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Chapter 1

The beginning of the Union, 1899–1914

Tasmania had a chequered career in the nineteenth century: first it was a convict colony, then, when independence came, the progress of the mainland due to the discovery of gold passed the island by. Tasmanians made every effort to live down their convict past, and there were calls for a university, which would prove that the colony was as advanced and cultured as any other part of the British Empire. A mineral boom in the 1880s brought prosperity, and in 1890 the University of Tasmania was established, the fourth in Australia. The site was the High School building on the Domain, built in 1850 in a suitably classical style.

Questions were asked whether a small colony really needed a university, and over the next twenty years the University’s position was often precarious. Nevertheless, lectures started in 1893. The number of students was very small and most studied part-time, so corporate life was difficult to build up, but by 1899 there were 35 students, enough to attempt some sort of activity. So the Tasmania University Union was formed, to facilitate social intercourse and to organise sport. It was based on unions in the two great English universities, Oxford and Cambridge, and on copies set up in Australian universities on the mainland. So, from the start, there was a strong element in the Union of duplicating university activity elsewhere.

The Union was different from what it later became. Membership was not compulsory, and was open to all university members, staff, students and graduates. Men paid an annual subscription of a guinea (twenty-one shillings), and women five shillings. The governor was patron, the chancellor president, all staff were vice-presidents, the treasurer was a professor. The committee consisted of delegates from five sections (cricket, tennis, football, debating and social activities) and a secretary and treasurer. As the years went by the number of sections increased to include lacrosse, rowing, drama and athletics, a

Women students in the library, about 1900, under the eye of the librarian, J.H.R. Cruickshank.
variety of activities. Members were given the registrar's old office for a common room in 1899, and women obtained a separate common room in 1901.2

A later handbook described this early Union as 'a poor creature'. With membership optional, money was scarce and few functions were possible. There were few amenities and no playing fields.3 Another problem was domination by non-undergraduates; although there is no evidence that the patron, president and vice-presidents played more than a nominal role, at first the committee was dominated by graduates, with five out of eight members having degrees in 1906. Perhaps this was too much for the undergraduates, for the next year almost all committee members were undergraduates, and from then onwards the Union became much more a student body. Women played a part from the start, with the first female committee member in 1903 and one or two women in most years, representing debating, tennis, drama and (not very often) social activities. Women were given more equality in 1911, when their subscription was raised to half the men's.4

A separate Women's University Union was founded in 1902 to promote the common interests of, and to form a bond of union between, past and present female students. Again, the patron, president and vice-presidents were wives of university staff or other notables, but there was a committee of about five, which usually included one or two graduates. The Women's Union seemed to confine itself to social activities.5

Student numbers gradually grew, with 80 candidates for the exams in 1910. By this time the Teachers' College had been built next to the University, and some students attended university classes, often completing their degrees externally when they were out teaching. Though the extra numbers were welcome, they added to the percentage of part-time students, and meant that more responsibility for running the Union fell on full-timers, always its backbone; but as the minutes of the Union are not extant it is difficult to gain a clear picture of union activities.

Some information comes in the descriptions of Commemoration, at which students were presented with degrees and the chancellor reported on the year's activities. In early years these were decorous affairs; while the audience was waiting for the procession the city organist entertained them, unhampered, and the procession entered with its dignity
unimpaired. By 1911, however, a tradition had arisen of a procession of male undergraduates walking from the University to the Town Hall for Commem, where they drowned out the city organist and interrupted the ceremony with improvised rhymes on local subjects, interjections, toy trumpets and squeakers. There was no criticism, however; student high jinks were traditional, dating from the Middle Ages, and could be seen as linking the infant Tasmanian institution with the grand tradition of university life.

After the ceremony, following another tradition, students went to the Grand Empire cinema 'to make a night of it'. They wore burlesque costumes, including 'the most flaring and outrageous dresses' which included a harem skirt; others came as 'darkies' and clowns. They sang comic songs, dropped fishing lines over the balcony and fished up ladies' hats and people's programmes, and made more noise with toy trumpets, squeakers, tin whistles and crackers; in short, they created pandemonium until the curtain rose. The audience took it in good part, heartily laughing at the general clowning. There was fairly good order during the films, but more 'mirth and mischief' at interval, and after the show was over the graduates made merry on the streets.

The tolerant tone displayed by the Mercury in reporting this vanished the next year, when students were seen to have gone too far; there were thunderings against 'ill-conditioned youths' who were so noisy that only the front rows could hear a word of the chancellor's speech, greeted one professor with calls of 'Pretty Cocky' when he rose to speak, and released a bottle of sulphurated hydrogen. A Letter to the Editor used the words, 'Uncontrolled licence... babel... disgraceful... intense disgust'.

The Professorial Board recommended that the University Council (the University's ruling body) adopt 'strenuous measures', but Council refused to ban undergraduates from the ceremony, and took little notice of one member who suggested asking students to set an example of good form and good manners. The Union was warned, however, that undergraduates must sit at the front, no unruly person or person armed with a musical instrument would be admitted, and any disrespectful reference to university authorities would be regarded as misconduct. The Mercury praised student restraint the next year; students managed to sit at the back, where they waved flags and made things 'pretty lively' at times, drowning out the organist when he tried to entertain the audience, and singing topical rhymes which greatly amused them; but these 'little outbursts of youthful spirits' were quite harmless.

