramsci's day.

With this in mind, Daniel Bell in The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A venture in social fore-casting (215), drew attention to the greatly expanded role of intellectual technique in post-war years:

In the same spirit, one can say that the methodological promise of the second half of the twentieth century is the management of organised complexity (the complexity of large organisations and systems, the complexity of theory with a large number of variables), the identification and implementation of strategies for rational choice in games against nature and games between persons, and the development of a new intellectual technology, which, by the end of the century, may be as salient in human affairs as machine technology has been for the past century and a half. (216)

The new intellectuals were neither from the classes which traditionally produced intellectuals, nor were they destined in the main to join that class, or to return unchanged to the working class or lower middle class. A new grouping, according to two Melbourne writers, Geoff Sharp and Doug White, the 'intellectually trained', were defined as

those employed persons who apply established intellectual and scientific skills in work geared to the ends laid down by owners or controllers of large scale industrial and administrative complexes. (217)

The whole range of the intellectually trained, the authors maintained, as teachers, chemists, managers and so on, used 'intellectual technique' derived from the intellectual culture disseminated through universities and tertiary institutions, which was

then sold by the intellectually trained as their characteristic form of working effort. (218)

Sharp and White provided some support for the research of Parkin (above) in affirming that



The highly conscious character of intellectual technique, its tendency to be governed by universal type moral rules and the need for a long period of training within institutions, traditionally set within the intellectual culture, all tend to impart a quite distinctive direction to the formation of ideology among the intellectually trained. (219)

The above interpretation was also generally supported by the social theorists discussed in Section (ii) of this Chapter, under the heading 'Some Suggested Causes', and other sections of Chapter Three.

In this interpretation then, student radicalism was the product of the rise of a new social stratum, not tied very directly to any of the old classes, but not between them either. Student radicalism was perhaps the sign of their emergence, and since that time many of them have found a niche in the management of the social order; but perhaps an uneasy and insecure place, for the managers themselves often come under threat of 'efficiency campaigns' and 'program reviews' from those much closer to the production of the social regime.

Whilst the new stratum doubtless possessed and possesses the knowledge which is power in the post-industrial society, further interpretation from Foucault is useful. (220) Foucault, in a consideration of a 'political economy of truth' was able to place a fresh interpretation on the role of the intellectual in society.

It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of 'science' and 'ideology', but in terms of 'truth' and 'power'. And thus the question of the professionalisation of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. (221)

Whilst there is a suggestion of the influence of Marx and Gramsci in Foucault's approach to the role of intellectuals, Foucault was able to clearly state in a way not previously done, the situation of the contemporary intellectual wherein 'truth' is, literally, manufactured.

Foucault maintained that the essential political problem for the intellectual was not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that scientific practice was accompanied by a correct ideology, but to ascertain the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth. The problem here was not changing people's consciousness so much as the political, economic and institutional regime of the production of truth. For Foucault, it was simply not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would not be possible, for truth was already power), but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural, within which it operated. The political question for Foucault was not error, illusion, alienated consciousness or ideology; it was truth itself.  
(222)

Traditionally, the role of the radical student as intellectual in society has been closely associated with a willingness to discern a 'politics of truth'. Illusion and reality were important in the communication of the Vietnam War to the radical students of 1966-1972; propaganda played a crucial role prior to, during and after the Second World War; indeed, continues to do so in a 'global village' where history and the present are continually re-interpreted as 'truth' and 'reality'.

This section has discussed three major lines of interpretation of the role of the intellectual in society associated with periods of radical student political activity. Parkin's concept of middle class radicalism has been helpful in exploring reasons why some middle class students would be disposed towards radicalism at different periods, and in exposing some apparent contradictions. Throughout the discussion, elements of the approaches of Gramsci, Marx, Bell and Foucault, were found to relate to each other. For example, Parkin's 'tensions' within the middle class relate to Marx' proposition of the breaking away of a section of the ruling class to join the proletariat. Middle class radicalism was also shown by Parkin and others to be basically moral in

content, an important motivating factor, with some applications to Australian student radicalism of the 1930s, late 1940s and the 1960s.

Gramsci offered a second major line of interpretation which further expanded the concept of the nature of intellectual work and removed the myth that intellectual work was determined by one's class position, which assists the view that student radicalism was morally based rather than determined by class position. It is in this way that the political nature of intellectual work became the issue. This aspect was enhanced by a third line of interpretation, that of Foucault, for whom the important political question for intellectuals was the politics of truth itself and how it worked. Chapter Two, for example, drew attention to the concern of La Trobe University radicals regarding the uses to which knowledge was being put during the execution of the war in Vietnam; and, in the general sense, of the social construction of reality.

For the student radicals of the late 1940s and 1966-1972, and their role as intellectuals in society, the above three approaches offered varying emphases and interpretations regarding their role as intellectuals. Naturally, the approaches of Marx and Gramsci would have tended to predominate for the radicals of the late 1940s; for the radical students of 1966-1972, other social theorists such as Bell, Parkin and Foucault have enlightened the context in which discussion of student political radicalism occurs. Essentially, the theory and the radicalism changed as times changed. The student radicalism of the 1940s tended towards a cohesiveness and camaraderie that the more anarchistic, diverse and individualistic sixties lacked. Perhaps this had something to do with the numerical differences of participants for both periods; perhaps there was a quite different socio-political climate for both times; perhaps too, the economic circumstances for both periods enabled the participants to express themselves in different ways. Underlying the entirety however, is a realisation that the crucial role of the intellectual had changed rapidly over a period of little more than twenty years. Finally, it is important to remember

that there was a philosophic and moral underpinning that, for both periods, remained essentially the same.

(xvii) Conclusion

Summaries to each of the sixteen sections of Chapter Three have been provided at the end of each section.

The Australian radical student movement did adapt much of its ideology and activism from overseas ideas and events. These included the decline of the cold war in the 1950s; the emergence of the civil rights movement in North America; the influence of Maoism; the establishment of S.D.S; the example of revolutions such as that of Cuba; and the example of a history of student movements in third world nations and western industrialised nations.

We may conclude that inter-generational disaffection played a small role in the emergence of student radicalism in Australia, and that economic, particularly Marxist based explanations, offer a more plausible explanation. This conclusion is given more support in the section 'The Student Movement in a Capitalist State'. It may also be concluded that students, traditionally, are progressive, and tend to lend themselves to radical ideas and activities. The section 'Some Suggested Causes' was also able to point to the emergence of student impatience with institutionalised processes of social change, and rejected the 'conspiratorial subversives' approach as a major cause.

A conclusion of this Chapter is that the need of the Australian capitalist system for an intellectually trained labour force of specialised workers was a source of disenchantment and radicalisation for some students, who perceived the system in general as being unjust, and the role demanded of them, unacceptable.

It is concluded that university curricula and administration were unable to meet, for the time being, some students' demands for re-structure, and this precipitated a radical reaction from students. Many radicals saw education as having a 'revolutionary role' whilst curricula planners and administrators saw it as 'functional'. This difference led some radicals to a belief that only a re-structuring of the State itself would be adequate. The physical situation of universities and the unique social status of students also served to enable the development of radical politics amongst students. That many radical students saw themselves as 'mass intellectual labour' enabled them to compare themselves to industrial workers, an analogy that also served to promote a radical political reaction from these students.

Further, student disillusionment with the institutionalised process of student politics encouraged the development of alternative political organisations more suited to the radical students.

As with 'student government', disillusionment with major political parties such as the A.L.P. and C.P.A. and the established peace movement, resulted in the establishment or joining by radical students of alternative organisations more suited to the achievement of radical aims.

We may conclude that a complex set of factors were associated with the motivation and formation of radical student activists around a variety of issues, two important such issues being the war in Vietnam and the conscription of Australians to fight in that war. It is concluded that many radicals were motivated by a strong sense of justice and identification with the oppressed, even to the extent of sacrificing their own careers. It is further concluded that the influence of popular culture in the form of film had some impact on the development of student political awareness. This section was able to indicate that an 'idealistic political optimism' was an important element in the development of radical student political activity.

We may reasonably conclude that, generally speaking, students of radical Leftist persuasion tended to come from Arts faculties, and that such students were more interested in liberal, non-vocational type studies such as Sociology. Also it is concluded that, in some contrast to the 1980s, radical Left students tended to come from families whose livelihoods were professional or managerial, and political views liberal.

There is evidence to show that radical Left secondary students also came from professional or managerial family backgrounds of liberal political persuasion. Such students tended to believe a 'fundamental transformation was necessary'.

The discussion enables us to conclude that the Australian student counter-culture was a philosophy that was based on disillusionment with the accepted values of the parental generation. Crudely put, this represented a confrontation between the materialistic/puritanical ideology of parents, and the humanistic/hedonistic ideology of the counter-culture. This confrontation was reflected in a displacement of feudal-Catholic, capitalist-Protestant beliefs by the counter-culture, and was replaced by philosophies of non-violence, Oriental religions, and communal living. It is concluded that this important cultural shift helped to shape the radical student movement, which was politically represented by the New Left. It is a final conclusion of this section that the New Left was also aided in its development by the economically fostered growth of 'a new Australian intelligentsia' that had sharp differences from the Old Left, an aspect which served to further assist the creation of a radical Left student movement in Australia.

There is mention of a shift away from a parochial and Anglo-centric orientation to a more liberal and self-confident Australia, a solid proportion of which orientation related to the period of economic prosperity of the 1950s and 1960s. We are able to conclude that this pleasant new reality assisted the development of a much more strident, politically independent, often radical, student movement.

The period 1966-1972 represented a shift from the purely acquisitive and materialistic to the aesthetic and environmental. This shift was expressed in a greatly liberalised attitude to the performing arts and literature, the liberalising of which further encouraged the growth of radical thought amongst students, particularly those who had had orthodox upbringings as in the Roman Catholic Church. Women's liberation, abortion and homosexuality, were important elements of radical discussion and activism which served to provide issues on which radical students could take action with a view to 'a more idealised and visionary future'.

It is a conclusion of this Chapter that military conscription and its associated issue, the war in Vietnam, were the two most important single issues associated with the development of the radical Left student movement in Australia.

The evidence enables one to conclude that the radical Left student activists were media stereo-typed in a negative way when presented to the public.

From the penultimate section, 'The Unexpected Student Movement', three conclusions are able to be drawn. First, the arrival of the movement was unexpected. Second, its abrupt departure was also unexpected. Third, the departure was expressed in the development of terrorist-styled groups. All three conclusions are, however, with the benefit of hindsight, understandable.

The final section established that there is a relationship between the perceived role of the intellectual in society and student radicalism; further, that middle class radicalism is usually premised on a particular moral outlook. Thirdly, both of these conclusions are applicable to the student radicalism of the 1920s through to the 1970s. Finally, differences in the expression of student radicalism during this period relate to a changing emphasis in the role of the intellectual in

society, as explained in the section's discussion of relevant theorists covering the same period.

The hypothesis of this thesis is that the Australian radical student movement of the late 1960s, early 1970s, was the product of a highly complex set of international and local social, political, economic and historical factors.

The above conclusions support such an hypothesis.

It remains to relate the above conclusions to the Introduction and the hypothesis.

Firstly, the Introduction stated that an argument of this thesis would be that the student activism of the period was not to be 'rightly characterised as a socialist, revolutionary movement' but one where 'student activists fought for liberation, not socialism'. (vii)

Secondly, the Introduction stated that, to the student activists, the issues appeared clear, and that these were essentially two: conscription and the Vietnam War. (vii)

Thirdly, the Introduction, whilst stating that 'deeper interpretation requires going beyond the statements made by the activists' promised that one would be attempted in this thesis. (vii)

They (the activists) were part of the reproduction of capitalism, but not directly of its structures. As part of its production they had notions of individualism, its patterns of consumption, and its division of mental and manual labour. At the same time they carried a moral opposition, notions of universality and fairness which represent the best of bourgeois morality. The student movement was thus contradictory, and unable to achieve its best side, for autonomy and morality alone could not find nor build a social structure in opposition. (viii)



Firstly, it may reasonably be concluded that Chapter Three has throughout provided support for the argument that the Australian radical student movement fought for liberation rather than a particular ideology such as socialism. Secondly, Chapter Three was able to show the student activists as persons who had definite aims regarding two issues in particular: the abolition of conscription and withdrawal of Australian troops from Vietnam. Thirdly, the Chapter was also able to provide support for the argument that activists were 'part of the production of capitalism ... its patterns of consumption, and its division of mental and manual labour'. Further, the 'contradiction' that many students were both part of this system yet opposed to its function, did, as Chapter Three showed, result in the movement not achieving 'its best side'. After all, 'autonomy and morality alone could not find nor build a social structure in opposition'. (viii) Capitalism, in a modified form, won out over radical culture.

The hypothesis of this thesis was that the emergence and decline of the Australian radical student movement of the late 1960s, early 1970s, was the product of a highly complex set of international and local social, political, economic and historical factors.

Consideration of international and local social political, economic and historical factors has threaded Chapter Three, using the writer's style of providing fact and interpretation. Chapter Three has supported this hypothesis.

Footnotes for Chapter Three

1. For a conservative account of the black American students' struggle from the early 1960s to 1972 see S.M. Lipset, Rebellion in the University, Routledge and Kegan Paul, U.K., 1972. More empathetic sources of elucidation may be found in K. Keniston, Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth, Harvest, N.Y., 1968; and by the same author, Youth and Dissent: the Rise of a New Opposition, Harvest, N.Y., 1971. A more recent source book by Todd Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left, Univ. of Cal. Press, 1980, provides useful background information on the black and white students' early protests on racial issues and relationship with the media.
2. These writers are the bright stars of a much wider galaxy of authors on revolutionary theory and practice who closely related their lives and researches into the blacks' struggle against exploitation and racism. See Che Guevara, Reminiscences of the Cuban Revolutionary War, Pelican, U.S.A., 1968; Regis Debray, Strategy for Revolution, Penguin, U.K., 1973; George Jackson, Soledad Brother, Penguin, U.S. of A., 1971; Eldridge Cleaver, Soul on Ice, Panther Books, London, 1968; and Post-prison Writings and Speeches, Panther Books, London, 1971; Bobby Seale, Seize the Time: the Story of the Black Panther Party, Arrow Books, U.K., 1970; Malcolm X., The Autobiography of Malcolm X, N.Y., 1965; Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, Grove Press, N.Y., 1965; Stokeley Carmichael, in David Cooper (ed.), The Dialectics of Liberation, Pelican, U.K., 1968.
3. Australian Union of Students, Aboriginal Affairs Department, Aboriginal Quarterly, Vol.1-2, Nat. Lib., Canberra, 1968-9. Australian Union of Students, Annual Reports, Annual Councils, (under Aboriginal Affairs), Nat. Lib., Canberra, 1969-1974.
4. For a closer look at traditional student political life at the University of Melbourne, 1920s - 1960s, see Chapter 2.
5. Lipset, op.cit., p.13.
6. Student involvement in these political movements, and others, are referenced and documented in Fred Halliday, 'Students of the World Unite', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn, (eds.), Student Power, Penguin, U.K. 1969, pp.287-326.
7. For an excellent account of this struggle see A. Benton Fields, Student Politics in France, Basic Books, N.Y., 1970; esp. pp. 32-40
8. F. Halliday, Student Power, Penguin, U.K., 1969, pp. 291-292.
9. J. Gretton, Students and Workers: An Analytical Account of Dissent in France May-June 1968, Macdonald, London, 1969, p.17.

