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Preface

This book, written to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Queensland, keeps up a tradition. The Silver Jubilee of 1935 was marked by a historical compilation produced by a number of leading academics and administrators, and this remains a useful source of information on the first twenty-five years of the University’s life. More comprehensive, and immensely more entertaining, was the unpublished manuscript prepared to mark the Golden Jubilee of 1960 by Harrison Bryan, the Forsyth Librarian. These two works, together with the very early history, of the years 1910–22, by Henry Alcock and Jeremiah Joseph Stable, which has some otherwise obscure information on the early academic structure, represent the main attempts to write the history of the University of Queensland. They have been supplemented in recent years by several departmental histories written by members of academic staff and by a valuable thesis on the foundation of the University by Edward Clarke in the History Department. All these accounts have been written by members of the University. Perhaps the centenary history of 2010 should be written by an outsider who will look less indulgently upon our foibles and our idiosyncracies.

This work was also undertaken as part of a widely perceived need to record and preserve material relating to the early history of the University. The recently established Archives section, the much older Alumni Association, and the even
longer established Fryer Library have in different ways given
impetus to this movement. As part of the research activity in
the preparation of this book, some three dozen tape recordings
were made of interviews with former staff and students of the
University, and some attempt has been made to safeguard the
oral traditions, even at the risk of perpetuating some of the
myths.

Personal memories, notoriously fallible, are, of course, only
one of the sources on which this account is based. Local
newspapers are an important guide to contemporary thinking
and sometimes record information not to be found within the
University itself. Similarly, the debates of the Queensland
Parliament are an unsurpassed indicator of the political context
in which the University grew and allow academics some
capacity at least to see themselves as others see them. Student
publications make the same sort of contribution and provide a
quite different perspective on affairs from that of the official
University committees that deliberate and legislate. The most
important of these bodies is the University Senate, and the
Senate Papers, incorporating as they do the proceedings of
most other important groups and committees in the Univer­
sity, provide the main documentary basis for this study. In­
evitably, they convey a view of history from above rather than
from below.

The question of what should go into a University history
and the equally important one of what should be left out are
not susceptible to a definitive answer. It is not possible that
one person’s selection will meet with universal approval. The
events and the incidents from the University’s past are so
numerous that only those adjudged the most important or
appearing the most interesting can possibly be included.
Similarly, many of the people who have contributed to the
University’s progress over seventy-five years do not receive a
mention, because the selection process must be fairly rigorous.
I hope that it will appear fair and not arbitrary.

I hope too that the method of assembling material will be
seen to have merit. There is a view that history must be either
a chronological narrative or an analysis and that anything that
attempts to be both must inevitably fail. I have tried to com­
bine a general chronological approach with an emphasis on
particular themes within the different phases of the Univer­
sity’s past; this method slows down the telling of the story
but allows time for reflection on certain parts of it.
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Part One

A People’s University,
1870–1911
1 Presenting the Case

On 10 December 1909, the fiftieth anniversary of the state's independence, the governor of Queensland, Sir William MacGregor, gave his assent to the University of Queensland Bill and formally dedicated Government House to its new purpose of providing a home for the centre of learning. Under this Bill the university was to be governed by a Senate, a body of twenty men who were advised of their role on 14 April 1910, two days before their names appeared in the Queensland Government Gazette. This announcement implemented the previous year's Bill, and the university was now officially in being. In less than a year its first students would enrol and begin their studies in March 1911. These events in the foundation of the University of Queensland brought to an end a debate lasting forty years, in which Queensland's need for a university had been strenuously asserted and just as strenuously denied.

The debate was Queensland's own. Similar arguments could have taken place in other states or other countries, but the precise shape of this one was determined by the nature of the land and the society in which it occurred. More than other Australian states Queensland responded to "the call of the land". In the years 1891–1921 the rural areas of the state received more immigrants than the urban, and in 1911 Brisbane contained no more than 23 per cent of Queensland's population. Of the state capitals only Hobart contained a
Government House becomes the University of Queensland, 10 December 1909 (John Oxley Library)

smaller proportion of its state's population. This least urbanized of Australian societies had 38 per cent of its workforce engaged in primary industry in 1901. After escaping from its convict origins, Queensland developed a rural society based on the primary industries of sheep grazing, the raising of cattle, mining, and sugar production, all of which took people away from the south-eastern metropolis, scattered them throughout the length and breadth of an enormous country of 667,000 square miles, and put them to work in activities which did not call, initially at least, for a high level of educational provision.2

Queensland was a frontier society. The pursuits of its people called for practical rather than intellectual skills, and a perceived need for what a university could contribute would occur only with the growth of manufacturing industries, service sectors, and professional classes in Brisbane in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Within such a society, technical education would have greater appeal than anything of an intellectual and academic nature. The pursuit of ideas would inevitably take second place to that struggle to conquer the environment and make the land yield up its
Presenting the Case

treasures, which was the central theme of the state's growth in the nineteenth century. Such an existence gave rise to a distinction between real requirements, which embraced matters such as water conservation and agricultural improvement, and superfluous adornments such as the culture that a tiny south-eastern minority thought fit to impose upon the rest. This distinction invariably found expression in what W.H. Groom, MLA, referred to in 1877 as "the increasing tendency to Brisbanization", a worry that the real people and the real needs of the country would be subjected to the whims of the city-dwellers far removed from life as it was lived.

Whereas primary and technical education were obviously useful and intended to be widely established, university education, of doubtful worth anyway, would be given (it was alleged in 1899 and in most other years of the debate) in only one part of the colony and would not be freely available to people in all parts. The problem was not confined to country-dwellers, for compounding the division between Brisbane and the extensive rural areas was that unceasing pressure from the non-metropolitan urban centres to extract economic advantages under political threat.

It is not then surprising that the advocates of a university for Queensland should have looked to the mid-western states of the United States for their models in the 1880s and 1890s. Conditions in Queensland, according to the Brisbane Courier, were very like those in Ohio, Michigan and Illinois, and their universities were the "outcome of the intense desire for practical knowledge among a practical and busy people". Nor is it surprising that much attention was given to contemplating some federal model for a university that might have its centre in Brisbane but constituent colleges throughout the state. The nature of Queensland society explains much of the early antagonism towards the idea of a university. It also explains the way out of the dilemma for those who were able to persuade the people that there was no intention of trying to recreate an old world Oxbridge within a society whose needs demanded something quite different.

Until this idea had been absorbed, a university was for many a nightmarish prospect. Some were quite scornful in their references: A. Rutledge, member for Charters Towers, opposed Sir Samuel Griffith's motion of 1889 to establish what he alleged to be a university for "'kid-gloved young men". Even in 1906 a Courier correspondent attacked the notion that universities were the fount of all light and
knowledge; rather were they "jolly places, and immense places for branding very inferior and gramophonic intellects for passage among the old-fashioned and ignorant, or filling them up with a lot of antiquated stuffing having no bearing upon life, and for manufacturing terribly bumptious persons". "To most of us," admitted the Courier, which had long supported the foundation of a university, "it means a place where some learned men impart their stored knowledge to a few young men out of a crowd of idlers who come to college to row in boats and 'see life'." To promote such an institution would, in the memorable words of another member of parliament, V.B.J. Lesina, in 1899, be like "establishing a white elephant that will require an expenditure which will be like pouring water through a sieve".5

Others, more ready to be persuaded of its utility, followed the ideas laid down by the Courier in 1889 that the university should not be on the lines of the schools of the Middle Ages, whatever they were supposed to be, but "in consonance with modern requirements". It should be free from what E.C. Barton was to call in 1906 "the narrowing influences of a too rigorous adhesion to the traditions of the past". To some extent Sydney University had failed to break loose by becoming essentially a training ground for the learned professions of the law, the church, and medicine, with engineering catered for within the Faculty of Science. By contrast, the University of Queensland, said J.W. Blair (a future chancellor) in 1909, was not to be like the old universities, which spent too much time on classics, dead languages, and the arts, studies which provided no help in the struggles of modern life. It was to be a university for Queensland, to meet Queensland's contemporary and practical needs.6

They were brave men who, against this kind of opinion, attempted to propagate the traditional values and purposes of a university; men like the Scotsman Andrew Chapman, a Chronicle reader from Gympie who wrote in 1893 that university culture had more than a commercial value and that "the breath of culture will have a sweetening and softening effect upon every stratum of society". Culture was almost a dirty word, yet it was again used, in November 1906, by Archbishop Donaldson when he bemoaned what he called the intellectual sterility of Queensland and looked to a university to set intellectual standards as well as provide practical services. An even more traditional view was taken by a Presbyterian minister and future senator, E.N. Merrington, in 1910, when
he denied the wish to turn out "well-mannered aristocratic gentlemen of leisure" but argued nevertheless for "ancient studies" as the indispensable basis of a liberal education and sound learning. These were courageous words. They probably helped not one whit in the campaign to establish a university, but they were to find a powerful champion in the first chancellor of the University of Queensland, Sir William MacGregor. Long before then the university advocates had learned the wisdom of rejecting such ideas or speaking them in whispers.?
The prehistory of the University of Queensland is probably most easily followed at the parliamentary level, where governments displayed their reaction to the university campaign and their reasons for a less-than-wholehearted response. It was the government’s job to establish priorities for public action and expenditure, and the inability of a university to compete with the demands for primary (and later technical) school provision within the education budget was equalled only by the inability of education as a whole to compete with railways, which absorbed no less than 72 per cent of the total public gross investment during the period 1860–1915. As the *Brisbane Courier* wryly observed in 1897, the cost of the Cairns railway alone would have paid for a dozen universities, but railways were always seen as being necessary for the development of the state and for the good of all the people. A university, by contrast, was long regarded as a luxury and a preserve of the privileged few. Similarly, within education, the push to improve a literacy rate of only 57 per cent in 1861 had meant that primary education was the first demand, followed by secondary and technical education, the last readily recognized as something that would be more useful to greater numbers of people. It was the government’s task to fit the university issue into an appropriate place among many conflicting claims upon public expenditure, and a lowly spot was usually allocated.

A misleadingly named University Act in 1870 gave the Queensland government the power to conduct local examinations for British universities, a power they were still exercising about forty years later. According to Sir Charles Lilley, Queensland would have been establishing a university at this time but for the unavailability of finance and the inauspicious beginnings of universities in the other Australian colonies. Such a possibility was clearly envisaged in 1871, when an Elections Act of that year foreshadowed the time when a University of Queensland might become a constituency to return a member to the Legislative Assembly. The Royal Commission of 1874, chaired by Lilley, which enunciated the idea of a free, compulsory and secular public education system, recommended the immediate establishment of a university to ensure the proper development of a secondary system, but Sir Samuel Griffith, as minister for public instruction, informed parliament that a university was a matter for future, not immediate, consideration. The *Courier* believed the omission of any proposal for a university was a serious mistake which would leave the educational system incomplete, but it con-
ceded that the absence of public demand and money made this hardly surprising. In 1877 Griffith believed that the time had come to act, but his proposed Bill received little support.

The second major phase of the parliamentary debate began with the governor’s speech in 1887, through which Griffith, now premier, intimated that the government had been considering for some time the idea of establishing a university and expressed his view that an institution conducted on American principles, giving scientific and practical instruction, would be useful for developing the mineral and agricultural resources of the colony. This represented a departure from traditional thinking on universities — a shock to many preconceived notions, according to the Courier — but Griffith failed to implement his ideas. When he tried two years later, with a determination and interest that absence from government seemed to excite, to persuade parliament to appoint a Royal Commission to consider a university, he had, not surprisingly, to listen to taunts about his own failure to act when in office. In 1889 he was maintaining that “all arguments of expediency, example, and utility” demanded that Queensland should keep pace with other civilized nations by founding a university and thereby safeguarding her progress. In reply, Premier Morehead made a classic statement of the anti-intellectual position, bemoaning the alleged glut of university graduates in Queensland, unemployed and unemployable, and expressing a preference for the opinion of a miner over that of a professor and a distaste for people who were capable of translating Latin and Greek. More conventional arguments were also raised against a university — the lack of money, a preference for railways, the problems of governing a sparse population within a large colony, and the need to avoid preferential treatment for Brisbane. Griffith, incensed by the action of the premier in sending round what he called a “fiery cross” to ensure that no one voted against the government’s wishes, so far forgot the need to appeal to expediency and utilitarian principles as to make a defiant plea for a university as “a centre of light and culture in Queensland”. On this occasion he went down fighting, supported by the Courier, which deplored the attitude of the premier and what it called “the exigencies of party”.

Two years later Griffith, now allied with Sir Thomas McIlwraith, had the power to appoint his Royal Commission under Lilley. An impressive group of churchmen, lawyers and educationalists, including the two grammar school heads, Roe
of Brisbane and Cameron of Ipswich, with Solicitor-General T.J. Byrne contributing a powerful presence from the government, produced a comprehensive report. This pointed in the same direction as the government hints of 1887: that Queensland’s needs were less for literary studies than for practical ones. An existence had to be sustained and material objects achieved; Queensland was a newly settled country and must look first to its physical needs. Despite this emphasis the commission recommended a balanced group of five faculties — arts, law, medicine, science, and applied science — but their proposals were academic in another sense as the government did not take steps to implement their recommendations. It has been suggested that this failure occurred for a variety of reasons: the current industrial situation, financial problems, Griffith’s own difficulties with colleagues, and possibly his declining interest in the matter. It is curious that his greatest determination was manifested when he lacked the power of government. It is less curious that the depression of the 1890s, which saw the education budget reduced by 12.5 per cent in 1893–94, should have diverted government thoughts from the issue of a university.  

Fortunately there were others determined to keep the idea alive and they gained their most useful propaganda machine in the Queensland University Extension Movement, which was launched in 1893. It began with a private meeting in the chambers of barrister John Laskey Woolcock, at which a committee of five was formed to organize a public meeting for placing the idea of University Extension before a wider audience and establishing an organization for its operations. It was the hope that lecture courses in adult education, given by southern academics or similarly qualified local people, would excite popular interest in the idea of a university in Queensland as well as spread a little enlightenment on a number of topics. For many years, according to the Queensland Times, leading public men in the colony had wanted to establish a university but had invariably been frustrated by the absence of money. This proposal for public lecture courses would, it believed, provide all the advantages of a university training without the expense, and thus the establishment of a university would be only a matter of time. The Brisbane Courier also responded enthusiastically, asserting, “The natural and sure way to a university for Queensland lies in the mental stimulus accruing from this modest work of University Extension”. If a university was not yet attainable, this was,
it was argued, the best substitute, and the substitute would inevitably lead to the real thing as a greater body of informed opinion was created through the Extension Movement.\(^\text{12}\)

This was certainly the hope of the distinguished group of gentlemen who formed part of the first council of the Extension Movement: Sir Samuel Griffith, the president, Reginald H. Roe, headmaster of Brisbane Grammar School and in 1910 the university's first vice- or deputy-chancellor, E. Lyttleton Groom, the secretary, Sir Charles Lilley, chairman of the 1891 Royal Commission, and J.L. Woolcock, another commission member and future senator of the university. Parliamentarians had heard from the Labor member Thomas Glassey in 1889 of the excellent work done in England in university extension, by which working men were being given a chance to overcome some of their earlier disadvantages; the new approach had a democratic aspect which helped to allay suspicions traditionally held of universities as elitist institutions, for this, in the words of many of its lecturers, was a movement that took the university to the people.\(^\text{13}\)

In the first year over 200 students enrolled in extension classes in Brisbane, and in 1894 the number rose to 245, the highest ever attained. Within a year the Wide Bay and Burnett News was able to report plans to extend the movement to Maryborough, Bundaberg and Gympie, but, though the intention was to have lecturers travel around the country towns and establish university centres throughout Queensland, it proved difficult to maintain educational provision outside Brisbane and Ipswich. For a time the lectures were enthusiastically received, and were described as "eminently practical and useful", despite their concern with such matters as economics and constitutional law, but the enthusiasm began to decline. In 1895 and 1896 no more than 150 students were attending the half-dozen courses on offer in Brisbane, and very few were taking and passing examinations at the end of them. R.H. Roe regretted that young people were not attending in greater numbers and were preferring to spend money on self-indulgence. Enough devoted ones existed in 1897 to form their own Students Movement, affiliated to the University Extension Movement, and in the same year Extension began to sponsor classes leading to Sydney University matriculation qualifications. A further step was taken in 1901 when Melbourne University allowed Extension to conduct examinations for Melbourne degrees.\(^\text{14}\)

But whatever nominal links were established and inspiration
offered, the practical achievements of the Extension Movement were limited. Very few students received degrees as a result of their Extension work, though others were enabled to proceed to study elsewhere having made a start through the Extension Movement. It is generally accepted that Extension helped to dispel much of the ignorance and prejudice about universities, and it did elicit some small financial contribution from the state government towards higher education, but it was, as the Courier realized as early as 1896, no real substitute for a true university where students could undertake full-time study for a degree. It did, however, provide continuity to the idea of having a university and would be responsible in 1906 for staging the University Congress, which led eventually but directly to the University Act of 1909.15

By 1897 University Extension was making an impact and the mood was changing. The Courier was again urging the government to make a modest beginning, for there was "no occasion to start with an imposing pile of buildings with a staff of highly paid professors, and all the dignified surroundings of college life". Also, the University Extension Movement was subjecting the government to deputations, and these were not without effect. Successive Bills were presented to parliament at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, apparently carrying the support of the government but never, it seems, involving their total commitment. In 1900, for example, a Bill which failed to progress beyond its first reading held only eleventh place out of thirteen measures proposed by the government. The untimely death of T.J. Byrne, political instability and, presumably, a lack of any real enthusiasm ensured successive frustrations for the council of the University Extension Movement, who secured neither the total involvement of any long-serving government nor even a firm commitment from any government on where a future university might be sited. Victoria Park, Yeronga, and Dutton Park were all under consideration in 1902, but the state government and Brisbane Municipal Council were unable to reach agreement to finalize this limited aspect of the bigger issue.16

In 1906 the Extension Movement enjoyed its crowning achievement, the University Congress. No fewer than 149 delegates from all walks of life — professional associations, businessmen, churchmen and trade unions — attended this congress to hear a wide range of lectures, listen to reports from their working parties and sub-committees, and actually
produce a draft Bill for a Queensland university. A thousand copies of the congress report were circulated, along with five thousand appeals for funds, and leaflets, letters, and other devices calculated to win publicity and support. The congress was opened by the governor and presided over by Sir Pope A. Cooper, the chief justice, and members heard papers from a great number of supporters of the university idea. They laid stress on scientific and technical education rather than a study of the classics, and they were typified by W.M. Nelson’s address on the need for “A Practical and Progressive University”.

Two practical and progressive steps were immediately taken: a fund was launched for a university (which reached £3,700 by 1909), and a copy of the proceedings was forwarded to Premier Kidston in the hope that this massive expression of opinion and support would be sufficient to persuade the government that the time had now come to make a firm commitment. Although there was to be no immediate fulfilment of their central ambition, the leaders of the congress now reconstituted themselves into the University Movement, a body with which the government was able and willing to discuss its thinking on the university issue over the following three years.

This was the period of reconciliation, when ideas that had for so long been voiced about the need for a university finally assumed such a form that they became acceptable to the government and were able to answer many of the fears, doubts, and prejudices that had long been expressed. The educational process embarked upon decades earlier finally persuaded the people, or enough of them, that a university was not only worth having but absolutely necessary. Whether its original sponsors shaped their notions out of political expediency or those ideas simply underwent realistic and sensible modification in response to the publicly expressed needs of Queensland society is difficult to say. Whatever the pressures that determined their final form, it is clear that by 1909 the envisaged university would be designed to meet the perceived needs of the state that it was intended to serve.

Indeed, no single theme had so dominated the 1906 congress as the usefulness of a university to satisfy the needs of the community. What Sir Samuel Griffith had identified back in 1889 as a need for a university to develop “the material resources of the colony” was given detailed expression in 1906 by those who argued that the prosperity of Queensland was
dependent on its industrial development and that graduates were required to take responsible positions within industry; that nothing was more important than the commerce of the state and this should be the university's prime consideration; that the development of agriculture and water conservation were matters that the university would be able to promote. In line with these ideas was the recommendation of the Curriculum Sub-Committee that the first three chairs to be established should be in engineering, mining, and arts. A university would also, it was maintained, train and stimulate teachers and other educational experts, promote citizenship and, in the opinion of one optimistic alderman of Brisbane Council, improve the personnel and increase the influence of parliament. In addition, Reginald Roe had schemes for the university to preside as an examining body over the civil service, the dental profession, pharmacy, and a range of other professions and organizations.

The envisaged usefulness of a university to Queensland has encouraged one attempt to place the movement within the theories and ideology of nineteenth century utilitarianism, while the strength that the university was to impart to the state and the opportunities it was to bestow upon certain groups within that state have inspired a complementary effort to place it within the context of social Darwinism. The belief that the university could advance the working class cause, a reversal of the older view that it would be socially elitist, produced expressions of hope that it would be open to the whole of the people (a term variously interpreted), that the poor man's son would have access, and that it would be a free service. The delegate from the Typographic Association made his support conditional upon the total absence of fees, but Roe, from the chair, offered the slightly more cautious and ambiguous view that the university should be free to many, if not to all.

Labor Party opinion was largely pacified by beliefs that this would happen, but attempts to assuage the discontent of country areas at the certain choice of Brisbane as the university site were less successful. During the debate on the Griffith motion in 1889 the minister for public instruction had warned that a university in Brisbane would not be approved by the central and northern portions of the state and had argued against Griffith's proposal on the ground that more than one university would be required to prevent jealousy. This jealousy would never completely subside; Dr John Thomson,
headmaster of Maryborough Grammar School, attempted to
combat it by his statement in 1906 that they would have a
Queensland, not a Brisbane, university, with affiliated colleges
throughout the state and that the university would embrace
no particular political or religious creed but would be for all
Queenslanders. There was further effort to implement this
kind of sentiment when the University Bill included a clause
to permit study without attendance, which would enhance
the standing of the university as an institution for the whole
of Queensland and not simply for Brisbane and its surroun-
ding areas.\(^{21}\)

The year 1906 was a clear landmark in the movement to
establish a university, for at the congress in November the
governor observed that the issue "now seemed to be passing
from the position of mere academic aspiration into the region
of practical politics". The chairman was also able to report
with pleasure that an excellent building and recreational site
had been granted by the government for university purposes
and that a deep debt of gratitude was owed to the minister for
lands. The Bill embodying this decision had been introduced
into the Legislative Assembly on 16 October with a prediction
from the minister that this was probably the first step towards
the institution of a university in Queensland. At the same time
care was taken to remind the House that there was no govern-
ment commitment to building a university, at least not in
1906. Premier Kidston had taken some of the gloss off the
government's magnanimity by explaining that the ownership
of the land concerned had been in legal dispute between the
government and the Brisbane Municipal Council so that
neither could make use of it. The decision to take over that
section of the park envisaged as a possible future governor's
residence, use it for a university, and allow the Brisbane
Council to have the remainder for a public park, had been as
much an expedient solution to a legal wrangle as a positive
step towards a university. Kidston believed that a university
was no matter of urgency since technical and secondary educa-
tion must be settled first, and he again made his personal posi-
tion explicit by opposing Johnson's motion in parliament nine
days later, by which the Assembly, with a 22-19 majority,
declared itself in favour of immediate establishment.\(^{22}\)

Nor did the secretary for public instruction attend the
University Congress the following month despite being
invited. Instead, he sent the departmental under-secretary, the
public servant J.D. Story, a man who was to have over the
next fifty-five years a greater importance for the university than anyone else in its history. Story had been at the department since his schooldays at Brisbane Grammar and had been acting under-secretary since 1904, and in a memorandum written much later was to recall how for many years the department had concerned itself almost entirely with primary education. His promotion, he believed, coincided with that time when the department needed to expand its activities to embrace secondary and higher technical education and the foundation of a teachers' training college, and the establishment of a university seemed a natural corollary of these activities. It seemed to him particularly appropriate that, with Queensland's Golden Jubilee year approaching in 1909, practical steps should be taken towards founding a university to commemorate that event.\textsuperscript{23}

Whether Story was himself the initiator of that idea it is not possible to say but, after a further period of political uncertainty and the visit of Premier Kidston to Britain, the idea began to receive some publicity. At a meeting of business and commercial interests in Brisbane in early October 1908, R.W. Thurlow suggested that a university would be an appropriate way of marking the Jubilee, and the premier himself was known on 27 November to be in favour of this proposition. Two weeks later R.H. Roe referred to it at the Brisbane Grammar School speech night, and the idea appears to have taken a firm hold. The earlier attitude of Kidston in 1906 suggests that his support for what he considered an appropriate step to be taken in 1909 was slightly whimsical rather than being the result of a conviction that was to earn him the first honorary doctorate of laws from the university in 1911. Yet the conversion of the government was also consistent with new thinking in the department, probably inspired by Story, about a comprehensive system of education from primary through to university level, under the control of the government and administered by the department.\textsuperscript{24}

It was with the wish of carrying this notion further that the minister asked Story in January 1909 to arrange a meeting between members of the University Movement and the premier to discuss the University Act which had been drafted in a preliminary way at the 1906 congress. On 30 June 1909, the governor's speech indicated to parliament that a Queensland University Bill was to come before them and that it was hoped to lay the first stone on the day of the state's fiftieth anniversary in December. It is worth noting that at
this stage it was evidently intended that a new building should be constructed for which a foundation stone would need to be laid.  

There was to be a university at last to serve a society which had at no time evinced any particular enthusiasm for the various proposals debated since 1870. When a Labor member, Patrick O'Sullivan, had maintained in 1889 that the working classes were as much in favour of having a university as any other group of people, he might well have spoken the truth, but this was no testimony to popular support. It is questionable if universities would ever have been established or, having been established, would have continued to receive public funding had they been required to demonstrate their popularity by means of a referendum. Democratic governments usually accept that it is their mission to inform as well as to be guided by public opinion, to lead as well as to follow, and so it frequently occurs that enlightened minorities are responsible for promoting changes that the apathetic majority would never get round to contemplating. This was almost certainly so with the foundation of the University of Queensland. If "the people" were persuaded of its desirability, they were not the whole, or perhaps even the majority, of the people, but were a sufficient number of sufficiently influential ones to cause the government to respond to their demands.

Popular indifference had plagued the university advocates from the beginning. The Brisbane Courier, lamenting the omission of any proposal for a university from the 1875 Education Bill, admitted that there was no generally expressed desire for one; pressure had come only from those who were influenced by "abstract ideas". Such pressure was ably mobilized and demonstrated by Sir Samuel Griffith when he introduced vast numbers of petitions, including sixty-six on one occasion alone, in 1887; these came, in response to a circular from Sir Charles Lilley, from municipal councils, divisional boards, and religious and educational bodies, but they were, like most popular campaigns, a contrived demonstration that provoked one member to protest that a university was being forced upon the public. The petitions were resumed in 1888 and 1889, but the public resisted and gave little encouragement to the Courier's claim of 1894 that there existed among the people of the colony an earnest desire for higher education. This claim it contradicted later in the same year by conceding that only those who had been privileged to ex-
experience university training could appraise the loss of its absence; few had enjoyed the experience and so there were few to appreciate the country's deprivation. By 1897 the Hon. T. MacDonald-Paterson could claim in the Legislative Assembly that the question of establishing a university in Queensland had been threadbare for many years, but that did not mean that all the arguments for its establishment had been universally accepted. Indeed, the 1906 debates at the congress contained further admissions of popular indifference. Professor Skertchley argued, somewhat dangerously, that the strongest evidence of the existence of a need for a university was the non-existence of any sense of need, while the chief justice, Sir Pope A. Cooper, frankly admitted that a number of people in Queensland were opposed to the idea of a university. Some people doubtless were, and some doubtless would remain so opposed, but by 1906 that was ceasing to matter. By that date, or shortly afterwards, an informed public opinion of sufficient strength had been created to persuade the government that a university should be established.  

It is worth noting too that after decades of delays and vacillations the government was in the end proceeding with what appears to be almost an impulsive haste in order to meet the December deadline. Lean years of drought, depression and flood had been followed by what one member described as "five of the most prosperous seasons that Queensland has ever experienced", and this was doubtless important. If there was to be a university in Queensland, the country must be ready for it, and conditions were as favourable in 1909 as they had ever been.  

Popular campaigners always need to feel that they have been instrumental in achieving success when the object of their campaign is finally adopted by governments, and it would be unjust to deny those who had struggled through years of University Extension, the congress, and the University Movement a major role in persuading the people's government. At the same time, it is now customary to see the hand of public servants behind the designs of governments, and the fates were clearly intending J.D. Story for a destiny within the University of Queensland. In the end, the government acted because it seemed a good way of celebrating the Golden Jubilee, and it is difficult to resist the view that many worse ways could have been found.
2 Moves in George Street

It was the claim of J.D. Story in later days that in establishing the university the government had pursued a major objective of having an institution which was to be “entirely independent of any other University, and not to be a subsidiary of any other organization governmental or otherwise”. This was undoubtedly a piece of ex post facto reasoning, for neither Story himself, nor his minister, nor the government had taken that position in 1908-9. It has been clearly shown that Story envisaged a comprehensive interrelated system of education in Queensland under government control, with a university forming one part of that system. In July 1908 he wrote of the likelihood that the university, when established, would be under government control, and when it became clear that the university was to go ahead he advised his superior, A.H. Barlow, to find out what happened in other states to ensure that the interests of the respective education departments were safeguarded. The results of the inquiry were not encouraging. Barlow learned an early lesson in academic freedom and the independence which universities value so highly, discovering, for instance, that in Sydney neither the government nor the department had representatives on a Senate in whom full power was vested. Although examples from elsewhere and the power assumed by the government to nominate completely the first Senate satisfied Barlow’s successor, W.H. Barnes, that enough control was being exercised, Barlow never forgave his colleagues for allowing power to pass from their
hands into those of a Senate. On many later occasions he was
to condemn the decision not to retain complete and permanent
government authority over the university.¹

Meanwhile the department went ahead during the first half
of 1909, doing its sums and preparing the Bill, first drafted at
the 1906 congress, that the government would place before
parliament. Story wisely consulted J.J. Walsh, the secretary to
the Extension Council, on the operating costs of a university
and received the advice that £10,000 would be necessary at
first; for the future, additional fees from students would cover
the cost of expansion and there would be no need for the
government to become further committed. This figure
evidently seemed unduly high to Story's political masters, for
Story then wrote to R.H. Roe, with whom Walsh had earlier
consulted, to inquire if some economies could possibly be
made. Roe's reply of 13 May is a most interesting document.
In it he stuck adamantly to the view that £10,000 was a
minimum figure to allow the establishment of three faculties
— arts, science, and engineering — and the appointment of
four professors of high quality. A cheaper university could be
established only by omitting a faculty, yet arts was needed to
make Queensland degrees acceptable throughout the world,
for training leaders, and for the provision of general culture,
that commodity which had previously been so unsaleable to
governments and public alike; engineering was similarly
necessary to ensure the proper development of Queensland's
mineral resources, for Sydney and Melbourne had, he argued,
failed to contribute properly to the development of national
resources because of their slight provision beyond the arts area
for so long. Like Walsh, Roe optimistically predicted that
good professors and good courses would attract students and
thereby student fees, and that there would be no need for
further appeals to the government for financial help.²

The University Bill was introduced to the Legislative
Assembly on 3 November by the member for South Brisbane,
James Allan, who had been accorded the honour of replying to
the governor's address. The situation proved somewhat over­
whelming, for he described the foundation stone as a seed, or
even a germ, and referred in the same breath to the
Metropolitan Water and Sewage Bill, with which he appeared
more at ease. The second reading on 9 November was in­
troduced by W.H. Barnes, the secretary for public instruc­
tion, who made an honest confession that some members of
the House would have been better members had they enjoyed
the advantages of higher education. These would now become available to their successors, for the government proposed to spend £10,000 on a university during each of the following seven years to pay the salaries of four professors and ten lecturers, and to cover the cost of "attendants, registrars, librarians, messengers, caretakers, and general expenses". The control of this sum of money would be in the hands of a Senate, which was to make appointments, manage and control the university, make statutes, conduct public examinations, and present an annual report of its activities to the governor-in-council. This Senate, inheriting the same name as the governing body of the University of Sydney and containing not more than three officers or employees of the university, was to consist of twenty members, all of whom were initially to be appointed by the governor-in-council. Eventually the election of twelve members of Senate would be the responsibility of the University Council, the body of graduate members of the university and donors of £100 or more, which would not be formally constituted until twenty-five masters and doctoral degrees had been awarded and not fully operational until fifty such graduates existed. When that time was reached, the government would nominate only the remaining eight members. The Bill made provision for the establishment of other educational institutions, including the Central Technical College on the University Domain, and their affilia-
tion to the university. It also made specific academic provisions for the three previously agreed faculties (arts, science and engineering), a Diploma of Education, and free attendance for trainee teachers, though fees were normally to be charged.3

The premier himself expanded some of the points made by the minister. The period of guaranteed government aid had been fixed at seven years, according to Kidston, “to give this House control over the system of education. . . . I think it is desirable that the representatives of the people should have effective control over the system of teaching in the University. . . . I do not put the University by any means in advance of Technical Education. . . . We desire to make the University in Queensland a good modern high class school on the lines of practical and scientific instruction that the newest universities in America and England have adopted.” This somewhat narrow view of the university’s role and its capacity to act independently received some reinforcement from Tolmie’s assertion that the Senate’s powers to extend the number of faculties would require the approval of the governor and that he would always be guided by the wishes of parliament, which were thought to reflect the opinion of the people of the state.4

Despite these assurances that parliament, through the government, would remain in command, several members saw the transitory nature of this control as the greatest of the Bill’s weaknesses. A future chancellor, J.W. Blair, urged the government to correct any defect in the legislation that permitted “a scintilla of a risk” of the government’s ever losing control, and others urged that its perpetuity should not be in doubt. Such pressures resulted in a slight modification of the Bill through parliament to the extent that the government decided to retain the power to nominate ten members, one half, of any future Senate, even when the University Council had been constituted. It was evidently believed that this power, together with the right to determine the whole of the membership during the initial period when important decisions were being taken and lines of development laid down, would ensure that the Senate remained amenable to departmental and governmental influence, an assumption that was not always borne out by events. Criticisms within parliament of the proposed composition and functioning of the council also produced some amendments to this section of the Bill. The extreme annoyance of Labor members that membership of the council was to be purchased by a £100 donation
caused the stakes to be raised to £500, which threatened an even more plutocratic and exclusive element added to the graduate body. It was also agreed that the council should come into existence when twenty-five ordinary graduates, rather than higher degree holders, had emerged and that the council should perform its full elective role when there were fifty. This would have the effect of shortening the period during which the university would be ruled entirely by government nominees, and the establishment of one supposedly democratic check on the Senate had the effect of weakening another.

The other main point of contention produced no concessions or modifications and that was the issue of fees. For years the Labor Party had insisted on the idea of a free university and they had received general, if not totally unambiguous, support from R.H. Roe. Members now repeated their belief in an absolutely free system, and William Lennon rejected even the idea that private endowments should be sought; the total cost should, he believed, be borne by the public purse. Others developed this notion of a free system, open equally to members of all classes, "a working man’s school, whose doors are open to the working man". There had previously been many references to the concept of a “people’s university”, and the premier again made use of the expression during the second reading of the Bill. He argued that small fees and government-financed bursaries were better than no fees, and maintained that the fee issue represented no undermining of the much publicized idea of a “people’s university”. Some members of parliament believed otherwise, and their fears were to be strengthened further when financial restrictions on entry were later compounded by academic restrictions which upset their ideas of a university readily accessible to all people.

In spite of the doubts, the fears, and the reservations, the Bill went through without formal opposition and with genuine all-party support. For no more than 2.5 per cent of the total education budget the government became the major sponsor of an institution which was expected to inspire the growth of secondary education in the state and largely coordinate education at the tertiary level. There were institutions scattered throughout the state: the School of Mines at Charters Towers, the Agricultural College at Gatton, and the Central Technical College and Teachers Training College to be developed in Brisbane — all these and others would, it was hoped, be brought under the protective wing of the new
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university. It was also still envisaged that the university could become the great central examining body for teachers, lawyers, public servants, pharmacists, dentists, and nurses within the state, a setter of standards as well as a training school for the whole professional range that would eventually come within its ambit. Of its use to the state there could be no doubt, and it would be very cheap at the price if the government could confine its investment to the initial £10,000. When Premier Denham was approached in the middle of 1911 to consider the establishment of chairs in agriculture and commerce, he replied that this was not the business of the state; rather was it “the duty of those who derived immense wealth from commerce to devote some portion of it to such purposes”. This was both an interesting insight into government philosophy and an indication that the initial backing of the university was regarded as duty done.

The naming of the members of the first Senate proved a much lengthier business than the completion of the legislation. The Queensland Teachers Union, taking up a parliamentary theme, urged that the department responsible for the state’s education should be strongly represented on the Senate. The *Brisbane Courier* agreed and went further: the university would link up the whole educational system and so the important parts of it should have a voice, the department, the technical colleges, the Teachers Training College (to be established in 1914), and the teachers themselves. The Teachers Union, it suggested, should be able to give experienced advice on the working of the university, though it failed to make clear what experience its members had of universities beyond the fact that some of its members had attended as undergraduates.

The Senate as eventually constituted did not in fact give such an overwhelming predominance to professional educationalists, and the government chose a different kind of mix through which to influence the beginnings of the infant institution. And when the infant at an early age indulged in behaviour not entirely acceptable to its parents, they behaved with a remarkable restraint and willingness to allow the university to find its own way. When the great matriculation debate of 1911 threatened some of the deeply held convictions of members of parliament and offered temptations towards government interference, members were told that these affairs were outside their province. The university must be independent of the government; the Senate, having been put in
command, must be free to act; the best possible professors had been appointed, and it would be a very serious matter indeed to intervene against their decisions. University independence and academic freedom found stout champions in the parliament of 1911, though both government members and public servants in the department must have been wondering by this stage if the university was going to serve the purposes for which it was intended or prove as amenable as they had supposed.\(^7\)

One of the government’s earliest disappointments must have been the discontent which the new university soon began to display with its home. The siting of the university, though not part of the proposed Bill brought to parliament, had proved one of the most contentious matters of the debate, and the completion of the Act by no means brought this contention to an end. This most controversial aspect of the university’s establishment had a long if somewhat unclear history. The notion of using Government House as a site for the future university had allegedly been mooted by Lilley as early as 1889, but there were years of propaganda to be undertaken before the matter of a site became one of practical politics. Sir Robert Philp had suggested during the 1906 debates that the site issue had been first raised about ten years previously, that is around 1896, but such thinking as there was on the question appears to have taken a clearer shape in 1902. At that time the council of the Extension Movement inspected various sites around the town and reduced them to a short list of three:
Musgrave Park in South Brisbane, a site on Ipswich Road, and a preferred one in Victoria Park. This last had been a bone of contention between the state government and the Brisbane Municipal Council, though it was adjudged ideal for the purpose of a university by the Telegraph, which suggested that a campus of a hundred acres would splendidly house all the necessary buildings in twelve acres, leaving twenty-eight for parkland, forty-four for residential colleges, and the remainder for a sports oval.®

Deputations to the government in 1902 and 1903 failed to extract any firm commitment, but in October 1906 progress began to be made. Almost out of the blue a Bill appeared before parliament to set aside for university purposes an area in Victoria Park which had previously been reserved for a future Government House. It seemed no longer likely that it would be required for this purpose and so it was proposed to reassign the land. It had, according to the secretary for public lands, very many of the features of a desirable university site: it was almost central, in a good elevated position, was quite the best site around Brisbane, and had been approved by the Extension Council. The premier rather spoiled the impact of the government’s generosity by explaining that this decision was an expedient solution to the land dispute with the Brisbane Municipal Council rather than part of any immediate plan to found a university, and one member feared that the long-term prospects for the university were such that the newly reserved area would become infested with prickly pear before anything was done with the land. Optimism was nonetheless strong at the University Congress in the November, certainly strong enough for the Financial Committee of the congress to request the government to set aside 10,000 acres of Crown land in each of the three great divisions of the state as a perpetual university endowment for future colleges. The Location Subcommittee spent some of its time inspecting buildings in the town centre which might be suitable for university teaching, finding the old Lands Office and the Normal School unavailable but deciding that St Andrews Church in Wickham Street would suit their purposes.°

By the early part of 1909 the matter had acquired a practical importance. The government had talked of a university to commemorate the Golden Jubilee that year, and so the matter of a site was acquiring some urgency. It was reported on 15 February that Kidston and his colleagues had received an unfavourable impression of Victoria Park, the previously
designated area, and were now favourably disposed towards the idea of commandeering the Government House Domain by the Botanical Gardens. Having become disenchanted with the idea of the proposed Government House site, they were casting possessive glances in the direction of the existing one. When the governor's speech of 30 June referred to the laying of a foundation stone in the December there was evidently still an intention to produce a new building, but by the time the Bill came to parliament in the November the intention had been changed. The government formed a site committee consisting of two future vice-chancellors, R.H. Roe and J.D. Story (both by this time employees of the department for Roe had become inspector-general of schools by this stage), A. Brady, a government architect, R. Gailey, another architect, and E.W.H. Fowles, a barrister and a member of the Financial Committee of the University Congress. It was a well-balanced committee of departmental, university and architectural interests, though one nominated by the government and one which reached a conclusion which had been allegedly favoured by the government in the February.10

This committee examined four sites, two in Victoria Park (including a recently proposed one to utilize the Exhibition end of Gregory Terrace), Yeronga Park, and the Government House Domain. According to their report they looked at the accessibility of the sites, the extent of the land available for building, and the possibilities for future expansion. They were particularly concerned to ensure a close connection between the university and the Central Technical College and to avoid time-wasting for students attending evening classes. Yeronga Park, though beautiful, was too inaccessible, and Victoria Park was unsuitable for building on one of its sites and too inaccessible to south-of-the-river students. The latter would result in severing the desired link with the technical college, with its south-bank clientele, and would also involve massive expenditure preparing the grounds for sporting and recreational purposes. A site which was generally thought to be ideal in 1906 was now thought to be largely unsuitable, and by Roe, among others, who had been involved in both decisions.

By contrast with Victoria Park, the Government House Domain was now seen to combine many advantages. There was no more central spot, an incontestable claim; there was sufficient elevated land not only for Central Technical College buildings on an extensive scale, but for a university hall and
library, a medical school, “and any other extensions that the University may hereafter need”, a claim of somewhat less validity. There was a beautiful environment, recreational space, existing buildings of Government House which could, with very little alteration, be used for lecture rooms, and an opportunity to share science and applied science facilities with the technical college. One thing the site could not supply was space for residential colleges, but it was not thought important to have these within university grounds. Whatever the sincerity of those who made the recommendation (and the whole manoeuvre smacks of a government decision for which a rational defence was being sought), it must at least be said that the report gives every indication that considerations of short-term expediency were allowed to outweigh any long-term vision that the more percipient might have possessed.

Parliament, asked to approve the University Bill in November 1909, received the news of the site committee’s recommendation and the government’s decision with some dismay, but they were powerless to act upon it since the site question formed no part of the Bill. Despite the assurance of the minister that the site decision had no political bearing and the protests, perhaps excessive, of Premier Kidston that the committee had entertained no idea of recommending that site until they actually saw it, which could hardly have been a novel experience for them, Brisbane members fulminated against the decision. They complained of the lack of consultation and the alleged unhealthiness of the site, and bemoaned the conversion of the governor’s dwelling, with its historic associations, to this new purpose, at the whim perhaps of the premier. E.B. Forrest made great play on the changing stands of R.H. Roe and E.W.H. Fowles, which, he believed, undermined and discredited their report, and expressed his amazement at how Roe could have allowed himself to be so manipulated. Damaging though these criticisms were, they were of less enduring significance than the words of one member, B. Fahey, who told the government that they had blundered: “A university,” he said, “is not built for to-day: it is intended to supply the educational wants of the State for all time”; in a few years the university would have to be moved. Many people, including the members of the site committee, would have good cause to remember his words.

Meanwhile, there was some support from the Labor members for the decision to take over Government House. It probably helped to give some substance to the notion of a
"people's university" as the governor's palace became a people's palace. Yet the disadvantages that followed from this decision were almost immediately apparent, and the best defence that can be offered of the government's decision is that the alternative to a badly sited university might well have been no university at all. The conscious magnanimity of a £10,000 per annum endowment of a university which could be housed in existing buildings suggests that the cost of developing a site in Victoria Park and starting an enterprise at ground level might have been enough to cause those who wished to commemorate the Golden Jubilee to look for a later anniversary to celebrate. Their limited vision, and the parsimony that helped to inspire it, are well illustrated by the premier's own assurance that no more than four or five of the Domain's thirty-seven acres would be required for both the university and the Central Technical College; on this small plot the two could flourish side by side so that they would become practically one institution.

Whatever consultation had taken place over the decision to use the governor's house evidently did not involve the incoming governor, for Sir William MacGregor, while still in England, was angered to learn that his prospective residence was to be utilized for these novel purposes. He believed, rightly, that the site would prove too small and the buildings unsuitable for a university, whatever else the government planned to erect on the site. He would, of course, require alternative accommodation, and one cynical member of parliament, noting the eagerness "to hand over the poor Governor's residence", as he put it, invited his fellow members to watch out over the next few weeks for news of someone with a big house and property to dispose of. The prophecy took longer to be fulfilled than he had predicted, but in June 1911 it was announced that the Queensland government had purchased Fernberg, which had been leased from the previous owners when the government had converted Government House into a university. The premier was reported as stating that this would not in any way interfere with the proposed erection of a new Government House on a site specifically set aside for this purpose in, not surprisingly, Victoria Park. This project would take at least three years to complete and prepare for occupation, an accurate prophecy. Fernberg, he confessed in June 1911, was quite inadequate for the purposes of a governor's residence, except as a temporary expedient. Thus were the fates of the university and governor
entwined, and thus did both find themselves in unsuitable homes. It is little wonder then that neither proved as cooperative and compliant with the state government over the next few years as that body would have wished.\textsuperscript{11}
3 Leaders and Followers

The expected agency of government influence, if not control, was to be the first Senate, a body of twenty to be nominated entirely at the discretion of the government. Fears had been expressed during the debates that the government would delay unduly in making its nominations and thereby retard the whole process of getting the university started. There had been a suggestion of amending the Bill to require implementation within six months, but this proved unnecessary as the government was ready to make its announcement by April 1910. Many interested parties had pressed their claims for Senate representation upon the government, particularly the professional bodies such as the surveyors, architects, and engineers, and the premier needed to consult widely before compiling a list of people who would be acceptable to the community, able to do the job, and sufficiently sensitive to the needs of the government. In the end, a nice balance was achieved of politicians and ministry representatives, figures associated with the university idea over the years, three members of the local business community, and representatives of the professions, such as three doctors, two lawyers, an engineer, and the government analyst. Some members, like R.H. Roe, overlapped these interest groups, and some interest groups, like the trade unions, were not represented at all. Some of the strongest members of the Senate, it has been perceptively observed, were those with close ties with the
Department of Public Instruction, which was a source of short-term strength and long-term weakness.¹

At the head of the Senate, as its chairman and chancellor of the university, was Sir William MacGregor. The government had evidently considered Roe, Griffith and former premier Kidston for this position, but favoured MacGregor for the authority and prestige which his office as governor could bring to the new institution. He accepted the position after an exchange of correspondence in March 1910 had impressed upon him his ministers’ wish that he should do so. He would have liked greater notice of this appointment so that he might have further acquainted himself with the role before leaving Britain, but he agreed to take it, retaining the right to retire from it should the position become too onerous, and intimating that he had no wish to be anything other than a chairman to the Senate. In fact he proved to be much more than this and, by common assent, exercised a dominant influence on the early history of the university and a domineering presence within its first Senate. According to Story he was the proverbial iron fist in the velvet glove, appearing to give advice but always having his advice accepted. According to Barlow, the former minister for public instruction, who clashed with him early on some major issues, it proved impossible to hold a free discussion with the state governor in the chair unless the individual happened to agree with him, which Barlow usually did not.²

MacGregor, the first chancellor, had trained in medicine, was a colonial administrator of vast experience, and was a Scot, specifically an Aberdonian, which was to be of some importance when academic appointments came to be filled. Reginald Heber Roe, the first so-called vice-chancellor, was an Englishman, an Oxford graduate who had spent most of his life as headmaster of Brisbane Grammar School, and who had come of late into the service of the department. It has been suggested that he had, through his long association with the university movement, strong expectations of the senior position, and that his relegation to second-in-command might well have prompted a jealousy which prevented him from working in cooperation with his chancellor. It seems more likely that the differences between the two were of a deeper kind; their philosophical disagreements about society and education were more than the superficial antagonisms of job rivalry and were fundamental to the whole direction which the university took during its initial period.³
The third man was J.D. Story, over forty years old when appointed to the first Senate, confirmed for some years as the permanent head of the Department of Public Instruction and, more than Roe (the mathematician and educational thinker), or MacGregor (the figurehead who proved a man of power), Story was the link between the state government and the university. Placed there perhaps as the government watchdog, described, without flattery, as a useful functionary with administrative talent, he displayed from the outset an organizational ability which soon had the Senate running according to plans which he had devised. To the first Senate he brought the offerings of the department in the form of the loaned clerk, J.F. McCaffrey, a future registrar, and its requests for information about building requirements, and also schemes for the future conduct of business together with a capacity to install himself in key positions, which he would continue to occupy for more than half a century. The manner of his proceeding is most instructive. He gave notice of motion for the establishment of four committees, on finance, administration, building and curriculum, together with suggestions for their membership. Although he professed to offer no more than suggestions for the future, other members accepted the good sense of moving towards an immediate decision and Story found his ideas readily and immediately accepted. The person who had prepared himself was in a position to direct the course of events, and Story was that person. From this position of influence Story would acquire an experience that would make him the greatest power in the university’s history.

Whatever the strengths and qualities of Story, Roe and MacGregor, it must be conceded that none had the slightest experience of running a university and that Story had never attended one. The same comments could be made about almost all other members of the Senate: a few of them had pursued their legal or medical studies there in times past, but none had the least experience of running such an institution, and even the graduates were a small minority. The former minister for public instruction, Barlow, freely confessed that he had never been inside a university until he became a member of the Senate, and he would not have been alone in this. Perhaps it was this inexperience that contributed to his feeling that he had never been in a “more uncomfortable body”, “a more impractical disagreeable body than the senate of Queensland”, “such a retrograde body”. The other reasons for his feeling will emerge shortly.
What the first senators desperately needed was to have academics around them. It was to take them quite a time to achieve this, but they moved quickly to appoint selection committees in England of British professors who were to assist Professor Bragg, an ex-Adelaide man now in Leeds, and the agent-general in London. They decided at their meeting of 22 April 1910 that, in the selection of men for the chairs in engineering and science, preference should be given to people who had a special knowledge of the practical application of the sciences to the industries of Queensland, and on 23 May J.D. Story, the go-between for the Senate and the government, was communicating the criteria that the selection committees were required to observe. The type of professor needed "should be fairly young, of strong individuality, good organizing capacity, proved teaching ability, and ready resource. He should also be a man who will not be easily daunted by initial difficulties but will be prepared to resolutely
face and overcome difficulties and give the Senate a whole-
hearted support in establishing the University on a sound
basis. It is essential also that he should be in robust health." The professors were to have the qualities of pioneers. Like the university, they were to be for Queensland.  

It has been suggested that the areas of the initial appoint-
ments, as well as the people who filled them, were very much
influenced by MacGregor himself, but this seems unlikely
since Roe's memorandum to Story of a year earlier had already
designated the first faculties and the first chairs to be filled and
Roe's advice appears to have been accepted by the govern-
ment. The governor as chancellor, or the chancellor as gover-
nor, was certainly influential in July 1910 when he apparently
on his own initiative encouraged the agent-general to take a
trip to Manchester to make Professor Ernest Rutherford an
offer of £200 above the advertised £900 salary if this would
bring him to Queensland. The bid failed, for the agent-general
had to report that Rutherford had recently rejected a £3,000
offer from another would-be employer. The distinguished
physicist was not even a near miss for Queensland, but his
name does conjure up thoughts of what might have been.  

By 18 September there were reports available that classics
had attracted fourteen applications, mathematics twenty-six,
chemistry twenty-four, and engineering thirty. On 9
November the government communicated to the registrar the
reports from the agent-general. The advisers in Britain were
recommending for the classics chair a Gilbert Norwood, who
was expecting an offer from Bristol but would prefer to go to
Queensland; he was said to have force, initiative, enthusiasm
and originality. As second choice they recommended John
Lundie Michie, another Aberdonian Scot, who was said to be
sound, steady and safe, a quite excellent man but inferior to
Norwood. For the position in mathematics they recom-
mended Henry Priestley, an Englishman of illustrious lineage
whose mathematics was strong and whose physics was
described as "sufficient"; he was said to be a good lecturer, to
have an attractive personality, reliable conchology, a wife, and
good social qualifications. In chemistry it was understood that
Bertram Dillon Steele had lodged an application in Brisbane,
and he was reported to be widely considered the best man for
the job. For engineering, with its special relationship to local
needs, a name was suggested but the overseas panel was
content for this to be resolved by those on the spot. 

On 8 December the whole Senate met to make their ap-
pointments, which they did by ballot: Steele came nearest to pleasing everyone with an eighteen-to-one defeat of his closest rival; Priestley was successful by fourteen votes to five, and Alexander Gibson, a professional engineer with university teaching experience but no degree, was appointed by eleven votes to six on the second ballot. The closest decision was that to appoint Michie over the recommended Norwood, for only one vote separated the two. This was an intriguing decision because of its closeness, the rejection of the advice from Britain, the refusal to reconsider the decision after Professors Jacks and Bragg from Britain had repeated their views on the all-round superiority of Norwood, and, it must be said, also for the coincidence that the surprise appointee hailed from the same corner of Scotland as the chancellor. This young classicist of twenty-nine, an academic success at Aberdeen and Cambridge and with a Blue in athletics, was to become a key figure in determining the academic standards of the new institution, despite his youthfulness and relative inexperience. He spent the rest of his life at the University of Queensland. Priestley too, an academic of greater experience and a person much loved by his colleagues and students, devoted the rest of his life to creating the University of Queensland. Gibson, whose stay was relatively brief, was more concerned, as befitted the professional man, with establishing and equipping his engineering school than with founding a university. Steele, the oldest professor at forty, was the most academically distinguished and experienced, having taught at universities in England, North America and Australia; he would later achieve the distinction of a Fellowship of the Royal Society. It was he who became the first president of the Board of Faculties and had the task of tendering academic advice to a Senate composed of gentlemen who had very little familiarity with universities and their ways.9

The ways of the University of Queensland were soon to be administered by F.W.S. Cumbrae Stewart, who was appointed as registrar from 1 September 1910 at a salary of £500. A figure with a legal background, considerable academic distinction and, reputedly, some presence, he was later to occupy the first chair in law. Assisting the registrar were two people on loan from the Department of Public Instruction, J.F. McCaffrey, who became chief clerk and later succeeded Cumbrae Stewart as registrar, and Olga de Tuety, the acting typist. On 16 September her status changed when she was given a permanent appointment at a salary of £52 per annum,
approximately one tenth that of the registrar, and it would change again when she married Henry Alcock, for many years professor of history. This administrative hierarchy was completed by Walter Wyche, janitor supreme and soon to be an institution in his own right.10

The university now lacked only its principal raison d'être, students. The first ones, admitted on interim and fairly mild matriculation arrangements, were expected to number about eighty. In fact only sixty matriculated on 14 March 1911, the day set aside for the purpose, though the total enrolment rose to eighty-seven during the course of the year.11

It was the question of matriculation that brought the first major academic controversy to the institution as it attempted to set down its long-term requirements. The importance of this issue had been stressed by the Courier in December 1909 when it suggested that, if the university succeeded in designing a thoroughly satisfactory matriculation examination but failed in all else, it would justify its existence — a curious view. Its further suggestion that the university was essentially the place for a selected few, those with appropriate mental qualities and the capacity for hard work, foreshadowed a stronger line on the matriculation issue than it later adopted. The minister, W.H. Barnes, confirmed the importance of the matter by urging the Senate to fix the matriculation regula-
tions without delay since these would determine the future curriculum to be followed in the higher grade state schools already started and in those under contemplation. He expressed the hope that no subjects would be prescribed which would not be required in students' actual university courses, and his sentiments were well applauded. This speech, in early January 1910, indicates that the minister was at this time taking a very liberal position on matriculation requirements. He probably shared Story's belief that the government looked towards R.H. Roe to help coordinate the various parts of the state education system through to university level, which is an interesting indication of the degree of support that Roe must have expected from the government when he took his stand on matriculation. Since Roe had never made any secret of his views, his failure to receive that support is rather puzzling.*2

During the debate on the University Bill, some of the battlelines were already being drawn. J.W. Blair, for instance, a future chancellor, speaking in favour of science and engineering and against those studies such as classics and dead languages which were allegedly "no help in the struggle of modern life", had argued that the clause relating to matriculation should be removed from the Bill. Access to the university could be safely left to the decision of the schools and inspectors, for the university should be "accessible to people of all classes from all schools". Tolmie, realizing that this was unrealistic, argued for special matriculation needs in areas such as law and medicine, but supported the notion of an "open door" and looked forward to a time when all would have free access to secondary education which would qualify them for university admission.*3

R.H. Roe, newly appointed to the staff of the ministry as its chief educational adviser, the person to whom the department and government were looking and whom they would place on the Senate as vice-chancellor, clarified his own position in early January 1910. He wished to see "the standard made such that an ordinary State school education would furnish sufficient competency to enter for the examination, and thus the University would be made what it should be, an institution for the benefit of the people of Queensland as a whole, and not merely for a privileged few". He had no objection to the teaching of languages, ancient or modern, but he was opposed to making them compulsory subjects in an entrance examination; it would be soon enough to do this when provision had been made for language teaching in the
state schools. Meanwhile, "the privileged few" were those who had attended grammar schools where languages formed part of the curriculum. Within the Senate, the former education minister, Barlow, resolved to prevent the erection of a matriculation system dependent on a grammar school education, which would, in his view, deny university education to all but a favoured class.14

If Barlow feared that his concept of a "people's university" would soon be in jeopardy, his fears were soon shown to be well founded. His principal enemies came from two directions. One was the chancellor, Sir William MacGregor, whose public utterances proclaimed the need of the university to have high internationally accepted standards to ensure the standing of its graduates and their degrees: there must be no back door in Australia to easy degrees. In private MacGregor believed that many saw the university mainly as a place to train teachers and hoped to allow large numbers of existing teachers to have degrees without the appropriate knowledge or education. He saw himself as the guardian of traditional standards. In practice this meant traditional subjects. He feared that languages and classics would not be given a proper place and he feared too the cosy chat about affiliating technical colleges and a teacher training college to the university. He was ever ready to defend the requirement of languages for scientists and engineers and was an eager champion of Barlow's other set of enemies, the academics, who sent up from the Board of Faculties proposed matriculation requirements that included Latin or Greek for arts students and a modern language for the rest.15

An attempt to counter this proposal was made by Vice-Chancellor Roe, who circulated among Senate members a full memorandum embodying the views with which he had been publicly associated in the past. This memorandum apparently incensed MacGregor, for he described it as "cunning" and "excellently adapted to a public appeal", with an argument "easily put to obtain favour with the masses", though it had been privately circulated as a Senate paper. MacGregor's response was that if the Roe position were to be accepted the university would forfeit the right to call itself such and he would resign as chancellor. He circulated a further document in rebuttal of Roe's case and in favour of the professors' proposals. According to Barlow, the legal and professional elements in the Senate were so strongly aligned under the leadership of MacGregor against Roe that he stood no chance
of winning his case in that arena when the issue was resolved at a special meeting on 13 November 1911. Instead Roe found his cause being pursued without his knowledge by Barlow on two other fronts.\textsuperscript{16}

Over the next few weeks Barlow conducted a bitter correspondence with his former department. On 6 November he had warned the minister to take further advice before agreeing to any matriculation scheme that might emanate from the present Senate, for there was, he alleged, a certain body in the Senate who seemed determined to make the University of Queensland a shabby copy of Oxford and who had the support of the professors and the host of lecturers and demonstrators whom they had collected around them. He warned that the proposed matriculation requirements would exclude many for whom the university was intended, and afterwards he lamented that this was now to happen, with the public powerless to know what was going on and judge for themselves because of the refusal of the Senate to allow a wider audience access to their material. The Senate were also, he contended, restricting the university to Brisbane "by their exclusive, antiquated ideas", because they were excluding participation by country state schools. Barlow himself decided also to "go public" and he raised the matriculation issue in the Legislative Council the day after the Senate decision, citing the Roe memorandum in full, and accusing the university of "departing from the paths of righteousness" by its abandonment of the principle that it should be for the whole of Queensland. The university was becoming, he said, not so much a popular institution as a scholastic copy of the universities of the old world.\textsuperscript{17}

His outburst, under parliamentary privilege, raised interesting questions about the protocol pertaining to both Senate documents and parliamentary debates and the uses and possible abuses of the twin positions held by Barlow as senator and parliamentarian. However, four days later another member, A.J. Thynne (a later vice-chancellor), with identical twin positions, turned the tables on Barlow by citing the MacGregor memorandum, persuading the House that "the professors of this University are much better qualified than any one of us to say what is required", a previously unthinkable argument, and securing the House’s acceptance of the MacGregor and academic position that the University of Queensland needed to establish high standards if it were to be held in high repute. This indeed was the position that the
Leaders and Followers

The premier had publicly taken at a dinner in honour of MacGregor on the very eve of the Senate decision on matriculation: the university was still a "people's university", with its scholarships, bursaries, evening classes, and correspondence courses, but there was such a thing as an "aristocracy of merit and capacity"; a democratic university need not throw open its doors to all irrespective of their educational level; Queensland must be seen to represent the highest standard of education when compared with universities in other lands.18

Winning causes have a powerful attraction when subjected to the judgment of history, and a cause which had the almost complete backing of the academic staff against men who appeared to be diluting standards would have irresistible appeal to later generations of academics, at least until they themselves changed their minds and decided that languages ancient or modern were not necessary for successful study, even for arts degrees. It was eventually accepted that there were ways of maintaining high standards without enforcing language requirements, even though the one was seen to symbolize the other in 1911. Roe and Barlow may have lost their case and incurred the outrage of the chancellor, who denounced the former minister in a letter of 19 December, but it is by no means clear that they had the worst of the argument. Roe denied his desire to lower the standards of the university and insisted that standards did not depend on a particular range of subjects to be used for determining admission but nothing else. The Brisbane Courier praised the general wish to preserve high standards but believed that "the position as laid down by Mr Roe is impregnable", and that his memorandum was the best contribution to date towards the study of the whole education system. It pertinently asked if Shakespeare, Darwin, Huxley and Edison would have qualified for admission to the University of Queensland, and deplored the new tendency towards an exclusive institution. It has been argued that Roe, not MacGregor, was more attuned to the society in which they lived, that MacGregor's insistence on languages in the matriculation examination imposed a formidable barrier against most members of the working classes, and that his action excluded many who would have been capable of profiting by a university education and reduced considerably the capacity of the new university to fulfil those needs of the community that it was intended to serve.19

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this whole issue is
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not the failure of Roe's and Barlow's attempt to relate the university to what they perceived to be the needs of Queensland, or the success of MacGregor and the academics in relating the university to the international community of scholarship and learning as they perceived this. It is rather the failure of Roe and Barlow to receive the backing of the department and the government. Roe was on the Senate to do a job, and Barlow, if anyone, was familiar with the arguments and trends within successive governments. Yet it was the recently arrived MacGregor, governor of the state, enjoying the political importance and social influence which the position still carried, who received the endorsement of the premier, Denham, on 12 November 1911 and a letter from the secretary for public instruction on 20 December in which the minister dissociated himself from Barlow and applauded the efforts to ensure that Queensland ranked with other universities. The thrust of the department, encouraged and managed still by J.D. Story, the co-ordination of educational policy that Roe was set to implement, and the philosophy on which the University of Queensland had been offered to the people and sold to the government were virtually set aside by a decision of the governor and the professors. Confronted by the power and determination of Governor MacGregor, Story, the public servant, knew his place and failed to support Roe, his colleague from the ministry. If this kind of pattern were to continue, there would be little danger of the university finding itself subservient to the state or little hope for parliament and the government that they would exercise any measure of control of a university established to serve the needs of the state.
and be "a people's university". The government nominees were clearly not intending to act as anything other than members of the Senate of the University of Queensland. In this first contest of wills, if such it was, the professors had emerged as clear winners.20
Part Two

The Early Years, 1911–1921
4 The Student Body

Institutions are established to serve people. The University of Queensland was established to serve the people of Queensland in general but in particular to serve its students, who would then extend its beneficial influence throughout the whole of the state. The first students had a large responsibility resting upon them and, like all foundation members of a new university, were about to share an extremely exhilarating experience. There are few surviving accounts of what happened to them and how they felt, but these are sufficient to convey the excitements and exasperations of their early days. As they struggled to survive the confusion they became, for their reward, the cherished objects of an equally new and unproven staff with whom they shared a camaraderie that would never be wholly recaptured in later years.