Kay Masterman, a student at this time, recalled that an English student, Geoffrey Cumine, 'a great character', was good at writing comic verse, and wrote songs for 'our university festivities' such as Commem. Students put on a play at the Theatre Royal to wind up Commem celebrations, and Cumine wrote an introductory speech, a parody of an eighteenth-century oration which he gave with great flair.

The Union was not asked specifically to control students at Commem; its tasks were confined to running sport and other activities, and controlling the common rooms. It was first described in 1914, when it started its magazine, the Platypus. By this time there were over a hundred students at the University, but most were part-time and only a few were members of the Union. Platypus described the Union as small but progressive and enthusiastic. Students had teams for football and tennis; athletics meetings were held; but lacrosse, rifle shooting and rowing were inactive. The most vigorous student group was the Christian Union, established in 1904, which held meetings and conferences, and had hosted the annual meeting of its national body. A Law Students' Association had been formed; debating flourished, with Joan Hore described as 'the finest lady debater ever'; the Literary Society held meetings and in 1911 at least was organising extension lectures; Commemoration had been most successful, with many amusing incidents and much drinking afterwards; social life was lively, with dances and a ball; and the Women's Union
held an At Home to welcome its new patroness, Lady Ellison Macartney, the governor’s wife — which sounds very proper.\(^{11}\)

This is more than can be said for activities in the men’s common room. This was open to all male students, but the University held the Union responsible for its upkeep. In 1910 there had been vandalism, and the Professorial Board asked the Union for an undertaking that it would secure reputable behaviour from its members, the first of a series of such requests over the years.\(^{12}\) The Union thought that since the common room was open to all students, not just union members, it could not be held responsible, and in 1911 asked the University Council to make membership compulsory for male undergraduates to enable the committee to keep order. This was refused.\(^{13}\) In 1913, in an ‘upheaval of unusual severity’, everything in the room perished except immovable objects like the fireplace. The University expected the Union to pay for repairs, but this made the Union furious. Non-union members had taken part in the upheaval, and there was a further call for compulsory union membership, again refused. Clearly the students were a lively body and, despite problems, *Platypus* reported a ‘spirit of cheerful optimism’.\(^{14}\)

The first extant photograph of a University sports team, tennis about 1908, taken at the imposing front door. From left: Eric Johnson, Alan Crisp, Charles Butler, Charles Rayner. The coloured cummerbunds or ties worn round the waist were for identification.

The first page of the Union’s first magazine, *The Platypus*, June 1914. The Editorial shows the enthusiasm and progressive outlook of the Union at the time. ‘The undergraduate is always a cheerful being’, it continues.

The auspicious day has dawned at last. For over twenty years has it been coming, and now Time, “the greatest innovator,” has approved its dawn. Past generations of students have rather looked forward to this with despair in their hearts; it seemed like hoping for the impossible. They were always assailed by the same old cry which assailed all who wished to introduce progressive but expensive innovations—"We are too small a body to make such an undertaking successful." The same cry could be raised now: but what we lack in numbers we endeavour to make up in enthusiasm. The publication of our Magazine is merely one of the many progressive measures undertaken this year by the Tasmanian University Union.
Chapter 2
Early Challenges, 1914–1929

The cheerful optimism reported by Platypus in 1914 did not long survive the outbreak of the First World War later that year. All university activities were affected by the war; the number of candidates for examinations fell from 104 in 1914 to 84 in 1918, the atmosphere also suffered, and Masterman recalled that university life was mainly confined to lectures in bare old rooms, for the University was ‘very ancient and battered... [it] was running rather under half-steam for that time’, and sporting activities were ‘pretty well cut down to nothing’. Some male students were told not to enlist as they would be doing important home defence, and were enrolled in the Fortress Engineers, with the job of running Fort Alexandra beside the Derwent River. In summer they manned the fort, recalled Masterman, but in winter they were released, as it was thought German raiders would be busy in the northern hemisphere then. He did not mention the Union in his recollections of the University, where he studied from 1912 to 1916.

Neither did another student of the time, Christine Walch. The University was an upper-class institution, she said, and found it hard to attract first-rate staff, not surprising during wartime. Walch did not feel any discrimination because she was a woman, and had no recollection of any student causes or discipline problems. There was no pacifism by students; clearly, in fact, not much activity in any field, as interest centred on the war, and many students left to join the armed forces.

By 1916 the Union was in financial difficulties, and the subscription was raised to two guineas for men and one for women. Its organisation changed, and instead of representatives of its four sections sitting on the committee (possibly because all or some sections were defunct) it was governed by a general committee of five for the duration of the war. This committee was all male until 1918, when Enid Hughes was a member. In 1920 the subscription was lowered, and the committee was not named and possibly did not exist; in 1921 the Union itself was not mentioned in the University calendar. This was despite a rise to 181 in the number of students sitting university exams in 1920.

In 1931 Roy Fagan, vice-president, gave a speech in which he ‘painted a touching picture of the struggles and sacrifices of the founders of the Union nine years ago’. So the Union was as good as defunct, and was revived with some difficulty. Its first post-war mention comes in 1920, when it asked the University Council for compulsory membership (as in mainland universities) which was refused. The following year the request was finally agreed to; all students were to pay a union fee of 10/6, for which they could use the Union’s facilities and join social and literary groups. Full members (£1 for men, 5/- and later 10/- for women) could hold office and play sport. This meant far more members and finances for the Union, and Platypus was revived. Its editorial stated that university activities had suffered so much from the ravages of war that only now, three years after the war ended, was it possible to publish its second issue.