10. D.J. Mabry, The Mexican University and the State: Student Conflicts 1910-1971, Texas A and M University Press, College Station, U.S.A., 1982.
11. Halliday, op.cit., p.292.
12. Philippines: ABC Radio (Sydney). Report From Asia, October 1983. Iran: Events leading to Islamic Revolution, 1979. Witnessed violent student demonstration between pro and anti-Shah students, Perugia, Italy. One student killed. China: Beijing marches, ABC TV News, January 1987. Latin America: Levy, D. in Altbach, P. ibid., pp.186-214. France: ABC TV News, Paris student marches, December 1986. Chile: print and video reportage, 1973-1987. P. Altbach, ibid., pp.1-15.
13. Halliday, op.cit., p.298. M. Shimbori, in P. Altbach, op.cit., pp.119-137.
14. Refer Chapter 1, passim.
15. See footnote 126.
16. Halliday, op.cit., pp.310-317. Gitlin, op.cit., (index SDS). W. Wolff-Dietrich, in P. Altbach (ed.), op.cit., pp.103-119.
17. Clubs and Societies Minutes, LTU SRC, 1968; University of Melbourne Clubs and Societies Minutes, SRC, 1968.
18. Halliday, op.cit., pp.311-312. Lipset, op.cit., p. 13.
19. Press report 1981. Halliday, op.cit., p.314. Statera, op.cit., (index).
20. Halliday, op.cit., pp 311-312.
21. Ayn Rand, 'The Cashing in: The Student Rebellion', in The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution. Signet, N.Y., 1970, p.34.
22. Mario Savio, quoted from Larry Spence, Berkeley: 'What it Demonstrates', in Studies on the Left, Winter 1965. In Arena, 13, Melbourne, 1967.
23. Kingsley Davis, 'The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict', in American Sociological Review, August 1940, p.535.
24. Gianni Statera, Death of a Utopia: Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe. O.U.P., N.Y., 1975, pp.3-44.
25. The following are selected references towards understanding the student revolutionary's role in Marxist terms. Paul Cardan, 'For a Modern Revolutionary Movement', in his Modern Capitalism and Revolution, A Solidarity Book, Bromley, Kent, U.K., pp.89-90. A. Quottrocchi, and T. Nairn, The Beginning of the End,

Panther Books, U.K., 1968. Provides an ideological background to the Paris student uprising, May 1968. Fritz Pappenheim, The Alienation of Modern Man, Monthly Review Press, N.Y., 1968. Places modern humanity in a neo-Marxist setting of alienation from the material and intellectual process of production. See Chapters 1 and 5. Ernest Mandel, The Revolutionary Student Movement, Socialist Youth Alliance, Sydney, N.S.W., 1969; wherein Mandel argued a defence of the Marxist concept of the indispensable integration of theory and practice in student revolutionary action, p.1. G. and D. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism: the Left-Wing Alternative, Penguin, U.K., 1969. The classic analysis of the 1968 Paris uprising in a neo-Marxist-anarchist genre, pp.41-48, 116-119, 114. Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964. Regarded with awe by Melbourne radical students as a foremost neo-Marxist theorist who popularised orthodox Marxism into an ideology that related student intellectual labour to the modern capitalist and class system. Richard Gordon, (ed.), The Australian New Left, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970. Contains articles by Australian student ideologues in a Marxist vein. See articles by Dennis Altman, 'Students in the Electric Age'; Richard Gordon and Warren Osmond, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left'; Dan O'Neill, 'Intellectuals and Radical Social Change'. Michael Hyde, (ed.), It Is Right to Rebel, Free Association Press, Marrickville, N.S.W., 1972. The Introduction clearly relates the intellectual labour of students with the struggle of the industrial proletariat, p.2.

26. See footnotes 23 and 25.
27. Statera, op.cit., pp. 38-39
28. Donald McRae, in H.W. Laqueur and G. Mosse, (eds.), Education and Social Structure in the Twentieth Century, Harper Torch Books, N.Y., 1967, pp.7-8.
29. W. Laqueur, 'Reflections on Youth Movements', Commentary, 47, (June 1969), pp.34-36.
30. T. Roszak, The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition, Faber and Faber, London, 1971.
31. For example, 'Such developments...appealing?' p.40.
32. Charles Reich, The Greening of America, Random House, N.Y., 1970. pp 4-5.
33. In looking through past issues of News Weekly for purposes of this thesis, I was amused at the fanatical consistency of News Weekly. For example, week after week, a photograph of Darce Cassidy would appear (a member of Worker Student Alliance) under which was captioned, 'Darce Cassidy - Communist'.

34. The late Professor Hugo Wolfsohn (Politics, La Trobe University) wrote a book entitled The Ideology Makers which drew out how leading figures such as Archbishops, politicians and academics, shape and reinforce the ideology of the status quo in Australia.
35. Dan O'Neill, 'Student Movement Strategy', ALR, 2, 1969, p.52. See also Brian Laver, 'Behind Student Action', ALR, No.3, June-July 1968.
36. Warren Osmond in an article 'Workers Control, Student Power', in ALR, No.5, 1969, p.55.
37. Ibid.
38. Worker-Student Alliance, 1969-1972. A student-union organisation based at Monash and La Trobe Universities.
39. Geoff Sharp, 'A Revolutionary Culture', Editorial, Arena, 16, 1969, pp.2-12.
40. Keniston, op.cit., pp.376-378.
41. Keniston, op.cit., pp.379-381. Reich, op.cit.; Rubin, op.cit.; Roszak, op.cit.; Hoffman, op.cit.
42. Z. Brezezinski, Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technocratic Era, Viking Press, N.Y., 1970, p.108.
43. Reich, op.cit., p.1.
44. N. McLean, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
45. If one is to appreciate such historical parallels: D. Caute (ed.), Essential Writings of Karl Marx, Panther, London, 1967, pp.76, 195, 196, 222-4. Plato, The Republic, H.D.P. Lee (trans.), Penguin, U.K., 1955. M. Cary, A History of Rome, Macmillan, London, 1962; especially chapters 'Domestic Politics in the Second Century' (XVIII); 'Roman Society in the Second Century' (XIX). M. Curtis, The Great Political Theories, Vol.1 and 2, Avon Books, N.Y., 1962.
46. N. Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millenium, Paladin, U.K., 1970.
47. Cohn, op.cit., p.286.
48. G.F.E. Rude, The Crowd in History: A study of popular disturbances in England and France 1730-1848, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1981.
49. Ideology and Popular Protest, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1980.
50. Rude, The Crowd in History:, pp 9-11

51. Beginnings. Documentary film produced by Rod Bishop, Gordon Glenn, LTU, 1971.
52. Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia chaired by Sir Leslie Martin. (Martin Report) Report to the Australian Universities Commission, Melb. Govt. Printer, 1964-5. 3 Vols. Quote: "It is both realistic and useful to regard education as a form of investment in human capital". p.4, vol.1.
53. Cockburn and Blackburn, op.cit., p.9.
54. M. Hyde, It Is Right to Rebel, Free Association Press, Marrickville, N.S.W., 1972, p.2.
55. Hyde, op.cit., p.8.
56. H. McQueen, 'Three Tactics for Student Power', Arena, 18, 1969, p.19.
57. Hyde op.cit., pp.51-53.
58. D. White, 'Cultural Revolution in Victoria?', Arena, 24, 1971, pp.14-16.
59. See Bibliography. National U., A.U.S., 97 Drummond Street, Carlton, March 1972.
60. J. Spigelman, 'Student Activism in Australia', Vestes, FAUSA, Vol.11, 1968.
61. Ibid., p. 124.
62. B. Abbey and B. Catley, 'Universities: the Neo-capitalist Context', Arena, 21, 1970, p.26.
63. E. Mandel, 'The New Revolutionary Vanguard', Black Dwarf, (anarchist journal), no.2, 1968.
64. I. Illich, De-Schooling Society, Calder and Boyers, London, 1971.
65. R. Neville, Play-Power, Cape, London, 1970. J. Rubin, Do It: Scenarios of the Revolution, Intro. by Eldridge Cleaver. Depicts political philosophy of Youth International Party ('Yippies'). Simon and Schuster, N.Y., 1970.
66. Official Year Book of Commonwealth of Australia, No.58, Govt. Printer, Canberra, 1972, p.165.
67. Commonwealth Year Book, No.53, 1967, p.884. Commonwealth Year Book, No.59, 1973, p.747.
68. Commonwealth Year Book, No.53, 1967, pp.1185-6. Commonwealth Year Book, No.59, 1973, pp.703-4.

69. Ibid.
70. Commonwealth Year Book, No.59, 1973, pp.648-9. For additional information re demographic implications, see B.K. Hyams and B. Bessant, Schools for the People?: An Introduction to the History of the State Education in Australia, Longman, Melbourne, 1972, pp.172-5.
71. Ian Turner, 'Conflicting Conceptions of a New University', in Arena, No.3, Autumn 1964, p.4. Turner was Senior Lecturer in History at Victoria's Monash University.
72. Ibid., p.7.
73. Under a pseudonym of M.O. Kalange, in 'Academics and Big Business', Arena, No.3, Autumn 1964, pp.8-15.
74. Victoria, Committee on State Education in Victoria, Ramsay Report, Victorian Government Printer, Melbourne, 1960.
75. Ibid., p.171.
76. Geoff Sharp posed this question in 'The End of Education?' in Arena, No.13, 1967, p.5.
77. Rex Mortimer, writing as a post-graduate student at Monash University, in 'Democracy and the New Capitalism', Arena, No.15, 1968, p.56.
78. One of the concerns of La Trobe University's present Vice-Chancellor, Professor John Scott, has been the clear lack of interdisciplinary studies. He has suggested, for example, the possibility of a common first year for undergraduates.
79. The V.C. wrote to Sir Henry Bolte (Premier of Victoria) on 17 September 1970:  
On the evidence available to us at this point in time (statements by reputable witnesses and injuries sustained by students as reported by the University Physician) there is reason for believing that on 16 September the Police may have used undue violence against the students in a demonstration which, up to that stage, is reported to have been peaceful and without incident.  
In view of these circumstances it seems appropriate for us to request that a thorough inquiry should be instituted under your authority....  
This letter has been written after a long discussion with the Deans and other senior officers of the University who unanimously endorse its contents.  
Yours sincerely,  
(D.M. Myers)  
Vice-Chancellor.

The University Council endorsed the V.C.'s action (La Trobe University Council Minutes, 21 September 1970, and the Chancellor, Sir Archibald Glenn, conveyed Council's position to the Premier by letter (LTU Registry Archives). V.P.D. records a full debate of the above actions. V.P.D., V299 (1970), pp.307-327). For Waterdale Road demonstrations: the Age, 24 September 1970, Sydney Morning Herald, 17 September 1970, Rabelais (LTU SRC), 25 September 1970.

80. Herald, Melbourne, 29 July 1982, p.4.
81. Interviews, notes, LTU, 1984-86.
82. The value of this perception depends on whether one is talking about a society's ideologies and institutions as they are, or said or ought to be, and how they really are. In any case, for elaboration on this aspect, see Lipset, op.cit., p.35.
83. Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1968, p.47.
84. Hyde, op.cit., p.51.
85. 'LTU SRC Constitutional Changes'. Incorporated by referendum, SRC Constitution, 1971.
86. New York Tribune, 15 August 1967.
87. D. Treisman, 'The CIA and Student Politics', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds.), ibid., pp.141-159.
88. R. Gordon and W. Osmond, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in R. Gordon (ed.), The Australian New Left: Critical Essays and Strategy, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970, p.5.
89. Ibid. pp.5-6.
90. Ibid.
91. Albert Langer, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
92. Michael Hyde, Interview, tape, St. Kilda, 1986.
93. D. Nadel, Interview, Warrnambool, tape, 1986.
94. Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament.
95. Dave Nadel, Interview, tape, Warrnambool, 1986.
96. The invasion of both countries by the Soviet Union. Also Gordon and Osmond, op.cit., p.13.



97. Patrick O'Brien, The Saviours: An Intellectual History of the Left in Australia, Primary Education Pub., Melb., 1977.
98. Ibid., pp.35-65.
99. Rex Mortimer, Problems of the Australian Left, Outlook Pubn., 1968, p.4. Humphrey McQueen, 'A Single Spark', Arena, 16, 1968, p.51.
100. Secretary's Report, Annual Meeting A.I.C.D. (Sydney), 19 June 1967, pp.2-3.
101. 'Match for the Stars and Stripes', Arena, 14, 1967, pp.15-17.
102. Harry van Moorst, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986, priv.avail.
103. Previous references in Chapter Three provide evidence of this development. However, the following are also valuable sources: Bob Neild, and Chris O'Connell, 'Profile of an Activist', Honi Soit, 18 March 1969 (on formation of Sydney SDS). Christopher Rootes, 'Australian Student Radicals - The Nature and Origins of Dissent', Honours Thesis, University of Queensland Government Department, 1969. Michael Hamel-Green, 'Beyond Pity', Melbourne University Magazine, 1969, pp.55-61. Dan O'Neill, 'The Growth of the Radical Student Movement', Semper Floreat, Uni. Q'ld Student Union, 17 March 1969. Michael Jones, 'The Radical 200', Quadrant, July-August 1968, pp.22-24.
104. See interviews: A Langer, M. Hamel-Green, H. van Moorst, M. Hyde throughout this thesis.
105. K. Keniston, Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition, Harvest, N.Y., 1971.
106. Ibid., pp.viii-ix.
107. Keniston, op.cit.,; Keniston, op.cit.
108. Keniston, Young Radicals:, p.4
109. Ibid., pp.8-9.
110. Ibid., pp.12-13.
111. N. McLean, Interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
112. Michael Hyde, Interview, op.cit.
113. Brian Pola, Interview, Sydney, 1986, script avail.
114. Lipset, op.cit.
115. Lipset, ibid., pp.80-102.