It would be an understatement to say that the university was not ready to receive them. Hilda Brotherton, down from Rockhampton Grammar School, knew only that she wanted to study biology but had no further ideas about constructing a first-year course. She was fortunate to make contact with Professor Steele, who is recorded as having given what help he could; but members of staff mainly gave the impression that they were nearly as bewildered as the students themselves and that they were about to deliver unplanned courses without the necessary equipment and in accommodation hardly suited for the purposes it was about to serve. In his first mathematics lecture Professor Priestley found himself without chalk, an in-
dispensable prerequisite of successful teaching in that subject; in chemistry the so-called laboratory contained buckets instead of sinks, and these had to be taken outside to be emptied; and biology, Hilda's chosen subject, proved to be a complete muddle, since the lecturer, Thomas Harvey Johnston, did not appear until the third term, during which time he endeavoured to fill all the gaps left by the ad hoc arrangements of the first two terms.¹

Members of academic staff appear to have been a friendly group, helpful and encouraging, promoting a happy family atmosphere within a crowd where everyone knew everyone else. Professors and lecturers in many cases possessed a youthfulness which permitted them sometimes to be mistaken for students, a problem compounded by the maturity of some students who were seizing this first opportunity for university study after some years as pupil-teachers or Extension students; this, together with the smallness of the institution, promoted close social relationships between staff and students, which characterize new enterprises of this kind. Staff attended student social gatherings, mingling freely at dances and with a sufficient absence of inhibition for the geologist H.C. Richards to make an early mark on the university by dancing
around the floor in full evening regalia with a half-eaten hot meat pie in his hand. Professor Priestley, best known and best loved for his caring attitudes to all his students, whose parents he was said to know as well as he knew the students, had also the best reputation for unfailing attendance at student functions as well as acting as coach to the ladies' hockey team. His wife too was involved, as president of the Women's Student Club. So too was Mrs Steele, who gave afternoon tea at home to her husband's third-year chemistry students.2

The social functions provided some of the happiest memories, even if the social facilities were in line with most other facilities that the university was offering in the beginning. There were no student common rooms during the first two years, but the women had a cloakroom, where they could deposit their hats, and this opened on to a courtyard where they could eat their sandwich lunches; a water tap and a gas ring were the limited amenities at their disposal. In June 1912, the Senate resolved that separate common rooms should be provided for men and women for the following year, and it was later reported that two suitable wooden structures had been erected. This helped to ease pressure on the entrance hall of the main building, which had been both common room and reading room for both sexes until this time. The men's common room was the scene of the weekly practices for Commemoration that were clearly highlights in the social life of students, especially when the grander rehearsals were held in His Majesty's Theatre. Commemoration itself, in the Exhibition Hall at first, was the grand climax of the social year, with its attendant dinner and ball, and features prominently in the memories of early students. For this the women were required to have special permission from their colleges or residences to be out late, in some cases until the early hours of the morning, and needed to state precisely where they would be and with whom, a requirement that was to survive for more than half a century in Women's College. Vividly remembered is the protocol of the dances: the women with their programmes and pencils, the men undertaking commitments with the formality, though not perhaps the dignity, of characters from Jane Austen.3

The transport arrangements of this age when motor cars were a rarity are also fondly recalled. If students could afford the luxury of a cab this would be a horse-drawn four-wheeled vehicle; for most students most of the time, travelling meant walking and late-night dances might mean long late-night
walks. Home for many was a place in one of the colleges on Kangaroo Point. This involved innumerable trips across the river either by the rowing boats which operated in daylight or by the Edward Street steam ferry which continued to operate until about eleven o’clock at night. The river crossings, the walks at each end, in some cases the runs (Women’s College, established in 1911, was said to be five minutes’ running time from the ferry), featured strongly in the lives and later the memories of the students, who were to recall their encounters with staff who might comment on the appropriateness of their attire or otherwise disconcert them as they shared a ferry.4

The colleges contributed substantially to the social life from their appearance in 1912. Before then the Senate had resolved to publish a list of approved boarding houses, which was in keeping with the prevalent view that the university was acting in loco parentis, and the colleges seem to have provided a structured existence for their members. The concentration of St John’s, King’s, and Women’s College on Kangaroo Point made that area an inevitable focus of university life and the river crossing a social occasion. Early life at Women’s College is remembered for the morning and evening prayers and for the servants with starched aprons who spared the female students the labour of making their own beds. The young men of King’s and St John’s were envied for their right to leave their shoes outside their doors and have them cleaned. This would be some consolation to the King’s students who, allegedly, neither danced nor drank because of their Methodism; they did, however, have boat picnics up the river.5

Much of the social life of the early days concerned sporting activities. The Sports Union, regarded as the best organized and most representative body of student life, also had the distinction of being the first undergraduate association, from its foundation in June 1911; in that year it already had seventy-seven members, a remarkable achievement that indicates a fair measure of staff support. A.C.V. Melbourne, for instance, a member of the history staff, played cricket for the First XI, and there were evidently sufficient cricketers among both staff and students for a match between the two in 1913; on this occasion H.C. Richards, away from the security of laboratory, museum and dance floor, sat down in fresh cow manure and attempted to auction his bespattered shirt for some good but undeclared cause. Inter-collegiate cricket, football and rowing were quickly established, and inter-varsity
contests were started in 1913. The Sports Union had the unenviable task of finding grounds for the many games that enlisted a following, and football and hockey soon acquired a foothold on the Domain. Cricket presented something of a problem in that the Brisbane Council, as trustee, would not allow the university to prepare practice wickets on the Domain and insisted on its own hastier, cheaper, and dangerous efforts which threatened the safety of the young cricketers. Tennis too posed some problems. Although there were tennis courts in the gardens of Government House on which students were allowed some rights, they were eventually reserved for the exclusive use of staff, who valued highly this means of exercise and relaxation and feared that the general public might disturb them in their enjoyment of this facility. The students were given their own tennis courts, but the university authorities found themselves in a prolonged battle with the Department of Agriculture and Public Lands over public access to Domain sports grounds at times when the students were not themselves making use of them.6

Outside the sporting area, the Student Christian Movement was the first to emerge, an association which the Senate viewed with some slight apprehension because of the tendency of certain senators to give strong reminders that the university had been erected on a clear non-sectarian basis with no regard for faith or ideologies. These men acted in marked contrast to those members of council at the University of Melbourne “who believed that a university was a traditional centre of Christian learning” when plagued by the Darwinian controversy during the early years of their institution. Early approaches from the national body of the S.C.M. were rebuffed, but when Queensland students themselves formed an organization in June 1911 the Senate could hardly deny them a place to meet. By the middle of 1912 the Musical Society, the Women’s Club, and the Dramatic Club were all in existence with staff presidents, Professor Gibson from engineering, and Miss Ulrich and Mr Stable from modern languages. The last-mentioned club began life in 1912 with a Sheridan play produced by its president and Elton Mayo from philosophy. The Debating Society, apart from its obvious activities, also indulged in river picnics, a characteristic pursuit of the carefree days before August 1914; such activities helped to inspire the fervent declaration of the *Queensland University Magazine*, in May 1913, that “as long as we are members of the University we will continue to club”. Not all clubs were concerned with
the pursuit of pleasure: the Engineering Students' Club, another product of 1912, was evidently formed with the main purpose of organizing workshop practice for its members at Ipswich during university vacations.7

In retrospect it seems almost inevitable that this same
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generation of students that danced until morning and held picnics on the river should sooner or later have turned to more mischievous activities and acquired a reputation for disorderly behaviour at certain appointed times in the university calendar. The students of Adelaide took over thirty years to adopt in 1905 the traditional street processions of Sydney and Melbourne, yet by the end of 1914 "the age of riotous Commemorations had gone for ever". By contrast with their statelier colleagues in the south, the students of Queensland moved almost immediately into line and were not to be diverted from their practices for half a century. As early as the inauguration ceremony of June 1911, when a great number of degrees ad eundem gradum was awarded, certain "untamed spirits a little too much inclined towards rowdyism" were silenced by the threat of female students' hatpins, but by the following year such threats were no longer effective. This time the restless audience "amused themselves, as is the wont of students, by singing popular airs to which they had added their own words", and this practice was in future followed to the frustration of those who believed that degree ceremonies should be conducted with dignity and decorum. In 1914,
when the first home-bred graduates were to appear, there occurred the first procession, though banned by the commissioner of police, and the first confrontations that were to take place in varying forms in the years ahead. This time the *Brisbane Courier* reported that the students “indulged in many of the fanciful pranks said to be dear to the heart of the undergraduate”, chanting during the academic procession and later turning the occasion into a bear garden. An extenuating circumstance in their conduct was the incredible, though customary, prolixity of the chancellor, Sir William MacGregor, whose speech helped to ensure that an afternoon ceremony extended into the evening. Since the technical college building in which the function was being held had no electric lighting, the audience were asked to strike matches over the closing stages to provide some illumination, and when existing supplies of matches were exhausted more were then fetched from the Belle Vue Hotel.

After the war there occurred the first big Commemoration procession of decorated carts and floats, and at the subsequent degree ceremony the students caused more than the usual commotion by throwing small detonators in the path of the premier; for their own janitor, who led the academic procession in full robes and a large hat, they had a gentler treatment: the singing of “Where Did You Get That Hat?”. The Commemoration procession of 1921 was welcomed by the *Brisbane Courier* as “good-humoured fun”. “University students,” it commented, “are a bunch of zealous reformers who... imagine that their mission is to set right all the supposed wrongs of the universe”; if this were really their declared intent, manifested by the emblems of their carts and trucks, then it appears a worthy enough ambition for any group of people. Less praiseworthy was the fire panic started at His Majesty’s Theatre in November, which inspired the *Courier* to report ironically, “Enlightened young men from a modern university were expressing their idea of humour in what is supposed to be a conventional manner.” This incident occurred shortly after a visitor to Brisbane had heard what he described as “Bolshevik utterances” made in a public park, which he assumed to be the work of university students and which allowed him and others to categorize students as “aggressive, rowdy, and unruly”, thereby establishing a stereotype that would survive to plague the public imagination and convince the taxpayer that his contributions were not being put to good use.
Trivial and normal as these incidents now appear, they probably helped to confirm the prejudices of some that universities were places where the irresponsible offspring of the wealthy came to waste three years between school and marriage. The public entertainment and goodwill generated by most aspects of Commemoration, which in these years and later gave the people of Brisbane a free show and a lot of fun, were offset to some extent by the occasional egg-throwing or other incident of anti-social behaviour, which caused people to look less indulgently on an institution which needed all the friends and all the public support that it could get. It was with a sensitivity to this kind of need that the Board of Faculties responded strongly, and even pompously, to some incidents of 20 November 1920, when it pronounced, "The rag is a tradition that need not be followed"; conduct which was childish and tasteless, it suggested, might do great harm to the reputation and prospects of the university, and this was its danger.¹⁰

Fewer than a hundred students enrolled in 1911 and discrepancies which occur in the stated numbers for these early years are mainly the result of late enrolments, the attendance of a small number of occasional non-matriculated students, and ambiguities in the classification of students taking courses by correspondence. When the university had complete first, second and third years, it had a student body of around two hundred, which remained near that number until after the Great War. The first students were admitted under matriculation arrangements devised by a Senate of non-academics in 1910 which were later thought to be rather lenient and to have resulted in a few mistaken admissions. They were sufficiently stringent to ensure that most of those who enrolled in 1911 came from the grammar schools, though there was a sprinkling of older students who had reached their present position through the University Extension courses that had been available since 1893. These older people were believed to have had a strong stabilizing influence within the undergraduate body, in the same way that the influence of ex-servicemen in 1919 was thought to have contributed certain qualities to the student body.¹¹

There were twenty government scholarships available annually to the early students, which provided for tuition for three years and £26 maintenance allowance for those who lived at home, with an additional £26 for those who lived away from home. Vice-Chancellor Roe believed that Queensland's provision of scholarships was more generous.
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Biology students at work, c. 1912 (University of Queensland Archives)

Biology trip to Masthead Island, c. 1912–13
(Fryer Library)
than elsewhere in Australia, and it had been the boast of the
government in 1909 that the scholarship scheme, even more
than the rejected free tuition, would make university educa-
tion available to all social classes. When this was sup-
plemented in 1913 by the introduction of twenty-five teacher
scholarships, which involved an undertaking or bonding that
holders would enter into the service of the department, it was
enthusiastically welcomed by the *Catholic Advocate* as a scheme to throw open the doors of the Queensland university to the children of poor parents. In theory this was so, though in practice a student’s access to the university was limited by his access to secondary education, and it would be some time before the new high schools that were established under the 1912 Act would allow children of the poorer classes to compete with any measure of success against the products of the grammar schools without recourse to evening study. When J.D. Story appeared at the prize-giving ceremony at Bundaberg High School in December 1913, he stressed that the University of Queensland was not simply a place for the elite of Brisbane or other places with grammar schools but was open to all students throughout the state who would stay on and complete Senior.¹²

This ideal could be achieved only gradually. In January 1914, the *Warwick Examiner and Times* reported with some satisfaction that “two young ladies” were to be the first
Warwick students to enter the university, but parliamentarians expressed some scepticism about the success of the institution in making itself equally available to the different social classes. In 1917, for instance, Charles Collins raised doubts within parliament about the role that the university was fulfilling, suggesting that its students were not the proverbial hewers of wood and drawers of water but were rather from the ranks of the wealthy. The university, he claimed, was doing little for the underdog; it was confirming, rather than changing, existing social stratification. Even fees, which Labor members had earlier opposed as a barrier to popular participation, became increasingly built in to the system as a revenue raiser for an organization perpetually short of money. In January 1919, the registrar’s office had to fight off a state government effort to impose higher fees as a condition for a higher endowment, warning that this was contrary to a general trend in the world towards free education. Fees would remain too useful to abolish, even though retained at low levels.\textsuperscript{13}

Nor did the next stages of the matriculation debate contribute much towards making the university less socially exclusive. Although defeated in his initial attempts to make a classical language an optional rather than a compulsory subject for arts matriculation, Vice-Chancellor R.H. Roe took up the
campaign again in 1912, but again the academics proved too strong. On 11 September 1912, the Senate received a report from the Faculty of Arts that they had considered a proposal to substitute a modern language for Latin or Greek in the arts matriculation requirements; they had considered it but had rejected it, and their grounds for rejection made somewhat strange reading. It was alleged, for instance, that Latin was just as important a requirement for the study of modern history as for ancient history, since Latin had been, until comparatively recently, the language of diplomatic and political life, which meant that the modern historian had to read his material in Latin. If such a spurious argument was typical of the content of the debates that had occurred, it is not surprising that Roe and others felt increasingly irritated and frustrated by what seemed a deliberate decision to exclude many able students for insufficient reason. The addition of geography to the list of optional subjects did nothing to affect the major question, as the Courier observed on 19 November 1912, and the Darling Downs Gazette attacked the "inveterately Conservative institution" for being less willing than Sydney University to open its doors to the clever sons of poor people. The Gazette's particular grievance was the fact that lectures were confined to Brisbane instead of being widely available at a variety of centres throughout the state, but its discontent was another expression of the feeling that the university was too exclusive. Story himself seemed to have a similar opinion when he tried to popularize the idea that Senior standard in a state high school would be the normal and easily passable route to the university, which view was in conflict with an academic view expressed in 1914 and frequently repeated in years to come that matriculation should be decided by a separate examination taken by students one year later than Senior, after an additional year at school.

In July of that year the Senate received a resolution from the Annual Conference of Queensland Teachers asking them to remove compulsory Latin on the ground that this would simplify language teaching in the new high schools, but members were unmoved by this argument. The only real liberalization of matriculation requirements occurred in 1920, when it was agreed that mature candidates of twenty-five for arts and science should be set a special examination outside the constraints under which the school-leaver operated, though doubts were still being expressed that existing requirements were correct, sometimes from those who believed that they were excessively liberal.
On 13 August 1920 the Senate received a report from the Board of Faculties which suggested that first-year science students, despite being required to have a foreign language pass in addition to the English language, were unable to write grammatical English and to express their ideas clearly; they were said to be overcoming their disabilities during the course of their university studies. The following year no less a person than the chancellor, Sir Pope Cooper, took advantage of Commemoration celebrations to raise a question which was both practical and philosophical: he sometimes wondered, he said, if the Senate was satisfied that the public examination system was designed to secure the best education for all but the abnormally bright students and if the study of French was of any real value when it stopped short of the capacity to enjoy literature. Such questions were to exercise many minds for many years to come. In the meantime the university continued to demand Latin or Greek for its arts students and a modern language for its scientists and engineers.¹⁶

Fundamental to any understanding of the relationship between the university and its students in these days is a need to realize that members of the university, academic staff and ultimately members of the Senate, believed that their responsibilities for student welfare went way beyond making provision for their academic training. Their physical and moral well-being was also thought to be the province of the Senate, which acted with a paternalistic authority that would eventually appear quaint. Bishop Donaldson firmly instructed the university in its duty to safeguard the moral welfare of its students in June 1911, and he would have approved of the concern shown by Chancellor MacGregor that some students had to pass public houses on their way to and from the university. This could scarcely be avoided, but the Senate could and did concern itself intimately with the nature of student accommodation and prepared a statute for the regulation of the boarding places used by undergraduates, all of which had to pass Senate’s approval. Further evidence of official concern for matters soon to pass beyond their interest is to be seen in the requirement that men and women should sit apart at degree ceremonies and the recorded incident, typical of its times, concerning an order received by Freda Bage, in charge of Women’s College, from the university Senate that a certain student should be instructed to “put her hair up”. Both the offending person and the intermediary in the chain of command doubtless complied with instructions without question.¹⁷
More serious breaches of discipline occurred in 1916. A certain W.F. Watson, student of geology, misbehaved himself by “drinking, shouting, and singing” while on a field trip. This apparently quite unacceptable behaviour caused the lecturer in charge to suspend him and report him to the president of the Board of Faculties, who suspended him again and reported him to the board, which imposed a £5 fine, to be doubled if not promptly paid. Even this offensive conduct seems mild when compared with a mischievous article published in the *Queensland University Magazine* in the same year.
year: this made particular reference to recognizable members of clerical and academic staff, and the author of the objectionable article reacted most unsatisfactorily when challenged by the president of the board. Nor did the president of the Council of the Students Association respond any more readily to the instruction that the Magazine editor be sacked, for the Senate appeared to be seeking to use as its agency a student body from which it had previously been withholding its full blessing. Legal opinions were sought on both sides on the allegedly defamatory nature of the article, and, not surprisingly, each side mobilized authoritative opinion to back its claims. Much heat was generated for a time and a little light too. Professor Michie received credit for finally smoothing out the dispute and the students won later acclaim for establishing their right to question a form of discipline more in keeping with the administration of a school than a university, at the same time showing a full awareness of the responsibilities which they had to the university for the ways in which they managed their affairs.18

The Queensland University Magazine, which first appeared in October 1911 with a portentous declaration that "there is a new force in Queensland and the world" (by which it meant the university, not itself), rarely raised the rebel standard. It
has been characterized as a publication of improving articles and chatty contributions, and it played a fairly innocuous role in university life. Its successor, *Galmahra*, was destined for greater fame following its enthusiastic reception by the *Brisbane Courier* on 15 April 1920, which was happy to view the student body with benevolence on the strength of its new publication.¹⁹

That body had encountered some early difficulties in organizing itself at the top, despite the readiness of special interest groups to form their clubs and societies. In the second term of 1911 a conference of delegates from day and evening student groups had established a University of Queensland Union, for which the new secretary sought Senate recognition in a letter of 17 August. This proved to be more than a formality, for inquiries by Professors Michie and Gibson led to a recommendation by the Board of Faculties through the Administrative Committee to the Senate in early November that the union should not be recognized and that it should renew its application only when a more representative body had succeeded in constituting an association open to all undergraduates. Then followed a period of divided responsibility and name changes, which ended with the 1921 merger that finally produced a settled University of Queensland Union, which assumed responsibility for both the political and social spheres that had previously been separated.²⁰
5 Academic Beginnings

It is a most remarkable fact that most of the academic staff responsible for teaching the first undergraduates of 1911 arrived at the university after the students themselves. Indeed the professors themselves only just managed to arrive before them. They had been appointed on 8 December 1910 but did not take up duty until the following February, and Priestley and Michie had to make their arrangements to leave Britain and sail to Australia in the meantime. They landed on 15 February, just four weeks before the beginning of term. It is understandable that the Senate should not wish to proceed with other academic appointments until the four professors were on hand to draw up academic plans and participate in decision taking, but it is nonetheless a frightening thought that it was not until 27 February that the Senate decided on the next four positions to be filled after advertising. Other appointments followed at different stages of the year so that the lecturing complement of seven lecturers, five assistant lecturers, one evening lecturer, and one demonstrator in chemistry was assembled bit by bit as the academic year progressed and students, getting away to staggered starts, accumulated their first set of credits.¹

It is equally understandable that the Senate should wish to have the advice of the professors on the equipping of the university before committing the state government to substantial financial investment, but it is again a disturbing thought that the students had been taking courses for six
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weeks before the registrar sent to the department the first outline of what the university needed to equip its departments. He requested £16,000 for engineering, £2,500 for chemistry, £3,000 for physics, £600 for biology, £700 for geology, and £1,000 for the Faculty of Arts, which quickly established its place within the hierarchy of spenders. There was an immediate need, he said, for £17,400 for the departments to start up, which makes more understandable the absence of chalk from the mathematics lecture room and the presence of buckets in the so-called chemistry laboratory. The registrar, worried by customs requirements on machinery that might not be accepted as scientific material, feared too that, if certain orders were not transmitted to Britain by August, the equipment would not be in place by March 1912. He feared that the university would not be ready to receive its second intake of students in 1912. The fate of the first intake, who arrived in March 1911, was something to be resolved by the gods and the demi-gods, the four professors who endeavoured to set the university on some academic course during the confusing months of 1911.2

The beginnings of an academic plan had been made by the Senate in 1910, when decisions were taken, implementing the earlier advice of R.H. Roe and the University Movement, to establish the Faculties of Arts, Science, and Engineering and to create chairs in classics, mathematics, chemistry, and engineering. Nominal Faculties of Law and Medicine were also created to permit the university to grant degrees ad eundem gradum, thereby bringing lawyers and doctors who had graduated elsewhere into the body of Queensland graduates who would eventually form the University Council. The chancellor was originally to be nominal dean of these two faculties, but by the time the four professors had arrived and three of them had been appointed chairmen of their respective faculties, the chancellor too reverted to being a nominal chairman and the title of ‘dean’ was put aside for the time being. Membership of the faculties, determined by the Senate, was in practice the academic staff of the faculty, who met and tendered advice to the Board of Faculties. This, the executive committee of the university in its early years, consisted of the four professors, the chancellor, and the vice-chancellor. Its president was Professor Steele, who lacked a faculty to chair but had instead the virtual academic leadership of the new community in his hands as president, for it was he who had the task of communicating the wishes of the academics to the Senate through
the chancellor and his deputy in the absence of academic staff representation on the first Senate.¹

The early board and faculty structure is clear. The departmental structure is not, for subjects were added to the curriculum in a curiously haphazard way in 1911 and later and became grouped together less according to some principle than, according to Michie, as part of arrangements “best meeting the exigencies of the time”. These arrangements are most easily understood within the Faculty of Engineering, which, to the layman at least, looks like a single-subject faculty. Professor Gibson was quickly able to persuade the Senate to give him an assistant lecturer to help him almost from the beginning, and in 1912 Roger Hawken, eventually to succeed Gibson in 1919, was appointed lecturer in civil engineering, and in the following year an electrical engineer was added to the lecturing staff. The faculty was soon offering full streams in both civil engineering and mechanical and electrical engineering combined, and was believed in 1922 to have undergone few changes since its inception. Mining engineering made at least a brief appearance in the programme for it was identified by a Silver Jubilee compilation as one of the early branch studies and it appeared in a Senate document of 1917 as one of the three departments, along with civil and mechanical/electrical, within the Faculty of Engineering. By the time of the Story Report of 1918 it had disappeared, and the faculty was reduced to its two departments, but it is unclear just what degree of autonomy was possessed by the two sections. The single professor, Gibson and later Hawken, imposed a large measure of unity, and it seems likely that the term “department” was being used to indicate a subject area rather than a large measure of administrative independence.²

The Faculty of Science with its constituent subjects presents a rather more complicated picture. Chemistry and mathematics with physics each had professors and were areas of autonomy. In June 1911, the Senate categorized geology and biology as further departments within the Faculty of Science but recognized their inferior status by requiring that all orders under the sum of £2 had to be countersigned by the registrar or the university accountant; the fate of orders above that amount was not revealed. These two “inferior” departments were at the same time given a petty cash fund of modest proportions, though not so modest as the £1 per month allowed to the Faculty of Arts, which was still being treated as one department at this stage. Biology, under the control of Dr
Harvey Johnston, a late arrival in 1911, and an absentee on prickly pear commitments later which gave an opportunity for Freda Bage to become lecturer in charge of the subject, was offering an Honours as well as pass courses from early days. It was given an assistant lectureship in 1915 and had an obvious need of a chair when more chairs were created. Harvey Johnston was appointed to the chair in 1919 and was succeeded, on his translation to the chair of zoology in Adelaide in 1922, by Ernest James Goddard, one of the most important figures of the university’s early history. Geology, to which mineralogy was attached by a Senate ruling of 11 September 1912, acquired an assistant lectureship in 1913 and began to offer third-year pass courses as well as an Honours course. In 1919 geology and mineralogy also came of age in that Henry Casselli Richards, another of the giants, who had been in charge from 1911, was appointed to a chair. Physics had perhaps the most frustrating existence in that it was an attachment to mathematics, a subject that straddled all faculties, and was therefore under the control of Professor Priestley. Thomas Parnell, the lecturer in physics, and his assistant lecturer, S.G. Lusby, must have had a good deal of independence in practice for they accompanied chemistry out to the new chemistry building in 1912 and later moved around buildings of the technical college, with their specialized needs and obvious importance entitling them to independent status in 1919 when Parnell was given a chair and enjoyed the services of both a lecturer and an assistant lecturer.\(^5\)

Arts was perhaps the most confusing area, for in June 1911 it was regarded as a single department. By June 1912 the Senate was acknowledging the existence of sub-departments within the faculty, and these were classics, modern languages, philosophy, history and economics, and mathematics. Lecturing staff had been appointed in 1911 in the non-professorial areas, though they had clearly been under the general jurisdiction and authority of J.L. Michie, professor of classics and chairman of the faculty. It is worth noting the comments of an obituary to Michie in 1946: “He was never reconciled to the departmental subdivisions of his faculty, which he always believed should be a unity.” By 1913 it was acknowledged that modern languages, history and economics, and philosophy and education were distinct departments, though what powers this allowed their lecturers to exercise against the higher authority of Michie is by no means clear. Also, the grouping of subjects appears almost random and accidental. In
June 1914 the Senate resolved that economics be transferred from the Department of Philosophy to the Department of History from the beginning of 1915, but it had certainly been associated with history in the early appointments and teaching in that area. So too had English for a brief time, though it was quickly decided, on 7 April 1911, that English should be separated from history, and that a lectureship should be advertised in English, French, and German and an assistant lectureship in classics and English. A report to Senate in 1917 indicates that English had clearly settled itself into a Department of Modern Languages and Literature, which was, by the Story Report of 1919, being referred to simply as the Department of Modern Languages. There had been an Honours school in modern languages from the time of J.J. Stable’s appointment in 1912, and his elevation to a chair in English in 1922, together with greater strengthening in the language area, made English Honours possible in that year. History, though threatened with English and plagued with economics, quickly established an Honours programme, which produced graduates by 1916, though it was not able to achieve chair status before the McCaughey bequest, which permitted Henry Alcock to be promoted in 1922. But of all the arts subjects, philosophy proved the most eclectic. Elton Mayo, appointed lecturer in logic, psychology and ethics in 1911, taught all these subjects plus metaphysics in pass courses as well as offering special courses for Honours students. In 1913 he was joined by a lecturer in the theory and history of education and in 1914 given an assistant lecturer in logic and psychology. In 1919 he was promoted to a chair in philosophy and in 1922 the department also welcomed Research Professor J.P. Lowson, in the field of medical psychology, financed by a £10,000 gift from the British Red Cross to investigate the application of psychology to the alleviation and cure of neuroses and to the study of education.

Anyone attempting to characterize the academic arrangements of these years would be compelled to concede the versatility of the staff involved and the somewhat whimsical nature of the subject groupings within which they were required to operate. In addition it is clear that the exigencies of evening class provision, the interruptions of war, constraints of finance, and general indecision meant that subjects were frequently taught by a range of part-time and temporary staff who were not the most appropriate for settling a new university into right modes of conduct. When an attempt was made
in 1933 to summarize this organizational structure of the early days, it was recorded that the years 1911–19 had been the period of personal control by “The Big Four” and that 1919–22 had been the period of departmental control under the supervision of “The Little Four” as the second round of professors emerged in 1919. At the same time the three faculties began to assume greater institutional importance than the men who ran them, along with the Joint Board of Commercial Studies, which was virtually the same as the Department of History and Economics.7

The structure of the first degrees, at pass level at least, was fairly readily and clearly established at the outset. Back in May 1910, the Senate had taken an early decision on the pattern of the academic year, which was to have three terms of ten weeks each. Through the first year of the university’s operation it was decided to make the B.A. and B.Sc. degrees of three years’ duration, and students would study three subjects in each year. Evening students were expected to complete their B.A. degrees in five years and B.Sc. students to graduate after six years, for the additional contact hours demanded by laboratory work would necessarily extend the period of their studies. Engineering students were to take four years to complete their B.E. degrees and Gibson insisted that the inability of evening students to complete all the work undertaken by day people must result in the award of an inferior degree to those who studied at night. This ran contrary to the general position adopted that day and evening students must cover the same ground, take identical examinations, and receive degrees of equal worth. The Honours content of degrees was less clearly structured, but in general involved a student in special Honours subjects in the final year after undertaking the same basic pass courses as others in the beginning with perhaps some Honours work in the second year.8

One of the more disconcerting aspects of the first intake of students in 1911 was the fact that some people had already completed one and in some cases two years’ work in other institutions, and so it was necessary to offer second- and third-year courses at once. In addition, Michie was required to provide Honours courses in classics at the outset to meet the requirements of students from elsewhere. Such problems, which appear to have been largely unanticipated, must have caused considerable headaches for the four professors. So too must the advice that had to be given to the first students who sought help on how to construct their degrees and needed to
know what combinations of subjects were thought desirable and permissible. These combinations seem to have been worked out in private arrangements between staff and students. Some students, arriving with only one subject in mind, received suggestions of what others might be appropriately added; one, arriving with the intention of studying chemistry, geology and biology, was told by Steele that he must take two years of physics if he wanted Honours in chemistry, and so he lost his biology and acquired physics; another who planned to go to the Bar had his courses modelled for him in conversations with Professor Michie and took final Honours in history. This unfortunate person found his books for his special Honours subject on the French Revolution arriving some six months after his examinations were over, which was no help to him in obtaining a high class. Having seen the first students almost through their first degrees, the Senate was ready in November 1913 to approve regulations for the higher degrees of M.A., M.Sc. and M.Eng. Doctorates and diplomas would be added in due course.9

The growth of academic staff to teach for these degrees was not a smoothly designed operation. The original four professors had been joined by the end of 1911 by fourteen more
lecturers or assistant lecturers of full- or part-time status — there had been decisions to appoint an evening lecturer in English, French and German, and to allow Professor Michie to engage temporary assistants, in one instance at £5.5s per week, in another, English and modern languages, at £2.2s per week. The first seven lecturing appointments included Richards, Parnell, and Mayo, all subsequently promoted to chairs, and Hermiene Ulrich, the first woman academic, to teach modern languages. She in fact married Thomas Parnell and was replaced by J.J. Stable in 1912, though she accepted several temporary appointments to help out over the next few years. Another of the lecturing staff was R.J. Cholmeley in classics, an eccentric who carried his books in a child’s satchel, and wore baggy trousers, an over-large coat and a straw-boater on the back of his head. By 1914 the academic staff had grown to thirty-two, including the part-timers and the temporary, and in 1915 the university, enjoying the benefits of one of its early and rare private endowments, from the Walter and Eliza Hall Trustees, was able to add fellowships in economic biology and pure chemistry and a lecturer in applied chemistry to create research as well as teaching positions.*

The terms and titles of these first academics are not without interest. The four professors, appointed on salaries of £900, were the only ones in the early history of the university to enjoy security of tenure, although the Senate had laid down in May 1910 that professors could be removed for misconduct and that they should take no part in politics beyond exercising their franchise, thus initiating a tradition that was to die hard. The second vice-chancellor, A.J. Thynne, was to restate the Senate’s position in August 1919 when he combined a statement that it was not the place of the university to take part in public discussions of questions of the day with a pronunciation on a very different issue, that it was not the duty of university teachers to inculcate political doctrine, thereby combining a universally acceptable principle with an opinion of expediency and dubious worth. The result of this act of self-emasculation by the university was to limit severely the role that it could play in public life and the service that it could perform within the state that it was established to serve. It is worth noting that the Great War was evidently not regarded as a public issue of the day, for senators had no inhibitions about public pronunciations in support of this and encouraged academic staff to behave likewise.**

There was clearly no inclination, and probably no time, for
the early lecturers, appointed on a salary of £350, and the assistant lecturers, at £300, to look beyond their purely academic responsibilities during the period of their first five-year contracts, the first of which came up for renewal at various stages of 1916 when all the men concerned received good reports and further five-year appointments. By 1917 many academic staff were becoming restive about their status and salary levels. The occasional person had been appointed acting professor during the absence of his superior, but an important group, including Richards, Alcock, and Mayo, believed that they had been doing the work of professors without either status or remuneration, for they were running departments and having responsibility for academic disciplines. These people led a deputation to the Senate on 8 November 1917 which helped to precipitate the first Story reports of 1918–19, from which certain improvements resulted. Four new chairs were created in physics, biology, geology, and philosophy for Parnell, Harvey Johnston, Richards, and Mayo, and professorial salaries were fixed on a scale of £600–£900. Existing assistant lecturers were made lecturers on a scale of £400–£550, and the rank of assistant professor was created, an honorary one in that a person of ten years’ service might receive the title but no additional salary. In fact only two people ever occupied this position, H.G. Denham, a chemist, and S.G. Lusby, a physicist. On the debit side of the new deal were the absence of tenure for the new professors who were to be subjected to review after seven years, and the continuation of five-year appointments for lecturing staff. Although this package was to raise the academic salary bill by 50 per cent, the lack of security of tenure is believed to have been detrimental to the university’s prospects of attracting good staff in the future.12

One consequence of this doubling of the professoriate in 1918–19 was the much-needed expansion of the Board of Faculties, eventually to be named the Professorial Board. Back in July 1910, the Senate had created an “Exemptions and Status Committee”, pending the establishment of a “Professorial Board”, but this name had been passed over in favour of a Board of Faculties. This committee of the four professors, supplemented by the chancellor and vice-chancellor when in formal session, had been the academic body responsible for all decisions ranging from those of highest principle and importance, such as degree structure and staff appointments, to the most trivial matters of everyday ad-
ministration. Their only cooperators and rivals in running the university were members of the Senate from whom they gradually obtained small measures of financial autonomy in areas where their special knowledge meant that they alone were competent to decide. Almost everything, nonetheless, found its way to the Senate for ultimate approval, including book purchases, but the board could expect to have its advice taken and to get its way in most matters. By 1918 the board members were themselves conscious that, although four people were sufficient to form an executive committee, this was too small a body to coordinate the work of a whole lot of new departments which had emerged over seven years. Various proposals for making the board more representative were discussed, but its members, as is often the wont of bodies that are being urged to broaden themselves, came to the conclusion in April 1918 that “there is no way of increasing the Board at the present time in which gain counterbalances loss”. By the creation of new chairs and an intention to rename the board, it acquired for the future a capacity to expand in time with the growth of the professorial body even if the change of name was to take a further twenty years.  

One area in which appropriate expansion failed to take place and in which the Board of Faculties occasionally found its advice to the Senate and its committees rejected was that of the library. The poor accommodation offered for library purposes, the appointment of the registrar, Cumbrae Stewart, as spare-time librarian, and the small amounts of money available for library purchases ensured that the library remained for many years a neglected and impoverished area. A brief account of the university written in 1922 mildly stated that it was some years before the needs of lecturing staff and research students were moderately provided for, and placed this failure within the context of Brisbane’s lack of public library facilities. Professor Priestley was still lamenting in 1922 that the library lacked many important books which it ought to contain and that a reading room which accommodated fewer than two dozen readers was hopelessly inadequate. In 1912 the Senate seemed more concerned to debate threatened departures from the Dewey system of cataloguing than the absence of a reading room, though its Library Committee had earlier found time to help launch the eternal debate on how much money should be allocated to different departments within the annual library budget. The registrar received assistance from the classicist Cholmeley, who was paid £100 for acting as
assistant librarian, at least until 1914 when his emolument fell to £50 in a reorganization of the hierarchy. The two men remained librarian and assistant, but Miss Hurwood was to give further assistance at £60 per annum, and a temporary assistant was to be paid £26 per annum. By the end of 1916 the library had 15,000 volumes, but the presence of white ants had become a constant source of anxiety and danger. The room was treated with cyanide of potassium over the long vacation, but the problems remained. In November 1917, the Department of Public Works was informed of the presence of borers in the wooden shelving of the library; several books had already been attacked and action was urged for the eradication of the pest.¹⁴

Although the university was inevitably preoccupied with establishing its academic procedures in these years, which necessarily meant an emphasis on internal affairs, it was at the same time forever aware of the expectations that were held of it and the role that it was expected to play within society at large. One example of this is to be seen in the establishment of the Department of Correspondence Studies. The University Act had provided for the granting of degrees to non-resident students and it was central to the general expectations held of the university that it would be accessible to remote areas of the state either by the affiliation of colleges in other centres of population or by other means. This expectation had indeed helped to mitigate the hostility of those who feared that the university would be both socially exclusive and limited to the people of the south-east of the state. Professor Steele proclaimed the university’s commitment to both evening and correspondence study at the inauguration ceremony of 1 June 1911, for by this time the government had agreed to add a further £2,500 to the university’s endowment to permit the staffing of these activities. On 10 May 1911 it was agreed to advertise the position of officer in charge of correspondence study at a salary of £400 per annum and with the status of lecturer, and T.E. Jones was appointed and sent off to North America to seek information on current practice. In 1912 his title was changed to that of director of correspondence studies.¹⁵

The annual report to parliament of 1912 recorded that twenty-one external students had been enrolled, and twenty examined, of whom six had completed the full work in three subjects and four had received credit for two subjects, which was regarded as a satisfactory start to the venture. The
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correspondence study had to coincide with internal work as the same examination had to be passed, and external students had to be given as much help as could be arranged. To meet these needs the director or his assistant would attend day lectures to take notes, after which they would write up the lectures, have their material checked by the lecturer, and then post it off to the student. The courses available initially to external students through correspondence courses were, as they have mostly remained, within the arts area. The school teachers of the state were anxious to have science courses made available but the problems of laboratory requirements were never solved.16

There is a good deal of contemporary evidence that many academic staff regarded both evening and correspondence study as being of an inferior kind, and tended to see part-time students as something of a nuisance; if staff had a duty to fulfil it was not a pleasure to be enjoyed, and there was an understandable reluctance, for instance, within the chemistry department to provide Saturday morning practical classes for the twenty-three evening students who were enrolled in chemistry in 1918. For those in remote areas for whom attendance was not possible the provision of correspondence courses was no adequate compensation for the almost total failure of the university to give any accreditation to technical and other colleges outside Brisbane and Ipswich, where science or applied science units might have been taken as part of degree work. In October 1912, the Darling Downs Gazette complained that as long as lectures were confined to Brisbane and all affiliated colleges were to be found there, doors would remain closed to the country poor; it was not impressed by the trip made to America by T.E. Jones to report on correspondence study in that part of the world. Nevertheless correspondence studies did make some headway, teachers were able to improve their departmental classification by taking units and obtaining their Class One, and small numbers of students achieved degrees by this means. In April 1915, the Senate expressed the pious hope that as far as possible external students should be encouraged to attend university during their last year at least, and in December 1918 the Department of Public Instruction initiated another debate that would plague all future generations when it raised the possibility that teachers living within reach of the university should nonetheless be allowed to enrol as external students. Teachers were, and would long remain, the backbone of external study.17
A second area of clear responsiveness to community needs and pressures is that of university expansion, the plans that were contemplated, right from the outset, to establish new faculties and embark upon new subjects. The debate about utility which had preceded the foundation of the university was in no way diminished and formed a background against which all plans for academic expansion had to be discussed. There was typical discussion in the Legislative Assembly in 1917 during which the minister for public instruction, in the first enthusiastic flush of T.J. Ryan's new reformist Labor government, informed the House that universities were well known for teaching doctrines subsequently exploded and that they gave very little assistance to the cause of reform; he had, he believed, done something to make the University of Queensland more useful during his term of office, in promoting the teaching of economics and constitutional history through the Workers' Educational Association. But other members seriously questioned if the university was doing the work for which it was intended and suggested that the Faculty of Arts should have been left out completely because it was not useful. This kind of approach acquired strong political overtones in September 1919 when the Telegraph, pressing the need for what it called "economic subjects", demanded a campaign against hookworm in the tropics and advanced the familiar argument that unless this disease were conquered White Australia would not be permanently established, for the white race must occupy the north or surrender it to a race that was willing and able to do so. The University of Queensland was being enjoined to save White Australia.\[^{18}\]

A more limited and feasible proposition was that it should promote agriculture. One of the Senate's first acts was to send a deputation to the premier, D.F. Denham, in May 1911 to request the establishment of faculties of agriculture and commerce, but the premier appeared to believe that the creation of the university was a final and complete act, beyond which the government should not be expected to go. His arguments were chilling; for besides questioning the capacity of the state to afford a Faculty of Agriculture he also questioned the need to conduct research in Queensland when work had been done in other parts of the world which could be read. More memorably, he asked if university graduates would be willing to "go into the back blocks and the scrubs to delve and dig, or would they not seek appointments as scientific expert[s]?"\[^{19}\]

Despite this strange wish from the premier to convert scien-
tific experts into hewers of wood, the chancellor, Sir William MacGregor, remained strongly convinced of the importance of this subject and the state’s needs for graduates whom the premier had regarded as unemployable. His ambitions for the university were encouraged by a gift of £1,000 by Robert M. Christison, late of Lammermoor in the north of the state but now resident in England, for the foundation of a chair of tropical and sub-tropical agriculture. He offered a further £1,000 if this could be matched within Queensland, and actively engaged in a campaign within Britain, aided by the agent-general, to raise funds to endow a chair. Although a substantial sum of £4,500 was raised, the scheme was abandoned without achieving its ambition. Instead, J.D. Story chaired a select committee in 1916 to investigate agricultural education in Queensland, which suggested plans that would allow the subject to be organized from primary school through to degree level, integrating Gatton Agricultural College into a structure that might offer diploma courses in anticipation of the full degree offered by the university. It was a characteristic Story integrationist approach, which viewed the university as part of the state education system.20

Commerce too was frequently demanded but without success. An early recommendation to the Senate in July 1910 from the Curriculum Committee favoured a Faculty of Commerce, though R.H. Roe, the vice-chancellor, had dissented from the proposal to treat commerce on its own. The Senate’s enthusiasm for commerce was not matched by the premier in the 1911 encounter, and though it remained a matter of frequent assertion that the business of Queensland would prosper if the businessmen of Queensland could be brought within the university’s influence, little progress was made beyond the addition of commercial subjects to the Junior Examination list in 1918, which has the mark of another Story move to approach tertiary provision gradually from the bottom.21

A third area of contemplated expansion, again close to the heart of Sir William MacGregor, was that of medicine. The thought of Queensland training its own doctors instead of sending its students off to southern centres of learning had long held attraction, and with the impending retirement of MacGregor from the governorship of the state it seemed appropriate to people associated with the university that a public meeting should be called to invite contributions to a fund in his honour and for a purpose of his choosing, which
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was the foundation of a medical faculty. Sir Robert Philp exploited the occasion to lecture the people of Queensland on their failure so far to do much for their university, and he invited them to make amends by contributing to the provision of a MacGregor School of Medicine. The Senate was at the same time commissioning a report from a select committee appointed to consider a medical school and resolving that the time had now come to act on this idea. When the report was received on 14 July 1914 it argued strongly on the basis of Queensland’s need for locally trained doctors, but suggested a probable cost of £35,000 for the establishment of a medical school. In the absence of public contributions of any consequence, this money would have to come from the government, and that meant that the university would be unable to move until the government felt ready to do so. The outbreak of war certainly discouraged any possible inclination to move quickly on this, but the matter was raised in parliamentary debate in 1917 and 1918, and in March of the latter year the registrar received a letter from the under-secretary to the home secretary notifying him of the minister’s interest in the proposed establishment of a medical school and requesting all possible information to be sent to him. The request was complied with, but the medical school was still a long way off.

Other more modest proposals were from time to time suggested to the university. In February 1912, the Rockhampton Scottish Association expressed its wish for the study of the vernacular language and literature of Scotland to be undertaken, and the Senate tactfully referred this to the Education Committee, reporting that it had no immediate plans to move in this direction. In October of the same year the Darling Downs Gazette called for a chair of domestic science, “to teach girl students that special branch of knowledge which Nature, in collaboration with social customs, has appointed them to do”. “We want neither fledgling [sic] surgeons nor fledgling [sic] lawyers,” it continued in the same article, eschewing even those practical callings in favour of something completely down to earth and related directly to what it believed to be the natural existence of one half of the population. This was the utilitarian case at its most extreme. Another proposal, from the supposedly hard-headed businessmen of the Ipswich Chamber of Commerce in November 1916, was the somewhat surprising support for a chair in Eastern languages, which anticipated actual developments by something like half a century.
These various proposals were rarely presented in any very systematic form and rarely seen in relation to one another, but occasionally some attempt was made to take a broader view. In March 1914, a member of the Senate, E.W.H. Fowles, returned from a North American trip and offered his colleagues a paper in which it was suggested that priorities for expansion should be first a chair in music, secondly a chair of law, and thirdly an expanded Faculty of Applied Science which should include architecture, astrophysics, sociology, and Eastern languages (suggested here for the first time), and then departments of dentistry, pharmacy, veterinary science, and accounting. The university would eventually acquire an astrophysicist as professor and another as vice-chancellor, but not before all other items on the list had been introduced.24

There was a danger, in an over-enthusiastic approach to expansion, that existing areas would not receive proper consolidation, and this was a message which J.L. Michie attempted to convey to the Senate in 1917 when he asked that existing departments should be strengthened before new ones were created. This did not prevent J.D. Story’s post-war report on reorganization and expansion listing medicine and dentistry, agriculture, commerce, and law as the first areas for expansion, at the same time confirming the view that existing areas should have priority over expansion. In 1920 a further select committee report to the Senate took a much more comprehensive, and perhaps realistic, view of what was desirable and what was possible. This time, priority was given to extending accommodation for existing commitments, and within a list of the proposals adequate salaries and a law lectureship were bracketed in second place, a Diploma in Education given fourth position, proper provision for the Workers’ Educational Association fifth place, followed by a Diploma in Agriculture, the setting up of a medical school including dentistry, a Diploma in Commerce, adult education, and a law faculty. In a list of ten items it was unlikely that close attention would be given to anything beyond the first few places, and it was indeed the case that some of the major and costly proposals towards the bottom of the list were destined to have to wait a long time for fulfilment.25

Another example of the new university’s concern for the external world is to be found in the kind of emphasis given to research during the first decade. When the Senate held a dinner in honour of its chancellor on 12 November 1911, Sir William MacGregor used the occasion to remind the company
that no university could be said to be functioning properly unless it extended as well as passed on knowledge and that universities had a duty to undertake research. Eleven years later, Professor Priestley, surveying the scene in 1922, stressed the importance of research work in all spheres of university activity. It was even more necessary, he said, for a young university with a name to make than for an old one with an already established reputation. During the intervening period devotion to programmes of research had not been easy. There was never a problem of unfavourable staff-student ratios, for student numbers remained relatively low through these years and staff expanded sufficiently with student numbers. Rather was the problem twofold: in part it was the result of a heavy load of courses that staff had to prepare and give, if sometimes to small numbers of students; in part it derived from the sheer consumption of mental and physical energy demanded by a university in its infancy. Members of academic staff were acutely conscious of how much time that should have gone into research was being spent on other necessary activities, but there was no answer to the problem in the early days and it simply had to be accepted as part of life. Relief that might have been given to over-taxed academics in the form of research assistance would have been very costly, and there was no concept of departmental research grants to sustain the enthusiastic in those days. It must also be mentioned that the Great War absorbed the research energies of the most prominent scientists and engineers at a time when the university was just beginning to move into settled routines, as well as requiring the services of other academics for whom these might have been years of academic opportunity.26

Nevertheless, a certain amount of research was undertaken by staff, and a tradition was founded that some of the best students in a few areas could expect to win scholarships which would allow them to do research either in Queensland or overseas. Even before the university opened its doors the Orient Steam Navigation Company offered two first-class return passages to Britain for students on completion of their degrees, and during the first year Professor Steele notified students through their magazine of two annual research scholarships of £100 each and a further travelling scholarship of £200 that were available in the science and applied science areas. Queensland was also able to participate in the scheme for Rhodes Scholarships, which were to remain the supreme award for which students contended. One winner of a
Queensland government scholarship for research in chemistry in 1915 found that he was denied the accompanying gold medal from the government on the grounds of a wartime gold shortage, and even after the war the university had cause to chase up the government for its failure to deliver the promised medals when the emergency was over.27

In their short history published in 1923 Professors Alcock and Stable, from the Departments of History and English, argued that the investigations of greatest ultimate importance were those which led to pure as opposed to applied knowledge, that these investigations were long, continuous, and difficult to summarise, and that their authors in consequence were given less immediate publicity and credit. They gave several examples of the research being undertaken in literary studies and mathematics, for instance, that would have no obvious practical implications, but they were well aware that it was the research that related to problem solving within the community that had the greatest popular appeal and provided the most acceptable justification for the existence of the university. Biology, for example, which conducted research largely in parasitology and was in pursuit of cattle ticks, worm parasites in cattle, and sheep maggot flies, soon lost its head, Dr Harvey Johnston, to the Queensland government Prickly Pear Travelling Commission in the period 1912–14, and again after the war he was allowed leave of absence, 1920–23, to be scientific controller of the scheme he had helped to develop for the eradication of prickly pear — the introduction of the celebrated cactoblastis. Similarly, the report from the Fellow in Economic Biology received by the Senate in March 1920 dealt with tick-resistance in cattle, work done on the epidemic among fish in western Queensland rivers, and cattle worms.28

The Senate was always alive to the need to foster research in matters of supreme importance to the agricultural economy of the state and was always ready to absorb any funds that the federal or state authorities were willing to make available. In November 1917, the Advisory Council of Science and Industry requested the use of engineering laboratory facilities for cotton-picking research, to which the Senate readily agreed, and the geology department also gave an enormous amount of practical help locally in the solving of problems; for example, the department undertook an investigation of the rock foundations of St John’s Cathedral at the request of the Chapter. And Alcock, conscious of the importance of pure research, was nevertheless moved to approach the Senate in
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July 1919 on the need for research on the economic issues confronting Australia, suggesting the creation of a Research Fellowship to undertake investigations into certain specific and practical issues. Any notion that the University of Queensland considered research from the viewpoint of an ivory tower could not be further removed from the situation that actually prevailed during these years.\textsuperscript{29}

That does not mean that the Senate was blind to scholarship for its own sake, for in August 1916 a sum of £20 was voted to assist the publication of original work by staff, and examples of such work were identified in the subjects of geology, biology, and engineering. The following year it was agreed to raise the amount to £50 and to ask the Library Committee of the Senate to act as a Board of Publications to judge what was worthy of Senate support.\textsuperscript{30}

This support for research found further expression in the Senate’s response to a recommendation from the Board of Faculties in July 1920 that academic staff be given relief from ordinary duties for research purposes. It was agreed that this relief should be given only for work that was already in progress; that the work should be truly original and exclude mere compilation; that there should not be more than one such award per year and that it should in most cases not last beyond one term; that no one should be eligible more than once in seven years; and that the average annual expenditure on this exercise should not exceed £150. Thus the Senate made hardly a bold leap but at least a first tentative step towards instituting study leave or sabbatical arrangements for the undertaking of research. It would itself deal with exceptional cases as they arose, for such applications were to be exceptional events, though the system was immediately tested by the first off the mark, Professor Mayo from philosophy, who expressed a need to prepare work for publication. It was found that he could be relieved of his lecture work at a cost of a mere £50, and this was well within the guidelines, which doubtless helped him to be successful. The board report had claimed, “In spite of limitations a considerable body of research work has been carried out to a successful issue” — and that seems a fair judgment on the first decade, even if a few of the best-known figures on the academic staff, such as Michie and Alcock, were not productive researchers and even if many of those who were had contributed in a very practical way by tackling the immediate problems of Queensland life. This was a virtue of their performance, not a detraction from it, for in
this way was the University of Queensland doing the job for which it was created.31

Another way in which it was intended to assist the community at large was in the conduct of public examinations, both the examinations relating to specific professional bodies or organizations and those that would establish the educational standards reached by students at different stages of secondary education. Under the first heading the Senate agreed, for instance, in September 1910 to be responsible for the examinations of the College of Pharmacy, and in October 1912 to help the Department of Public Instruction by taking over the Class One examination for practising school teachers who were trying to upgrade themselves, which in practice meant allowing unmatriculated teachers to enrol in arts subjects. The second area was of much greater importance — the responsibility for both the Junior and Senior public examinations — for by assuming control of this exercise from the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne and using these examinations for matriculation purposes the university, in fixing its own entrance requirements, imposed a pattern upon the state's secondary education system and became an integral part of that system. In September 1912, the Senate accepted a Board of Faculties recommendation to consolidate and formalize arrangements operating since 1910 and to constitute a Public Examination Board to advise on all matters pertaining to secondary school public examinations, and this body, which included representatives from schools and technical colleges, possessed a university majority which ensured university control. On 19 November of the same year the Brisbane Courier reported that the public examinations of the University of Queensland, an interesting description, had begun the previous day and were involving candidates at twenty-four different centres throughout the state, 436 at Junior level and 79 at Senior; on the basis of these examinations the twenty government scholarships to the university would be awarded. By 1919 the numbers involved had grown to 1,168 at Junior level and 279 at Senior, and J.D. Story not surprisingly claimed this as a triumph both for the department's policy of promoting high schools and encouraging students to study on until Senior and for the impact that the university was making by providing the incentive for such students and their teachers. On the university side there were some reservations about the competitive element that was part of the Senior examination, and in December 1913 the Senate
approved a proposal that Senior should be retained for matriculation purposes but discontinued for scholarships, which should be awarded on the basis of a special scholarship examination to be taken a year later than Senior. Such a scheme had considerable social and financial as well as educational implications and would elude the grasp of many people over many decades.  

Meanwhile, the university had to face occasional criticism, and even unwanted praise, for the way it went about its job. In the latter category was the speech of the parliamentarian in 1917 who detected a considerable improvement in the style of questions set in the most recent Senior English examination; the paper, he said, had been far more practical than previously and paid far less attention to the subtleties of literary criticism. This change, for the better or for the worse, might have been related to the complaints received in May 1915 from the headmaster of Rockhampton Grammar School about the marking of papers in Junior English. A committee was appointed by the Senate to look into the matter and it was agreed that there was no cause for further action, though members of the Senate queried the appropriateness of Shakespeare at this level. They were quickly assured that Shakespeare was entirely appropriate.

If the university was successful in fixing patterns for the secondary schools, it was less so in the attempt to consult with and accredit a network of country technical colleges throughout the state. These had to be of the required standard to justify affiliation with the central body and perhaps even become the country campuses of a federal university that had its centre in Brisbane. The Central Technical College was easily accommodated, for buildings and workshops were shared as well as a general site; the technical college curriculum was adapted to meet university requirements and a four-year diploma course in engineering was organized that would allow students to move from the technical college to the third year of the university degree course. The affiliation movement was also believed to have made an advance through the decision taken in November 1912 to regard work done at Ipswich Technical College as having a value equivalent to that of certain engineering studies within the university. But Brisbane and Ipswich hardly represented a statewide achievement; Townsville was found to be not up to the required standard, and the ideal looked increasingly less likely to be realized. Nor did any real progress seem likely to be made.
from the desultory negotiations in the early years with the College of Pharmacy, the Dental Board, and the Ophthalmic Opticians of Queensland, all of whom sought some measure of affiliation and recognition. It is difficult to see what kind of recognition the university was competent to award these bodies and how recognition could have furthered the notion of a Queensland university spread over the whole state.34

Part of the process of mutual adjustment between the university and the community was accomplished by the award of University of Queensland degrees to people other than those who had studied for them in the new institution. The official inauguration on 1 June 1911 was an opportunity for the university to give thanks to the premier under whom it had been founded, William Kidston, and at the same time to cement relations between gown and state. The Senate agreed to award him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, a decision taken in the absence of its chancellor and chairman, who later recorded that he would have opposed it had he been present. Whether MacGregor’s attitude sprang from a general cynicism concerning Kidston’s attitude to the university or from a belief that it was Kidston who had been responsible for driving him out to Fernberg it is impossible to say, but the chancellor performed his duties in spite of his personal feelings. He also awarded degrees ad eundem gradum to 180 graduates of other universities, thereby associating a large number of important people in the local community with the new university, which needed all possible friends. The following year honorary doctorates of law were conferred upon Sir Samuel Walker Griffith and Viscount James Bryce, in an occasion said by the Brisbane Courier to be unique in that the Queensland university was the only one in Australia with the power to confer honorary degrees.35

Despite these friendly gestures and marks of favour bestowed upon deserving dignitaries, the university was itself slow to receive reciprocal gifts from the community in the form of financial endowments. In the very early months of the university’s life two donors made provision for the Thomas Morrow Prize for the best essay on a subject of Australian interest and the Lizzie Heal-Warry Prize for the first-year woman most proficient in English, but repeated reminders to wealthy members of the local community that they might feel some obligation or even desire to make a contribution to university funds went largely unnoticed. Some donations were made, but not of the scale achieved by Robert Christison and
his contacts in England who tried in vain to promote the chair in agriculture. In 1915 the university became the recipient of the generous Walter and Eliza Hall benefaction which created three fellowships immediately and would be a continuing source of additional revenue to the university in the future. The other major benefaction of the early period occurred in August 1919 in the McCaughey bequest from the Riverina grazier, which was to realize for the university an annual income in excess of £7,500 which was three-quarters of the government’s original annual endowment. This was to open up a whole range of possibilities to the university; but it did not substantially undermine the words of J.D. Story when he reported in the same year his regret “that the public has so far not shown a general desire to support the University in the way of donations and benefactions”. It would, he wrote, be unwise to rely on the public, and therefore the Senate must approach the government with its plans for the future. Story’s observations are of the utmost importance to an understanding of the future academic development of the University of Queensland. They also highlight the contrast between the University of Queensland and its southern counterparts: Adelaide, founded through the efforts of financial benefactors; Sydney, enjoying the Challis and P.N. Russell bequests after 1890, which together financed seven chairs and ten lectureships; and Melbourne, where private donations of over £300,000 equalled the entire government expenditure over the twenty years from 1870 to 1890.36
6 The Home and the Housekeepers

Not the least important aspect of establishing the University of Queensland was the matter of converting the old Government House and Domain into a working university that must share its site with the Central Technical College and other institutions which the government might choose to develop there in the future. Early memories of the place are mixed. Former students remember it as "a gracious place", very conveniently and centrally situated, and usefully provided with a kiosk for eating in the Botanical Gardens; one student remembers "a mixey, muddly sort of place, mixed up with the Technical College", while another recalls, perhaps a little uncharitably, that its only advantage was that students could take their lunch in the Botanical Gardens in good weather and enjoy the stroll back afterwards.¹

The processes of conversion and adaptation were not easy ones. Despite the enthusiastic report of the committee that had recommended the site to the government, no one who had to work there had the least doubt that Government House was totally inadequate and unsuited to its new purpose. At an early meeting in May 1910, the Senate was informed that £50,000 had been provided for the buildings of the university and technical college, and an immediate request was made that the Department of Public Instruction should provide sanitary arrangements for at least three hundred students and remember that a certain proportion would be female. Meetings with technical college and departmental representatives in
April 1911 on the problems of shared accommodation led to a decision that chemistry should be given a new building and that the university should have control over some rooms in the college as opposed to those over which the department would retain authority. The various lecture rooms of the university, according to the Brisbane Courier on 14 March, once either the bedrooms or the living rooms of distinguished people, had all been allotted and awaited only their furniture, though much still needed to be done concerning equipment. The makeshift benches and buckets of chemistry were testimony to that, though the department had its own modern laboratory by 1912 even if other science subjects were fast encroaching upon technical college space.  

Although Government House was manifestly inadequate, the minister for public instruction wrote a worried memorandum to the premier in June 1911 about the money that was being spent on buildings and equipment for the university, and reminded him that the university had to share a joint budget with the technical college, which catered for twenty times the number of students. By the end of the second year, 1912, with the completion of the new chemistry building, conditions were, according to Hilda Brotherton, much improved but the situation was never static, and growing numbers of students and the need to offer classes to three different years meant that the pressure was renewed in 1913. Accommodation at George Street would always fall well below requirements, and during a parliamentary debate of
1922 one member would speak of a lecture room where "members stood on the veranda and veranda railings peering through the windows throughout the lecture".  

One frequently worrying feature of the university's tenure of Government House and the Domain was the precise jurisdiction which the Senate exercised over these properties. As early as April 1911 the chancellor approached the premier on the matter of recreation grounds for students and initiated a prolonged wrangle over title. The acting premier, Barlow, MacGregor's adversary on many occasions despite their fellow membership of the Senate, was most insistent that Kidston
had always been opposed to granting fixed title to the university, and he had indeed given undertakings during the 1909 debates on the University Bill that the public would retain access to the grounds; if title were granted, according to Barlow, the public would soon be excluded. And there the matter appears to have rested until it was taken up again by the registrar, Cumbrae Stewart, in March 1915 when he wrote to the chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee about the problem of controlling lands over which no title was possessed. In practice, he admitted, the university had exercised practically exclusive occupation of the main building, the tennis courts, the common rooms, the chemistry laboratory, and the surrounding land. This area was enclosed by a fence except on the technical college side, and he feared that with the growth of the college there would be thousands of students who would loiter around the university precincts. There was a danger that staff would be interfered with in their enjoyment of the tennis courts, which were their sole form of available exercise and barely adequate for a staff of almost thirty. Only recently, he said, he had caught young boys cycling round the main building during examinations, which had prompted him to call on the under-secretary for agriculture who had assured him that he would be justified in warning off intruders. Now he was calling for a stricter definition of the area under his control and the nature of his authority, and he
proposed that a Board of Trustees should be created, including the Board of Agriculture and Senate representatives. He further asked for a fence between the university and the college. Such an affront to the integrationist hopes of the government in 1909 was not to be encouraged by the Senate, who declined to support the registrar’s requests as embodied in a recommendation from the Buildings and Grounds Committee.4

The struggle was now taken up by J.D. Story, as under-secretary to the Department of Public Instruction, who exchanged memoranda with his counterpart in the Department of Agriculture, deprecating any interference that might occur in the use of the Domain by the university or the technical college. Agriculture, however, stood firm. The educational institutions would have preference in the use of the grounds for sport, but when they were not using them the general public must be free to do so. It must be a university for Queensland, not simply for university students, and the serious consequences of this were to be indicated by a Buildings and Grounds Committee report to the Senate in September 1918: people were wandering around the university at night; football teams which were using the Domain at weekends and people who were attending Sunday afternoon meetings were all using the university latrines and creating “a disquieting state of affairs and a danger to health”. The tolerance and community spirit of university members were being sorely tested.5

Meanwhile, inside the buildings the white ants were pursuing their destructive course, prompting many Senate requests to the Department of Works for their eradication, petitions which were either unheeded or impossible to fulfil. In 1922 Professor Priestley summed up the university’s predicament in the immortal words: “We are housed in a building inadequate in size and unsuitable in design. It is riddled with white ants; leaking roofs are frequent and falling ceilings not unknown. With the exception of the department of Chemistry, the faculties of Science and Engineering are in buildings or portions of buildings borrowed from the Technical College.” This was the fate of the university wished upon it by the 1909 site committee who had painted in glowing colours the house and grounds which were now the source of so much exasperation. One member of that committee was still a member of Senate, the under-secretary who had tried to persuade the Department of Agriculture to see things his way, J.D. Story.6

During the very first winter of their discontents, 1911,
members of the Senate, prompted by the reactions of the academics, were beginning to accept what Sir William MacGregor had known from the start: that the former Government House would not suffice as a permanent home for the university. In a flurry of meetings, site visits, and deputations to the premier, the Senate alternated between requests for the government to set aside a sufficient area in Victoria Park for housing a university and recommendations that Yeronga Park be made available since Victoria Park was neither available nor even suitable. They even considered the possibility of a so-called remote bush suburb, St Lucia, which offered a pocket of land that might have been used to provide generously for a university, with 240 acres of parkland, 200 for the university, and 50 more for a teaching hospital. Premier Denham was not much impressed by their arguments and their pleas, assuring them that their existing site would meet all educational needs for a further fifty years; there would be no more land grants for university purposes for some time and certainly no likelihood of any move for the university. The government nevertheless offered Yeronga Park to the Senate, which they accepted, before being told three months later that it was not available. The Senate then renewed its request that Victoria Park be vested in the Senate for the future use of the university, despite being told three months earlier that its unevenness would raise the cost of building there to prohibitive heights. There followed two more years of meetings and deputations, during which a permanent Site Committee came into existence within that body of graduates shortly to form the University Council. Victoria Park still retained its role as the preferred site, and on 15 May 1914 Brisbane Municipal Council was thanked by the Senate for its generous offer to make 111 acres available to add to the 60 that had been set aside for university purposes in the legislation of 1906. Criteria for the site laid down in 1913 — that it should be big, central, have easy access to the hospital, and be suitable both for residential colleges and sporting facilities — were not altogether met by Victoria Park, but most of them were, and the Senate was content that the government declared an intention to introduce legislation in 1916 to make most of their dreams come true.7

The Bill went no further than an introduction, and the next few years were taken up with abortive negotiations involving the government, Brisbane Municipal Council and the university about the terms of transfer and the possibility of a new
Bill. In December 1920, the Senate adopted a Story report which listed the further encroachments that would need to be made on technical college space, and which reiterated the now-familiar options of Victoria Park, Yeronga Park, and St Lucia Estate, Toowong. Victoria Park was again adjudged the most suitable, but an estimate of £61,170 as the probable cost of removing and reinstalling present and additional apparatus and equipment on a new site was doubtless sufficient to frighten the government from hasty action. Although the University Council had a committee in being to consider how Victoria Park could be best used for university purposes, the
Senate was more immediately concerned with providing additional accommodation on the existing site for the start of the 1921 academic year. The Bill eventually came through in 1922 and Victoria Park was there for the building, if the money could be found to pay for it.8

Despite the frustrating lack of progress in the quest for a permanent site, one kind of physical expansion that did occur in these years was the growth of a network of residential colleges mostly sponsored by religious bodies. It is slightly ironical that the Hon. A.H. Barlow had been opposed to the efforts to give the university a bigger site because he believed, rightly, that this would encourage the construction of playing fields and the congregation of sectarian residential hostels on the site. The University of Queensland would then, he believed, become far too much like Oxbridge for its own good; its members would fritter away their time at sport, and the evil of sectarianism would creep in to an organization required by law to give no official recognition to political or religious creeds. The site did not appear, but the colleges did. Emmanuel, established by the Presbyterians on Wickham Terrace, opened in March 1912, as did St John's, established by the Anglican Church on River Terrace, Kangaroo Point. In the same year King's College, a Methodist institution, was also established on River Terrace, and in March 1914 Women's College, an undenominational body, joined the Kangaroo Point group, on Shafston Road. Four years later St Leo's was founded for Catholic men.9

The reasons behind some of these foundations are important. Those responsible for Emmanuel stated that they would henceforth be able to prepare their own ministers; they proposed to appoint professors, lecturers and tutors for students of divinity and did in fact appoint lecturers in various aspects of theology, despite the fact that this was not a university subject; at the same time they offered students “an efficient tutorial assistance in their preparation for the lectures and examinations of the University”. St John's too appointed tutors for the students of the college. Another motive behind the establishment of colleges was the wish to provide reliable accommodation for country students, which, it was believed, would make the university more attractive. This was thought to be particularly necessary for women students, and the Warwick newspaper of 29 January 1914 reported with some satisfaction that female students from the country who were attending university would take up their residence at the
Women's Residential College, which was a house at Kangaroo Point pending the erection of a new building. The early colleges were not distinguishable from private residences; St John’s, for instance, was said to consist of three wooden houses side by side to which annexes were shortly attached. The essentially unsatisfactory and temporary nature of the colleges, like the university, meant that their governing bodies were always prominent in the moves to secure a large, permanent site for the university, but, as with the rest of the university, their temporary accommodation needed to be more permanent than they would have wished.10

Accommodation, whether academic or domestic, was just one of the many problems to be faced, and not necessarily solved, by those people with the ultimate responsibility for creating and operating the University of Queensland. They were not the academics within its ranks but the members of the Senate, the body to which the Act of parliament had entrusted power. In the early days they appear to have been a very well organized and efficiently operating body of people, and that must be attributed in part to the control exercised by the first chancellor, Governor MacGregor, in part to the very evident concern of the senators for conscientious attendance and performance of their duty, but most of all to the careful planning and organization of the link man J.D. Story, the man from the ministry who stayed on to be the man who ran the university. The committee structure on which the Senate operated was of his making and two of the committees, the Finance and the Administrative, were his and remained his.
The others, the Education, Library, and Buildings and Grounds Committees, were all to remain a permanent feature of the university's structure, if not for all time as Senate committees, and so for this contribution alone J.D. Story would have claims for having made a contribution of paramount importance to the development of the university. The measure of his early dominance is the series of reports on administration, reorganization and academic expansion which were issued in the immediate post-war period under his name. An indication of his perception is that the report adopted in December 1920 looked forward to the eventual need for a full-time executive head of the university, suggesting the possibility that he might be called the principal. Story would one day fill that position, though not with that title.11

During its first year of life the Senate was the only university body in being and had therefore to deal with everything, matters academic as well as those concerned with more general aspects of university government. When the academics finally arrived old habits died hard, and members did not always find it easy to allow the devolution of power into hands where it could be more properly exercised. An abiding impression left by the records of Senate meetings over the early years is of the infinite detail which came before members and their willingness to involve themselves in matters that were quite trivial. In May 1911, Professor Steele had difficulty in persuading Senate to give him authorization to buy quite small items of stores and equipment which he required, and the reluctance to allow academics a fair measure of freedom and responsibility inevitably raised the question of how extensive their sphere of action ought to be. On 13 February 1914, the Senate gave its approval to the allocation of rooms to teaching staff, in the absence of anyone else with the clear authority to undertake the task; on other occasions the Senate frequently had to consider tiny book requests before orders could be placed. In 1914 members showed a curious concern for insisting on the teaching of Australian constitutional history, at both federal and state levels, and in February 1915 called for a report from the Board of Faculties when it was pointed out to them that students could complete a B.Sc. degree without having studied physics, which seemed to them a somewhat undesirable state of affairs. Their highly paternalistic approach to the university, which might uncharitably be termed interfering, was doubtless a product of their having lived through times when the Senate had total responsibility for
everything and of the thorough way in which the early members went about their task. It is significant that the first Senate, which remained in power until 1916, had no problems with attendance at meetings. The second, which contained a large number of people who were new to the job and who had not been part of the excitement of the early days, had a lot of problems; the political nominees seemed less enthusiastic in their participation and even the secretary for public instruction suffered the ignominy of being exposed in parliament as a “big sinner on non-attendance”. Meetings attended by fewer than ten people became quite commonplace during the second Senate, 1916–20.12

The first Senate came to an end in a storm of controversy. With the departure of Governor MacGregor to Great Britain on his retirement, Sir Pope Cooper, the chief justice, took over as chancellor in April 1915 and found the politics of choosing a new Senate little to his liking. Under the University Act the University Council, a body responsible for electing half the membership of the Senate, was constituted when the university had produced twenty-five graduates of its own. These people, along with almost two hundred people who had been admitted to degrees of the university ad eundem gradum, donors of £500, representatives of certain professional and commercial groups appointed by the governor-in-council, and the senators themselves, were to have the power to elect ten senators, thereby sharing control of a twenty-person body with the government, which retained the right to nominate the other half. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the government was in no hurry to implement this part of the Act and weaken its position, though it must be stressed that the original senators, though appointed entirely by the government, had shown no disposition to be the mouthpiece of government and had acted in a thoroughly independent way. Nevertheless, the government had to be reminded of its obligations to implement the Act, which happened in November 1915, eight months after the Brisbane Courier had correctly predicted that a considerable time would elapse before the necessary machinery was set in motion and a new Senate elected. Members of the Senate were naturally curious to know if it was the intention of the government, by now a Labor government, to prolong the membership of the existing senators or whether they would have to take their chance of securing election at the hands of the University Council. With the intention of clarifying matters Sir Robert Philp, the warden of the council, led a
council deputation, wrongly described in the *Brisbane Courier* and elsewhere as a Senate deputation, to inquire of the minister what his intentions were, whether he would, for instance, declare his nominations ahead of the election to spare some of the leading figures the ordeal of election and whether he would be willing to undertake that certain people, Roe, Story, Henderson, Woolcock, and the chief justice, who were said to be indispensable, could be guaranteed nomination. The minister gave a guarded reply, but it was sufficiently encouraging to cause later disappointment to some who were subsequently passed over. On one matter the government was quite clear, and that was the requirement that the election must precede the nominations, and so plans for that went ahead. To the horror of Sir Pope Cooper, who appealed for integrity not vote selling, many of the prospective interest groups came together to make arrangements for the election of their candidates. Although the lawyers pulled out of these negotiations and the medical profession was not unanimously in favour of them, a clear “ticket” emerged of three university professors, two churchmen, and two doctors whose supporters were in agreement to support the whole group. This arrangement produced widespread resentment among retiring members, who saw themselves being supplanted instead of being given special consideration for the part they had played in the early and difficult years. Nor was there general contentment that the academic staff were seeking to move into a body which was virtually their employer and entitled to give them orders.¹³

After the manoeuvres were complete there remained 28 candidates for 10 places, to be determined by the votes of 283 people who must cast them by 30 June. The organization triumphed. Academics, doctors, churchmen, and lawyers were elected, and Professors Gibson, Michie, and Priestley joined the governing body of the university to add a different kind of voice to its deliberations. Different too were the voices to be heard from the ranks of the government nominees, for little attempt was made to leaven the mix of political appointments. Another churchman, the government analyst, and J.D. Story came in with the politicians, but R.H. Roe, vice-chancellor from the beginning, did not; nor did J.L. Woolcock, long-standing chairman of the Senate’s Education Committee and elder statesman of the University Extension Movement. The dropping of such people by the government and the manner in which this was done were a source of
prolonged bitterness and resentment. The government had exercised its rights, as its predecessor had done, to make its nominations; the University Council had similarly carried out its democratic right to choose, but the outcome of the whole exercise had seemed to many to be less than satisfactory and there were only four survivors from the first Senate.  