Platypus reported that, though the Union was not inactive, it was not strong either, and student life was not really flourishing. A ‘goodly crowd’ enjoyed the annual ball, the Law Students Association was revived and the Literary Society was active, but sport was languishing: tennis was dead for want of a court (a play, June, had been put on to raise funds for one), the football team played occasional games and the most active sport was women’s hockey, though even here it was difficult to gain a full team on Saturday mornings. Another writer, however, described the Union in 1921 as an ‘entirely
inadequate body.8

By 1922 the Union was in better shape, with a new aim. Inter-varsity contests had been established for the six Australian universities9 and Tasmanians wanted to take part. In 1931 Fagan spoke with passion about the advantages of inter-varsity competition: a university degree was useless unless the University was known outside the state, and competing would make Tasmania known on the national university scene; students would gain intangible benefits from meeting others and broadening their minds; and the Union would gain recognition from its organising role. Other reasons offered were that Tasmania could not take advantage of the benefits offered by larger universities without inter-varsity, and the standard of competition was raised by these contests. The opinion seemed to be that Tasmania was not really a university unless it sent teams to national university competitions. (Not mentioned officially was another reason, perhaps the strongest: most students had not travelled much outside Tasmania, inter-varsity competitions were known for their exciting social life, and going away on IV, as it was known, was highly enjoyable.)10 But sending teams interstate cost money, impossible to obtain if union membership was voluntary. Probably it was the existence of inter-varsity which encouraged the authorities to make membership compulsory, so that the Union could afford to take part in inter-varsity. The University Council was as keen as the Union to see Tasmania take its place among mainland universities and win renown in inter-varsity contests.

The newly resurgent Union was run by a committee, which eventually consisted of representatives of sporting and other clubs (rowing, football, athletics, tennis, hockey, social, literary and debating, and later rifle shooting and basketball); an elected secretary and treasurer; a woman (later officially called the women's representative); and a chairman, Charles King, whose method of appointment is not known. A former student at the university and Rhodes Scholar, King had completed an MA at Oxford, served in the war with distinction, and was appointed as History lecturer in 1919. He remained chairman for three years; still relatively young, he was presumably acceptable to the students, and no complaints were recorded that the committee was chaired by a member

The first team to represent the university at an inter-varsity sports carnival, the rowing eight in 1924. From left: H. Freeburgh cox; John Hood, Frederick Ford, Donald Urquhart, Harold Wright, Charles Adams, John Edwards, Colin Gibson, Archibald McDougall. The eight rowed in the inter-varsity competition on the Yarra on 31 May 1924, and came fourth out of five crews.
Tasmania University hockey team, 1930: tunics with the University crest, black stockings, ordinary shoes and in some cases, shin pads. Back: Phyllis Jillett, Stella Pemberton, —, Winnie Davis, Jean Batt, —. Front: Doreen Taylor, Lilian Ault, Muriel Lewis, Marjorie Baker, —.

of staff. On his retirement as chairman, he was thanked for his assistance and advice, which 'even if not always accepted has been of the greatest value, and it is due to him to a large extent that the Union enjoys its present position'.

The prospect of inter-varsity trips meant the encouragement of sports clubs: the rowing club was formed in 1923 with the express purpose of sending a crew to inter-varsity in 1924. This happened, with Tasmania coming fourth, and the following year Tasmania won, a great triumph. The rowing club continued to send an eight every year. Athletics was the other early competitor; its position was easier, as only individual representatives were sent, with two in 1924. The athletics club held an annual sports carnival with varying enthusiasm, sometimes more in men's activities and sometimes more in women's.

Tennis was always popular, particularly after a court was built in 1922. Men's and women's teams played in local competitions, and from 1928 tennis sent both teams to IV. Women's hockey had a similar record, fielding a team, sometimes with difficulty, from 1921, and an IV team from 1928. One member, Lilian Ault, recalled twice a year playing a team from Cadbury's, and enjoying a sumptuous afternoon tea with delicious cocoa and cakes, and a gift of chocolate to take home. Less enjoyable was practising on North Hobart oval at 7 a.m., with the ball sometimes leaving a track through the frost. 'We practised strenuously', and inter-varsity was 'great fun', crossing on the boat and meeting the other women. Lilian did not remember that mainland teams had a particularly higher standard: 'I don't remember being licked every time'. In 1928 women were given the old tennis court for basketball and sent a team to basketball inter-varsity in 1929; the rifle club did so in 1930, so Tasmania had six sports which sometimes attended inter-varsity.

A highlight for the Union was when Tasmania itself hosted IVs, showing real equality
with mainland universities. Winning was another achievement. Oddly, the two traditional sports of football and cricket did not gain much following among students, with a football team being sometimes fielded and a cricket team never. Possible reasons were that football needed the largest team, eighteen players, and the cricket season took place over two university years and included the summer break, when many students left Hobart, either to return home or to find employment.