116. Lipset, *ibid.*, chapter 1, pp.3-38.
117. Keniston, *op.cit.*, p.146.
118. Horne, *op.cit.*, pp.51-69.
119. Michael Hyde, *Interview*, *op.cit.*
120. Albert Langer, *Interview*, *op.cit.*
121. Albert Langer, *Interview*, *Ibid.*
122. Barry York, *Sources of Student Dissent: La Trobe University, 1967-72*, unpub. paper, 1984. Brian Pola, 'Student Protest in the 70s'. Two articles in *Rabelais*, La Trobe University SRC, Vol.16, No.19; Vol.16, No.10; 1983.
123. Brian Pola, 'From Pentridge Prison', *Rabelais*, La Trobe University SRC, June 1972. Kenneth White, 'From Prison', *Rabelais*, La Trobe University SRC, 3, 1972, p.6., *Rabelais*, 2, 7 March 1972, pp.1-2.
124. Donald Horne, *Time of Hope: Australia 1966-1972*, Angus and Robertson, 1980. *Passim*.
125. Abbie Hoffman, *Revolution For the Hell of It*, Dial Press, N.Y., 1968. James S. Kunen, *The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary*, Random House, N.Y., 1969. Norman Mailer, *The Armies of the Night*, Weidenfeld/Nicholson, London, 1968. Richard Neville, *Playpower*, Cape, London, 1970. Jerry Rubin, *Do It: Scenarios of a Revolution*, Simon and Schuster, N.Y., 1970.
126. Carl Davidson, 'Campaigning on the Campus', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds.), *op.cit.*, pp.327-367. Colin Crouch, *The Student Revolt*, Bodley Head, U.K., 1970. Lipset, *op.cit.*, Cohn-Bendit, *op.cit.* For Australia, the following is a selective list of sources that detail the university base of the student movement and how student protesters related campus issues to national issues of politics, justice, class, foreign policy and government. Percy Allen, 'The Student Revolt in Australia', *Honi Soit*, Sydney, 19 September 1969, p.6. Dennis Altman, 'Party Youth Groups in Australia', in Henry Mayer (ed.), *Australian Politics: A Second Reader*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1969, pp.176-186. Dennis Altman, 'Students in the Electric Age', *Arena*, No.21, 1970, pp.3-18. Rowan Cahill, 'The Seventeen Days that Shook the Campus', *Honi Soit*, . 5 April 1968, pp.8-9. Peter Cole-Adams, 'Reform of Society, or Revolution?', *Age*, 22 May 1969, p.6 (interviews with Jim Spigelman, Albert Langer, Harry van Moorst, Warren Osmond). Bob Connell, 'The University as a Civil War', *The Recorder*, Sydney University Union, Vol.49, No.1, 12 March 1969, pp.5-6. Grant Evans, 'The Radical Movement at La Trobe', *Rabelais*, 8 August 1969, pp.8-9. Five Monash University Radicals, 'What's Wrong with Australia?', in Henry Mayer (ed.), *Australian Politics: A Second Reader*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1969, pp.187-193. Bruce Guerin, 'From Apathy to Student

- Power', The Advertiser, Adelaide, 21 March 1969, p.2. John Hallows, 'The Student Revolution', The Australian, 13 June 1968, p.9. Michael Hamel-Green, 'Theory and Practice of the Student New Left', Tribune, 12 March 1969, p.6. Grant Hannan, 'Campus Revolt on a Global Scale', Tribune, 10 July 1968, pp.6-7.
127. Rabelais, La Trobe University SRC, 15 May 1969, p.4.
128. Rabelais (Ed.), 19 June 1969, p.2; 8 August 1969, pp.8-9; 20 March 1969, p.4; 31 June 1969, p.3.
129. See article on involvement by La Trobe Student Bill Hartley, former State Secretary Victorian ALP 1969, Rabelais, No.3, 1972, p.11. See also La Trobe student involvement in by-law 418 protest, Rabelais, 21 April 1969, p.2; an article by Rod Bishop on the 'Style of the New Left', Rabelais, 20 March 1969, p.4. For La Trobe student involvement in anti-Vietnam war Moratoriums see Rabelais, 1 September 1970, p.5; Rabelais, June 1970, p.4; La Trobe academic staff involvement in Moratorium, Rabelais, April 1970; philosophy and strategy behind removal of Defence Department officials from La Trobe, Rabelais, 26 June 1970, p.5; open letter from Long Bay Gaol written by Hamel-Green (Monash University), MacDonald (La Trobe), Landau (Sydney), Jones (Sydney), Dowling (La Trobe), to Tom Hughes, Federal Attorney-General, Canberra, Rabelais, 1 September 1970, p.4.
130. See footnote 129.
131. A personal reminiscence.
132. For some general comments on why Australian students protested, see K. Rowley, 'Why Students Protest', Farrago, 1 May 1970, pp.16-17. James Spigelman, 'Student Activism in Australia', Vestes, Vol.XI, No.2, July 1968, pp.107-118. 'Student Activism', Australian Left Review, August-September 1968, pp.30-38, 43-53, (Interviews with Douglas Kirsner, Grant Hannan, Rowan Cahill, Brian Aarons, Mitch Thompson, Peter Duncan and Peter O'Brien). Tony Morgan and David Taylor, 'Why We are Revolting', Tharunka, 24 October 1968, pp.12-17. The above literature reveals that students of the period rarely protested about issues solely concerned with their direct benefit. The issues were related to conscience, ethics, justice, and took the form of action against imperialism, racism and exploitation. For La Trobe University, see Red Moat (published by La Trobe Worker Student Alliance) for the period 1970-1972 (priv.avail.).
133. Antonioni, M., 1970 'Zabriskie Point'.
134. Nichols, M., 1967 'The Graduate'.
135. Hopper, D., 1969 'Easy Rider'.

136. B. York, 'Sources of Student Unrest in Australia with Particular Reference to La Trobe University, 1967-1972'. (MA Thesis, University of Sydney, 1985), App. 3, p.383; Chapter Three.
137. Horne, op.cit., pp.44-45.
138. See, for example, emphasis on demonstration strategy in interviews with A. Langer, M. Hyde, van Moorst, Chapter 1.
139. R. Bishop, 'New Left', Rabelais, 20 March 1969, p.4. I. MacDonald, 'Moratorium', Rabelais, June 1970, p.4. A. Campbell, 'Against Student Participation', Rabelais, 19 April 1971, p.12. B. York, 'Rationality and Persuasion', Rabelais, 9 September 1971, p.2. G. Evans, 'The Radical Movement', Rabelais, 8 August 1969, pp.8-9.
140. Keniston, op.cit., p.152.
141. Rabelais, 24 March 1971, p.5.
142. Rubin, op.cit., Hoffman, op.cit.
143. Rabelais, 24 March 1971, p.5.
144. Refer to university student newspapers and political club pamphlets, Bibliography.
145. Australian Left Review, (ALR) Marxist journal of review published by Communist Party of Australia, No.4, 1968, pp.30-39.
145. Ibid.
147. In the U.S.A. the work of Kenneth Keniston revealed this clearly. See his Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition, Harvest, N.Y., 1971, p.152. Also his Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth, Harvest, 1968, chapter 2, pp.60-67. Also, Richard Flacks, 'Liberated Generation: An exploration of the Roots of Student Protest', in Peter Rose (ed.), The Study of Society, (2nd edn.), Random House, N.Y., esp. p.945.
148. Donald Horne, Time of Hope: Australia 1966-1972, Angus and Robertson, 1980, ch.5, 'Affluence - and the Rise of the New Middle Class', pp.83-100.
149. Bob Birrell was a lecturer in Sociology at Monash University in 1970.
150. Bob Birrell, 'Student Attitudes to the Left', Arena, 24, 1971, pp.57-67.
151. Ibid., pp.61-62.
152. Ibid., p.62.

153. In addition to Keniston's studies in the U.S. of A. (ibid.), for surveys on the motivating factors of radical U.S. students see: (a) Richard Flacks, 'The Liberated Generation', Journal of Social Issues, July, 1967. (b) 'Youth in Turmoil', in Fortune, Time-Life Books, N.Y., 1969, chapter 3. (c) Newsweek, 2 June 1969, p.39; wherein 10 per cent of students saw themselves as being radical. (d) Playboy, October 1970, p.57.
154. Birrell, op.cit., pp.63-64.
155. Birrell, Ibid., p.64.
156. From my observations of radicals at La Trobe, a disproportionate number came from the Arts based schools, that is, School of Social Sciences and School of Humanities.
157. Birrell, op.cit., p.64.
158. See Bibliography under Theses.
159. Birrell, 'High School Attitudes to the Left', Arena, 27, 1971, pp.49-64.
160. Birrell, op.cit., pp.63-64.
161. An organization of radical secondary school students of about 150 students based in 21 Melbourne schools by 1968.
162. Tabloid Underground. Periodical of Students in Dissent, October 1968.
163. See Letters to the Editor, the Age, 18 October 1968.
164. Ubique Underground. University High School, Parkville, student publication, 1968, No.6.
165. Ubique Underground, ibid.
161. Pravda was a Peninsula Underground Paper distributed in 1968-1969 in Melbourne secondary schools.
167. Hedonism in the form of libertarian socialism was embraced by many radicals. Others, such as the Worker-Student Alliance and strict Marxist-Leninist-Maoists tended to frown on overt hedonism, particularly drug experimentation.
168. For an excellent analysis of the commune and its role in revolutionary praxis, see Hannah Arendt, On Revolution, Viking Press, N.Y., 1983, esp., pp.247-251.
169. S. Burgoyne, 'the World Youth Festival', ALR, No. 1, 1969, pp.47-48
170. Horne, op.cit., p.3.

171. Sir Arthur Rylah, Chief Secretary and Deputy Premier, Victoria, 1955-1971.
172. Tharunka, University of New South Wales student paper 1970; cited in D. Horne, Time of Hope: Australia 1966-1972, Angus and Robertson, 1980, p.19.
173. Humorously related in D. Horne, op.cit., p.20.
174. Horne, Ibid.
175. Horne, Ibid., pp.17-20.
176. Horne, Ibid., pp.23-26.
177. Kate Millett, Sexual Politics, Rupert Hart-Davis, London, 1971.
178. Germaine Greer, The Female Eunuch, MacGibbon and Kee, London, 1970.
179. M. Hyde, Interview, op.cit.
180. Minutes of proceedings of Greg Weir Defence Committee, 1973-1981, Australian Gay Archives Inc., 144 Adderley Street, West Melbourne.
181. Hamel-Green, in King (ed.), Australia's Vietnam: Australia in the Second Indo-china War. George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983. pp.100-102.
182. Hamel-Green, op.cit., p.106.
183. Ibid., p.106.
184. Ibid., p.107.
185. Ibid., p.113.
186. Gordon and Osmond, in Gordon (ed.), op.cit., pp.28-29.
187. Together with DRM (Draft Resisters' Movement), SOS (Save Our Sons) and SDS, mounted sit-ins, raids on government offices. See Hamel-Green, ibid., pp.112-117.
188. Richard Gordon and Warren Osmond in The Australian New Left, op.cit., p.29, analyse this event.
189. On the formation of Sydney SDS see Bob Nield and Chris O'Connell, 'Profile of an Activist', Honi Soit, 18 March 1969; and Mike Jones and Chris O'Connell in Honi Soit, 5 April 1968.

190. From an early SDA leaflet, University of Queensland, St. Lucia. Also, for an account of the Brisbane movement, see Semper Floreat (University of Queensland student paper) 17 March 1969, an article entitled 'The Growth of the Radical Student Movement', by Dan O'Neill.
191. Todd Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left, Univ. Cal. Press, 1980.
192. A. Langer, Interview, op.cit.
193. Cohn-Bendit, op.cit., pp.45-46.
194. Horne, op.cit., pp.160-161.
195. J. Halloran, P. Elliot and G. Murdock, Demonstrations and Communications: A Case Study, Penguin, U.K., 1970. E. Windschuttle (ed.), Fixing the News: Critical Perspectives on the Australian Media, Cassell, North Ryde, 1981.
196. Halloran and Elliot, op.cit., pp.300-301. Windshuttle, op.cit., pp.178-181.
197. Horne, op.cit., p.178.
198. Sozialistische Deutsche Studentbund (SDS). For a brief history see Fred Halliday, 'Students of the World Unite', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds.), Student Power, Penguin, U.K., 1969, pp.310-317.
199. Factors behind the rapid decline of the student New Left as a militant force in campus protests after 1970: Gianni Statera, Death of a Utopia: The Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe, O.U.P., N.Y., 1975; Philip G. Altbach, Student Politics: Perspectives for the Eighties, Scarecrow Press, N.J., 1981.
200. On the rise of the Weathermen (later Weather Underground), and other Left splinter groups after the American SDS collapse of June 1969, see K. Sale, SDS, Random House, N.Y., 1973, pp.455-650; H. Jacobs (ed.), Weatherman, Berkeley, Calif., Ramparts Press, 1970, specific articles. For information about what happened to the various Weather activists such as Bernardine Dorhn and Mark Rudd from 1970-1980 see T. Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left, Univ. Calif. Press, 1980.
201. Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills in, Irving Louis Horowitz (ed.), Power, Politics and People, Ballantine, N.Y., 1963, pp.257-8.
202. F. Parkin, Middle Class Radicalism: The social bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Manchester University Press, U.K., 1968.

203. Parkin, op.cit., p.2.
204. Ibid., p.47.
205. Ibid., p.94.
206. Ibid., p.96.
207. Ibid., p.99.
208. A Gramsci, The Modern Prince and Other Writings, Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., London, 1957.
209. Gramsci, op.cit., p.121.
210. Ibid.
211. S. Aronowitz and H. Giroux (eds.), Education Under Seige: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1985.
212. Aronowitz and Giroux, op.cit., p.35.
213. K. Marx and Frederick Engels, The Communist Manifesto, Penguin Books, U.K., 1967, p.102.
214. Marx and Engles, op.cit., p.91.
215. D. Bell, The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting, Penguin Books, U.K., 1976.
216. Bell, op.cit., p.28.
217. G. Sharp and D. White, 'Features of the Intellectually Trained', Arena, No. 15, 1968, p.30.
218. Sharp and White, op.cit., p.30.
219. Ibid., p.32.
220. M. Foucault, French social scientist and historian of ideas, 1926-1984.
221. P. Rabinow (ed.), The Foucault Reader, Penguin Books, U.K., 1986, p.74.
222. Rabinow, op.cit., pp.74-75.



CHAPTER FOUR

Epilogue and Conclusion

Chapter Four is divided into two main sections, the first an Epilogue, the second the Conclusion to the thesis.

The Epilogue itself is divided into two sub-sections:

- (i) The Australian Union of Students
- (ii) The Activists of 1966-1972.

EPILOGUE AND CONCLUSION

(i) The Australian Union of Students

The events at La Trobe were part of the national political picture of the period. In March 1972, Ken Newcombe (President, the Australian Union of Students), Ian MacDonald and I were agreed that the freezing of SRC funds had national implications for student unionism. The AUS, at that time, received one dollar for every student enrolled at an affiliated tertiary institution, and this levy was the AUS' main source of income. The AUS reached the height of its influence in the period 1970-1975, led by an Executive well to the Left of mainstream labour politics. The financial state of the Union was never really secure, despite an expanding number of affiliates, and any time was a good time to undermine the AUS financially, should an organised opposition wish to do so.

The power of the Union had been the envy of student DLP and Liberal Party oriented clubs, particularly students with NCC empathies. Senator Gair, DLP, had condemned the AUS for organising the anti-Springbok demonstrations in 1971, (1) and the NCC, Country Party and Returned Services League were critical of the AUS for its anti-Vietnam war and anti-National Service Act policies. (2) The churches, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, were aghast at the AUS policies of liberalisation of laws on abortion and homosexuality. (3) Newcombe, MacDonald and I believed that La Trobe University was to be the first of a set of dominoes to establish a case for the cessation of payment of fees to the AUS. In 1975, Professor Wolfsohn informed me that a major struggle of the DLP/NCC and Liberal Party was to destroy the AUS through disaffiliations and financial strangulation. Terry Monagle (Democratic Club, LTU) also informed Newcombe that this was the policy. The hard campaign fought at La Trobe in 1973 against a Democratic/Liberal Club/Moderate Student Alliance sponsored disaffiliation from the AUS, evidenced this strategy. In the 1980s, it was still the strategy of

conservative student groups on Australian campuses, and one must admit it has been successful.

So important do the conservatives see the universities that as recently as 1982, B.A. Santamaria fought off a Victorian Supreme Court challenge over an internal NCC power struggle with several industrial officers who desired NCC resources to be directed into the factories. But Santamaria saw the future direction of the NCC as lying with the universities - the leaders of the twenty-first century. I know of several NCC operatives at La Trobe in the 1980s whose functions are not only information gathering for the NCC but also for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO).

The erosion of the AUS also occurred with the complicity of Liberal/National Party Governments in the States and nationally from 1975-1982, particularly through the Australian Liberal Students' Federation, (endorsed by Malcolm Fraser) and the Australian Union of Jewish Students.

In 1972, the issue of financial autonomy at La Trobe was really a testing ground for a national campaign to destroy the radical Left, or the Left Alliance as it came to be called, and the luke-warm leadership of the AUS in the early 1980s bore testimony to a fear of disaffiliations by conservative campuses. Ironically, radicals were so disenchanted that they too threatened to secede. (4)

Neil McLean, President, AUS 1972-3, was, and perhaps more importantly, remains, a radical activist. McLean, interviewed in 1986, reflected on the work of the AUS:

AUS was important to student radicalism. It's certainly a great shame there isn't a union now, even just from the point of view of the immediate interests of students. For all the limitations of A.U.S. it still had important positive qualities. The important contribution of A.U.S. to the period we're looking at was the network and resources, the back-up

organisation. It had money, it had people staked out all over the joint. It had its own printing presses, media unit and hundreds of thousands of dollars to spend. People could travel, it could fund programs, radical programs. The things we did through the A.U.S. were partly because we were unrestricted by a very big constituency that permitted us to act. We were not troubled by any opposition forces of the conservative kind or the left kind or of any kind. We were not restrained by legal constraint or pressures from authorities or anything. We had an open go. It was a field day. Where as what happened to them in the mid 70's was they got into one mine field after another. The internal unity of the Union went. The rightist forces were activated. Massive amounts of legal action were used against the Union. So there it was.