Back in 1912 the *Darling Downs Gazette*, an indicator of one sector at least of country opinion, had argued that country districts were entitled to representation on the Senate if the university were to lay claims to being anything other than a Brisbane institution. Now the cry was taken up by the *Toowoomba Chronicle* that the whole of provincial Queensland had been ignored by recent developments. The University Senate was now a Queen Street body, a Brisbane coterie; party politics and religious denominationalism had been introduced into the Senate; Queensland had been insulted, with the result that a number of Queensland students would now go “to the southern universities instead of to the Queens-street concern. The latter is being dragged into the mire of contempt”. These were strong words. One day later, after some staff research, the newspaper announced to its readers that the new Senate contained only one native Queenslander and only four people born in Australia. “Nothing can be done now,” it predicted, “but to watch the senate drift to the rocks of party politics and of sectarianism.” The dire prophecy was not fulfilled, and the second Senate showed no particular disposition to divide on party or sectarian lines, aided, perhaps, by the frequent absences of many of its nominated members. Under the chairmanship of the chancellor, Sir Pope Cooper, and the vice-chancellor, A.J. Thynne, another lawyer, it maintained all due decorum and remained susceptible to the promptings of J.D. Story who was able to use his administrative ability and government connections to tidy up the messy situation of having elections of the university’s two major officers out of phase with the three-year cycle of future Senates. This he did by having the life of the second Senate prolonged until February 1920, when a third Senate was chosen without any of the commotion attached to the birth of its predecessor.

Like the academic body, the Senate too had to look outside and beyond the university confines in its efforts to secure for the institution a proper place within the community and within the esteem of the people. A first tentative step towards establishing good public relations was taken in September 1910 when it was agreed that the chancellor should be allowed
to supply the press with information about Senate decisions at the end of meetings. Again, in February 1911 when the inauguration ceremony came up for discussion "it was the general feeling of the meeting that a good display should be made in connection with this Ceremony". It was to be an occasion for an exercise in public relations, and as such it was a great success. More than this would soon be needed, however, for the *Darling Downs Gazette*, pursuing its usual theme in August 1912, protested that the university was not meant to exercise its entire influence in Brisbane alone and demanded some attempt to show the taxpayers in the country districts that the Senate was aware that there was more to Queensland than the area of the metropolis. Responding to this kind of urging, the Senate received in June 1913 a select committee report on how to bring the university into closer touch with the people. The report made recommendations concerning press items that could be prepared, visits made and lectures given to people around the state, and permanent committees that should be created in the major population centres to maintain a continuous contact with the work of the university. T.E. Jones of the Department of Correspondence Studies was entrusted with the press officer's job, and he and J.J. Stable from the Department of Modern Languages undertook a northern tour in the early part of 1914, during which they addressed large audiences and were warmly received.¹⁶

This beginning of a public lecture programme failed to develop into anything bigger at this stage because of the interruption of the war, though the annual report for 1914 also recorded the interesting experiment of using seven honorary lecturers in engineering to help staff and students keep in touch with work that was going on outside and to help promote a feeling of interest in the university within the engineering world. After the war this quest for better public relations was extended, partly in response to a letter from Acting Professor Denham of chemistry, who suggested the existence of some antagonism towards the university within professional and educational bodies and advocated a resumption of the newspaper articles and public lectures started earlier. Such a campaign, he believed, might well inspire wealthy people to endow chairs in memory of people killed during the war. The Senate responded by creating in April 1919 a Publicity and Public Lectures Committee, subsequently changed to the Public Lecture Committee, which had the task of securing a "proper appreciation of the University", which
involved the preservation of total impartiality when any controversial subject was to be attempted. This was but one thrust towards a proposal in July 1920 for a systematic extension of the university's extra-mural activities including correspondence studies, the Workers' Educational Association, and the public lecture scheme. It was suggested that there should be centres in Brisbane, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, and Townsville to house local councils for the organization of adult education, which would have the services of four district lecturers who would move from area to area.17

At the same time as the Senate was attempting to implement such a programme and being held back by the usual lack of money, the *Brisbane Courier* was continuing to urge the university to seek greater publicity, keep in closer touch with the people by telling them of its proposals and its needs, and extend its extra-mural activities. The monthly public lectures in Brisbane were indicative of public enthusiasm, and even more sympathy and cooperation would be received, argued the *Courier*, if only the Senate would not insist on excluding the press from its meetings! Despite financial restrictions that prevented the fulfilment of the whole programme, public lectures were given in provincial towns as well as in Brisbane, and in the years 1921-22 four Extension classes were held in literature and history in country districts. This post-war push for publicity and better contact with the public was rounded off by Sir Matthew Nathan at the 1922 Commemoration ceremony, when he reminded Queensland of what the university was doing for the state and of the degree of mutual dependence. He talked of providing the skill to build dams, railways, and harbours that would not fail, the need of mining for the deductive powers and knowledge of geologists and mineralogists, the call within agriculture and industry for the skill of the chemist, and the importance of instruction and research within tropical medicine and tropical and semi-tropical agriculture. This was the university's message to the community, and this was the kind of role for which the university wanted to be valued within the community.18

Part of the effort at involvement in the outside community in these years focused upon the development and support of a Queensland branch of the Workers' Educational Association, begun in Great Britain by Albert Mansbridge, who was invited to visit Brisbane by the Senate in 1913 to discuss the possibility of establishing classes in Queensland. For some years members of the university gave help to the WEA in
their spare time, but in 1916 the university acquired a more formal commitment through the employment of part-time staff and participation in a committee of management, which was succeeded by a joint committee of university and WEA members. Despite the association’s independence and the university’s involvement for reasons concerned with the advancement of adult education and the wish to be seen to be associated with the enterprise, the university in fact derived some fairly unfavourable publicity from its connection with the WEA when one of its leading figures was reported in March 1919 as having attacked the university for its failure to teach class consciousness and help in the political education of the working classes. This was an occasion for upholding the much-vaunted policy of the university of not taking part in the discussions of the day and denying any responsibility for a person who was not actually employed by the university. In July the secretary of the WEA approached the minister to say that his colleagues were desirous of seeing their organization, which he described as the Tutor Class Department, attain the dignity of other departments in the university. It was a somewhat misleading argument, given the peripheral nature of WEA activities, but the Senate, despite this bad publicity, continued to include plans for WEA expansion as a part of its general wish to move forward on the whole adult education front.  

Despite its general wish to stand aloof from politics, the Senate inevitably became caught up in the Great War. A flying minute of 14 August 1914 enunciated the principle that students who enlisted should not suffer the loss of any credit for work already done, and by the September meeting the Senate was taking the decision to release Professor Gibson and the registrar, Cumbrae Stewart, on full pay for military work; they were to be expected to pay back to the university whatever they received from the military authorities after making deductions for necessary expenses incurred. A refund from the registrar, on censorship work, in March 1915, allowed £45 to be shared out among the remaining administrative staff who were carrying extra loads. In 1915 the university established a War Committee to assist the defence authorities, to help in recruiting, and to deliver lectures, write articles and pamphlets, and produce reports on the state’s resources; this was part of the process of taking the war more seriously that was precipitated by the allied munitions crisis. On 20 June 1916, the Senate paid tribute to the late Lord Kitchener,
and on the second anniversary of the declaration of war issued a stirring declaration on the defence of liberty and justice. In September the Senate heard that eight chemists had been selected to do munitions work in England, and in December it received the schedule of eight members of staff engaged in military duty. During this year members had been worried that Queensland government scholarships might get into the hands of children of what was called alien parentage; they stressed the need to protect democracy against the influence of disloyal persons of enemy origin or descent, suggesting to the prime minister that naturalisation should be granted only after proof of allegiance had been clearly demonstrated. Like the Windmill Theatre on another occasion, the University of Queensland never closed its doors during the war and as far as possible attempted to follow Mr Asquith’s injunction about “business as usual”, despite a sadly depleted staff and student body.20

One of the few good things to come out of the war occurred when Professor Parnell, in August 1919, returned £437 to the university from excess salary arising from his military activities, and asked that the money be spent in helping other returned soldiers who were in need of financial assistance to pursue their studies. Twenty-five students did not return, having been killed in action, and R.J. Cholmeley, the eccentric classicist, was killed on active service in Russia in 1919 as was William Arthur Cramb, a member of the administrative staff. One who did return, John Dennis Fryer, died subsequently in 1923, and his life was commemorated in the library of Australian literature built up by Dr F.W. Robinson.21

Another good thing to come out of the war was the comic episode of J.J. Stable, lecturer in modern languages, whose duties as censor for the Commonwealth government and their execution on one occasion caused him to be accused in parliament of being a stifler of modern languages in general and the Australian one in particular. Premier T.J. Ryan, whose anti-conscription speech had been censored from the newspapers, repeated it within the Legislative Assembly, and Stable suppressed the publication of parliamentary debates for that day, earning for himself the title of “a rather dangerous individual for the future democracy of Queensland” and, it is said, a chase down George Street by the angry premier. Members believed that his role as censor was incompatible with his custodianship of young people and their education and accused
him, unfairly, of receiving two salaries from separate employers. One person also misleadingly emphasized the undesirability of having a lecturer in German set apart for military duty. More seriously, the whole discussion came up at a time when the government was proposing to make the university endowment an automatic charge on the annual budget, and members used their annoyance over the Stable affair to criticize the spending of money on such an institution. The university in consequence remained open to annual scrutiny.\textsuperscript{22}

This debate highlighted a relationship that was always implicit and often quite explicit in dealings between the University of Queensland and the government of Queensland, that of recipient and paymaster. It has been suggested that the fact of being tied so closely to the government’s purse strings inevitably slowed down the tempo of university growth and would continue to do so. This seems an incontestable judgment. According to the short history published in 1923, the university had been founded and almost entirely maintained by the government and became in consequence part of the educational and scientific equipment of the whole country. The university derived its income from the state and was expected to perform services in return, even though J.D. Story, as under-secretary at the Department of Public Instruction, might in September 1911 observe the formality of seeking the registrar’s approval for the professors to be consulted by the department on the question of the curriculum of the new high schools.\textsuperscript{23}

Sometimes the dependence of the university was quite explicit. When the Senate deputation visited the premier in May 1911, to discuss expansion into agriculture and commerce, A.J. Thynne told Premier Denham that it was entirely a matter for the government to decide. When the registrar wrote to the under-secretary for public instruction requesting an endowment of £14,500 for 1915, he had to explain the need for an increase in some detail, for he was going cap in hand as a petitioner. The expenses of running a university and the endowments required inevitably crept upwards. The Senate meeting of December 1917 heard of projected expenditure of £18,913 and an expected income of £18,925, including £15,000 from the government. This would mean a balance of £12, and happiness, therefore, for all concerned, but it was a nice calculation that had been made. The figures for 1920 were an income of £23,500 against an expenditure of
£25,099, which no doubt constituted unhappiness for all rather than an exercise in deficit financing that would one day be indulged in by their successors. The university did at least have control of the sums that were given to it, despite the occasionally renewed demand for it to be "in the position of any great public department", such as the one made by W.F. Lloyd in 1917. At the same time the relationship between what the university wanted and what the government would give was always such that there was very little freedom to manoeuvre. And helping to adjust the movements of both sides was J.D. Story, whose position must have stopped just short of requiring him to address memoranda to himself in one capacity and compose replies in another.24
Part Three

Towards Completeness, 1922–1938
The Senate and Its Public

A central theme in the history of the university through the first two decades of the century was the desire to establish "a people's university". Similarly, the next two decades were dominated by the frequently expressed wish to make the university complete. In the event, it proved no easier to fulfil the latter ambition than it had been to achieve the former, though the attempt was not, surprisingly, frustrated by semantic differences. A complete university would be one that had succeeded in adding to its academic structure those two most useful of service faculties, agriculture and commerce, and the professional faculties of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary science, and that had succeeded in establishing itself in a permanent home. By the time J.D. Story became vice-chancellor in 1938, the university had made considerable progress towards achieving this programme.

Presiding over it was the Senate, which successfully resisted that decline into political and religious sectarianism threatened in 1916, though the great site debates of 1926 and later produced something akin to professional sectarianism and a few acrimonious exchanges. And presiding over the Senate was the chancellor, who was never to become the mere figurehead that existed elsewhere. Chairing regular Senate meetings required an intimate knowledge of university business and involved the important responsibility of chief negotiator when discussions needed to be held with the government at ministerial level or higher. A governor of the state or a chief justice was well
fitted for this role. In May 1922, the vice-chancellor reported to the Senate that the government intended to appoint Governor Nathan to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of F. McDonnell from the nominated membership and that the chancellor, Sir Pope Cooper, would like to resign the chancellorship in favour of the governor. A special meeting in June elected Governor Nathan to be chancellor, who then informed members that kindness had dictated McDonnell’s resignation, not to mention that of Sir Pope Cooper who stayed on as a humble senator; it was clear that due deference must be paid to the wishes of governors and governments. Nathan was followed in 1925 by the Hon. A.J. Thynne, a former minister for justice now practising as a solicitor, and his death in 1927 precipitated the first contested election for the position. The vice- or deputy-chancellor, Dr W.N. Robertson, was nominated for the office by the two archbishops, but Chief Justice J.W. Blair was proposed and seconded by Story and Hanlon. An unseemly wrangle was avoided by a postponement of the election, and by the next meeting Dr Robertson was himself ready to propose Blair, who would remain chancellor right through to his death in 1944. Although a stern critic of excessive independence for university academics in his parliamentary days, J.W. Blair would become almost a folk hero with students and staff alike in the position which he held for so long. A story is told that a newly appointed professor in 1938 was taken to a public house and invited to meet Jimmy. When he eventually discovered that this was the chancellor he regarded this familiarity as near sacrilege, which would have been unthinkable in Melbourne.¹

The vice-chancellor’s position was in no sense comparable with that of a modern vice-chancellor. The main duty was that of deputy chairman of the Senate; despite the elevation to chancellor of A.J. Thynne in 1925 after nine years as vice-chancellor such a progression was unusual. In this year retiring Chancellor Nathan urged the need for a full-time vice-chancellor, but his recommendation went unheeded, for Dr W.N. Robertson was to hold the position until 1938 though in regular medical practice. Unlike J.W. Blair, Vice-Chancellor Robertson remained a rather distant figure, who always referred to the male students as boys. He played no part in the everyday running of the university, which was left to the registrar and the president of the Board of Faculties as the senior full-time officers. The situation was to change with the election of J.D. Story as vice-chancellor in 1938, for, on
his retirement from the public service in the following year, he was able to become the university's first full-time vice-chancellor and bring Queensland nearer to the Australian pattern. What did not change was the practice of board presidents' having to represent the University of Queensland in the company of academic vice-chancellors from other universities. The professor who had been surprised by the informality of the chancellor in 1938 had been equally surprised to find a non-academic vice-chancellor and the university represented at the recently formed committee of the Australian Vice-Chancellors by Professor Parnell as president of the Professorial Board (formerly the Board of Faculties).

After the novelty, not altogether welcome, of having academic staff first elected to the Senate in 1916, there were other barriers quickly to be broken. In 1923 Freda Bage was the first woman to be elected. The head of Women's College had also been the first female departmental head when she had substituted in a temporary capacity for Harvey Johnston in biology a decade earlier. The same elections brought to the Senate E.J.D. Stanley, the first graduate of the university to achieve this rank, and in 1925 A.C.V. Melbourne became the first non-professorial academic to be elected. Already by 1923 the students of the university were making early tentative noises about their representation on the governing body. They rarely rose above a murmur during the interwar period, but in 1938 they threatened to become more insistent as the Students Union Council, believing that the government planned to amend the University Act, judged that it would be appropriate to try to secure some right of representation under the new legislation.

The Senate continued to operate through the work of its principal standing committees, which reported, along with the Board of Faculties and select committees appointed for particular purposes, to the monthly Senate meetings. Eventually, in 1936, meetings of the Administrative and Finance Committees were held together thereby sparing the chairman of each, J.D. Story, a few meetings in his yearly calendar. Virtually all decisions were either taken or confirmed by the Senate, and authority was delegated sparingly and apparently with reluctance. In April 1930, the chairmen of the Buildings and Grounds Committee and the Finance Committee were authorized to confer with the Central Technical College over the joint purchase of a lawn mower for the two institutions, but the two men were told how much they could spend.
Executive authority of a broader kind was entrusted to a so-called Vacation Committee of the Senate which operated between sessions and consisted of a few important people. In 1932–33, for instance, it was made up of the vice-chancellor as chairman, Professor Alcock, the president of the board, W.L‘Estrange, the chairman of Buildings and Grounds, and J.D. Story, the chairman of the Finance Committee. This Vacation Committee appears to date from 1927. A further significant delegation was approved in October 1936, when the Senate accepted a board recommendation that it should henceforth exercise powers on certain student matters such as examinations, exemptions, thesis titles, and transfers.4

That still left the Senate with an amazing range of trivia to handle. In August 1928, members had discussed the arrangements that should be made to allow the janitor to dry his washing, solemnly pronouncing where it should be hung, how it should be transported, and what time the janitor should be allowed for carrying his washing from the washhouse to the drying yard. Ten years later they were hearing an application from Mrs A.L. Perkins of West End to have her premises registered as a boarding house for students, to which they graciously agreed. Such decisions illustrated the proposition daringly put forward in Galmahra as early as May 1922 that “occasionally, from the dim recesses where sits the Senate in conclave, there flickers forth a gleam of light”. The students in those days were rejoicing in the fairly recently established Combined Advisory Committee through which their leaders passed on their advice to those in power.5

Even before formally delegating powers over students to the board, the Senate members were usually content to allow the academics a de facto power. They went through the motions of approving four M.A. thesis topics on 27 October 1922, and on 7 August 1925 happily endorsed the examiners’ recommendations that the university’s first D.Sc. be awarded to W.H. Bryan, without pretending to special competence in these areas. Only occasionally did they attempt to do more. One such occasion was the campaign waged by Judge McCawley in 1923–24 to propagate his ideas on the importance and proper content of English studies. During this period he attempted to make English and Australian literature compulsory for all students, had certain proposed Senior and Junior texts sent back to the board for reconsideration, and persuaded the Senate to have the board organize a commission of inquiry into the teaching of English in Queensland schools.6
Apart from receiving and implementing, where possible, the recommendations of the Board of Faculties, the Senate's principal dealings with academic staff related to their conditions of employment, and particularly to their salaries and status. In May 1922, Professor Steele was given permission to act as expert adviser to a company about to be formed in Brisbane for manufacturing alcohol from agricultural and waste products on condition that this activity did not interfere with his university duties; he was also told that the Senate would prefer him not to become a director of the proposed company.7

The following year the Senate had its first dealings with the University Staff Association, which sent a letter asking for higher salaries. The request was passed on to the Department of Public Instruction with the information that professors in Queensland were being paid £200 per year less than elsewhere in Australia. In 1925 the Staff Association was again active in seeking the admission of its members to the Public Service Superannuation Fund, which was negotiated in 1927–28, although the decision not to subsidize staff contributions left Queensland academics in an inferior position to those elsewhere and made the recruitment of good staff more difficult as a result. The weakness of superannuation provision probably influenced the decision taken in May 1928 to allow T.E. Jones, the first director of correspondence studies, to continue working on annual contracts beyond the age of sixty-five. He did in fact continue to work for several years beyond his seventieth birthday, though only on monthly contracts at that stage. The failure to institute adequate superannuation provision for staff was to have lasting repercussions for the university and its staff, and the Senate made no more than a gesture when it assumed responsibility for the difference in premiums resulting from the salary cuts of the Depression years. It was a sign that these were drawing to a close when the Senate was able to greet Christmas 1934 with the news that professors would receive an extra £1 per week and sub-professorial staff ten shillings per week.8

The other persisting disadvantage suffered by Queensland academics was their lack of tenure. Its absence does not appear to have resulted in non-renewal of contracts during these years, but lecturing staff had, nevertheless, to go through a reporting and reappointment procedure at the end of five years, as had professors at the end of seven. When Sydney Lumb became professor of dentistry in 1938 he was offered
only a five-year initial contract; Story told him that dentistry was in a mess and that he had this time in which to put things right. His long occupancy of the position was testimony to his success. Yet despite short-term contracts, low pay and restrictions that prevented them from political participation, Queensland lecturing staff could derive some comfort from the reputation that the Senate soon acquired for looking after its own staff where promotions and appointments were involved. Between the initial four appointments of 1910 and the staffing of the new professional faculties in 1935–36, chairs were almost entirely filled from inside the university. Advertisements would call for applications and a wide field would sometimes be attracted, but the man on the spot was invariably adjudged the most suitable person for the job. This process even involved appointing the registrar, Dr Cumbrae Stewart, to the Garrick Chair in Law in 1925. One of its victims, however, was Karl Popper, author of the celebrated texts The Open Society and Its Enemies and The Poverty of Historicism, who was one of sixteen applicants for the philosophy chair in 1938 but who failed even to make the short list of four people considered worthy of appointment. The successful candidate was said to possess ‘the special advantages of long and responsible experience in this university and of experience in the service of the Queensland Department of Public Instruction’, which had doubtless helped to make him philosophical.

Titles as well as salaries could be controversial matters. It was resolved in August 1924 that there should be no further appointments to the grade of assistant professor, a title very sparingly bestowed, and it was known that the Board of Faculties favoured that of associate professor. The board repeated its preference in August 1928, but not until October 1932 did the Senate respond by passing a motion to institute the title for conspicuous service and to bestow it upon A.C.V. Melbourne, senator and historian, who had performed distinguished scholarly work as well as service to the university and the community by his efforts to promote St Lucia and his fact-finding missions to the Far East. This initiative was not, however, entirely acceptable to the board, which produced the austere response that associate professorships should be determined by the needs of departments and subjects, not by the merit of individuals. Honour was satisfied when a select committee proposed a new hierarchy from president, through professor and research professor, associate pro-
fessor, lecturer, assistant lecturer, and senior demonstrator, reader and part-time lecturer, down to demonstrator. It was proposed to pay associate professors an extra £100 and to give an allowance of this amount to the president, but the Board of Faculties again responded austerely to the latter proposition though welcoming the promotion that was now possible for Melbourne and a few others. It seems curious that a readership held such a lowly place; it was the equivalent of a tutorship in the 1930s, and occupants of this grade were expected to read lectures for other people before being promoted, if they were fortunate, to an assistant lectureship. Another title which made its first appearance in these days was that of "professor emeritus", created for Bertram Steele when he resigned the chemistry chair in December 1930 after twenty years as the foundation holder.\textsuperscript{10}

Whatever the consciousness of academic hierarchy in these years, there was undoubtedly a hierarchy which was associated with years of service. James Mahoney knew that mere tutors had no place in the staff common room in 1932 and waited a few years to be invited to join, which happened when the senior members were seeking a secretary for their tea club. They revealed the intimacy of their relations by dropping titles and addressing each other by surnames alone, and some of them demonstrated their habitual behaviour by lunching daily at a staff table at the kiosk in the Gardens. A breach of the established group etiquette would be reprimanded, just as staff who offended against the moral conventions of the age would be invited by the chancellor or vice-chancellor to look for another position.\textsuperscript{11}

This tightly knit, conforming community is best illustrated by that tiny group, the university administration, memories of which are dominated by the "happy family" metaphor which was commonly applied to the whole university in its early days. Whether under the somewhat authoritarian rule of Cumbrae Stewart or the more benevolent figure of J.F. McCaffrey, who was registrar from 1925 to 1935 and remembered as a friend to staff and students alike, the administrative staff did as they were told. In 1925 the staff schedule listed nine positions besides those of registrar and accountant, and all the junior members had to be willing to perform a variety of functions. Bruce Green, for instance, recalled lunch hours on the switchboard in his earlier days and being called upon to pacify troubled parents as he became more experienced. Thelma Atkin, a member of staff for many
decades, began work in the Department of Correspondence Studies in 1914 at the age of sixteen, and moved through various sections before being transferred to the Registrar’s Office and Committee Section.\textsuperscript{12}

The paternalistic rule of the registrar demanded not only impeccable behaviour, which meant dismissal for the youth charged with drunken driving, but also a renunciation of weekend sport after one member broke an arm and incapacitated himself from serving his employer. Lacking the social facilities of the academics, representing the less public side of the university’s activities, and having no formal place in the structure of reporting to the Senate, the administration appears to have been an under-staffed and rather neglected part of the university in this period.\textsuperscript{13}

This arose in part, perhaps, because of the determination of the Senate that the university should be outward-looking rather than introspective. Governor Nathan, chancellor in the years 1922–26, was conscious of the unique position of the University of Queensland as an institution which drew a proportion of its students from a white race domiciled in the tropics, and he and others were perpetually aware that all opportunities must be taken to extend the role, and public knowledge of that role, which the university could play in this special sort of community. The \textit{Brisbane Courier} reported in 1922 that, whereas the university had at first been inclined to live within itself, it was now ‘becoming what it was intended to be, a thoroughly democratic educational institution of the whole State’\textsuperscript{.} This judgment was inspired more by the programme of public lectures and tutorial classes than by any appraisal of the university’s governmental structure, but it was a recognition of the public esteem in which the university was beginning to be held. It supports the commonly expressed views that members of academic staff were well known and respected within the local community, that there was no public impression of an ivory tower, and that the opening of every new faculty was an occasion for public pleasure and satisfaction. The students had rather more cynical opinions, and they were themselves responsible for the view of the university as a place where everyone went mad once a year, but the university was to become known for more than its student parades.\textsuperscript{14}

The extensive programme of public lectures that had resumed after wartime interruptions was supplemented in 1922 by so-called experimental lectures involving laboratory
demonstrations and intra-mural courses on Wednesday evenings at five shillings per course, given by Michie, Alcock, and Lusby, assistant professor in physics. Sometimes a star performer such as Sir Ernest Rutherford was brought out through the joint efforts of Australian universities, as in 1925, to give lectures in each state, and in 1929 there occurred the first endowed public lecture, the Macrossan Lecture given by the Rt Hon. W.A. Holman, which was to be an abiding feature of the university’s contribution to local life. In August 1925, the Senate replied to a letter from the manager of the Queensland Radio Service agreeing to the general principle of broadcasting lectures, and degree ceremonies were to become part of the early broadcasting treats for local audiences. In May 1931, a broadcasting sub-committee was established of Professors Alcock, Parnell, and Stable to supervise what were called “lecturettes”, and in the following year an Educational Broadcasting Committee for Queensland was established, largely dominated by university personnel. Broadcast talks given by members of staff on an almost infinite range of educational and diverting topics are part of the memories of academic staff who lived through these exciting days of early radio, and these were good publicity for the university as well as valuable for the local community.

Nor did the Senate neglect its opportunities to entertain as well as educate. The holding of University Week in June 1925 involved throwing open the science laboratories for public inspection as well as the more familiar degree ceremony and public lectures. When it was known that the Duke and Duchess of York were to visit Australia in 1927, the Senate put in an early bid to have the university placed on their itinerary so that an honorary Doctorate of Laws could be awarded, and the event duly took place in the Exhibition Hall on 12 April 1927. In that year too the students described their own role in providing public entertainment to the people of Brisbane in the shape of the Commemoration procession, the Dramatic Society’s performance, and the Musical Society’s concert.

The biggest show occurred with the Silver Jubilee celebrations of 1935. Associate Professor Melbourne was empowered to organize and supervise the celebrations, and the Senate decided that it would be appropriate to award an honorary doctorate to Premier Forgan Smith, not because members were inclined to be profligate with such awards but because, having bestowed one upon Kidston twenty-five years earlier,
they felt that it was a good idea to honour the head of the government of the day at the end of each quarter century. An open day was organized which included a science exhibition. Members of the public were invited, and the professorial staff, in black ties and academic gowns, received them and displayed the miraculous powers which they controlled in their laboratories and workshops. Over a thousand guests attended; red carpets had been borrowed from Parliament House; the grounds were floodlit; there was a big marquee erected on the tennis courts for supper; the band of the Moreton Regiment played on the lawn; and the whole affair was subsequently described as "a very good turn". It was certainly a most successful exercise in public relations between gown and town.17

The Senate was more concerned, however, to project an image throughout the whole of Queensland, which it attempted to do, for instance, through the annual report to parliament, a document with scarcely the circulation to achieve this aim. In 1938 the report emphasized that much of the university's research was of a local kind, citing tropical physiology and the regeneration of western pastures as examples. It also listed some of the services performed locally...
by academic staff: the testing of materials by the engineering department, participation in ABC broadcasts, an investigation of Brisbane City Council transport services, work on the Queensland Cancer Trust, and membership of the Queensland place-names committee. At no time could it fairly be said that the university permitted itself to become remote from the society which it had been created to serve.\textsuperscript{18}

In return it was hoped that the community would be generous with gifts and bequests to the university, but there were problems over this. As the Board of Faculties pointed out in 1928, if the government were to insist on emphasizing its own role as paymaster and to assert that professors were on the public payroll, members of the public would feel that they had done their part by paying their taxes and would be discouraged from making private contributions. Yet even before the Depression the university's share of the state's education budget had fallen from 2.97 per cent in 1914–15 to only 1.95 per cent in 1929. The arrival of the McCaughey bequest in 1921 created a suspicion that the government might attempt to reduce the annual endowment by the amount of the annual income from the bequest, and members of the Senate were informed by the students that they would "lose the last vestige of student respect if they acquiesce in this scandalous course of action". The situation did not arise, but the registrar admitted to the Department of Public Instruction in May 1923 that the university had been compelled to use some of the McCaughey money to meet current expenditure and feared that people would cease to give money if this became a
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regular practice. The smallness of the number of people who did give to the university was a subject of frequently expressed regret. A Galmahra writer in August 1921 recorded ten years of experience of ‘‘the moneyed powers within the State’’ not coming forward voluntarily to support the university, and the complaint was repeated in 1925. In April 1924 the minister for public instruction, W.W. Gillies, expressed his regret that more people in Queensland were not prepared to make bequests to the university as occurred in other states; a new university would, he said, cost around £600,000 and this could not come out of the annual endowment of £20,000.19

One possible remedy was fund-raising campaigns. By October 1921, the university had neither a new site for future building nor plans to raise the necessary money, and the student magazine pronounced that ‘‘for its apathy and lack of initiative in this matter the Senate of the University stands condemned’’. It continued to vent its wrath on those who made their money inside Queensland and spent it elsewhere and on the failure of the Senate to organize past members of the university as a probable source of future benefactions. The Brisbane Courier, too, supported this attack on those who had made their fortunes in Queensland but declined to give to the university. One small, but significant, gesture was the creation in 1925 of a Book of Student Benefactors, which would be presented annually to the university as a record of student gifts during the year. A bigger, but less memorable and less successful, gesture was the establishment in May 1927 of a Public Appeal Campaign Committee, which aimed to raise £500,000 to pay for new buildings, equipment and additional staff. One half, it was believed, would come from the public and the other half from the government. A further decade elapsed before the government was ready to begin its contribution, and hopes of half from the public had long since died by then. This did not prevent the Senate from setting up a committee in 1937 to consider ways of inducing benefactions, but there is little in the early history of the university to suggest that the responses from members of the public were the result of fund-raising appeals rather than some privately reached decision to present money to the university.20

The bequests that were made to the university were usually directed towards the creation and maintenance of chairs. The first major one, the McCaughey, was used to create a chair in English and one in history and economics in 1921. The arrival of the Darnell bequest in 1931 to endow a chair of English
allowed one of the McCaughey chairs to be transferred to biology so that the Darnell money could be used without undesirable duplication in English. The Darnell bequest also included £5,000 for the university library, which was supplemented the following year by the Forsyth gift of £10,000 towards the cost of a permanent library building. As the university was able to persuade the government that these gifts had been made to help the university rather than to save the government expense, the university was able to endow a librarian’s position with its funds while the government agreed to bear the building costs for a new library in 1938.
Law was another beneficiary from gifts. The Garrick bequest of 1923 for establishing a chair of law or medicine was used to create the law chair filled by Dr Cumbrae Stewart in 1925, and the founding of a full Law Faculty was made possible by a £20,000 endowment from T.C. Beirne, the warden of the University Council, to celebrate the Silver Jubilee in 1935. In addition, the William Robertson bequest, announced to the Senate in December 1933, brought a further £20,000 for a chair in agriculture. Fine arts, too, was an eventual recipient of some of the bounty from the Darnell bequest in that some of the proceeds from the original gift were diverted (by the ingenuity, it was said, of Professor Stable) to the purpose of building up an art collection, and a Darnell Appeal was launched to produce money for a Queensland Art Fund.

These gifts provided exceptional moments of financial relief from a situation that left the university’s governors and administrators very little to spare. Such gifts allowed expansion to take place at a slightly faster rate than government funds permitted, gave the university a higher proportion of endowed chairs than at any other period of its existence, and provided a small reserve into which the university was occasionally tempted to dip, though there was a full appreciation of the need to preserve the capital intact and spend only the income. By comparison with its southern counterparts the University of Queensland enjoyed only few and modest benefactions, and its annual endowment from the state government did not compensate it for the sparseness of its private funds. The Silver Jubilee history was to observe, in a masterpiece of understatement, that “on the whole, Governments have not treated the University lavishly” and revealed comparative figures from other states to show how Queensland enjoyed the lowest proportion of its state’s educational spending. Yet the university could not afford to abuse its main supplier of money. As the chancellor remarked during the Silver Jubilee celebrations, the university depended on the government for its annual income and the maintenance of its buildings and, no matter what party had been in power, the relations of university and government had been “continuously and mutually helpful”. There had been a “close and fruitful association” between the university and the government of Queensland for twenty-five years.

In purely financial terms, the relationship was not outstandingly fruitful in 1935. An original statutory endowment of £10,000 was increased in 1922 to £20,000; this, together
with supplementary appropriations from the state, income derived from its own money, and student fees, enabled the university to push up its annual budget beyond the £50,000 mark by the end of the decade. The Depression then hit, the endowment was cut by 20 per cent, and £50,000 was not to be reached again until the end of the next decade. Estimates for 1930 were for a total income of £51,566, which was expected to provide a surplus of £828, but in September of that year news was received that the government proposed to introduce a cut of almost £4,000, and the Senate had to move quickly to appoint a select committee to make recommendations on how a balanced budget could be achieved without a loss of faith with students. Before Christmas it was ready to report with a set of proposals to increase the working week of administrative staff from thirty-nine and a quarter hours to forty-four hours, to drop certain courses and require extra ones of teaching staff, cut support staff, replace full-time assistance with part-time, cut maintenance funds, and make a big reduction in the library vote. There was more to follow in the middle of 1931, when academic salaries were reduced by 13–15 per cent, with the highest paid taking the biggest reduction. The government also cut the additional endowment in 1932, and the budget for 1933 was down to a mere £39,000. The total staff of the university, seventy-five, was back to the level of 1928, and would never again be so small. The estimates for 1934 were only 8 per cent higher than those for 1923, yet student numbers had almost trebled in the same period. Chancellor Blair was reported in the Telegraph in April
1935 as having declared the university in an acute position at the very end of its reserves.\textsuperscript{23}

This was the moment when the university reached its twenty-fifth anniversary, and it is little wonder that the Senate was moved to offer a political sweetener to the premier in the form of an honorary doctorate. In the event, 1935 proved to be the turning point. Forgan Smith contributed generously to the birthday celebrations of the year with promises of huge support from the government in all directions, and in December 1936 the government even promised that staff salaries would be restored. The university had nonetheless experienced, like the rest of society, a very lean period in its growth, and it is not surprising that Dorothy Hill, returning in 1937 from seven years in Cambridge, should have found very little increase in staff numbers during her absence.\textsuperscript{24}

During the same period student enrolments continued to rise. The post-war increase had been interrupted in 1923 by the first decline in annual enrolments since 1916, but numbers continued to grow through the interwar period, and even during the Depression years, so that by 1936, when the university was emerging from its worst troubles, there were 1,149 student members. If their growth was an encouraging sign, their distribution was not altogether pleasing to the university’s governors. Immediately after the war there had been a rush into the science and applied science areas to study the potentially "useful" subjects which were expected to contribute so much to the development and running of the country, but from 1923 this trend ceased and students came to university increasingly to study arts subjects, held in much lower public esteem, and, to a lesser extent, commerce, which was more acceptable to the utilitarians. This inclination, which at least had the advantage of reducing average student costs since students were favouring the subjects which were cheap to mount, was not to be corrected in these quota-free days, and in 1936 more than half of all students, 576, were studying arts and law compared with 109 in commerce, 118 in science, 41 in engineering, and 17 in agriculture. In the new professional faculties, 74 were studying medicine, 40 dentistry, and 4 veterinary science.\textsuperscript{25}

Even more disturbing was the breakdown of this 1,149 total into 357 day students, 389 evening, and 403 external, for both academics and senators alike were convinced that the best way to study was as a full-time internal member of the university community. The foundation debates had made it clear
that the university would have obligations way beyond this category of student, and Professor H.C. Richards was to remind everyone in 1936 that “the University of Queensland has specialized more than any other Australian University in external work, at the behest of the Government, for reasons which have special cogency in this country of great distances and relatively even distribution of population”. The rise in external registration was nonetheless regarded with some horror. The annual report for 1923 noted that there were 144 external students at the end of 1922, of whom 72 were matriculated students of the Faculty of Arts and 58 were school teachers studying for their Class One with the Department of Public Instruction. This latter group of students were seen as the inferior members within this generally deprived section, and it was observed by the Faculty of Arts in 1932 that the Class One candidates achieved passes at levels well below those of the matriculated students. The department was advised that it should not allow teachers to take Class One until they had qualified for matriculation and confirmed its oft-repeated view that internal status was “in every way preferable” to external. In December 1928, the Board of Faculties had expressed concern at the number of Brisbane students who were signing statutory declarations to qualify them for external status, emphasizing that study without lectures was an inferior way of obtaining a degree. It was concerned when it encountered the argument, expressed in the Senate by Archbishop Duhig in September 1932, that internal students might be suffering some disadvantage because the prepared lecture notes sent to the external people were superior to those which the internal students were capable of taking for themselves, which said little for the enlivening and inspiring presence of the lecturer.26

By 1933 more than half of the total enrolment consisted of external students, and this was also true of 1934, though what were considered healthier trends set in afterwards. In March 1933, the Senate made plans to study the use of radio in external studies, and acknowledged the pioneering role that must be maintained by “the only true external studies department” in Australia. This seemed far removed from the days of December 1921 when the director of correspondence studies had sought an assistant to help him to report lectures and members of the Senate had been concerned that the correspondence staff should be properly employed in other departments of the university in out-of-term times. Compared
with the external students, those who came in the evenings were closer to the ideal, for they did have the personal contact, though they imposed great burdens on many members of teaching staff. The chemists, for instance, recall having to work until ten o’clock for three nights each week to fit in all the necessary lectures and laboratory classes.  

Meanwhile, the matriculation debate was continued in a muted form during the interwar period between those who believed that successful completion of Senior should lead automatically to a university place and those who looked for something extra or special. The latter still pursued the phantom extra year, which continued to elude them. They were more successful in retaining the classical language requirement for arts people despite Galmahra’s rejection, as “worn out”, of the arguments that “a bit of Latin never did any body any harm” and “Latin trains the mind”; it found no evidence to support either of these propositions.
8 Academic Growth

University expansion into new academic areas during the interwar period was partly according to plan, partly by happy accident, and partly through a kind of evolutionary process through which new departments and faculties eventually appeared. The great designer was J.D. Story, who had produced plans and reports for future development in 1919 and who would repeat the exercise in 1929. At this time he was able to show that the Senate had followed his earlier guidelines as well as possible, that much had been achieved, that a few things remained to be done, and that it was desirable to ensure "a well-ordered development for the next decade". The Depression effectively curtailed any real progress for six years, though a further select committee report to the Senate in March 1933 looked forward to the next stage by recommending government boards of human health, animal health, and agriculture, proposing that education in these areas be vested in the University of Queensland, and suggesting the establishment of quaintly named Faculties of Human Health and Animal Health.¹

The other key figure in pushing forward university expansion was undoubtedly Professor E.J. Goddard, appointed professor of biology in 1923, but an energetic campaigner on many fronts for many years as he strove to establish agriculture, dentistry, and medicine. In December 1922, the Brisbane Courier acknowledged the existence of a long-felt need for a medical school, but stressed that the staple industries of
Queensland were the breeding of stock and cultivation of the ground. The first need of the educational system was to fulfil "its function of providing a knowledge of the things of 'practical value in daily life'". Medicine might have seemed defensible to some on these criteria, but it was agriculture and commerce that came first on the Courier's list, the subjects in which the Senate had attempted to interest Premier Denham in 1911. The first commercial courses of 1922, leading initially to certificates and diplomas in this area, were under the control of the Department of History and Economics, and even when a Faculty of Commerce was formally set up in December 1925, and bachelor's and master's degrees created, the new dean of commerce was Henry Alcock, the professor of history. The establishment of a separate Honours school in economics from 1926 still left the subject tied to history through Alcock, who presided over the first commerce graduation in 1928. In 1934 a certificate in accountancy became available within the Commerce Faculty.²

Agriculture was not so easy. In March 1923, J.D. Story presented a lengthy memorandum to the Senate on the need for a Diploma in Agriculture, emphasizing the state's dependence on primary industries and its need of people to operate them. It resolved to institute the diploma as soon as possible and created, at least on paper, a Faculty of Agriculture to operate from 1926. At this stage the state Cabinet was opposed to financing this development, having been informed by the Department of Public Instruction that there was no money for expansion and greater areas of need, but they soon relented and gave £5,000 towards a Faculty of Agriculture to start in 1927. A chair was announced, for promoting research, and appointed to it was J.K. Murray, the principal of Gatton Agricultural College, who combined the two positions on the one salary and brought the two institutions together in a combined degree of theoretical and practical instruction. Goddard became dean of agriculture, and Murray travelled down to Brisbane one day per week to teach his course to a handful of students, an arrangement which the Department of Public Instruction found less than satisfactory. Despite poor student numbers, Goddard remained fervently expansionist and agitated for chairs in agricultural chemistry and entomology.³

Another area of long-intended growth was that of law. The gift of £10,000 by the Misses Garrick in memory of their father enabled the Senate to create a Garrick Chair of Law, to
the annoyance of the Queensland branch of the British Medical Association, who wanted to have the money set aside for medical school purposes. The position was advertised but not immediately filled. Meanwhile, the registrar invited the government to say whether it would be willing to endow a proper Law Faculty, which the university planned to create for 1925. The government was not willing and so in December 1924 the Senate accepted instead a recommendation that a professor and two part-time lecturers could satisfy the present needs of the university and its law students and form the basis of a future faculty. Dr Cumbrae Stewart, currently a little disillusioned at the wide range of duties expected of him by his employers and the modest recompense, must have been delighted if a little surprised when the Senate eventually offered him the chair in law for three years at an improved salary, for him, of £800. They had earlier failed to fill the chair from outside at a higher salary. The professor taught academic subjects such as Roman law and jurisprudence within the university, but for most of their professional subjects students went outside to leading members of the Bar. Within the university lawyers could still obtain only their B.A. and had to sit the difficult Barristers’ Board examinations if they wanted further qualifications. In 1930 the Senate came very close to constituting and starting up a Law Faculty, but the financial
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A crisis destroyed this plan, and it was not until T.C. Beirne presented his benefaction of £20,000 in 1936 that a full Law School became possible and law degrees became attainable within a Law Faculty. The engineering department was also involved in a number of changes. In November 1922, the Senate received a report from the two chemists, Steele and Bagster, proposing a degree course in chemical engineering, which was accepted. Twelve years later there was provision for third-year work in mining engineering and a significant step forward in granting approval to Townsville Technical College to teach the first- and second-year diploma course in mechanical and electrical engineering. In between these developments, Professor Hawken of engineering attempted to sponsor the introduction of architecture. In August 1927, he first introduced proposals for architecture and was able to make some headway in 1929 by having architecture courses in building construction and the history of architecture for engineering students given by F.L. Jones, the instructor in architecture at the Central Technical College. This use of external institutions and individuals as a means of getting subjects launched became almost a model for academic expansion during this period and helped the university to take first steps tentatively without too frightening a commitment. During 1932 the Senate was interested in going ahead with a plan for a university diploma course to be taken in the technical colleges, but the Board of Faculties believed that the time was not opportune and the Senate decided against a diploma at this stage, though it was willing to enter into a Joint Board agreement of the kind that had earlier linked the university to the dental profession and dental education. The architects were particularly anxious to interest the university in this area, believing that this was the only way to improve the status of their profession, and eventually the university was persuaded to appoint Robert Cummings to a lectureship in architecture in 1937. He became head of a department administered through a Board of Studies chaired by the dean of engineering, and a Diploma in Architecture became available to students who had studied other basic subjects in their first year. Eventually architecture, like law, would come of age and have its own faculty and degree. In the arts area too there was slight, if not spectacular, expansion. In 1934 the Institute of Modern Languages was created outside the B.A.-structure to attempt to meet an expressed demand for language teaching from within the com-
munity at large, and in August 1936 the Senate received specific inquiries from the Japanese Consulate about the teaching of the Japanese language. After A.C.V. Melbourne's second trip to the Far East and the publication of his report, it was thought desirable that Japanese history and culture should start to be taught within the Department of Social Studies, formerly the Department of History and Economics. The committee appointed to study the Melbourne report envisaged eventually a Department of Oriental Studies, but a start was made with the appointment of Rynnosuko Seita as lecturer in Japanese history and culture from January 1938, an enterprise that was short-lived because of the outbreak of war in 1939.

Music was added to the list of arts courses in 1934, followed in 1937 by a course in biblical literature, after the abortive efforts of Anglican Archbishop Wand in 1935 to have theological studies introduced, a proposal that was not acceptable to the board.6

Another area of Professor Goddard's activities was that of physiotherapy. He, along with Professor Parnell and the vice-chancellor, Dr Robertson, was appointed in December 1927 to represent the university on a committee proposed by the Hospitals Board to report on the establishment of what was then called a Massage School. This became an area of interest for him, and in 1932 he was strongly supporting the idea that massage training facilities could be available in Queensland from the beginning of 1933, with the university actively involved. In fact their introduction came under the auspices of the newly formed Medical Faculty which brought proposals to the December Senate of 1937 for a Diploma in Physiotherapy, with a first-year programme consisting of biology, anatomy, introductory massage, and introductory medical gymnastics.7

Besides these there were other developments of note in a variety of areas. In 1923 at the request of the premier, facilities were made available for the training of cadets for the forestry service who would then proceed to the Australian Forestry School at Canberra; in 1926 J.D. Story proposed a Diploma in Education for Queensland graduates, for which the Senate drafted a statute in 1934 and which finally became available in 1937; in 1938 the biophysics laboratory began to issue radon for use in Brisbane hospitals, geology established its seismological station, and the Senate received a request from the honorary secretary of the Queensland Physical Fitness Committee on the possible introduction of physical education, said to be favoured by Premier Forgan Smith for school teachers.8
At the postgraduate level the Senate, on the board's recommendation, decided in 1935 to institute the higher doctorate of D.Litt., having eleven years earlier declined to accept the lower one of Ph.D. This they did on the grounds that each degree should be distinct in title and associated with a particular faculty, that the Ph.D. might lower the value of existing doctorates, and that what had been considered appropriate for British universities in the post-war period was not necessarily justifiable within the context of Australian universities.9

The greatest academic leap forward of the interwar period was that associated with the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, and Veterinary Science in 1935, the professional faculties which along with the Law Faculty would make the university, it was supposed, complete. Strangely, it was dentistry which came first to the University of Queensland, ahead of medicine, the more usual leader. Whereas medical students had traditionally gone south to Sydney and Melbourne to do their clinical training, dentists had trained in Queensland and so there was an existing educational structure which the university could at first permeate and eventually take over. The Dental Board of Queensland, the professional body of dentists, looked forward to the establishment of a Faculty of Dentistry and the emergence of a graduate profession within Queensland, academically qualified as well as practically trained by the Dental Hospital. The Senate also sought this development but agreed initially in 1926 to participate in a Joint Board of Dental Studies with the Dental Board, which was extended into a memorandum of agreement in August 1927 between the University of Queensland, the Dental Board of Queensland, and the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board. The joint board constituted by the Senate was to control dental education in Queensland under the 1909 University of Queensland Act, and the anatomy department at the Dental Hospital was to come under university control. The arrangements were not entirely satisfactory and, following student complaints to the Dental Board about their training at the hospital and the Dental Board's evident dissatisfaction, the Senate appointed a select committee which recommended that dental education should be reorganized on a diploma basis, to be superseded by a degree course as soon as practicable. That would mean a complete faculty at the university and, according to Goddard, chairs in anatomy and physiology; he saw the dental degree and the establishment of a medical school as interdependent developments.10
Meanwhile, the Joint Board of Dental Studies, consisting of twelve members and chaired by the ubiquitous Professor Goddard, attempted to keep a precarious alliance in being, and in September 1932 Goddard announced that the Diploma in Dentistry had been established. Tensions among the professional body concerned with its own ideas of standards and its rights, the Dental Hospital where the students trained, the government health department which wanted practising dentists in being, and the university which had its own notions of the academic content of dental education, led in 1934 to a complete rupture in the tripartite agreement. For a time there were acrimonious pronunciations and denunciations from the Dental Board which denied the right of the university to usurp, as it claimed, its own authority and award diplomas in dentistry following the collapse of the agreement. There was only one possible satisfactory solution for the university. In February 1935, the government announced that money would be available for a chair in dentistry and a new dental hospital, and in November E.M. Hanlon introduced a Bill to amend existing Dental Acts and to vest the training of all dental students in the university.\(^\text{11}\)

There were still bridges to be built, and in appointing F.E. Helmore to the chair the Senate had to disregard the petition of ninety-one local dentists for the appointment of their favourite son, but the full Dental Faculty now became possible, especially with the government’s simultaneous decision to build a medical school. The years of controversy had at least left the university with a well-established Anatomy School, for Dr E.S. Myers had taught anatomy to dental students and demonstrated dissection at the William Street Anatomy School from 1927. Thanks to a gift from the Freemasons, the former Masonic Hall in Alice Street was used, from 1934 according to the \textit{Courier-Mail}, “for instruction in anatomy, physiology, and some mechanical work”\(^\text{12}\), and it had some years of service still to render.

The troubles were not quite over. The law was still inadequate to cover the question of registration of dentists, the first professor did not stay long, and the new dental hospital was slow to appear. When Professor Sydney Lumb arrived in 1938 he was shown “an excavation in the hill and a bit of a plinth, a foundation stone, and that was the Dental School”. He had a staff consisting of one lecturer, one half-time lecturer, one technician, and a morning typist who went to mathematics in the afternoon. The Dental School was, for the time being,
scattered throughout the city. Nevertheless a start had been made and, under Professor Lumb, real progress was to follow.\textsuperscript{13}

In contrast with dentistry, the early history of medicine seems relatively uncontroversial, if somewhat sparse, at least until the decision was taken to build a medical school. Such a development had been the greatest unfulfilled dream of the first quarter of a century of university history, and repeatedly the subject of academic staff and Senate resolutions, public declarations, and government half-promises. The case for medicine had been demonstrated many times over, but as late as May 1932 Registrar McCaffrey was making a prediction, born of resignation, that there would be no medical school until St Lucia had been occupied. In choosing to come to St Lucia the Senate had held back eleven acres of their old Victoria Park site for the purpose of building a medical school there, but they were persuaded by the Brisbane City Council in 1931 to exchange this block, upon which the council had already encroached with roadworks, for what was allegedly a seven-acre block, though in fact only six acres, to the north, adjacent to Victoria Park and even more convenient for the hospital than the earlier site. The Senate was informed in September 1932 that the deeds had been issued, but there was no expectation that a medical school would quickly follow in the circumstances of the Depression.\textsuperscript{14}

Though many people have been seen as important figures in the back-stage manoeuvres to get a medical school started, Premier Forgan Smith, as befits a politician, was inclined to claim the major credit for the eventual decision, which had to be a political decision taken by governments within the range of options open to them. In announcing the decision to set up a medical school in April 1935, Forgan Smith supported the view that the university would not be complete without one. The medical profession was said to be jubilant. The \textit{Courier-Mail} spoke of the “unparalleled economic and social undertaking of settling a vast subtropical territory wholly with white people”, and there seems little doubt that the great emphasis given to the conquest of tropical diseases is evidence of the growing influence of Sir Raphael Cilento in government circles as director of health. A committee, with heavy university representation, was established to advise the Cabinet, and its recommendations reported on 13 June illustrate graphically the expedients to which the university would have to resort in the early days of the new faculty. Anatomy would continue in
the Masonic Hall, Alice Street; physiology would be taught in the Pharmacy College building, also in Alice Street; pathology and bacteriology would be based in the new laboratory of the Department of Public Health in William Street; morbid anatomy and related subjects would be taught in relevant sections of the Brisbane Hospital, which would also supply a common room and other facilities for staff. The 120 or so people who went to Sydney and Melbourne would be replaced by a body of medical students who could remain in Brisbane but would for all time expend much of their energy in local travel.  

By 19 July the committee was again reporting its contentment with the ease and relatively low cost at which "the University could be brought to a state of completeness and the necessary faculties provided". This probably encouraged the government to approve the building of a medical school at an estimated cost of £10,000, and the Senate to send a deputation to the premier asking that the new faculty be inaugurated in 1936. H.J. Wilkinson was appointed to the chair of anatomy and became first dean of medicine and D.H.K. Lee, a Queensland graduate, became the first professor of physiology. In 1937 Dr James Duhig accepted the position of honorary professor of pathology and Sir Raphael Cilento that of honorary professor of social and tropical medicine. For a long time the Medical School was obliged to make use of whatever professional expertise was available to escape the expense of full-time appointments to chairs and would, of course, always be dependent on good relations with the hospitals to have use of their facilities. There was some disappointment expressed by the Mater Hospital that it had not been chosen as a teaching hospital, and the Senate’s advisory committee had to give assurance that all students could at that stage be accommodated at the General Hospital and that no slight was intended.

More difficult than the Medical Faculty’s public relations were its financial ones with the government. The foundation stone of the Medical School was laid by Health Minister Hanlon on 3 June 1937, and the government became reconciled to the fact that their £10,000 estimate had been unrealistic and that the new school would be costing £22,000. The Senate was already aware of the difficult problem of ensuring that the medical experts went through the appropriate channels of the Buildings and Grounds Committee instead of communicating directly with the Department of Public
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Works, as had been the practice of Professor Wilkinson in the early months of 1937. Costs escalated as the needs of the school became more apparent, and by September 1938 the premier was delivering a severe reprimand to the Senate, whose members assumed a convenient air of injured innocence, because a probable cost of £71,000 was by now envisaged. When the Senate delivered its annual report to parliament for this year it chose to accentuate the positive and mentioned the establishment of a Department of Obstetrics and the new Diploma in Physiotherapy.

By this stage Forgan Smith was being similarly outraged by the mounting costs of his other new offspring, the Veterinary Science School at Yeerongpilly, where buildings were also proving more expensive than the government had estimated. In his announcement of the Medical Faculty in April 1935, the premier had also proclaimed, in slightly ambiguous language, "Medical and veterinary science are so closely associated that the staffing of a medical school renders the inauguration of a Veterinary Faculty very easy." Queensland, he argued, was a primary producer, and its problems could in large measure be solved by research; veterinary science would supplement the contribution of agriculture. In Professor Goddard’s words, a scientific veterinary staff would enable the Department of Agriculture and Stock to deal efficiently with all aspects of veterinary problems, and only a Queensland school could meet Queensland’s needs. In the very practical language of the Courier-Mail, animal husbandry, sheep, beef and dairy cattle supported the whole edifice of the state’s economy. The need was clear; only the location and the survival powers of the new establishment were in doubt. The Animal Health Station was suggested as a temporary expedient, but Professor Herbert Seddon, a New Zealander appointed from the Department of Agriculture’s Experimental Veterinary Farm in New South Wales, soon realized that with all the question marks hanging over St Lucia he would be better to press for completing his buildings at Yeerongpilly rather than putting up with further inconvenience and living in hope rather than expectation. As a result he too became a target for the premier’s frustrations, and Forgan Smith delivered a blistering letter on 5 August 1938 refusing his approval for any further buildings and proposing that, because student numbers were so small, the university should confine itself to a diploma course and allow fourth- and fifth-year students to go on to Sydney. The Veterinary Science School was heading towards
Another section of the university vital to the proper functioning of an academic institution, the library, also experienced a long and exasperating period of unfulfilled hopes during these years, being moved from place to place and having to wait many years for appropriate staffing and a home of its own. The early twenties were years of declarations of principle that a full-time librarian should be appointed and pious hopes that a separate library building could be constructed, perhaps with money from the Carnegie Trust. Neither occurred, and the library, particularly vulnerable to the insect life of old Government House, enjoyed nothing better than a move into technical college buildings and the de facto rule of assistant librarian, Miss E.K. McIver, who presided over a reading room of bare floors, trestle tables, and hard wooden chairs, and bookshelves and stacks to which students were not allowed direct access. In April 1927, the Dramatic Society, by means of a £10 gift for the purchase of books, initiated a Fryer Memorial Library of Australian Literature which would eventually become a very valuable asset. In October 1929, Dr F.W. Robinson, its custodian, commented that it was impossible to study Australian literature or history in Queensland for lack of the bare material, and he helped to rectify this deficiency through the Fryer Library, opened initially as a reading room, to be approached through Dr Robinson's own study.

This lack of accommodation derived from the further round of abortive proposals for a librarian and a library in 1929-31; £20,000 for a new building was a lot of money in the days of October 1931, especially when, a few months later, a decision had to be taken to cancel a large number of journals and periodicals and substantially curtail purchases of books. The appointment of the resourceful A.C.V. Melbourne as part-time librarian at £150 per annum in May 1934 reopened the whole issue, and the Buildings and Grounds Committee reported plans for a new library that might serve the state as a Public Archives Office as well as incorporating the John Oxley Library. Shortly afterwards the government agreed to a new library for the university, and it was hoped that the foundation stone might be laid as part of the Silver Jubilee Celebration in 1935. It was still agreeing for four more years, before assuming full responsibility for the cost of the new structure, and allowing the Forsyth bequest, originally intended for building purposes, to be retained as a permanent endowment.
acknowledged in the appointment at last of a James Forsyth Librarian, Richard Pennington, in 1939.20

One of the gravest consequences of the library’s defects was that it was useless for research purposes, though there is little evidence to suggest that this problem was clearly appreciated or caused much concern. It presented itself most dramatically to returning scholarship holders who had visited Oxford or Cambridge and seen what research could be done through the facilities of a great library. Two geologists, Frederick Whitehouse and Dorothy Hill, had research scholarships to Cambridge and returned with Ph.Ds, though the scholarships, like so much else, fell victim to the Depression, to the great regret of the Board of Faculties, and proved very difficult to restore. As late as December 1936, the board was declaring a preference for having research and travelling scholarships restored before additional laboratory and library facilities, for academic research was seen to be very dependent on this kind of award. A.C.V. Melbourne had benefited earlier from a fellowship which had taken him to London and a Ph.D. from that university; his thesis was subsequently published by Oxford University Press after the warden of the University Council, T.C. Beirne, had generously agreed to provide a £400 guarantee to the publishers. But this type of academic research was exceptional and not what was normally understood by the term “research”. Indeed, in September 1936 the Senate received a paper from Professor Richards questioning how much original research there had been in the university’s twenty-six years of life. He emphasized that what he was talking about was not government-financed activity with an economic goal but pure research for its own sake, for which there was no special provision, which teaching staff must be encouraged to undertake, and for which they would require proper library and laboratory facilities. This would have been strange talk to many of the university’s leading professors, who spent their lives teaching, administering the university, or advising the government. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake had not been a major preoccupation, and some of the best known figures of this period have left no permanent record of original achievement as scholars.21

Research meant something rather different and quite specific. It meant putting scientific and technological knowledge and skill to work on precise problems that needed to be solved within the community. When an expert on bridges was required to chair a committee of experts in-
vestigating cross-river facilities, it was obviously sensible to ask Professor Hawken to fill this position, and when Galmahra was arguing that most departments were carrying on research it cited pest control, animal breeding, and petroleum investigation as examples. In March 1922, Senate awarded A.W. Harvey £100 to finalize his “fruit fly lure”, to be refunded if the device proved successful and able to be placed at the disposal of the Stanthorpe and District Research Fellow who was assisting the fruit-growers. It was evidently a success for it was reported in 1924 that Harvey’s invention, the product of fifteen years’ work, was now cheaply available to all orchardists in Queensland and other states. In April 1924, the Senate offered the facilities of the school of Applied Chemistry for the investigation of banana ripening, and this prolonged investigation eventually brought Professor Bagster an honorarium of £100 from the CSIR for his work on “the maturation of bananas”. The Senate permitted him to retain this money and thanked the manager of the Fruit Marketing Committee for the bunches of bananas which he had forwarded, noting the firm quality of the fruit treated under the ripening process. On another occasion Bagster was helping the rum industry, which involved producing rum that then had to be destroyed in the presence of a customs officer. The technical staff demonstrated their skill by organizing the illicit collection of the rum beneath the sink, and members of the administrative staff were invited to the laboratory at lunchtime to share the ill-gotten gains.22

Forgan Smith, at the Department of Agriculture and Stock, stressed the importance of cooperation between the university and the department in October 1929, and later the first professor of veterinary science was paid a retaining fee by the government, with the Senate’s approval, for the right to consult him in problems relating to his field. Melbourne’s visit to China and Japan in 1932 to inquire into trade possibilities would be a great help not only to Queensland but also to the whole of Australia, parliament was told. His report to the public service commissioner, written for businessmen and for the information of the general community, showed the university to be “a people’s university, and not merely an academic institution”. This was the kind of investigation and research that was best understood and most welcomed. And so, when the CSIR in 1936 offered £30,000 to promote research in Australian universities and Queensland acquired £4,200, the annual report of the following year was able to list
sixteen projects funded by the grant, mainly of a practical kind and all of them of local importance. This was the theme of Chancellor Blair’s speech at the laying of the St Lucia foundation stone in March 1937: the university’s greatest gift to the community in the future would perhaps be the result of research work; a bigger teaching and research staff was needed to render greater public service.

In December 1925, it was decided to abolish the Public Lecture Committee and the Joint Committee for Tutorial Classes, through which the university was associated with the Workers’ Educational Association, and to replace them from March 1926 with a University Committee for Tutorial Classes and Public Lectures which would do the work of both bodies. The function of the tutorial classes among the adult population always had potential for sparking off controversy such as had occurred in 1919 over the allegations of political indoctrination. Again in 1923 a member of the Legislative Assembly questioned the purpose and value of giving £3,000 of public money to these activities when the principal subjects taught were ‘‘Marxian Economics and Industrial Evolution’’. He was answered by the minister, who assured him that the vote was controlled by the university, evidently a guarantee that it was being spent wisely, and that good work was being done throughout the state in a variety of lecture and tutorial courses. D.A. Gledson, member for Ipswich, who was less well disposed to the university, nevertheless saw the Workers’ Educational Association as an important link between the working class and the university, perhaps a means of keeping the academic crowd honest men and socially relevant.