 Though this record sounds lively, all was not entirely well, and in 1927 the Union president commented on the lack of spirit and enthusiasm for inter-varsity sport. More successful was debating. At first there was little enthusiasm for this also, but visits from overseas teams galvanised the locals, and a team was sent to IV from 1928. The following year Tasmania won, and in 1930 hosted the Australian competition. To everyone’s delight Tasmania won again, the team including an outstanding woman, Elinor Hurst. Connected with debating was the Literary Society, which produced *Platypus* and held lectures and other meetings.

The Union’s earliest club, the Christian Union, was re-established in 1924 and ran well, fluctuating a little in enthusiasm, but ‘the centre of life at university’ for many who came from church families. As well as the Law Students’ Society, a similar society for Commerce students was started in 1924, and the Engineering Society was revived in 1928. Drama came and went, with plays put on in order to raise funds for sporting groups. Overall, during the 1920s, seventeen clubs were formed by students, so there was a considerable variety of activities.

These clubs ran themselves, but contributed delegates to the union committee, which appeared to function well. Inter-varsity activity had ‘an immediately felt and far-flung beneficial effect’ on the Union, and even in 1922 benefits were reported: there were signs of awakening interest, and record attendance at one meeting where the constitution was changed. It was still hard to galvanise much corporate activity because students rarely came together: lectures were held at different times of the day and evening, there were no recreation grounds, and no residential college. The Union tried to overcome this by holding more social activities, gaining more sports facilities, and encouraging team spirit with jerseys, scarves and blazers in the University colours.

In 1923, probably because the increasing number of students meant space was needed in the main building, the men’s common room was moved to a tin shed in the grounds. This had been part of a temporary laboratory, and measured 10 x 35 feet (3 x 11 metres),

![Members of the University Dramatic Club rehearsing *June*, 1921, in front of the University buildings. From left: Terence Crisp, Mark Stump, Lance Geeves, Beryl Miller. The play was put on, not so much out of a love of drama, but to raise funds to build a tennis court.](image-url)
long and thin, not an ideal shape. *Platypus* did not think much of it, but was much more cheerful about undergraduate life in 1924. It was in a healthy condition, with the number of full members rising from under 30 a few years earlier to 73 (of whom 53 were men). The great triumph of the year was sending representatives of two sports to IV, showing that Tasmania was an equal with mainland universities. Social life was also improved, with 'considerable intermingling of students'. There was an annual dinner, the Engineers held an annual dance, the annual ball was popular, and small dances held in the University library were successful and enjoyable. *Platypus* thought that 1924 was a turning point in the Union's history.21

This did not prove the case, for membership fell instead of continuing to grow, and *Platypus* urged, 'Support the work of the Union... The word “apathy” has been used far too often'. Apathy was encouraged by the limitations of the new men's common room, which was not much used. The old common room had consisted mainly of two rings of rickety chairs round the fire, but at least it had shown life. The new one was out of the way, and the separate faculties tended to congregate in their own corners, though there was trouble over students playing cards for money there. The Professorial Board wanted to prohibit all card playing of any sort, but a Union Meeting thought stopping gambling was enough. Over the years there were many attempts to stamp out gambling, with no success.22

'The absence of any semblance of University life or corporate spirit in the University must be and is admitted by everyone and the reason for this is generally considered to be due to the lack of suitable Common-room accommodation’, wrote *Platypus*, and in 1926 the Union asked the University Council about it. A sub-committee inspected the common room, to show the Union how better organisation could improve matters according to *Platypus*, but the visitors were taken by surprise by its 'sheer inadequacy' and told Council so. The Union presented plans for a new building; Council and the premier agreed, but Glebe residents objected to a small area of the Domain being used, and plans fell through.24

The women had their own common room, which was in the main building, but very tiny. 'Our main concern was getting facilities to make tea and coffee, and plenty of logs for the fire', recalled one. Women did not play much part in the Union, though they had their own representative, and representatives of hockey and basketball teams were also members. The Orient Line of steamships had given the University a scholarship, providing free travel to Europe for one student each year for further study, and this was usually given to a woman to compensate for ineligibility for the Rhodes Scholarship; it was regarded as 'the blue-ribbon of a woman student's career'. The Women's Union continued, for example holding an Underworld Cabaret in 1925, but afternoon tea in the common room lapsed, due to the small number of women present.25 In the history of the Union written in 1940 mention was made of 'the Great Schism with the Women, which occurred chiefly through slights discovered in treatment shown in the literary world'; the details have been forgotten, but fortunately the history went on to say that it was healed. A woman student of the period recalled that women were treated equally at university, though not everywhere else.26

The most lively occasion for students was the annual commemoration ceremony. The deadening effect of the war had extended to students' activities at Commem, so there were complaints of how dull it was.27 But by the early 1920s students had recovered, and in 1921 held the 'time-honoured' procession of lorries and other conveyances, with students in costumes sending up well-known identities, enlivened by bells, whistles, rattles and a piano. A spectator remarked that she thought it was a circus: 'What better proof of its success is required?' asked *Platypus*. At the Commemoration ceremony in the evening,
Commem Day 1929: a cheerful group advertises Mock Commem that night. Characters include a convict, an aviator, Arabs, scholars, gentlemen, various ruffians and a man with a small saxophone.

in the traditional manner, students sang comic songs about their lecturers and well-known local identities, interrupted the programme, provided barracking for the graduating students, and afterwards enjoyed a dance.28