The A.U.S. developed ties with South East Asian students in Australia with links to their own parties, student communists who were active in Australia at the time, such as Malaysian students. Hishamuddin Rais for instance, and the O.S.S. (Overseas Students' Service). O.S.S. figured prominently, particularly when tied in with the Asian Students' Association.

The AUS played an important part in the Springbok, demos and it joined in with everybody. It also played an important part in the siege of Melbourne University in 1970; it was a national movement, it had name, structure, and relative unity.

We provided them with back-up, by involving workers and students in large numbers who were energetically and politically tough. AUS mobilised students around the country, co-ordinated the students' side, got people to demonstrations, and held meetings. It's significance of value was not that of great initiator or leader, but as an institutional focus. A lot of other groups had more radical images, but we had a certain legitimacy, and carried the cause for the wider circle of students.  
(5)

Campus activism had deflated swiftly after Whitlam's election in 1972. His Government fulfilled many student demands. Within forty-eight hours of his election, Whitlam abolished conscription, freed the draft resisters and began to bring the troops home from Vietnam. The student Left divided after his victory, and various persuasions went along their different ideological paths.

Some students believed that the assassination of the student spirit was completed on 11 November 1975, the day Whitlam was dismissed. Perhaps Whitlam could have mobilised students that day if he had thought to or wanted to. The President of the A.C.T.U., Bob Hawke, had made a general appeal to 'cool it', and averted a national strike. It seems that Whitlam's lack of decisive action, outside of the institutionalised and desecrated parliamentary processes, in so meekly accepting his dismissal, produced a similar lack of will in students. Saigon and Canberra had fallen within six months of each other. On the Left it bred aimlessness, and on the Right, opportunism.

The realities of the Whitlam government were brought home to me when, in 1974, a delegation of student leaders approached Bill Morrison (in 1988, Ambassador to Indonesia), as the then Minister for Foreign Affairs. Neil McLean, several others and I, had discussed the East Timor situation with Jose Ramos Horta (Fretelin representative) who sought independence for East Timor from Indonesia. Morrison was overheard to yell at his private secretary 'Oh no! Not those bloody students again!'. The victories at La Trobe were but a small part of a struggle to assert new found power, but it seemed that the new Federal government could afford to dispense with traditional support on a national basis, and abandon socialist solidarity. I find it amusing that in the 1980s, in the light of the Hawke, Keating, Richardson clique, that the Whitlam years are seen as 'radical'. Mildly reformist would be a more apt description. As for the Hawke years, it is early enough to put the right-wing reactionary tag on those.

A story throws light on this.

In 1985 I answered a knock on the front door and two ASIO officers identified themselves. They informed me that they had been instructed to seek out former Worker Student Alliance/Maoist activists with a view to finding out more about the Builders' Labourers' Federation. They told me they had tried to contact Robinson and York but had been

unsuccessful. After I insisted on being told where the officers' orders were coming from and getting no response, we said good-bye.

Obviously ASIO keep their files reasonably up to date, although I later applied for mine under the Freedom of Information Act only to be told nothing would be forthcoming. Nevertheless, when I was teaching in Ballarat in 1976, the Vicar-General of Catholic Education for the Diocese, Dr. George Pell, handed me a dossier that a local DLP member had provided. It had everything on it, right down to with whom, when and where I had had intimate relations, as well as a complete political history and a personality analysis. The lot. I had even been followed from hotel to hotel. Years after my public involvement, the ASIO-DLP-NCC network just could not leave me alone. The reason for the Ballarat incident was clearly intended to ruin my employment prospects. The reason for the ASIO visit to North Fitzroy was, I surmise, that either Hawke or Evans (Senator Evans, Attorney-General) wished to gain information to substantiate the case for the deregistration of the BLF. The BLF was a thorn in the side of the Hawke and Cain governments and a threat to the Prices and Incomes Accord, the corner-stone of the Hawke economic strategy. The BLF has since been deregistered. Several La Trobe activists have, at times, worked with the BLF, among them Bryan Boyd, Fergus Robinson and John Cummins. This was no secret. Boyd and Cummins were on T.V. several times being taken off building sites or bundled off to Pentridge. (6) Peter Cochrane had observed in 1986 that

We were all a bit crazy because we had to be. The one great comfort I take from those years. The extreme energy of the Maoists, and the end result of all the political campaigns at La Trobe, is that basically we were on the side of the goodies. The fact that we were extreme in the way we went about it might have done tactical damage along the way, but it didn't change the ultimate result, which in my view was simply that the committed core at La Trobe committed themselves heart and soul, and if that had a bit of youthful impetuosity about it that seems to be a minor thing. So that's the way I defend it. (7)

When the Whitlam government came to power on 13 December 1972, with it came the end of Australian involvement in Vietnam and conscription. The causes of the occupations and gaolings were closely linked to these national controversies and with their passing went much of the emotional and active impetus of the radical student movement at La Trobe and elsewhere. At La Trobe the leftovers of the WSA and the Maoists formed into a group called the Radical Student Movement (R.S.M.) but it was not like the 'old days'. (8) The student scene comprised an entirely new set of students who lacked the experience of Waterdale Road, 4 July, moratoriums and university protest. In addition, the Australian economic situation had worsened, and by 1973 'youth unemployment' had become endemic. As early as 1971, employment officers at Victoria's three universities reported a sharp fall in jobs available. (9) From the mid-1970s to the 1980s, these economic and political realities have not substantially altered.

The rise of the Right in 1976 on Australian campuses was a product of the disarray of the radicals, and an extension of conservative forces. Conservative groups moved to emasculate AUS. Between 1974 and 1976, AUS had used its resources to campaign on racism, sexism, homosexual rights, education, and international issues. But the Union, with its central base in a rambling row of Carlton terraces in Drummond Street, failed to produce local campus activism.

With the arrival of Malcolm Fraser as Prime Minister, a twenty year explosion in tertiary education ended. If Whitlam had the effect of discouraging student activism, Fraser took measures to actually stymie it. With the undermining of the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme (T.E.A.S.) students simply did not have the time for activism when they had to find part-time jobs. Others were forced to live at home where it was difficult to oppose parental values. The experience of living communally, which often radicalised student consciousness, was being lost.

The inheritors of the Left tradition were the Left Alliance, a group that could command 40 per cent of the AUS Council vote, but who ultimately lost the battle to save the AUS because of the combined rush to destruction of the Labor Left (AUS Management), Centre Unity, Liberals and NCC factions. (10) Disagreement and the road to destruction centered on the Middle East debate and whether the AUS should simply be an 'education and services' organisation or have policies and campaigns on a broad range of issues, such as international affairs and sexuality. La Trobe University's consistent position was to support Left Alliance, (11) and the University of Melbourne was basically Labor Left. By 'Labor Left' was meant those who started their post-AUS careers in the ALP Socialist Left: Julia Gillard, Andrew Watson, Bill Watson, Michael O'Connor and Andrew Scott. (12) At La Trobe, Left Alliance was led by Mark Johnstone, Greg Davis and Phillip Ablett, (13) the national convenor being a brilliant theoretician from the ANU, John Buchanan. (14)

Before Fraser and before Whitlam, in 1972, the AUS had 22 full-time paid political officers and a budget of 1.5 million dollars and was the cutting edge of Left-wing politics. (15) The collapse of the Union's travel company in 1979; its pro-P.L.O. policy, and such declarations as making 1984 the Year of the Lesbian, alienated a student electorate more concerned with surviving a three year degree course. Bob Santamaria of the NCC, the Australian Liberal Students' Federation, and the Australian Union of Jewish Students worked to destroy the AUS for they could not actually control it. (16) An effort by the Labor Left (Management) faction to grab the AUS' remaining 150,000 dollars and start their own union was narrowly averted in 1984, (17) just before the Union collapsed.

The AUS could not long survive sustained attacks from those student organisations which traditionally had been its bread and butter. Dan Hogan, University of Melbourne SRC President (1979) and Peter Costello, Monash Association of Students President (1979), were instrumental in advocating the abolition of the AUS. Costello went on to be an



industrial advocate for employers and Hogan a legal counsel for major commercial interests such as Myers.

During the declining years of the AUS, issues such as sexism, access to education, East Timor, uranium, overseas student fees, tuition fees, homosexuality and racism continued to be debated at such forums as the AUS Students' and International Affairs Conference (Adelaide, 3-5 September 1983) and a Commonwealth Students' Conference (Melbourne, 29-31 August, 1983), in addition to the Annual Councils of the AUS up until 1985. Debate, however, despite some advances, has done little to alter the reality of lack of access to education for many Australians. Higher education is still dominated by students from relatively well-to-do families, despite the number of tertiary students doubling several times during the past two decades. (18)

The AUS, one of the important forums to address such injustices was dismantled in 1985. The history of the demise of the AUS warrants a thesis of its own for the period 1975-1985.

The death of the 48 year old Union came when the results of a national poll were announced on 10 December, 1984, with a decision to abolish the AUS and establish a new union, with education, welfare and services as its priorities. (19) But a national student convention in Sydney, 16-19 December 1984 at the University of N.S.W., failed to form the new union. (20) CALPS (Council of Australian Labor Party Students), the national grouping of Labor Left which dominated the management of the old AUS, had previously argued for a new national body, but shifted ground when it realised it did not have the numbers to control the new body. (21) An attempt to create a new union came from right-wing elements in 1985, with the Australian Council of Tertiary Students (ACTS). (22) ACTS claimed to represent fifteen campuses, including the Universities of Melbourne, Sydney, N.S.W., Queensland, Macquarie University and N.S.W. Institute of Technology. One of its four executives was the President of the University of Sydney SRC, Mark Heyward, a member of the Liberal Party. (23) It had been intended to

engage Bill Royce, of the Liberal Students' Federation of Australia, as a Canberra lobbyist for ACTS, but by March 1985, two of its four executives had resigned and ACTS struggled to remain a national force.

The Liberal Students Federation of Australia is a growing force on campuses in the 1980s.

For Victorian tertiary students, a push from the University of Melbourne Labor Left to form a state based union, in September 1985, has been successful, although Left Alliance campuses such as La Trobe were reluctant to affiliate. The Victorian Student Union disassociated itself from ACTS, as did the Left Alliance. (24) Needless to say, the University of Melbourne Labor Left elected one of their own, Andrew Watson, president-elect of the VSU. (25) Late in 1986, a new group, the National Coalition of Students, claimed representatives on campuses all over Australia, including La Trobe, and seemed to be an organisation more to the liking of the Left Alliance, if its public condemnation by the Victorian Students Union is any indication. (26)

In 1988, there is a loose federation of State-based unions (including the Victorian Students' Union), styled as a National Union of Students, and dominated by CALPS representatives. The NUS finds Federal Government education policy very difficult to sell to the grass-roots in 1988.

Overall, the national, off-campus picture of the Australian student scene is one of disorganisation. Any worthwhile initiatives seem confined to the local campus level, which is, when one comes to think about it, where it all started years ago.

To summarise this discussion of the Australian Union of Students, we saw that the Union had grown into a large and powerful organisation by the early 1970s, with considerable influence on the development of radical policy initiatives on a wide range of education and social issues.

The discussion revealed that the Union became subject to an orchestrated attack from conservative student elements from the early 1970s, an attack which strengthened throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, so that by 1985, the Union was no longer able to sustain itself, and so officially dissolved itself. The conservative organisations responsible for this attack included the Australian Liberal Students Federation; the National Civic Council; the Council of Australian Labor Party Students (CALPS) and the Australian Union of Jewish Students. There was also complicity from Liberal/National Party governments from 1975-1983.

The LTU 'financial autonomy' issue, 1972, should be seen in this national context.

Whilst the discussion in this section questioned the attitude of the Whitlam Government to the radical student Left, it is not suggested that the Whitlam government supported the attack on the Union.

After all, the decline of the AUS must be seen in the light of the world-wide retreat of radical student activism, due to the winding down of the Vietnam War and the end of conscription, as well as the transitory nature of student populations and worsening international economic circumstances. Therefore, the decline of the AUS should be seen in the context of a fading away of the radical student Left that became weaker and weaker as the 1970s went on. The spontaneous liberationist radicalism could not maintain itself, for the Left had built no on-going organisations and programs. This was similar to what happened to the radical Left students of the late 1940s. Instead, former radicals went into occupations such as teacher union activism. What happened to the radical Left students of 1966-1972 is discussed in more detail in the next section.

We can see that factors associated with the decline of the Australian Union of Students were highly complex and of a political nature, which helps to confirm the hypothesis of this thesis.

(ii) The Activists of 1966 - 1972

The second section of Chapter Four discusses what happened to La Trobe University and other activists of the period 1966-1972. There is consideration here of the issue of the financial autonomy of the LTU SRC in order to show that whatever the legal situation, it is possible for student organisations to allocate finance as they see fit, providing the political battle has been won on the issue. This was an important issue in 1972, particularly in the light of the AUS debate of the time regarding 'compulsory unionism'. This section then proceeds to clear up several inaccuracies regarding myself made in Barry York's thesis. I debated within myself whether to do this but decided that I had an obligation to set the record straight. There is nothing personal in this. Barry York and I get along very well and I regard him as a friend.

The discussion proceeds to a study of interviews from former student activists such as Albert Langer, Michael Hamel-Green, Michael Hyde, and Harry van Moorst, who reflect on the past. The section concludes with some observations on what the activists of 1966-1972 are doing today, with particular reference to contemporary issues of student involvement such as equal opportunity for women.

It was to ensure the continued radical nature of student politics at La Trobe that Robinson, York, myself and others successfully stood for the SRC in July 1973, and it was with a sense of irony I took up the offer of the SRC Presidency once more, with a certain satisfaction taken in resuming a position on the University Council, surrounded by those who had organised my imprisonment. Thirteen years later, in 1986, as a State Government appointee, I did not see any of those faces in the Council Chamber, as they had either retired or died, but I still heard notes of disapproval and concern from some parts of the University when my appointment was made.

The new 1973 SRC, the seventh SRC, on a progressive-Left platform, concerned itself with the development of a free dental health service, a contact centre and legal aid service. It was felt that the previous years had exhausted much of the political momentum and that more effort to provide student services was needed. Barry York was instrumental in establishing a Prisoners' Action Group, which experienced publicity when the SRC passed a motion naming the University as a haven for prison escapees, declaring that two escapees had already been so sheltered. 'We believe all prisoners are political prisoners because they are victims of their socio-economic positions' stated the SRC. (27) These were clear-eyed days, when Australia really did seem to be moving at last.

The first meeting of the seventh SRC made generous donations to various 'non-student' causes, such as the Vietnam Aid Appeal and the Zimbabwe liberation movement, Zapu-Zanu, and the Bail Fund was re-established. (28) These donations may have been in contravention of Statute 24.1. which prohibited the SRC from expenditure on non-university purposes. (29) As far as I was concerned, this SRC was going to spend its money as it saw fit and SRC autonomy was a fait accompli, a non-issue. As SRC President I gambled that the LTU Council would not stop the above payments. It did not stop them, and so the financial autonomy of the SRC was firmly established.