Who controlled whom and for whose benefit was never entirely clear, but in 1938–39 it was the government, not a private member, who were concerned over alleged communist propaganda that was being dispensed, and it was decided to end the subsidy from the government to the WEA. The university had evidently not kept a sufficiently tight rein on its partner, and when the Senate resolved to move more extensively into the adult education area, something which had been talked about before but which now seemed opportune, the government virtually warned it off this area and seemed intent on retaining it for the Department of Public Instruction. For the present, perhaps for all time, the university would need to concentrate on those who sought formal academic qualifications, the student body, rather than those members of the wider community who might eventually
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A well-balanced and complete account of student life during the interwar period is difficult to achieve, for neither contemporary publications nor later recollections are really representative of the great numbers of people who came to the university in the evenings or who studied externally by correspondence. Student life is therefore seen largely from the perspective of those who were sufficiently well provided for to be able to study as full-time students. The number of government scholarships rose only marginally and temporarily during this period, to twenty-five in 1928, which meant that the full-time section of the student body represented the better-off sections of the community and had a view of student life not necessarily shared by their more numerous contemporaries in the other categories. It was a view still of a golden age of staff–student relations. Somehow the professors managed to
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combine the attributes of gods with the readiness of humans to be friendly and accessible and part of the social scene which students organized outside lecture hours and at weekends. Professor Priestley remained through the twenties as patron of the women's hockey club, and students still found old or new staff as mentors for their dramatic and musical productions. Academics and their wives still came in force to the regular Saturday night dances, organized, perhaps, to raise money to send a university sports team to some distant contest, and both groups still mingled freely with the student body and offered themselves as dancing partners. It was the custom, widely testified to, for the men and women to arrive and pay their entry fees independently, meeting their partners inside the hall amid the balloons and pot plants brought in specially for the occasion. Some such functions left vivid memories, like the Engineers' Ball, held in the unpromising surroundings of the engineering department. All the equipment was cleared out of the drawing office to provide a dancing and social area and Professor Hawken, bedecked in tie and tails, together with his wife, greeted all guests as they arrived. On another occasion the chancellor invited all undergraduates to a garden party in November 1922.26
The close social relationship with academic staff appears to have carried over into the academic side of life, for there is general agreement that staff knew their students much better than in later times and that an atmosphere of greater intimacy prevailed, a result of the size of the institution as much as of the character of the individuals concerned. There was already a perceived distinction between the arts students, who had relatively few formal commitments to lectures and tutorials, and the science-based students, who began their day at nine o'clock and could expect to have most of their time filled with laboratory sessions when they were not at lectures. If they were students of chemistry they would quickly become used to losing the battle to keep Wednesday afternoon free for sport, though it was the generally observed convention that this should be so preserved. By 1938 the Senate, while agreeing that this was desirable, was compelled to acknowledge that it was not always possible. One tradition that did survive and become strengthened was that of regarding the flowering of the Jacarandas as a sign that examinations were approaching and the student lifestyle needed to be adjusted accordingly.\textsuperscript{[7]}

There is little evidence that there was discrimination between the sexes, at least at the undergraduate stage, though
Una Bick, as Una Prentice, would later recall the warning that she had received of her likely unfavourable reception from Cumbrae Stewart when she declared her intention of studying law. In fact her fears were not fulfilled, and it seems probable that the brighter students were well received, as they usually are; a few women were even invited to join the male academic staff. The women enjoyed somewhat better common-room facilities than the men, but these were largely of their own making. Whereas the men’s common room was described as a bare wooden building, like a suburban house with no partitions inside, bare floors, a slap of paint on the walls, but altogether the most desolate place imaginable, the women bought curtains and linoleum floor-covering for theirs and beautified it in other ways. In August 1927 the Senate went so far as to suggest to the men that they should follow the women’s example on the furnishing and maintenance of their common room, but it was all to no avail. Five years later broken windows and other damage were reported, and there was said to be “some evidence that men students were not showing proper appreciation of steps taken by the Senate”. Henceforth the student organizations would have to be responsible for the cost of repairs.

The great event of the student year remained Commemoration, which brought the university into the public eye as no other aspect of its life did. Preparations for the procession would begin on the previous day, when wagons and carts were driven to the university grounds, and students worked through the night putting up their displays and banners. There seems to have been a growing sensitivity to political satire, at least among the politicians of the state, and students were encouraged to regard politics at the Commonwealth level as their only appropriate target. This increasingly turned them towards the bawdy, which caused further problems for the president of the Board of Faculties who was the Senate’s inspection officer, and he took the drastic step of calling in the police in 1929 who assumed an annual responsibility. Their censorship did not grow more lax with the passing of the years, for in 1937, according to the Telegraph, “the police paid a courtesy call” and “a tactful inspection led to the elimination of certain things”; according to the Courier-Mail seventeen floats were reduced to twelve. Whatever passed the inspection set off at nine o’clock and the Brisbane public had their free show, in which they would occasionally participate vigorously. The procession would be waylaid at various
points, and the public servants at the Government Printing Offices and the Taxation Building had a particular reputation for their projectiles. Part of the procession tradition was the student crocodile which went in and out of city stores, across streets, and even through tramcars, and was described by the Courier in 1930 as "a sinuous ‘crocodile’ of hilarity".29

Most of the time these antics were tolerated, even enjoyed, but in 1932 the mark was clearly overstepped. The tableaux were described as "degrading and offensive", "a disgusting and immoral exhibition", displaying outrageous "ethical concepts". According to the Telegraph it was "neither amusing nor what is rightly expected of young men of culture and education" and "Varsity Yahoos" were condemned for their "Indecent Antics in City Streets". The police promised to punish the worst hooligans if they could catch them, members of the public demanded that the students should confine their folly to their own grounds, and the Brisbane City Council considered asking the police to restrict street processions to "occasions of national significance". The excesses of 1932 and the response of the public and the Senate had a deadening effect on the next few years. Students, required to behave in a seemly manner, produced "bitterly
disappointing” affairs, “short and dismal”, a parade with “hardly a laugh in it”.  

The hilarity shifted from the procession to the ceremony, which had itself been moved for the 1922 function from the technical college to the Exhibition Hall, and then in 1930 to the “New Town Hall, Adelaide Street”. In 1922, according to Galmahra, the students in their sombre academic dress were conveyed in trams to the Exhibition Hall, but on some later occasions students arrived at the City Hall at three o’clock still wearing their procession costumes and resolved to turn the occasion into the proverbial bear-garden. Even the presentation to the Duke of York in 1927 had not been an event of great solemnity, but degree ceremonies of later years appear to have gone increasingly out of control. At the May meeting of the Senate in 1931 the president of the Students Union denied any student responsibility for “the fowl and duck escapade” at the Commemoration Ceremony, natural as was the assumption that it had not been organized by academic staff, and the Senate resolved to seek help in future from the Students Union Council and the police to man the doors and prevent incidents and practical jokes. These did, of course, continue. Dangling carrots, snow storms of cigarette papers, more live hens in honour of Henry Alcock, president of the Board of Faculties, streamers, and fireworks would all descend from the dome of the building, and the songs official and unofficial would take up such a time that the Senate attempted to legislate in March
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1932 for a maximum of two verses for each one. Verbal exchanges between the students and Chancellor Blair were a feature of all ceremonies and the chancellor was held in high student esteem for his capacity to handle the situation and his evident enjoyment of it, though the final ceremony of the prewar period, in 1939, the last fling of the student body, found him at last unable to compete with the noise. Not everyone thought that such behaviour was appropriate for such occasions, and there was eventually a move to have them made more dignified and to exclude completely the features that had so long characterized them.31

At the organizational level the University of Queensland Union emerged in 1922 as the undisputed body that spoke for the students. It was recognized by the Senate and given a subsidy of £50 to support its publication, Galmahra. Its first secretary was R.L. Hall, who would return as Sir Robert to the Golden Jubilee celebrations of 1960. By March 1933 Semper was able to report that the constituent bodies of this union were the Men’s Club, the Women’s Club, the Evening and External Students’ Association, the Debating Society, the Dramatic Society, the Wider Education Society, the Musical Society, and the International Relations Club. Affiliated bodies were the Agricultural Undergraduates’ Society, the Engineering Undergraduates’ Society, and the Queensland Dental Students’ Association. In addition, the Men’s and Women’s Sports Unions had large memberships and were prolific organizers of student events. In 1925 an inter-university sports meeting took place in Brisbane for the first time, though this was planned by the Combined Advisory Committee, and in the same year a team of debaters from the Oxford Union confronted the local champions on the subject of prohibition. One thing that was lacking for many years was political societies, perhaps because the student body was for a long time too small to produce groups of like-minded enthusiasts, perhaps because political expression was discouraged among staff and frowned upon in the annual procession. When a proposed Radical Club eventually emerged and sought affiliation with the Students Union in March 1936, this evoked considerable discussion; according to Semper, some people thought that there should be a political club but urged the need for caution; the proposed name did not meet with general approval and the matter was deferred until the next meeting of the Students Union Council.32

In 1927 the union had its first full-time secretary/treasurer,
having previously been accorded the services of J.D. Cramb from the university administration. In the following year it actually had its own office (on the veranda of the men’s common room), issued a monthly newsletter, and prepared its first handbook. By August 1934 the union could report a membership of over four hundred, an increase of sixty-five on the previous year, but of these only twenty were evening students. Two years later it was suggested that evening students might be helped to feel that they belonged to the university if membership of the union were made compulsory, but it would take more than this to solve the problems of those people whose visits to the university came only at the end of a full day at work. By 1938 the student body was sufficiently self-confident to be asking for a student member of Senate should the University Act be amended, a very bold request for its time, and it attempted, again without success, to have Wednesday afternoons kept free of lectures and laboratory classes. Although mainly receivers of university benefactions, the students also achieved some success as donors, for it was reported that up to the end of 1936 the Student Benefaction Scheme had raised £2,446.\textsuperscript{33}

The quality of the student body can be judged in part by the quality of its publications. The literary talents of Partridge,
Lindsay, Paterson and Stephenson were carried over from the old *University of Queensland Magazine* to the new *Galmahra*, which began in May 1921 and contained a mixture of serious writing, social news, gossip and comment. The Students Council was worried about the tone of one of Lindsay's early poems for *Galmahra* and resolved that in future doubtful material should have to pass the scrutiny of a "lady editor". However, most of the time there was little about the content of the magazine to cause any eyebrows to be raised, as long as it was accepted that student apathy, the unwillingness of the public to give great sums of money to the university, and the apparent inability of the Senate to push the government into a speedy implementation of its wishes were fairly self-evident and uncontroversial issues. Future members of the academic staff, C. Hadcraft and F.W. Whitehouse, were among the editors who helped to keep it on the right tracks during the 1920s, but from 1932 it began to make only annual appearances following the foundation in June of that year of *Semper Floreat*. This weekly newspaper, which promised to be a more radical contributor to the student debate as a "medium for expression and exchange of news and views" satisfying "a long-felt want", was hardly that and its early years posed no threat to the establishment. More impish in tone was the unfortunately titled *Whack-ho*, a book of student songs, jokes, and comments on teaching staff, which first appeared in 1935
and at subsequent Commemoration ceremonies. This at least succeeded in provoking the Senate into demanding in 1938 that the magazine should first be submitted for Board of Faculties’ censorship; otherwise Senate would withdraw its £75 grant towards the cost of running *Galmahra* and the Commemoration Ball. This was seen as holding a gun at the students’ heads and the use of quite improper pressure. Censorship, it was argued, should be by the students themselves and not by the president of the board. “Don’t treat us like naughty school children” was the demand, and the age of paternalism appeared to be drawing to its close.34
9 The Great Site Debate

The most important decision taken by the Senate during this period, probably during any period, was the decision to accept St Lucia as the site for the university's permanent home. This much-desired end would do more than anything to satisfy that quest for a complete university that characterized the interwar period, and it is regrettable that at the outbreak of the Second World War the university was still in George Street, thirteen years after the big decision had been taken.

The old Government House remained the university's home and the Senate was perpetually reminded of the need to look to existing accommodation as well as to plan that of the future. In March 1922, for instance, members were informed that the main building had not been painted since 1910, and that the woodwork was badly in need of repair; the window cleaner had advised that the putty had perished and would fall away if any pressure were exerted on the glass; and the eternal white ants had resisted all measures for their elimination and had reappeared in the doors and window frames. The quality of the accommodation was one problem, its quantity another. In May 1923 it was announced that the general office was to move into the technical college and that the Department of Tutorial Classes was to move into the Old Fire Brigade Station at the corner of Ann and Edward streets. The following year the Senate received a resigned report from the Buildings and Grounds Committee which argued that, as the university was likely to remain where it was for a further five
years, and probably longer, there was need to extend its existing accommodation, and in the November it heard that the government had agreed that the entire arts block of the technical college should be available to the university, which would allow the library and the Department of Geology to move. With one prospective site already in hand at Victoria Park and a further one about to appear in the bush at St Lucia, the Senate was probably not unduly concerned when the Domain was transferred to the custodianship of the Brisbane City Council in 1925, but it was to be some time before leave-taking. In presenting his annual report in June 1928, the principal of the Central Technical College joked, “The University staff are fine fellows and most welcome neighbours, but the time has arrived when they should be given notice to quit, or additional accommodation be secured for college classes.”

There would be much more strain before breaking point was reached. It came for the walls and ceilings in 1929, when the students were refused use of the main hall and adjoining rooms for dances and other activities because there had already been some ceiling falls, others were showing signs of collapsing, and ominous cracks were appearing in the walls, quite apart from the white ant infestation. The Department of Public Works attended to the worst problems, and the governor, perhaps a little surprisingly, evidently began to show interest in returning to the former seat of power. For years, reported the Courier-Mail in July 1934, governors had complained about the inconvenience of Fernberg, and there was speculation now about their return to George Street, which encouraged the minister for public instruction to admit that it was time the government did something about building a university. For the George Street premises the period ends with the not unfamiliar cry in 1938 that the technical college buildings were overtaxed and that there was desperate need for the St Lucia buildings to be ready at the earliest possible date.

They were not, of course, to be ready for many years, and the whole drama surrounding St Lucia has tended to overshadow the fact that for a long time the expectation was that the university would move eventually to Victoria Park. That had been picked out in 1906 when the first university reserve was established, and the choice was confirmed by the new Site Bill, introduced into parliament in September 1922, by which some 170 acres were at last vested in the university. Introducing the Bill, the secretary for public instruction explained why
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the Senate was so anxious to obtain this site, dwelling in particular on the close proximity of the General Hospital, the Children’s Hospital, Wattlebrae, and Lady Bowen Hospital. When they decided to have the university in its present position, he observed correctly, they spoiled a good Government House and made a poor university building of it. He failed to identify the villains, chief of whom had been Premier Kidston, but the mischief was now to be corrected as far as that was possible. Both the student body and the vice-chancellor confidently reported that the site question had been finally settled, though Galmahra at the same time admitted that the Senate was at a loss to know where the money for the new university would be found.³

Well might they have been puzzled, for though the Department of Public Works had drawn up plans that, according to the Courier, “foreshadow fine architecture and will involve the expenditure of about £600,000”, a Senate deputation in April 1924 was most frostily received. Forgan Smith, a hero later as premier, on this occasion produced as minister for public works the old argument about primary schools being more important than a university, while the minister for public instruction revived an equally old one, questioning how many university students really were the sons and daughters of working men. The Senate, earlier hoping to have the foundation stone laid in 1923, had to be content with spending £50 on eradicating prickly pear from the site in consultation with Professor Steele, freshly back from his year as chairman of the Prickly Pear Commission. Further investigations took place and on 18 December 1925 the Buildings and Grounds Committee brought to the Senate a report which estimated that it would cost £89,000 to complete the basic levelling of the site before building could begin and a further £40,000 to prepare the ground for the colleges. “The question must now arise,” said the report, “as to whether it is advisable to spend such a large amount of money in preparing this site for building operations, or whether it would not be preferable to proclaim a more suitable site for only a small proportion of these amounts.” So much for the final settlement of the site question.⁴

The Senate was now back to the days of 1911, considering again the options of Yeronga Park with its 122 acres, and St Lucia with its 274 acres. The consulting architect of the Department of Public Works confirmed that £130,000 would need to be spent to prepare the Victoria Park site even
roughly, and the department warned the university that even then they would not have a first-class building area. The Victoria Park site, they warned, did not justify such a proposed expenditure. Nor was the cost of preparing the site the only thing that was beginning to worry the Buildings and Grounds Committee. There were now questions being raised about the future policies of the city council for road construction and traffic flow, there were doubts about possible railway extensions in the area and the nuisance of nearby railways even if there were no extensions, and there was a prediction that even if building were to start at once it would take at least seven years to complete. The whole thing had become a nightmare. Over twenty years Victoria Park had seemed attractive, then unattractive, then attractive again, and now, once more, a possible disaster, and the Courier moved in by arguing that Victoria Park was not a good site for a university and would become useless as a recreation space for the citizens of Brisbane. The Daily Mail reported the visit of the Greater Brisbane Association deputation to see the mayor in an effort “to prevent such a ghastly mistake as the establishment of the University at Victoria Park”.

Suddenly the whole scene had been transformed, and the debate had acquired an immediate and practical significance because it became public knowledge in the middle of October that an anonymous benefactor, soon to be identified as Dr James O’Neil Mayne of Toowong, in association with his sister, Miss Mary Emelia Mayne, was willing to make available the £50,000 thought to be necessary for the Brisbane City Council to resume the land at St Lucia and present it to the university. Although Mayor Jolly expressed his regret that his report to the Senate had been made public, he was clearly delighted with the offer because it was to stand even if the university declined to take up the St Lucia option. In that case the land at St Lucia would become available to the city council as a public park; if the option were accepted then Victoria Park would become similarly available, and so the city council stood to gain handsomely whatever the decision.

It is clear that the mayor was very anxious for St Lucia to be chosen. On 19 October 1926 he was reported as saying that the land near the point would be eminently suitable for an agricultural experimental farm, hardly a clinching argument, but he did better the following day when the Mayne gift was officially handed over to him. “This is a site,” he said, “unequalled for a University in any city in Australia or in the
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Dr Mayne and the mayor of Brisbane inspect the St Lucia site (University of Queensland Archives)

world," and he predicted that ultimately St Lucia, enhanced by the university's presence, would become one of the great residential suburbs of Brisbane, untroubled by manufacturing concerns. The Students Union Council, entranced by the prospect of endless sporting and social facilities on land and water, declared strongly for St Lucia, and the Daily Mail, supporting their decision, assured the university community that St Lucia would increasingly become more central and that Victoria Park was not suited to large buildings and was threatened with railway extensions to cope with Exhibition traffic.7

But just as the enthusiasm for St Lucia was mounting, so too was the determination in certain quarters that Victoria Park should not be abandoned. On 15 October there appeared in the press a letter from Professor Steele, the first president of the Board of Faculties, and a figure of great weight and standing, arguing strongly against St Lucia in terms of the inconvenience of the site and the difficulties that students would have in reaching the place, not to mention the expense of travel. Indeed, it became a commonly heard argument that the university would never move to St Lucia because evening students would be unable to get there. He also developed the argument that was to unite the medical profession against St Lucia: that this site was too remote from the hospitals and would cause impossible problems for the establishment of the
medical faculty, which ought to be on the main university site and close to the facilities that it would require. within the senate Dr Lockhart Gibson led the medical opposition and even invested some time in walking members over Victoria Park to demonstrate the virtues of that place.8

it is difficult to know in retrospect how many of the arguments of the medical profession were genuinely heartfelt and how many were rationalization. Dr Lockhart Gibson, for instance, argued that were a university being sought on the Oxford or Cambridge model he would have been a supporter of St Lucia. “The University, however, is and is to continue to be a people’s university” — the majority of students would not be residential, their great need was accessibility, and to go to St Lucia would be to limit the usefulness of the university to the community. according to a fellow senator, Dr Lockhart Gibson was also persuaded that because fog often lay deep and heavy over St Lucia residents could die of asthma and pneumonia. on 26 October three letters from the doctors appeared in the Daily Mail. Dr A.J. Turner opposed St Lucia because of the need for a university of a more modern character, cheaper for students, drawing from a wider range of classes, and in closer touch with the life of the people. “To exchange the ideal site of a modern University for the academic remoteness of St Lucia would be to impose a handicap on the University for all time.” Sir David Hardie wrote that people did not send their boys to the university to become experts in rowing, football, and cricket, another blow against the Oxbridge model, but to learn a profession, while Dr E.O. Marks spoke highly of the Victoria Park site with its views to the bay, “exposed to all the cooling breezes”.9

It is interesting to note how the opponents of St Lucia played upon the emotions so frequently encountered in opposition to the very foundation of a university in the early days, and how they again championed the notion of a people’s university set in a city centre rather than a university apart, where social privilege and academic elitism, sustained by gentlemen’s sports, would evidently prevail. But when all the rhetoric and rationalization are stripped away, the two basic arguments against St Lucia were those of Professor Steele — the place was remote and inaccessible in 1926 and its adoption would cause problems for a future Medical Faculty.

Among the academics, with the notable exception of Steele, support for St Lucia was strong. In part they probably shared the Courier’s vision of the time “when a noble building will
adorn the St Lucia site on the banks of an equally noble river”. They saw the possibilities of the site, the river, the gently sloping landscape, the higher ground for buildings, the lower for playing fields; a setting according to Melbourne “secure in its isolation”, never to be threatened with major roadworks across the site or the encroachments of railways. It was a site which seemed to offer limitless space for easy building and expansion, after the cramped conditions of George Street and the doubtful building and sporting potential of Victoria Park. In an attempt to meet the problem of access Melbourne devised an ambitious scheme of land resumption which would, he claimed, pay for the cost of a bridge across the river and leave the university with an even greater area than the two hundred or so acres that were expected. The plan was rejected but the Senate, not surprisingly, focused strongly on the accessibility question.10

In a series of special meetings from October to December 1926, the issue was thrashed out at great length, with the chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Dr Lockhart Gibson, leading for Victoria Park, and its future chairman, A.C.V. Melbourne, leading for St Lucia, seconded by Professor Richards. Because of the importance of the issue it was agreed that all members of the Senate should have the opportunity to record their views in writing so that their votes could be counted even if they missed a vital meeting or division. On 29 October, Chancellor Thynne rose from his sick bed and, with his doctor’s permission, attended a Senate meeting for fifteen minutes to declare for Victoria Park. The doctors, as expected, spoke and wrote clearly for Victoria Park, as did Archbishop Sharp, who showed a somewhat worldly concern that a very valuable site should not be exchanged for one of less value; he also argued that the university should be within the population, not removed from it, a nice presentation of an old idea. Archbishop Duhig, however, supported St Lucia as did E.J.D. Stanley. When all the opinions had been taken from those present and the ones who had recorded them in writing, the Senate meeting of 10 December finally opted for St Lucia by what was reputedly the narrowest of margins, providing that the city council would agree to make St Lucia accessible. Many months of negotiation with the council failed to elicit a definite commitment that a bridge would be built within a specified time, and produced only an undertaking that a vehicular ferry would be provided as soon as building began and that a tram line and bus service would be provided as soon as the need arose.11
The uncertainties concerning the provision of transport facilities and other doubts about the feasibility of the exercise and when it would begin caused a slightly unpleasant wrangle between the university and the city council. The latter declined to hand over the St Lucia land until it had a firm declaration from the Senate that the new university would be built there and that the Senate would be willing to hand back Victoria Park. The Senate, incurring the wrath of the local press as well as the council by attempting to use Victoria Park as a bargaining counter, eventually settled for the drafting of a “University Medical School Act of 1928”, which would reserve an area of eleven acres for the purpose described in the Act. Not until 16 May 1930 were Senate members asked by the chancellor to attend a function being organized by the mayor for the handing over of St Lucia to the university, in return for which the council was to get the Victoria Park lands, less eleven acres, which had been vested in the university in 1922. It was a pity that Dr Mayne’s magnificent generosity, a munificence universally applauded, should have been followed by this wrangle. It was a pity, too, that this man, who as an undergraduate at Sydney had been impressed by the lack of space and a waterfront (defects which he later resolved to rectify in the University of Queensland), should have been required to wait almost four years before the gift was finally received. The whole process must have been less than encouraging to other prospective donors in the community.

That still left the university retaining the original sixty acres of Victoria Park which had been reserved under the 1906 Act. In September 1928, the director of education, with building plans of his own, was notified that as far as the Senate was concerned the exchange of St Lucia for Victoria Park had nothing to do with the original sixty-acre block; the gift from the Maynes, it was rather tendentiously argued, had been intended to benefit the university not the government, though the Senate would be prepared to discuss matters further with the premier and the secretary for public instruction. The legality of the Senate’s position was probably stronger than its morality. Four years and several letters later the Senate finally declared its wish to assist the minister, but at the same time delivered him a lecture: the Crown was being enabled to extend its facilities through a private benefaction to the university; the Senate would hand back the land providing that the Crown undertook to protect the interests of the
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university with regard to such developments as might have been possible through the possession of the site in Victoria Park that was now to be relinquished. The worth of such an undertaking is a matter for speculation. What is more certain is that this kind of dispute can hardly have encouraged the government in a resolve to come to the immediate and generous assistance of the Senate in building a university at St Lucia, and without such aid there could be no university.13

Meanwhile, the prospects of actually getting started at St Lucia had risen and fallen. In the months following the decision to accept St Lucia there was much speculation on the uses to which the land would be put. Galmahra reported in April 1927 that the lower land would be excellent for sports grounds and farm plots, showing an uncanny premonition of the fate that it was soon to suffer. Professor Hawken and his colleague A.J.M. Stoney from engineering produced a preliminary drawing of what they thought the site might look like when buildings had been erected, and this was published in the Courier in September of that year. By May 1929, little headway had been made towards building, or even outright possession, but the Senate discussed the immediate future of its inheritance, deciding that it might well be useful for grazing or dairying purposes; its five cottages should be retained and it would probably be able to support three dairies. As a longer term prospect, it envisaged finding two hundred people who would be willing to pay £5 per year to pay for the cost of planting and maintaining trees with which they would be permanently identified. By November, Hawken had produced a preliminary layout for the site incorporating the wishes of the Men’s and Women’s Sports Unions, and was seeking to have an architect on the university’s staff associated with the building, but threatening signs already existed that plans would be further delayed. It was agreed in August that a Senate deputation of Archbishop Duhig and William L’Estrange should see the minister for labour and industry for a second time, following a preliminary visit on 30 July, offering St Lucia for site work for the unemployed. Relief work should be undertaken, it was resolved on 8 August, according to the Hawken plan, but talk of relief and unemployment was all too ominous. The Senate’s resolution to undertake a thorough general survey of the site which it had been promising for a long time was, in July 1931, deferred because of “the existing financial position”, a decision which prompted the Warwick Chamber of Com-
merce to suppose that the university was again open to bids since they now proposed the re-establishment of the University of Queensland in a country town, Warwick. 14

Resignation to long delays ahead was confirmed by the willingness of the Senate to entertain other proposals for the use of their land. In March 1932, the army was allowed to use St Lucia for a training camp for field engineers, but more menacing was the proposal from Forgan Smith in the October that the government should be allowed a five-year lease on the land to develop a farm school to prepare the unemployed youth of Brisbane for agricultural work out west. Three years later the secretary for agriculture was able to report to parliament that the St Lucia Farm School had opened on 30 January 1933; it had involved a total expenditure of £10,620.16s.8d., and 166 boys had remained in employment for periods exceeding six months as a result of their training. The establishment must have been looking something of a permanency in June 1933 when permission was granted for the erection on the site of a residence for the principal of the Farm School, and the Buildings and Grounds Committee was gloomily reporting in June 1934 that the university would have to take the initiative in building the university since the government was not expected to agree to provide the money. It was expected then that the new buildings and equipment would cost £366,000, a new suspension bridge a further £150,000, and that no removal to St Lucia could take place without a simultaneous transfer of all university activities to the new site. The prospects of the Senate's financing this enterprise were, in the light of its previous efforts at fund-raising, not bright. And yet eighteen months later the government
was being asked to transfer its Farm School because the site was now needed, and the Board of Agriculture and Stock would draw up alternative plans for the use of university land at Moggill for which it requested a thirty-year tenure.  

The change occurred because of an announcement at the end of July 1935, following a Senate deputation to the premier, that the government would undertake the construction of a new university building at St Lucia. This was not long after the decision that the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, and Veterinary Science could go ahead. It was expected that the buildings would cost £300,000 and equip-
ment a further £200,000, and there would be a bridge too, sometime. Vice-Chancellor Robertson, reacting excitedly to the new prospects, cautiously predicted that it would take three years to transfer to the new home at St Lucia. Twenty years later the exercise was well in hand though far from complete. To add to the joy of the moment Mr O’Connell, the proprietor of the Swann Road, Taringa–St Lucia bus service, declared his willingness to provide a special bus service for university students.16

There now seemed real prospects that the building would go ahead, and in August the Senate again called for suggestions for a site layout, information on the needs of departments, and a contour plan, and suggested that there should be a competition for a design for the university. This was also the wish of the Queensland Chapter of the Australian Institute of Architects, who believed that the board set up by the government to advise it was inadequate for the purpose. This joint committee of government and university representatives (including Melbourne and J.D. Story), appointed to investigate the St Lucia site, draw up plans, and report to the government, received at least six suggested plans from enthusiasts such as Hawken and Dr F.W. Robinson from the English department, who made frequent visits to the site to take wind measurements and clearly invested much time and effort in the exercise. Robinson was not altogether pleased with the procedures of the committee or the outcome of its deliberations, for the committee adopted an eclectic approach, feeling itself free to take the best features of the suggested plans, whereas Dr Robinson objected that his scheme should have been taken in its entirety or not at all.17

The plan that did emerge appeared in the local press on 28 July and is quite unrecognizable as the university of today. Apart from the axis of the main building, the direction of which would cause problems for some time, the principal building was E-shaped, and the outlying buildings related to the main one in no clearly discernible way; the broken lines of the buildings appear fussily ornate and unattractive to an eye accustomed to the clean lines and plain surfaces that eventually appeared. The design might have appealed to the committee members but had little attraction for the government’s appointed firm of Sydney architects, Hennessy, Hennessy and Co., who transformed it into the coherent and logical plan which lies at the heart of the modern university. On 25 September Mr Hennessy addressed the Senate and described to
them "a great central semi-circular quadrangle around which the various buildings are arranged, all connected by means of an arcade, enabling students to reach any portion under cover". The basic concept was established. There would be changes, such as the dropping of the Great Hall, said by the Telegraph to look "most imposing" but looking from its drawings a little like the inside of a London railway station, and the disappearance of the Teachers Training College, but the pattern was set. The plans, according to their architect, "should embody Australian and English culture and should be symbolic of progress from the pioneering stages up to the present time". They would provide accommodation for fifty years at a cost of a million pounds; present requirements could be met for half that cost, and if building began by 1 March 1937 it would be over by March 1939.18

The Senate’s response, apart from initial pleasure, was to create a liaison group of four people, including Melbourne and Alcock, the two historians, to cooperate with the architects. The latter were still speaking optimistically in March 1937 of the likelihood that the university would be in its new quarters in the near future, but on 17 May the Senate, on being told by the acting premier that there was no money for starting the building, was actually contemplating lending £95,000 from its funds to allow the Bureau of Industry to make a start. The Crown Solicitor warned that such an action would require a special Act of parliament, and the very fact that this was under contemplation indicates a deteriorating situation. In August the Senate received a letter from Forgan Smith indicating that the government’s financial position was such that the most that could possibly be spent over the next five years was £500,000 at £100,000 per year. "How many years to St Lucia?" asked Semper, correctly supposing that the completing of the university would be a lengthy exercise at that rate of progress. A joint meeting of the Senate and the Professorial Board on 3 September expressed concern at the harmful dispersal of university activities that would be entailed in such a drawn-out exercise, but rejected the idea of amending the plans for economy’s sake and chose rather to have the construction processes extended over many years.19

The decision was Senate’s and the taking of it recalled some of the worst moments of the site debate of 1926. The longstanding opponents of St Lucia seized the opportunity to try to reverse the decision of 1926, encouraged by J.B. Brigden, a senator and director of the Bureau of Industry, who was ready
with an alternative scheme to erect a complete university adjacent to the existing site in the city. Brigden was supported by Archbishop Donaldson, who maintained that building at St Lucia would throw the university back a generation. In a sense he was right, and he appears to have had the backing of some of the denominational colleges whose governors were irritated at inadequate consultation and frightened of the costs of moving, but he was defeated, if only narrowly. Melbourne, Duhig, Stanley, and J.D. Story rallied the St Lucia forces, accepting the inevitable delays that must follow from a piecemeal implementation of the plans rather than acquiescing in any reduction in size and space. And, as E.J.D. Stanley informed the Senate, the government was doing the building, not the university, and so it was necessary to trust the government and “suffer in the way in which those providing the money think fit”. It was realistic if not encouraging. The Senate decided that its preferred sequence of stages was first a main building for arts, commerce, law, and administration, with half of the library, secondly a bridge, and then the preparation of the grounds, followed by the provision of equipment and services. When these had been achieved they would then move on to buildings for geology, physics, chemistry, biology and agriculture, veterinary science, engineering, physiology and anatomy. It was to be a sadly truncated university at first, but the final product would be the university which they desired, even if many of them would not be alive to see it when it eventuated.

The work began on 7 March 1938, and by the end of the year was well advanced. In the September the chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee reported the procedures by which architects’ plans were submitted to heads of departments who, after consultations with the architect, the registrar, and himself, signed them, after which they were then sent to the Board of Works for implementation. At the same meeting the Senate rejected a student proposal for an eighteen-hole golf course at St Lucia intended to cover 100-120 acres. There was a strike at St Lucia during 1938 as a result of the unskilled unemployed labourers being used to do builders’ jobs, but the main building was in a sufficient state of completion to serve as a military headquarters during the war that began in 1939 though not to accommodate a university for many more years. It was to be named the Forgan Smith Building, in honour of the premier who had made the money available for its construction and who had laid its foun-
The foundation stone is laid but not to rest, 6 March 1937 (John Oxley Library)

dation stone on 6 March 1937 with much celebration before and after the event. A later decision to shift the alignment of the building allegedly caused the stone to have to be moved and incorporated in the tower of the building, but it had served its function as a gesture of the government’s goodwill and intention, and even gestures were not to be despised when realities took so long to appear.21

Compared with the main event, the university’s physical growth in other areas contributed very little drama. In January 1922, the government agreed to lend the council of Women’s College up to £1,100 for the purchase of Oscarsholme in Shafston Road, Kangaroo Point, and in 1939 promised loans to the colleges to enable them to make the transfer to St Lucia, in the belief that this would cost no more than £40,000 each. There was an additional college in being by this stage, since Duchesne was started in 1937 in Stuart-holme Convent for Roman Catholic women. In August 1927, Professor Goddard proposed to the Senate the establishment of a Marine Biology Station at Dunk Island and suggested that the university should buy the island. They were not, however, in a position to afford this £2,500 investment, which would
have appreciated considerably over the years, and the only encouragement that Goddard received was permission from the Appeals Committee to try to raise money personally as long as he made no public appeal for it which might interfere with the committee's own efforts. On the credit side, the university was offered a gift of the Masonic Hall in Alice Street towards the end of 1932 and this gift, valued at almost £6,000, was acknowledged by the establishment of three commemorative

Women's College celebrates its 21st birthday, 1935
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scholarships. This property was to provide a home for dentists, students of anatomy, and engineers in the years to come and proved an invaluable relief to the overcrowding that was so much a part of the George Street existence.\textsuperscript{22}

The other outstanding property gift was that by Dr Mayne and his sister in 1923, when they anticipated their later generosity by handing over 693 acres of land at the junction of Moggill Creek and the Brisbane River, which the Senate was delighted to accept in view of the likelihood of a Department of Agriculture. Although members were pleased to have it, they were never quite clear what to do with it, and when Professor Goddard surveyed the land in July/August 1925 he was appalled to find that the Senate had followed a Forestry Department recommendation to chop down the timber and was turning the property into a worthless asset. He found the soil poor and predicted no prospects for agricultural development or the grazing of sheep or cattle. Timber-growing, he believed, would be its only use, and the Senate was persuaded to terminate its present timber contracts, clear the rubbish, and aim at the natural regeneration of the better species. Various tenants were allowed to lease the land for enterprises of an agricultural or dairying kind over the succeeding years, but inspection visits of 1935 revealed signs of neglect everywhere. It was probably with some relief that the Senate resolved to make the Moggill land available to the Department of Agriculture and Stock in September 1935 for the transference of its Farm School from St Lucia. It was some indication of the failure of the bequest to fulfil earlier hopes that in October 1937 the Buildings and Grounds Committee reported to the Senate that the Departments of Agriculture and Veterinary Science were seeking up to twenty acres of St Lucia for crop-raising, pasture plots, and grazing. This was one more indignity that people envisaged for the gently sloping lands beside the Brisbane River at St Lucia.\textsuperscript{23}
Part Four

The Age of J.D. Story, 1939–1955
10 Student Affairs

The period between J.D. Story’s accession to the vice-chancellorship in 1938 and the Commonwealth’s assumption of a major responsibility for financing the university in 1958, two years prior to Story’s retirement, could well be seen as the adolescent crisis of the University of Queensland. The small institution of the interwar period was dramatically transformed by the flood of ex-servicemen and civilian enthusiasts for tertiary education who carried student numbers beyond the 4,000 mark. Academically the university expanded and diversified to keep pace with new demands upon it, but it could neither be accommodated within the George Street premises that had long since been overstrained nor be transferred to its new home at St Lucia because of post-war constraints upon building programmes. And if accommodation was decided year by year in an apparently unending series of unsatisfactory expedients, so too was the precarious financing of this fast-growing concern. By 1955 the university was desperate to know whether the state would provide the means to relieve it from the uncertainties and crises which had characterized all its recent budgeting exercises or if there was any possibility of increasing Commonwealth contributions; it was also concerned to know what political price would have to be paid for any act of economic rescue.

In 1940 the University of Queensland had a student enrolment of 1,710, which represented almost a 60 per cent increase over the previous five years. Voluntary enlistment and
national service called a temporary halt to this trend, though there were 1,789 students enrolled in 1944 partly because of the availability of external studies to members of the armed forces and no obvious calamities within the academic departments except the collapse of veterinary science. In January 1942, the vice-chancellor issued a statement, following a universities conference held at the instance of the Commonwealth government, that work would continue in all faculties, though only certain ones, the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, Engineering, and Physical Science in particular, would be treated as reserved areas. Admission to these would be by merit and on a quota basis; the unreserved courses could be taken only by male students under eighteen, women, and those with exemptions from military service, though some slight modifications were permitted in the Departments of Mathematics, Economics, and Modern Languages. The university’s activities were clearly part of the national war effort. This became even more explicit at the start of 1943 when the Universities Commission declared its objective to be the granting of financial assistance to produce trained personnel for national service in the least possible time.

Appropriate quotas in the reserved faculties that would qualify for student financial assistance and in the unreserved faculties that would not were negotiated between the university and the commission, but it was made clear to the university that the commission had the ultimate authority over both selection and enrolment of students. It was also made clear to the university that it was not expected to fail many students. Two aspiring students who tested the validity of the quota system by bringing legal action against the university for failing to fulfil its obligations under the 1909 University Act and secured a High Court ruling that the wartime regulations had no proper legal basis did no more than delay the implementation of tight manpower controls. The operations of the university were integrated into the war effort, and student growth survived only insofar as the university performed this national role.

As early as April 1944, the vice-chancellor sought Professorial Board advice on the establishment of ex-servicemen and women in civilian life, and in November the Senate enacted a special statute empowering it to modify the customary matriculation requirements and to waive regulations relating to degree courses where former service people were concerned. It was the declared intention to make it as
easy as possible, without undue lowering of standards, for people to come out of the armed forces and into the university; it was expected that there would be a great rush of such people when the war ended, though no one correctly estimated its extent. One member of staff spoke of the 1940s as "very much a holy operation", surviving the war and educating the great wave of ex-servicemen, and there is no question that the university made every effort to be accommodating, encouraging rehabilitation through special guidance sessions and tutorials, through the War Students’ Committee, and administering regulations with a flexible benevolence. Quotas were scrapped, and the vice-chancellor was proud to announce in April 1946 that the university had reopened on time, accepting all qualified students, even though that had necessitated putting on classes at 8 a.m. It had been expected that an enrolment of more than 600 from the services would push the student total beyond 2,000; in fact more than 1,000 enrolled from this area and a student total of more than 3,000 was reached as over 1,000 students came into the first year.

National service during wartime had its reciprocal side from 1946 as returning soldiers enjoyed financial support under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. In 1947 there were 1,548 in this category, 709 full-time students and 839 with part-time status, and by 1948 the total enrolment had risen to 4,343, with 1,733 ex-service people benefiting from the Commonwealth scheme and a further 188 civilian students receiving assistance under it. The ex-service people showed an inclination towards the sciences and vocational training in medicine, engineering, and commerce. In 1945 the Departments of Chemistry and Physics had taught 250 students, whereas in 1946 they were required to teach 600, which is just one example of the strain imposed by the unexpectedly large intakes of the immediate post-war period. Nor was there any inclination in the first years of freedom from the restraints of war to direct students away from obviously overcrowded areas. Besides being vocationally oriented, the post-war intakes were, by common consent, the most dedicated and determined students encountered by teaching and administrative staff, "the best group we ever had".

Total enrolment reached its short-term peak in 1948, and first-year enrolments were already falling. The latter would begin to revive in 1951, though total numbers would continue
to fall a while longer as participants in the Commonwealth scheme moved out of the system before being replaced by the new Commonwealth Scholarship holders under the scheme drafted by Labor and implemented by Menzies. The annual report for 1952 offered the perceptive observation that the total decline was less remarkable than its very slight extent, which indicated a growing wish for university education quite independent of the ex-service people’s bulge. From 1951 the Commonwealth was making 400 scholarships annually available, and by 1954, when the total enrolment had jumped from 3,735 to 4,112, there were 1,172 Commonwealth Scholarship holders in the university, some two-thirds of all scholarship holders. There were also by this date almost one hundred Asian students from fourteen different countries who had started to come in during 1952 under the Colombo Plan and UNESCO schemes, a sufficiently important part of the student body to cause the Senate in April 1953 to appoint a committee specifically to supervise the overseas students and their needs.5

Inevitably, this rapid increase in the size of the student body, which placed severe strains on academic resources and physical accommodation, almost recreated the situation of the earliest days in that the university coped to the best of its ability (but not necessarily as staff would have wished) with the students who appeared. Familiar problems of giving some sense of university identity to large numbers of evening, not to mention external, students, would be exacerbated from 1949 with the growth of a separate community at St Lucia, where 529 day and 649 evening students were now being taught. In February 1951, Semper expressed the predictable
regrets that membership of a scattered university was denying students access to a settled community centre of student life.6

Another worry created by the growth in student numbers, and one shared by the whole of the Western world, was the concern stated in the annual report for 1952 that quality should not be sacrificed as the quantity of students grew. Any cautious support for the abolition of fees together with the expressed concern of J.D. Story that the university was not permeating and enriching the life of Queensland sufficiently was balanced by the knowledge of the financial headaches that abolition would produce and the experience of Western Australia, where half of the freely admitted students failed to complete degrees. Within the university there were repeated calls to raise the school leaving age and defer matriculation, and in 1951 a concern for allegedly high failure rates prompted the creation of a Senate Committee on Matriculation after the vice-chancellor had concluded that the problem of failure resolved itself into two sections, the foundations and the whole structure. Ambitious plans to involve all the education authorities and institutions concerned in reaching agreement on a revised code of matriculation requirements involved more than two years of meetings and discussions but little was achieved. People would continue to be haunted by the conflicting attractions of a people's university open to all and an increasingly selective institution that had the right to require ever higher standards on entry.7

Meanwhile, the students themselves were expressing some concern with some aspects of academic standards. In 1943 the Students Union Council had reported with a certain lack of enthusiasm on the prevailing lecture system, recommending that lectures should be voluntary and supplemented by printed notes. A sub-committee of the Combined Advisory Committee also reported on lecturing methods and the whole area of staff-student relations, and recommended an orientation programme for new students, which was not instituted until 1949. The union also participated in discussions with the chairman of the Universities Commission, Professor Mills, warning of the dangers of premature establishment of further university colleges before the facilities of the existing university had been made adequate. There were further serious meetings in 1944, of a "historic" kind according to Semper, when representatives of the Senate, the staff, and the students attended an enlarged gathering of the Combined Advisory Committee to hear an inspiring address by Professor Alcock and to discuss
university affairs. This did not eliminate the student feeling that all was not well, for in June 1945 Semper received much local publicity for an article on "Revitalizing the University", which claimed to expose the allegedly unfeeling attitudes of impersonal staff and their educational methods. While Semper is not necessarily the best guide to these years, it is useful for its indications of a growing concern among students to participate in debates about their own education. By 1948 the Students Union had itself entered into the business of roneoing and selling lecture notes, as well as operating a book exchange, and was clearly not happy with the provisions being made by the teaching departments.8

By this stage there were other aspects of facilities that were provoking comment. In May 1947, a Senate committee was appointed to consider student health services, which reported two months later that these should be confined to students of medicine, dentistry, and physiotherapy, already a fairly health-conscious group, though the medical students were themselves providing a more general service in helping to administer X-rays and inoculations as part of the 1949 orientation programme. Also in 1949, the call for a permanent guidance officer was initiated by the students, echoed in 1952 by the University Council in its concern at failure rates and again in 1954 because of comments that the psychology department was having to assume an unofficial advisory role. The first attempts by the Senate in 1954 to make such an appointment foundered on the absence of suitable applicants, but the vice-chancellor was himself persuaded of the need to establish a guidance service and secured a part-time officer in 1955, promising a full-time appointment when finances and, presumably, suitable applicants permitted.9

But the facilities of which the students were most aware were those lacking from the new home at St Lucia. The 1949 edition of Whack-ho carried a dedication:

To those intrepid souls of the advance guard, who have forsaken all, to plunge into the wilderness and wrest from the inhospitable bush and the wild indigenous savages, a Home for Learning at St Lucia. Braving the perils of the bus service, defying hunger and thirst, and ignoring the inroads of lecturers, they have earned for themselves and for those who follow the right to slumber at peace in marble halls through another half century of Higher Education.

The wit and the sense of humour should not obscure the fact that St Lucia was not enjoyed by its first student members who found it a barren and inhospitable place. Supplanted by
academic departments in the accommodation intended for their use, they had to make do with wooden huts and old farm buildings to house such facilities as they possessed, and it would be some time before the Senate started to talk about the possibility of a Students Union building, let alone be in a position to deliver one.

The more serious and earnest attitudes of the post-war students were reflected too in such decisions as the motion of the students' Radical Club in 1949 to imprison or deport Communists who promoted industrial unrest, and the willingness of the student body in 1948 to entrust affairs to an elected Students Union Council which was not required to report to an annual general meeting. In December 1947, the Senate approved the foundation of a University Regiment and in November 1950 a Queensland University Air Squadron was established, which immediately attracted more than fifty applications for membership.10

If the Senate welcomed these developments as evidence of maturity, it was less happy about the challenge mounted in 1949-50 by the student body against the compulsory wearing of gowns; the objection was raised on the grounds that gowns were useless, a nuisance in the Queensland climate, and an extravagance, that they were being illegally enforced in the absence of definite regulations, and, most daring of all, that students had not been consulted on the issue. The traditionalists on the Senate and within the academic staff would insist for a little while that academic dress was vital to the maintenance of academic standards, but the younger academic staff were already leading the students in the revolt and it was not to be halted. Neither was the movement towards Sunday sport which occasioned something of a furore in May 1952, when the Lord's Day Observance Society and the Methodist Conference both protested against the holding of University Athletics Championships on successive Sundays. The Senate once more declared for the traditional attitude but was compelled to make a series of retreats during the following months in the face of arguments of both expediency and counter-principle, eventually conceding in November that even athletics championships, the cause of the commotion, could be held on Sundays if no other day could be conveniently used.11

The most visible presence of students within the community was not, of course, in the enjoyment of Sunday games but in their annual assault upon the taste and tolerance of Brisbane during Commemoration week. Even before the outbreak of
war an unusually sensitive student president had attempted to cancel the 1939 procession on the grounds that it threatened to be more of a disgrace that year than in the past and that it conveyed an entirely erroneous impression of students. A student threat to boycott the degree ceremony enabled the procession to go ahead, but in 1940 the students held only a dance, with no procession and no dinner. Wartime austerity and restraint were extended into 1946, but in 1947 something approaching normal service was resumed. The Courier-Mail promised an absence of hooliganism from the university parade, and the police and university censors eliminated most of the comment on state affairs from the banners and floats, but there was a highly successful coup, allegedly staged by engineering students, to divert traffic from Victoria Bridge, which was said to be about to collapse. The procession of 1948 was memorable for the medical student, playing the role of a casualty, who became a real one after being accidentally struck on the head by a hammer. In 1949 rowdyism re-emerged at the Commemoration degree ceremony and was so bad in 1950 that the Professorial Board persuaded the Senate to exclude all but final-year students in the future. This quietened the ceremony but not the procession. Political censorship by the police remained strong from 1952 to 1954, and physical clashes with the police in 1952 and 1954 followed when there were attempts on the day to regulate the conduct of the marchers. In 1953 third-year students were permitted to return to the degree ceremony, but behaviour remained unsatisfactory. In 1954 a Professorial Board committee recommended that the degree ceremony should be separated entirely from Commemoration Week in order to give it the dignity that it deserved, but it would have to await the strong hand of Vice-Chancellor Schonell to attain this dignity. Meanwhile the rowdyism continued and would be much enjoyed in retrospect by those who subsequently joined the academic staff and governing bodies of the university, despite the frustrations and indignities that it caused to their predecessors in these positions. The rags too continued, for in 1955 students painted white a black statue outside the museum and proclaimed that their action was "in support of our White Australia policy"; federal politics had never enjoyed the same immunity to satirical criticism afforded to state affairs.12

In other ways too the university attempted to exercise its paternalistic role over the behaviour of its students, though post-war society would find it increasingly difficult to accept
the notion that the university acted in place of parents and had the responsibilities which it had invariably assumed in pre-war days. In November 1945, the Senate fined four dental students £5 each for breaches of discipline after the university solicitor had advised that the president of the Professorial Board had no ex officio power of the kind which he had been accustomed to exercising on such occasions. On the whole, however, the Senate was less concerned with matters of personal behaviour than with incidents that achieved some publicity and threatened to show the university in a bad light. In April 1951, for instance, there was a mild storm over allegations that unlimited supplies of intoxicating liquor had been available at a St John’s College function for first-year students; the vice-warden of the college countered this by denying that the supplies had been unlimited and stating that soft drink had been equally available, and there was no suggestion from the Senate that alcohol should be banned from such functions. Another continuing problem was that of student publications. There were complaints at the May 1952 meeting of the Senate about the “unfit” content of Whack-ho, which had been subjected to the customary censorship procedure. On this occasion, however, unseemly material had been slipped into the magazine after the censorship exercise had been completed, according to the censor, and the students concerned had acted deceitfully. In retrospect the 1950s look like the last decade of student innocence.
Proceeding by Plan

The implementation of academic plans was determined above all by the decisions of governments, and in the first instance by decisions concerning war and peace. The declaration of war once more in 1939 brought staff enlistments to add to the problems of the Senate, though this issue appears to have loomed less large than in 1914, partly because of the increased size of the staff. Professor Stable resumed his censorship duties, accompanied by Dr Robinson, and the distinguished Dr Whitehouse hit the press by enlisting as a private in the A.I.F., from which position he was soon promoted. The university became much more integrated into the national war effort than previously. The war was closer, there was conscription, and the staff who remained behind could help the war effort on a part-time basis. The Professorial Board turned its attention to emergency training and in September 1940 Professor Parnell reported the existence of special courses in first-aid, field-cooking, demolition, and physical education. Of these, physical education was the only one to become part of the regular future curriculum of the university, some compensation for the demise of veterinary science, a war casualty which lost its students to the Australian armed forces and its buildings to the American. Architecture just survived, external studies offered wide facilities to enlisted soldiers, and engineering awarded the degree of B.Sc. Engineering to students who had completed three years of study prior to
enlistment, but it was physical education which captured the mood of the moment.¹

As early as January 1939, the National Coordinating Council for Physical Fitness was pressing the federal government to create lectureships in all Australian universities, and in April the Senate received both the Professorial Board’s recommendation to institute a Diploma in Physical Education if the money became available and a letter from the minister for health telling members that money would be forthcoming. Although Mr Hanlon achieved a certain notoriety for pronouncing the notion of national fitness through university lectureships “a lot of hooey”, a federal grant of £1,500 was delivered and the Senate was able to appoint Ivor Charles Burge as the director of physical education from March 1941. He came to no department, no equipment, and no accommodation, knowing that his subject was not really accepted by the academics and that his job was simply to produce teachers. However, with the assistance of Professor Stable, he managed to get it accepted within the B.A. schedule in 1948 and put on an even sounder basis through his own Ph.D. studies in education under Professor Schonell.²

The academic diversification and expansion of the University of Queensland in wartime and afterwards were, as before, decided in part by the wishes of academics and administrators, who were increasingly inclined to formulate three-, five-, or seven-year plans in the terminology of underdeveloped or

¹ A university contribution to national fitness (Courier-Mail)
recovering countries, and in part by the wishes of governments, state and national, whose desires were more attainable because they could be supported by the giving or withholding of money. One such desire that achieved only limited fulfilment in these years was that long-expressed wish to spread the University of Queensland throughout the state by increasing the number of university colleges. A specific provision for this was included in the new University Act of 1941, which was supported by one member with the arguments that Brisbane was becoming too thickly populated and congested, that there was no point in bringing more people to Brisbane when they could be taught in other parts of the state, and that places like Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, and Cairns were at present being deprived by the absence of university colleges there. The war prevented any immediate implementation of this idea, which was more popular with the politicians than with the academics, who saw it as a threat to the academic standards which they had struggled to establish at the university. But it reappeared in October 1947 when the state government announced its intention to create university colleges at Rockhampton and Townsville and Premier Hanlon, in pursuit of educational decentralization, asked the Senate to investigate the use of educational institutions outside Brisbane for university teaching and to report by the middle of 1948. The reply that he received was perhaps a little disingenuous, for the report concerned itself with a scheme to establish study circles and centres in country towns and proposed that certificates might be obtained by correspondence study through the Department of External Studies, plans that were worthy enough in themselves but which side-stepped the issue of university colleges. They served nonetheless a short-term political use; the Courier-Mail reported in January 1950 that when university classes were fully launched in Townsville they would cover most subjects in arts, commerce, law, and education, and it did so under the heading “‘Varsity to ‘go North’’,”.

In the aftermath of the 1941 Act, which attempted to place the university more clearly within the context of the state educational system, Premier Forgan Smith called for a university review, which J.D. Story gave every appearance of supplying, though the exigencies of war and the preoccupation with re-establishing and accommodating ex-service people within the university meant the effective postponement of major new planning until after the war. In December 1946,
the Senate discussed the idea of a seven-year plan, but Story's view at this stage was that only developments in public administration and social sciences could be contemplated as all else would be too costly and require equipment and accommodation that were not available. Neither area was proceeded with, but Story did propose a five-year plan to operate from 1948 when the university's endowment was due to come up for renewal. This proposal elicited a huge number of schemes for new departments and courses from within the university, and the vice-chancellor attempted to impose some sort of order by suggesting the three categories of "highly desirable", "desirable", and "commendable" into which the various ideas and plans could be placed.4

This scheme, or five-year plan, was the basis of all developments in the late forties and early fifties and allowed developments to occur in a systematic way and according to an order of priority. Even the "highly desirable" were expected to cost £36,675, which was a large sum in relation to an annual endowment of only £40,000, and postponements and deferments were inevitably a feature of these years. Yet despite the reservations about the rate of progress expressed by the Senate committee on the development and expansion of the activities of the university in September 1949, the annual report for that year claimed that 1949 had been a record year in terms of degrees awarded, the number of full-time lecturing staff, and established chairs, as well as income and expenditure; altogether it reported an "extension of University activities in keeping with the increased tempo in the cultural and material life of the State". This momentum was carried into at least the early part of the 1950s, when increasing costs and uncertainties about revenue created what Story was to describe as a static situation in which expansion was very difficult.5

Despite this uncertainty, the Senate embarked upon a three-year plan from 1954, resolved not to allow recession or even stagnation. It had already done a great deal to counter the taunts of the Sunday Mail in June 1945 that the university lacked the curricular facilities, the modern outlook, and the inspirational teaching of other institutions. The University of Queensland, according to its vice-chancellor in 1954, now ranked as a teaching institution with those of Sydney and Melbourne; it shared their problems, it had the same claim for national consideration from the Commonwealth government, and it was well on the way to making Queensland self-
The expansions in the range of academic offerings meant a change in the size and composition of the academic staff. Numbers had doubled during the 1930s, remained steady during the war, and more than doubled again in the five post-war years which brought the total up from 79 to 189, out of a total university workforce of 541. But even with this increase the staff-student ratio had risen to a peak of 1:17.1 in 1950 as a result of high student enrolments; temporarily declining enrolments and further staff appointments brought the ratio down to 1:13.9 in 1952 but this figure, deemed to be still too high, would soon move up again. Accompanying this growth was a change in personnel, arising not simply from expansion but also from the death in the immediate post-war period of the remaining members of the early staff. During the short period 1946–48, Michie, Richards, Hawken, Goddard, Parnell, and Alcock died in rapid succession, all mighty figures in the university’s past, even if some of the newer professors had found some of them too steeped in what they considered the British tradition, rather conservative and reluctant to innovate. They had all, in one view, been overworked, underpaid, and without prospects of an adequate pension, and they left the university on the eve of its biggest transformation. Although the Senate continued to promote to chairs men from within the university, there was a greater willingness to look outside the university and bring in new people. Old and new
chairs attracted men like Greenwood and Schonell from outside and helped, among other things, to create a research strength in new areas.7

In April 1950, the Professorial Board appointed an executive sub-committee under the appropriate chairmanship of Professor Stable to look at the stabilizing of staff. Story’s reaction was to convert this body, preserving its membership, into a Senate select committee with responsibility for academic and ancillary staffing needs. This prompted the board, in July 1952, to seek clarification of its responsibilities for staffing and other matters. The vice-chancellor agreed that the board should annually elect a Standing Committee that would take over the work of the Stabilizing Committee as well as exercising broader functions. He was evidently content to allow this committee to draft proposals on staffing and other matters as long as the final decision lay with the Finance or the Academic Committee of the Senate. A previous Standing Committee had existed, 1937-46, but the new one was destined to have a much longer life and make staffing its special concern. And as the staff grew and became stabilized, so too did the apparent need to train them in the arts of teaching. The Professorial Board invited Professor Schonell to come up with proposals for this in May 1952, and the education department, steaming ahead under its dynamic leader, organized for itself an invitation from the vice-chancellor in April 1955 to work with the Research and Publications Committee to produce a book on teaching methods in universities. This at least would put an end to student complaints about their lecturers, it was hoped.8

One of the main academic casualties of wartime, veterinary science, was by 1944 provoking renewed discussion, and the Professorial Board, conscious of the very small numbers that had come to the undergraduate course before the war, proposed that it should be re-established after the war mainly as a research faculty responsible for a postgraduate diploma. There was also an approach made from the chancellor to the secretary for public instruction declaring the university’s wish to cooperate with whatever plans the government had and linking veterinary science with agriculture for possible future development. Both had lost their professors to work of national service and both were concerned to know what was to become of them in the future, especially when, to the annoyance of the Courier-Mail, there was no mention of veterinary science in the vice-chancellor’s June 1945 statement
of post-war plans. In September 1946, a special meeting of the Senate was held to consider a report from the Faculty of Agriculture suggesting a National University College in Agriculture and Veterinary Science at Gatton. Full-time professors in both areas were considered, but the vice-chancellor believed that new buildings at Gatton would have low government as well as university priority, and the scheme came to nothing. So too did the proposal in 1947 for a general Faculty of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, and Veterinary Science. In May 1948, a Senate sub-committee recommended that the university should offer a certificate rather than a degree course in agriculture, to help practical farmers rather than train academics in agriculture, but the appointment of Professor L.J.H. Teakle in February 1947 as first full-time professor of agriculture had clearly committed the subject to a different fate within the university. So too was veterinary science destined for more than a postgraduate diploma, for in 1949 the government gave its support to advertising a chair in animal husbandry and three lectureships and it was promised that the faculty would be fully operative in 1951. In July 1950, T.K. Ewer was appointed to this chair, and from February 1952 J. Francis occupied a further chair in veterinary preventive medicine.

Engineering, never under threat, was expanding so healthily that by 1949 it was able to subdivide into three separate departments of civil, mechanical, and electrical engineering under Professors J.H. Lavery, M. Shaw, and S.A. Prentice. In June of that year the Chamber of Mines offered £2,000 per annum for five years to establish a School of Mining Engineering, which the government agreed to subsidize. A chair was advertised in August 1949 and filled by F.T.M. White. The acquisition of a long lease over the old silver-lead mine at Indooroopilly in 1951 was to be a great asset to the department and the university, and more successful than the course in sugar technology which was adopted in 1949 but which attracted few students other than those who came from overseas under the Colombo Plan. There was a similar division within the old Department of Biology, agreed to in 1948, when zoology and botany were accorded separate chairs which were filled by W. Stephenson and D.A. Herbert, and in January 1950 V.B.D. Skerman was appointed to the chief lectureship in bacteriology. A further beneficiary of the upgrading process was architecture. A degree course in this subject had been first offered in 1947, but in 1949 a full faculty was created and R.P. Cummings was elevated to a chair.
In the area of the social sciences, education was also given faculty status in 1949 and future Vice-Chancellor Fred Schonell, a research scholar of international distinction, was attracted to the chair from Birmingham. In 1949 too a professor of history, separated from economics, was appointed — G. Greenwood from Sydney University — though he was to have his title changed to professor of history and political science in July 1952. The economics chair was not filled until 1950, by J.K. Gifford. Psychology, for so long taught within the Department of Philosophy, was producing its own Honours graduates by the early fifties and in 1954 was given a chair to which D.W. McElwain was appointed from Melbourne. Public administration, long promised and seen as early as 1946 as a cheap subject which the university could afford to establish, was given a senior lectureship to advertise in 1955, but social work remained an unsatisfied demand
though first contemplated in 1938. In 1944 the Professorial Board had recommended the institution of a diploma course for the training of social workers at the University of Queensland. In 1949 the Cabinet was under pressure from the Queensland Council of Social Agencies to make some provision but replied that it could not “go into Social Studies” because there were so many other new courses to support at the university. Further attempts were also unsuccessful.

The Department of Modern Languages was also a strong candidate for subdivision in the early 1950s, though J.D. Story, with considerable prophetic wisdom, warned that if separate departments were created for French language and literature and German language and literature this would lead to increased expenditure and increased demands for accommodation. He sought more justification before agreeing to the suggestion, but his heart melted in 1953, at least as far as French was concerned, and J.C. Mahoney, chief lecturer in French, was appointed to the chair in 1954. In the following year Semper argued that the time had come for “the authorities in this University” to give serious consideration to establishing a chair in Oriental studies, which it advocated on the rather curious ground that the university had now some 150 Asian students studying there, people who had not presumably come in order primarily to study the Orient. This area would also have to wait a little longer. So too would music, valiantly taught to arts students by a lone lecturer for many years but never thought by the government to be a sufficiently attractive investment for anything so serious as a chair or a faculty. And well beyond the horizon was domestic science, advocated from Warwick as a subject for the fifth chair in 1911 and raised again by the University Council, of all groups, in August 1947, as a fit subject for a diploma course, to be conducted in the interests of the community jointly with the technical college. This was carrying community consciousness and obligation too far. It did, however, stretch to the inclusion of what the Methodist Conference and the Council of the Queensland Congregational Colleges chose to call a “School of Divinity” within the Faculty of Arts in 1953. They welcomed it enthusiastically, but it would have been unacceptable to the shades of those dogged secularists who had debated the 1909 Act and even to those first senators who had agonized over their partiality if they allowed the Student Christian Movement rooms for their meetings.12

But of all the academic areas to which members of the
Senate devoted their time and energy in the war and post-war years, none consumed so much time and created so many difficulties as the Faculty of Medicine. If dentistry had created the nightmares earlier, it was now medicine which took over the role of the section which posed repeated and apparently insoluble problems. This is not to say that members of the Faculty of Medicine were particularly difficult people to accommodate, only to observe that the years following the establishment of the Medical Faculty and the opening of the Medical School brought to the surface a whole series of issues that were inherent in the situation created by the government and the university in the 1930s. In retrospect it seems ludicrous to suppose that anyone could have seriously believed that a medical faculty could be operated on an annual endowment of £5,000 and a medical school built and equipped for £25,000. Probably no one from the university really did. The characteristic establishment of the professional faculties on the proverbial shoestring, dependent for their operation on the willingness of the existing profession to exercise a benevolent foster-parenthood over the new offspring, occurred in extreme form with medicine. Two full-time chairs in anatomy and physiology, a range of honorary professors and part-time appointments, a teaching hospital in whose direction the Medical Faculty had no voice, a university governing body from which the Medical Faculty found itself increasingly remote — all these and many other factors guaranteed that the town and gown relationship would be strained to the extreme by the university’s attempt to train doctors through facilities which it did not control or could not afford to provide for itself.13

On the positive side the Senate had the courage to create a statute for postgraduate medical education when its whole medical curriculum was under attack from the British Medical Association. It had the enterprise also to make available from 1946 a degree in medical science for training technologists, which was acknowledged to be of great service in staffing hospital laboratories; in 1949 the regulations were changed to admit M.B.B.S. students to the B.Sc. App.(Med.Sc.) course. It also had the wisdom to see the need for full-time chairs in surgery, medicine, and pathology in 1947, even if it was unable to carry out its wishes. On the negative side the Senate could blithely go ahead and investigate the facilities for the training of medical students in hospitals in 1944 through a committee of traditional academics, Richards, Goddard,
Parnell, Jones, and Stable, who chose to co-opt Yorke Hedges, a lawyer, instead of the doctors who might have been useful to them. Whatever the advantages of having a committee of uninvolved people, this procedure infuriated medical staff.  

The Hospitals Act of 1944 formally created a clinical training school for medical students at the General Hospital, but in September of 1945 the Senate received a blast from the clinical teachers that there was a lack of action on a clinical school, that all decisions were being taken by non-professionals, that neither the Senate nor the Medical Faculty had any representation on the Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board under whose management they were being required to work, and that even the Senate was choosing to exclude the doctors from its own deliberations. In March 1946, Dr Alex Murphy, lecturer in medicine, delivered one of his many resignations, finding it impossible to combine his academic duties with his appointment on the staff of the Brisbane Hospital, and warned the university that it would never have an efficient clinical school until it joined the Hospitals Board, which the premier refused to permit. The creation of part-time chairs in medicine and surgery offered to Drs Murphy and Sutton were no more than short-term palliatives, though a professor of pathology, Dr A.J. Canny, was appointed to replace Professor Duhig, who had held the position in an honorary capacity for ten years and resorted at the end to the columns of *Semper* to vent his frustration against the government and the Hospitals Board. In October 1946, Sir Raphael Cilento also departed from the honorary chair of tropical and social medicine and was replaced by Acting Professor Meyers. The newly appointed Professor Murphy treated the Senate to a report on the proper functioning of a professorial unit at the Brisbane Hospital, but he must have known that such a unit would not materialize.  

In 1949 the Mater Hospital was also gazetted as a school for the clinical training of medical students, which opened the way to disputes with another hospital administration when complaints were made that the Senate had failed to implement the requirements to provide permanent accommodation for the clinical training of students within the hospital grounds. The next year was another one of crisis when Professor Murphy declined to continue as half-time professor of medicine, again outlining his difficulties with the General Hospital. He was persuaded to continue, but the Senate was
still faced with another report on existing facilities for the training of medical students. During the course of this, Dean Meyers reported that members of the Faculty of Medicine were persuaded that the ideal solution to most of their problems would be the establishment of a university teaching hospital at St Lucia, but this solution was not available. In November 1951, J.D. Story conceded that “the general set-up of the Medical School has not completely passed the stage of expediency”.

But steps were being taken that suggested that some sort of action was at last happening. It was decided to advertise for a full-time professor of medicine from the start of 1954 at a salary of £3,000. Dr Meyers resigned as dean on the grounds of his unhappiness at the administrative arrangements existing between the Senate and the Medical Faculty. Tropical medicine was put under the new professor of medicine, J.H. Tyrer, and a full-time professor of social and preventive medicine was sought. Consideration was being given to a Department of Biochemistry to extend the teaching and research that had been going on in that subject for twenty years. However, it would have been foolish to suppose that a bigger range of full-time academic staff in the medical area would automatically lead to a solution of all the problems that beset the university in its relations with its own staff and the hospitals where they spent much of their time.

An area that appears to have created few problems, apart from the concern expressed from time to time about the undesirability of non-attendance at the university, was that of external studies. Although not formally associated with the university tutorial classes and the Workers’ Educational Association, the Department of External Studies was an indirect beneficiary when the government chose to withdraw its grant from the WEA in 1939, since it became the university’s unrivalled organizer of extra-mural study. In February 1939, the premier, concerned again with the allegation that the WEA was a cover for communist propaganda, decided to appoint a two-man inquiry into the organization and its activities, but before the university had nominated its member the Senate was rather tersely informed that this would be unnecessary as the government had gone ahead and appointed a police magistrate to fill the second place. The inquiry’s findings were made the basis for the government’s decision to abandon its subsidy to the association, which expressed some disappointment that the university was now prepared to wash
its hands of the matter and not join in a protest to the government, on the grounds that the university’s own tutorial classes had not been a point at issue.  