The following year there was no procession as the Union had too few members, but students had a 'high, uproarious time' enlivening the evening's proceedings. Before the official party arrived, and intermittently during the evening, they sang comic songs, to the amusement of all except possibly their subjects, when the songs were a little too personal to be pleasant, as the Mercury wrote. The audience was convulsed with laughter when, while the vice-chancellor was solemnly conferring degrees, a bottle of stout and a crayfish suddenly appeared above his head, suspended on a thin wire. The unfortunate vice-chancellor had already had 'constant though good humoured interruptions' from students during his speech, which, wrote the Mercury tolerantly, could only have been audible to those in the front rows.29

Such tolerance did not last. The procession was revived in 1923, but in the evening students went too far for the University Council, which asked the Union for an explanation. A full meeting of male students resulted in a report expressing deep regret to the Administrator for the interruption to his speech.30 Next year the procession insulted local sensibilities, being spoilt, wrote the Mercury, by 'needless, meaningless and hopeless vulgarity', which it did not defile its pages by describing, though there were hints that it concerned sanitation. Flour was also thrown at police. At the ceremony, as well as singing rowdy songs, students interrupted the speeches by releasing cats, counting out the chancellor and shouting with a megaphone. They greeted the premier, Joseph Lyons, with the song 'Poor Old Joe', to which he replied, with some presence of mind, that the Joe of the song was not as poor as the Treasury.

The Mercury, and eight letter-writers, were outraged. The cats caused some consternation, especially a 'half-grown kitten' whose head was soaked in turpentine and was 'blind and frenzied'; but the procession caused outrage. It was openly vulgar, said the
premier; it could not afterwards be discussed at decent tea tables, said a citizen; the minds of the perpetrators must be 'regular cesspools of filth'. Lyndhurst Giblin, a prominent member of University Council, pointed out that the procession had been marred by 'two pieces of simple coarseness' (nothing morally wrong) such as were seen in Shakespeare and the smoking room, but the Mercury reprimanded him. The display was inexcusable; taxpayers largely funded the University and what were they obtaining for their money? The perpetrators should be expelled. If ordinary citizens acted in this way they would end up in the Police Court.\(^1\)

The University authorities were always touchy about criticism, as they depended on parliament, and ultimately the public, for funding. Despite apologies from the student body, Council asked the Professorial Board to inquire into the incidents. The main activity of the Board was disciplinary, and the generally good behaviour of students is clear from the fact that it had no meetings from 1914 to 1923 (card-playing in the common room). It then made up for its inactivity. Besieged by complaints from the police, the RSPCA and Council, it asked the Union for an explanation, reminding its committee that in 1923 it had agreed to be responsible for order, and asked it to take steps against the students responsible. The Union refused, saying blame attached to students as a whole, though it apologised to the RSPCA about the cats, and to a staff member for insulting him in a song. After six lengthy meetings of the Professorial Board in a month, the issue died down for that year, with the procession and the presence of male undergraduates at Commem banned the next year.\(^2\)

Instead, students put on 'Mock Commem', an extension of the traditional concert before Commem, but held separately. There were the usual parodies of popular songs, a farcical imitation of the Commem ceremony which brought forth continual laughter from the audience, then a dance.\(^3\) In 1926, wrote the Mercury, there was an understanding that students refrain from interrupting official Commem and put on their 'perfectly harmless' Mock Commem in the evening; the consequence was that official Commem was dull, with a smaller audience. Both occasions were overshadowed by the best known of all student pranks in Hobart, when students changed a well-known advertising sign on a hill overlooking Hobart from 'Keen's Curry' to 'Hell's Curse'. 'The whole city was chuckling' wrote the Mercury, which wondered if the sign was aimed at the University authorities for forbidding the traditional procession.\(^4\) (As some people had criticised the use of 'Hell' in public, at a later date students tried to change the slogan to 'Heaven's Bliss', using newspapers for the extra letters, but the weather played up and blew them away.\(^5\) ) Students made their feelings even clearer in 1927, when the building where Commem was held flew a skull and crossbones, a crayfish was suspended from the ceiling, and during the chancellor's speech

---

**Commemoration Songs**

4. THE LONG AND SHORT OF IT.

Tune: "Michael Finnigan."

There is a Prof. called Thompson Flynnigin,
He gets tight through drinking ginagen,
Thus he wastes away his tinagen,
Poor old Thompson Flynnigin.

There is a Prof. called Thompson Flynnigin,
Set his hopes on a sardine tinigin,
But God's Own Country has got inigin,
Poor old Thompson Flynnigin.

There is a Prof. called Dunbabinigin,
Oft he scratches at his shinigin,
Takes off several yards of skinigin,
Poor old Dunbabinigin.

There is a Prof. called Dunbabinigin,
Very fat and longs to be thinigin,
When he dies he'll have to beginigin,
Poor old Dunbabinigin.

Student humour: a song composed for Commem, 1930. The Professor Flynn mentioned was Errol Flynn's father, and Professor Dunbabin was well-rounded.
an alarm sounded from a suspended box, which was removed by the registrar after an undignified scramble over the roof.36

The next year, 1928, was a vintage year for student humour. Hobart awoke on Commem day to a huge red sign on a major building, reading, 'We've got Gertie's garter'. It remained for some time, as the paint was difficult to erase.37 The procession was allowed, subject to police inspection; the two detectives made only one change, insisting that a lorry load of 'girls', whose legs were visible beneath red, white and blue draping, wear longer skirts. The students duly wrapped their coats around their legs, and the procession was bright, amusing and entirely correct, according to the Mercury; it poked fun at the King, the armed forces, a woman aviator, the method of selecting Rhodes Scholars, agricultural experts, newly-weds, and a writer to the Mercury, 'Mother of Ten'. Thousands of people watched it, with business entirely suspended and shops emptied of customers.