York, however, contends this was not the case. (30) After agreeing that the above 'unlawful' payments were made, York asserts that the SRC was

now in a position to finally resolve the issue of SRC autonomy in the handling of its funds. (31)

This was not the situation. The SRC already had de facto autonomy.

York proceeds to state that

The gauntlet was thrown down by Robinson, when he successfully moved that a \$250 donation be forwarded, 'directly', to a fund established by striking workers at Ford's Broadmeadows plant. It is possible that, in order to avoid trouble, the Council would have turned a blind eye, and the SRC would have established a de facto autonomy. The issue was never finally tested, however, because in his capacity as ex officio Council member, Pola had assured the councillors that, 'The present SRC (has) no intention of making improper use of SRC funds by using them for non-university purposes'. Referring to the Ford strike donation, he stressed that 'substantial honoraria had been given to two visiting speakers'. (32)

As President, I had no concern as to how the money was paid to John Halfpenny, the speaker representing the Ford strikers. My only intention was to see that it was paid. The SRC was so tightly in control of its finances at this stage that the University Council were, to all intents and purposes, irrelevant. A 'blind-eye' as York states, was turned by the Council to the SRC's activities. The LTU Council could hardly have done anything else. This was the political reality after it had incarcerated its SRC President for three months over this very issue.

It is thus quite inaccurate to assert that I was responsible for the SRC not establishing de facto autonomy, as I was, in effect, the person who established it, at least whilst I continued in office.

York is correct in that I assured the LTU Council that the

present SRC has no intention of making improper use of SRC funds by using them for non-university purposes.  
(33)

York did not place this comment in correct context. I recall making this statement to the Council and it was made clear to both the SRC and Council that when it came to donations, honoraria or any SRC expenditure whatsoever, that if the SRC allocates money to a purpose, it

is a university purpose, and hence cannot be improper. That is, the students dictated the definition.

Under such wide interpretation, it was simply not possible for the SRC to make an 'improper use'. This is the way I deliberately designed it. I was aware of the La Trobe University Act which stated

All fees and all other moneys received by or on behalf of the University under the provisions of this Act or otherwise shall be applied by the Council solely for the purposes of the University. (34)

I viewed SRC decisions as a self-evident purpose of the University.

As far as the Ford donation itself was concerned, I was happy to sign a cheque in whatever form Halfpenny and Robinson saw fit. It was only after I asked the two gentlemen how they wanted the cheque made out that it was agreed a 'speakers' honoraria' would be suitable. There was no argument and everyone seemed happy. I was never aware of any 'gauntlet' being thrown down.

When the late Herbert Chitepo from Zapu Zanu spoke at La Trobe in 1973, an SRC cheque was written out to Herbert Chitepo. No 'substantial honoraria' here, just a direct donation to the leader of an African liberation organisation whose struggle made the Ford workers' struggle pale into insignificance. No-one objected. The LTU Council and LTU administration either ignored it or could not have cared less. The SRC had carte blanche.

York, in his thesis, gives not only an inaccurate account of the SRC financial autonomy issue, but goes on to interpret my motivations in a manner which has no foundation. He writes

Pola's action was regarded as a betrayal by many of the Left, especially the Maoists. It seemed to be confirmation of the 'iron law' whereby adherence to

principles diminishes in proportion to one's ascendancy in institutionalized power structures. (35)

Without wishing to engage in this level of attack on the character and motivation of a fellow activist, one fact may be worth considering. The elections for office holders of the seventh and most radical of La Trobe SRCs, then or since, were not as successful for York as he might have wished.

York stood against myself and lost. (36).

Students on the Left, it appears, were not immune from the individualism of the culture to which they were opposed.

I find it very disappointing that one with whom one has been imprisoned over students' rights rushes so urgently to accuse his comrade of 'betrayal'. It is unfortunate that York did not interview me before writing his thesis, as a discussion would have prevented subjectivity playing havoc with accuracy. I had a wide-ranging discussion with York in Sydney, 1986.

For the record, from 1969 to the present, I have not heard any person state that I betrayed the Left, nor has any such assertion ever reached me indirectly. On the contrary, persons often refer to the achievements during 1973 with some satisfaction. I have, however, detected a lot of others who have betrayed the Left; indeed, one of my hobbies is predicting who is going to be co-opted next, and these days that hobby keeps me busy.

York states that 'many' on the Left regarded my action on financial autonomy as a 'betrayal'. Who are these people? He does not name anyone.

The Maoists at La Trobe in 1973 could be counted on one hand, and even then each Maoist had one's own variant on ideology. There never



was a consistent Marxist-Leninist or Maoist line at La Trobe. As the leftovers of WSA well knew, by 1973, Maoism was no longer radical chic, and it was this political reality from which came the ineffectual Radical Student Movement (R.S.M.). So, to 'betray' becomes a matter of a difference of opinion between two former Maoists. One Maoist may accuse another Maoist of 'betrayal' if either one differs from the other. No wonder the revolution is a long time coming.

York suggests that I diluted my principles. York does not say where, or how, or why, but just suggests that I did. Such suggestions are not the stuff of sound research unless properly and very carefully documented. No effort at all is made in York's thesis to so document. It is unable to be documented.

My principles are all I have left. I have not ascended the 'institutional power structures'. The most cursory glance at my rather unspectacular career since 1973 reveals periods spent either as a classroom teacher in working class areas of Fitzroy and Northcote, or periods on unemployment relief. Hardly the stuff of unprincipled grabs for power. Unlike other supposed Marxist-Leninists, Maoists and 'radicals', I have deliberately avoided a career.

The happiest periods of my life are spent with a wide variety of people in the inner suburbs of Melbourne and Sydney developing strategies towards revolutionary change. An orthodox career interferes with this activity.

York states that when Pola

was released from prison, he 'simply dropped out'. 'The pre-jail Pola', reported the Herald, 'had a strong Marxist-Leninist bias... The post-jail Pola aims at projects like a fifty-acre permanent ecological-study camp for the university...'. The article was appropriately headed, 'Student Firebrand Back in Harness'. (37)

This is a misrepresentation. When I was released from prison I became involved in re-organising the Left at La Trobe University and Melbourne generally. I had obtained a casual job picking up the sheep guts at the Melbourne City abattoirs in Flemington, which lasted several months. Most people have to work for a living, if they can find work. As for 'dropping out', the realities of day to day survival after Pentridge did not allow for such bourgeois luxuries. As a result of my abattoir job and other casual jobs, by March 1973 I had saved enough money to enable a return to university full-time to complete a Diploma in Education, and I played a leading role in the landslide Left victory for the SRC in July 1973, as a result of which I was elected President. Once again, York's thesis is disturbing in its inaccuracy.

The 'Student Firebrand Back in Harness' line York interprets as meaning Pola had harnessed himself to the ruling class, his true race-track. With York's analysis, a student leader is not allowed to do anything positive to improve the lot of the student electorate. That land camp for the La Trobe University was designed to be used as a centre for students to have off-campus discussion and to obtain outdoor skills. What's wrong with that?

One would have thought that a Maoist would jump at the chance to have a training camp.

Or maybe it was better to sit around and pontificate and play at cafe society.

When Andrew McKay from the Herald interviewed me on 20 July 1973, it was with my sense of being a radical very much intact. My experiences had made me so. I do not regard my understanding of being a radical as a 'harness' but as a liberating, even ecstatic, way of life. Yes, it's true I was a 'firebrand' prior to being imprisoned, and by the time I got out I was more convinced than ever that this was the way I would remain. To me, 'Student Firebrand Back in Harness' means I was back as a student 'firebrand'.

I hope that clears the record.

In 1986, Albert Langer, Michael Hyde and Michael Hamel-Green, three prominent Melbourne activists, were asked how they saw the 1970s and 1980s.

Langer:

The fear today is unemployment, students are more focused on that rather than social issues.

People in the Left are criticising the Labor Party. They criticize Hawke. People are getting outraged. I don't care if it is Liberal or Labor. I only think it is terrible that people are supporting the Government. But this is generally a wider problem, that nobody has been able to build a revolution in a western civilized country.

There was a shift from Menzies to Whitlam. A loosening up and a lot had been achieved. The main theory for decline is that it's due to the decline of the revolutionary left. On the campuses the students have left the campuses, and there has been a generation turnover. The revolution didn't become rooted in permanency. There wasn't a question of actually overthrowing the government. It was more an overthrowing of capitalism, a general upsurge against imperialism.

Before November 1975, we would never have voted for the ALP. I recognise that in November 75 everyone would have supported Whitlam and would have voted ALP and there was a real sense of emergency. But to me that was disastrous, and marked a turning point because we no longer had a movement that was independent of the ALP under any circumstances. People who were previously revolutionary Left and hostile to the ALP, came to this position in November 1975 that it would be wonderful if there was a Left in support of an ALP government which they believed would have led to a potentially revolutionary crisis. I think a sober analysis shows that with the hard Left supporting an ALP government to stay in office, a consequence was the dismantling of the revolutionary Left. (38)

Langer might be correct here. The 1975 Federal election did seem to split and compromise the student Left between those who

shunned electoral politics and those who thought they should support the dismissed Whitlam. The price may have been the loss of an independent radical student Left, although the student Left had by this time declined in influence greatly due to factors already outlined.

Hamel-Green:

I'm not quite sure why the decline happened so rapidly - maybe lack of unity in student groups.

It was a whole world wide phenomenon. I think student movements in the 60's were outstandingly successful, and did get a change of policy. Withdrawal of troops, an end of conscription. Mass mobilization achieved that. The same applies to nuclear war and unemployment.

Activists haven't lost their idealism generally, more so their activism. They are interested in community action on various issues - like Nuclear power or some form of political involvement. After the 60's you had diversification of the radical movement into social justice issues. I don't think we'd somehow join the system and get comfortable jobs. That's not right, we have to keep up our commitment. (39)

Hyde:

Whitlam took the heat out of things. Things that were once upsetting weren't there, for instance, conscription. The university administrations had loosened up, were forced to concede to students, and bring back people that they had expelled.

I am not cynical, I don't like cynical people. If I think that what we did was truly magnificent, truly heroic, truly inspiring, I'm not one of those people who put it down. I suppose the Whitlam era gave the people a chance to say I can take a breather. (40)

Anne Draper, in a study of Adelaide's former activists, concluded that

Essentially they failed to bring on the social revolution that they hoped would develop, and they admit this. The heartening thing is that in general,

they have not given up trying to bring change about.  
(41)

Draper's conclusion agrees with the material I have gathered in Melbourne.

In 1985 Harry van Moorst, one of the founders of the SDS in Melbourne, and pressed for an interview,

said that he was continually approached by the mass media for "whatever happened to the 1960's" interviews. But he would be happy to talk to Farrago except that he had a meeting with the BLF in 45 minutes, and would be tied up with the People's Tax Summit (concurrent with the Bob Hawke tax summit) in Canberra for the next two weeks. (42)

Not all SDS founders are to be found organising demonstrations in the 1980s. Mike Jones was national chairperson of SDS and founded SDS in 1966 in Sydney. (43) By 1969 his grip weakened after arguments with other student leaders, and he left student politics. He is now regional manager for an American multi-national company and admits to being 'virtually a millionaire'. (44)

Many of the La Trobe activists fulfilled in later careers their earlier political tendencies. Ian MacDonald became President of the AUS in 1975, a senior adviser to N.S.W. Labor Government Minister Frank Walker and an M.L.C. in N.S.W. in 1988. Geoff Walsh has been press secretary to Prime Minister Hawke and worked for the I.L.O. in Switzerland. Barry York completed a Masters' thesis on the protest movements of the sixties and has worked on a Doctorate at the ANU. Fergus Robinson has been working with Community Youth Support Schemes in Victoria and the BLF, and spent several years 'on the line' at Ford Motor Co., Broadmeadows. Grant Evans teaches Sociology at La Trobe. Peter Cochrane has taught and written history at the University of Sydney. Many Labor Club-WSA activists went into teaching in Victorian schools; John Redenbach, Ian Coulter, Ken White, Alf Dowsley, Peter

Dowling, John Herouvim to name a few, as did former Monash activists such as Mike Hyde and Dave Nadel. Two ex-LTU SRC Presidents, Christina Bell and Paul Reid, have worked for the Victorian Secondary Teachers' Association. Bell was a Governor-in-Council appointee to the LTU Council, 1982-1986. Albert Langer, of Monash University fame, lives in North Fitzroy and spends time fighting multi-national copyright of computer soft-ware. Michael Maher is studying law at the University of Tasmania. Of the conservatives, their careers also followed their politics. Terry Monagle has been executive officer of the Association of Teachers in Victorian Catholic Secondary Schools. Campbell Gordon has purportedly been working for ASIO. Ian Blandthorn has worked for the NCC influenced Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Union, as has Christine Hardy. Andrew Campbell has worked with Australian intelligence organisations and as an academic, and during the Fraser years severely embarrassed the intelligence community when he revealed gross incompetence in Fraser's Office of National Assessments. One cannot avoid noticing the absence of women in this brief list. This may be a reflection of the New Left's poor track record on women's issues. The New Left, like the Old Guard, suffered from many of the prejudices and hang-ups that the feminists are now wearing down.

One La Trobe activist, Bill Hartley, who straddled both the Old and New Left, works for the Food Preservers' Union and commissions for the Iraqi Government News Agency. Hartley was recently expelled from the ALP and has endeavoured to establish a radical party, the Industrial Labor Party, to the concern of 'old silver', Bob Hawke.

Today in the workplace the understanding of what it means to be a political activist is being quietly put into effect in numerous areas, such as politics, law, academe, teaching, welfare, unions, the media and the public services. Occasionally we hear of a wish to return to the 'good old days' of the sixties and seventies, but this is sentiment at its worst. It reminds one of the comedies being written about Catholic childhoods, such as 'The Christian Brother' and 'Once a Catholic', which try to render humorous what certainly was not humorous, but serious.

The student movement was strongly motivated by opposition to war and conscription, and no sensible person would wish such injustices to return simply for the sake of opposing them. As to future possibilities, it is inevitable that political movements of students and workers will rise again as the forces of capital and labour battle it out generation after generation. The relative quietude on Australian campuses since 1975 has most often and correctly observed to have been induced by the economic recession and consequent stringency of employment opportunities. And economics is forever mutable.

After all, this thesis and others have shown that the 1960s were not unprecedented. Goldman, for example, suggests that the Left and Right of 'peak' student movements in history, such as the 1930s and 1960s, were parts of social movements; as distinct from 'quiet' periods such as the 1950s and 1980s, when Left and Right were usually parts of political party organisations. (45) The 1980s' concentration of student power in the hands of student institutions and student bureaucrats suggests this.

As ageing radicals lurch towards the 1990s, the sight of French students fighting on the left bank in Paris, (46) or of Chinese students struggling with police in wintry Peking, (47) no doubt stirs the memories if not the blood, of middle-aged ex-radicals tucked up in front of televisions in safe old Australia. Life in Hawke's Australia is so demoralising for former radicals, and worrying even for conservatives, that a voyage back to former times, more hopeful and more youthful, has a seductive appeal that cannot easily be denied. How hard it is to escape from that comfortable nostalgia when the world and we were young and the student international seemed to herald utopia. But that was long ago; the world has grown old and cold.

Despite the apparently irresistible rise of materialism, cynicism and pessimism in recent years, optimism, idealism even naivete are the forces that move human society to better things. But recent events in Paris, Shanghai, Peking, Seoul, (48) Manila (49) and Santiago, (50) have

provoked a suggestion that after almost two decades of slumbering, selfish conservatism, students are once again on the march. (51) Another view is that it cannot be a re-run of the 1960s. (52) The fall of the first student international was like the expulsion from Eden; radical politics so pure and so innocent could never be revived.