The ending of the joint control between the university and the WEA of adult education caused the Senate to suppose that it could go ahead through an Extension Board, in place of the Department of Tutorial Classes, and expand freely in the adult education area. This prompted a stern rebuke from the premier, who informed the Senate that in future adult education would be organized directly through the Department of Public Instruction and accused the university, rather surprisingly in view of its noninvolvement with the WEA, of displaying an attitude ‘‘indicative of non cooperation with the Government’’. This occurred when Forgan Smith was experiencing irritation over a number of issues and reacting rather strongly, but it presaged no lasting breach. Members of staff continued to give help to the WEA on a voluntary basis, university representatives eventually joined the Board of Adult Education, and external studies became the focus of the University’s educational thrust into the community at large, especially as it was able to offer facilities to members of the armed forces to enrol and study during wartime.

This operation had been controlled by Thomas Thatcher, appointed director of external studies from 1938 in succession to T.E. Jones who had founded correspondence studies at the University of Queensland. Before Thatcher’s death in 1948 several important developments were already in hand: the work of the department was extended to cover the setting and marking of assignments; it was agreed in 1947 that in future attendance at a Summer or Winter School at the university should become part of the external students’ programme; and plans were set in motion for the establishment of a special library for the use of external students. This became the Thatcher Memorial Library. E.C.D. Ringrose, who was director from the beginning of 1950 until his death in 1957, presided over changes of even greater significance. It had been agreed in 1949 that the department, besides being given an assistant director, should be allowed to build up its own academic and support staff in many of the teaching subjects, which would lead to increasing academic autonomy in different areas. The time had also arrived to implement the scheme much favoured by J.D. Story for study circles in provincial towns, and by 1951 these had been established in Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Ipswich, help-
ing to take the university to the people and lessening the dominance of Brisbane. Ringrose fostered the development of a system of tutorial classes in major country centres, as well as promoting the network of specialist libraries that was to bear his name. His work, consolidated later by Frank Olsen, gave Queensland a system of external studies teaching unrivalled in Australia, preceding by decades the British Open University's exercise in "distance education". These changes provoked a very favourable response in parliament in November 1951, when a member applauded the excellent job that was being done by the director in launching the study centres in provincial areas. The university might not have moved swiftly to establish university colleges, but it could at least be seen to be doing something to cater for the needs of non-metropolitan parts.

Another modest expansion that took place in this period concerned the conducting of research. In the pre-war period this was interpreted almost exclusively in terms of projects that were thought useful by the government at state or federal level. In the language of a member of the government in October 1941, one of the purposes of a university is to engage in research work and "we do not ask that work be done for nothing"; payment would be made for services rendered. A year later J.D. Story also reminded the Senate that one of the purposes of the university was "to encourage original research and investigation". So far, he believed, the university had lacked the opportunity, but the post-war need for more intensive settlement, development, and expansion of Queensland would require more vigorous government action in future and they would wish to make use of university research work. Cooperation at Commonwealth level also was envisaged in the proposal conveyed to the Senate in September 1940 that research laboratories should be established "in close proximity to the University" and that some thought should be given to finding sites.

Not surprisingly, many of the professorial appointments in the period 1938–50 came to departments where research formed no part of university life; in some cases they found this being justified in terms of inadequate staffing; in others they found it not to be a subject worthy of remark. Yet research was being undertaken, quite apart from all the useful projects that were being financed by the CSIR, and it would be less than just not to remark on the outstanding reputation that was being built up within the Department of Geology and
Mineralogy at this time. In 1939, for instance, Professor Richards was again representing Australia at the Pacific Science Congress in California, taking with him bore samples from his work on the Barrier Reef. In 1941 Dr F.W. Whitehouse was awarded the Walter Burfitt Prize, given every three years by the Council of the Royal Society of New South Wales, for the most outstanding scientific research in Australia during that period, namely his work on the geological structure of western Queensland. In 1940 Dr Dorothy Hill was awarded the Lyell Fund of the Geological Society, one of the three awarded annually on a worldwide basis to those making distinguished contributions to geology. Such a concentration of research prowess within one department, which also included W.H. Bryan, the university’s first Doctor of Science, would be hard to equal.22

No serious attempt to generalize research throughout the university occurred until after the war. In September 1947, the University of Queensland Gazette carried an article on “The University and Scientific Research”, listing the forty-four projects currently being financed by the Commonwealth, and stressing the need for staff and money for research purposes. A year later Professor Jones, returning from a visit to the United Kingdom, reported his outstanding impression — the importance attached to research in British universities. At the same time the university was asked to react to a letter from the CSIR to the premier and did so by supporting the view that the Commonwealth should continue to provide money for “general research” but that the university would be available to conduct research on specific projects for the state if the government were willing to pay for them. The vice-chancellor thought this reaction insufficiently positive and suggested that governments needed to be led, an entirely appropriate response for a retired civil servant. To assist this process he secured the appointment of the Senate’s first Research Committee in April 1949, a body of five academics and two lay senators, displaying again a not unusual disposition to have Senate control over an area which the Professorial Board had previously supervised through a committee of its own. The annual report for that year recorded that the Departments of Chemistry and Physics were the leaders in pure research and that such unlikely departments as economics and history were now undertaking research activities. The state government was insufficiently impressed to respond positively in August 1950 to suggestions that it might make a research grant to the
university, arguing that it was already paying for research in several areas, unspecified, and that the university was already absorbing a considerable sum. More arts departments joined the lists in 1951, though the 1952 annual report reverted to the more acceptable view of research to illustrate its proposition that “The University of Queensland serves the whole of the State of Queensland”. Nevertheless, a momentum had now been achieved, research activities were expanding considerably, a total income of £31,113 was being received for research purposes, and J.D. Story felt the need for another of his stabilizing exercises to standardize procedures for the spending of money, the publication of results, and allied matters. The Research Committee and its companion, the Medical Research Committee, were given effective control, and in August 1953 asked the Senate to set aside £32,000 annually for research fellowships, equipment, and maintenance, insisting that all departments should be encouraged to do research, not just those which appeared useful in the eyes of the Commonwealth.23

The vice-chancellor now judged research worthy of a three-year plan and asked a select committee to help establish research on a better basis “with due regard to the first and foremost function of the University — Teaching and Training”. The sub-committee reported in May 1954, and the Senate agreed to its two main recommendations: that 4 per cent of university funds should be devoted annually to research and “that it be a condition of appointment of members of staff that they shall carry out research in addition to teaching duties”. Thus was the bull seized by the horns. Since 1950, when the Ph.D. degree had been introduced, implying a willingness to make research facilities available to students, pressure had mounted steadily. In October 1954, the new mood was demonstrated by Schonell’s proposals to establish an education department journal to publish the results of research work done on behaviour of children and Greenwood’s plan for a National Journal of Politics and Modern History.24

The days of parochialism were drawing to a close, though it still remained to bring the university library up to the necessary level. As recently as April 1953, the appointing committee for the chair in English had reported that the English section of the library was below the standard required for teaching and research. The Library Committee was asked to do something about it, and through the work of James
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Forsyth Librarian, Harrison Bryan, 1950–63, the library at last reached the standard necessary to support research activities. The emergence of research as a normal and expected part of academic life would assume a pleasing symmetry if it could be reported that the University of Queensland Press was established at this time to publish the research findings of staff members. It had, however, come into existence on 1 October 1948, for the main purpose of making study material and textbooks available to students and to create a bookshop.25

Associated with the conduct of research was the right of academic staff to apply for periods of study leave to pursue their academic inquiries free from the constraints of teaching. Such leave had been occasionally granted during the interwar period, not always with happy results it seems, for in August 1939 Professor Alcock gave notice of a motion in the Senate regarding the recovery of salary from staff members who failed to return to the university after periods of leave. Such experience could have inhibited the Senate’s response to the Professorial Board’s request in 1945 for a formalization of study leave provisions, and this was not really met until 1948, when provisions were introduced that appear less than generous to a modern age.26

Not until November 1950 did the university get round to regularizing its procedures for the granting of recreation and sick leave for staff, but finding an acceptable superannuation scheme proved an even more difficult task to accomplish. Back in the 1920s academic staff had been admitted to the state scheme, but they resented the fact that, unlike their counterparts in southern universities, they benefited from no contributions by their employers and could look forward to a retirement gratuity of no more than thirty weeks’ salary, provided that they did not leave the university before retirement, in which case they received nothing. From 1945 onwards the Professorial Board and the Staff Association pressed the Senate to introduce an effective scheme, which they wanted to base on the Federated Superannuation Scheme for Universities (FSSU) of British universities, and countless committees and reports conveyed staff wishes to the Senate and to the government. The stumbling block was usually the capacity of the university, which meant the willingness of the state, to pay out the sums required by such a scheme, for the state government was unable to see why academics should be treated better than public servants and the academics were unable to see why they should be treated any worse than their counterparts in other
parts of Australia. Four years of legal consultations and abortive negotiations reached something of a climax in September 1949, when the minister refused to discuss the issue further on the grounds that Cabinet had already made its position clear. By May 1952, the Staff Association was willing to concede that the scale of pensions which the university was proposing at least looked better than anything that had gone before, but that still left the matter essentially unsatisfactory and unresolved.27

The question of salaries, too, always appeared to be dealt with inadequately, leaving staff with further evidence for supposing that they were much worse off than academics elsewhere. For a time the Staff Association believed that it was on firm ground by attempting to coordinate salaries with those prevailing within the public service, and this idea accorded well with the ideas of J.D. Story, who was widely understood to regard the university as one more branch of the public service. In May 1945, the director-general of education informed the Senate that the question of salaries was really one for the Senate itself to determine; if the Senate wished to adopt the public service scheme of reclassification it should make use of the attached schedule, but it must be understood that the government would accept no responsibility for increases. Academics at this stage were evidently something less than public servants. By 1948 the situation had improved in that J.D. Story notified the Senate that classifications and scales had been adjusted and that checks had been made with the Public Service Commissioner’s Department “to ensure that the variations were in harmony with those of the Public Service”, an explicit adherence to this criterion even at the cost of £16,000 on the wages bill. Staff expansion during this period brought to the university an increasing number of people from other Australian universities and it soon became evident that the academic staff needed comparability with their southern counterparts, not with their neighbouring public servants. Through 1954 the Staff Association urged the Senate to accept the national scale proposed by the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, but the negotiations and increases of 1954–55 only left members aggrieved that they had again fallen behind southern universities, CSIRO, and the Commonwealth Public Service, evidently thought to be a better model for comparison than the state organization.28

The other main concern of academic staff in these years was their rights and freedom as individuals: academic freedom
within the university and political freedom to express themselves like other members of the community. From the outset, members of academic staff had accepted political emasculation and been content to cast a silent vote, and early senators had found no difficulty in justifying the extreme restrictions placed on those who were responsible for the impartial teaching of young people at the behest of a state government which paid their salaries. Although there is little evidence that the academics fretted excessively under this restraint, they found themselves championed during the 1944 state election by the Opposition and by the Courier-Mail, which raised the question: "Is our University free?" In a most incisive article on 28 March it made the observation, "If the Senate of Queensland's University has been bound to deny its professors freedom to express in public their personal views on political affairs through fear that their views might not always be acceptable to the political party in power, then the cause of freedom of expression has been abandoned in this State at the very place where it should be most strongly defended." These stinging words provoked the Standing Committee of the University Council to demand of the Senate that academic staff should have neither less nor more freedom of speech than other members of the university, and the Senate succumbed to this on 3 November 1944, when it was agreed that the so-called gagging clause would not be inserted in future contracts and that it would remain inoperative in existing ones. Whether staff were informed of their new freedom is unclear; the resolution was reported at the next meeting of the Standing Committee of the Council on 11 May 1945, and the vice-chancellor's statement on the new position did not appear in the press until seven-and-a-half months after the Senate decision. It was evidently considered to be news in June 1945.29

Academics, released from their former silence, needed to be coaxed gently into the world of public affairs, and their occasional appearances were not always well received. In May 1947 the Courier-Mail, which had helped to secure the new rights, urged staff to assume the role of issue-raisers, advisers, and independent commentators, believing that this was an important service that they could perform, but when the chief lecturer in law, Harry Ross Anderson, who was president of the Council for Civil Liberties, offered criticism of the proposed Newspapers Bill in 1953, some members of the Senate responded to parliamentary criticism by seeking to call
him before them for an explanation. The good sense of the majority prevailed, however, and it was resolved to take no action. Old traditions died hard and the Staff Association was prompted to issue a strong declaration on academic freedom. This was again under threat in 1955, this time within academic rather than political territory, when P.D. Edwards, lecturer in English, publicly expressed his regret that the university had not shown more spirit and faith in the ability and integrity of a lecturer who had come under criticism for teaching the poetry of A.D. Hope. The new willingness of academics to speak up on public issues in which they felt involved was best demonstrated in 1953 when there was again talk of amending the University Act. In contrast to 1941, when infringing legislation had gone virtually unchallenged, the Staff Association was now anxious to be involved in the debate, pressing for greater staff and even student representation on the Senate, an end to the nominated government majority, and the appointment of a salaried vice-chancellor not necessarily from within the membership of the Senate.

Amidst these weighty matters the question of academic staff titles seems less than momentous. Associate professors proliferated in 1946 but were abandoned for future appointments in 1949 on the ground that they were appropriate only for small universities, though they had been initially introduced because the university was growing and would be subsequently reintroduced when the university had more than quadrupled in size. The austere voice of J.D. Story could be heard behind a Finance Committee report of May 1945 of the growing tendency for promotions to be regarded as automatic rather than based on duties and responsibilities. But that did not prevent the Senate from accepting in the August the new hierarchy proposed by the Professorial Board which created new grades of chief lecturer and research professor, the latter to have the same salary as the old associate professor. It was a title very sparingly bestowed. So too in these years was that of professor emeritus. When the Senate decided on 7 August 1952 that Professor Stable should enjoy that honour, he was, according to the Courier-Mail, only the second person in the university's history to receive it, the first having been Bertram Steele, the foundation professor of chemistry. The decision had the additional virtue of not costing money, and that was becoming an increasingly important consideration in these years of renewed and mounting financial crisis.
When *Semper* welcomed new students in 1945 it ran a cartoon showing the George Street university beset by army huts and one student exclaiming to another: ‘‘Good Lord! Didn’t you know? Moving to St Lucia is a University legend — one of those Dream Homes you hear so much about!’’ Four years later *Whack-ho* reproduced what it described as an action photograph, showing a picnic group with two men in shorts who were playing a leisurely game of chess. The caption read: ‘‘Special Senate Committee working day and night, ceasing not from their labours, in pursuance of a vigorous policy whose aim is to have the University moved completely to St Lucia by the spring of 2075.’’ Whatever the justice of these satirical observations they did convey the frustrations of the post-war years, as a return to peace-time conditions meant George Street revisited. The war had meant the erection of air-raid shelters and the digging of slit trenches near the main building and student common rooms, said to be capable of accommodating 615 persons, among whom fire-fighting and first-aid arrangements were practised. It had also meant the erection of the ubiquitous huts and temporary buildings that seem to have appeared on every piece of ground in which the university had an interest.¹

By August 1943 the Senate was considering a report on post-war accommodation needs that would be created by the expected large influx of students and was still expressing the hope that the transfer to St Lucia would take place soon and in
one movement. Shortly afterwards it gave more realistic consideration to the buildings on the Domain which might serve for temporary use by the university after the war, and in the annual report for 1944 announced in triumph that two temporary buildings had been provided by the state government to accommodate a section of the administration and a zoology laboratory.2

This was to be the story for some years, one of expedients and ad hoc and temporary arrangements as fast-expanding departments vied with each other for anything that could house a class or an office. Sometimes small building exercises extended what was already there, sometimes existing buildings simply acquired a new purpose, as when a regimental drill hall became the refectory, and a record expansion was reported by the University of Queensland Gazette in June 1947 after thirteen buildings on the Domain had been taken over for university purposes during the past year. And still the demands grew. It was hardly a university fit for heroes, but it was to serve for many years during the building of and transfer to St Lucia, and it was somehow fitting that J.D. Story completed his twenty-two years as vice-chancellor without moving his office to St Lucia.3

It would be tedious to record the many shifts and changes at George Street in the post-war years of waiting, for there is always more interest in following the progress of the eventual winners than the certain losers, and St Lucia would eventually emerge, if not as speedily as most people hoped. The delay had nothing to do with the non-appearance of the bridge which had long been seen as the necessary prerequisite of establishing a university at St Lucia and which, in retrospect, looks like a certain loser, however necessary it seemed at the time. In August 1939 engineers were reported to be favouring a three-span steel structure that would cost an estimated £175,000 and be the largest of its type in Australia, extending along with its approaches to a distance of 2,000 feet. The war put a stop to such flights of fancy, and post-war conditions made it impossible to revive them afterwards with any expectation of their fulfilment. On 6 October 1954 Premier Gair told parliament that it was not possible at that time to estimate when a St Lucia bridge would be completed and open to traffic, and perhaps this comment deserves to be the last word on the subject. The inability of successive governments to afford this mammoth project and their eventual willingness to let it slip gently out of contemplation, for a long time matters of regret, were eventually accepted by many as a blessing.4
Even before the outbreak of war it was realized that all earlier plans for St Lucia had been unrealistic. In February 1939, the director of the Bureau of Industry notified the university that it would be impossible to include all the previously intended buildings within the first instalment of £500,000 and proposed confining work to the main building, part of the library, the chemistry building, and that for geology; nor would this curtailed programme be completed before 1943. The Buildings and Grounds Committee pleaded vainly for more money from the government to avoid piecemeal transference, which at this stage appears to have been regarded as the ultimate nightmare, but the Premier, Forgan Smith, agreed to soften his attitude only to the extent of being willing to start work on the physics building if the university wished to lend the money for it. While relations between the premier and the university became increasingly acrimonious with Forgan Smith warning the Senate that the cost of the Medical and Veterinary Science Schools was being
charged against the St Lucia half million, the architects blithely corresponded with the university over the names of those people who should be commemorated in the fabric of the new buildings. The founding premier, the first senators, and the four original professors, in that order, were recommended for inscriptions on wall tablets, but others, Kidston again, MacGregor, the Maynes, Vice-Chancellor Roe, and Justice J.L. Woolcock, a prominent member of the first Senate, were recommended for busts or statues. The architects then came forward with a proposal for life-sized human heads in stone to commemorate members of the university closely associated with the institution since its inception and sought photographs to assist the stone-masons; in reply the Senate expressed a preference for twenty-eight heads of persons with outstanding contributions to education, as well as four larger-than-life full figures, Justinian for law, Chaucer and Shakespeare for the arts, and Plato for education. It is pleasant to think that such matters as these were under contemplation, amidst the more serious business of the times which would eventually catch up with the university.\textsuperscript{5}

It is pleasant, too, to note that a decision had already been taken to name the central hall after Dr Mayne, the greatest of
the university’s benefactors, and to read the Semper report on St Lucia in September 1940: “It is growing slowly and laboriously — as a great tree stretches itself up from the blank earth and adds over the years the imperceptible inch upon inch to girth and height.” Semper also noted that, following the course of the river, there was “a triple-section road, divided into a cycle way, a motor-way, and a strip for pedestrians”, said to be the first road in Brisbane to incorporate the excellent idea of making special provision for cyclists.6

By mid-1941, a shortage of materials was noted and the bridge project indefinitely postponed. In December St Lucia was inspected as a possible military hospital, building work
was suspended shortly afterwards, and the transfer postponed until after the war. In July 1942, the Senate learned that the Australian military authorities were to move into the buildings such as they were, and books, documents, and works of art already transferred to St Lucia for safety reasons were moved back into the city. General Sir Thomas Blamey established his Land Headquarters in the main building, and military archaeologists can still identify the secure doors that protected the maps and plans of the first occupants of these premises.7

By June 1944, the Senate was again contemplating its future needs at St Lucia, and in September was enjoying a discussion on tree-planting policy, during which Archbishop Duhig ex-
pressed the hope that trees would be planted sufficiently far apart to allow the erection of busts of famous men on pedestals such as he had seen in the grounds of overseas universities. This idea was not enthusiastically received. Nor were prospects bright in 1945 for the resumption of the main event, for the Senate was warned in May that shortages in manpower and materials would make it almost impossible for the government to proceed with building, even though the army was evacuating St Lucia in that month. The university, which had for years stood in the queue behind primary and secondary schools, now stood behind housing, which was deemed a much more important social need to satisfy.

The ending of the war, even if it did not mean an immediate resumption of building at St Lucia, encouraged the discussion of resumption of another kind as members of the university began to think again of what was desirable, if not actually achievable. The possibility of increasing the St Lucia site had frequently arisen in the past. In April 1941, for instance, the Senate noted a proposal from the University Council that a hospital and dental unit should be added to the St Lucia complex. In November 1943, the Buildings and Grounds Committee came up with a specific proposal to add seventy-eight acres south of Carmody Road: it was agreed that at least 60 acres of good building land should be added to the 241 acres which the university at this stage possessed. In 1944 there was again talk of the need to extend the land area, particularly to provide for college accommodation at St Lucia, and after the war the Senate showed considerable enthusiasm for going ahead with earlier proposals. Resumption notices were issued for about eighty acres, for possible use as a medical or dental hospital, but there was much community resentment of the university’s action, which focused on the threat to returned soldiers already resident in St Lucia. The government, wanting neither the cost of the exercise nor the public outcry, eventually informed the Senate in July 1946 that it had been decided not to proceed with resumption to add to the St Lucia site. Many believed that the university site, already the largest in Australia, was big enough and that acquisition of more land would have been greedy. Politically the decision to stop the action was probably wise, though it would certainly have been cheaper for the university to become an extensive property owner in St Lucia in 1946 than it was to be in later decades after the development of the area as a residential suburb. When the Staff Association operated a “St Lucia Sug-
gestions Committee’ in 1950, the common suggestion received was that the university should acquire more land and the issue would continue to arise in the future.9

Meanwhile, it was desirable to make use of the land that was held, and that was not easy in the post-war years. In 1947 the government allowed the CSIR to occupy part of the incomplete main building, and in 1948 the Departments of Physical Education and Surveying were also there, partly to demonstrate the university’s resolve to use its own premises. Building work began again this year, though the Sunday Mail pessimistically feared that it would take three years for all departments to move to St Lucia, a prediction that would soon pass for optimism. At the end of 1948, arts with the exception of mathematics, and commerce, education, and the library moved to St Lucia in time for the 1949 academic year, and country life began for many. Even in 1939 a farm school building had been altered and equipped for engineering drawing, but now a wooden hut left over from the farm school became the Students Union offices, and a collection of iron sheds around the area of the later Staff Club housed the Department of the Coordinator General. Jock MacPherson, later to be honoured by Jock’s Road, lived in this area as a site caretaker, as town impinged upon gown and contributed its huts and sheds to the collection of rising ivory towers.10

In May 1949, Premier Hanlon officially opened the main building, and chemistry, law, and mathematics moved to St Lucia, with geology delayed until 1950. It was already clear that the rapid post-war expansion of the academic departments was making it impracticable to accommodate the administrative sections as well as many teaching departments in the main building. In September 1949 J.D. Story was calling for the first of his many reviews of the original St Lucia concept of 1937, which now seemed somewhat out of date. What, he asked, did they mean to do about anatomy, physiology, engineering, veterinary science, the Great Hall, the Students Union buildings, and many other issues that seemed in need of further examination after twelve years? He would continue to ask the same questions without receiving any clear answers for some years. Semper, in February 1951, sought the same sort of reappraisal in asking “Just what sort of a University is this?” and offering the reply that it was one scattered all over the face of Brisbane.11

Despite this, it was establishing a new centre of gravity, and that was coming to be St Lucia. Parliamentarians were proud
to think that their new university was said by visitors to be ‘the finest building to be seen anywhere’, and in November 1951 the Courier-Mail took time to reflect on what had been achieved and the importance of completing the work. It singled out the work of Richards in selecting the stone and the granite base and that of Melbourne in organizing so much of the early effort, and predicted that this service along with that of the designing architects, Hennessy, Hennessy and Co., would be measured only when a history of the university came to be written. With work on the main building complete in 1952, including the preparation of the first floor of the central tower for use as the Darnell Art Gallery, and the administration ready to move, the vice-chancellor raised the not uninteresting question of where the various governing bodies and committees of the university should continue to meet from this time on. There had been a token meeting of the Senate at St Lucia at the end of 1949 but it would be some years before George Street relinquished control. And while the university remained divided there would be, as J.D. Story reminded the Senate in August 1953, great problems of transport, logistics, public relations, and other kinds.*

They would persist as long as the building delays and the uncertainties about what could be achieved at St Lucia and how soon. In a circular of May 1950, J.D. Story asked all heads of departments and faculties to estimate their future needs, which he placed within the context of his belief that the university would never expand beyond a total of 6,000. When that number was reached future growth would, he believed, occur through the decentralization of university activities in country parts, in accordance with philosophies that had been expounded for forty years. He was in fact seeking to plan a university only one-third the size which it eventually reached, but building of any sort was difficult to accomplish in these years. In 1951 a shortage of materials, on which defence projects had first claim, caused work to come to a complete halt at one point, and Semper sought an answer in September as to why St Lucia had been abandoned. Before the end of the year work was said to have been resumed on the physics building but it was now expected to take a further five years to complete.**

In March 1954, Semper was again reporting ‘Creeps on This Petty Pace’ and J.D. Story was concluding that the university required its own architect. Once more he called for a reappraisal and a five-year building programme, and his plans
down to the end of 1955 had now narrowed to the modest ambition to complete the physics building and make alterations to the tower to accommodate architecture. One year later he remained confident that physics and architecture would be able to transfer by the end of 1955, though he still seemed no nearer eliciting an answer to his endless plea for a review of the St Lucia concept and a determination of what they should now be planning to achieve on the site. The existing Senate had determined that anatomy and physiology were to be at Herston, not St Lucia, but they were still undecided about veterinary science and they now had four engineering departments to cater for, not one; they must think again about a bridge, estimated now to be a further £250,000 venture, and they must ask if a Students Union building was not more urgently needed. At the same time a sub-committee was reporting on the location and other features of the Great Hall and staying with the original idea of having it attached at right angles to the main building to balance the library at the other end. It was time, decided the vice-chancellor, to establish a small committee to begin fund-raising for this inevitably expensive enterprise.

It is hardly surprising that during this post-war period of prolonged delays and inflation the costs of building St Lucia had greatly exceeded the original estimates. By 1954 they were £1,500,000, three times the amount that Forgan Smith had intended should cover the whole of the first phase of building. There was no telling how many millions it would take to finish the job, how many years, or what ravages inflation would work upon whatever estimates were conceived.

Meanwhile the university would remain scattered all over the face of Brisbane, and the fate of its other locations was hardly compensation for the delays at St Lucia. The various armies spread themselves widely during the war at the expense of the university. In October 1941 the Commonwealth took over Moorlands as a convalescent home. The former home of the Maynes had come to the university on the death of Miss Mayne in 1940, but, rather surprisingly in view of accommodation pressures, the Senate could find no purpose for it and agreed in November 1944 to overrule the wishes of the Maynes that it should remain part of the university and offer it for sale. In July 1942, the United States Army declared its intention to take over the veterinary science building at Yeerongpilly, and though this was handed back to the government in excellent order, with some improvements, in
September 1944, the Veterinary Science School was destined to spend its pre-St Lucia years in temporary wooden huts as the government found other uses for the building which had irritated the premier in 1939 because of its expensive nature. This was revenge indeed. In February 1943, the army even took over the Masonic Temple, the old Anatomy School, in Alice Street except for a room which Professor Hawken was allowed to retain, as incongruous a presence among his new neighbours as he had been among his old. The Medical School was handed over to the university on 11 August, just before war broke out, and the main structure at the Dental Hospital and College in Turbot Street was nearing completion.¹⁶

In the post-war period the Herston accommodation was supplemented by more of the temporary buildings that...
appeared in the grounds of every centre of learning, and by additional structures on its roof to house physiotherapy and provide common-room facilities for the increased number of women students attending medical school. Perhaps the most shocking statement made in relation to medical accommodation occurred during an attempt by the Medical Faculty in April 1953 to secure what was called an ideal site for a university hospital in the complex of the new South Brisbane Auxiliary Hospital that was being built. They supported their demand for a University Teaching Hospital by alleging the inability of Brisbane General Hospital to meet even the minimal needs of full-time Departments of Medicine and Pathology. With the construction of a University Hospital, they said, the existing Medical School building would no
longer be used, for it was quite unsuitable for a medical school or for any other institution requiring laboratory accommodation of a changing character. Despite these limitations it would have to serve.  

So too would the various college properties around Brisbane which would eventually be vacated when permanent colleges had been completed at St Lucia. Before the war the Senate had taken steps to allocate prospective sites of four to six acres to the six colleges, Emmanuel, St John’s, King’s, St Leo’s, Women’s, and Duchesne, and the government had agreed to lend £20,000 towards an expected cost of £40,000 for the building of each college. The war halted these programmes too, and even resulted in the closure of Duchesne College when the American authorities took over Stuartholme in the middle of 1942. During 1944 the Students Union began to
plan a non-denominational Union College at St Lucia and from the beginning of 1947 showed great enterprise in operating a Union Hostel in Wickham Terrace, in a building where the Union Jack Club had provided a servicemen's hostel. Eventually the Senate accepted the Union Hostel as an affiliated college of the university, but it showed no great enthusiasm for giving the desired grant of land at St Lucia for a permanent home.

During the early fifties Senate wrestled with the problems of what kind of tenure to grant the colleges that were to be constructed at St Lucia under building schemes begun in 1953, and in September 1954 the co-ordinator general agreed that the government should provide a £75,000 subsidy to each college, which could, it was thought, now be built for £150,000. So far, he reported, plans had been received only from King’s, Emmanuel, and Cromwell. In March 1955, Semper joyfully reported the opening of King’s and Cromwell colleges for these residences, more than any other institutions it was agreed, could produce a vital university. But the colleges, like the academic departments, were clearly experiencing a long and difficult struggle to become part of St Lucia, and 1955 brought disappointment to those people who had collaborated to try to persuade the Senate of the need to establish an International House for the many students who were joining the university under the Colombo Plan and the schemes of UNESCO and other international agencies. Despite the recommendations of a select committee, the Senate was willing in August 1955 to offer sympathy but no site for a college.

Student growth, academic expansion, and the impossibility of accommodating these through the necessary controlled physical growth had placed the university by 1955 in what appeared a severe financial crisis but was in fact the culmina-
tion of a general course of political development for the government of the university and its relationship with external bodies.

Senate membership changed to some extent in 1944 with the implementation of the 1941 University Act which gave the government the power to nominate a majority in a slightly enlarged body. In practice this appears to have made little difference either to the sort of people who were nominated or to the way in which they behaved. Sir Abraham Fryberg, who replaced Sir Raphael Cilento in November 1946, was later to recall that, although he was there as a government nominee, he was not there to push government policy and that in the whole of his long service on the Senate no minister ever tried to influence the way he acted. The sprinkling of politicians and ex-politicians, never the most assiduous attenders anyway, was never sufficient to outweigh the senior public servants, present or past, or others of distinction who were willing to serve. In July 1946, Governor Cooper joined the Senate as a mere rank and file member, which would not have suited the early governors who participated in university affairs, and if the academic staff, through its association, sought more representation for the working academics on the Senate this was desirable for clear practical reasons and not because the politicians had oppressed them at the Senate level.

The student body too, given a named senator, Albert E. Axon, to look after student interests from October 1947, continued their demand for independent representation. Semper reported in April 1955, "Those demands have been ignored, but they must be continued until this aloof conglomeration of civil servants, ecclesiastics, and academics deign to notice us. . . . It is up to [the] Union now to renew its attacks on this smouldering bastion of oligarchy." Fierce as these words were, they were at the same time reassuring in their implication that nothing had changed and that the university was not seen to be in the grasp of some totalitarian government. The nominees were seen to be of a kind with the academics, and governments still liked to have a pair of archbishops among its representatives, not to mention a retired public service commissioner called J.D. Story.

Perhaps the most intriguing arrival on the Senate was William Forgan Smith, the great patron of the university in the mid-thirties but more recently remembered as the man responsible for the legislation of 1941. He was welcomed to the Senate on 1 October 1943 as "the University’s friend"
and there is little doubt that his contribution to the university’s development far outweighs that of any other Queensland premier. The working alliance of the two old Scots, Story and Forgan Smith, had been and would remain crucial to the university’s well-being, for in 1944 the ex-premier was elected chancellor on the death of Jimmy Blair, who had served for seventeen years. Although there were some apprehensions about the role that Forgan Smith would now play and limited enthusiasm for his appointment in some quarters, he did, like Chancellor Blair before him, live down his earlier criticisms of the university and become one of its stoutest champions when formally associated with it. He was clearly happy to continue his long association with J.D. Story, and was seen as a person who would guarantee the university a good hearing from the government. He appears to have won the growing affection of his colleagues, so much so that they refused to allow him to resign in April 1951 on health grounds. He was followed by Dr Otto Hirschfeld in November 1953, the first graduate of the university to hold the office, but this very popular figure was soon lost through untimely death.

If the chancellor’s job as chairman of the Senate and chief university spokesman with the government is easily defined, that of the vice-chancellor is less clear. The 1941 Act had prescribed a deputy chancellor to preside over the Senate in the absence of the chancellor, and Professor Richards was accorded the honour of appointment to this position. It had also been indicated in the parliamentary debates that “as in the Sydney University, the vice-chancellor will be the executive officer of the senate; he will be the man to do the real work”. Thus was a transitional role created for J.D. Story between the nominal figures of earlier years and the first full-time paid academic vice-chancellor, Fred Schonell, who was appointed in 1960. J.D. Story was available for full-time duty on his retirement from the public service in 1939 and he continued to perform it, unpaid, until his second retirement in 1960, a full-time executive officer of the Senate but not quite a vice-chancellor as the term was understood outside Queensland. Although he was heavily involved in taking and implementing academic decisions and readily available to academics who wished to speak to him, he was not himself one of the academics and did not pretend to be what he was not. His absence from the Professorial Board and from the meetings of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee compelled the
emergence of an academic leader from within the teaching staff and successive presidents of the board, Stable, Jones, and Schonell, carried on many of the duties of a modern vice-chancellor. This arrangement appears to have worked because talented individuals sought and enjoyed the prestige and influence of the presidency, but such a cheap and expedient solution to university leadership and administration could not last indefinitely. The Staff Association, without wishing to reflect on the existing vice-chancellor, sought in 1953 to bring Queensland into line with other universities and argued that the size and complexity of the modern institution demanded a full-time paid head. Amendments to the University Act prepared the way for such an appointment; in the meantime the university continued to enjoy the free services of its senior executive. 23

Story is remembered with a variety of conflicting emotions. Many recall his considerable talents as an administrator, his grasp of what was happening, and his capacity to plan and make the most of limited resources. A modest man not given to self indulgence, he is remembered for his bus-ride to work and his walks along George Street in preference to taxi-rides, rather than for his Wednesday afternoon golf or the Corio whisky which he preferred to Scotch. He was approachable, considerate, energetic, and of acute perception, to the end selflessly devoted to promoting the interests of the state and people of the Queensland to which he had come as a boy. He would, it is said, have built more and done more if the money had been available; it was the opportunity not the perception that was lacking. 24

His critics believe that, as a public servant in a vice-chancellor’s office and lacking a university background, he was inherently incapable of understanding that the university was not a branch of the public service which needed to harmonize with the designs of governments and be run as economically as possible. He has been criticized for his tight, sometimes secretive, control of finances, his personal dominance, and his general scepticism about academics and their capacity to exercise power. A few academics had personal experiences which caused them to believe that J.D. Story had the sympathy and the breadth of vision necessary to lead and inspire as well as to administer, but others believed that his control and influence prolonged unduly the adolescence of the university and looked to academic leadership freed from the constraints of government, if this were possible, to take the university into adulthood. 25
Story’s paternalistic authority was wielded through a judicious management of standing and select committees. There is no doubt that most important decisions that followed from select committees’ reports were initiated by the vice-chancellor, who invariably came to the Senate with an idea to pursue and a proposal on how it should be pursued. He had a clear preference for those committees that were created by and answerable to the Senate over those that were not. In 1952, when the Professorial Board sought to replace the Stabilizing Committee with its own Executive Committee as a body more appropriate for the determination of plans for academic development, Story was quick to remind the board that it was itself only an advisory committee to the Senate. The Senate’s own standing committees, for academic matters, buildings and grounds, the library, publications, and administration and financial affairs (the last vital one chaired by J.D. Story himself
as it always had been and would continue to be even after he ceased to be vice-chancellor), were his preferred means of operation. Between academic years he worked with a small Senate Vacation Committee which varied in composition but would usually include a few other committee chairmen, the president, and the chancellor. Like other vice-chancellors he was doubtless accused of reserving some troublesome issues for the period when the full Senate was not sitting. Like others he was adept at passing on the difficult questions which he did not want to answer to committees that could shoulder some of the less pleasant responsibilities, as when the Combined Advisory Committee was invited in May 1949 to consider the request from the Queensland Temperance League that alcohol should not be served at university functions.

The tactful handling of such a suggestion was essential to good public relations. Despite the great efforts made in the past to associate the university with the community and to break down barriers, there would always be some to say that not enough had been done and that the university was a world unto itself. It might be performing its teaching functions adequately, according to the Courier-Mail in March 1944, but many people were disappointed that it should have done so little to stimulate the general intellectual and cultural life of the state. For a long time, argued the Sunday Mail a year later, the university had maintained a "lofty indifference to the outside world". That this was untrue made it scarcely less damaging, for it was difficult to launch any kind of public appeal for funds against this kind of background. J.D. Story had the idea of bringing out a brochure to let the people of Queensland see that the University of Queensland was not "moribund", as he put it, but still there appeared criticism that people knew far too little of what was happening within the university, especially at St Lucia, and that, it was alleged, was because the University itself has not shown a highly developed sense of public relations”. In June 1945, a decision had been taken to start a University of Queensland Gazette which would publicize some of the main developments within the university and contain some chatty articles designed to excite interest. Senior staff were still actively engaged in promoting local cultural activities through repertory theatre, the Art Gallery, the Royal Queensland Historical Society, or talks on the ABC, but the functioning of the university itself was not receiving the publicity that would persuade people of its value to the community.
In order to try to rectify this a decision was taken in November 1952 to make a university film that could be shown to audiences throughout the state in a three-month publicity tour the following year. The work of producing the film was mostly undertaken by Ernie Hollywood, the splendidly named university photographer, assisted by Professor Cummings from architecture, but the task of taking it round Queensland was carried out by Associate Professor Frederick W. Whitehouse from geology and mineralogy and Bruce Green from administration. Their visits attracted good crowds throughout the state, their reports suggested great enthusiasm for their purpose, and the response of local dignitaries who wrote to the registrar was most gratifying. J.D. Story judged the publicity tour "a very fine piece of work" which should be followed by very carefully planned approaches to industry to encourage leaders to show their appreciation in tangible ways. The idea, and the language, have a modern ring, but it required a more professional operation to implement them than these amateur efforts of good men. Two years later the vice-chancellor organized a conference at the university for the heads of secondary schools to display the university's assets and offer guidance for intending students. With an eye again to good publicity he maintained that such a conference "if well staged and well managed might be made an Educational highlight of 1955". His scheme was supplemented by a pro-Distinguished visitors, St Lucia, October 1954: Dame Sybil Thorndyke and Sir Lewis Casson (Fryer Library)
posal from Professor Schonell for another film on "University Education" for showing in secondary schools, and the professor of education was empowered to produce this in association with the successful team of 1953.  

This was a year full of publicity schemes. In May, Archbishop Duhig suggested the writing of a university history that would commemorate the achievements of the founders and a committee was set up to back this project. In August an invitation was issued to country people visiting Brisbane for Exhibition Week to make a trip out to St Lucia part of their programme. Fifteen hundred copies of the brochure "Community Support for the University" were to be available for their gentle seduction, a sample bag of the good things at St Lucia waiting to be expanded through their patronage.

Much the most important aspect of the university's public relations during this period was its relations with the government of the state of Queensland, and there is little doubt that the decades of the 1940s and 1950s were the most difficult phase in these relations. On 15 October 1941 a bill was introduced into parliament with the slightly ominous title of "The National Education Coordination and University of Queensland Acts Amendment Bill", ominous because coordination was said to mean greater cooperation between the Department of Public Instruction and the university in a scheme for ensuring that "the state and the University shall discharge jointly and in cooperation their national obligations in the interests of a sound national educational policy". This was to be achieved by the creation of new bodies, an Academic Standing Committee of the Senate chaired by the director-general of education, a Board of Post-Primary Studies representing all the educational interests in the state, including the university, and a University Scholarships Board of mixed composition. It was a Bill, according to Premier Forgan Smith, to create machinery for controlling education from the kindergarten stage through to the university, and the university was to be integrated into a national pattern jointly determined rather than to continue its existing role of self-determination and control over the whole secondary system and the fixing of matriculation requirements. To equip the university for its new role it was in future to have a "more representative" Senate consisting of nine elected members chosen by the University Council, the president of the Professorial Board, the director-general, and fourteen nominated members. A Senate composed equally of elected and nominated members
was to be replaced by one in which government nominees would have a clear majority.30

It is ironical that Francis Nicklin, for the Opposition, immediately welcomed the proposals for altering the composition of the Senate as wise ones, enabling the greater representation of commercial and agricultural interests on that body. It is even more ironical that the University Senate, the body under discussion, should have offered not the slightest reaction to the Bill and that the academic staff, labouring still under their gagging clause, should not have found this the occasion for questioning the restraints laid upon them. In the absence of the leaders of the academic community, it was the Students Union which took up the debate. Semper opened its columns to the honorary professor of pathology, Dr J.V. Duhig, who reasoned that a nominated Senate was not the best way to ensure that the state was well served by the university. In more journalistic phrases Semper pronounced “Government to Grab Varsity” and “A Dangerous Piece of Legislation”, and asked “How’s Your Goose-stepping?” A student meeting voted 180 to 2 against the Bill and the Students Union president, R.S. Hopkins, a later president of the Alumni Association and member of Senate, had the temerity to convey these results personally to the premier and express university opposition to the measure. This interview, reported accurately in the Courier-Mail according to the students but inaccurately according to the premier who was represented as a bully who meant to have his way, did at least help to promote the debate that the Senate and the academics had declined to initiate, and the parliamentary Opposition were now inclined to see problems where previously they had seen only reason and light. They began to talk of the “certain monopolistic and totalitarian powers to be taken by the present Government”, being particularly suspicious of a strange clause that seemed to empower the government to conscript professors into whatever service was required of them. They feared, too, that if the university were seen to be so much the creation of the state there would be no incentive to private citizens to give it help, which they had shown little inclination to do anyway.31

Such taunts and challenges provoked the premier and his supporters into retaliatory comments that confirmed the worst fears of the opponents of the Bill; whether they were spoken merely in the heat of the moment or were truly indicative of deeply held conviction is difficult to say. Besides reiterating in various ways the old adage about paying the piper and calling
the tune, and not unreasonably questioning the way in which secondary education within the state had for a long time been dominated by university needs, they questioned, like the Queensland Teachers Union, the very need for a Senate and demanded a departmental assumption of control. They asked how government control of the university was any different from control of secondary schools, and again questioned the value of academic teaching as opposed to what was useful or likely to produce a more just society. H.R. Moorhouse, the member for Windsor, even condemned the idea that private benefactors should possess the right to contribute to the financing of an institution which was the state’s responsibility.

The premier, as he appears to have promised the student president, did win the day, though it was thought inopportune to implement the Act at once. The 1944 Senate was the first one to be constituted under the new legislation. The moving power behind it is uncertain. The premier had certainly become intensely irritated with the university over mounting costs, building problems, and the WEA in 1939, and he personally emphasized the inability of the university to live within its means during the debates. Yet the educational philosophy, almost the “cradle to the grave” ideology of the 1942 Beveridge Report, was that frequently expressed by J.D. Story during his years at the Department of Public Instruction and afterwards. He was supposed to be a willing enough partner to the director of education, L.D. Edwards, in bringing the university into line.

J.D. Story had been the government minder over the university for thirty years and there is little to suggest that he abandoned this role on his retirement from the public service. Indeed, Semper commented in April 1944 that his value to the government had been ratified by his retention as an adviser on major public works. That he had other duties seems to be clearly indicated by Premier Forgan Smith’s letter to the chancellor on 6 September, when he reported, “Mr Story (as my Liaison Officer, and at my request) has indicated to me the lines on which a comprehensive University review might be made”; this was a review intended to involve thorough association with the Department of Public Instruction.

Some would have said that J.D. Story had a conflict of interest and loyalty, but he never saw his position in this light. In April 1947 he was still seeking to establish university machinery to ensure and promote “a national coordinated
system of education in the state of Queensland', and he was always sensitive to the possibility that what might happen at the university could be contrary to the wishes of the government. In March 1948 he banned a lecturer from the Trades and Labour Council who was scheduled to address the Radical Club on the current strike with the words: "It is considered that the duty incumbent on the University to remain neutral in political matters makes it inadvisable for such a speech to be made here when a state of emergency has been proclaimed." A more unambiguously neutral stance was taken in May 1955 when the Labor Party committed itself to free university education: "It has now become Government policy, and I can make no comment on its advisability or what it will mean to higher education in Queensland." There was in fact no danger of precipitate action, for Premier Gair reminded people, in not unfamiliar language, that the government’s first duty was to provide adequate education for primary and secondary school pupils.35

It is difficult to know how far the criticisms that followed the implementation of the Act were justified and how far they represented the determination of individuals to demonstrate that their earlier fears had been well founded. There was repeated criticism in the Sunday Mail through June 1945 of the stranglehold which the government was supposed to have on the administrative system of the university, said by the Queensland branch president of the BMA to be particularly frustrating to the medical profession and their enthusiasm for developing medical education. The doctors were more concerned about financial constraints, bureaucratic procedures, and the relations of their profession with the Hospitals Board than with the supposed threat to "the right of the University to remain an unregimented voice". This last surfaced again in May 1951 when a paper at the ANZAAS conference criticized the Queensland government for practising a "gerrymander" and the author was strongly criticized in parliament. Again in 1953 criticism of the proposed Newspapers Bill provoked the attorney-general into making the threatening remark that the government would have to look at how it was spending its money.36

Control of the purse strings was the ultimate sanction. Usually members of parliament would be content to emphasize the size of the state government’s contribution to university finance and stress generally the obligation of governments to ensure that public expenditure was in the
public interest, something the next generation would call “accountability”. Indeed, it is the opinion of many that the possession of financial control made any other kind quite unnecessary. If the government chose to have a nominated majority in the Senate, it was not because it needed one to keep the university in line or because it actually proposed to stack the Senate with its supporters and keep them under instruction. And there is little evidence that government nominees behaved in a recognizably different way from elected members, except perhaps that they were less punctilious over attendance.

One who did throw himself wholeheartedly into the university cause was Forgan Smith, the ex-premier whose 1941 legislation had caused such a fluttering in the dovecotes. When the ex-cop joined the robbers, quickly rising to the senior position of chancellor of the university, he was immediately responsible for a classic defence of academic freedom. At the degree ceremony of April 1945, he upheld “the complete freedom for University teaching staff and students to seek truth in discussion and research”, thereby encouraging the alternative view of the responsibilities of a government which financed a university. These were accepted by J.C.A. Pizzey in November 1951, when he commended a vote of over £370,000 for the university which had not one member of its staff as a member of a government department; he hoped the University of Queensland would always retain complete independence in its administration and research. That it was so far successful in this was claimed by Professor Gordon Greenwood in July of that year when he testified that the power of government had never been used to suppress the independent judgment of the university. He even produced a quotation from Forgan Smith’s successor as premier, E.M. Hanlon: “The University is a centre in which there should be no restrictions of anybody’s line of thought whatever.” The biggest crisis in the university’s relations with the state government was to come in 1957, when an Amending Bill slightly enlarged the University Senate without disturbing much the distribution of representation within it.37

In any relationship between the university and the state it was the invariable lot of the university to play the role of financial petitioner, going cap in hand to the government to finance its projects and eventually to pay the difference between running expenses and an annual endowment related to pre-war costs. This dependence was the essence of the
relationship between the two institutions and must always militate against any declaration of independence. The university could never afford the cost of such a gesture for it was funded and financed by the state, and never succeeded in attracting private funds of a kind that would permit self-assertion. The deaths of Dr Mayne and his sister in 1939 and 1940 brought property valued for probate at almost £200,000, in Queen Street and elsewhere, into the hands of the university, to produce an income to be used primarily to assist the Medical Faculty. The greatest and most consistent of the university benefactors had made their final contribution, and it was appropriate that the Medical Faculty should have attracted money to the university, for it had been largely responsible for the exhaustion of the McCaughey funds that came from the earliest of the university’s major bequests. Income from such sources, calculated to be about 40 per cent of the pre-war total, was believed to have dropped to a mere 4 per cent by 1946, despite the income from the Mayne Estate. Increasing salaries, a drastic fall in the income from student fees and the unexpected costs of medicine and veterinary science had thrown the university into a deficit situation by 1942, and it was never to re-emerge except through the willingness of the state government to cover the increased expenditure above the annual endowment that every year would now bring.

In 1944 there were prospects of almost £32,000 to be spent on new equipment and £15,000 on extra staff, and 1945 produced a full and frank discussion on finance with the acting premier; the deficits continued despite a higher fee from increased enrolments, and in 1947 the vice-chancellor submitted a five-year plan on university finance. He was aware of increased government contribution to universities in the United Kingdom and he was asking for a similar assessment of state needs and university requirements in Queensland. The year 1948 brought an estimated deficit of a further £71,000. Salaries were now running at 60 per cent of the annual bill, which then seemed a high proportion, and the university was becoming conscious of what was termed “uncontrollable” expenditure: the costs and salary rises that had to be met even if the university simply stood still, which it was not doing. The vice-chancellor asked the state to consider education as a social service of the highest importance, and invited the government to take up the slack created by a universally felt wish to keep Queensland a low-fee university. The university had, he suggested in 1949, been “pursued by a kind of finan-
cial hoodoo almost since birth”, and to combat this he needed bigger contributions from the state and some idea of what would happen when Commonwealth payments through the reconstruction scheme tapered off. The state declined to put up its annual endowment from £40,000 to £100,000, though it was already being asked to cover deficits of that amount beyond its statutory payments and by 1952 was contributing more than £400,000 to the university’s income. In 1950 the vice-chancellor was reporting that the financial position had become “somewhat acute” and appealed again for public support for a service said to be essential and not a luxury.

In April of that year Story produced his report for the Commonwealth committee of inquiry into university finance and needs, in which he identified Queensland’s special problems: its evening and external students, its role in conducting public examinations, the scattered nature of its buildings, and absence of bequests arising from the popular belief that the university was the government’s responsibility, all these factors compounding the problems of rising costs and inflation. Through 1951 university finance was the subject of various discussions between the Senate and the state government on the one hand and the state and Commonwealth authorities on the other. As the Commonwealth began to contribute £125,000 to the University of Queensland’s expenditure, the state faced ever higher demands for special grants, and fees were virtually doubled. By 1952 annual expenditure was about £750,000, most of the expenses falling into the “uncontrollable” category, and the extra having to be sought from the state. The Commonwealth was now supposedly contributing £1 for every £3 received by the university over the statutory endowment, but as the contribution was pegged at a maximum of £125,000 the university felt that it was being badly treated at federal level. In 1953 the Commonwealth declined to pay an extra £60,000 to which the university claimed a moral entitlement, and the state government, unhappy to observe additional staff, rising costs, and apparently falling enrolments, continued to pick up the mounting bills and hope that the federal government would relieve them.

In 1954 fees were raised again, 70 per cent in medicine and 100 per cent in other faculties, though these were not to be implemented before 1955. J.D. Story prepared to supply the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee with information on university needs over the next ten years, based on an assumption that there would be a 25 per cent student growth by 1959.
and a 50 per cent growth by 1964. The Commonwealth was now contributing £160,000 under a new Act and the state government was being asked for almost £500,000; yet one year later, in 1955, the state was being asked, and was agreeing, to provide £615,000 to attract a full Commonwealth grant of £196,000, and the university was now a million-pound-a-year operation, having been a mere £50,000 exercise at the beginning of the war.41

From the university’s point of view the situation, even with the most careful planning and husbanding of resources by J.D. Story, was now totally out of control. Each year now it was simply a question of how big a bill would be left for the state government to pick up and how long they would continue to accept this obligation. For the state government it was a question of how long they would have to face this frightening cost that got worse every year and how soon they would be released from their torment by the Commonwealth government. That this exercise lasted so long is itself a tribute to the skill of J.D. Story in extracting ever larger sums from governments for expansion instead of being willing to accept the apparent financial constraints of his position.

The developing role of the Commonwealth in the affairs of the University of Queensland was to be the university’s great hope for salvation and financial stability. The process began during 1942 with the appointment of a Universities Commission under Professor R.C. Mills, the creation of reserved areas and Commonwealth scholarships, and the new status of universities as an industry vital to national survival. Scientific Man Power Advisory Committees and Sub-Committees in Queensland were chaired by Professors Parnell and Richards in their respective areas to ensure that skilled men were not simply absorbed by the army, and the Universities Commission reciprocally selected students to fill university quotas while university staff selected members of the public for work of national service. The universities were expected, even required, to cooperate with the Commonwealth government in wartime and again under the Reconstruction Training Scheme, and in return the government accepted the obligation to pay the costs of these activities; post-war scholarships were less a reward for being in the services than a “means of satisfactory re-establishment in civilian life in accordance with the needs of social and economic post-war reconstruction”. So too were Commonwealth contributions to teaching costs seen as part of post-war reconstruction, though individual univer-
sities inevitably haggled over definitions and their legitimate entitlements. By contributing £2 for £1 on full-time student fees and £1 for part-timers, and contributing towards the cost of extra necessary appointments, the Commonwealth government provided something like 18 per cent of the university's income from 1946. This helped to see the university through the post-war years of high student enrolments, and as those payments came to an end in 1950 the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee made inquiries of what the various universities would need from the Commonwealth in the 1950s if they were to continue to do their job. Queensland Vice-Chancellor Story suggested that £190,000 would be a reasonable Commonwealth contribution and sought at least £156,000, a calculation which had the backing of the Senate, but one which exceeded the figure of £125,000 which was set as the limit that Queensland could reach whatever its other income. Although the Commonwealth declined to raise this in 1953, the contribution was lifted in 1954 and again in 1955.42

In August 1954, J.D. Story was occupied in the familiar business of briefing the state government, this time on the need for it to take a stronger line with the Commonwealth government on its interests and obligations concerning universities. This time there could be no possible disagreement about the vice-chancellor's position as an adviser to the state government, for both the state and the university were felt to have a strong common interest in shifting the burdens of university finance as far as was possible on to the shoulders of the people in Canberra. It remained to be seen how successful this exercise would be and what kind of political demands the new paymasters might choose to make.43
Part Five

Towards Expansion, 1956–1968
On 5 April 1957, the University of Queensland was officially notified of the proposed inquiry, instigated by the Commonwealth government, of the Committee on Australian Universities. It was chaired by Sir Keith Murray, chairman of the University Grants Committee in Great Britain, and its first requirement was the completion of a questionnaire and the supplying of information by the end of May. Large sums of money were at stake in this exercise and it was comprehensively undertaken by J.D. Story, who assembled a complete statistical account of the university, its past development, its present state, and its future needs.

Story began by reminding the Murray Committee of the purpose for which the university had been established as it was defined in the 1909 Act: to promote sound learning, to encourage research and innovation, and to provide a liberal and practical education for the pursuits and professions of Queensland. From this state context he moved cleverly to the national one and argued that the relationship between the Commonwealth and the University of Queensland embraced very directly the provision of food, health, education, and administrative services for the whole country. He sought Commonwealth backing on behalf of a university for Australia, not simply a university for Queensland. This meant money for academic expansion and maintenance but much more money for capital expenditure on buildings. He requested £3,380,000 for St Lucia projects and a further £1,375,000 for
medical and medical science buildings. Specifically excluded were requests for the establishment of an additional university in Queensland and even university colleges, which were adjudged "not likely to be warranted in the foreseeable future". The Students Union also presented a submission, predictably emphasizing their need for a union building, welfare services, and political representation on the Senate, and less predictably submitting academic proposals for the introduction of Australian literature, Eastern studies, and the building of a University Teaching Hospital at St Lucia.

The Murray Committee visited Queensland over the period 23–26 July, having previously indicated their wish for an informal occasion with no publicity, no speeches, and no lavish entertainment. Their declared austerity boded ill for the would-be beneficiaries of their visit, but Sir Keith Murray began his stay in Brisbane with a public statement that the big problem facing Australian universities was the need for more finance, and that sounded promising. When the committee reported in November it was revealed that the University of Queensland was to receive emergency grants of £607,500 over the next three years to remedy urgent deficiencies in equipment and services and to increase salaries. There was also to be a building grant of more than £1,500,000, providing the state undertook to match the Commonwealth on a pound for pound basis. Premier Nicklin responded quickly, saying that the Queensland government would "gladly accept" its share of these expenses.

These sums of money, though large in relation to the existing annual budget and a welcome relief to a beleaguered Finance Committee, would soon appear a less-than-adequate response to the university's needs. They were also given in return for a tacit understanding that the university would be quick to respond to criticisms that the Murray Committee had to make about Australian universities in general: their high failure rates, the low numbers of Honours and postgraduate students, and the weakness of research. Such a response would lead the university into expansion policies of trying to improve staff–student ratios, extending the tutorial system, and developing postgraduate and research activities.

The immediate Commonwealth subsidies were, however, less important in themselves than for the principles which they introduced. As the vice-chancellor informed the Senate in December 1957, the university was now merely a third party to Commonwealth and state action, and its own ability to
An Exercise in Partnership

manoeuvre would be determined almost entirely by the decisions and cooperation of the two governmental bodies. Furthermore, the Murray Committee had included in its recommendations a proposal for a permanent University Grants Committee to advise on the financial needs of universities. From the beginning of 1958 a new and clear form of relationship of Commonwealth, state, and university would develop, and the Grants Committee would require a regular and detailed system of reporting and accounting. The relative contributions of the university’s two paymasters remained to be worked out in practice. So too did the extent of their political control over the institution which they would finance. The prospect of increased Canberra influence seemed a menacing one to some observers, but it was the Queensland government which did in fact cause the greater concern in these years.4

The point at issue, which created what was undoubtedly the biggest crisis, albeit one of short duration, in the university’s relations with the government throughout its entire history, was the University of Queensland Acts Amendment Bill, which was introduced into parliament on 21 March 1957. Most of the proposed legislation was fairly inoffensive. Membership of the Senate was to be increased from twenty-five to twenty-nine by the addition of a Staff Association representative and a salaried vice-chancellor who could in future be chosen from outside the ranks of the Senate. Graduates of the university were to become eligible for membership of the University Council immediately on graduation, a sensible change, and an innocuous clause foreshadowed the establishment of provincial centres capable of teaching to university standard, which had been part of the philosophy of the original Act of 1909. These clauses were unexceptionable, and the early discussion of the Bill in the Legislative Assembly concerned little more than expressions of government pride at the state contribution to university finances, 55.7 per cent in 1956, and the familiar regrets of northern members that their parts were being neglected.5

What produced the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary storm a few days later was a clause to establish an appeals provision for university staff against appointments, punishments, and dismissals. An Appeals Board, consisting of the representative of the appellant, one Senate representative, and a government-nominated chairman, could be appointed at the request of a staff member who believed himself unjustly treated by his employer. According to the minister for public
instruction, L.F. Diplock, the appeals clause had been introduced to protect the Senate; according to the premier, Vince Gair, it had been put there to protect members of staff against the mistakes of the Senate and to allow them the same kind of protection as employees in the public service who felt themselves unjustly treated.⁶

The reason for the government’s decision to introduce the appeals clause was hinted at by Opposition members, understood well enough by members of the university staff, and explained to some extent by the premier himself though without reference to the Catholic/Masonic antipathy that had generated suspicion and accusation. It was expressed in the government’s dissatisfaction with the procedure followed by the Senate in recent appointments which had resulted in several chairs being filled by outside applicants, chosen in preference to internal candidates with many years of service. In specifying the case that had finally caused the government to act, Premier Gair also gave details of an earlier case where the university had been saved from an external appointment by the willingness of the Senate to overturn the recommendation of an appointing committee, which had put forward a candidate of Polish extraction against the claims of a local candidate. On that occasion, claimed the premier, the Senate had done its job properly and avoided a public scandal, but on other occasions the Senate had allowed external applicants to prevail.⁷

Gair’s xenophobia was compounded by the remarks of Tom Aikens, who took the opportunity to express his dislike of “New Australians” as well as to question the truthfulness of academic referees from 10,000 miles’ distance. He also made a generalized attack on snobbery of university staff, “the favouritism, wire-pulling, and nepotism” which had characterized appointments, “the queer birds they have put on”, and the qualifications and references on the basis of which appointments were made, suggesting that there would be “nothing as revealing and as purifying as the light of public opinion and public knowledge” on the sinister procedures of the university. But the most revealing comment of all was the admission of Premier Gair that he could not understand why the one clause had created such a fuss.

Opposition members tried to explain. Their leader, F.R. Nicklin, inferred from the proposed legislation that it was intended to take away from the Senate the right of final decisions on appointments; others talked of academic enslavement,
particularly to be feared in the one university in the "free world" where government nominees had a preponderance in the governing body. One member talked quite reasonably about government control driving away potential donors to the university; another, less reasonably, defended the need for complete university autonomy by speaking of "Fascist and Iron Curtain ideas" and envisaging the possibility of Communist government for Queensland in the future. Their most effective speaker, J.D. Herbert, relied heavily on a Staff Association document for his speech, for which he was strongly criticized, but he succeeded in imparting to parliament the concerns of the academic staff: that the Bill constituted a gross infringement of self-government; that Queensland would become the only Commonwealth university not to control its own promotions and appointments; that universities were not part of the public service; and that seniority was not the appropriate basis for appointment or promotion.

Within the university staff there was a small amount of support for the Bill, for the staff contained members whose claims to recognition were based mainly on their seniority and it was these people whom the government was attempting to protect. The overwhelming majority, however, reflected by the Professorial Board and Staff Association votes, were fiercely opposed to it, and during the last days of March and early April they mobilized a massive popular campaign against the measure of a kind never witnessed before or afterwards. Although the premier refused to receive a Staff Association deputation, that body moved in other directions, taking the unprecedented step of keeping the student body fully informed of developments and inviting its cooperation. While the staff lobbied members of parliament and staged a huge public protest meeting in City Hall, which was addressed by representatives of other Australian universities as well as the officers of the Staff Association, the students organized petitions among themselves, collected signatures from the householders of Brisbane, and distributed Semper to spread their message of discontent. Quite apart from the principle involved, this exercise in staff political participation and staff-student cooperation gave a tremendous boost to university morale and was to pass down into the oral traditions of the university community as "their finest hour". It also acquired a certain romantic folklore as senior members of the university came to believe in the time when they brought down the Gair government.8
Observing these developments with slightly less detachment than usual was the University Senate, the body under threat. Despite its nominated majority it could hardly welcome this undermining of its authority and integrity, particularly as members had themselves received an appeal from the disappointed applicant whose cause the government had chosen to adopt. One lay member expressed disquiet at academic staff who were alleged to be giving up lecture time to attack the Bill, but the chancellor reported his great concern for what was at stake and gave an account of his own interview with the premier. The vice-chancellor, J.D. Story, was in something of a quandary. For so long regarded as the government's man and so commonly believed to equate the university to a branch of the public service, he must now recognize the immense alienation that had occurred from the government and attempt to repair the damage. His ambiguous position was to be highlighted at the October meeting of the Senate when he himself argued in favour of new appointments procedures and maintained that the Appeals Board would never have been heard of if past procedures had been entirely satisfactory. In the heat of the crisis he attempted conciliation by proposing a review committee and suggesting that the government be asked to delay the proclamation of the new Act. This latter ploy was forestalled by the premier, who had two days earlier, on 9 April, invited the governor to proclaim
it immediately on the grounds that it had passed its third reading on 28 March without a formal division. It was a short-lived triumph for the government, which fell shortly afterwards, in very small part because of its handling of this measure, but it would be a mistake to suppose that it fell because the professors from St Lucia came to town. The new government repealed the offending clause, but they took a further eight years to move on the issue of the government-nominated Senate majority, which they had found so unacceptable to them as the Opposition.9

When new legislation was finally introduced in November 1965, it came, according to the minister, J.C.A. Pizzey, in response to the wish of the Senate to re-examine its constitution and broaden its composition. Most of the Senate’s recommendations had, he said, been incorporated in the new Bill. This was a novel occurrence. In the past, governments had legislated either in the face of apparent Senate indifference or, in 1957, against the Senate’s wishes. Now the government was being prompted by the Senate, which had appointed a committee to consider the revision of the University Act as early as August 1963. The University Council, the Staff Association, and the Students Union had all contributed to the debate, but the committee’s report, when discussed in July 1965, revealed certain divisions within the Senate about both the contents of the recommendations and how they should be presented to the government. There was no agreement, for instance, on the extent to which the academic staff and the government should be represented on future Senates, and there was an obvious unwillingness on the part of the vice-chancellor to upset the government by appearing to present a set of demands which included one for the elimination of the government’s majority.10

Eventually the proposals were presented and a Bill drafted. The Senate was to be increased from twenty-seven to thirty-three, with extra seats going to a Professorial Board representative, a member of the graduate body to be selected by the Students Union Council (for, said Mr Pizzey, “obviously we could not have an undergraduate sitting in at a Senate meeting”), one more to the University Council, renamed Convocation, and one to represent the University College of Townsville. Two further members could be co-opted by the Senate, and the three Church representatives, the two Archbishops and the Council of Churches nominee, were to be there by right rather than by convention. Although the pro-
posed changes seem less than radical, they did shift the balance within the Senate and leave only a minority of eleven places to be filled by government nominees.  

Other clauses in the Bill relegated the Academic Standing Committee to the same status as other standing committees of the Senate and removed earlier references to the equal treatment to be accorded to people of both genders and all religious creeds, specifications thought to be no longer necessary in an enlightened age which would not contemplate discrimination on religious or gender grounds.

The parliamentary debate, unlike so many of its predecessors, was curiously refreshing in tone, with the Opposition leader outreaching the minister in his declared concern for building up a university which offered the research opportunities and facilities to attract the very best staff and which would be able to supply all the needs of the community for Honours graduates and professionally trained people in many walks of life. Inevitably some of the old favourite themes returned. The Opposition was not happy to be handing over autonomy to the university when the state was spending heavily and not getting all the graduates it needed. Nor had Mr Aikens mellowed with the years. He believed that the time was ripe for more not less government control and he listed a number of grievances old and new: the “never-ending succession of pretentious, palatial buildings”; the thirty-week year allegedly worked by academic staff; the social snobbery attached to the university. He still lamented the existence of a system allegedly inherited from Great Britain, and he demanded that no more money should be spent on the university other than what was strictly necessary for the development and expansion of Queensland.