That night a highly successful concert was put on, entitled 'Getting Gertie's Garter'. It consisted not just of comic songs and a parody of Commem, but other items, such as a policy speech by the Fence-Sitters Party, a comic opera by 'Guilty and Succulent', and a caricature of a meeting of University Council. The Town Hall was filled to overflowing.38 After this, 1929 was quieter. The chancellor's speech was interrupted by a sudden and thunderous fanfare of crackers, but the police actually wrote to the University praising students for cheerfully complying with regulations concerning the procession, and suggesting that these could be relaxed.39

Commem was the only time when most students joined together in either the procession, the revue or in other antics. One girl, from a sheltered home, remembered how all students gathered in the men's common room and 'learnt the ribald songs. I wasn't shocked, but my parents were' — they had sent her to university to 'study and improve myself', and though Commem was stupid nonsense.40 Commem's development during the 1920s, from songs sung during Commem to a separate Mock Commem, the procession and various antics, meant the student body combined in a highly enjoyable way, which must have led to some strengthening of corporate life. It also meant that the Union appeared as the representative of the students, standing up for their point of view and refusing to single out individuals for punishment, which gave it added prestige among students.

Meanwhile, there were changes to the Union. The Union's democratic base is clear in that questions of general interest were decided at general meetings, of which seven were held from 1925 (when extant minutes begin) to 1929. Attendance averaged 29, reasonable considering the Union's small membership. Topics discussed included changes to the constitution and union fee, and requests by the Professorial Board to enforce discipline in the common rooms.41 In 1926, presumably in order to be more democratic and abolish staff influence, the Union adopted a new constitution which 'completely reorganised' it. It was governed by a Students' Representative Council, of which the president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer and women's representative were elected. Other members were representatives of sporting and general clubs.42 Elections were held at annual general meetings; the first elected president was Jack Edwards, an Engineering student, who had politics in his blood, with his grandfather a long-term politician and his mother a feminist. He told his daughter that once he was in power he ran the Union like a dictator: she assumed he was joking.43

Reorganisation did not at once bring renewed enthusiasm, and Platypus reported financial difficulties and apathy, due to lack of life in the common room.44 Athletics and rowing had little support, and no issue of Platypus appeared in 1927, all showing lack of interest. Full union membership continued to drop, to 44 in 1928, with a particular drop in the number of women members, to six in 1927.45
In response, the SRC asked the University Council for a compulsory fee of a guinea. After two conferences with union representatives, Council granted this for 1928. In 1929 a meeting of undergraduates agreed to ask for a compulsory fee of £2 for all students, which Council granted, and finally, the next year, the extra fee for full membership was abolished; so in 1930 all students had to pay a union fee and were equal members. It is possible that this did not really address the causes of apathy, however. One student from these years, Lilian Ault, recalled that she only voted in union elections out of a sense of duty, and found Union Meetings boring, 'because they talked about topics which were outside my sphere'. She did recall that 'we always wanted a better Union base'.

The consequences of the higher union fee were that finances were much improved, much more IV representation was possible and, according to the union history, 'Union strength and Common Room life, which had completely died out in 1926, underwent a rebirth'. By this time women took much greater part in IV, providing half the six teams competing (tennis, basketball and hockey), and Platypus congratulated the SRC for its progressive policy in encouraging women's teams to participate. The SRC was itself pleased that its efforts to create a better spirit in the University were at last meeting with some success (though it did not say what these efforts were). It had to run finances well, because each year the previous year's records were perused by the University Council before they gave the Union its current fees.

Another success was the opening of Christ College, the University's first residential institution. The Union played its part in this, as a committee of students led by president Jack Edwards had requested a college open to all denominations. Christ College was run by the Anglican church and included theological students; at first it accommodated ten

---

Union activities were reported through the decade by Platypus, which appeared every year except 1927. It was never easy to bring out the magazine, recalled one editor, R.G. Osborne, and 1927's omission was due to lack of material and lack of interest. Osborne thought that Platypus never was really alive, but it did describe activities and provide a place for students to express their opinions.

A Platypus obituary of George Barnes, a leading union member, shows the attributes for which students were admired in the 1920s. Barnes graduated in Law in 1925 and was union president in 1927, then left Hobart to practise in Sydney. He took part in negotiations which resulted in a compulsory union fee and in the establishment of Christ College; he was a member of the winning debating team in 1928; he instigated some of the most daring and original student jokes at Commem, for which he was much admired by his contemporaries; but he was not a good editor of Platypus, though he wrote some 'bright' articles for it. 'His chief characteristic was his burning enthusiasm for the University and the Union in particular', wrote his co-editor, R.G. Osborne. 'He was an outstanding example of a good member of the Union.'