I suggest both views have arisen in such different political and economic circumstances that 'compare and contrast' exercises are futile. Not all students in the 1960s were radicals; nor are all students in the 1980s dying to work for Price Waterhouse. Global generalisations are more likely to mislead than illuminate.

Nevertheless, times do change.

In 1968, only 11 per cent of 18 to 25 year olds in the U.S.A. identified with the Republicans. Today it is 25 per cent. (53) In 1970, only 39 per cent of American students said being 'well-off' was an important goal. Today, it is 69 per cent. (54)

Internationally, it is nevertheless very clear that activism is not dead. On a visit to North American campuses in May 1985, I was surprised at the level of political work at Berkeley and Columbia. In May 1985, 88 were arrested in a blockade at Princeton, protesting against investments in South African companies. (55) On 26 November 1986, 59 students were arrested at the University of Massachusetts, protesting against CIA recruitment. 1960s activist Abbie Hoffman and Amy Carter (daughter of former President Jimmy Carter), were among those arrested. (56) On 1 October 1964, Mario Savio jumped on the roof of a police car to address a student crowd. Historians pinpointed that moment at Berkeley as the beginning of the student rebellion of the 1960s. (57) On 1 October 1984, Savio, a greying 41 and a post-graduate physics student at a San Francisco university, again addressed students; 6000 of them, gathered to concentrate opposition to US military intervention in Central America. (58)



Changing music patterns may serve as a political barometer. 'Blowing in the Wind' (59) was the first anti-war song to make the charts in 1963. The message was change was easy. By 1967 music turned inward to psychedelia and Flower Power, as the Beatles turned to the Maharishi. (60) From 1974 until 1978 the disco-boom took over. It was the multi-billion antithesis of the protest-song, a one day a week Saturday Night Fever escape from drudgery. The challenge to disco came with punk in 1977. Despite cheers from the Left, punk was just another retreat from commitment into teenage bravado and anarchism. But in the 1980s, bands such as Midnight Oil, U2, UB40, Bronski Beat, The Style Council and Frankie Goes to Hollywood have been very consciously political, anti-war, socially progressive and articulate. (61) It is a healthy sign. It would be alarming if a new generation of students comes to 'maturity' without having developed a form of political expression, as this would mean students would have no say in what affects them. Such apprehension has been expressed by Denis Altman et alia. (62)

At least some hope lies in the women's movement. The AUS Women's Department, first established in 1975, well after the demise of the student New Left, and led during its first two years by Laurie Bebbington, pioneered affirmative action and equal opportunity struggles still being fought in the 1980s. (63) The New Left had treated women no better than the Old. But the women's movement inherited some of its ideas. La Trobe University is seeing some of the effects. The LTU Statutes and Regulations were to be re-written in 'non-gender terminology' as a result of the Report to Council of the Working Party on the Status of Women at La Trobe University, (64) and the University community was made aware of glaring inequities in the comparatively small number of women in senior administrative and academic positions in the University. (65) The LTU Proctorial Board, virtually defunct since the protests of 1969-1972, was geared up in 1986 to hear charges against five male students relating to sexist misbehaviour. One student was permanently excluded from the University, another for two years, another for one year. The remaining two were each fined \$250, the maximum

permissible. (66) Today, it is electoral suicide to run a team without a fair proportion of the sexes.

Claims of racism were also heard at the University. La Trobe sociology lecturer, John Carroll, had his photo plastered up around the campus as part of a 'Rid La Trobe of Racist Academics' campaign. Carroll was depicted as a racist. (67) Carroll later successfully sued Rabelais.

With the passing of time, the LTU Council has changed its membership almost entirely. Four Convocation members, two elected under-graduates and one post-graduate, as well as the SRC President, now provide students with a substantial voice on Council. Commencing in 1987, the Academic Board has three student representatives, a struggle for students since 1969. (68) The present Chancellor of the University is Supreme Court Justice Richard McGarvie, sometime luminary of the important Independent faction of the Victorian ALP, an appointment directly related to the Cain Labor Government, Cain having himself served on the Council prior to becoming Premier of Victoria. Former ALP Senator Ms. Jean Meltzer also became a Council member. (69)

In addition to advances on equal opportunity within the University, La Trobe has established an Institute for Peace Research. (70) This initiative came from the Chancellor following an exciting visit to the University of Moscow in August 1983. (71) It was refreshing, as a member of the LTU Council in 1985, to read a wide-ranging list of study areas offered by the University's academic staff, for the Institute. (72)

As for the SRC itself, until a keenly fought 1987 election, it had struggled to fill its nineteen vacancies, due to lack of interest. From 1986-88, there has been a campaign against the re-introduction of tertiary fees, and a proposed Graduate Tax, which was quite successful, though its long-term effectiveness remains unclear. (73) One other

project of interest emanates from an SRC report to LTU Council regarding a Student Exchange Program between La Trobe and the Philippines. (74)

We may draw several conclusions from this discussion.

First, many of the student activists of the period 1966-1972 continue to work in a wide variety of occupations associated with Unionism, equal opportunity and assisting the disadvantaged. This represents a continuation of the tradition of former activists who enter occupations often associated with alleviating want and ignorance, occupations such as teaching, writing, politics, social research and union activism. Doubtless however, many former radicals would also have retreated into indifference and cynicism.

Second, in regards to student financial autonomy, it is always important to consider what is politically possible despite possible legal challenge.

Third, it is important for researchers in any area to be sure of fact before developing interpretation.

Fourth, the interviews with Langer, Hamel-Green, van Moorst and Hyde suggest that the 1975 Federal election compromised the Left and disadvantaged the maintaining of an independent student Left.

Fifth, activists admit that there was a failure to bring on the social revolution they hoped for but that, in general, they have not given up trying to bring change about.

(iii) Conclusions

Whilst conclusions have been provided throughout this thesis it is now appropriate to differentiate between what is fact and what is interpretation. Initially I present a general conclusion which draws on

material contained in all four chapters. This conclusion relates to how I view the nature and decline of the student movement.

Following this general conclusion are conclusions of a more specific nature which relate to each Chapter.

I then offer suggestions regarding future research and directions.

The following general conclusion is made on the basis of research conducted over a long period in this area of history.

A major contributing factor to the decline of the student movement was that the typical student radical did not find it easy to develop personal rationalisations and philosophies: in some cases these were borrowed hotch-potch from leading personalities and popular revolutionary writings. Understandably, some Leftists did not have the political maturity to realise their personal ideologies. The vast majority however, combined what they believed to be their ideology, with the issues of the day. The limitation here was that the effect was too often the philosophy of dissent and lacked a strategy of overall revolution. There was a problem associated with this lack. The movement based at Melbourne's three universities found it difficult to work out problems associated with radical students' own environment and culture: the reasons for its birth became reasons for its retardation. Because most in the movement came from middle class backgrounds, a fear that radicals would merely be reformers of an overly administered, bureaucratic society filled many with apprehension. It did me. This fear fed the philosophy of dissent, in itself a short-lived strategy. The student movement may also partly have been a product of middle class guilt brought about by the suffering of those on which that middle class was built? Perhaps for some the movement was a purgation of that guilt, a washing of hands, to prepare the way to enter the holy of holies - the ruling class itself.

For a few ex-La Trobe student 'radicals' we may conclude that this has proved to be the case. Unable to clearly articulate their ideological commitment in 1970, erosion of time resulted in radicals becoming former radicals, apologists for the system they sought to liberate in those halcyon student days.

It has been noted that anti-authority attitudes were a strong causal element in the movement to begin with. This was reflected in an unwillingness to accept a defined creed, a 'party line'. There was after all, a disposition to experiment. This was part of the movement's nature. Also, some of the effort of the movement was directed to simply shocking the Melbourne establishment by defending LSD, Mao, the Viet Cong, ridiculing the Catholic Church and so on. Naturally, Melbourne at large responded with outrage, the desired response. Such a knee-jerk syndrome explains only some of the psychology of the student movement. The attack on the Melbourne establishment was, in part, thought out, and not solely designed to shock so much as convert, subvert and isolate.

One matter appears certain. New Left culture in Melbourne, whilst unique and possessing a kind of romantic adventurism, fell far short of a lasting revolution or reformation that would have permanently altered the structure of the State of Victoria. At best there have been changes in attitudes; for example equal opportunity for women, homosexual law reform and growth of the anti-Nuclear movement. The 'This is a Nuclear Free City' campaign has its roots in many years, not a few years, of struggle. If the student movement of the sixties and early seventies had cadres and activists in numbers dedicated and articulate enough to continue beyond the edge of romanticism and into the stark realities of the 1980s, then the 1980s would have been different. But they are not different. The prerequisites for a sustained revolutionary movement were never established by the students themselves; which is not to say that the pre-conditions for revolution did not exist at all and do not exist now. To a degree, they did and do.

We may conclude therefore that a part of the decline was the failure of radical students to achieve a genuinely revolutionary consciousness. At La Trobe and elsewhere this would have involved a reversal of students' social upbringing and social conditioning, a difficult exercise. Inability to do this was reflected in an unwillingness by 'radicals' to use certain concepts and pursue certain activities because 'people will label us communists'. Hence, crucial sessions held on analysis at La Trobe were conducted in the bourgeois ambience of the very same language and concepts which, so students protested, they were trying to do away with. And so the implementation of bourgeois values was repeated, resulting in an unstable cultural identity for the Left, one from which it was difficult to extract a coherent, identifiable revolutionary theory.

Strategy had urged protest against the uses of Universities so that the New Left alternative would assume hegemony. Precisely what the alternative would have been is difficult to discern, not because it was conceptually non-existent but because it had not been articulated. In a sense, the movement was becoming popular because dissent was popular. Undeniably however, the intent was not solely dissent, but a new social system. Dissent was a means, not an end.

Dissent and protest at Melbourne's universities was expressed in students being involved in diverse experiments with ideas and social relationships. This was before 'radical chic' and the nostalgia craze of the mid 1970s. Such diversities were unlike the lives of our parents who, raised in different times, could only see the 'one best way'. The crisis in tertiary education was partly produced in Melbourne through a poor comprehension by elders, of changing ideas; an older generation simply not equipped for the rapid changes in the ideas and lives of its students.

Therefore, try as often old elitists did, their lack of comprehension rarely rectified matters before violence occurred. There was in student radical circles an underground and naive understanding

that we could not trust anyone over thirty. The authorities were, of course, themselves victims of deficiencies in the Victorian education system, deficiencies which had produced a lack of tolerance and understanding. Sir Henry Bolte and Sir Arthur Rylah were cases in point. It was, believed many New Left students in Melbourne, up to themselves to take the initiative in changing the education system and so change society. Nobody else would.

In so doing, many radicals at La Trobe and elsewhere did not regard any institution as sacred. Institutions were seen as merely performing a function and if that function was not properly fulfilled then an alternative had to be sought. The danger was that an uncompromising bureaucratic elite and a messianic movement might make a cocktail of violence. And, not surprisingly, it did.

I now proceed to some specific conclusions drawn from Chapters One, Two, Three and Four.

From Chapter One it is concluded that there is a history and tradition of radical Left student political activity in Melbourne which played a role in the development of the student movement of 1966-1972.

A part of this history and tradition was the identification of the radical student Left with the Australian industrial proletariat through attempts to organisationally link mass industrial labour with mass intellectual labour. These efforts were only partly successful.

A significant factor in the development of the above was student disillusionment with Australia's mainstream Left political parties and organisations, particularly the ALP, and this resulted in the formation of extra-Parliamentary opposition organisations.

A further conclusion from this Chapter is that the movement of 1966-1972 has association with two other periods of student radicalism in Melbourne, and that this represents a continuing history of

radicalism. These two periods were the 1930s and 1946-1950. The Chapter was also able to show that there were relatively quiet but by no means inactive periods of political activity in Melbourne, such as the 1950s.

We may conclude that the growth of student activism in Melbourne during the 1930s and 1946-1950 was related to the lessons of the economic depression of the 1930s and opposition to the advance of Fascism during the 1930s and 1940s. The period 1966-1972 was also related to 'boom and bust' economics and involvement in war, though the halcyon days of the student Left of the University of Melbourne 1946-1950 represent a celebration of the end of Fascism and a clear vision of a better world. For the student generation 1966-1972, the Vietnam War was of a different nature to the Second World War, though both generations had in common a fight against imperialist aggression. The 1950s saw the smothering of the radical vision in the cold war and anti-Communist paranoia. The thaw came in the early 1960s, but it was 1966-1972 that most potently captured public attention, due in part to the numerical size of the movement which dwarfed previous student movements.

This fact, and that the period 1966-1972 was part of an economic prosperity previous student generations could not have experienced, serves to contrast 1966-1972 with previous periods of student activism.

However, we may conclude that in common with the activist of the 1930s and 1946-1950, the popular ideologies of 1966-1972 were Marxism, anarchism and a philosophical cultural bohemianism.

Finally, it is a conclusion of this thesis, based on the examination of student Left political activism from the 1920s to 1966-1972, that it is not possible to accurately predict periods of student unrest. Chapter Three was able to show that 1966-1972 took most by surprise and Chapter One provided no evidence that periods of activism were predicted. It appears that it is a certain conflux of those local



and international social, political, economic and historical factors' in the thesis' hypothesis that results in such periods.

Chapter Two concerned itself with La Trobe University as a local study of student activism for the period 1966-1972.

The conclusions from Chapters One, Three and Four also apply to Chapter Two, and it serves no purpose to repeat them. There are, however, several specific conclusions I have drawn from Chapter Two.

The Chapter was able to evidence that, at La Trobe University, the University administration and the University Council did not respond constructively to the student requests, thereby exacerbating the crisis.

The gaoling of three La Trobe University students in 1972, York, Robinson and Pola, was prompted by subtle political pressure brought on the Vice-Chancellor by the Victorian Government and conservative elements within the La Trobe University Council.

The gaoling of Robinson, York and Pola was politically vindictive and unnecessarily provocative. This was even more so in light of the length and nature of the sentence.

The student political activities at La Trobe University, 1968-1972, were often influenced by 'outside' political parties and organisations, such as the National Civic Council, the CPA M/L, the CPA, the ALP, the Liberal Party, the DLP and Unions.

From Chapter Three, it is a conclusion of the thesis that, as suggested in the Introduction, the student movement was one of liberation rather than socialism.

An important finding of the Chapter was that, as initially suggested in the Introduction, the student activists were themselves 'part of the

production of capitalism' at the same time as carrying a moral opposition to its uses and functions: conscription and the Vietnam War.

We may conclude from Chapter Three that moral opposition alone could not find nor build a social structure in opposition to the social system itself, and that a modified capitalism won out over radical culture.

The liberationist philosophy of the radical student movement in Melbourne was a product of post-Second World War economic expansion in areas such as secondary and tertiary education, itself a product of the need of capitalism for a more intellectually skilled base of 'mass intellectual labour'.

It was the uses and abuses of this requirement, as perceived by some students, that precipitated student opposition to the government of tertiary institutions.

The above conclusions fulfil, I suggest, the promise of the Introduction, which was to provide a 'deeper interpretation' for the growth and decline of the student movement than a mere relating of the two major issues of 1966-1972: conscription and Vietnam.

From Chapter Four, it is concluded that the demise of the latest recognised period of student radicalism by 1972 coincided with and was related to, the end of Australian military involvement in Vietnam, the end of conscription, the election of the Whitlam Government and the decline of the movement internationally. The decline of student radicalism is also related to the end of the economic 'boom' by the early 1970s, the consequent growth of youth unemployment and a levelling out in the growth of tertiary education.

We may conclude therefore that Australian capitalism has shown that it can contain a student radical movement, and use the best of that movement to even further strengthen the perceived legitimacy of Australian capitalism.

It may now be seen that the period 1966-1972 was unusual, and that the 1980s represents a more normal picture of student political life rather than a period of unusual apathy.