There was strong opposition too from both the staff and student members of the university. For the latter the Bill, though allowing them a little progress towards Senate representation, remained paternalistic and did not permit direct representation. For the former the Bill seemed a deliberate attempt to withhold from the academics an opportunity for a substantial voice in university government. No more than two staff members could be elected in the Convocation group, and these, along with the president of the Professorial Board and the other board member, permitted no more than four members of academic staff, excluding the vice-chancellor, to membership of a body of thirty-three. Like the students, the staff also condemned the removal of the
statutory requirement for religious and gender equality and the guaranteed places for three representatives of the churches. There was some women’s protest too at what was seen as a retrograde step for women’s rights. Most public campaigning, however, was undertaken by the Staff Association, which demanded the right to at least seven staff places on the Senate and attempted to publicize its cause through a further public meeting in the Albert Hall in March 1966. The Senate attempted to accommodate this discontent by appointing a committee to consider the revision of the new Act, but though the committee was willing to voice the complaints of the staff the Senate was less than enthusiastic about endorsing them and rejected committee recommendations on both the questions of staff and church representation.12

The government majority had gone but the financial control remained and Semper reported in July 1966 what it called the growing alarm at the reduction of university independence in an era when the university needed huge government subsidies and the students were increasingly dependent on various government sources for the payment of their fees. This was a general fear of the constraints that governments could impose on university activities of all kinds through their economic control, but there was still a fear that a more direct and overt political control might be exercised on individuals by the same means. Queensland governments had always displayed an incredible sensitivity to any suggestion of political criticism by students during their Commemoration parade. Their reaction to such criticism from staff members had usually been to suggest that it was unacceptable from people who were on the public payroll. This was the gist of the state treasurer’s remarks in October 1956 when staff members of the Department of Politics were critical of the operations of his government department, remarks which prompted a Staff Association statement on the university staff’s freedom to make public comment as well as to teach and investigate. With the new legislation of 1957, which brought the government into the area of staff discipline, “the intimidation of University teachers”, according to Professor Duhig, “which has been practised directly and indirectly in the past will be worse than ever”.13

In the event the clause was repealed and there were few examples of overt intimidation, until the civil rights demonstrations concerning both staff and students in September 1967 caused members of the university community
to consider again their rights and obligations as members of society. Following the arrests of some of these demonstrators, the Professorial Board, in an unprecedented move, offered the belief that a dangerous situation existed on the civil rights issue and the advice that it would be better to amend the law so that one man did not have the discretionary power over permits for protest demonstrations. Some members expressed concern that the Professorial Board should be making a statement of this kind, and the motion passed by a majority of only two, but pass it did and the professors thereby fulfilled the request of the *Courier-Mail* twenty years earlier that university staff should begin to participate more fully in public life and comment on public affairs. Such participation, particularly from those staff members who had been arrested and charged with breaking the laws of the state and inciting others to do the same, was not, of course, welcomed by the parliamentarians, who questioned ministers for several days about the academics’ supposed dereliction of duty in taking part in demonstrations when they should have been teaching.¹⁴

Parliament’s fury reached new heights in November 1968, after one member of academic staff had allegedly declared a willingness to fight for the Viet Cong against Australians. This caused one member to inquire if treason had been committed and whether appropriate action would be taken against the individual concerned. The minister for education calmly replied that the Senate had the full power to take whatever disciplinary action was considered necessary. Two days later a member sought an inquiry to find out if the university was being used for political purposes, particularly to disseminate ALP/Communist propaganda, which he lumped together in one evil package. What the government, the Opposition, and even the governors of the university were having to face, for almost the first time in the university’s history, was the fact that many members of the university believed that they had a duty as well as a right to initiate discussion and debate on a whole range of issues that had either never arisen before or had been considered sacrosanct. This was how they perceived their role within the community, and they believed it to be just as legitimate as that of training school teachers or doctors. By 1968 it was less a question of the political role of the government in the university than of the political role of the university within the community.¹⁵

Throughout these difficult years of adjusting relationships within the trio of Commonwealth, state, and university, the
key element was always finance. Without it the university could not survive, and those who provided the means of survival would always be in a position to exact certain terms for its provision. Even before the Murray Committee the Commonwealth was already providing more than £250,000 towards a total budget of £1,000,000 which the university reached in 1956, and though the sums of money increased and the Commonwealth contributions became a more assured source of supply, its proportional contribution to university spending did not change dramatically during this period and stood at no more than 34 per cent in 1967. Similarly, the state government contribution, which had been nearly 57 per cent in 1956, was still 41 per cent in 1967, by which time huge sums of money were being paid annually from the state treasury to the university. The two authorities were sharing the capital costs of providing university buildings, but so great was the expansion in the period 1956–68 and so great were the strains imposed by rising costs and inflation that the exercise in partnership between state and Commonwealth appeared to bring little relief to the state treasury in meeting its payments to the university. Nor did the university, drawing increasingly from the two sources, appear to move any nearer to having enough money to meet its needs or away from a situation of near continuous financial crisis.16

The new era, as J.D. Story told the Senate in October 1959 on the eve of his retirement as vice-chancellor, though not as chairman of the Finance Committee, had brought a phenomenal demand for education at the tertiary level. It was thus the duty of the Senate to satisfy that demand and prepare for the greater flow of students who would be seeking tertiary education in the 1960s as the post-war bulge came through to the university level and supplemented the already fast-growing demand. The university had spent almost £2,000,000 in 1959, nearly doubling its expenditure since 1956, and the progression was expected to continue. Story argued that only a pound-for-pound basis between Commonwealth and state would be adequate to meet the needs of the situation — half shares of running costs as well as those of building. But the federal government accepted no more than a willingness to contribute one pound for every 1.85 pounds raised through state contributions and student fees, up to a maximum figure determined by the Universities Commission. Fee increases were beginning to feature more frequently in the annual budgeting exercise, and more frequent salary increases for ever
greater numbers of staff were carrying salaries towards the 70 per cent mark as a charge on recurrent grants. The year of the Golden Jubilee, 1960, was also a year of financial crisis. The state government expressed great concern at rising university costs, complaining that it could spend only what it had, however great its willingness to help, and urged the Senate to put up fees mid-year and seek further help from the Mayne Trustees for running the expensive departments of medicine and surgery.17

In December 1960, the Finance Committee wryly confessed that working out financial estimates was a “somewhat intriguing” affair, since the state could not determine its own contribution until the Commonwealth had determined what was the maximum available from that source. Calculations had then to be made on what the state needed to do to guarantee that maximum. Despite delays in receiving the figures, it was expected that income and expenditure would be in balance for that year, and Story saw some value in a system which gave the university a figure within which it had to work rather than leaving it free to draft a budget and then apply for money. It brought a measure of stability, providing the Commonwealth grant was sufficient and the state could carry out its part of the bargain.18

The conditions were becoming increasingly difficult to fulfil. In September 1963, Vice-Chancellor Schonell called a special meeting of the Senate to discuss the financial situation facing the university in 1964. He produced figures to show that student members had doubled over the years 1957–63, from 5,615 to 11,466, and were expected to reach 16,500 by 1966, growing particularly fast in the high-cost subjects. Everything was getting out of control: the equipment vote was totally inadequate, as were the library and research votes; Townsville University College was becoming an increasing drain on resources and ought to have its own budget; the absence of quotas and the consequent rise in student numbers meant that staffing, equipment, and maintenance and research were inadequate; existing resources were spread thinly over existing departments; no new developments could be contemplated; a halt would have to be called. The university would need £4,000,000 to pay its way in 1964 and it looked like falling short of that by almost £200,000. The proposed federal grants for the triennium 1964–66 fell below expectation, and it would be necessary to raise fees again and appeal to the charity of the state to pay more than its matching con-
tribution if the university were to survive through 1964 even on a pared budget, of which 80 per cent was deemed uncontrollable and 20 per cent totally committed.¹⁹

Two partial solutions suggested themselves. One was the unpalatable one of contemplating quotas, which offended against the traditional notion of a “people’s university” of free access to those who were qualified to deserve it. The other was to campaign for a second university in Brisbane, for it was realized that Townsville with its 300 students was making only a minimal impact on St Lucia’s growth and that the only substantial relief could be obtained through an alternative university in the main population centre.

One other possibility existed, one that was to haunt, perplex, and frustrate vice-chancellors for another twenty years: to try to secure a better deal for Queensland from the Universities Commission. The commission’s recommendations for the 1964–66 period were seen to be manifestly unfair to Queensland. On their own figures the commission reckoned that the cost of an equivalent full-time student was £540 per year, yet they were proposing to allow the university only a rate of £434 for 1964, £432 for 1965, and £452 for 1966. By this year Queensland would be the lowest funded of all Australian states, which would be receiving finance at the average level of £564 per student. Senate protests, letters from the vice-chancellor to the premier, the prime minister, and the chairman of the Universities Commission, Sir Leslie Martin, failed to shift Queensland from the financial groove where it seemed destined to stay. In 1966 a campaign was mobilized through state senators and members of the House of Representatives to extract assurances that allocations would change in the next triennium, but the university was again to be disappointed, if this time in dollars rather than pounds.²⁰

During the debates on the 1965 University Act, Minister Pizzey wryly announced that it was proposed to remove the reference to the old annual endowment of £40,000 which had become something of an anachronism in view of the state’s current contribution of £3,926,000 to the university’s accounts. He also reported with some pride that the state had always managed to find enough money from somewhere, even in the most difficult times, to allow the university access to the maximum Commonwealth grant. This somewhat disingenuous claim ignored the fact that in the drought year of 1963 the state government had given private notification of the limits of its own possible contribution, which allowed the
Commonwealth grant to be fixed at a lower level — one that the state could publicly match.\textsuperscript{21} In November 1966, the Senate heard that not only was the Commonwealth government unwilling to grant all that the commission had recommended, but also that the state would be unable to match what the Commonwealth government was prepared to make available. This, together with disappointing news of massive cutbacks on capital grants for all states, meant a depressing financial year in 1967. Another salary increase meant more problems, for the state government claimed that it could not meet the entire increase, that the Commonwealth should pay more towards meeting these increases since it got so much of it back in tax anyway, and that fees would have to rise again. In the 1968 budget fees were expected to provide 23.28 per cent of the university’s income, compared with 34.24 per cent from the Commonwealth and 40.06 per cent from the state. A further 1.26 per cent was to come from conducting public examinations, and a mere 1.16 per cent from other sources, which illustrates quite graphically the almost total absence of income from private donations and the almost total dependence on public money. This now came from a Commonwealth–state partnership, but it was not one that brought monetary satisfaction either to the state or to the university. The partnership was showing distinct signs of cracking at the end of 1967, and the bills would continue to mount. The estimated expenditure for 1969 of $14,751,550 represented an increase of more than $2,500,000 on the previous year, which was almost a 20 per cent rise.\textsuperscript{22}

The inability to secure private donations remained a weakness in the university’s capacity to press on with programmes which were considered desirable and in its relationship with its two principal financiers, to whom it must always go as a petitioning dependant. The Senate was not unaware of its failure to secure benefactions but has been criticized for not applying itself strenuously or consistently to this purpose over many years. There was a good deal of talk but very little action, and the only sustained and successful effort was the Great Hall appeal, launched in 1960 but followed by such a period of inactivity as to deter future contributors.\textsuperscript{23}

In spite of the lack of effort and in spite of the impression conveyed by successive governments that the university was their responsibility as a branch of the Department of Public Instruction, there were occasional bright moments to relieve the
gloom on the benefactions scene. In 1956, for instance, parasitology received £12,500 from the Commonwealth Bank, an area of farmland at Redland Bay was given to the university by the Acclimatization Society, and 25,000 shares in Queensland Press Limited were also donated. In 1964 A.L. Nevitt financed a chair in chemistry at Townsville with a gift of stocks and shares worth £114,614, and in the same year the Rockefeller Foundation gave £23,000 for the research station on Heron Island. Throughout these years Archbishop Duhig continued his periodic acts of generosity: along with his gift of seismology equipment to the Department of Geology and Mineralogy, he managed in 1957 to secure for the Department of Classics a collection of twenty-five supposedly unobtainable books, and in 1958 he presented to the university a portrait of the Queen.24

Archbishop Duhig, a nominated member of the Senate for almost half a century, from 1916 to 1965, and an excellent public relations figure on the university’s behalf, represented like J.D. Story a strong element of continuity in its proceedings. It was observed in March 1956 that the new Senate contained twelve out of twenty-five members who were themselves graduates of the University of Queensland, which was a further mark of the university’s maturity. It also contained the new president of the Professorial Board, Professor Fred Schonell, who would shortly be featuring in a different role. Despite the heat that was periodically generated over the
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composition of the Senate and the allegations over the government’s intentions, there is little to suggest that the Senate was ever packed with party men who responded to their leader’s call, and much evidence abounds that men like Sir James Holt, the coordinator-general and a man of great engineering experience, were able to bring their talents into the service of the university.  

In this period, too, the local businessmen played an increasingly prominent part in the life of the Senate. Albert Axon, another graduate of the university who became chancellor in 1957 on the death of Dr Hirschfeld, was keen to have the university more involved with the community, and used his business connections to the university’s advantage during the campaign for funds for the Great Hall. It was also his idea to have the university do more entertaining, and the Golden Jubilee garden party was the outstanding example of this new approach. J.A. Barton, who followed J.D. Story as chairman of the Finance Committee in 1963 when a new Senate convened for the first time without its longest-serving member, brought his experience as a banker to this crucial position. Similarly, Augustus Gehrmann brought to the chairmanship of the Buildings and Grounds Committee his experience as state manager of Australian Paper Mills. An allegation made in June 1959 that “the University Senate is a service branch of the civil service dominated to its confusion by you know who” was a polemical as well as an ungrammatical piece, and if academic staff and students sought to create or increase representation for themselves it was because they believed this was right rather than because there was great discontent with the behaviour of existing members. And if Chancellor Axon believed that student membership of the Senate was quite impracticable in March 1958, the government did at least nominate a very recent student president, John W. Greenwood, to fill a vacancy in March 1960.

The chancellor continued to be much more than the figurehead of British universities, being a member of many Senate committees, a diplomatic link with the state government, and heavily involved in university activities, besides chairing the monthly Senate meetings. In March 1966, Sir Alan Mansfield, as governor-elect, came on to the Senate and into the chancellorship, following precedents of earlier days, and he would in turn be followed by another judge who would become chief justice.

The vice-chancellor’s position, by contrast, changed very
significantly during this period. It had been accepted for some years that J.D. Story’s position was unique and that he would be followed by a full-time paid executive officer in the pattern of other universities. The 1957 University Act made provision for such an appointment and the Murray Committee also stressed the need for a vice-chancellor who would be a member of the Professorial Board. They did in fact see the vice-chancellor as a likely president of the board, in accord with practice elsewhere, which was not an idea that would attract the professoriate. On 13 March 1958, J.D. Story agreed to carry on until the end of the existing Senate but expressed the belief that his successor should be installed for the Fiftieth Anniversary in 1960 to undertake the ceremonial responsibilities, and so it proved. To the end Story remained in George Street, a symbol of the old order, and to the end he refused all efforts to foist an honorary degree upon him. He accepted himself for what he was and asked only that the new administrative block should be named after him, a request that the university was very ready to grant. This was a fitting tribute, as was the comment of T.A. Hiley in the Queensland parliament that “when he retired from the Public Service he made work within the university a labour of love”. In choosing a successor the Senate created a select committee to
consider the conditions of appointment but failed to involve the Professorial Board in this exercise and proceeded to handle the whole business on its own, taking advice only from an advisory body of vice-chancellors and Sir Keith Murray in Britain. There were thirty-two contenders for the position, and it was decided to interview one from Britain, one from interstate, and one New Zealander, as well as the local applicants.28

At the end of the exercise one of the men on the spot got the job, as he so frequently did, but this appointment was seen by many as the logical fulfilment of the previous few years. Professor Schonell had been seen as having the qualities and the reputation necessary for leading the university and he had for some time been exercising leadership of the academics as president of the Professorial Board. In December 1959, he was appointed vice-chancellor from 1 March 1960, and in July 1962 was made a knight. An initial apprehension that the new vice-chancellor was such a pleasant fellow that he could not be a tough administrator was soon dispelled, and the professional administrators were quick to appreciate the difference in having a permanent academic head who was present and in control. Whereas Story was always seen to be part of the educational network emanating from the state Department of Public Instruction, Schonell was a man of international reputation, whose membership of national bodies such as the Martin Committee, which recommended on the Colleges of Advanced Education, allowed him to mingle with figures of importance at Commonwealth level. He was also a successful politician and innovator within his own university, willing to go round and talk to people to ensure the success of his schemes, such as the promotion of Asian studies against the opposition of the Arts Faculty or training courses for university teachers against traditionalists among his colleagues. His leadership was strengthened from January 1963 by the appointment of Professor Hartley Teakle as the first deputy vice-chancellor.29

As the achievements of the Schonell years, Teakle identified the planning and growth of Townsville University College, the early work on a second Brisbane university, an expanding building programme, and his concern to achieve the higher academic standards and quality desired by Murray in face of the tremendous growth in student numbers. Some of Schonell’s achievements included having greater emphasis placed on undergraduate teaching through induction courses.
for new staff, the withholding of extra staff from departments which did not provide tutorials, and the building up of a tutorial staff who strengthened both the teaching and higher degree activities of the university, whatever problems they would eventually pose for future vice-chancellors. He was seen as so much a benefactor of humanity at large, especially in the field of sub-normal education, "that people should be happy and thankful", according to the Courier-Mail, "that he had been able to make the world a little better". It was the deputy vice-chancellor's lot to deputize for Schonell during the time of his illness in 1968 and to preside over the university following his death, a period of disruption which would again cause the university to feature prominently in the debates of parliament and the pages of local newspapers.

Meanwhile, the Senate found some little difficulty in its relations with its powerful adviser in university government, the Professorial Board. That body had been largely content to function as an advisory body to the Senate, happy in the knowledge that its advice, conveyed by the president, was almost invariably accepted. In November 1958 there occurred a rare breach with the board over the introduction of pharmacy when the Senate changed a board recommendation in a strictly academic matter and implemented the amended version without further reference to the academic body. A more serious division was threatened in 1961 when the board made the unsurprising request to have early access to draft budget plans to assist them in staffing matters, through their Standing Committee, and in the planning of other academic developments. This seemed to J.D. Story, no longer vice-chancellor but still chairman of the Finance Committee, a real challenge to the power of the Senate. The board, he argued, was ceasing to accept an advisory role and challenging to become the supreme determining authority; the Academic Committee would cease to supervise academic policy, the Finance Committee would cease to be the main financial adviser to the Senate, and the vice-chancellor would cease to be the Number One administrator.

It was a surprisingly strong reaction to a proposal that would make academic planning more rational and to a body that had shown no particular lust for power. J.D. Story had already taken steps to involve the board members more in appointments to chairs after the 1957 tussle with the government, and it was inconceivable that it should not be more fully integrated into academic planning. By 1963 it was, with the
Senate's blessing, developing its modern structure by creating an Education Committee to deal with matters coming up from the various faculty boards and with postgraduate studies, having rejected, for the time being, the recommendation of the McElwain Committee that there should be a separate committee for postgraduate affairs. In November 1968, the Senate sought to atone for its earlier oversight by accepting a board proposal that in any future appointment of a vice-chancellor the board should be consulted about the terms of the appointment and directly represented on the appointing committee. The need to implement this decision occurred all too soon.32

Of the other vital sector of university government, the administration, it must be said that only in the 1960s did this branch receive appropriate recognition and sufficient staff to accommodate the needs of the growing institution. In the years 1960-62 the registrar was recognized first as a reader-equivalent position and then placed on a par with a professor, while the assistant registrar moved from senior lecturer to reader status and became deputy registrar. In this period the university began to employ graduates in administrative positions and a process later identified as "professionalization" began to develop. In January 1966 it was reported that no fewer than six female graduates as well as two male graduates were employed in administrative work, and a new breed was clearly in the making. The earlier administrative officers had tended to be represented by former public servants such as Registrar Page Hanify who retired in 1957, fifty-one years after first entering the public service, or the long-serving members such as Lou Livingston, Frank Fentiman, and Bruce Green who had joined the staff as boys from school and worked their way upwards over many years. As an assistant registrar with responsibility for administrative matters, Lou Livingston left a permanent imprint upon the university through his development of the centralized services such as the printery, started initially for external studies, a photography section, the curatorship of microscopes, the purchase of stores and supplies through the government network and, much later, the university garage.33

Although the university appointed its first public relations officer, T.R. Drake, in February 1965, Vice-Chancellor Schonell undoubtedly saw himself as the person with prime responsibility for public relations and did not hesitate to telephone the Courier-Mail and the ABC to give them news
items. Another aspect of this work was the extensive programme of public lectures developed under the chairmanship of Gordon Greenwood and the secretaryship of Ron Lane during the late 1950s for Brisbane and country areas. A further one was to encourage staff to involve themselves within the local community and to counteract the unfavourable publicity usually achieved by Commemoration festivities in the April. This was done through encouraging a wide range of visitors to the university, who would either see for themselves what the place was really like or at least allow it to receive
favourable coverage in the press or other media. For the October meeting of 1956 Senate members were reminded that they would be visited by cameramen who would be including a segment of a “live” Senate meeting in the new university colour film that was being made. In February 1958, the Queen Mother visited St Lucia for a highly successful function that permitted the public to see students on their best behaviour, as did Princess Alexandra the following year, when she collected an honorary degree for her trouble. During the second term of 1958 a further conference of secondary school principals was held at St Lucia to discuss such issues as the five-year secondary programme, transition from school to university, subject spread, and Honours degrees. Much more
daring was the 1960 exposure of the work of individual departments to the eye of the TV camera.\textsuperscript{34}

This was a bumper year for meeting the public. The new vice-chancellor instituted a series of weekly press conferences; inaugural lectures were resumed after a lengthy interval, there was a great increase in the number of public lectures, and the university celebrated its Golden Jubilee. The public, invited to view the university for a whole week in 1959 as part of the state’s centenary celebrations, were encouraged to come back again in 1960, and various special functions were arranged for the occasion. Messages of congratulation were conveyed from other members of the international university community, honorary degrees were awarded, and a splendid Jubilee banquet which attracted chancellors and vice-chancellors from other Australian universities was the climax of celebrations. A sum of £5,000 had been set aside for the exercise but for once the estimate exceeded the actual cost and only £4,200 was required for the university to celebrate its fiftieth birthday.\textsuperscript{35}

In the following year Prime Minister Menzies paid his first visit to the university and received an honorary degree, giving
further distinguished endorsement to the status of Queensland’s premier centre of learning. He also announced Vice-Chancellor Schonell’s membership of the Martin Committee, a very significant development since it brought him into policy-forming bodies at the highest level. Other events are worthy of note: in May 1967, the recently founded Alumni Association held its first reunion at the Student Union’s relaxation block and, as part of their entertainment, members, along with academic staff, were invited to attend a garden party at Government House, an event reminiscent of some of the very earliest of university social functions. A second role for the public relations officer, T.R. Drake, was that of
alumni officer, a reflection of Vice-Chancellor Schonell’s perception of the importance of the association, confirmed and later emphasized by Vice-Chancellor Zelman Cowen. On a more serious note, the Trades and Labour Council attempted to draw the university more fully into the local community by asking the Senate that all its employees should again be members of the relevant union and covered by an award or industrial agreement and be prepared to draw up agreements where they did not exist. Conciliating local opinion did not run to this, and the Senate declined on the grounds that it was neither necessary nor desirable.36
The physical growth of the university, at St Lucia and elsewhere, was far more extensive and expensive in the period after 1958 than everything that had been undertaken previously. In 1958 the only permanent buildings at St Lucia were the Forgan Smith Building and those for chemistry, geology, and physics. The semi-circle still lacked the biological sciences block and the Great Hall to complete the original Hennessy concept, and there were still innumerable decisions to be taken about the site and its development, as J.D. Story had long been insisting. But now there was to be a new and powerful partner whose financial support was necessary to any future construction and who had both the right to be consulted and the power to refuse permission. Building would, from 1958, be jointly financed by the special Murray money and later by the Commonwealth government through the Universities Commission and the state government on an equal basis. Without the Commonwealth share the state would be hardly likely to move and so the university now found itself required to submit all its proposals for approval and accept the inevitable delays that would result from refused permission or under-funding. The preparation of the first proposals to the Universities Commission in 1959 was very much the work of J. Mulholland, a city engineer and chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, who came to the university’s rescue by allowing his draftsmen to prepare detailed plans for submission in the absence of qualified university staff.
These were some of the constraints under which the university now went ahead with its building programme, and they caused certain guiding principles to be evolved. One was that building beyond the half-circle could not be undertaken on the same lavish scale as with the original buildings; their high ceilings and handsome proportions were most uneconomical in their use of space, and their freestone veneers, which contributed so much to their aesthetic appeal, were simply too costly for the future. Despite the regrets of contemporaries and those who would come later to St Lucia, the traditional architecture of the original concept had to be abandoned on
grounds of economy and replaced by a variety of styles and
designs to suit the purposes of the building and to make use of
whatever man-made materials were serviceable and more
cheaply available. Another principle was the need to plan in
terms of triennial programmes as well as to attempt to predict
the long-range needs of the university. This was necessary for
Commonwealth funding, though this very funding invariably
meant that the finance for one triennium was used in part to
complete the work that had been started during the previous
one. Sir Leslie Martin, chairman of the Universities Commiss­
on, assured Vice-Chancellor Schonell before the start of the
1961–63 triennium of the “flexible procedures” that could be
“based on the principles of consultation between the Univer­
sity, the State Government, and the Commission”, but flex­
ibility usually meant delays in the completion of plans because
of inadequate financing. Just as the recurrent grants of the
Universities Commission would soon be seen to be treating
Queensland unfairly, so too did the capital grant for 1961–63
appear most unjust, whether measured by state or student
population, and the vice-chancellor realized that there was a
long hard road ahead.

Making full but proper use of St Lucia was a further ever­
present concern. In July 1960, for instance, it was reported to
the Senate that the Great Court might be used to house two
large buildings and still be left with areas as large as Anzac
Square on both sides of each, which caused some eyebrows to
be raised and hearts to sink. The notion of evaluating the
potential of the Great Court was wisely resolved in August
1961, when J.D. Story insisted that it should remain
sacrosanct; he insisted similarly on the preservation of the
front lawns, and in May 1962 Dr Nye attempted to bind
future Senates by proposing a motion that no building should
ever be erected between Circular Drive and the main building
or inside the quadrangle. He was informed that such a hmita­
tion would be constitutionally improper and the Senate was
content to pass on advice. Already in April 1961 the vice­
chancellor was recommending that the Senate think about the
purchase of house properties adjacent to St Lucia to relieve ac­
commodation pressure in the years ahead; there was even im­
mediate need in that some sections of certain departments had
been compelled to make the return journey to George Street
for short-term relief.

In July 1964, a Senate committee on further university ex­
pansion reported that its first priority was to complete the
transfer to St Lucia of those departments still to be found in the outlying provinces of the empire: mining and metallurgical engineering, pharmacy, music, and parts of mechanical engineering and education were still at George Street, microbiology was awaiting translation from Herston, and dentistry fondly hoped to escape from Turbot Street. It was now a question of just how much more could be fitted into St Lucia, for it was felt that the university was fast running out of space. This view was not shared by the Universities Commission, which appeared to be dragging its feet over the new university at Mount Gravatt in 1966 because of the low density of building on the St Lucia site. It clearly believed that money for Mount Gravatt could be put to more effective and efficient use at St Lucia. From 1961 the university had employed its own architect, James Birrell, as well as benefiting from the services of Professor Cummings of architecture, who had worked closely with the coordinator-general in an effort to ensure that St Lucia avoided over-intensive development.

Within these constraints and according to these ideas building did go ahead, slowly in the eyes of those who suffered the frustrations but quickly when seen in the whole context of St Lucia’s history to this stage. The completion of the original semi-circular concept was the first call on available resources, and the Murray recommendation of £1.5 million permitted the biological sciences building to be completed in stages that allowed the entry of agriculture in 1959, zoology in 1960, and botany and entomology in 1961. Already by December 1958 the Academic Standing Committee was reporting a “catastrophic situation facing the Departments housed in the Main Building”. This most uneconomical of all buildings in terms of utilization of space was bursting at the seams and had to be relieved either by the erection of further teaching buildings or structural alterations or both. In December 1959, J.D. Story envisaged the erection of a humanities block at the western end of the main building where the Great Hall had been intended, and it was decided in January 1960 to seek approval for such a scheme. There was no money for it in the 1961–63 building programme, though sketch plans were approved by the Senate in 1961. By the 1967–69 programme it was featuring as the most expensive item, estimated to cost over £1 million, and in September 1968 the university was still wrangling over final approval from the Universities Commission, which was refusing to allow air-conditioning in the building, thereby, it was argued,
discriminating once more against Queensland after having provided heating in many southern university buildings. The only answer, it was felt, if the building was to go ahead was to accept the ruling and introduce air-conditioning later. It had earlier been agreed that if this building were to be constructed separately from the main building, it should at least conform to it in external appearance. The other solution to the limitations of the main building was to increase its size, and in November 1961 it was reported that Hennessy and Hennessy were in favour of adding a third storey to the building; such an addition, they said, would be feasible, economical, and would even improve the aesthetics of the place. Their prediction was never to be put to the test, though as late as March 1965 it was being proposed that the 1967–69 triennium should involve spending £370,000 on adding a further floor.4

Outside this inner ring a whole series of quite differently conceived and designed blocks appeared in the 1960s to shock those who wished to preserve the integrity of the initial plan but to provide custom-built accommodation for specific purposes. In April 1959, the Staff Association was successful in its approaches to the Senate for land for a Staff House, in accordance with the recommendations of the Murray Committee, and seven-and-a-half years later it received a loan of $30,000 to furnish the finally completed building. The physical education building, between Circular Drive and the river, was ready for occupation in 1961, and a first-year science building, eventually known as the Priestley Building, and a social sciences building were both constructed on the outside of Circular Drive ready for occupation in 1964. A shared lecture theatre was constructed between them, named in February 1966 the Abel Smith Theatre in honour of the governor. Sites were also recommended in April 1967 for a building to house architecture, music, and fine arts and another to house the therapies, but these were for the future. Meanwhile, large buildings to accommodate other aspects of the university’s activities appeared on Circular Drive. A Students Union building had been sought from Murray and, though its approval involved some delays, the first stage of the building was eventually available in 1961. In 1965 the Buildings and Grounds Committee confirmed their siting of a Union Theatre, and in February 1968 had completed designs for the theatre and an extension of the Union complex which were expected to cost almost $675,000 to carry out.5
The other major appearance was that of the administration building. It had long been obvious that if the main building was to provide substantial teaching accommodation it would be necessary to house administration separately, and a new block, to be named after J.D. Story, was envisaged as part of the stage two post-Hennessy development. Such a project was
approved as part of the 1961–63 building programme, at the expected cost of £400,000, and a plan was finally approved by the Universities Commission by August 1963. In early October 1965, 170 members of administrative staff moved in, but not before Chancellor Axon had inspected the inside of the building and found the exposed aggregate finish not at all
to his liking, particularly on the first and fifth floors where it would be seen by visitors. The Buildings and Grounds Committee did not, however, share his distaste, and eventually the culture shock subsided, while the J.D. Story Building continued to stand supreme over all it surveyed.6

The medical sciences buildings were a controversial matter. When J.D. Story called for “Operation Priorities” to follow “Operation Location” in 1956, the Buildings and Grounds Committee was still favouring having anatomy, physiology, and biochemistry out at Herston. However, in April 1958, a
special meeting of the Professorial Board voted for physiology, biochemistry, and bacteriology at St Lucia, with anatomy at Herston, with the medics favouring Herston and the scientists preferring St Lucia for this group of subjects. The state government was probably decisive in its preference for St Lucia, and anatomy was soon on the way, though there were predictions that it would be overcrowded from the moment it first came into use in 1961. The biochemistry building, also available in the second half of 1961, was thought by some of its later occupants to vie with social sciences for the title of cheapest and nastiest of all the new buildings of this period. It
was extended in the later 1960s, and the physiology building was also available for occupation in 1964, this the most spacious among its contemporaries and the best equipped with research facilities. Beyond St Lucia, where the teaching hospitals made repeated demands for extensions, the new clinical sciences block became available at the Royal Brisbane Hospital in May 1966, which inspired Dean Gordon to comment that the Medical School had at last moved out of the dungeon stage of its development.7

Engineering had a long and difficult history in establishing itself at St Lucia. It featured in the Murray programme and by
April 1961, after some delays, Professor Lavery was able to report that the morale of his students had been raised considerably as a result of the recent transfer of his whole department to the new civil engineering laboratories. Stage one of mechanical engineering was completed in 1964, confirming the confidence of the *Courier-Mail* in February 1962 that the Engineering School was well on its way, at which time it predicted that it would take eight or nine years more and £1 million to finish the job. Professor Prentice, of electrical engineering, later recalled a ten-year period spent travelling backwards and forwards between George Street, where he retained an old wartime hut for some of his work, and St Lucia to conduct classes before moving his entire staff out in 1965. Other branches were less fortunate and would have to wait longer.8

After its early traumas at Yeerongpilly, veterinary science secured a favoured place in the Murray building programme, and its new building was ready for use in 1961. Less fortunate was dentistry, destined to be tantalized by bright prospects in 1964 only to have them dashed away in 1965. Like every other part of the university, the Dental College was constructed to cater for numbers that bore no resemblance to the reality of the post-war experience, and in February 1963 it was reported that dental staff were working under almost slum conditions and students were grossly overcrowded. In January 1964, the premier announced Cabinet approval of a scheme for a new £800,000 Dental School to be built at St Lucia and the *Courier-Mail* announced that this was to go ahead. The newly appointed professor of dentistry, G.N. Davies, declared that the shift to St Lucia was essential, designs were completed, and local residents were promised free or cheap dental treatment when the new college was erected and students began to practise on suburban patients. By March 1965 the balloon of optimism had been pricked. A local federal member warned that the plan was likely to be rejected, and by August the Universities Commission had spelt out its grounds for opposing St Lucia, which would allegedly provide insufficient variety and experience for dental students. In place of a new school at St Lucia, the Universities Commission offered £400,000 towards the cost of a new school at Turbot Street on the site of the existing premises. Bitterly disappointed, the Dental Faculty accepted the offer of extensions to the physiology building, so that the pre-clinical years could be completed at St Lucia, and a new clinic at Turbot Street,
which was expected to cost up to £800,000. The St Lucia part of the package was not delivered, though oral biology was eventually to find a home within the physiology building.9

Perhaps even more frustrating, for it was a more widely felt disappointment, was the failure to build a Great Hall during this period. Although it had been part of the original plan by Hennessy, as the western end of the main building, it had not been started in the pre- or post-war periods, and it had no immediate attraction to the Universities Commission because it was highly desirable rather than strictly necessary, and was expected to be very expensive. At the end of 1959 it was decided that a humanities block rather than a hall should occupy the western site, that a Hall Appeal should be launched as part of the Golden Jubilee celebrations, and that a film should be made to help to sell the idea to the public. The siting of the proposed hall remained unresolved but an appeal was launched on 27 June 1960; the chairman of the Appeal
Committee, E.D. Summerson, was to be assisted by Professor McElwain from psychology. It was believed that if £150,000 could be raised by donations the Universities Commission would agree to a £75,000 contribution and the state government would be persuaded to do the same. The idea was advanced of placing the hall on the northern side of the main building, towards the eastern end, and funds were invested in a brochure to publicize the project along with the film. Despite disagreement over location, a competition for a Great Hall design was agreed to by the Senate in March 1961, to be conducted and assessed with the cooperation of the Institute of Architecture, though this too created difficulties because of the Senate’s determination to have the final word in deciding what was acceptable. The cost was not to exceed £300,000. The competition was not advertised until September 1962, and some 120 entries were received, including 40 from within Queensland. The assessors chose the design submitted by Stuart MacIntosh of Melbourne, estimated to cost £294,000, towards which £170,000 had been collected, and he was appointed architect for the hall in October 1963, in cooperation with the coordinator-general, who was asked to be the building authority.

Unfortunately for the success of the project, the lowest estimate that could be obtained for building to the chosen design was £470,833, which was £200,000 more than the university now expected to be able to raise with the help of its partners. In March 1965, the Senate, encouraged by the Buildings and Grounds Committee to abandon the project, discharge the architect and pay him his dues of about £20,000, decided to give him a further chance to produce a cheaper design, but no progress was made. The chancellor promised that the Great Hall would not become another Sydney Opera House; in November the project was postponed indefinitely, and the architect, having sold up in Melbourne and moved to Brisbane in expectation of steady employment supervising the work, threatened the university with legal action for improper dismissal. The whole affair could hardly have been encouraging to those who had been persuaded to donate to the project, and in March 1967 the Senate decided to try again. At a meeting on 6 April the Department of Works was invited to be both architect and builder of a Great Hall to cost not more than $550,000. Resolutions of 1961 that the hall should not be west of the main axis of the main building and that it should in fact be on the north-eastern side of Circular Drive
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were still available to guide the new Great Hall Committee, but neither had much influence on the ultimate location of that building. In August 1967, thirty years after the foundation stone had been laid at St Lucia, the Courier-Mail was taking a nostalgic look at old Government House, George Street, and still finding pharmacy and education in occupation of the building, but its university days were drawing to a close. At St Lucia the university was looking at fresh acres to occupy, and departments that were sharing established buildings were looking towards expanding into blocks of their own. A draft programme for 1967–69 envisaged a new building for agriculture and entomology, to cost £710,000, as well as extensions to veterinary science and other buildings. A plan for this major project was ready for submission in November 1966, and this building was to be given the main place in the 1967–69 programme. In 1968 the librarian, Derek Fielding, proposed a new undergraduate library, incorporating the Thatcher Library, that would allow the existing library to be devoted to reference and research, and in November a request for $2 million for this purpose was formulated. A new indoor sports pavilion joined the list of competitors for money in 1968, while the Law Faculty looked on in anger, claiming to be the only Law School in Australia without adequate accommodation. Their dream of a separate Law School was to remain unfulfilled. Meanwhile the university brought a number of other projects to completion during the 1964–67 period to assist its off-campus activities. These included the conversion of two floors at the Mater Hospital to the purposes of teaching medicine and surgery; the building of stage one of the Veterinary Science Clinic at Goondiwindi and stage one of the Marine Research Laboratory on Heron Island, extensions and renovations at Herston, and the comprehensive development of facilities at Moggill Farm.

Over the years 1966–68 there was also much attention devoted to the naming of university buildings, and it was during this period that most of the names were given by which different parts of the university are known today. This exercise created a certain amount of anguish, partly because of the difficulty in establishing criteria; as one senator was unkind enough to point out, the mere fact that a person had been one of the early professors did not mean that he had necessarily been either distinguished or outstanding, and the so-called Commemoration Committee frequently found it
more convenient to defer taking decisions rather than risk upsetting people by those they included or those whom they excluded. They also had problems finding buildings for some of the names on their list, which would continue to remain uncommemorated through identification with buildings. It seems scarcely necessary to comment that another unfulfilled intention was the bridge across the river, and as late as April 1962 it was reported that the University of Queensland had bothered to object to a new Town Plan that had failed to include a bridge from West End.13

The other aspect of the university’s physical growth during this period was the expansion of the college system, a
characteristic form of student accommodation associated with the University of Queensland from the outset and one that made some advances during this period. On 17 December 1959, the *Sunday Mail* enthusiastically reported the progress that had been made during that year. Women’s and Duchesne had opened at St Lucia. King’s and St John’s had both acquired extensions, and Emmanuel had gained a further wing. Work on St Leo’s was about to begin. The graduation of the first Asian students in the late 1950s served to restore some impetus to the movement to establish an International House as did the sterling fund-raising efforts of its president, Bert Martin; it admitted its first students in February 1965 and was officially opened in June that year. Union College also succeeded in moving to St Lucia in this year. The proposal to erect a three-and-four-storey college on Upland Road evoked protests from the residents of this and neighbouring streets, but the college went ahead and at the beginning of 1968 made history by admitting fifty women and becoming the first coeducational residential establishment. In June 1968, it was reported that an area of 1.73 acres on the corner of Carmody Road and Walcott Street had been made available for Grace College, this time for Presbyterian and Methodist women.14

The academic growth of the University of Queensland during this period occurred in response to certain external pressures and community needs, which were occasionally articulated from outside but more usually perceived and inter-
interpreted by members of the university body. Sir Keith Murray was the herald who proclaimed in no uncertain terms what had for some time been understood. On his arrival in Brisbane on 23 July 1957, he declared that there would be a tremendous need for university experience in Australia in the next ten years, and three days later he had a message more specifically for the University of Queensland: with the vast potential increase of students coming along the existing position of the
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university was serious and its future critical. The Murray Committee had a lot to say about pass rates, standards, and the need to develop Honours and postgraduate work, and although the vice-chancellor was persuaded that the committee intended no particular criticism of the University of Queensland, he nevertheless requested the Professorial Board to examine the implications of the Murray Report and observe the strictures which it contained.\(^{15}\)

For the next ten years the university attempted to follow the advice given by Murray as selected and emphasized by the Universities Commission under Martin. It also attempted to meet more local needs. In a characteristic statement in the annual report for 1958, J.D. Story put forward some basic aims for the next ten to twenty years, one of which was the development of additional university centres, which at last appeared both desirable and attainable, and another the effective cooperation with teacher-training and technical colleges to coordinate education at tertiary level within the state. In July 1961, after his retirement as vice-chancellor, he was still pressing for a long-term plan for university development as
part of a bigger plan for tertiary education as a whole. Three years later a Senate committee on further university expansion was concerned to examine the implications of the new five-year pattern of secondary education and the fact that from 1964 nearly every Queensland child would enter a secondary school. This would dramatically increase the number of matriculated candidates in 1968 and it behoved the university to be ready for them.\(^{16}\)

Responding to numbers was one thing, responding to politicians another. In the debates on the new University Act in November 1965, the minister for education made many demands upon the university. On the one hand he complained that the state was not getting enough doctors, lawyers, scientists, agricultural scientists, veterinarians, and teachers, and blamed the shortage of professional people in part on the unwillingness of matriculated students to accept the discipline of study. On the other hand he appealed for more graduates at the pass level and appeared to advocate a lowering of standards for the pass degree to ensure that no time was wasted in tackling Honours work and becoming over-qualified. The university, he maintained, had an obligation at the pass degree level to implement programmes that had a bias towards industrial and community needs. At least one senior academic was moved to express his sense of shock in the columns of the local
press that the minister had opted for lowering standards, yet the Opposition spokesman had similar comments to make about the university and its responsibilities. It was its function, said Mr J.E. Duggan, “to train personnel to serve the economy or the requirements of industry”. When the state was spending enormous sums of money on the university and not getting the people it needed, then matters were out of hand. This kind of dissatisfaction was not general, for in December 1967 Premier Nicklin praised the big contribution to state development made by the university through its “constant output of high-level manpower”. In August 1966, for example, there had been a glowing tribute in the local press to the Veterinary School, perhaps more publicity-conscious than most areas, which was said to be doing a big job for the nation through its work on beef production and animal diseases. A university established initially to serve the state was still seen to have this function, and it was one that was rarely overlooked by Vice-Chancellors Story and Schonell as they guided the institution through its years of greatest academic growth.17

A student population that was growing by approximately a
thousand per year throughout the period 1957–66 clearly demanded a great expansion in the university’s academic offerings, and this expansion appears to have taken place according to some observable patterns. Most of it involved the expansion of existing teaching areas, the addition of new areas within old subjects, the subdivision of existing departments to allow the separating out of subjects that would be permitted independent growth, or simply the upgrading of subjects. Sometimes there would be new subjects introduced on grounds of pure academic desirability, sometimes to satisfy what was thought to be a local social need, and occasionally as part of some grander notion of developing an area that was thought to be of national political importance and in harmony with some concept of national interest. These categories were not exclusive of each other, but they provide a useful guide to the different kinds of change that occurred.

The general areas of medical and biological science illustrate well the principle of growth from an existing base. In 1956 J.F.R. Sprent became professor of parasitology by courtesy of a generous gift from the Commonwealth Bank. In 1957 a full-time chair in social and preventive medicine was filled by Douglas Gordon, and Professor Neville Sutton became foundation professor of surgery having been half-time for some years. A second chair was given to physiology in 1959 and in 1960 Dr G. Rendle-Short became professor of child health. New departments of child health and biochemistry were created in December and, after some delay, Edwin Webb was appointed professor of biochemistry in August 1962, in the same year as Victor Skerman was promoted to a chair in bacteriology, to become microbiology. In November 1962, physiotherapy was given departmental status, while occupational therapy came in under the medical umbrella, receiving its own degree course from 1968. In October 1964, Dr E.V. Mackay was appointed to the chair of obstetrics and gynaecology, and in July 1967 it was decided to have a full-time dean of medicine, a position to which Dr E.G. Saint was appointed in April 1968. Such accessions of senior staff, backed up by other appointments, and the continued popularity of medical studies with students, necessitated the development of a clinical teaching unit at the Mater as well as at the Brisbane Hospital, and as early as February 1962 a paper was presented on the need to establish a further teaching unit in medicine and surgery at the Princess Alexander Hospital.18

Dentistry also underwent considerable changes during these
years, but not quite according to the plan that it would have preferred. In 1960 the course was extended to five years, a development which was forced upon it, according to Professor Lumb, on the insistence of the General Dental Council of Great Britain which controlled registration. By 1963 the situation at the Dental School became desperate. It had opened in 1941, able to accommodate a maximum of 80 students, but temporary post-war additions had stretched the number to 150 and now there were 250 using the place, with 350 expected by 1966. The Universities Commission was reluctant to give this situation the priority that the university wished, partly because of the state’s aid to patients, and believed that the state should assume most of the responsibility. A plan by Professor Davies to replace the existing temporary lecturers by permanent ones and remodel the course presupposed an early translation to St Lucia, and when this plan collapsed he was left, like medicine, to make the best of a divided school, being given provision at St Lucia for the pre-clinical subjects, and extensions at Turbot Street to increase accommodation, but having to postpone other developments which he thought important.

The Department of Psychology is an interesting case. Though itself only recently independent of philosophy it began, through the accident of circumstance and the interests of its personnel, to teach both anthropology and sociology. The Professorial Board unavailingly recommended a separate chair for anthropology in the staffing round for 1962 and resolved in the middle of 1966 that the new department should now add sociology to its name. The anthropology museum, housing a collection donated by Dr L.P. Winterbotham, had been opened to the public the previous year.

In August 1961, the Professorial Board recommended that accounting should be separated from commerce under R.S. Gynther, but was opposed to the creation of a chair, which did not come until 1967. The following year the Commerce Faculty pressed for a separate Department of Business Administration and the introduction of a master’s course in business administration. The Senate agreed in principle but looked for outside funds to launch the new proposal effectively, which meant a lengthy postponement. Politics was separated from history in November 1964, and C.A. Hughes became the first professor of government in November 1965. Music, too, acquired a chair in February 1966, with the appointment of Professor N.J. Nickson, and in October 1966
was awarded its own B.Mus. degree for 1967, against the opposition of those who wished to confine the subject within the Arts Faculty. Computer science also broke free from electrical engineering as Gordon Rose came to the foundation chair at the start of 1969.\(^1\)

Within the arts area other subjects were finally accorded professorial status. In 1958 a chair was created in geography to which R.H. Greenwood was appointed, and in 1961 Archbishop Duhig tried in vain to secure the establishment of a Department of Fine Arts, a most courageous step within such a utilitarian community. German, a sufferer from two world wars, acquired a chair with the promotion of K. Leopold in March 1964, and by 1967 fine arts had attracted patrons within the Professorial Board, but they were in a majority of only one. It would require stronger backing than this finally to establish the department.\(^2\)

The kind of backing that always helped was indicated in a Professorial Board recommendation to the November Senate
meeting of 1961 of a diploma course in speech therapy. "A growing University in a growing State," it was reported, "must constantly move forward to implement new developments; some of these should be supported by a strong community demand." This was the basis of their current proposal, as it had been the reason behind earlier ones. In the late fifties the Queensland pharmacists had believed that the best way to secure full recognition by the British Pharmacy Guild was to have the subject taken over by the university, and J.D. Story so firmly believed in the importance of this that he determined to push ahead with the scheme in advance of receiving the responses from the high schools about the likely popularity of the course. The Professorial Board, conscious of the Murray Committee's reservations about diploma courses in universities, nevertheless recommended a three-year diploma course to the Senate in July 1958, only to find the Senate exceeding its customary role and inaugurating a degree course without further reference to the academic body, which occasioned a breach reminiscent of the days when Judge McCawley had attempted to determine the syllabus in English. Eventually the board acquiesced and cooperated and the first degree students in pharmacy arrived in 1960. Town and country planning was also recommended at this time as a diploma course in response to a locally perceived need, and eventually started in 1966 as a postgraduate diploma course involving three years of part-time study. Journalism also came up for reconsideration in 1968 when it was recommended by the Arts Faculty that steps should be taken to eliminate the Diploma in Journalism and simply make the subject available within the arts degree and attach it to the English department. This was not to provide a permanent solution to the issue.23

Social work, an area close to the heart of Vice-Chancellor Schonell, was expanded as a service activity for the people of Queensland. Introduced as social studies in 1956, when it had attracted an enrolment of only ten, it had become, according to a Courier-Mail report in July 1966, the new glamour subject, with 115 new enrolments in that year, and was at last enjoying departmental status. The social workers who operated at the university’s Remedial Education Centre in George Street in the 1960s and who otherwise pursued their calling would probably have questioned the glamour, but they were heading for independent faculty and degree status in the future. Another kind of very direct service to the community was offered in the sixties by the Department of Electrical
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Engineering, which its head, Professor Prentice, publicized as "a centre of critical thought and organized research on problems affecting electricity supply and associated manufacturing industry". 24

Grander in their ambition were three new proposals and developments within the university that were inspired by Australia’s place in the world and designed to further national interests within her sphere of influence. In 1959 Professor Greenwood advocated the establishment of a School of Asian Studies which would supervise courses given by new staff who would be appointed to teach Asian studies within existing disciplines. The history department was able to implement in 1960 a Professorial Board recommendation to appoint a senior lecturer in Indo-Pakistan cultural history, and the board continued to push hard for developing Asian studies as part of Australia’s "Approaches to Asia". In August 1964 a Senate committee on university expansion, guided by the wishes of the vice-chancellor, recommended a Department of Japanese Language and Literature, and foreshadowed a future chair in Indian history. The following year Professor Joyce Ackroyd was appointed to establish Japanese and, according to the 1968 annual report, students began to acquire the "opportunity to prepare themselves as members of an increasingly inter-related Pacific community" through courses on Japan and South-east Asia which were being taught within geography, anthropology and sociology, and economics, as well as Japanese. In July 1968 it was agreed to accept the offer of the Taiwanese government to pay for a teacher of Chinese to come to Queensland, which the Education Committee of the board wished to reject as an insufficiently considered piece of academic planning. Despite the failure of the Taiwanese government to keep its promise, other ways were found to provide for the introduction of Chinese. It was decided in September 1968 to set up a committee specifically to consider the future of oriental languages within the university. Chinese was in fact being advocated against the claims of Italian, on the grounds that all Australia’s interests were focused on the Pacific and that national interests should outweigh personal ones, an interesting development of the old ideas of the practical purpose that the university ought to serve. 25

To enable all these academic plans to be carried out the university had to recruit great numbers of academic and support staff over a period of many years. The Murray recommendations permitted sixty-five new academic positions to be
created and advertised during 1958, but this was no more than a hint of what was to come. The Rayner report on staffing, presented in November 1958, warned that 350 new academics would be required over the period 1958–64 if existing staff–student ratios were to be preserved, and it is a measure of the university’s success that in the period 1961–66 the ratio fluctuated only between 1:11.1 and 1:11.7. This was higher than the Universities Commission recommended, but it was much lower and much more stable than on most earlier occasions. It was not uncommon during this period for the Standing Committee of the board to be recommending over a hundred new appointments in one year, having suitably reduced the numbers that the heads of departments requested, and even as late as August 1967 it was still recommending eighty additional positions, by which the staff–student ratio would be maintained at 1:12.1. It is clear that difficulties were frequently encountered in filling these positions with suitably qualified and experienced people, and the struggle to preserve high standards during a period of rapid expansion concerned staff recruitment as well as student performance. This was the golden age of jobs for the aspiring academics and it would never be so easy again for people to come into university teaching, especially when academic staff were granted tenure for life from 1962.26

Several other aspects of this staff expansion are worthy of note. One feature of it was the appearance of second and even third professors within departments, which destroyed the traditional nexus between the professor and the head of department, for not all professors could be heads. Nor did all departments necessarily have professors. In 1960 the Professorial Board declared its opposition to extending membership to non-professorial heads and argued that all new departments should be given chairs, which they were not. Within this seller’s market it was on some occasions proving so difficult to fill senior positions that appointments decisions were confirmed by flying minutes lest the candidate should escape as a result of delays in administrative procedures. On other occasions, which were becoming increasingly frequent, senior but non-professorial staff members were able to secure promotion to chairs by threatening to take up positions elsewhere. It is often suggested that the University of Queensland had greater difficulty in recruiting staff than other Australian universities because of its long-delayed adoption of a superannuation scheme, but the problem in the main during this period was
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that of a large number of expanding institutions chasing a limited amount of talent. The most distinguished scholar of all Queensland’s graduates was never allowed to escape, for in August 1959 Dr Dorothy Hill became Research Professor of Geology, establishing a number of firsts in so doing. In 1965 she became a Fellow of the Royal Society.27

Another aspect of expansion in these years was the university’s move into areas of new technology; 1959 was an important year in this respect. Besides deciding that the purchase of an electron microscope should be a priority commitment, the university also began negotiations for its first digital computer. This was seen as a first-rate public-relations exercise, thoroughly involving the state government and helping to dissipate lingering feelings that the government was not entirely behind the university, for government departments became a major user, along with nineteen separate university departments, when General Electric installed their computer in 1962, the same year as the electron microscope started to be used in cancer research. The ramifications of the computer centre would be enormous, not least the need to go on extending capacity and replacing equipment. Great credit should go to Professor Prentice for the establishment of the first computer, but the university did badly in the competition for computing funds in this early period and there was a failure to appreciate the need for extensions. By April 1967, the university began negotiating for a bigger and better system.28

That older aid to learning and research, the library, continued to be a deprived area. When Harrison Bryan wrote his final annual report for 1962 he admitted that at 300,000
volumes the library was well below his target of 500,000 for the size of institution he was servicing. With all its limitations and overcrowding it was in his own words “closer to being adequate”, though its existence in the sixties appeared to be one of impending or actual crisis as student numbers grew and the necessary additional building was slow to appear. Nevertheless, the decade of the 1960s was one of enormous growth for the library. The combined efforts of Derek Fielding, the librarian, and Gordon Greenwood, chairman of the Library Committee, made it an institution of national significance, able to support research activities across the disciplines as well as handle the study needs of 16,000 students.

University expansion throughout the Western world was accompanied by a large amount of soul-searching about the preservation of standards, the fear that quality would inevitably decline as the quantity increased, and the concern to pursue excellence amidst all the democratic pressures to make university education available to those who wanted it. This theme appears even in the closing years of J.D. Story’s time as vice-chancellor, and it is a strong characteristic of the approach of his successor Fred Schonell. One route to excellence was through improved teaching. In 1958 tutors were appointed in various departments, mathematics, economics, history, and French, to increase the efficiency of the university as a teaching institution, and in 1966 the English department put the whole of its tutorial staff to work in first-year courses so that new students could receive the biggest benefits. Streaming was also thought to be a desirable mechanism for improving teaching and enhancing the quality of Honours graduates. It was reported at the end of 1959 that many of the largest departments, inspired in part by the innovations of Professor Clive Davis in mathematics, had established a separate first-year Honours programme for their ablest students; others followed slowly if at all. External studies still caused worries in 1960 because less than one-tenth of their students were appearing at the Vacation Schools for face-to-face contact with staff, and not more than one-third were even making use of the Thatcher Library.

There were repeated committees of inquiry into undergraduate teaching methods and repeated efforts by the vice-chancellor to improve instruction through teaching the teachers how to teach, including the well remembered sessions for junior staff members, which they failed to attend on pain of stern reprimand. Despite the professional interest of
the vice-chancellor in this area and the expert assistance available, the problem was never really solved. In November 1968 there was yet another report from a committee responsible for organizing a conference on university teaching in 1968, and one senator expressed the modest yet apparently quite unrealizable wish that lectures should be made interesting. Ways to do this are still being sought.\textsuperscript{31}

Another possible approach to the pursuit of excellence was through limitations on student entry, the dreaded quotas which started to be talked about in the early sixties. During the decade of the 1960s this issue was little more than a bogey which periodically appeared to frighten people, though in July 1964 it was agreed that entry to second-year medicine should be confined to 160 students, a restriction which provoked angry questions in parliament. Vice-Chancellor Schonell was personally opposed to quotas, and the widely accepted argument that first-year studies were a better predictor of later success than was performance in Senior helped to keep their advocates at bay. By March 1968, however, the vice-chancellor predicted that by 1970 there would be insufficient accommodation, library space, or tuition available if quotas were not applied. The best would be taken; the more marginal would be refused. The more selective policies would, it was believed, be assisted by the decision of 1966 to eliminate all non-matriculated students from casual enrolment in the future. Also, the new matriculation requirements to be in force from the start of 1968 would introduce a new scale of marks and insist on a minimum that was 10 per cent higher than the previous one, to be achieved over a range of five subjects.\textsuperscript{32}

The implicit movement to greater elitism within the university, to be seen against the background history of an institution which had always, by its nature, been concerned with the educational elite, was evident in two other trends. One was the effort to follow the Murray advice and eliminate all sub-graduate or diploma and certificate courses from the university’s offerings. Even before 1957 it had been decided that the Diploma in Commerce no longer served a useful purpose and should be dropped, and the new vice-chancellor pursued this policy with some determination. In his 1965 report he recorded the disappearance of diplomas in accounting, commerce, divinity, and social studies, and anticipated the future demise of physiotherapy, speech therapy, and public administration as diploma subjects. These subjects must in future, he said, be upgraded to degree standard or transferred to other institutions.\textsuperscript{33}
The other self-consciously elitist trend was to regard the University of Queensland as an institution that would increasingly concentrate on Honours and postgraduate teaching and leave the more routine tasks to other institutions. Early suggestions that the University College of Townsville might be a service establishment supplying St Lucia with one-year trained undergraduates envisaged a role for Townsville comparable to that of post-war Mildura in relation to the University of Melbourne. In August 1962, when the Universities Commission was contemplating a second university for Brisbane, it was suggested that the University of Queensland might be upgraded to handle advanced degree work in the main. This idea was even more strongly supported in 1964 when there was a widely held notion that all first-year and possibly second-year teaching might be undertaken at the new university and that the old one might become almost a finishing school for graduates and the university where research was done. This would hardly have allowed the new university an auspicious start.\textsuperscript{34}

On 13 November 1958, J.D. Story put forward his recommendations on the establishment of “a Multiple Regional University Centre in Townsville”, where secondary, technical, and the lower years of university education could be given. There was specific description of the proposed institution as a feeder to the University of Queensland, and this was the proposal which the Cabinet accepted in May 1959. It was decided to use the name “The University College of Townsville”. This fulfilled in part the intention of the original 1909 Act that the university in Brisbane should eventually become the head of a federation of university colleges throughout the state, but also left open the possibility that Townsville, like the university colleges in Britain before this time, would soon be in a position to exist in its own right. Repeated attempts by Rockhampton and Toowoomba to move in the same direction required very tactful handling, for the small numbers enrolling at Townsville through the sixties indicated that relief to St Lucia could come only from a further Brisbane foundation, but the Townsville project moved smoothly ahead. The college opened on a modest scale in 1961 under the wardenship of Professor F.J. Olsen, director of external studies at the University of Queensland since 1958, and occupied a certain amount of the Senate’s time on academic and building plans despite the existence of a local advisory council. Staffing and other financial matters remained
part of the St Lucia budget, but by April 1967 the warden of the university college, Dr K.J.C. Back, was advising that the time had come to set the machinery in motion for complete autonomy by 1970. The Senate agreed, for the northern outpost was felt to be something of a drain on central funds, and it was felt that separate funding made more sense. By this time thoughts had turned to the new university at Mount Gravatt, and the Senate was happy enough to receive the Advisory Council’s recommendation for a University of Townsville in February 1968, and to go to work on a draft bill for establishing and incorporating the new university.35

In July 1962, Premier Nicklin was already predicting a second university for Brisbane, and in March 1963 Vice-Chancellor Schonell, advocating university expansion as holding great promise for the community, expressed a preference for a new university over quotas as a means of relieving overcrowding at St Lucia. Such an institution, it was agreed in July 1964, should be set up within the constitutional
framework of the university though it would have a separate campus and separate staff from the outset. There was now an even more explicit reference to the subordinate role that this new creation would play in taking the weight of first- and possibly second-year teaching away from St Lucia, and there was a clear expectation by many that this would be the fate of the institution, to supply the needs of the University of Queensland. The Universities Commission approved the idea in principle in March 1965, made money available for basic services, and also approved plans for a new Institute of Technology and colleges for technical studies at Toowoomba and Rockhampton; by September Mount Gravatt had emerged as the most favoured location.36

It was thought vital to have it opened by 1969–70, when St Lucia was expected to have over 16,000 students, and the agonizing debates began in the various university bodies about the measure of autonomy to be granted, the planning of the site, and the design of an academic plan, three issues which were inextricably interrelated despite the wish of some people to treat them as independent ones. A compromise was reached by July 1965 that full autonomy was desirable as soon as possible, but it was clearly the wish of the Universities Commission that the existing university should go on taking responsibility and so plans were laid to make the first senior appointments by 1969 and to start the university with arts, commerce, and education, to be followed by science in the second triennium. The reluctance of the Universities Commission to divert money from St Lucia to Mount Gravatt ensured that there would be no speedy implementation of these plans; an autonomous institution would eventually take its own decisions and render earlier ones redundant.37

One area in which Griffith University would not be content to sit back and take direction was that of research, which it would be keen to develop from the outset. Research had been talked about as a desirable activity at the University of Queensland from the beginning, and it had been given some institutional organization in 1949, but it had never seemed a high priority activity when money was being allocated. Following the prompting of the Murray Committee, J.D. Story reported in 1958 that “University research and invention must now be rated as a major University activity”. It certainly gave rise to more committees and more reports than ever in the past, though in December 1965 the accusation was made by Professor Mugglestone of physics that the
university still paid only "lip service" to the principle and did not commit sufficient resources to that area. Judgment was to a large extent a matter of perspective; the staff came under criticism from one of its members in 1967 for being more interested in research and promotion than in teaching, while the Liberal Party State Convention in the same year attacked the university for having research rather than education as its main concern.38

Finance was, of course, an important determining factor. It was said of Professor Schonell that, having accomplished his own work at very little cost, he would usually maintain that a pencil, some paper, and hard work were the only necessary ingredients of successful research. In practice he supported claims for equipment and technical assistance, but displayed impatience with those who sought large sums of money to pay for teaching so that they could concentrate solely on research. Large amounts were needed in some subjects: in 1958 the vice-chancellor reported that £127,569 had been spent on research, and in 1967 over one million dollars was devoted to this activity. Like all other university activities this one was jointly financed by the Commonwealth and state governments, through changing machinery and in varying proportions, though, unlike the rest, it had some hope of support from private sources. In 1963 a Professorial Board committee under Professor Hill attempted to list potential non-university sources and recommended the establishment of a permanent Research Endowment Committee to oversee approaches to outside sources on a permanent basis, but the Senate was worried that such activity might undermine the Great Hall appeal.39

For its general funding the university depended on the Australian Research Grants Committee's endorsement of individual projects, Universities Commission block grants for research, and the willingness of the state to match what the Commonwealth offered. In 1965 the state government was attacked in parliament for failing to measure up to its responsibilities in the research area, and in October 1966 Prime Minister Holt wrote directly to Premier Nicklin regretting the state government's unwillingness to keep pace with the Commonwealth contribution. Its attitude might be explained in part by the horror that was allegedly felt in January 1965 at some of the research projects that were being undertaken at St Lucia, including a study of Roman citizens in the early days of the Roman Empire. Such unrewarding investigations that
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would require the employment of typists to help complete them were one of the reasons the local press was threatening the university at this time with an inquiry by the state government into the alleged waste of money.40

What constituted a worthwhile investment of research funds would always be a controversial matter, as would the justice of the allocations made to Queensland. In November 1965, for instance, the vice-chancellor reported that the university had received the second lowest total in Australia from the ARGC despite being one of the largest universities: a mere £140,000 out of £1.85 million. Not for the last time in its history the university wanted to know why this had happened. And from the monies which the Finance Committee could itself control, the Research Committee was not, it believed in November 1967, receiving its proper allocation. The debates would continue.41

One measure of growth in the research area was the number of postgraduate students. From 173 in 1958 they rose to 779 in 1965, a much greater rate of increase than student numbers as a whole. It was appreciated that Queensland lagged behind other states in postgraduate numbers: in 1965, for example, it was calculated that the university had only 5.5 per cent of the country’s Ph.D. students, when the state population entitled it to about 14 per cent, and it was suggested that the situation might be improved by the appointment of a dean of research and postgraduate studies at the level of the deputy vice-chancellor. In 1966 fifty-five awards, largely Commonwealth ones, were given for postgraduate study, and more resolutions were passed promising increased emphasis on postgraduate studies.42

Another measure was the growing success of individual departments in identifying themselves with large research projects in specific areas and attracting substantial grants to conduct their work. For example, in 1959 the physics department landed a large contract from the American Air Force for space research; in 1960 electrical engineering installed its one-million-volt transformer equipment and began a big programme of lightning research strongly supported by the Southern Electricity Authority; and agriculture conducted its wheat research programme on the Darling Downs. More and more departments accepted that research activities were the normal expectation rather than something exceptional. Many of these were on a smaller scale and of an unspectacular kind that failed to receive publicity, but even in 1960 it was
reported that 500 separate projects were under way — the esoteric, the mundane, the valuable, and those for which society would have no ready use.\(^{43}\)

If members of staff, in undertaking research, were doing no more than their duty as it had been redefined in 1954, they were concerned too with their rights, which they tended to pursue through the Staff Association. Two ongoing sagas concerned salaries and pension schemes. Keeping up with southern salary scales was not easy. As the under-secretary from the Premier’s Department informed the university in February 1956, the Senate should exercise restraint over its promises to staff; comparability was important, but it must be remembered that the cost of living in Queensland was lower than elsewhere and that anomalies should not be created in relation to public service salaries. On this occasion the government relented, but it was clearly unsatisfactory to have this kind of debate at frequent intervals. In a Staff Association submission to the Universities Commission in July 1960, the Commonwealth was urged to implement national salary levels, but even nationally recommended scales did not guarantee the state’s ability or willingness to pay. The Senate was urged in March 1962, in the gentlest of terms, to speak for the staff and not to be unduly sensitive to the government’s financial problems when making recommendations for salary increases, but these did involve delicate negotiations. In August 1964, the Senate made a submission to Mr Justice Eggleston, who was conducting an inquiry into university salaries, again asking for uniformity throughout Australia. In practice this was now achieved, though in July 1967 the federal minister for education and science, when agreeing on a certain Commonwealth contribution to the latest salary rise, was still insisting that salaries were in the last resort a matter for the individual state and its university.\(^{44}\)

Superannuation was even more a question of local agreements. After decades of abortive endeavour, in which the state declined to finance university contributions to the kind of scheme operating elsewhere, agreement was finally secured from the government in 1960 to allow a scheme based on the FSSU that prevailed in Great Britain. J.D. Story had never accepted the need for such a scheme, but its absence had been a bone of contention with staff for many years, during which time their only expectations from their employer had been a gratuity, providing that they were still with the university at retirement age and had worked long enough to qualify.
Defects remained such as the absence of provision for insurance contributions when staff were on prolonged invalidity, but the central point had been won.\textsuperscript{45}

There were substantial gains in other areas too, notably over tenure and other conditions of appointment. The 1957 debates had drawn a lot of attention to the procedures of appointment, and in the same year promotions came into question and the vice-chancellor informed a disappointed candidate that research as well as teaching was now a criterion for promotion. There was also a disturbing case in 1957 when a lectureship was reclassified as a research assistantship, to the anger of the head of department and staff member concerned, who believed, with apparent justification, that had she not been a married woman with a small baby the issue would not have arisen. Such cases would become less frequent after 3 May 1962 when the Senate agreed to appoint lecturing staff and above until the age of sixty-five, subject to the successful completion of a probationary period. Previously staff had received five- or seven-year contracts. Now they had tenure and also retained an expectation of being allowed to continue beyond the age of sixty-five if good health prevailed and such
an arrangement was mutually agreeable to the individual and
the university. Even the new provisions of 1968, which em­
phasized sixty-five as the normal retirement age, did not rule
out the possibility that a person might go on to the age of
seventy.46

As part of the new package of 1959–62, members of staff
also acquired the right to apply for study leave after six years
with more generous allowances, guarantees of housing loans
became available through the university, and the Staff Associa­
tion sought approval for a Staff House in the triennial submis­
sion to the Universities Commission. In October 1965, the
Senate was notified of the formation of the University of
Queensland Club, which it helped to finance with loans, and
in May 1967 it was reported that a survey had been taken of
the probable use of a kindergarten by academic and ad­
ministrative staff if such an amenity were to be provided. Sir
Keith Murray and his successor Sir Leslie Martin had both
stressed the need for a happy and contented staff and had
urged the creation of facilities and amenities to make this
possible.47
15 Student Change

Over the years 1953–59, the University of Queensland experienced a growth rate of 80 per cent compared with an average of 45 per cent for Australian universities as a whole. Queensland’s rate was almost three times that of Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, the older establishments, and this was in part because there was a lot of catching up to be done. When Premier Nicklin assumed office in 1957 there were, he said in September 1962, 13,000 pupils in state high schools; by 1964 that number would have increased fivefold to 65,000. Enrolment statistics reveal that in 1951 there were only thirteen state high schools contributing a total of 116 students to the university’s new enrolment of 700. By 1961 forty-eight state high schools were sending 667 students and at last contributing substantially to the intake. However, catching up at secondary level meant pressure of student numbers at tertiary level a few years later.¹

It is ironical to think that in March 1956 Vice-Chancellor Story was expressing concern that the distribution of enrolments between day and evening students had meant that staff, accommodation, equipment, and facilities were being under-utilized for much of the time, especially in the humanities area. His production-line philosophy under-estimated the extent to which a shift system was already being worked as well as raising fundamental questions about the very nature of the exercise. By 1962 students were seen to be suffering from overcrowding rather than loneliness, and
quotas were being hinted at. A report of the Professorial Board in November 1962 threatened students with more rigid exclusion policies as well as higher entry standards, and in March 1963 class enrolments revealed much congestion in certain courses. Fifty-eight classes had 100–160 students, thirty-three had 160–200, thirty-one had 200–250, and a further six were in the 250–300 range. Some lecturers found these groups too noisy and unruly to permit efficient teaching. In August it was even reported that postgraduates would shortly have to be turned away in physics because the department was unable to handle any more, and a rule amendment was introduced as a short-term expedient to allow the restriction of entry of postgraduates where they could not be accommodated. The threat was made, whatever the intention concerning its implementation.¹

Not all Queenslanders had the opportunity to participate in this tertiary education boom. In March 1957, the secretary for public instruction, L.F. Diplock, reported that in 1955 only 135 students in the area north of Mackay had sat for Senior and six-and-a-half years later, in October 1963, members of parliament were still being told that metropolitan dwellers were two-and-a-half times more likely to go to university than country dwellers; these figures were calculated in relation to the age group, not to the numbers who lived in the different areas. The student body had other features too. The 500 or so overseas students of 1957 were still looming large at the beginning of 1965, and proposals were already being made in 1962 for limiting the number of students to be taken from overseas and from other Australian states. Women, another conspicuous minority, were seen to be increasing in number, to such an extent that 23 per cent of the enrolment in July 1960 was sufficient to prompt a paper from J.D. Story on the "Occupational Outlook for Women Graduates". Less than a year later it was revealed that Queensland had the second lowest known enrolment of women in the world, being second only to Hesse in Germany. This discovery induced no panic, but it did lead the vice-chancellor and others actively to encourage the enrolment of women which enabled them to observe with satisfaction the growing numbers of women throughout the various faculties during the sixties. At the end of 1966, for instance, the vice-chancellor urged women who were already filling 25 per cent of the science places to increase this trend, for Sydney now had 33 per cent.³

More stringent matriculation requirements were inevitably
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seen as a response to overcrowding. In pursuit of that elusive scheme, the five-year secondary programme, J.D. Story had the idea in 1956 of an extra, pre-university year, to be taken at St Lucia. This was at the time when he was worried about under-utilization of plant; it would certainly have helped to fulfill his ideas of a totally integrated educational system. In the absence of a pre-university year, the university was left to decide such issues as the disappearance of Latin as a compulsory requirement for arts students, and the abolition of other requirements at Junior level. From 1965 all faculties required five passes at Senior level for matriculation, with some having additional prerequisites for enrolment, and in 1966 a new scale of grades and passes required effectively raised standards by 10 per cent. Another interesting feature was the reduction of the non-matriculated students to a mere 2 per cent of the total. In 1960 they had constituted 20 per cent, mainly people who were trying to complete professional requirements in education, accounting, and other subjects.4

Two new kinds of scholarship holders appeared within this changing student body. One kind was the winners of Commonwealth Postgraduate Research Awards, the first twelve of whom began work at the start of 1959. The other was that group of ten fellowship holders for university teaching who were to appear in 1964, selected at the end of two years of university study and groomed to become university teachers, though without bonding, as part of the move to overcome difficulties in staff recruitment.5

Growing student numbers meant growing responsibilities for the Students Union, which was their officially recognized body representing them. One major responsibility was to make a submission to the Murray Committee in 1957, in which Murray was advised not only of the need to make a new £400,000 Union Building the priority commitment but also given advice on academically desirable expenditure such as the building of a teaching hospital at St Lucia to allow medical students to escape from the General Hospital, where they were allegedly admitted only on sufferance. They were more successful with the former than the latter request. In March 1957, Semper had reported that the Students Union was the student body and the student body lived in slums, in George Street offices eight feet away from the mud of the Brisbane River. After Murray, the union was delighted to hear in July 1958 that the Senate had approved plans for the long-awaited Union Building, and by August 1960 a Senate committee was
being appointed to discuss the supervision and running of the new building. The students had been given a free hand in planning it, but it was a piece of expensive property and the Senate required some guarantees about its management when it became available in 1961, especially as there were soon plans conceived to extend the building and add a theatre to the Union complex, a scheme envisaged in April 1962 to cost £350,000. The Students Union was fast becoming a major business in its own right, and eventually in 1968 the Senate would be asked to agree to a proposal that its president should be allowed a year’s leave of absence from study to do the job, during which time he would virtually become a salaried officer of the union. This proposal was accepted. Although, by virtue of its very existence, committed to present a student viewpoint and involve itself in argument with the university authorities, the Students Union rarely appeared as a militant or uncooperative organization in these years, and it was with some surprise and unhappiness that Vice-Chancellor Schonell heard union complaints in 1967 that their business was being held up in its progress to the Senate.6

That year, 1967, was, however, a very exceptional year, for the Students Union as well as for the student body at large. In the early sixties it had been seen as an opportunity for students to gain administrative experience before going out into the world, and Humphrey McQueen had found it such a conservative organization that he had regarded it as “enemy territory”. Even through the middle sixties union presidents tended to be aspiring professionals — lawyers, doctors, would-be politicians. In the early part of 1967 the union was concerned to improve the student image tarnished, it was believed, by the excesses of Commemoration, and planned to undertake community projects in order to get rid of the “unwashed crackpots or bearded beatniks” view said to prevail within the community. In April, a thousand underprivileged children were given a Commemoration party, transported to St Lucia, fed and entertained, and this was good public relations. Within a few months the picture had changed dramatically. The Student Movement had reached Queensland. The new presidential elections brought an end to the gentlemanly politicking of earlier days, and, as rumours of a “Union takeover” were denied by staff activists, union officers, interceding with the state government to try to prevent conflict over civil liberties, found themselves pushed into leading a movement which would otherwise overthrow them in this mood of awakened political consciousness.7
Before then there were more conventional issues to tackle, such as student welfare, though this was developing new facets. The shortage of suitable living accommodation for students, always a problem, assumed new proportions in the early sixties as ever more students flooded into the university. Among the most troubled were the Asians, for a union survey conducted in 1960 showed that only fourteen out of ninety-four householders questioned were willing to take Asian students, a further strengthening of the move to establish an International House. The union began to envisage schemes for cheap blocks of student residences that might be constructed on the campus, but these were not fulfilled. Some need was felt to offer an alternative to what some people saw as the unnecessarily comfortable lifestyle enjoyed by the wealthy residents of the traditional colleges, though by no means everyone shared this rosy view of life there.