By the end of the 1920s the Union was in a much more satisfactory position than at any time in the past. Student numbers had risen during the decade, and 300 sat for university exams in 1930, providing a larger support base. The Union had control of its own affairs: membership was compulsory for all students; the financial situation was improved; a corporate spirit was growing; the University was accepted among mainland universities; and the university administration had proved reasonably co-operative to students' wishes.
The Union flexes its muscles, 1930–1939

The Union had improved its position just in time, for by 1930 the Great Depression had begun, and *Platypus* recognised it, writing of 'the crisis that confronts Australia now'. The Union, however, was reported to be doing well, with the increased compulsory subscription enabling more inter-varsity participation, and activity in debating, hockey, basketball, rowing, tennis (Allan Knight won the Tasmanian Open) and social life. The main problem, according to *Platypus*, was that the rowing team was prevented from entering inter-varsity for the first time since 1924, because it was in Perth and the costs were prohibitive.1

This comment set the tone for the next few years. From Union publications, it does not appear that there was a depression at all, for it was never mentioned — most students came from middle or upper middle class families, so were cushioned against the Depression's worst effects, though even so, there was not much money for children's entertainment or luxurious clothes, and most students were perennially hard up. One student, Dick Clive, said he did not see much evidence of the Depression, though some students had less pocket money than before.2 Student numbers did drop, however, from a total of 379 in 1929, to 326 in 1934, and there seemed a generally quiet atmosphere.

This comes through in the Union's new publication, born in August 1931 when two Christ College students, Laurence McIntyre and Eric Warlow-Davies, were deploring the absence of a university newspaper like those of mainland universities. By this time *Platypus* was moribund, and in any case was worthy and dull. They decided to start another paper, and Laurence soon had enough copy for a first issue, four cyclostyled sheets called *Superheat*. The fifty copies sold out, and Laurence produced a further edition each fortnight, but *Superheat* was unattractive and difficult to read; real success only came when it made itself the centre of a controversy, which split the student body wide open and boosted circulation. The editors were not happy with the title, which was 'faintly erotic or unnecessarily cataclysmic', and with Professor Dunbabin's help chose *Togatus*, 'reasonably dignified, but not too stuffy'. The meaning, 'one who wears a toga', implies citizenship. The next year they hired a printer and went through the year without missing a deadline, said McIntyre; he aimed at defending academic freedom and intellectual honesty, and chronicling university events.4

The great controversy was with the Teachers' College, many of whose students took university subjects. So they had to join the Union and pay £2 a year, and a few, but not many, took part in Union activities. The two groups of students tended to come from different backgrounds; university students' families were usually wealthy enough to pay university fees (though there were some scholarships), but College students were paid for their training (and had to teach for a certain number of years afterwards), and therefore attracted the less wealthy. Indeed, teacher training was a route to the middle class for working class children. There was a tendency in the University to feel superior to College students, whose training was more job-oriented than the liberal education available at the University, and who tended to come from a lower social class.5 Bill Perkins, a student at College in 1928 and 1929, recalled very little connection between it and the University, with separate sporting and social events.6

The Union wanted closer unity with College students: the College executive to affiliate with the SRC, a College representative to sit on the SRC, and all College students to be
eligible for Union membership, which would boost membership and therefore funds. A meeting of College students passed this last proposal, presumably seeing the honour of being members of the University Union as worth the considerable sum of £2. Subsequent Union elections caused a great deal of interest, for the College made a ‘virtual attempt at a coup d’etat’, nominating candidates for president, vice-president, treasurer and other positions. Chances appeared even, and Togatus urged the University student body ‘to bestir itself from its Laodicean torpor and break away from tradition by turning up in decent numbers’.

Togatus profiled some candidates. Roy Fagan, a Law student, was an able debater and tennis player; ‘his opinions always command great respect’, and he was believed to hold the record ‘for the quick dash from [Christ] College to the Varsity on an empty stomach at two minutes past nine in the morning’. Eric Warlow-Davies, Engineering, had been a capable president at turbulent sessions of the SRC, and ‘has dealt tactfully with an inquisitive constabulary after more than one Commem’. B.B. Smith, another engineer, was a prominent figure at Mock Commem, ‘where he successfully impersonated no less than four women’. F. Watts from Teachers’ College was a member of the inter-varsity debating team.

The 1931 AGM was the largest Union Meeting for decades, with 117 present. After a lengthy and ‘highly technical’ argument, the College candidate for president was declared ineligible, as he had not been a member of the Union at the close of nominations. University candidates won all the executive positions, and a motion was passed allowing a College representative on the SRC.

After the meeting, College students concerned with the compulsory fees put forward a petition asking for an extraordinary general meeting. Their salaries had been reduced as part of a general 20% reduction, so they could not afford to pay; they only came to the University for lectures, did not usually have the opportunities to join in Union activities, so they gained little from membership. Union representatives stressed the importance of the Union to the University — its activities were just as important as lectures — and the necessity of it having an income. After a lengthy and sometimes vituperative debate, the matter rested with the compulsory fee still £2, but only students who attended lectures having to join the Union. This marked the end of outward difficulties with the Teachers’ College, but a cool climate persisted, and university students of the 1930s remember no common activity at all between the two institutions, and a continued feeling among some that the University was superior; ‘they were there but they didn’t want to belong, and we didn’t always rub along’; ‘they didn’t fit in exactly’. It was rumoured that there was a mock honour board at the College, inscribed with the names of the heroes of 1931.