However, despite an apparent lack of overt activism in Australia in the 1980s, actual student attitudes do not seem to have changed dramatically, and this may have implications for future student activism. For example, student reaction to Federal Government Administration Fees introduced in 1987 was quite strong. Nevertheless, in the 1980s in Melbourne, student politics is based on locally-based institutions such as SRC's and campus Unions. Internationally, students continue to be active, in the third world especially. In the USA, the picture is also far from being apathetic and may instead be seen as transitional.

Nevertheless, we may conclude that there has been a demise of the organised student New Left of 1966-1972 and virtually all of its student political organisations have now gone: AUS, SDS, WSA, the secondary student unions. Campus political clubs, both Left and Right, are generally in decline.

The movement of 1966-1972 itself perceives that it has failed to achieve massive social change and revolution, although many former radicals continue to maintain ideals and work in areas of political change.

We may conclude that the effects of the radicals are incalculable as they work their way through many facets of Australian life. Most are now in their late 30s and may have the best years of their lives ahead of them. The important outgrowths of the 1966-1972 movement were the emergence of the peace movement, the women's movement, gay liberation, the environmentalists, inner-urban conservation, the anti-nuclear movement and changes in secondary and tertiary education curriculum.

Finally, it is concluded from Chapter Four and Chapter Two that Australia's intelligence authorities continue to observe former and current student political activists. It is beyond reasonable doubt that during the period 1969-1972, there was a working relationship in Melbourne between the National Civic Council, ASIO, and campus student political groups such as the LTU Democratic Club. It is also beyond reasonable doubt that ASIO infiltrated the student Left in Melbourne and that some academics and university administrators also had a working relationship with ASIO, JIO, CIA, the Federal Government Office of National Assessments, the Victoria Police Special Branch and the Commonwealth and Victoria Police.

This brings to an end the conclusions to the thesis, and as we have seen, there appears to have been no 'single cause' for the emergence and decline of the 1966-1972 student movement. We may conclude therefore that the movement was as the hypothesis suggests: the product of a highly complex set of international and local social, political, economic and historical factors.

This thesis had two related themes and purposes and these, I contend, have been achieved. The first was to describe, in narrative form, from the perspective of one - the author - what happened in those years. One senses that the flavour of the times has also been passed on to the reader. The second theme was interpretative; that the student activists fought for liberation rather than a clearly defined ideology. The thesis interpreted the growth of student activism in the context of the reproduction of capitalism, in the form of intellectual labour. The continuation of this process of production marks the ability of Australian capitalism to change and adapt in order to ensure its own survival. For the time being.

#### Future Research and Directions

Attention given by scholars and analysts to the topic of student political activism in recent years has been very modest. This lack is

thought to be due to a relative lack of activism in the universities of industrialised nations such as Australia. Even so, it is just as important to study the apparent lack of activism in Australia as it is to reflect on the 'abnormally' activist period of 1966-1972. This is because those involved with the higher educational institutions need to be concerned with the patterns of student activism in a total historical context. This may enable administrators, academics and politicians to respond more constructively to challenges than was the case during 1966-1972.

It seems clear that research on student activism was stimulated by the crises of the 1960s rather than intrinsic academic concern for the topic. After 1972, published literature slowed to a trickle and research funds are today virtually unavailable.

No satisfactory theoretical framework for analysis of the student movement of the 1960s is widely accepted in the field. This lack of theoretical perspective has hampered further research. Social scientists who wrote on student activism when there was a ready and profitable market for books and articles and when funds were available, have now returned to more established research topics.

Despite, or perhaps because of this, there is a never-ending demand for nostalgia interviews of the 'whatever happened to the sixties' type which trivialise the period in the media.

Perhaps indicative of the derivative features of the student movements in Australia, there is an absence of a 'great work' that captures the spirit of the period. Such a work is long overdue. However, curiously, Australia's former student activists do not seem interested in analysing their past experiences. This is quite different to the American situation, where the Yippies and Maoists of yesteryear are churning out autobiographies, reminiscences and scholarly studies. The work and conclusions of this thesis notwithstanding, the marvellous question of history still begs an answer: Why? and, where to now?

This thesis contributes to an answering of the 'Why?', but concentrates on Melbourne. A national study would be an exciting study for a future researcher.

For myself, my position throughout this thesis has consistently been one of both historian and participant, of providing fact and interpretation. I believe that history has already shown that the principles for which friends and comrades marched and were gaoled were correct.

I have no regrets. I would not have missed it for the world.

Recently a young person told me: 'I'm a university student. 'Course, I'm not a real student like they were in the sixties.' One tires of such disillusion. I am much more impressed with the reaction of Louise Carbines on her arrival at the University of Melbourne in 1975 when she reflected in 1983:

I began university in 1975. In first term the Vietnam War ended. During the exams in third term, the Whitlam Government was dismissed. Older students were already talking about the early 1970s as though they were a golden age, a time when idealism grew into activism, and students, who had been a powerless minority, spoke with a strong voice. I listened to stories about this heady time, but felt that I belonged to a different generation. I did not yearn for the old days because I had not known them. I wanted to share their enthusiasm and live their memories, but realized that their stories were a substitute for the euphoria that had died. The cause that brought them together ended in April with the fall of Saigon. (75)

Carbines went on to pioneer important changes at the University, particularly in child care and equal opportunity for women. She edited Farrago in 1979 and was and is part of that phenomenal social movement to come out of the 1960s, the women's movement, which has gone from strength to strength during the 1980s.

The simple message for today's students is that a great deal of work remains to be done.

Footnotes for Chapter Four

1. Pamphlet, the AUS, 1971, re H.A.R.T. (Halt All Racial Tours).
2. News Weekly, Freedom Publication, Melbourne, 7 July 1971, p.4; 1 September 1971; 25 August 1971, p.1; 11 August 1971; 28 July 1971, p.3; 15 September 1971, p.5. Transcripts, interviews, with: A. Langer, M. Hyde, D. Cassidy, D. Nadel, P. Cochrane, 1986. M. Carey, 'All the Dirt on the National Civic Council', in Farrago, 1984, p.13.
3. See footnote 2. Little (Senator, DLP), ABC TV News, 10 April 1972; LTU Bulletin, Vol.3, No.19.
4. B. Pola, Observer, the AUS Annual Councils, 1980-1985.
5. N. McLean, *ibid.*
6. ABC TV News, Melbourne, 22 November 1984.
7. Cochrane, *op.cit.*
8. York, *op.cit.*, p.340.
9. Age, 2 September 1971, p.3.
10. Rabelais, undated, July 1984, p.11; Rabelais, Vol.18, No.5, p.17.
11. Rabelais, Vol.18, No.5, p.4.
12. Age, 2 July 1984, p.11.
13. Rabelais, Vol.18, No.5, p.4.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Age, 2 July 1984, p.11; AUS Annual Reports, 1970-1975, National Library, Canberra.
16. Age, 2 July 1984, p.11; footnotes 63, 61, 60.
17. Memo, Pola to Davis, 3 December 1984; Rabelais, No.12, 1984, p.25.
18. D.S. Anderson and A.E. Vervoorn. Access to Privilege: Patterns of Participation in Australian Post-Secondary Education, ANU, 1983.
19. Age, 11 December 1984, p.15; Farrago, Vol.62, No.15, p.3.
20. B. Pola, observer, national student convention, U.N.S.W., 16-19 December 1984.
21. Australian, 22 December 1984; Age, 22 December 1984, p.3.



22. Sydney Morning Herald, 30 January 1985, p.2.
23. Ibid.
24. Age, 9 September 1985.
25. Age, 23 September 1985, p.4.
26. Sun, 3 November 1986, p.4.
27. LTU SRC Newsletter, September 1973.
28. LTU SRC Minutes, 12 July 1973; 7/1/22, 7/1/34, 7/1/50.
29. Statute 24.1 (LTU SRC Constitution).
30. York, op.cit., p.338.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid. York cites the Council Response to the Report of the 7th SRC to Council, July 1973, 24 July 1973 (74.11.7).
33. Ibid.
34. La Trobe University Act, 1964, Part One, Div. 7, 33(1).
35. Ibid., p.339.
36. Minutes, LTU SRC. First meeting of seventh SRC, July 1973, Election of Office Bearers.
37. Ibid., p.339. Herald, 21 July 1973, p.6.
38. A. Langer, op.cit.
39. M. Hamel-Green, interview, tape, Melbourne, 1986.
40. M. Hyde, op.cit.
41. A. Draper, 'Adelaide Student Radicals: Then and Now, 1968-80', (BA Hons. thesis, Adelaide University, History, 1980), p.59.
42. Farrago, 17 July 1985, p.6.
43. National Times, 7-13 December 1984, pp.26-27.
44. Ibid.
45. J. Goldman, interviewed. 'Student Politics - a Vehicle for Social Stability?', LTU Record, November/December 1983, p.12. Also see P. Altbach (ed.), Student Politics: Perspectives for the Eighties, Scarecrow Press, N.J., 1981, pp.1-36.

46. Age, 6 December 1986, p.9.
47. Times HES, 9 January 1987, p.28.
48. ABC TV News, Melbourne, 16 November 1984; 17 October 1984.
49. Age, 4 October 1984, p.1.
50. D. Levy, 'Student Politics in Contemporary Latin America', in P. Altbach, (ed.), op.cit.
51. Times HES, op.cit.
52. Ibid.
53. Age, 17 October 1984, p.8.
54. Ibid.
55. New York Times, 24 May 1985, p.1.
56. Sun (Melb.), 26 November 1986.
57. Age, 4 October 1984, p.13.
58. Ibid.
59. 'Blowing in the Wind', Bob Dylan. Rec. 'Peter, Paul and Mary', 1963.
60. Age Extra, 8 December 1984, p.8.
61. Ibid.
62. National Times, 11-17 May 1980; Rabelais, 4 June 1980, p.22.
63. Farrago, 18 October 1979, pp.18-22.
64. W.P.S.W., First Report, 4.3.85, C85/12.
65. Ibid.
66. Message from the Vice-Chancellor, LTU, 18 December 1987.
67. Poster, LTU, November 1984; Age, 28 August 1984, p.13.
68. Rabelais, Vol.20, No.13, p.9.
69. LTU Handbook 1987, LTU 'Officers of the University'.
70. Report of Working Party For an Institute of Peace Studies, LTU Council, C85/163, 7.10.85; C85/195.

71. Chancellor's Report to Council on Discussions at Moscow University on 1 August 1983, C84/16.
72. LTU Academic Board, AB85/5, 13 February 1985.
73. Your Guide to a Free Education, LTU SRC Education and Welfare Action Group, LTU SRC February 1987.
74. LTU SRC-Action Resource Centre Report to LTU Council, C85/157.
75. Dow, op.cit., p. 201.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Altbach, P. Student Politics: Perspectives for the Eighties. Scarecrow Press, U.S.A., 1981.
- Altman, D. Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation. Penguin, 1973.
- Anderson, D.S. and Vervoorn, A.E. Access to Privilege: Patterns of Participation in Australian Post-Secondary Education. A.N.U., 1983.
- Arendt, Hannah. On Revolution. Viking Press, N.Y., 1963.
- Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H. (eds.). Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1985.
- Bell, D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting, Penguin Books, U.K., 1976.
- Benton Fields, A. Student Politics in France. Basic books, N.Y., 1970.
- Blainey, G. A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne. M.U.P., 1957.
- Brzezinski, Z. Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technocratic Era. Viking Press, N.Y., 1970.
- Cardan, Paul. Modern Capitalism and Revolution. A Solidarity Book, C/o Russell, H., 53A Westmoreland Road, Bromley, U.K.
- Caute, D. (ed.). Essential Writings of Karl Marx, Panther, London, 1967.
- Chomsky, Noam. American Power and the New Mandarins. Penguin, U.K., 1969.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. Soul on Ice. Panther Books, London, 1971.
- Cockburn, A. and Blackburn, R. (eds.). Student Power. Penguin, U.K., 1969.
- Cohn, Norman. The Pursuit of the Millenium. Paladin, U.K., 1970.
- Cohn-Bendit, G. and D. Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative. Penguin, U.K., 1969.
- Conway, R. The Great Australian Stupor: An Interpretation of the Australian Way of Life. Sun Books, Melbourne, 1971.
- Cooper, David. The Dialectics of Liberation. Pelican, U.K., 1968.

- Coxsedge, Coldicutt, Harant. Rooted in Secrecy: The Clandestine Element in Australian Politics. CAPP (Vict.), 1982.
- Crouch, Colin. The Student Revolt. Bodley Head, U.K., 1970.
- Davis, Angela. If They Come in the Morning. Orbach and Chambers, London, 1971.
- Debray, Regis. Strategy for Revolution. Penguin, U.K., 1973.
- Dow, Hume. Memories of Melbourne University, Hutchinson Group (Aust), Richmond, Victoria, 1983.
- Fanon, Frantz. The Wretched of the Earth. Grove Press, N.Y., 1965.
- Fromm, E. The Fear of Freedom. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1960.
- Gitlin, Todd. The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left. University of California Press, 1980.
- Gollan, R.A. Revolutionaries and Reformists: Communism and the Australian Labour Movement, 1920-1955. ANU Press, Canberra, 1975.
- Gordon, Richard (ed.). The Australian New Left. Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970.
- Gramsci, A. The Modern Prince and Other Writings, Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., London, 1957.
- Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. MacGibbon and Kee, London, 1970.
- Gretton, J. Students and Workers: An Analytical Account of Dissent in France May-June 1968. Macdonald, London, 1969.
- Guevara, Che. Reminiscences of the Cuban Revolutionary War. Pelican, U.S.A., 1968.
- Halloran, J., Elliot, P., Elliot, G. Demonstrations and Communications: A Case Study. Penguin, U.K., 1970.
- Hoffman, Abbie. Revolution For The Hell Of It. Dial Press, N.Y., 1968.
- Horne, Donald. Time of Hope: Australia 1966-72. Angus and Robertson, Australia, 1980.
- Horne, Donald. The Education of Young Donald. Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1967.
- Horne, D. Death of the Lucky Country. Penguin, U.K., 1977.
- Hyams, B.K. and Bessant, B. Schools for the People? An Introduction to the History of State Education in Australia. Longmans, Melbourne, 1972.

- Hyde, M. It Is Right To Rebel. Free Association Press, Marrickville, N.S.W., 1972.
- Illich, I. De-schooling Society. Calder and Boyers, London, 1971.
- Jackson, George. Soledad Brother. Penguin, U.S.A., 1971.
- Jackson, H. (ed.). Weatherman. Ramparts Press, Cal., 1970.
- Keniston, K. Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition. Harvest, N.Y., 1971.
- Keniston, K. Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. Harvest, N.Y., 1968.
- King, Peter (ed.). Australia's Vietnam: Australia in the Second Indo-China War. George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983.
- Kunen, James S. The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary. Random House, N.Y., 1969.
- Leary, T. Confessions of a Hope Fiend. Bantam, U.S.A., 1973.
- Legge, J.S. (ed.). Who's Who in Australia 1971. Herald and Weekly Times (Melb.), XX Ed., 1971.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilich. What Is To Be Done? Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1968.
- Lipset, S.M. Rebellion in the University. Routledge and Kegan Paul, U.K., 1972.
- Luttwak, E. Coup d'Etat. Penguin, U.K., 1969.
- Mailer, Norman. The Armies of the Night. Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1968.
- Mailer, Norman. Miami and the Siege of Chicago: An Informal History of the Republican and Democratic Conventions 1968. Signet, N.Y., 1968.
- Major, G. (ed.). Mass Media In Australia. Hodder and Stoughton, Sydney, 1976.
- Mao Tse-tung. Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1967.
- Marcuse, H. Eros and Civilisation. Sphere Books Ltd., U.K., 1972.
- Marx, Karl; Engels, Frederick. Manifesto of the Communist Party. Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1968.
- McQueen, H. A New Britannia. Penguin, 1970.