Another social problem that began to be given publicity at this time was drugs. In November 1963, the *Sunday Mail* very dramatically announced without revealing evidence that 25 per cent of University of Queensland students were sitting their examinations under the influence of illegal personal drugs. The Senate had no great taste for the policeman’s role and a declining willingness to act as a parent, but it did agree in December 1967 that a circular “Drugs and You”, issued by the Harvard University Health Service, should be distributed among students during Orientation Week in 1968. Meanwhile, the problem was very much in the hands of the counselling services that had started to function on a full-time basis ten years earlier. Before then there had been four members of academic staff who had been part-time guidance officers in addition to performing their normal duties. A study by Professor Schonell and others on “Promise and Performance” in university students suggested the need for counselling, and late in 1958 Dr H.W. Thiele became the first full-time counsellor, with half a typist. This marked the start of a counselling and welfare service which would include a doctor from 1961 and chaplains from 1969. One of its most useful activities would be eventually to take over the Student Loans Fund, established at the December 1957 meeting of the Senate, which rapidly extended the number of students assisted.

Student welfare occasionally involved student discipline. A much publicized discipline case occurred in July 1962, when Humphrey McQueen found himself arrested by a member of
administrative staff and summarily suspended by the president of the Professorial Board for publishing statements on what the *Courier-Mail* called the “unconventional sex behaviour” of a controversial southern speaker who had been invited to come to Brisbane. More formal trial procedures failed to find the student guilty of bringing the university into disrepute and the suspension was lifted, being viewed by many as an overreaction on the university’s part. In his welcoming address to students in 1965, the vice-chancellor warned that they would be sent down for a term for misbehaviour, and he made a strong attempt to stamp out the loutish initiation ceremonies that often faced new students within colleges. These brought the university some very unfavourable publicity in 1967 when there were allegations of violence and beatings. In April 1968 the vice-chancellor reported that he had written to all heads of colleges that all practices involving the degradation or possible injury of students, whether physical or mental, must be abolished. Two people were shortly afterwards fined and expelled from a college for ignoring this instruction and a third one fined. At the same time, July 1968, the Senate decided to invoke the St Lucia Site by-laws to ban from the campus a former student whose distribution of political pamphlets was considered “detrimental to the welfare of the University”, and once again the fears of the liberals were plainly in evidence. Against this it is pleasing to report the success of female students in July 1966 in winning the right to attend lectures in slacks, but only “providing the Head of Department does not disapprove”.

In this period of new student welfare issues and a growing political consciousness, the old Commemoration festivities came to appear increasingly an anachronism from a bygone era. The move to St Lucia, the growing size of the student body which made the traditional Commemoration dinners, balls, and graduation ceremonies an impossibility, the police restrictions which ultimately confined the processions to the university grounds, all these combined to destroy the old significance of Commemoration though there were in fact still some surviving features in the late sixties. During the debate on the controversial legislation of 1957 students were identified in parliament as “a lot of filthy dirty louts” who annually took to the streets, and the late fifties experienced the usual mixture of street incidents, clashes with the police, letters from outraged citizens, and stunts, such as the hiring of City Hall in 1958 for a supposed meeting on equal pay, just to
show that students could after all hire the hall, whatever the City Fathers decreed. In 1963 “the filthy weirdies march again”, in 1964 the police threatened to take a tough line on “student larrikinism”, and in 1965 police reportedly drove cars at 1,500 students to break them up and arrested 18 in a city brawl. Even the $5,000 raised for charity by the Commemoration activities of 1967 seemed an insufficient justification for the annual blood-letting, which more serious students were beginning to dismiss as “juvenile”. Disruption of classes, another accepted feature of Commemoration, was thought to be less than amusing by most of those who were not personally involved in the disruption. What was about to happen was a change of mood. Students began to take to the

Cecil Page-Hanify, registrar, 1935–57, receives the honorary degree of Master of Commerce from the chancellor, Dr Otto S. Hirschfeld, 1957
(University of Queensland Archives)
streets for quite different reasons from those which had inspired their earlier public appearances.11

The growing politicization of student activity can be seen in both university affairs and those of the outside world, though this distinction had become increasingly artificial by 1967–68. The appeals clause controversy of 1957 was an occasion of extensive political activity by staff and students alike and produced a high point in staff–student relations. Afterwards there was little in university affairs and politics to promote controversy, though questions were asked in parliament in 1962 about the alleged existence of an organization called “Student Action”. The minister denied its existence and traced the fears to the practice of a small group of students that met to discuss controversial issues. He was probably referring to the “Free Thought Society”, formed by Humphrey McQueen and his friends in the belief that universities should have free thought and that Queensland was somewhat lacking in that commodity. At this stage, the students were less likely to be roused by purely intellectual issues than ones of immediate personal concern, and in March 1963 they were prodded into action by the university’s decision to insist on identity cards, with student numbers and photographs. This evoked thoughts of “1984” and “Brave New World” and some students were loud in their refusal to cooperate, but the university’s insistence that no one could be admitted to examinations without a card caused the protest to collapse; the scheme would soon appear to be no more than part of the workings of an efficient bureaucracy and not much of a threat to liberty. That was in any case being safeguarded by Semper, which shocked the local public in 1963 and 1964 with its satire on royalty and religion and proved that the days of effective censorship were over even if sensitivity remained high. This was again demonstrated in March 1966, when Semper published a scornful account of the vice-chancellor’s welcome to new students and suggested that “the hand of welcome has feet of clay”.12

The year 1967 brought protests and a deputation to the vice-chancellor over fee increases in which students were clearly not exceeding the bounds of their legitimate concerns, but the growing requests of students for participation in university affairs, exemplified in Queensland by an expressed wish for representation on the Faculty Boards, persuaded Professor Schonell, as unacceptable points of view repeatedly do persuade honest and intelligent people, that the university was
suffering from a failure in communication. He proposed a Senate/Student Liaison Committee as a panacea, another cliché of the times, and repeated his message in the annual report for 1967. One of the most significant elements in university life over the past few years had been the greater interest of students in the affairs of the university and the wider community. No longer did the university stand in loco parentis, but it did require better communication with its students to prevent ‘that conflict with authority . . . backed by a vocal militant minority who flout democratic methods’.

The University, while deploiring this group, must nonetheless respect the right of students to express unpopular views. It was a classic statement of liberal beliefs and liberal fears. One year later, in November 1968, the Students Union submitted its proposals for better communication. They sought open meetings between the vice-chancellor and students, meetings with the Staff Association, an ombudsman, a changed Senate, more ‘autonomy and democracy’, administrators and senior academics more responsive to student opinions, and departmental power to staff/student boards over which the head of department would preside as chairman. The Combined Advisory Committee took up this last recommendation, but the Senate rejected it as it did the idea that Senate meetings should be open to the public. Communication was one thing, but the Senate knew the limits of decent exposure.\textsuperscript{13}

The students were less certain, and their political campaigns of the 1960s became more frequent, more popularly supported, and more determined in their tactics. Overt political protest had occurred against Dim Sim’s Formosan petrol which Premier Gair wished to bring into Queensland, and there had been a series of demonstrations in 1962 over the deportation of three Portuguese naval ratings and a further deportation to Communist China, and a boycott of city buses as part of a demonstration against rises in bus fares. Police had been involved in these, and the Commonwealth Immigration Department in particular had become a target for hostility, but they were minor skirmishes compared with what came later.\textsuperscript{14}

An early ‘protest squat’ against Australia’s involvement in Vietnam occurred in May 1965, when about ten university students were involved. The following year brought more student protests against Vietnam and conscription with twenty-two students locked in the Watch-house after clashes with the police. An appeal for an end to the clashes between
students and police was supported by the patronizing comment in *Truth* that students were expected to tilt at windmills, hardly an appropriate description of either the Vietnam war or conscription, and arrests and jailings led to further demonstrations against imprisonments. The right to demonstrate, described in the *Telegraph* as "a legitimate form of protest in most democracies", also became a big issue through 1967, in particular the procedures by which permits for marches could be granted or withheld. During July the Students Union president helped the premier to postpone a student march, allegedly "whipped up on the campus by agitators", and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Teakle declared that he could name four members of staff engaged in such activity. Despite the student president's efforts, an earlier threat to march in September if the government had changed nothing in the meantime was implemented by large numbers of staff and students, many of whom were arrested. Fifty-three appeared in court and sixty-seven failed to appear. There were accounts of "frightening displays of police brutality" during this demonstration. The *Courier-Mail* for once received more letters criticizing the police than the students, and the Trades and Labour Council planned a "stop-work" in support of the students. While angry parliamentarians asked questions about the arrested academics who were said to be on the public payroll and abusing their position, the head of philosophy wrote to the press that the demonstration had been a justification for the hard work he had invested in teaching over the years; and members from opposite sides of parliament came under heavy verbal attack at a civil liberties seminar at the university. Clearly society was much divided over the rights
and duties of both students and academics. Nor were the breaches healed by the decision of two members of staff to go to jail rather than pay $10 fines and discussions on such issues as the sending of medical aid to the Vietnamese National Liberation Front and even the morality of Australians' fighting for North Vietnam against fellow Australians in the official army.¹⁵

By 1968 the radical students who had existed somewhat apart from the student body as a whole in the early part of the decade were now in the centre of things, no longer a highly self-conscious minority but confidently proclaiming a message to their fellow students and to society as a whole. The university was about to enter its most troubled phase when there would be endless soul-searching about the nature of universities and their role within society. The old answers to these questions would no longer seem sufficient to many people.
Part Six

Troubled Years, 1969–1979
16 Radicals and Reformers

During the last two years of the old decade and the first three years of the new one the University of Queensland underwent its sternest test, when, according to some, its credibility as an institution was at stake. These were the years of “the troubles”, when student protest assumed proportions never previously encountered and St Lucia became literally a battleground for conflicting forces. These events have tended to overshadow the fact that this was, for the University of Queensland, still a period of expansion and that the normal life of teaching and research went ahead largely uninterrupted during these years.

It is customary, indeed necessary, to see these developments against a background of events that were taking place in America, Europe, and elsewhere, but, like all local manifestations of a general trend, this phase of the university’s history had features that were derived from the local as well as the universal context. Vice-Chancellor Cowen was right to stress the importance of satellite transmission of American news, and others emphasized the imitative nature of much that happened within an increasingly Americanized Australia, suggesting at times an externally organized movement to involve the University of Queensland in patterns of action initiated elsewhere. Dr Thiele’s report of increased demands for student counselling that had produced a record 2,000 students requiring help in 1969 might well have typified world trends, but the ingredients that produced the explosive mixture in
Queensland in these years were mixed by local hands fashioned in a local setting.¹

The three principal issues which dominated respectively the years 1969, 1970, and 1971 for the University of Queensland were the student movement for greater participation in university government, the war in Vietnam, and the Springbok tour with its attendant State of Emergency, which best illustrates the importance of the local setting in determining the precise nature of the local conflict. These issues were
not, of course, confined to single years, and they all occurred simultaneously with movements associated with sexual liberation, the freer use of drugs, women’s liberation, racial equality, and civil liberties. This coming together of such a wide range of social and political issues created tensions within society as a whole, and these were naturally experienced most deeply and articulated most clearly within the university community. Only a university could undergo the experience of having its governing body addressed by a rank and file member of the institution on the questions “What is man?” and “What is the role of the University within Society?”, which happened to the University of Queensland Senate in June 1969 when student leader Brian Laver, along with two other students, was permitted a ten-minute address. In July 1971, a large student meeting resolved to go on strike and use the university as a place to debate social issues, and the vice-chancellor himself accepted the proposition that the university existed to criticize as well as to serve society, a familiar enough view in other parts of the Western world. In an age of conflict the university would become a place of conflict; it could not opt out of this role.2

The permissive society came to St Lucia with a vengeance in
the middle of 1969. The acting president of the Students Union reported having received many complaints from his members about the *Paper Dart*, the newsheet of the so-called Revolutionary Socialist Students' Alliance, which proclaimed the message of sexual liberation. It was to be heard most clearly in a much publicized erotica display of July, which Semper described as almost a non-event, highlighted only by the appearance of a nude male on the library roof. The happening was sufficiently novel to cause the university administrators to consult their solicitors and institute disciplinary proceedings against those allegedly involved; it also excited the passion of R.J. Hinze who, having heard that a further event was intended, demanded that the government ensure that the university remain 'a place of intellectual and religious freedom for all, not one of licence and unrestrained vulgarity'. Ironically, it was parliament itself which enjoyed both licence and vulgarity as the member for South Brisbane, Colin Bennett, legitimately concerned at the alleged peddling of pornographic literature, produced an astounding accusation on 15 October 1970 that there were twenty-one cases of V.D. within the English department and asked the tasteless question of how many pregnancies there had been at St Lucia during that year.³
Interest soon shifted to other matters: the nude ballet at the Schonell Theatre in March 1972, and the set texts for first-year students being used by the English department, offending again. The Queensland League for National Welfare and Decency, followed by the Community Standards Association, attempted to protect students and society against the magazines brought out for Orientation Week and Expo-Uni, and along with the occasional private individual tried to stem the rising tide of liberation heralded by such publications as *Camp on Campus*. To all these complaints the vice-chancellor had one reply: if individuals broke the law they were liable to prosecution; if they did not, the Senate had no interest in exercising any kind of censorship. As late as July 1975, the Senate was still recording its refusal to act in loco parentis, yet the letters continued to arrive, focusing almost exclusively, as Prof. Zelman Cowen informed a writer in April 1974, on one issue, sex, out of the many confronting the world.

Another issue that did worry certain parliamentarians was that of drugs. Since a local journalist had suggested a high incidence of drug-taking among examination candidates in 1963, Mr Bennett had favoured a special visitation to St Lucia by the Drug Squad, and he was encouraged in his wish “to safeguard the mental and moral fibre of the students” by an admission from Dr Murray Williams of the University Health Service in October 1969 that some students were making illegal use of certain drugs. There is no doubt that during the late sixties and early seventies a fair number of people were experimenting and inducing flashbacks and other hallucinations, and the coverage given to this kind of experience in student publications helped to suggest that these practices were widespread and encouraged within the university. This was always refuted, though it was never denied that some cases existed. In January 1971, Dr Williams, a forthright exposé of the “squalid working conditions and financial stringencies” under which the University Health Service operated, admitted again that some students did try drugs though they were by no means as “licentious” as some liked to believe. Similarly, in July 1973, Professor Edwin Webb conceded that there was some marihuana smoking at the university, though he did not believe it a serious problem. It was university policy to treat this matter as a counselling rather than a disciplinary affair, a matter for the Health Service, the student counsellors, and the chaplains, and it remained merely one of the growing pains of the new and different breed of student so much in evidence during this period.
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The group was characterized by a heightened consciousness of social issues, among which women's liberation and racial equality began to feature prominently. A request from the Union of Australian Women in December 1969 for child-care facilities on campus for the children of staff and students during working hours was a sign of the times, and in October 1971 a worried parliamentarian asked if the Women's Liberation Movement was affiliated with the University of Queensland, a strangely conceived question which the minister could confidently answer in the negative. By February 1975, a student member of the Senate was ready to begin the long drawn-out struggle to remove sexist language from all university publications and papers, but he overreached himself in making the chancellor his first candidate for the role of "chairperson" and received little senatorial backing.

Racism was seen to be a problem that existed outside rather than inside the university, but it added one more element to the ferment of 1971 when it was announced that an "Action Conference on Racism and Education" was to be held at the university in January 1972, and advance notices promised, "This thing's going to end in riots if not massacres." In July of that year a band of masked students, representing the Black Panthers, stormed the Board Room to demand Black Rights and an end to racism; the assembled members of the Library Committee, however sympathetic to their aims, were powerless to grant the wishes of the invaders and chose to vacate the premises.

The university's greatest capacity to respond to radical demands was on the issue of student participation in university government, which dominated the protest movements of 1969. They had what might be recognized as a reformist constitutional wing and one that sought more revolutionary changes. The former was represented by R. Wensley, the Students Union president, who was quoted in the Australian of 20 February 1969 as seeking through the union a greater student participation in the running of departments and faculties. The Senate decision to allow the students a voice in the selection of the new vice-chancellor was seen as a victory for this approach, as was the Senate decision of 15 March to initiate a full-scale investigation of all major aspects of university activities. The president of the Professorial Board, Professor Edwin Webb, commented in May on the enormous acceleration that had taken place in the previous six months in the movement to give students a bigger and more important
university role; there had been ordered and progressive change, he said, through cooperation between the Senate, academic staff, and the student body. This was the classic pattern and language of accommodating reformists to undermine revolutionaries, a gradual integration of the students into the established machinery of the institution.8

The revolutionaries did not want this. Although their methods were not those of physical violence to overthrow the system, their concept was the radical one of changing the traditional governmental machinery and replacing it by some form of participatory democracy involving staff and students on equal terms. “I want staff/student control and autonomy from the State Government,” wrote Dan O’Neill in Semper, in March 1969. It was this idea of popular control, as opposed to the traditional hierarchical authority, that made the movement revolutionary, not the methods that were employed for obtaining such control, for they never progressed much beyond those of the reformists even though conducted in a more dramatic manner.9

The Senate responded in the accommodation style. As early as 10 April 1969 it was agreed that the afternoon of 25 June should be given over entirely to a large-scale seminar on the nature and role of the university, and the Professorial Board followed suit by establishing working parties on reform and encouraging its members to attend student forums. This was all a little too low-key a response for the more ardent spirits, and on 12 June members of the Senate were physically confronted by a sit-in of students, three of whom were allowed ten minutes each to present their case before leaving the meeting. This restrained response from the Senate temporarily defused a potentially explosive situation, and the Great Court seminar, actually held on 2 July, helped to create an impression of reasonable response. According to the Courier-Mail there were some 4,000 staff and students in attendance on this chilly winter afternoon; they listened to a range of speakers until five o’clock, returned at six o’clock, and some remained well into the evening. Reforms were advocated, on this occasion and on others, including the reconstitution of Faculty Boards to include students, the establishment of departmental committees with student representation, the disappearance of the permanent heads of department, and the reconstitution of the Professorial Board.10

All these things were to happen, if not at once, and the capacity of university institutions to respond to student
pressures preserved them from the hostility of the majority of students. The revolutionary group found the proposed reforms insufficient and there were further incidents in the J.D. Story Building, disruption within the history department, and talk at least of the possibility that the annual elections for the Students Union officers would be physically sabotaged to frustrate a feared victory for the moderates. The elections were held and, according to Semper, a conservative backlash allowed the moderates, or the conservatives as Semper described them, to fill the ranks of the Union Council. Political science students might hiss the premier, and the Students Union might find itself in many a future conflict with the university administration, but 1969 had been the high-water mark of the movement for student power within the university and any future gains would be achieved within the traditional machinery and not by overthrowing it.

The reforming spirit of the university was to undergo immediate strain in 1970 as Vietnam and conscription became the centre of student protest, which shifted from university government to politics, though the former remained prominent because of the implications of the political movements for the control and efficient operation of the university. In July 1968, about sixty students were involved in a demonstration against Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia, but it was American and Australian involvement in Vietnam, accompanied as it was by conscription, that brought student political consciousness to its peak. During the Labour Day celebrations of May 1969, many anti-Vietnam demonstrators, including students, attempted to gate-crash the festivities at the Exhibition Grounds wearing Viet Cong steel helmets, but they were not warmly received. Not until May 1970, with the Vietnam Moratorium, did the student movement gain momentum. The vice-chancellor warned that lectures and classes must not be cancelled, though they could be rearranged, and he had his first encounter with pitched tents in the Great Court during the May days of protest.

Vice-Chancellor Cowen faced bigger problems in the early days of September. First there was a destructive attack made upon the headquarters of the Queensland University Regiment, and this was followed by what the Courier-Mail described as a ‘near riot’, when the First Secretary of the South Vietnamese Embassy in Canberra visited the university amid scenes of violence as students clashed with police. The press condemned the university’s ‘day of shame’ and deplored the
failure to uphold the much vaunted traditions of free speech and academic freedom, while the vice-chancellor ordered an immediate inquiry into the incidents to be undertaken by Mr Justice Campbell, who was to report directly to the vice-chancellor. As a result of Justice Campbell’s recommendations, a University Disciplinary Committee, chaired by Professor G.N. Davies, was convened to undertake the main investigation and action against the students involved and to conduct perhaps the most significant student discipline case in the university’s history. Sir Zelman Cowen was later to describe this as an absolutely central case, embodying the right of individuals to come and go freely and be heard without impediment. His opponents saw it otherwise. Again the tents went up in the Great Court, which became a “People’s Park”, and again the vice-chancellor ordered the defiant students, assisted by a few staff, to dismantle them, forbidding the erection of any type of structure on university premises and reminding at least one member of the academic staff of his obligations and responsibilities. A referendum among staff and students revealed that three-quarters of the voting members were opposed to tents in the Great Court and the vice-chancellor received the backing of both the Senate and the Staff Association for his handling of the issue, including invoking Statute 13, the disciplinary statute, against those believed to have been involved in the disturbances against the Vietnamese diplomat.  

A visit by the governor-general, Sir Paul Hasluck, to open the Schonell Theatre some two weeks after the campus brawl produced a further demonstration against a symbol of government authority and policy, but the immediate crisis was over even though it took Senate suspensions and a court conviction to convince some radical leaders that the limit had been reached. Vietnam continued to exercise the student mind as it did the public mind, and in June 1971 Dr Benjamin Spock, an internationally famous campaigner against American action, visited the university and made a plea for student involvement in a further moratorium, this time against apartheid and the impending visit of the Springboks. Students marched from St Lucia to the city in May 1972 to protest against President Nixon’s decision to blockade North Vietnam, and they would continue to denounce the policies of their own government until Gough Whitlam brought an end to conscription and Australian involvement.  

The way in which one issue appeared to supersede another
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as the focal point of student protest seemed to some to indicate that the university was under the influence of a group of people who were determined to voice grievances and make trouble whenever the issue in question. This cynical interpretation, strengthened when anti-apartheid and opposition to the Springbok tour became the popular movements of July 1971, underestimates both the ideological unity of the successive issues and the capacity of people, particularly students and academics, for being moved by moral issues. For the vice-chancellor and his beleaguered administrators the visit of the South African Rugby team to Queensland, supplemented by a state government decision to declare a State of Emergency, must have seemed like fate’s determination that their lives should be made miserable. Anti-apartheid supporters within the university resolved to coordinate their activities with local trade unions in a protest march on the day of the Springbok match, and the government’s proclamation of a State of Emergency ensured the opposition of large numbers beyond those who would otherwise have wished to demonstrate. A meeting organized by the Staff Association condemned the government’s decision, and on 24 July the Courier-Mail announced that 2,500 students had taken over the Students Union for the duration of the Springboks’ visit, that a strike had been called by students and their supporters among the staff, and that the vice-chancellor had resolved that the usual business of the university would be conducted. Estimates of the numbers involved in the strike varied enormously, from the official figure of 24 to that of 400 from a more imaginative reporter; 4,500 students were said to be missing lectures, and the vice-chancellor promised that striking staff would lose their pay in consequence of their activities. Senator Georges called on the vice-chancellor to close the university for a week, but Professor Cowen was determined to resist what he was now beginning to view as a threat to bring the university to its knees. Some departments stood resolutely with the vice-chancellor while others entered with some spirit into the demonstration, but by 31 September the Sunday Mail was reporting that the “Live-in” at the Students Union had been settled and that normal service at St Lucia was expected to be resumed quickly.¹⁵

The Springboks left, apartheid survived, and so too did the University of Queensland. A mere narrative of events and an outline of incidents are insufficient to convey the essence of what the university experienced in the years 1968–72, and to
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measure its importance for the centre of light and learning. This can be better understood by analyzing the attitudes of the different contending parties and interests, their expectations and fears as well as their more accurate perceptions. It would be a mistake, for instance, to ignore the widely held conspiracy theory of the whole period, the belief that what was happening at the University of Queensland was designed and directed from outside and that Queensland students and staff were no more than the toys of their manipulators. In October 1968, the *Courier-Mail* suggested that the vast majority of students were moderates and that only about two hundred were "considered extreme radicals", these people belonging to three allegedly powerful organizations, the Society for Democratic Action, the Queensland University Labor Club, and the Civil Liberties Coordinating Committee, hardly the most sinister sounding bodies and ones which had a distinctly local flavour. However, in May 1969, the Queensland Police warned of unrest that was to occur in the middle term, and the federal attorney-general made a "discovery" of national campaign plans, formulated by three separate national groups which were said to be behind youth demonstrations throughout Australia: these included the Revolutionary Socialist Student Alliance and the Young Socialist League, slightly more menacing sounding bodies than those identified previously, though not perhaps sufficient to justify the surprising declaration of the acting vice-chancellor, Professor Hartley Teakle, that a worldwide network was now apparent. The conspiratorial view was supported by the *Courier-Mail* in February 1970, when it alleged that the militant minority were concerned to disrupt the university in order to disrupt the social system of which the university was part. This view, which had wide currency among parliamentarians and the general public, came near to acceptance by Vice-Chancellor Cowen during the exasperating days of July/August 1971. It should be remembered that in August 1968 Vice-Chancellor Schonell had warned students against both violence and treason, and the troubles had barely begun at that stage.16

There is, however, a much stronger theme than this occasional undercurrent of fear running through the university’s response to student protest, and that is the determined liberalism of all its administrators, which was sorely tried and frequently put to the test but usually survived the battering it was required to take. Acting Vice-Chancellor Teakle, thrown in at the deep end during the interregnum of 1969, spoke in
the May of the need for enlightened administration when dealing with student dissent. At the June meeting of the Professorial Board he called for patience, warned of overreaction, and insisted on the need to preserve the university as a place where dissidents were free to speak out. Already Professor Gates was suggesting that the university might need to be "a little less liberal towards its would-be destroyers", but there was no disposition to take strong action against the early invaders and occupiers of the J.D. Story Building. The registrar, Dr Sam Rayner, had drawn a nice distinction when welcoming them as individuals but not as a mob and would produce a wry verdict on the administrator's lot when he observed, after verbal exchanges with neo-Nazis in September 1974, that there was nothing new about being attacked from both sides. The skirmishes of 1969 were not, in the Staff Association's view, "serious trouble"; the Senate agreed on 11 September to a general amnesty for past disruptions coupled with a warning that future disruptions could involve suspensions or expulsions, and the Courier-Mail accepted this as a sound decision.*

Undoubtedly the most plagued and beleaguered liberal was the newly appointed vice-chancellor, Professor Zelman Cowen, who declared at the outset his welcome for criticism and dissidence but his dislike of chaos and destruction. Liberty there would be at St Lucia, but no licence to disrupt. By September 1970 he was beseeching students and staff to give him "a campus free from violence, ugly and intemperate language, and march and countermarch", a description sadly evocative of London's East End in the days of Mosley's Black Shirts. The violent disruption of the Vietnamese diplomat's meeting, he believed, struck at the very heart of the university's activities and operations and its tradition of free debate, and he doubtless endorsed Sir Paul Hasluck's observation that universities should be places where knowledge and reason prevailed, not mindless abuse. Much of the abuse was personally directed at the vice-chancellor; this personal hostility and unpleasant treatment demanded all the wisdom, courage, and self-control of which he was capable. There were few who did not sympathize with his unhappy predicament, the dignity with which he performed, and the skill with which he stood for so long between the university and those who saw in the troubles the opportunity to impose those fetters with which they believed the university should be bound. He was appalled that the university was falling into low esteem and he believed that this was happening "because it is seen to harbour persons..."
who have no respect for the institution''. The traditional liberal values had, he believed, been flouted by the present nature of student and staff protest, and he could not forgive his opponents for the damage that he saw them inflicting upon the university.18

The fine line separating freedom and licence was as difficult to locate as that narrow pathway which vice-chancellors had to tread avoiding the pitfalls created by politicians and public opinion on one side and radical critics on the other. Professor Zelman Cowen, condemned by the radicals, was simultaneously criticized by C.J. Bennett, MLA, for condoning violence by showing moderation. C.L. Porter, MLA, demanded to know if Statute 14 (the dismissals statute) provided him with sufficient authority to cope with staff members who gravely impaired the good order of the university. By pure chance, one of those people most frequently accused of such a contribution was due to come up for confirmation of his position in April 1971. Although one of his parliamentary foes wished to have him dismissed for sabotage, the vice-chancellor was punctilious in distinguishing between the person’s abilities as an academic and any irritation that he might be causing at the time. The appointment was confirmed and academic freedom preserved.19

The public relations aspect of the vice-chancellor’s role was extremely important during these difficult times. He worked hard to establish a close working relationship with the editor of the Courier-Mail, John Atherton, so essential for fair coverage of university news, and within the government he enjoyed the friendship of Sir Gordon Chalk and the sympathetic cooperation of police commissioner Ray Whitrod which helped ensure that reason prevailed in that quarter. This was vital since one of the most controversial aspects of preserving order on the campus concerned the presence there of the police. Their absence during the so-called erotica display in July 1969, and the natural reluctance of the university’s leaders to seek police help every time a broadsheet threatened an incident, prompted a parliamentary accusation that the police were being deliberately kept on a leash and even a belief that the campus was an area of sanctuary into which their jurisdiction did not extend. Vice-Chancellor Cowen was always quick to disabuse people on this notion and to insist that the law of the land must be enforced within the university as it was outside. At the same time he held firmly to the view that agreed procedures must prevail between the police and univer-
sity authorities, and that there were many situations in which he would expect the police to appear only at the request of the university. He confessed that the police had entered the campus during the South Vietnam protest of 4 September 1970 without the knowledge of the university administrators, though he admitted to a willingness to call them back in future should similar incidents occur. This remained the understanding, that the police would normally wait to be asked before appearing. When, for instance, in April 1973 the vice-chancellor reported to the Senate the secondment of a regular police officer to inquire into breaches of general law, he assured members that university discipline was not in question and that he would retain responsibility for calling in the police on this matter. The area of university/police relations was still sensitive in the early months of 1978 to a different issue when it was alleged that a student who was a member of the Special Branch had been placed on campus to collect information. The acting vice-chancellor, Professor George Davies, advised the commissioner of police that such conduct would be unacceptable unless prior discussion had occurred and approval been given. The commissioner was not disposed to accept this view.20

The other controversial aspect of preserving law and order was the disciplinary action that the university chose to take against its members. Forbearance and tolerance were vital, but any refusal to take some sort of action against behaviour that the community adjudged outrageous would have been politically disastrous as well as personally humiliating for the individuals under attack. It was invariably seen by the outside community as too reluctant to act and put its house in order, and when it did act there was always a likelihood that a proportion of its members would dissent from its decisions and become involved in a further escalation of protest and demonstration. Of the various incidents that occurred in 1969 it was the “erotica” display that was selected for disciplinary action, a mistake in the opinion of many senior academics because it left the university vulnerable to censorship charges when it should have been taking a stand on the issue more central to its own operations, that of disruption. In addition the Senate embarked upon the unrewarding tasks of drafting a revised Statute 13 on student discipline and misconduct and encountering the opposition of Students Union and staff alike to serving on disciplinary committees constituted to examine particular cases. The 1970 round of incidents brought suspen-
sions and the laying of disciplinary charges following the South Vietnam protest, and the *Courier-Mail* called for "Discipline, not dithering" as the Senate repeatedly showed signs of wishing to forgive what had happened and to threaten action only for the future. More action was taken against students following the "sit-in" of 29 September in the J.D. Story Building, and one investigation was even said to be occurring under the dreaded Statute 14, by which members of academic staff could be dismissed from their positions. No staff were dismissed but a few cases of student suspensions and fines provided the minimum blood-letting demanded by the community, even though they were guaranteed to provoke more petitions and protests at the alleged injustice or tyranny of university authority. The vicious circle of protest and punishment was one from which the administrators would have gladly escaped had they been able, and it is a significant illustration of the university's general antipathy to this internal policing action that it was ready enough to lift the bans on some of its most vehement critics when they sought re-admission in 1972 and gave undertakings of good behaviour.21

One area of particular vulnerability was that of relations with the state government. In July 1968, at a very early stage in the troubles, the *Courier-Mail* informed readers that student discipline was a matter for the university to undertake, not the government, and in October 1969 the minister for education confirmed that the university was an autonomous body, responsible for the conduct of both its staff and its students. The Senate was both willing and able to administer the affairs of the university in a satisfactory manner. Such was the officially stated view, but there were occasions when both private members and even ministers threatened the university with government intervention. During the 1969 clashes some members suggested reorganizing the Senate to ensure a "more effective and positive control" of the university, investigations of the university's affairs in the interests of the taxpayer, and an opportunity to discuss and determine the appointment of the next vice-chancellor. During the Vietnam demonstrations of 1970 Police Minister Hodges threatened to "starch up" the University Senate if it could not fulfil its obligations and to use the police on campus to enforce the law, while the Cabinet at the same time asked the minister for education to institute a review of the University Act.22

In 1971 the government was planning a new state law on sit-ins, though in March it was conceded that university sit-ins
would be dispersed only on the request of the administration. Later, in July, the premier talked of bringing academic staff under industrial legislation and taking action against troublesome scholarship holders, and was asked to extend the State of Emergency to cover the university. A week later the insatiable Tom Aikens sought a commission to get rid of one-third of the staff and one-third of the students, while Russ Hinze wanted to know if the Senate or parliament had power to dismiss persons of disrepute and what protection existed for unsophisticated teenage girls at the university, following an adultery charge. The Staff Association was moved to declare its opposition to imposing sanctions on grounds of personal and private business, but a further “erotica” incident the following year prompted an exasperated Mr Aikens to ask when something was going to be done about the university and the premier to give an assurance that he had personally taken control of the government’s inquiries into the Queensland University erotica scandal.

The threats, open and veiled, were an ever-present feature of these years, as were the innuendo and overt criticism of a small group of parliamentarians. They accused the senators of being “pussy-footed, weak, and inept” in their handling of the “rat-bag radicals” and they remembered that “this larrikin conduct” by staff and students was being supported by taxpayers’ money. They asked who would pay Mr Justice Campbell’s salary and do his duties while he was inquiring into the Vietnam protests at the vice-chancellor’s request, a singularly uninformed reaction to an exercise of modest proportions; whether the state health authorities had adequate powers to enforce anti-plague regulations on campus; what were the facts concerning Professor Cowen’s new house; whether academics gaol ed in 1967 were still being employed in 1970; whether such people were receiving “the lucrative university ‘lurk’ ” known as sabbatical leave and double salaries; whether certain staff were employed only because the university was being run on the cheap; whether a member of staff who committed adultery was in breach of a university statute. Colin Bennett, Tom Aikens, and Russell Hinze featured prominently in the parliamentary debates of these years whenever the university came up for discussion.

Conversely, the university served as public watchdog of the state government. Vice-Chancellor Cowen, for all his problems within the university, did not neglect to express “deep concern at the possible threat to fundamental civil liberties”
over the emergency powers assumed by the government in 1971. Seven years later three other prominent academics, Professors Davies, Saint, and Holborow, would condemn the government’s handling of the Social Education Materials Project and the programme Man: A Course of Study, alarmed by the premier’s chilling statement: “Someone in the Education Department did not seem to know what the Government wanted children to be taught.” Even when the Commonwealth took over responsibility for funding universities at the beginning of 1974, the University of Queensland, like other state universities, remained anomalously controlled by the legislation of the state government, which would cause Vice-Chancellor Wilson to have to look in two directions when he made his plea for no “government meddling in the university’s affairs” shortly after his arrival in 1979.25

The decline of student protest appears fairly sharp after the transitional year of 1972, which saw a marked easing of the tensions of 1971. A new federal government at the end of 1972 brought new policies on Vietnam and attitudes more sympathetic to student thinking on many issues. Many people argue that the coming of the semester system in 1974 finally killed off the protest movement as students became caught up in the necessity to maintain a steady output of assessed work to ensure good grades. This pressure was exacerbated by a deteriorating economic situation from the middle of the decade as the pursuit of increasingly elusive jobs made students more conformist and fully conscious of the need to pass well to ensure their economic future. By May 1976, Semper was nostalgically looking back on the great days that were no more and inviting contributions and reminiscences from the folk-heroes of the earlier years, under the heading “The Rise and Fall of Student Consciousness”. By the end of the decade it was alleged that students had lost their radical fervour and a desire to change society. If economic recession and unemployment were taking this toll of the student population, they were indeed exacting a high price.26

Anything approaching a final verdict on this period is not, of course, possible. Many who were present through the troubled years believed that the university emerged strengthened as a result of its experiences. Complacency was shattered and purposes were re-examined. Some believed that the student radicals only confirmed that the university had been moving in the right direction all the time; others believed that they had served a useful purpose in forcing change upon
the university and causing reappraisals. In February 1969, Professor Edwin Webb, president of the Professorial Board and a veteran of the 1967 civil liberties street march, predicted that in the long run nothing but good would come out of the student ferment. Two-and-a-half years later he was still maintaining that this had been the most stimulating time of his life. For Professor Lewis Keeble, the events of these years had been the perfect liberal education and a most valuable exercise; he reckoned that the loss of teaching time had been insignificant compared with the valuable educational benefits to be derived from contemplating such issues as the Springbok tour, and the relationship between government and parliament, government and police, police and public and so on. Not all academics wished to see education acquired by so much direct participation in events, but there were many who chose to emphasize the positive aspects of the troubled years.27

By comparison with the events of the stirring times just described, those of the later seventies were pale shadows. The Whitlam years brought new hopes and fears, among the latter being the worry of the minister for local government and main roads, R.J. Hinze, that it had become "the policy of the University to indoctrinate students into the concept of a socialist republic of Australia, as proposed by the Whitlam Government". This arose from an alleged neglect of the National Anthem at university functions, and the vice-chancellor was displeased that the minister for education should even have thought it necessary to pass on such a query. In November 1975, students and staff marched again over the dismissal of Gough Whitlam, and in July 1976 Brian Laver re-emerged to speak on behalf of bigger student allowances after a further march of students and staff from the various tertiary institutions of Brisbane. Allegations of police brutality which the vice-chancellor and the police minister wished to have investigated were dismissed by the premier, but the vice-chancellor lost some of the friends he had made on this issue by docking a day's pay from those staff absent from duty "without adequate reason". According to the Staff Association president, R.W. Byrom, this was "hasty and arbitrary action invoking illegality, inefficiency, and lack of equity". Civil liberties demonstrations of 1977 brought further skirmishes between police and members of the university, both students and staff, who were again made to realize that life in their native state had, as most people always maintained, if for varying reasons, a different quality from life in the rest of Australia.28
Troubled Years, 1969–1979

The Students Union could hardly expect to stand aloof from the disturbances of the troubled years or to emerge unscathed. If the academic and administrative aspects of the university were targets for reduction to “participatory democracies” so too was the Students Union, a more vulnerable target in that the radical students were at least operating within their own sphere of influence. Even if the officials of the union appeared more militant than their predecessors, they still attempted to operate through the traditional machinery of elections and a Students Union Council, and they were prone to the criticism besetting most elected governments, that they overspent, mishandled money, and were incompetent. Nineteen seventy-one was a year of accusations, resignations, and recriminations, with the new student president, Paul Abernethy, fondly supposing that he could concentrate on extending catering services. The bizarre move of the Union Council in December 1971, by sixteen votes to fourteen, to bring in the university’s most voluble critic, Colin Bennett, MLA, as chairman, predictably created near-riot situations as Union Council meetings were invaded and disrupted. The chairman resigned, the postgraduate students attempted to separate themselves from the main body, and the vice-chancellor rallied to the defence of a Union which threatened to disintegrate. Increasingly, demands were made that this million-dollar-a-year enterprise must put its house in order if it was to survive, and its financial affairs occasioned as much concern as its political. More resignations occurred in 1973 amid charges of political intrigue and mounting debts, and in July a new president, Jim Varghese, came to office as head of a Community Action Team, a resounding victory for a new emphasis, though one achieved on a less than 20 per cent poll, which indicated some cooling of student ardour for politics.29

The Students Union’s problems were by no means over for in October 1975 the Senate appointed a committee to meet with union officers to discuss matters of finance, in particular the new trading venture that was being undertaken in the shape of a city centre shop. It was not clear whether the union had the right to employ funds derived from fees for this commercial purpose, but it was equally unclear precisely what power the Senate had to intervene in Union affairs. An attempt was made to tidy up this situation in March 1977 through arrangements which would, according to the deputy vice-chancellor (Fabric and Finance), J.M. Ritchie, merely formalize relations between the Senate and the union. The
university would continue to impose an annual service charge which would be distributed between the union and the Sports Association after a budget had been received and the Senate had been satisfied that the money would be applied only for university purposes within Section 30 of the University Act. This was helpful but not conclusive, for the union financing of 4ZZZ radio station came under close scrutiny through 1978–79 and again it was unclear if funds were being properly used. This time it was ruled that the union could subsidize the station only to the extent that the radio station was providing services requested by the union in fulfilling its own obligations.\textsuperscript{30}

Not surprisingly the politicians watched these developments with some interest, and if the Senate was worried about the...
financial dealings of the union, the government parties were more worried about the political purposes to which funds were being put and the allegedly obscene nature of student publications. In February 1977, the government began to contemplate new legislation to dissolve the existing union, a name which was sufficient in itself to strike terror into some hearts, and replace it by two separate bodies, a service sector which would attract fees and a totally voluntary Students Representative Council which would not. Vice-Chancellor Cowen joined the students in opposing this proposal, believing that it would bring an end to student activities. The state government toyed with the idea for the next two to three years, occasionally prompted from Canberra, and by no less a figure than Prime Minister Fraser, who personally encouraged Premier Bjelke-Petersen to introduce legislation to ensure that fees were not spent on matters unrelated to the interests of students as such. If legislation had to come the Senate asked that it should take the form of an amendment to the University of Queensland Act rather than be general legislation encompassing the tertiary institutions of the state, but government delays allowed new Vice-Chancellor Wilson to argue in May 1979 that change was undesirable when the union was behaving responsibly and the Senate had appropriate controls to ensure that it did so. For the time being the union had earned a reprieve.31
17 Other Problems of Government

If the period 1968–72 did not prove to be an age of revolution it was at least an age of reform, bringing many changes in university government and preparing the way for many more, as ruling bodies broadened their composition and power was gradually redistributed throughout the university. The Senate itself was sometimes encouraging and sometimes reticent in fostering these developments. In 1968 it again affronted the academics, this time from the economics and commerce area, by taking a decision over the elimination of their proposed building from the next construction round without consulting the people concerned. Such occasional high-handed action produced murmurs of discontent from the Senate’s main rival for power, the Professorial Board, which, from August 1969, was allowed to receive the reports of the Research, Library, Buildings and Grounds, and Limitation of Enrolments Committees, a not excessively magnanimous gesture given the academic nature of much of this business.¹

In September 1969, the Senate declined once more to accept a Staff Association proposal that the press should be admitted to meetings, but did agree, as it had in times past agreed, to make information available in a modified form. A working party to review Senate committee structures, appointed in December 1969, led to the separation of the Administrative Committee from Finance, many decades after J.D. Story had brought them together and saved himself a few meetings, and the Administrative Committee was renamed the Legislative Com-
mittee. Rather surprisingly, the Research Committee was retained as a Senate committee for several more years, and it was decided that students should not be admitted to the Planning Committee. In April 1972, senators were again informed of Professorial Board anger that they had decided to establish a Board of Asian Studies without either Professorial Board or faculty advice, and in September 1974, almost twenty years after their earlier momentous gesture, they overturned a recommendation from the Appointing Committee to a chair, not, on this occasion, a unanimous recommendation. Their exercise of power earned them further rebukes in 1975, when FAUSA, the national body of Staff Associations, censured them for failing to pay the costs arising out of a Dismissals Advisory Committee’s proceedings which did not lead to a staff dismissal. They also evoked a little hostility by the decision in March 1978 that the Senate Improvements Committee had served its purpose and should not be reactivated, thus closing one avenue by which suggestions and criticism could reach them, and in September 1979 resisted yet again a proposal from the student president, Eugene O’Sullivan, to open the Senate to the public.²

One area that gave rise to problems in this period was the Senate’s relations with the individual academic departments and its response to the issues that were generated at departmental level. In February 1969 it was admitted that the management and control of the multi-professorial Department of Law had produced problems that were not easily solved. It was hoped that the advertisement for a new person to fill the Garrick Chair and become head of department would settle the situation, but it did not and the Garrick Chair itself became a bone of contention during the 1970s. By the end of 1969 the Senate was in possession of the Professorial Board committee report on departmental reorganization, which recommended the abolition of the permanent heads of department, something more easily recommended than achieved because of the nature of their contracts of appointment, and made provision for short-term headship appointments, shared decision-making when more than one professor was involved, and the establishment of consultative machinery within departments. It took a year for these proposals to receive formal endorsement, and an eternity to have them implemented in letter and spirit, though some departments made a serious effort to carry them out. The new spirit of cooperation and consultation received something of a blow when a
Chair Committee was created for philosophy which contained not a single member of that department, which condemned the arrangements as "an absurdity", with all the force at the logician's command.3

The Senate found the situation equally absurd in March 1973, when the vice-chancellor recommended them to appoint a reader as head of department in mathematics when there were five professors who either did not want the job or were not wanted for it. They swallowed their doubts and accepted that times were changing. In that month another professorial head of department resigned because he was unable to work with a minority of his colleagues, and again the previously accepted status of a professor appeared to be changing. A subsequent attempt by a department to have a senior tutor appointed as acting head was regarded by Vice-Chancellor Cowen as carrying the new equality further than he was prepared to countenance.4

A bigger area of contention was that bastion of hierarchical privilege, the Professorial Board, which sought to take from the Senate but to give little to those below professorial rank who wished to share the delights of decision-taking within the academic sphere. In 1971 a Professorial Board committee, responding to the mood of the times, had recommended that some non-professorial members be elected by the faculties on to a renamed Academic Board, and the professors came under heavy fire as they procrastinated on this matter. After a year's thought they agreed to the establishment of two new committees, one for promotions and reappointments which were to be taken away from the Standing Committee, and one for postgraduate studies which were to be taken from the Education Committee, but they resolved not to change their membership. This disturbed even the Senate, which reminded them that changes were occurring elsewhere, even within the Senate, and a new committee under Professor Davies was given a wider brief to look again at the Professorial Board and all its works. It produced an enormous comprehensive report on almost everything but getting non-professorial representation on to the board; it had bold words to say on the incomplete progress being made by the board towards an oversight of all academic areas, and even bolder proposals for scrapping the Standing Committee, replacing it by an Academic Executive Committee of the board, and arranging the academic departments in schools for resource purposes.5

Parts of the report read like a prophecy of the shape of
things to come, but its immediate reception was not a welcoming one. Some senators feared that they were about to become merely a rubber-stamp for decisions that would in future be taken by the academics, an unthinkable role, and they appointed the inevitable sub-committee to draw breath and study the report in detail. The Professorial Board had incurred five votes of no confidence by various other academic bodies when it had declined to extend its ranks. Now the Davies Report came under similar fire for showing so little concern for the matter that interested people most, people who wanted representation not efficiency. Eventually the Senate committee, determined that the board should be just as susceptible to changing its composition as the Senate had needed to be, repeated the earlier lecture on participation and representation, and produced a set of proposals that guaranteed non-professors twenty elected members and denied the professors automatic membership. "What is at stake," quoted a Staff Association document from an earlier speech by Professor Lyons, "is the power of Professors." Henceforth professors were to appear on the board if elected to fill twenty positions or as heads or deans, but their automatic rights and powers as professors were waning and it was agreed that their partial demise should be recognized by seeking an amendment to the University Act to create an Academic Board in place of the Professorial Board. Besides gaining a lot of non-professors, and a few students, the board also acquired, belatedly, the Research Committee and the Library Committee. Representation triumphed over resource allocation, but the Davies Report was not forgotten, if temporarily forgiven.

During the last illness of Sir Fred Schonell and after his death, Professor Hartley Teakle occupied a very hot seat as acting vice-chancellor, and his services to the university were acknowledged in the naming of the Hartley Teakle Building in June 1971. During this period, Professors J.H. Lavery and H.C. Webster served as deputy vice-chancellors. It seemed important to the Staff Association that for the future such appointments to senior administrative positions should take place according to defined rather than ad hoc procedures, but the very fluid political situation within the university made this difficult to achieve at once, though the presence of a student on the selection committee for the next vice-chancellor seemed to indicate that the board at least would not have future difficulties in establishing its participation in all such exercises.
Once more there were strong internal candidates for the vice-chancellorship among more than forty aspirants to the position, but none strong enough to emerge as a decisive winner, and Professor Zelman Cowen, vice-chancellor of the University of New England, was invited to come to Queensland on terms rather more favourable than his predecessors had enjoyed, for the university undertook to provide a suitable residence to help attract him to Brisbane. The approaching retirement of several senior academics allowed the Senate to proceed with its redistribution of the duties of the deputy vice-chancellor. From August 1970, Professor Webb was appointed deputy vice-chancellor for matters academic, and shortly afterwards he was joined by Mr James H. Ritchie, as deputy vice-chancellor in matters pertaining to the “fabric and finance” of the university, a title more accurate than neat. The placing of full-time members of staff in these positions constituted a great strengthening of the administration of the university, and the trend was confirmed by the decision at the end of 1971 to allow veterinary science, like medicine, a full-time dean, Professor Trevor Heath. The appointment of the new vice-chancellor had been accompanied by the announcement that Dr Sam Rayner was to become registrar in succession to Cyril Connell, and the new team girded its loins for what the 1970s had to offer, which was not always bouquets. According to his successor, Cyril Connell’s great achievement had been to develop an administrative infrastructure which had permitted the university to handle the great student
growth of the sixties. Three subsequent university registrars had trained under him as the University of Queensland made increasingly important contributions to the staffing of sister institutions. This was highlighted in 1975 when Professor Edwin Webb was appointed to the vice-chancellorship of Macquarie University and in 1977 when Professor Ronald Gates was appointed to be vice-chancellor of the University of New England.8

A more dramatic departure was announced in July 1977 with the appointment of Sir Zelman Cowen to succeed Sir John Kerr as governor-general, and leave of absence was given to allow preparation for the new responsibilities. The new governor-general left behind him no fewer than seventeen buildings completed in his period of office, including the magnificent Mayne Hall, a reformed administration incorporating many of the ideas from the period of ferment, the new leadership structure, and a quiet campus. He would have given much for such a blessing during his first year there. He also added a new dimension to the University of Queensland through his encouragement of the arts and cultural activities, the establishment of a Department of Fine Arts, the provision of a performance room within the music department, and the development of the Mayne Hall as a concert hall, where the university paid one of its farewell tributes to Australia’s new governor-general. Once more the machinery of appointments had to be set in motion and Professor Davies acted as vice-chancellor until Professor Brian Wilson arrived from Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, and quickly foreshadowed a move to reorganize the university along lines not totally dissimilar to those suggested in the earlier Davies Report.9

The other constitutional question to plague the Senate was that of its own composition, which would never be to everyone’s liking. The nominated majority had gone in 1965, but the composition of the elected and ex officio groups still left plenty of room for disagreement. In February 1969, the Staff Association communicated its anger that Dr K.W. Knight, though attracting sufficient votes to justify election, was excluded from membership because he was outside the limit of places allowed to members of staff, while the Trades and Labour Council again asked for representation, which it was not within the power of the university to give, when the next amendments were introduced. In attempting to present a university position to the government in late 1972 and early 1973, the Senate moved fairly cautiously, accepting proposals
to bring in the student and Staff Association presidents and abolish Church representation as such, but it was unwilling to move as far as the Staff Association, the Improvements Committee and the Students Union wanted over altering the balance between government nominees and staff and student representation from within the university. Nor did it choose to recommend the reinstatement of a clause against discrimination on grounds of sex, religion, and race.¹⁰

When the minister for education interviewed the vice-chancellor, he exposed some of the disagreements on the university side, which doubtless encouraged him and the government to produce the Bill which they wanted. The government declined to eliminate Church representation and to remove the appointment of vice- and deputy vice-chancellors from the purview of the governor-in-council, which the Senate had requested, though it did make minor concessions to staff and students which could be set against the introduction of a new category of two members from the Legislative Assembly. More irksome to some staff and students than the precise allocation of positions was the fact that they were determined by an external body, that the university did not choose its own government, and that the process of assembling more proposed amendments had to be set in motion almost before the proverbial drying of the ink on
the 1973 Act. From 1977 there was a government initiative, to regulate the Students Union by legislation, as well as a university one, but the 1979 Amendment Act had the main effect of renaming the Professorial Board; there was no great leap forward to representation for the general staff, which was a disappointment to many, and no legislative controls for the student organizations, which was the good news.\(^{11}\)

The main business of the Senate during this period was, as always, that of financing the operation of running a university. It was a $13 million enterprise in 1969. In the absence of private endowments of any magnitude the University of Queensland continued to rely like other universities on that curiously balanced mechanism by which the Commonwealth government contributed $1 for every $1.85 of income from the state government and from student fees, up to a maximum fixed by the Australian Universities Commission. The university’s income was thus subject to three constraints. The most important was the allocation recommended by the Universities Commission, which was always less than the university needed and felt that it had the right to expect. After the 1969 report of the Universities Commission, it was again demonstrated that Queensland had been badly treated, receiving the lowest per capita recurrent grant of all Australian universities, for reasons which no one seemed able to justify or
properly understand. This so outraged the Staff Association that it demanded a Committee of Inquiry, along the lines of the Murray Committee, into Australian tertiary education, as it had no confidence in the workings of the Universities Commission. For Queensland a general deterioration was predicted: research, the library, equipment, maintenance, staff–student ratios, all were expected to suffer decline; capital grants for building provided small hopes of extra accommodation in the near future; and for computing the University of Queensland was said to have received less than any other major university.12

The second limitation was the capacity and willingness of the state government to match the grant that the Commonwealth was preparing to make available. Usually it did so but in 1967 had declared its inability to do its share. Although it soon came back into line, it did so on the requirement that 23 per cent of income would have to come from fees, and that both its annual contributions and any supplementation that came from the Commonwealth (and was therefore expected from the state) would be given on this understanding that fees continued to provide 23 per cent of the total. The third constraint was therefore the amount that could be raised from fees, for without fee increases the state government would not contribute its share, and without that the Commonwealth contribution would fall below the maximum that could be obtained. This produced a succession of fee increases in the early seventies to keep the interrelated stages of funding in operation and many moments of apprehension as the university awaited responses from its two money suppliers. The one persistently underestimated the university’s needs. The other repeatedly declared its inability to go further, imploring the university to balance its budgets and resist the temptation to expand.13

Vice-Chancellor Cowen was soon to discover a “critical financial position” at the end of 1970, resulting mainly from salary increases for non-academic staff which were not producing supplementary grants, and he anticipated the need to borrow money to carry on work on the Great Hall until the Commonwealth’s contribution was released. In 1971 Treasurer Chalk lamented the plan to have a small deficit, which the Finance Committee thought reasonable enough “in these times”, but the deputy vice-chancellor (Fabric and Finance), was already speaking severely of the need to practise economies and of the freezing of general funds and equipment
votes. The metaphor of the freeze was already part of the university’s vocabulary and would re-emerge with greater frequency in the later years of the decade. This year, 1971, was acknowledged to be “a difficult year”, though it ended with a small surplus because of additional supplementation agreed to by the state.\textsuperscript{14}

By the end of 1972, a year in which fees had risen by 26 per cent, another crisis loomed when the treasurer insisted that the state’s limit had been reached and that fees and total university spending remained the only adjustable part of the calculation. Fees were already among the highest in Australia and threatening to reach unthinkable proportions. In November the treasurer informed the vice-chancellor that over the past decade and for the next triennium the state’s contribution to the university had risen and would continue to rise at one-and-a-half times the rate of growth in state resources. Perhaps with an eye on the relief shortly to come from the Commonwealth, he nonetheless weakened to the extent of agreeing to a further $830,000 for 1973 on condition that the university undertook to introduce no further fee rise in that year and to confer with James Cook and Griffith to institute a uniform scale. The universities were promised no supplementation except for salaries, but this was a substantial gain in a period of inflation, since salaries constituted the main need for supplementation. Prudence was nevertheless the watchword at the end of 1972. Nor could the state contemplate more than salary supplementation for the next three years. Resources were being stretched to the limit. In Vice-Chancellor Cowen’s view, this was equally true of the university. It had, he believed, outgrown the resources available to it, and he called for nationally funded universities as the only means of lifting the heavy burdens on state treasuries.\textsuperscript{15}

Fees had assumed a central role in university finances, and the three-way relationship with Commonwealth and state authorities had proved agonizing. It was with some relief, if with mild trepidation about its implications, that the university received the news, which the Whitlam government conveyed to the premier on 27 March 1973, that fees would be abolished from 1974 and that the federal government would be assuming full responsibility for a wide range of tertiary institutions, including universities. This did not mean a life of affluence for the university, but it did mean that in 1974 the vice-chancellor could budget for a $793,000 deficit on the understanding that the Universities Commission would
recommend supplementation to cover inflation and that by November an expected $215,000 surplus encouraged him to plan a deficit of $910,000 for 1975, with a similar expected pattern of events. The Professorial Board was affecting to talk in 1974 of how to act “in times of financial stringency” and the deputy vice-chancellor had the common problem of that period, liquidity, but in September 1975 Christmas came early when it was announced that over $1 million was available for distribution. The bad news soon followed. In his budget speech the federal treasurer, Bill Hayden, a Queensland graduate, announced that 1976 would be a year outside the triennial arrangements.16

It was soon clear that trouble was brewing. Political events in Canberra raised worries on what could be expected from that quarter. On the one hand inflation was said to be threatening social and political stability and requiring big cuts in government expenditure. On the other the annual finance Bill was being held up in the Senate. Universities were told that they would receive no equipment funds in the first half of 1976 and hardly any research money through ARGC in that period and would need to borrow on the strength of later expectations. All available money would have to go on meeting current expenditure, and 1976 would, it was mildly predicted, be a difficult year; 1975 was still not quite over, and the political crisis threatened to reduce the university’s available cash to a few thousand dollars. Dependence on a single paymaster had its disadvantages. The annual report commented that high inflation had posed formidable problems and that the immediate future was sombre. Nor would the university derive much comfort from Professor Karmel’s advice, as chairman of the Universities Commission, that universities would have to attract more private funds.17

Australian universities yearned in 1976 for the restoration of triennial planning and funding, but the new federal minister, now advised by a new Tertiary Education Commission, which was in turn advised by a Universities Council, hesitated to give complete reassurance. There was to be a “rolling triennium” for 1977–79, with firm figures available only for the first year, no promise of full compensation for inflation, nothing for building, and no prospect of significant growth in real terms. Despite the gloomy prospects, September 1976 found the university with almost $400,000 to spend on a new telephone system, though talk of the reintroduction of fees for second and higher degrees began to be heard. In 1977 there
was again full supplementation on existing arrangements, and a further sum to allocate in September after the budget review, but Prime Minister Fraser was speaking ominously with the state premiers about the need for coordination and rationalization within education. Minister Carrick also was warning that in 1978 supplementation would be limited to wages and salaries, and promising a mere 2 per cent growth for 1978–80 in the tertiary sector. The University of Queensland now began to face the concept of “zero real growth” in its recurrent grant for 1978, and this, accompanied by its sinister partner “incremental creep”, meant problems for an institution which was spending about 87 per cent of its income on wages and salaries.  

Before the situation deteriorated further, the opportunity was taken to write off some of the debts of the Queensland University Press, which, according to a Finance Committee Report, “seemed to completely ignore financial constraints”, a split infinitive which the Press’s editorial staff would never have tolerated. It was also agreed to establish a General Development Fund, by setting aside $245,000 in the hope that this might inspire the Universities Council to be kind to Queensland, having seen what initiative the university was itself prepared to take to foster new developments. And just when everyone’s loins were girded for the struggle, the immediate financial prospects again brightened as significant supplementation was awarded for 1977 and the base grant for 1978 increased. The budget for 1978 was based on an expected income of $56,471,325, a measure of recent inflation as well as expansion, against an expected expenditure of $56,801,728, anticipating a small deficit which it was hoped to absorb during the year. According to Professor Davies the university was now receiving, in relation to other Australian universities, an estimated $4 million less than equity demanded, and it was no help at all to be told by Rosemary Kyburz, MLA, that if the university was unable to function on $54 million it should not function at all.  

In May 1978, the acting vice-chancellor declared that the “rolling” triennium must go, and the federal government, hearing this message in many places, agreed that it should. Proposed levels for 1980–81, on a par with 1979, again suggested difficult years ahead. The retention of unallocated funds in 1979 allowed the real deficit to be kept to very small figures and a virtually balanced budget to be achieved. But with the national economy displaying several unhealthy signs, and uni-
Other Problems of Government

The other principal preoccupation of the Senate, and especially of its important Buildings and Grounds Committee, was the physical growth of the university, the extension and maintenance of the university buildings at St Lucia and elsewhere. According to the *Courier-Mail*, 1 April 1969, St Lucia had so far cost $30 million to build and many more millions would be required before the job was complete. Indeed, the reaction of Vice-Chancellor Cowen on arrival was that the university suffered from gross overcrowding, unsatisfactory functioning, and obsolescence; in particular, he found the accommodation of the Law School most inadequate. Professor Keeble, of the Department of Regional and Town Planning, was even more severe: the buildings were "a perfect muck-up"; St Lucia was a "hotch-potch of buildings of differing architecture and design". This had, of course, happened in part as a result of a deliberate decision that the original Hennessy concept could not be extended beyond the half-circle, but there was certainly sufficient disquiet to suggest that the university now required a new concept or what came to be called, perhaps erroneously because it never had that status, a "master-plan".