- Miller, Michael V., Gilmore, Susan (eds.). Rebellion at Berkeley. Dell, N.Y., 1965.
- Millet, Kate. Sexual Politics. Rupert Hart-Davis, London, 1971.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Sociological Imagination. Pelican, U.K., 1970.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. O.U.P., 1956.
- Neville, R. Playpower. Jonathon Cape, London, 1970.
- O'Brien, Patrick. The Saviours: An Intellectual History of the Left in Australia. Primary Education P/L., 41 Rowena Parade, Richmond, Victoria, 1977.
- Pappenheim, Fritz. The Alienation of Modern Man. Monthly Review Press, N.Y., 1968.
- Parkin, F. Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Manchester University Press, U.K., 1968.
- Playford, J. and Kirsner, D. Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique. Pelican, U.K., 1972.
- Quottrocchi, A. and Nairn, T. The Beginning of the End. Panther, U.K., 1968.
- Rabinow, P. (ed.). The Foucault Reader, Penguin Books, U.K., 1986.
- Rand, Ayn. 'The Cashing In: The Student Rebellion', in The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution. Signet, N.Y., 1970.
- Reich, Charles. The Greening of America. Random House, N.Y., 1970.
- Roper, Tom. The Myth of Equality. Heinemann, Melbourne, 1971.
- Roszak, T. The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition. Faber and Faber, London, 1971.
- Rubin, Jerry. Do It: Scenarios of a Revolution. Simon and Schuster, N.Y., 1970.
- Rude, George. The Crowd in History: Popular Disturbances in France and England 1730-1848. Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1981.
- Ideology and Popular Protest. Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1980.
- Sale, K. SDS. Random House, N.Y., 1973.
- Scott, Peter. The Crisis of the University, Croom Helm, Australia P/L, Sydney, 1984.

- Seale, Bobby. Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party.  
Arrow Books, U.K., 1970.
- Statera, G. Death of a Utopia: Development and Decline of Student  
Movements in Europe. O.U.P., U.K., 1975.
- Windschuttle, E. (ed.). Fixing the News: Critical Perspectives on the  
Australian Media. Cassell, North Ryde, 1981.
- X, Malcolm. The Autobiography of Malcolm X. N.Y., 1965.
- York, B., Robinson, F. and Pola, B. August Fourth Victory  
Commemoration. La Trobe Marxist-Leninists, 1973.



ARTICLES

- Abbey, B. and Catley, Bob. 'Universities: The New-Capitalist Context', Arena, 21, 1970.
- Allen, Percy. 'The Student Revolt in Australia', Honi Soit, Univ. of Sydney SRC, 19 Sept., 1969, p.6.
- Altman, Denis. 'Students in the Electric Age', in R. Gordon (ed.), The Australian New Left. Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970.
- Altman, Denis. 'Party Youth Groups in Australia', in Henry Mayer (ed.), Australian Politics: A Second Reader. Cheshire, Melbourne, 1969, pp.176-186.
- Baracchi, Guido. 'What's New Professor Derham?', MUM, 1970 pp.66-71.
- Birrell, Bob. 'Student Attitudes to the Left', Arena, 24, 1971; 27, 1971.
- Birrell, Bob. 'High School Attitudes Towards the Left', Arena, 27, 1971.
- Birrell, Bob. 'Monash Survey', Arena, . 24, 1971.
- Bishop, Rod. 'Style of the New Left', Rabelais, 20 March 1969, p.4.
- Burgoyne, S. 'The World Youth Festival', Australian Left Review, no.1, 1969.
- Cahill, Rowan. 'The Seventeen Days that Shook the Campus', Honi Soit, 5 April 1968, pp.8-9.
- Campbell, Andrew. 'Against Student Participation', Rabelais, 19 April 1971, p.12.
- Carroll, Ian. 'The New Radicals', Arena, 21, 1970, pp.65-72.
- Cole-Adams, Peter. 'Reform of Society or Revolution?', the Age, 22 May 1969, p.6. (with Jim spigelman, Albert Langer, Harry van Moorst and Warren Osmond).
- Coleman, Peter. 'The Student Generation', the Bulletin, Sydney, 11 August 1962.
- Connell, Bob. 'The University as a Civil War', The Recorder, Univ. of Sydney Union, vol.49, no.1, 12 March 1969, pp.5-6.
- Davidson, Carl. 'Campaigning on the Campus', in A. Cockburn, R. Blackburn (eds.), Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action. Penguin, 1969, pp.327-367.
- Evans, Grant. 'The Radical Movement at La Trobe', Rabelais, 8 August 1969, pp.8-9.

- Fitzpatrick, Brian. 'Student Life: The Twenties', Melbourne University Magazine, Spring, mcmlxi, pp.10-16.
- Flacks, Richard. 'Liberated Generation: An Explanation of the Roots of Student Protest', in Peter Rose (ed.), The Study of Society, Random House, N.Y., 1970.
- Gordon, R. and Osmond, W. 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in R. Gordon (ed.), *ibid.*
- Gott, K. 'Student Life: The Forties...That Other R.S.L.', MUM, pp.23-27.
- Guerin, Bruce. 'From Apathy to Student Power', The Advertiser, Adelaide, 21 March 1969, p.2.
- Halliday, Fred. 'Students of the World Unite', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds.), Student Power, Penguin, U.K. 1969, pp.287-326.
- Hannan, Grant. 'Campus Revolt on a Global Scale', Tribune, C.P.A., 10 July 1968, pp.6-7.
- Hamel-Green, M. 'Theory and Practice of the Student New Left', Tribune, C.P.A., 12 March 1969, p.6.
- Hamel-Green, M. 'Beyond Pity', Melbourne University Magazine, 1969, pp.55-61.
- Hamel-Green, M. 'The Politics of Commitment', National U, A.U.S., 24 March 1969.
- Harman, G., in J.E. Anwy (ed.), Occasional Papers, Proceedings of the Conference of University Governing Bodies, August 1982, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, Churchill House, A.C.T., No.5, 1983.
- Hollows, John. 'The Student Revolution', the Australian, 13 June 1968, p.9.
- Jackson, A. and Weineke, D. 'Student Power - An Alternative View', Arena, 19, 1969, pp.85-92.
- Jones, Michael. 'The Radical 200', Quadrant, July-August, 1968, pp.22-24.
- Kalange, M.O. 'Academics and Big Business', Arena, 3, Autumn 1964.
- Laqueur, W. 'Reflections on Youth Movements', Commentary, 47, June 1969, pp.34-36.
- Laver, B. 'Behind Student Action', Australian Left Review, no.3, 1968.
- MacDonald, Ian. 'Moratorium', Rabelais, June 1970, p.4.
- Mandel, Ernest. The Revolutionary Student Movement. Socialist Youth Alliance, P.O. Box 581, Sydney Sth., late 1960s.

- Mayer, H. 'What's Wrong With Australia?'. Interviews with five Monash Uni. radicals, in Australian Politics: A Second Reader. Cheshire, Melbourne, 1969, pp.187-193.
- McQueen, H. 'Three Tactics for Student Power', Arena, 18, 1969, p.199.
- McRae, Donald, in H.W. Laqueur and G. Mosse (eds.), Education and Social Structure in the Twentieth Century. Harper Torchbooks, N.Y., 1967.
- Morgan, Tony and Taylor, David. 'Why We Are Revolting', Tharunka, 29 October 1968, pp.12-17.
- Mortimer, Rex. 'Democracy and the New Capitalism', Arena, 15, 1968.
- Neild, Bob and O'Connell, Chris. 'Profile of an Activist', Honi Soit, Univ. of Sydney SRC, 18 March 1969.
- Nicholls, A. 'Student Life: The Thirties (...And In These Days Too)', MUM, pp.19-22.
- O'Neill, Dan. 'Abstract and Real Worlds: Intellectuals and Radical Social Change', in R. Gordon (ed.), *ibid.*
- O'Neill, Dan. 'The Growth of the Radical Student Movement'. Semper Floreat, Univ. of Q'ld. Student Union, 17 March 1969.
- O'Neill, Dan. 'Student Movement Strategy', Australian Left Review, no.2, 1969.
- Osmond, W. 'A Monash at Monash', Arena, 16, 1968, pp.12-16.
- Osmond, W. 'Student Revolutionary Left', Arena, 19, 1969, pp.22-28.
- Osmond, W. 'Workers Control, Student Power', Australian Left Review, no.5, 1969.
- Pola, Brian. 'Notes from Pentridge Prison', Rabelais, La Trobe SRC, June 1972.
- Pola, Brian. 'Student Protest in the 70s', Rabelais, La Trobe Univ. SRC, vol.16, no.19; vol.16, no.10, 1983.
- Playford, John. 'Bibliography of the International and Australian New Left', in R. Gordon (ed.), *ibid.*
- Reid, P. 'Planning Without Thinking', Rabelais, 17 June 1968.
- Rowley, Kevin. 'Why Students Protest', Farrago, 1 May 1970, pp.16-17.
- Sharp, Geoff. 'The End of Education', Arena, 13, 1967.
- Sharp, G. and White, D. 'Features of the Intellectually Trained', Arena, 15, 1968.

- Smart, J.C.C. 'The Philosophical Andersonians', Quadrant, vol.20, January 1976, pp.6-10.
- Spigelman, James. 'Student Activism in Australia', Vestes, vol.XI, no.2, July 1968, pp.107-118.
- Treisman, David. 'The CIA and Student Politics', in A. Cockburn and R. Blackburn (eds.), Student Power, Penguin, U.K., 1969.
- Turner, Ian. 'Conflicting Conceptions of a New University', Arena, 3, Autumn, 1964.
- Wilenski, P. Honi Soit, Univ. of Sydney SRC, 6 March, 17 April 1962; 11 September, 5 March 1965.
- White, Doug. 'Cultural Revolution in Victoria', Arena, 24, 1971, pp.14-20.
- York, Barry. 'Rationality and Persuasion', Rabelais, 9 September 1971, p.2.

NEWSPAPERS

Student: National U, the A.U.S., 1969-1974. Incomplete set, National Library, Canberra; private collections.  
Farrago, Univ. of Melbourne SRC, 1925-1986.  
Tharunka, Univ. of N.S.W. Student Union, 1969-1972.  
On Dit, Univ. of Adelaide SRC, 1970-1972.  
Rabelais, LTU SRC, 1967-1986.  
Semper Floreat, Univ. of Queensland Student Union, 1969-1972.  
Lot's Wife, Monash Assn. of Students, 1967-1971.

Dailies and other: Advertiser (Adelaide); Tribune (C.P.A.); Vanguard (C.P.A. M/L); Sunday Observer (Melbourne, 1971); Age, (Melbourne); Sun (Melbourne); Herald (Melbourne); Australian; National Times (Sydney); Le Monde (Paris); Observer (London); New York Herald Tribune (1967); Times Higher Education Supplement (London); Sydney Morning Herald.

Periodicals: Arena (Melbourne); Quadrant (Sydney); Commentary (U.S.A.); American Sociological Review; Melbourne University Magazine; The Recorder (Univ. of Sydney); Vestes (F.A.U.S.A.); Australian Left Review (C.P.A.); Fortune (Time-Life, U.S.A.); Newsweek (U.S.A.); Playboy; News Weekly (Melbourne).

Pamphlets: La Trobe University Bulletin, LTU Pub.; Message from the Vice-Chancellor, LTU Pub.; La Trobe University Record, LTU Pub.; Red Moat (LTU Worker-Student Alliance); Student Guerilla (Brisbane S.D.A.); Resist, (Melbourne S.D.S.); Enrages (LTU Labor Club); Half-Baked (Melbourne Revolutionary Socialists); Liberty (LTU Democratic Club); Vanguard (LTU Marxist-Leninists); Proletariat (Univ. of Melbourne Labour Club, 1932-1935); Ubique Underground (Melbourne University High School Pub.); Tabloid Underground (Students in Dissent); Pravda (Peninsula Underground Paper, Melbourne); Wall (LTU SDS); La Trobe University Bullet (sic), LTU 1972; Black Barb (LTU Anarchists); Red Ned (LTU Communists); Probe (LTU Postgraduates); Moderate Student Alliance (LTU, 1971-1972).

Minutes and Reports: LTU Council, 1967-1986; LTU Academic Board, 1970-1986; LTU SRC meetings and GMS, 1967-1986; Australian Union of Students, Executive Minutes and Annual Reports, 1969-1985; Greg Weir Defence Committee, Australian Gay Archives, Melb.; LTU Working Party on the Status of Women, First Report, LTU, 1985.

Transcripts: Reasons for Judgement, Supreme Court of Victoria, 1972, as sourced; Monday Conference, 'Conflict on Campus. The fight for the A.U.S.' 28 March 1977, ABC TV (Sydney).

Government Publications:

Martin Report. Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia. (Sir Leslie Martin, Chairperson), Government Printer, Melb., 3 Vs., 1964-5.

Commonwealth Year Book, Aust. Govt. Printer, Melb., no.59, 1973.

Ramsey Report. Victoria: Committee on State Education in Victoria, Victn. Govt. Printer, Melb., 1960.

Victorian Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), Melb., 1970-1971.

Commonwealth of Australia Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), Canberra, A.C.T., 1970-1972.

La Trobe University Act, no.7189, Parliament of Victoria, 1964.

Summary Offences Act (as amended), Parliament of Victoria; as sourced.

Letters: As sourced.

Theses and essays:

Draper, A. 'Adelaide Student Radicals: Then and Now, 1968-80', (BA (Hons) thesis, History, Adelaide University, 1980).

Goldman, J. 'Student Political Activists of the late 1970s in the USA, England and Australia: A Sociological Study', MA thesis, 1983, LTU Borchardt Library.

Henry, M. 'La Trobe: A Study of the Idea of a University', (MA thesis, Social Science, La Trobe University, 1971).

Herouvim, J. 'An Alien Association: Australian Maoism and the Communist Party of China, 1971-1977', (MA (prelim.) thesis, History, La Trobe University, 1983).

Marshall, N. 'La Trobe University: The Vision and the Reality', (MED thesis, La Trobe University, 1979).

MacTiernan, A. 'Politics in a Small Community'. A political analysis of La Trobe University SRC 1967-1980. Unpub. undergraduate essay, LTU, 1980.

Pola, B. 'Aspects of the Radical Student Movement'. Unpub. B.Ed. mini-thesis, LTU School of Education, 1980.

Saunders, M. 'The Vietnam Moratorium Movement in Australia: 1963-73', (Ph.D. thesis, Flinders University, 1977).

Rootes, C. 'Australia's Student Radicals: The Nature and Origins of Dissent', (BA (Hons) thesis, University of Queensland, 1969).

Walter, J. 'The Perception of Conflict: Profiles From Student Politics', (BA (Hons) thesis, Politics, La Trobe University, 1974).

York, B. 'Sources of Student Unrest in Australia with Particular Reference to La Trobe University, 1967-1972', (MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1985).

Interviews: Taped and transcribed - 1986: Peter Cochrane, Jean McLean, Albert Langer, Neil McLean, Darce (Jon) Cassidy, Michael Hyde, Harry van Moorst, Kerry Langer, Michael Hamel-Green.

Unrecorded: Hugo Wolfsohn (1984); Barry York (1986).

Film: The Graduate, Nichols, M., 1967; Easy Rider, Hopper, D., 1969; Zabriskie Point, Antonioni, M., 1970; If..., Anderson/Sherwin, 1969; Beginnings, LTU SRC, Bishop, R., Glenn, G., 1971; ABC TV News, 1966-1987.