This evolved from a fifty-six page report by Professor G.E. Roberts of architecture, whose plan was approved in principle by the Senate though departed from in practice. Its main features included the closing of Circular Drive and the strengthening of radial links to the buildings around the semi-circle, the creation of a pedestrian precinct where traffic had previously flowed, and the development of the area in front of the main building to include buildings at each end and a further pedestrian precinct in between. This plan contradicted an earlier decision not to have any buildings between the Forgan...
Smith Building and Circular Drive, but there was good building land there and it was becoming scarce. At the eastern end he envisaged two library blocks and at the western end a Great Hall and a Law School closer to the Main Building. When the Great Hall site was approved in July 1970, it was moved nearer to the Main Building than Professor Roberts had intended, and he complained that it was incorrectly sited, being contrary to the Roberts Plan. As some compensation he made slight progress over Circular Drive, which was converted into a one-way system by a decision in November 1970, following complaints from biochemistry about the noise of the traffic.22

In November 1972, the development plan was further revised by the inclusion of two multi-storey car parks, but these have never been constructed. Nor have the buildings which individuals were tempted to try to erect on the vast low-lying lands of the playing fields and other areas stretching down to the river. If the great floods of 1974 did something like $800,000 damage to the university, for which the Universities Commission paid compensation, they did at least confirm the wisdom of those people who had insisted on building beyond the flood plain and render future debate unnecessary. In November 1977 it was resolved to close Circular Drive for a
trial period, which was gradually extended, and the pedestrian precinct eventually appeared in the middle section of it. This was enhanced by a beautification of the area consistent with the earlier ideas of the plan. Although this occurred after the departure of Sir Zelman Cowen, it was a continuation of that tradition expressed in the Senate's minute of appreciation to him in July 1977, when record was made of his work in attracting bequests and donations which made possible an extensive programme of landscaping and beautification of the grounds.23

On his arrival Vice-Chancellor Cowen had found that the lack of an administrative infrastructure was resulting in considerable delays in the construction of approved buildings. He acted energetically to overcome this, initially by his own efforts and later through the activities of Deputy Vice-Chancellor J.H. Ritchie, who had a particular responsibility for speeding up the building programme in his earlier years, and W.J. Humble, the director of Buildings and Grounds. The successful completion of so many buildings, always seen as one of Professor Cowen's principal achievements, he was later to describe as no more than an outward manifestation of the fact that procedures were being reformed and improved and blood was beginning to flow more freely through the main arteries of the university's system. And symbolizing this new life was the building that the vice-chancellor was most proud of bringing to completion, the Great Hall, which had been talked about and petitioned for over such a long period. In 1969 the Great Hall seemed a very distant prospect. The state government was not able to match the contribution that the Commonwealth government was prepared to set aside for this purpose, some $50,000 had already gone in architects' fees and other costs, and subscribers had been kept waiting for almost ten years and seen nothing for their money. Talk of a $1 million Hall seemed unrealistic at the side of the $600,000 that the university could raise; the vice-chancellor did not believe that the latter sum was adequate but he had faith that the project, once launched, would attract sufficient funds, and in August 1970 Robin Gibson was appointed architect for the hall and asked to design within a $600,000 limit. His designs gave great satisfaction, and in December 1971 it was finally confirmed, some thirty years after being initially proposed, that this would be the Mayne Hall, in memory of the family who had made St Lucia possible, and several generous donations were received for the furnishing and equipping of the build-
ing. Myer and B.P. both contributed substantial sums, but it was the Alumni Association which took on a massive responsibility for this project and later donated a further $20,000 towards the cost of an organ. While he was overseas in 1974
the vice-chancellor visited Weikersheim in West Germany where the organ was being manufactured, and learned that the makers were awaiting the arrival of some timber from Australia to help them complete the job. The organ was the icing on the cake. In November 1972 the Senate resolved to give the vice-chancellor an honorary degree as an appropriate recognition of his part in bringing the project to fruition. It served as a great morale booster to the university and, as the deputy vice-chancellor (Fabric and Finance) explained in March 1973, it was not an extravagance since it had not diverted money from any other purpose.24

In contrast with what was to follow, the first half of the seventies was a period of rapid growth. In 1969 high priority was given to the long-discussed Western Arts Block, the Michie Building, and a chemistry building for the next triennium, and the Buildings and Grounds Committee was acutely aware of the accommodation problems facing commerce and economics, architecture, and music. When the Universities Commission made its allocation, the Staff Association gloomily predicted that no more departmental space would become available before 1972 and that teaching staff would continue to suffer overcrowding and repeated shifts from one location to another. A commerce building and a building for architecture and music became high priorities for the 1973–75 triennium, and in 1971 a biological sciences library was approved with catering facilities on the ground floor, a scheme eventually accepted by the Universities Commission in July 1974, at a cost of $1,200,000. The Senate received the recommendation to fit a therapies building into the programme, and in September 1973 approved $900,000 for chemical engineering.25

There was to have been a big period of expansion in 1976–78. Veterinary science needed more accommodation, computer science was inadequately housed, lecture theatres needed up-grading, and, above all, law, education, and psychology were all high on the list for attention, having received unfulfilled promises in earlier phases. In March 1975, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Ritchie came forward with an imaginative scheme for creating a new Law School with provision for education and psychology in one great building near commerce which was to cost $5.5 million. Robin Gibson’s plan was sent for Universities Commission approval, and the enormous proposed allocation to Queensland promised an early start to this great project. But ominous signs were already appearing.
Contractors on the biological sciences library and the architecture/music building went into liquidation. The university was able to finish the latter itself and find new contractors for the former, but it could do nothing about the September news that all the great schemes for the next triennium would have to be shelved as there was to be no money for new projects. During the 1973–75 triennium, commerce and chemical engineering had been completed and occupied, architecture was partially occupied, the biological sciences library was virtually ready, and some progress had been made on the stone facing of the Michie Building. There was to be little further joy for some years.

Throughout this period funds for capital development invariably fell well short of what was requested. At least, that
was so until 1975, when $15,600,000 had been sought for capital works to help clear the backlog from previous triennia. The Universities Commission in fact proposed that $19,470,000 should be given, the largest of all capital grants within Australia, a sum of unprecedented proportions which probably encouraged the Senate to approach the state government for permission to raise loans on its own account to finance what was to be a car park with charges and off-campus student housing.27

Decisions about triennial planning and the 1976 standstill...
soon shattered the pleasant dreams. The university heard in September 1975 that there was to be no building grant at all for 1976 except a small sum for site works and minor works; after being promised the largest grant of all, the Senate received this as devastating news. The vice-chancellor’s report for 1975 confirmed that on the capital side the picture was dismal, involving the indefinite postponement of major projects, and in 1977 there was again virtually nothing. One year later it was announced that 1978 was also to be a blank year, and though it brought slightly improved news for 1979 that year was marked by the further decision that no new buildings were to be started in 1980. The second half of the decade had witnessed an almost total standstill. In the lean years that followed the years of plenty the universities of Australia had fared badly and the University of Queensland especially so.

Areas of discontent would not be difficult to find. Education and psychology were reported to be increasingly desperate for space in 1977, computer science was so much in need of accommodation that thoughts were turning towards the erection of huts, despite an earlier policy decision against temporary buildings, and the Law School continued to dream about the possibility, increasingly remote, of escaping to premises comparable with those of similar schools elsewhere. In July 1978, the university decided that its priorities for capital expenditure were a Psychiatric Unit, for which the state hospital authorities, acting independently of the Universities Council, had made provision at the Princess Alexandra Hospital, a psychology building to cost $3 million, a Student Health and Counselling Centre at $750,000, and a law building at $3 million, in that order, which did not please the lawyers. In October it was learned that psychiatric facilities could be established and that designs might be drawn for a psychology building, but there were no promises about when it could be started. A year later, in September 1979, there was further information available that no buildings were to be started in 1980. This was somehow a fitting end to a decade that had pointed ever more clearly in the direction of increasing austerity.

There was other progress made during the decade. After some debate about the relative merits of the western and eastern ends of the Forgan Smith Building, the eastern was chosen in March 1970 as the site for a single-block library which, contrary to earlier thinking, was to become the main reference library, leaving the existing one to house the under-
graduate collection. Robin Gibson's drawings were approved in May and another major project was set in motion. The building of the new library also created a site for the Schonell Memorial Fountain. Consideration had been given to placing this within the Great Court, but wiser counsel prevailed and it was decided in August 1971 to place it between the Main Library and the Forgan Smith Building. At the same March 1970 meeting, work on the completion of the tower block was also given a high listing; it continued to house architecture until that department was able to move into its own building and was then prepared for its modern role as an art museum, ready for use in 1976, again with the generous help of the Alumni Association. On one celebrated occasion in 1978 it proclaimed its existence to the world by a banner that captured the attention of users of the Great Court but had little aesthetic appeal to senators. Not so the work of Rhyl Shepherd who responded to a Senate decision to extend the grotesques in the Great Court and won a stone carving competition, which gave her a commission to undertake seven more grotesques, eighteen decorated arch-stones, and twenty-five university shields, thereby complementing the work of J.T. Muller, whose earlier work had contributed so much to the interest of the St Lucia campus. The setting for her work was much enhanced in 1979 by the completion and closing of the Great Court, made possible by a generous payment of $2,000,000 by the state government to cover the cost of the stone cladding of the Michie Building as well as the last link in the Hennessy half-circle. Cabinet approval for this gift had been negotiated in 1974 by Deputy Premier and Treasurer Sir Gordon Chalk, whose friendship to the university on this and other occasions was highly valued.  

Student facilities also featured prominently in development projects of this period, though, as with academic buildings, not all of them went beyond the proposal stage. In April 1969 it was reported that work had started on the $800,000 theatre, shopping, and refectory complex in the student precinct, a section of what the Courier-Mail was shortly afterwards to describe as 'part of a $2.5 million complex being completed by the University of Queensland Union'. Within this precinct the Buildings and Grounds Committee came forward in December 1971 with a proposal for a new building to accommodate Student Health and Counselling Services.  

Housing for students was a perpetual concern. A new women's college, Grace College, to be built by the Presby-
terian and Methodist Churches was agreed upon in 1969 but that would make only marginal impact on housing needs. The Senate was asked in December 1971 to give high priority to a student housing project on campus but was unable to agree to do this because of land shortage. In November 1973, a private developer was said to wish to build a $750,000 hostel to ease the critical shortage of student accommodation, but nothing came of this idea, or of the efforts by the Senate in 1975 to raise a loan to build student housing or to secure a capital grant for the development of non-collegiate accommodation from the Universities Commission. And as students travelled daily to and from the university, many of them as car owners, they contributed to the problem of parking in the narrow
streets around the university’s fringes, and it would not be un­
true to say that parking has remained a problem for both the
logistics and the aesthetics of the modern university. More
easily solved than the driving problem was the drinking prob­
lem, for in June 1975 a proposal from the Sports and Physical
Recreation Association for the establishment of fully licensed
club premises was approved in principle. By October 1976,
the “Rec” Club was ready for inspection and a licence applied
for, and another university institution was set to take its place
within the seat of learning.32
After eighteen post-Murray years of unprecedented expansion in tertiary education the universities of Australia would soon be called upon to adjust to new economic circumstances, to more restricted growth, and eventually to a static situation. Maintaining academic vitality in such a situation would not be easy. The progress of Griffith University indicated a slowing of the tempo. Originally seen as vital for the relief of an over-expanding St Lucia, it was to have been ready to take students no later than 1970, but the Universities Commission, having taken the initial decision that it should go ahead, was in no hurry to make this possible, and by 1969 it was evident that it could not open before 1975. It was also evident that it would not be the kind of operation originally envisaged, for in September of that year the Senate unanimously resolved that it should be an autonomous university from the outset and that the government should be asked to create an Interim Council in the near future to carry out the necessary planning. So much for the abortive discussions and disagreements of the 1960s. By May 1970, Vice-Chancellor Cowen was concluding that the demands of providing actively for the establishment of a new university were too great for the University of Queensland to devote the necessary time and energy to the exercise and it really was up to the government to go ahead with the appointment of the Advisory Committee as recommended, which it proceeded to do. By June 1972, the vice-chancellor of Griffith University was seeking an exchange of information
between the two institutions to prevent an overlap in academic planning, which seemed to pose particular problems in the field of Asian studies. These were never entirely resolved, and the establishment of a liaison committee for the two universities in July 1978 emphasized the continuing need for cooperation rather than competition.\(^1\)

In April 1971, Professor Cowen had warned against multiplying tertiary institutions without sufficient planning and careful thought, and he illustrated the principle in 1973 with the cautious approach taken to the idea of giving Australia an “Open University”, suggested by the British model. He argued that there was a “very strong case for the use of those regional centres and instrumentalities which have proven to be valuable centres of external studies”, rather than starting afresh. This approach was implemented within Queensland by the establishment of further university centres in country towns, in cooperation with local benefactors and local authorities. The centres, created and strengthened by Ringerose and Olsen, were mainly established in high schools and progressively transferred to university-controlled property. The Toowoomba University Centre, opened at the beginning of 1974, was a community project made possible by the generosity of Mr and Mrs L.A.G. Boyce, who gave their home and fourteen acres of land to the university for the purpose. In October 1976, the Senate gladly accepted the Rockhampton City Council’s offer of an external studies site, and gifts of land and money were made for a centre at Cairns, which was opened by the new governor-general in May 1978. In March 1979, the *Mackay Daily Mercury* praised the Mackay University Centre for being probably the best equipped in Queensland, for it was establishing all the modern technology necessary to maintain the most efficient links with teachers in Brisbane as well as the more traditional aids to study. This seemed a more rational approach to offering educational opportunities within the tertiary system than any proliferation of universities in sparsely populated areas, and it still fulfilled the spirit and intention of those who had framed the Act of 1909; on the other hand the centres offered only a limited range of subjects and could not compete with the variety that a College of Advanced Education would bring to an area such as Rockhampton.\(^2\)

Controlling the number of institutions within the state was one issue, controlling the size of the University of Queensland another. Demographic patterns and social trends had to be
accommodated in what governments could afford or were prepared to pay. The financial administration of the university and the growth, or otherwise, in student numbers were quite inseparable issues. Despite the introduction of quotas in the sixties in such areas as medicine and veterinary science, Queensland had managed essentially to preserve what was described as an "open door" policy. Qualified students were not turned away and enrolments by 1971 exceeded 18,000, having risen by over 2,500 over two years, despite, perhaps even because of, the unfavourable publicity that students were currently receiving.³

By July 1971, the university was under pressure from both federal and state authorities. On 16 July the state treasurer, Gordon Chalk, wrote to the vice-chancellor and made liberal references to the observations of Professor Karmel, chairman of the Universities Commission: the "open door" policy had imposed "considerable internal financial stresses"; quality was under threat, it was unjustifiably alleged; the future of Griffith University was being prejudiced; the state's contribution to universities was growing faster than its resources; the numbers at St Lucia were some 1,150 higher than the number the Universities Commission had used as its planning target and they needed to be firmly controlled. In the short run this was achieved by the tightening of matriculation requirements, which reduced enrolments in 1972 and 1973 to below the 1971 level. Severer exclusion policies also had some effect, and the numbers enrolled in 1972 and 1973 were actually below the figure the Universities Commission had estimated. In some areas, particularly medicine, the quota system, which was operating at second-year level, was excluding a few students who had successfully completed first year, and its
apparent injustice gave rise to criticism in parliament and the press. It was nevertheless to be extended. In July 1973, for instance, the Senate responded to a veterinary science demand for a quota of 100 at first-year level because of deteriorating facilities and falling standards which increased enrolments were creating in that subject, and the abolition of fees by the new Labor government and the approaching first intake under the Radford Scheme were expected to stimulate demand for places and increase the need for more quotas. The 1974 enrolments, before errors were picked up, appeared to be almost 19,000 and all faculties were invited to fix quotas for the following year. The *Courier-Mail* reported in August that there would be quotas in all twenty-one first-year courses being offered by the university in 1975, with very stringent ones in certain areas.*

The University of Queensland was the last of the old established Australian universities to introduce overall quotas, but it did not go as far as the Universities Commission wished. Opposition was expressed to the numbers the university proposed to take in 1975, and warnings, to be repeated in the future, were given that no financial support would be granted beyond a certain total enrolment, though scepticism was expressed about the university's capacity to meet the postgraduate targets that it was setting for itself. Vice-Chancellor Cowen expressed satisfaction at the end of 1975 that the introduction of comprehensive quotas had allowed the university much better control over its size and shape, but the Universities Commission again delivered a warning: Queensland was once more about to exceed its intended numbers in 1976. It was a difficult exercise, in a situation where one year's intake would continue to affect total enrolments for several years, to avoid alternating advance and retreat policies. "Targetry", a new art of the mid-seventies, was an imprecise one, and the vice-chancellor preferred to aim a little high rather than risk falling too low, for any fall below the funding level would be viewed with some gravity. Over the next year or two Queensland continued to receive lectures about the need to come nearer to the official calculations, and reduced enrolments in the second half of 1977 and reduced quotas for 1978 made this easier. By 1979 it was clear that the decline in the number of students who could afford to study on a full-time basis was such that, despite a reduction in the law intake from 350 to 300, there was a need to increase numbers slightly in some general areas and to fill more places overall than had become
customary in order to keep up the university’s student load. During these exercises the total enrolment was fluctuating between 18,000 and 19,000, but a lower proportion of full-timers would necessitate a higher number of bodies to meet enrolment targets.²

Part of the balancing act between numbers and money was performed by matriculation requirements, acknowledged by the Senate resolution of August 1971 that enrolments should be regulated by a variation of the minimum score for matriculation. Under pressure from both the Universities Commission and the state government, the university agreed to raise the level from twenty-two to twenty-four points, rather than the twenty-three which it wished to have, a score to be achieved over five subjects. This higher standard produced a fall of 450 in first-year enrolments to below 3,000, and evoked a certain amount of opposition. The Courier-Mail estimated that it would on average reduce by 9 per cent the numbers qualifying for admission from the schools, and the principal of Nudgee College calculated that only 31 per cent of students finishing secondary education were qualified to go on to the University of Queensland. The “people’s university” was again receding. The same school principal expressed his discontent at the apparent wish of the university to give greater emphasis to postgraduate training and research work and less emphasis to first degree work, a further sign of suspected “elitism”.³

If the demanding of higher scores was expected to reduce enrolments, the introduction of the Radford Scheme of school-based assessment at the beginning of 1972 was expected to make the higher scores easier for the 1974 intake to achieve. Relieved after more than sixty years of the responsibility for the Senior examination, the university, though irritated by the lack of consultation and determined to reiterate the right to fix its own entry requirements, nonetheless hoped that the new scheme would work well and that it would never have to resort to carrying out the occasionally made threats to introduce its own entrance examinations. That was still being proposed by some in June 1978, but the Senate resolved against such a course; confidence was expressed then, and again in 1979, that under the Radford Scheme the university’s entry standards were generally higher than those of other Australian universities, an opinion supported by the Gibb Report of 1979 which complimented the University of Queensland for being one of the few Australian universities not to lower entry
requirements in recent years. In the opinion of some, standards were not assisted by the decision finally taken by the Senate in October 1975 to abolish the language requirement even for degrees in the Faculty of Arts. This followed a long and hard-fought battle as the traditionalists gradually succumbed to the growing numbers of social scientists within the Faculty of Arts and the apostates in their own ranks. It finally brought to an end the contretemps started between Roe and MacGregor in 1911, whatever its implications for the teaching of languages inside and outside the university.7

It is interesting to observe that over a decade in which tertiary education moved out of its expansionist phase and into what might euphemistically be called a “steady state”, the concern for wastage of talent and the deprivations of certain social classes broadened. In August 1968, Vice-Chancellor Schonell commented, as he and his predecessors had done many times before, that not enough children were proceeding to higher education; this, according to Dr Rupert Goodman, resulted from the heavy under-representation of working class groups and country areas, to remedy which he advocated the abolition of fees. In January 1970, a “brain drain” was identified of 400 matriculated students who failed to engage in further studies. Within the under-represented, women were an obviously deprived group. By 1970 they constituted 32 per cent of the student body, but, said Acting Vice-Chancellor Hartley Teakle, this was still far too low. Professor Dorothy Hill delivered the same message two years later; able girls, especially from country areas, were not making full use of their abilities and exploiting their potential. By the end of the decade 44 per cent of students were women, still an under-represented group but a measure of the success achieved by Queensland University leaders, especially Schonell, in their propaganda efforts to persuade parents to send their able daughters to university.8

The trends of the 1970s are also represented by the pattern of academic staff recruitment. Towards the close of 1969 the Professorial Board was recommending sixty-five new appointments for 1970, if mainly at lecturer level, in an aim to bring the staff–student ratio back to 1:11. The following year the president of the Staff Association, librarian Derek Fielding, called for 100 additional staff and suggested that the current financial state of the university was a factor in helping to promote student unrest, for no more than fifty new staff were expected to be appointed during the year. The mood was still
expansionist but even from 1970 the Standing Committee had begun to make slight inroads into the establishments of departments with falling enrolments to permit growth elsewhere. A university submission on academic salaries in November 1972 referred to the twenty-two bachelor’s degree courses being taught, twenty-seven master’s, and forty-six departments with Ph.D. students, and a Planning Committee report in the same month indicated an expectation of 123 academic and 131 non-academic positions to be created in the next triennium. These were to be the last of the good times. In June 1976, the vice-chancellor ordered a virtual freeze on new staff appointments in both academic and non-academic areas, and departments were asked to review their priorities, eliminate small, uneconomic courses, and batten down the hatches before the storm. People recommended for appointment but not formally appointed before the “freeze” were told of what might have been, and at the end of the year the registrar reported a net saving of twelve and three-quarter academic positions. The annual staffing round had been conducted “in an atmosphere of gloom and uncertainty”; need had been felt to transfer resources from what were perceived to be declining areas to others which were seen to be growing; a few departments, particularly the Department of External Studies, experienced staff losses and many others were placed on the “warned” list for future reductions. Despite the continuing gloom in 1977 and the obvious scepticism concerning the federal government’s proposed 2 per cent growth rate, no net reductions in staff were recommended for 1978, but the days of growth were over. In July 1979, Vice-Chancellor Wilson commented that ten years earlier universities had been seen as the key to social and economic development, of societies as well as individuals; this was no longer so. From now on he would be looking for ways to reduce staff in order to cut from 88 per cent to 84 per cent that huge slice of the recurrent grant that they were consuming annually.9

Within overall staff growth the number of chairs increased during the early part of this period, but chairs became very vulnerable to the freeze later partly because they offered the greatest economies and partly because they became more difficult to justify in areas of falling enrolments. Whereas the university was still able to create chairs to retain the services of outstanding staff during the early part of the period, it was at the end increasingly dependent on the help of outside funding for new creations. In December 1969, pharmacy was given a
chair for Dr James Dare and Lewis Keeble of the Department of Regional and Town Planning was appointed to a personal chair from January 1970. Social work was awarded a chair filled by Edna Chamberlain's appointment in December 1973. In January 1973, Ernest Roe had been appointed as a professor to lead the Tertiary Education Institute, established to investigate learning and teaching processes within the university, and in April 1973 a chair of special education was created to which Betty Watts was appointed in August 1974. Within the Medical Faculty, a chair of community practice was created in 1974 to which Dr J.G.P. Ryan was appointed in January 1975, and in August 1977, with financial support from the Utah Foundation and Roche Products Pty Ltd, Dr Mervyn Eadie became professor of clinical neurology and neuropharmacology. Chairs were also established in radiology and anaesthetics in September 1975, to which Drs H. Baddeley and, later, Tess Brophy, were appointed. Dr Margaret Bullock joined the small but growing band of female professors when she was made professor of physiotherapy in 1978 and Professor Dorothy Hill left it to begin a very active retirement from the beginning of 1973, at which stage it was decided that the rank of research professor should be abolished.\textsuperscript{10}

The early years of the period saw steady expansion, mainly from existing bases. In July 1969 it was announced that a new master's degree in public administration was to become available, as was Honours in physiotherapy, and the Arts Faculty dealt something of a blow to some departments by deleting a foreign language pass from the requirements of a B.A. pass degree. In this year it was thought desirable to accept the offers of the Australian Institute of Management and the Institute of Directors to provide $50,000 for a chair in business administration to launch a master's course in this area, but approval for the chair was delayed until February 1970, and even then the Professorial Board questioned the wisdom of founding a new department at a time when established departments were said to be existing on reduced funds and within inadequate accommodation.\textsuperscript{11}

Both speech and occupational therapy operated as independent departments from the start of 1970. In that year the Senate declined to implement a Professorial Board recommendation to create separate faculties for pharmacy and social work, though it eventually relented over the latter in November 1974. It was further decided that regional and town planning should become a separate area from architecture in 1971, that a
Department of Business Administration should be created, and that a Department of General Studies should be created with a director to develop interdisciplinary studies. Although the Atherton Report on this last matter was well received, no appointment was ever to be made. Early in 1972 a Board of Asian Studies was again thought desirable, the Department of Classics added Ancient History to its name, and the Department of Accountancy became the Department of Commerce, three changes that cost no more than the man hours involved in making them. In the first case these were considerable, for the draft statute for the new Board of Asian Studies was approved by the Senate in 1973 without consultation with the Professorial Board or the Arts Faculty, and the time saved by this was outweighed by the time spent on subsequent complaints.\(^{12}\)

The year 1973 was one of important decisions. Both the Professorial Board and the Senate were in agreement that the time was inappropriate for any major expansions in undergraduate fields or the introduction of costly new developments. The Planning Committee wanted to stimulate and coordinate Aboriginal studies, but did neither and missed a valuable opportunity, and expressed hopes for the establishment within the university of national research schools in mineral and energy resources and regional science, but neither materialized. The Webb Report on the future of external studies confirmed that the department had a future as a major activity; it was to become a school and its director a professor, but the recommended entry of external studies into postgraduate teaching was postponed, to the disappointment of staff and students alike. The Bachelor of Divinity degree, by contrast, was to have no future. Earlier agreement to have a chair in divinity if the churches could raise the necessary money came to naught. There were to be no new enrolments after 1974 and the existing sub-department was to become the Department of Religious Studies, a name suggestive of a different emphasis. Within the degree schedule divinity was replaced by something more corporeal, the Bachelor of Human Movement Studies, approved by the Senate in September.\(^{13}\)

The flame of expansion was, however, now burning much less brightly. A scheme for mounting a certificate course for Aboriginal and Islander field officers, contemplated for 1976, founded on the absence of federal funding. In April 1976 a proposal to establish a Department of Industrial Relations was
not approved, and in July the faculties were instructed that suggestions for new courses within existing departments must be accompanied by corresponding reductions, the beginning of the notorious "credit point squeeze" that attempted to curb the "credit point inflation" of recent years in which the Arts and Science Faculties had quadrupled their offerings. In September, veterinary science was reorganized following the second major investigation of the faculty in six years, and medicine and surgery became separate departments. Journalism became fully integrated into the Department of Government from the beginning of 1978, and fine arts emerged from under the wing of philosophy to become a department in its own right.14

Much attention was now being given to the uses to which a general development fund could be put in stimulating fresh initiatives now that money was in desperately short supply for any major academic proposal, but the first distribution proved a disappointment to the humanities and social sciences, which picked up a mere 3 per cent. The university's enterprise in starting the fund did at least have the desired effect of producing an earmarked $375,000 for general development in the recurrent grant announced at the end of 1978. Hopes for the future were pinned on the special recognition that might be given to Queensland as a solar energy research centre and an Australian Studies Centre, both approved in 1979, or on general development grants that might be awarded to specific areas such as external studies, which found favour with the Tertiary Education Commission in 1979. It was becoming increasingly necessary to determine what the University of Queensland was doing best and to attempt to secure national acceptance of this as an area worthy of special funding. There was little hope now that the ordinary recurrent grant would provide much scope for academic innovation, and the university's leaders became increasingly convinced that resources would have to be redeployed away from declining areas if new ones were to have any chance of developing.15

Research activities it was feared would also begin to suffer from cutbacks in government spending as the decade advanced. Despite the hopes of J.D. Story and the oft-stated commitment of Sir Fred Schonell to developing Honours and postgraduate work at the University of Queensland, and in spite of growth in these areas, the institution lagged behind other comparable Australian universities. Early in 1972 the Professorial Board, led by Professor Ralph Parsons from physics,
demanded an increased emphasis by the university on research and postgraduate activities and an attempt to change the role envisaged for the university by the Universities Commission on the basis of past performance. Whereas the national average was 16.7 per cent of registered students at the postgraduate level, Queensland was recommended to aspire to only 13.2 per cent, a proportion higher than it seems when Queensland’s high numbers of part-time and external students are given due weight. Even this seemed ambitious in view of the low ratio of research funds to recurrent grants expended by the university. The Vice-Chancellor’s Planning Committee took up this theme again in April 1975, and pointed out that Queensland lagged behind other Australian universities in its coursework master’s enrolments too; departments were invited to submit plans for rectifying this situation, though they were warned that small enrolment courses, which master’s courses tended to be, should not proliferate.

In the annual report for 1975 the vice-chancellor returned to a very old theme, saying that it was noteworthy that much of the work in university research was on matters of great importance to Queensland, and his identification of the impressive output of work performed on cattle, sheep, horses, and crops, as well as that related to mining industries, was vintage J.D. Story. Research was still financed through a variety of means: the Australian Research Grants Committee, the Australian Universities Commission, the university’s own research allocation, specialist sources such as the National Health and Medical Research Council, and many public and private business organizations. There was still talk of more systematic attempts to tap this last source of revenue, but little coordinated action to achieve this. In 1977, the Burnett Report examined research within the university and suggested ways of rewarding virtue and punishing vice, but Vice-Chancellor Wilson was quick to admit that all people were not equally capable of treading this one road to salvation and that other roads remained open to them.

One major change that did go ahead in the 1970s, at a cost impossible to calculate, was the introduction of the semester system in 1974. It was foreshadowed in 1970 by a unilateral decision of mechanical engineering to organize its fourth year work on a semester basis, a report of the Professorial Board which considered the idea as part of a timetabling exercise, and a growing feeling within the Faculty of Science in particular, articulated by Professor Jim Thomson of zoology, that more
broadly based study was desirable and that semester units would permit this. By the end of 1971 it had been agreed to introduce the semester system in 1974 in the belief that half-year units would permit a wide choice of subjects and greater flexibility of course structure. During 1972 a new credit point system was worked out to accompany the change. The introduction of semesters in 1974 proved to be one of the most controversial decisions ever taken within the university, the consequences and ramifications of which would produce endless debate and unresolved speculation. After half a year, a Tertiary Education Institute report was already identifying the “current tendency to use ‘the semester system’ as a scapegoat for almost everything which anyone wants to criticize in the University of Queensland in 1974”. This could be equally said of every subsequent year. It was widely argued that the system had a disastrous effect on the social and cultural life of students, that it denied them time to live and to think, that they had become over-examined and over-assessed, that the university had begun to waste vital resources on a double exercise of administration, and that academic staff were somehow prevented from doing research because of the new divisions of the academic year. Investigations have usually failed to locate the student discontent said to exist over semesters and the strain which they allegedly impose, and the semester system remains. Whether this is because its critics are more vocal than numerous or because of the sheer inertia that prevails when further reorganization is contemplated is difficult to say.18

Perhaps the most ominous signs of the changing times were to be seen in connection with two matters considered of great importance by Staff Associations throughout Australia: the employment of tutors and the right to study leave. The tutor group, an auxiliary branch of staff, whose extension had been much favoured by Vice-Chancellor Schonell, contained by the mid-seventies a number of people for whom a tutorship was a career job rather than a means of temporary employment while a higher degree was being completed. There were many people within the tutorial staff who had been in the university’s employment for many years without security of tenure and the benefits of superannuation, and a ten-year debate was about to stretch over the period 1973–83 on what to do about this group of auxiliary academics. For their part the tutors and senior tutors sought the same sort of rights and conditions as other staff, with promotion and tenure prospects. On the other side the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee wish-
ed to preserve the concept of the short-term appointment with no expectation of renewal beyond a certain limit. In 1974 the Standing Committee and the Staff Association were in disagreement over tenure and promotion, as one side attempted to preserve the flexibility of the staff establishment and the other endeavoured to protect the interests of its members. A compromise was reached in 1974, but it did nothing to protect the thirty-four tutors who were informed towards the end of 1975 of their non-appointment for the following year. Some who managed to reach the senior tutor grade and secure a sufficient number of reappointments found their way into tenured positions, but Senate again refused to grant tenure to tutors of eight years’ service in 1976 and they remained an unhappy and vulnerable group, awaiting the period of acute financial stringency that would eliminate virtually all of them as full-time members of the teaching staff.

The study leave issue was important because it incorporated a number of trends. The announcement in February 1977 that the Universities Council was conducting an investigation into academic study leave at the request of the Commonwealth minister for education was greeted with some despondency. It was seen as being in part a response to the long-standing grievance of the taxpayer that money was being wasted on ‘‘holidays’’ for academics, a yielding by the government to the prejudices of the ill-informed; it was seen too as an infringement by the central government of the traditional autonomy and independence of the universities, for no one supposed that the inquiry would fail to come up with a recommendation for greater central regulation; and it was, of course, seen as another illustration of the economies and cutbacks which the government was determined to impose on the tertiary sector in general and universities in particular. Eventually the working party advising the Tertiary Education Commission recommended that no more than 7 per cent of staff weeks should be allowed for leave or special study purposes, and other guidelines were laid down for the implementation of their ideas.

Both the Staff Association and the Professorial Board were vehement in their denunciation of the new policies, which would allegedly reduce the quality of both teaching and research within the university, but it would be difficult to argue that they did in practice have any dramatic effect on either. Any decline in the number of people pursuing special studies programmes in the post-1979 period seems to have
resulted as much from the high cost of overseas travel and accommodation as from any severity with which the new guidelines were followed. There has nevertheless been a growing awareness by academics of public scrutiny, and that has tended to be a disturbing influence when much in evidence, whatever the rights and wrongs of the situation.20

One way or another, 1979 was hardly the best of times for a new vice-chancellor to take up office.
Part Seven

The Eighties
The history of recent times presents peculiar problems, and journalists and political scientists rush in where historians fear to tread. There is, nevertheless, an obligation to look at the most recent period in the university's growth with a view to judging how far events have continued the trends and fulfilled the tendencies of earlier times and how far they have initiated new ones. Such judgments can only be tentative and they must not involve prophecies of likely future developments, but within these limitations they may be attempted. It could be suggested, for instance, that Vice-Chancellor Brian Wilson has had a greater influence on the structure and directions of the university in the first few years of office than any previous vice-chancellor in a similar time and that the University of Queensland of the mid-eighties is, in significant ways, a very different institution from that which emerged from the seventies. The early Wilson years might well be seen as a period of discontinuity quite unlike that following any previous appointment to the office of chief executive.

This characteristic was not, of course, immediately or everywhere in evidence. Vice-Chancellor Wilson encountered familiar problems of declining recurrent funding accompanied by falling morale and a prevailing view that universities were no longer supplying the sort of graduates that society required. He countered this last by the most traditional and acceptable response that could have been produced: the University of Queensland was part of both the national and inter-
national university community but its major responsibility was within Queensland. If, as the vice-chancellor predicted, the university was about to enter what could be its most difficult decade, that would not prevent it from being a university for Queensland, however that concept might be understood.

The basic problem was as usual financial. Although the University of Queensland was now one of the few agencies in the state that were spending more than $100 million per year, this figure was indicative of the ravages of inflation rather than increased allocations, for there still persisted a strong belief that the university was being heavily underfunded for its size and range of teaching commitments. It still continued to tremble on the edge of a substantial deficit each year, only to be saved by some last-minute reprieve by the federal government, but the news in 1981 suggested that the annual escape acts were fast drawing to a close. Savings from unfilled positions were more difficult to make as people were less mobile; full reimbursement for wage rises was in doubt and, worst of all, the government was proposing to go over to a system of prospective rather than retroactive funding. Money was to be allocated on the basis of expected rises in wages and prices, rather than supplemented in the light of actual ones, and mistakes in prediction were expected to cost the university dearly. A deficit of $3 million was thought to be a distinct possibility for 1982. Even though the Universities Council was beginning to acknowledge that the University of Queensland had been badly treated in the past (to an extent of $50 million since federal funding began, according to the university), it was not proposing to do much to rectify the situation in the short run. Just when the worst fears looked like being fulfilled, a further government adjustment saved the day in 1982, though once again it was thought that the day of reckoning was merely being deferred for another year. The change of government in Canberra in 1983 brought a welcome end to prospective funding and a slightly more optimistic mood, though the 1983 budget indicated no more than a 1 per cent growth in real terms in the funding of universities and colleges for 1984.

Financial crisis for the university continued to be narrowly averted. Repeatedly the institution was shown a vision of impending financial disaster, and the resolve was strengthened in these years to try to make the university slightly less dependent for its money supply on the federal government and slightly more able to control the nature of its annual expenditure by reducing the very high proportion committed to
wages and salaries. The Alumni Association was continuing to raise money and contribute to specific projects, but the university was needing to think in terms of millions rather than tens of thousands.

If recurrent funding had kept the university balancing on the proverbial tightrope, capital funding had for many years given it virtually no opportunity to perform. The achievements of 1979 were symptomatic of the malaise: psychology students were given some temporary accommodation because their new building awaited money; an expanded Law Library had to suffice for the perennially frustrated law students; a temporary structure was created for computer science, the fastest-growing department in the university, because there was no money for a permanent one; and a ceremony was held to mark the completion of the Great Court, forty-two years after the laying of the foundation stone. It was hardly a catalogue of triumphs.

In 1980 the future began to brighten. Approval was at last given for a $2.67 million extension to the social sciences building for psychology, money was provided for the planning of a new clinical sciences building at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, and $1.25 million was given by Mount Isa Mines Holdings Ltd to expand accommodation at the Julius Kruttschnitt Mineral Research Centre. In addition, the university acquired sole responsibility for the Heron Island Research Station and the Staff Club received approval for its proposed linking structures between its two halves. In 1981 construction began on the psychology building, the proposed clinical sciences building was approved, and another major development was approved — an extension to the Priestley Building to house the Department of Computer Science. In September a new Veterinary Pathology Block was opened, made possible through the donations and benefactions which Professor Francis had helped to attract, and the Alumni Teaching Garden for Botany was officially opened, another gift from the Alumni Association, exceeded in 1982 by their contribution of $83,000 to build a residential complex, Alumni House, at the Goondiwindi Pastoral Veterinary Centre. In this year $1.3 million was promised for 1983 to start the clinical sciences building and a total of $3.1 million was allocated for the Priestley Building extension which could now get under way.

It was also in 1982 that the university was accused of a St Lucia land grab, having acquired eleven local houses over the previous twelve years in an effort to acquire land for new
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Developments in the twenty-first century; neither the Brisbane City Council nor sections of local ratepayers were willing to see the university solve its office problems by this means. The Schonell Bistro was another feature of 1982, and in 1983 the Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre acquired a new $360,000 campus home between Union College and the physiology building, which was to be shared with Uniest and
the Alumni Association and named Cumbrae Stewart House after the first registrar. The Wilson years had brought a resumption of building at St Lucia and elsewhere and continuing efforts to beautify the campus, but there were still many unsatisfied petitioners awaiting a favourable response and the Law Faculty still featured prominently in this group.6

Although there were few dramatic changes to observe at St Lucia, the people of Brisbane and from further afield came to the campus in greater numbers in these years than ever before. In 1980 about 45,000 people were believed to have attended Expo-Uni, and in 1982 the total was around 50,000. The practice of holding this event in alternate years and having a careers week in the off years was thought to be a good means of ensuring a bigger effort and success when Expo-Uni was staged. In addition thousands of visitors were beginning to visit the campus annually to inspect the teaching museums of
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antiquities, anthropology, and art, as well as the many parents who attended from 1981 as part of the proceedings of Orientation Week.

On some occasions the university was taken to the people. In 1980 the vice-chancellor attended several graduation ceremonies outside Brisbane as well as the first one to be held outside Queensland, in Manila, and in May 1981 a further ceremony was held at Mahidol University, Bangkok, for seventeen students who had completed the master's degree in community health. St Lucia was fast becoming the home of a university for South-east Asia. In March 1983, a degree ceremony was held in Brisbane gaol, and the university continued to provide some facilities for academic staff to teach prisoners in gaol as well as offer opportunities for others on day-release. A further contact with the community was pioneered in 1981 by those staff who took an Antiquities Museum Exhibition to Toowoomba and later on a most ambitious and successful tour of northern towns. This was an important contribution to the public relations exercise promoted by the vice-chancellor when he decided in 1981 that the university’s annual report, traditionally a fairly dull document designed for politicians to whom the university had an obligation to report annually, should be a brighter and more entertaining booklet, able to be disseminated through the libraries and waiting rooms of the state to give people an opportunity to see what was going on at their university.
One thing that was not likely to be of great interest outside the university, though of enormous concern inside, was the exercise in internal reorganization conducted by a committee appointed to review the academic structure of the university in May 1980, under the chairmanship of the librarian, Derek Fielding. After some six months at the university, Vice-Chancellor Wilson gave notice of his wish to reorganize the university in such a way that it would become a more efficient mechanism for the distribution and utilization of the limited resources at its command, replacing the traditional faculty structure by a smaller number of schools (under the headship of “super-deans”) which would compete with each other for resources and then allocate them among the various departments within the school. He was particularly struck by the fact that so large an organization as the university could be so deficient in “middle management”. According to its critics the scheme placed undue emphasis on the managerial aspects of running a university, the management of resources and the management of people, and it was seen as a movement towards the creation of an efficient professional bureaucracy, deriving its authority from above, and away from the popular participation that had been part of the democratization movement of the early seventies.

The debate lasted for over two years, during which time the Fielding Committee produced a scheme of parallel structures: five groups to be responsible for resource distribution and much of the academic organization, and the old faculties to retain formal responsibility for the administration of degrees. The deans survived and the “super-deans” became pro-vice-chancellors, expected to be very powerful people within the system. They would, along with other senior executives of the university, be members of a powerful Academic Resources and Planning Committee, where they would represent the interests of their respective areas: humanities, physical and technological sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, and health sciences. Each would be advised, but not controlled, by a Group Council and they would meet regularly with the vice-chancellor for the exchange of information.

With considerable reservations about the probable cost of the reorganization and uncertainties about how it would work, the Academic Board (the reconstituted Professorial Board) eventually gave its cautious approval, which was a more enthusiastic support than the Staff Association or the student body, and the pro-vice-chancellors prepared to take up
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their duties from the start of 1983. The vice-chancellor emphasized in July 1982 what he saw to be the positive aspects of the reorganization: the opportunities for departments to work together with others of similar interests, the more effective operation of the university at lower cost, the greater opportunities to divert resources into the library, postgraduate scholarships, and maintenance and research funds.\textsuperscript{11}

It is too early to say how many of the expected benefits of the scheme have materialized. It seems certain that many routine matters have been taken over by the pro-vice-chancellors from the vice-chancellor and his two deputies, thereby freeing them for broader policy-making functions, but it is unclear whether departments feel themselves any freer to control their own destinies, whether any real power has devolved upon the pro-vice-chancellors in major policy decisions, and what the effect of the reorganization has been on the Senate and the Academic Board. It seems fairly clear that within a system where those who exercise authority are appointed and not elected, their responsibility will be to those who appoint them rather than to the academic community at large, and this has meant some sense of separation between the managers and the managed. There has been no revival of the power of the so-called “God-professor” at either departmental or board level to balance the shift away from popular influence; the board and its executive body, the Standing Committee, both appear reduced in status. What seems to have occurred, whatever the intention of the reorganization process, is an enhancement of the power of the vice-chancellor to manage the running operations of the university through appointed officers at various levels and to guide the decisions of the Senate by the very completeness of control thus demonstrated. This may well be the most efficient way of running a highly complex operation like the modern university, but it remains to be seen whether the individual academic becomes happier and more efficient under the reorganization.

The students have been more concerned with economic survival than with matters of university government during these years. In 1979 they were still following the national trend towards part-time study, with only 50 per cent of the student body in full-time enrolment but, by the time the Tertiary Education Commission was reporting in November 1982 that the numbers enrolled in full-time tertiary education over the years 1975–81 had fallen by 18 per cent, Queensland students were already reversing this trend against what the vice-
The chancellor described as Australia's dramatic shift to part-time higher education. Overall numbers remained fairly steady, above the 18,000 mark, and the University of Queensland continued to attract a disproportionate share of the best-qualified school leavers to undertake study, which encouraged the belief that Honours and higher degree enrolments could still grow in relation to undergraduate ones. Indeed, the university was warned in 1981 that it should not be contemplating an increase in student load over 1982–84, and did in fact feel compelled by the sparseness of its resources to reduce the overall admission quota from 3,815 to 3,500. The recently achieved landmarks of the fifty thousandth graduate and the thousandth Ph.D. were poor consolation for the need to reduce the student intake because of a federal government which declared its wish to increase educational opportunity but denied the means to make this possible.

Not surprisingly, 1981, the year of the "Razor Gang", brought rallies and demonstrations back to the campus and the streets of Brisbane, supported by academic staff, 125 of whom gave up a day's pay on 20 May to promote this cause. The inadequacy of TEAS and the government proposals to introduce student loans and fees for second and higher degrees were the principal issues of student protest, which once more involved an occupation of the top floor of the J.D. Story Building in an effort to dissuade the Senate from administering the fees and loans proposals: it declared that it would collect fees unwillingly if required to do so. A further round of protest demonstrations occurred in 1982, including the well-publicized all night "study-in" in the Law Library in April, when Law Student President Paul O'Shea made an impressive TV debut, and senior members of staff debated the relative responsibilities of the federal government and the university for the plight of the Law Faculty. In May the Senate Room was occupied as part of a campaign to increase the hours of library opening, and a student was arrested for allegedly assaulting Prime Minister Fraser, who denied that an assault had occurred. There was a further top floor occupation by staff and students on 28 July, after a Great Court rally against government policies jointly organized by the Staff Association and the Students Union, but the enemies were mostly perceived to be outside the university and not within. There was little to be gained by harassing a vice-chancellor who was in agreement with the objects, if not perhaps the means, of the protests and was voicing the same complaints in public at every opportunity.
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It must have been encouraging for students, at least, to learn that in 1981 the unemployment rate among Queensland graduates had reached the lowest levels since 1974 and to find this more optimistic outlook confirmed by a further analysis in March 1983, when it was reported that only 2.5 per cent of respondents had reported unemployment. This was excellent news for Fleur Kingham, the first woman to be elected student president in seventy-two years.¹⁴

Academic developments during this period have come from the redeployment of existing positions and the utilization of existing facilities rather than additions. Computer science, the fastest-growing section of the university has had the strongest claim not to be denied new staff, and the Prentice Computer Centre demonstrated its potential by a 44 per cent growth in usage over the year 1980. In that year approval was given for a new Diploma in Dental Health and for a Master’s Degree in Social Welfare Administration and Planning, while the Departments of Chemical Engineering and Microbiology were permitted to go ahead with a new multi-disciplinary postgraduate course in biotechnology. The Master’s Degree in Community Health, added to the Certificate in Medical Parasitology, assisted the teaching of tropical medicine and the university’s Third World contribution. It was also possible to report in 1981 the great boost that computing facilities were now giving to teaching as well as to research activities within the university.¹⁵

One means of ensuring that there was some capacity for initiating new developments was the General Development fund that had made possible the visiting professor scheme successfully launched in 1978. The following year brought the first General Development Grant from the Universities Council, and one of the beneficiaries of this was external studies. A new director, Professor John Chick, was appointed, more postgraduate courses were approved for external study, and in November 1982 the Senate approved the establishment of a School of External Studies and Continuing Education, to bring together the Division of External Studies, a course development unit, and a continuing education unit. In 1979 it was reported that the university was now mounting more than 250 courses and involving more than 13,500 adult members of the community in what could be termed “continuing education”, and the move to recognize and formalize provision was just one more way in which the university sought to fulfil its obligations within the community. This
boost to external studies was accompanied by a comparable boost to dentistry by the opening of the Queensland Dental Care Research Centre at Indooroopilly State School in July 1981, financed by a $400,000 grant from the Kellogg Foundation, which helped to promote the concept and practice of community dentistry and the new diploma course in dental health. Against this must be balanced the failure of the university to secure a place among the ten Centres of Excellence announced in the early part of 1982, despite the high hopes for the Department of Biochemistry and the Julius Kruttschnitt Mineral Resource Centre and for Professors Burt Zerner and Alban J. Lynch respectively.16

The whole question of innovation within the university had been put in a state and even national context by the increasingly insistent demands of the Fraser government for rationalization and of the Tertiary Education Commission to oversee new developments with a view to preventing overlap among tertiary institutions. During 1981 the vice-chancellor was commended for the cooperative activities of the University of Queensland along with the other institutions within the state, and even more care was being taken, first to try to ensure that the university was not duplicating offerings that were available elsewhere, and secondly to work closely with Griffith University and the Queensland Institute of Technology in the combined purchase of major equipment items.17

One area in which it was believed that the university had something very special to offer was in management and marketing practice. The vice-chancellor spoke of “the development of an entrepreneurial thrust in our management programmes” as a Business School was established to sell the services of the Department of Management to buyers within the local business community. This particular example of relating the university’s services to local community needs received a hostile reception from Semper; nor were academic staff unanimously happy about the new commercialism which seemed to be inspiring the university’s educational provision and its willingness to respond so readily to the requirements of business interests.18

For many, this kind of enterprise was the alternative to that inactivity or academic contraction frequently expressed in the metaphor of the “freeze”. One victim of this state of affairs was the library, which was accustomed to receiving a larger share of the recurrent grant than the libraries in other large universities. In 1979 constraints of space compelled the
librarian to embark upon a programme of book withdrawals to match any additions, though high inflation rates, particularly overseas and in Britain especially, savagely reduced the capacity to buy new books and keep up subscriptions to periodicals. Towards the end of 1981 it was reported that book purchases were down to half the level of the years 1974–76, and in that year the library was being asked to achieve a 5 per cent reduction in its staffing levels. This soon made an appreciable impact on the opening hours and general level of service which the library could sustain, and the student campaign against these trends coined the slogan “Hitler burned books; Fraser closes libraries.” 19

The library was, of course, just one of the sufferers from a large group who felt the consequences of the freeze, which had been first encountered in 1976, when new appointments had been halted and new courses had been approved subject to the willingness of departments to make cuts as well as additions. In the following years there had never been any significant lifting of restrictions, though people had become slightly less conscious of the need for austerity until it was brought home forcibly in 1981. Threats of large deficits and a perceived need to reduce the stated 89 per cent share of recurrent expenditure devoted to wages and salaries precipitated a major assault upon established positions and those holding a short-term contract. A freeze was imposed on academic positions, from chairs downwards, to be accompanied by comparable savings in administrative and technical staff; the immediate target was the saving of 100 jobs and the annual staffing round brought in a collection of chairs, senior lectureships, lectureships and tutorships to mark the severity of the purge. The Courier-Mail announced in May 1982 that the university was still experiencing a “deep freeze” and that a further 130 jobs would have to be taken out of the system within a year. They were to include nine more chairs in the annual staffing round, which left seventeen such positions without any immediate prospect of a thaw. Despite the well-publicized threats of draconian measures and their actual impact on chairs, the total number of academic staff in 1983, 1,134, was only thirty-four below the figure for 1979. Little real headway had been made in reducing the size of the academic establishment. 20

The new stringency did not threaten members of staff in tenured positions. In general the Standing Committee moved against positions when they became vacant, but there were people in employment who now found themselves under
threat, the tutors and senior tutors who held short-term contracts which would be renewed only at the university’s pleasure. The conditions of employment for tutors and senior tutors had occasioned many committee reports and debates over the years. Now they produced one last Senate committee report which proposed the integration of certain categories of senior tutor into the tenured academic staff, made provision for the survival of others on a limited basis, but proposed the abolition of the tutor from the ranks of teaching staff.

The decision in April 1982 to change the tutorship system was, according to the vice-chancellor, possibly the most important one taken by the Senate over a three-year period. He chose to accentuate the positive: the enhanced opportunities for postgraduate study through the creation of tutorial fellowships and tutorial assistantships and the stimulus given to research within the university. He could not altogether eliminate the negative: the foreshadowed loss of valuable members of the teaching staff who had in some cases been employed at the university for many years. Even for those beyond the tutorial ranks there was menace in the air from a Commonwealth Senate Committee recommendation of October 1982 that in future not more than 90 per cent of teaching staff in Australian universities should be tenured; the University of Queensland figure was 92.5 per cent. Its other major recommendation, that of a five-year probationary period, was already in operation in Queensland. More cheering were the prospects of joining the new Superannuation Scheme for Australian Universities, which became available to staff in 1983 and promised a better deal than the existing scheme could offer.21

Financial stringency also threatened research programmes, and it was this threat that helped to produce two of the most significant developments of the early Wilson years. This period has firmly re-established the emphasis given to practical problem solving within the local society by those who first sought to justify the existence of the university in the first decades of the century. The annual report for 1979 specifically emphasized that many of the projects being conducted at the University of Queensland were of direct relevance to the community and cited as examples the work being done to exploit solar energy, to assist the development of mining industries, and to maximize energy conservation. The very practical problem of using fuel more economically, for example, was one being tackled by members of the Department of Mechani-
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cal Engineering. These interests all had wider than purely local implications, as had the multi-million-dollar enterprises being conducted by the Department of Agriculture to help boost food production in Thailand and to train postgraduates from many Asian countries to help in the same kind of work. By 1979 the university was receiving $6.1 million for research from a variety of external sources and allocating $1.13 million from its own recurrent grants. Substantial contributions were being made available by the state government for the establishment and running of the Solar Energy Research Centre, which acquired a director for 1981 in Dr U. Ortabasi, and began several highly promising projects such as the development of solar ponds for collecting energy. While university physicists questioned the law of gravity, the Alumni Association assisted other seekers after truth by providing $47,000 in 1980 for the microfilming of four major Queensland regional newspapers, and the Department of Architecture sought to improve the comfort and convenience of shoppers at Mount Isa as part of its 1981 activities. In that year too the federal Department of Science and Technology announced a $700,000 contract for a new centre for the development of microwave technology at the University of Queensland under its director, Professor Morris Gunn.22

Despite the tremendous growth in research income, dominated now by specific grants from organizations other than the ARGC which contributed only a small proportion of the total income, the fear was expressed in 1981 that university research was dangerously dependent on external sources, which might not prove totally dependable, and that its long-term health might be safeguarded by a University of Queensland Foundation, based on uncommitted gifts from donors who were willing to contribute in this way. In 1982 the University of Queensland Foundation was launched, largely inspired by the vice-chancellor and Senate member Sir James Foots, and for the first time the university attempted a professional approach to fund-raising of a kind previously talked about but never attempted. The vision of a university with some measure of financial independence and in consequence a greater degree of autonomy was one that Vice-Chancellor Wilson had resolved to fulfil from the time of his appointment. The scale of this enterprise would have shocked those members of the earlier Queensland parliaments who had seen distinct advantages in retaining strict financial control over their university and who had feared the kind of influence that
private donors might acquire for themselves within that body. Some of those members would have been even more disturbed by the decision in 1982 to establish what became known as Uniquest, a company to undertake contract research and sell the expert knowledge and ability of university staff within, as it was put, "the commercial market-place". A few departments, especially within engineering, had been doing just this for over a quarter of a century. To perform this new marketing operation, Uniquest was launched in July 1983 by Barry Jones, the federal minister for science and technology, who thereby conferred the blessings of a Labor government on this novel exercise in free enterprise.

Meanwhile the ARGC, after treating the University of Queensland severely for two years, relented somewhat in 1983, increasing substantially both the number of recipients and the total grant, though this still left the university with a mere 7.36 per cent of the national allocation for an institution that looked after 10 per cent of the nation's university students. Nevertheless, the overall picture for research was not discouraging. Every month the Senate registered the receipt of new major grants from a great variety of sources to sustain established projects and to initiate new ones, and Governor MacGregor would not have been displeased had he been able to foresee the contents of the annual reports of the mid-eighties and the accounts of work performed by his university for Queensland.

When Harrison Bryan wrote his extended "Essay towards a History of the University of Queensland" to mark the Golden Jubilee of the university in 1960 he recorded a series of observations and judgments which encourage further reflection as the university approaches its seventy-fifth anniversary. In 1960 he found an institution of 8,700 students, taught by 416 academics, which made it a large university even by world standards. In 1984 there are 18,400 students and 1,150 academics, which makes the University of Queensland one of the three largest universities in Australia, exceeded only by the Universities of London, Wales and the Open University among those of Great Britain, and dwarfed only by those vast institutions such as characterize some elements of tertiary education within the United States of America.

Within Brisbane the students of 1960 were taught at Herston, Turbot Street, William Street, Yeerongpilly, and George Street, as well as at St Lucia. Now only the medical
and dental students among the long-deprived are located away from St Lucia, though new specialities have meant new dispersion — of social workers to Toowong, mining students to Indooroopilly, and vets to Moggill. Beyond Brisbane the university of 1960 was seen to be catering, through the Division of External Studies and the Colombo Plan Scholarships scheme, for the whole of Queensland, for New Guinea, and the South Seas. Today, despite the appearance of universities in the emerging nations of the old empires, the University of Queensland has extended its links with East and South-east Asia and the Pacific, with Malaysia, Thailand, China, Japan, the Solomon Islands and elsewhere, and continues to be the hub of an ever-increasing network of activities and operations concerned with teaching, research, and service spread throughout the state of Queensland.

As its responsibilities grow, without a comparable growth in the availability of resources, the need for efficiency becomes ever greater. The university has for well over a decade attempted to ensure that, where opportunities occur, teaching and service staff positions and finance are transferred from old areas of declining need to newer growth areas within the system, a process limited by the existence of tenure for academics. The need for more efficient operation has also been expressed in the growing concern for evaluation.

A parallel development has been the growing pressure to make universities accountable to society at large, which carries the cost of their existence. Members of the university community can expect to find themselves under continuing public scrutiny and with an increasing need to justify their existence and activities to governments and societies which do not necessarily share the assumptions and outlooks that are taken for granted within universities and which are the source of occasional irritation to the outside world.

Efficiency also means the adoption of up-to-date technology available for data processing and the communication of information, and already the university of the future is beginning to take shape. The computerization of the lending system within the library is an internal reform to match the access which is increasingly available through its external network to the databanks of the world. The offices of pro-vice-chancellors and departmental heads now have their computer terminals that give their masters access to the central computer and details of current expenditure, and the old problems of communication between administrative sections and academic
departments become open to new and immediate solutions. The vision of all members of staff connected through the office terminal not simply to the administrative information of their own institution but to the academic information of their subject on a world scale is one that raises questions of the speed of implementation rather than of principle. Vice-Chancellor Wilson is well aware that by 1990 matriculants will arrive at the university experienced in the use of computers and that the university will need to remain well ahead, in its teaching as well as its research and administrative methodology. Computer-assisted learning and self-administered tests are already widely employed and replacing traditional practice classes, and few academics remain free from the haunting thought that personal home computers and visual display units are fast making them and their skills anachronisms in the world of study and learning. The university registrar, Dr Sam Rayner, a close observer and colleague of Story and Schonell and a highly valued mentor to their two successors, looks now to the vice-chancellor and to the computer manager, A.W. Coulter, to help him guide the university into the next phase of the technological revolution.

How the university survives this experience will strongly influence its capacity to go on fulfilling those purposes for which it was created, the first of which was the spread of sound learning. In 1960 only 3,489 of the 8,700 students were enrolled on a full-time basis; 2,684 were part-time evening students and 2,527 were externally enrolled. This distribution, in Harrison Bryan’s view, severely undermined and limited the university’s capacity to fulfil its intended mission. The external students, in having little or no contact with their teachers and fellow students, were being denied the opportunity to enjoy a ‘‘liberal education’’, and evening students were intent on fulfilling formal requirements and were gaining little more from their contacts and opportunities than their external counterparts. Even the full-time students were seen to be bedevilled by problems of over-specialization (which meant learning rather than reading), the chasm said to exist between the arts and the sciences, C.P. Snow’s fondly remembered ‘‘two cultures’’, and the lack of opportunity to become familiar with what were called ‘‘liberal values’’. The university’s efforts to provide a ‘‘liberal’’ as opposed to a practical education, to offer something quite different from and better than what the high schools were offering, were fairly recent endeavours and the record hardly one of brilliant success.
Nor is it possible to write with any absolute conviction of success almost a quarter of a century later, though a declining concern to define sound learning or liberal education leaves fewer people with the belief that these are not being achieved. If breadth of sympathy is to be achieved by breadth of study, it must be reported that attempts to civilize engineers, humanize doctors, make mathematicians literate and arts people numerate have not on the whole been very successful, despite the increased willingness of faculties to allow their students to wander further afield and the efforts of some to rectify earlier deficiencies at the second-degree stage. The Department of General Studies did not come to pass, and inter-disciplinary subjects have not achieved the prominence that many people expected, but against these failures must be reckoned the opportunities for versatility offered by the semester system, under which students can assemble degrees of almost infinite variety. Whether this promotes sound learning is a matter of opinion rather than fact. So too are the disadvantages supposedly suffered by the evening and external students who are denied that magical ongoing relationship that works such remarkable transformations on the minds of those full-time students fortunate enough to enjoy such a privilege. The debate will continue, but there is today at least a greater readiness to concede that there are different categories of students with different kinds of needs that can be satisfied by different kinds of study, which are not necessarily to be listed in some hierarchy of desirability or efficacy. The changing distribution of students is nonetheless worthy of note. Since 1960 the number of full-time day students has trebled. The evening students have more than doubled, and the number of external students enrolled in March 1984 differs by only two from that of 1960. In addition, the presence of many part-time students attending day classes under government schemes and choosing to come to university during the day is swelling the number of those with better opportunities to enjoy what St Lucia has to offer.

Breadth of study has also been promoted by the proliferation of subject areas over the past quarter of a century. In 1960 there were forty-three academic departments; in 1984 there are sixty-four, though this comparison gives little hint of the multiplication of courses available for study within different subjects (particularly after semesterization), the so-called "credit-point inflation" which academics and administrators have tried for some years to combat but with little more
They have, however, been constrained, by lack of resources and national concern for more rational planning, from embarking upon major academic expansions of the kind that gave such a major impetus to Asian studies in the 1960s before Griffith University emerged as a successful competitor in the 1970s and much student interest was lost outside the language area.

The second intended purpose for the University of Queensland was the promotion of research, which Harrison Bryan observed, with some regret, had always taken second place to teaching. He believed that there was evidence in 1960 that the university’s assertion of independence, manifested in recent clashes with the state government, had helped to promote a parallel growth in the attention given to research. The University of Queensland had within its ranks some scholars of international distinction and possessed a few schools with an Australian, even a world, reputation, but he saw these as exceptional and implied that there was still some distance to be travelled. In 1960 there were 222 postgraduate students registered for master’s degrees and doctorates. In
1984 there were 2,430. By 1960 it had been for six years a stated expectation of all academic staff that they should undertake research. By 1984 it was becoming widely accepted that many do not and that there are several other ways in which they can serve their institution. Not all are thought capable of high-grade research, the value of low-grade research is questioned, and many feel that the quality of the university’s output is more important that its quantity and the numbers involved.

Although it is still the aim to promote postgraduate study generally, even, some believe, to the detriment of undergraduate teaching, it is also the frequently stated aim that the university should concentrate on doing very well that which it does best. This could mean, as at the time of Harrison Bryan’s account, some schools of world renown and some scholars of international distinction but not, perhaps, the uniform excellence associated with the very best institutions in Great Britain or the United States, Oxford and Cambridge, Harvard and Yale.

Still, the capacity to participate in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding at the very highest levels has grown over the decades from the days of Steele, who came to Queensland with an established reputation, enhanced it, and became a Fellow of the Royal Society; Elton Mayo, who taught much besides philosophy in the early years, left Queensland soon after acquiring a chair, and achieved renown in other places; Richards, who took his samples and specimens to international conferences between the wars; his student, Dorothy Hill, who put Queensland even more clearly on the map and became only the second F.R.S. in the university’s past; Schonell and Greenwood, who came after the Second World War with already established reputations and pushed the University of Queensland towards greater effort in the research field; Sprent in parasitology, Skerman in microbiology, Davies in dental health, Francis in veterinary science, Webb, Zerner, and Scott in biochemistry, Stacey in geo-physics, Lyons in chemistry, and McElwain and Sheehan in psychology, have all reached new heights in their respective fields and brought distinction to the university through their achievement. To name just a few is invidious; to name several more would not be difficult, though it would be quite impossible to match the proud boast of the University of Melbourne in 1905 that it had five Fellows of the Royal Society on its staff at the one time.26
The third intended function of the University of Queensland was to provide a liberal and practical education for the professions and pursuits of life in Queensland; in this aim, Harrison Bryan believed, the university had been eminently successful by 1960, for there was no greater choice of professional training available within Australia and few wider ranges within the British Commonwealth. Altogether Queensland possessed "a practical University for training young Queenslanders for the practical business of everyday life", a job which it did very well even if Bryan had some difficulty in accepting that this was what a university should really be doing. If the University of Queensland had followed Australian patterns in its general academic development, it did perhaps display a greater readiness to accept subjects and faculties traditionally thought to be more appropriately housed within tertiary institutions other than universities in its quest to extend the range of professional training available to its students. Before the Second World War, the more traditional professions of engineering, law, medicine, including physiotherapy, and dentistry had already been joined by agriculture, veterinary science, and commerce. Afterwards they would also be joined by education, architecture, social work, pharmacy, the other therapies, surveying, regional and town planning, accounting, management, journalism, and human movement studies, which gave a diversity and a particular flavour to the University of Queensland rarely encountered elsewhere.

These subjects have ensured a constant flow of graduates into influential positions throughout Queensland society, though not, perhaps, in sufficient numbers into the one place where some feel that they are most needed, the ranks of government. A few lawyers, doctors, academics, and other graduates have found their way into the Queensland parliament but not, in great numbers, into the Cabinets that have governed the state. The touching faith of that supporter of the 1909 University Bill, that a university education would have been good for him and other members, has never really been given the chance to prove itself. The thirteen Queensland graduates in parliament are largely outside government ranks, which suggests only a modest success in permeating the parliamentary ranks at state level, despite more notable successes in federal politics.

Apart from filling the professions with its graduates, the university has other obligations towards the society which it
was intended to serve. The reassuring demand for places at the University of Queensland from the best-qualified school-leavers is a guarantee that the quality of the institution will be preserved; at the same time the rapid growth in the numbers seeking tertiary education in Queensland, unaccompanied by any growth in size of that university which most people would prefer to attend, has helped to ensure that Queensland is now much worse off than New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia in the availability of university places. There is speculation about yet another metropolitan university for Brisbane as the alternative to requiring expansion from Griffith or the University of Queensland, and there is clear evidence that the university system is not adequate to cope with social need. It must be asked too whether the University of Queensland is giving sufficient thought to the major problems which Barry Jones posed concerning the nature of the "post service" society and work within that society, whether it is doing sufficient to prepare its graduates for the different kind of life that is rapidly evolving through the new technological revolution, whether the university is keeping pace with the needs of society. Jones also raised again the age-old problem of the wastage of national resources through the inaccessibility of universities to the lower social classes. It is a sobering thought that a university established in part to help promote a state system of secondary education was in 1961 drawing only 667 members of its intake of 2,586 directly from only forty-eight state high schools. In 1981 there were 119 state high schools sending new students from Year 12 to the University of Queensland, but the total number of these students had risen to only 870 out of a total intake of 3,818. The interrelationship of society, its governments, and the educational institutions they create reflect the failures as well as the successes of the planners in their search for the integrated whole. It is not in the nature of universities that they should wish to become merely part of someone’s grand design for society, but it is important that the University of Queensland should remain sufficiently alive to changing social needs to deserve still the description of "a people’s university".27
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