Teachers’ College students had much the same opinion: they were based in College and their life centred there. Jean Montgomery came south not understanding that she was to attend University classes as well as College — ‘we knew nothing about the University in the north’. She took English and Latin, where she found Dunbabin scathing to all students; she thought women were treated in much the same way as men, and the main difference was between University and College students, ‘a kind of subtle class distinction’. Students had to pay Union fees, but for her and many others these were covered by studentships; those with no such support resented paying such a large amount as £2. ‘We were part of the University in a way, yet we weren’t. We used the library, and went to the Commem ball, took part in a few things, but most things were separate.’ Other College women said they were not welcomed in the women’s common room; they went once, but never again.

Apart from the Teachers’ College drama, Togatus usually reported sporting events, SRC meetings and university events. Gradually its scope widened, to include articles on current
affairs, literary efforts (*Platypus* became defunct) and controversies. In 1932 the short-lived Young Lenin Association criticised labour leaders for failing the working man, which led to discussion of the dangers of unfettered political writing which might encourage communism; but eventually those who approved of ‘sane, broadminded criticism’ won the day.14 In 1934 a letter doubting the existence of God (always good for creating a stir) brought forth a number of replies, and there was heated debate at the Union AGM over whether religious bodies could use the title of ‘Tasmania University’; it was decided that they could not (though this was later allowed). A motion congratulating the premier on extending licensing hours was defeated, but one deploring fines for late payment of university fees was passed.15

Such complaints were rare in these years, and the Union was generally quiescent, partly probably due to the Depression, though there were those turbulent SRC meetings which Warlow-Davies had handled. It was dominated by Roy Fagan, president from 1931 to 1934, and ‘jolly good’ according to the 1933 secretary, Dick Clive. A disciplinarian, Fagan adopted a no-nonsense, responsible approach. Dick commented that he did not have much work, for as in the 1920s, the SRC’s major function was allocating funds for one or two teams to go to inter-varsity each year. There was always wrangling when funds were allocated, and in 1932 there were complaints of ‘high-handed treatment of women’s sporting bodies’; the basketball representative was not present and basketball was ‘with the utmost callousness’ given no funds; there were also complaints that women’s tennis and hockey received summary treatment.16 The hockey secretary wrote to say that in fact the team could not get away,17 and looking at the decade as a whole, the various sports went to inter-varsity roughly in turn. Occasionally, inter-varsity competitions were held in Hobart, when great efforts were made to give the visitors a good time and show that Tasmania could host such events as well as anyone else.

By this time many sports were played: for men, football, rifle shooting, tennis and rowing (seen as for ‘the favoured few’), with rugby and skiing started; and for women, hockey, basketball, tennis and skiing. Complaints that rowing, often seen as an elite sport, took up too much money, are borne out by the Union’s request to University Council for a loan of £200, a third of its income, to complete its rowing shed. Council was sympathetic, but could not legally provide the loan. Instead, in 1932 a Union Meeting confirmed the SRC’s decision to grant £130 to the boat club for a boatshed. Considering that only a few members of the Union were rowers, this amazing grant showed their power. A happier report is of men and women playing basketball and hockey, usually to give women’s teams practice before IV; the men did not know the rules, trying to take high marks in basketball and claiming not to know which end of the hockey stick to use, so great fun was had by all.18

Fun was also clearly had by the football team in Launceston, on a trip in 1931. The rifle team went north at the same time, and a member complained of the footballers’ behaviour: they stopped at pubs en route and stole the Melton Mowbray pub sign, drove round Launceston resplendent in their university blazers and hatbands, offended citizens with songs and shouts, drank too much, and in the evening went to a low cabaret into which no respectable person could venture. The footballers said that the drive (to provide publicity) was much appreciated by the populace, and their behaviour had not been so bad; they ‘conducted themselves as became University undergraduates, who have the traditions of the University at heart’; or, alternatively, they enjoyed themselves ‘as only “Shop” [University] men can when on a trip’.19

There were two glorious victories in inter-varsity in the Depression years. In 1934 the rifle shooting team gained ‘immortal renown’ by winning the Venour Nathan Shield when inter-varsity was held in Hobart. *Togatus* criticised the lack of humour by local magistrates,

who fined a student who was caught trundling a garbage tin lid along the footpath, and mainlanders who appropriated an advertisement which advised, ‘Don’t Leave Tasmania without a Souvenir!’ The year before, Tasmania hosted and won the inter-varsity debating competition, with its team of Roy Fagan, R.K. Green and Peter Crisp. (One of their topics was ‘We will not fight’, and a letter in the Mercury bemoaned the fact that the team did not resign when forced to adopt a pacifist position.) Debating was lively, and the University also usually put on an annual play, though without enormous success. Potboilers were chosen, ‘not very wonderful, but fun’. Some clubs were formed, notably Professor King’s International Relations Club, where current affairs were discussed. It was started largely because the Carnegie Peace Endowment provided money for such clubs to buy books, which the University Council did not want to forgo.

The most obvious example of lively spirits was Commem, with four traditional activities: pranks, a procession, Mock Commem, and interruption of the official event. Each year, wrote Togatus in 1936, students tried to outdo previous efforts in daring and suggestiveness. On Commem Day 1930, work started late in many Hobart offices, as during the night students had blocked up many keyholes and tenants were unable to enter their buildings; one office could only be entered by breaking a window. The gaol walls were painted ‘To Let’; a ‘body’ was discovered hanging on cords in Franklin Square; the monument to Sir John Franklin was crowned with a garbage can; clothing was suspended above the Tourist Bureau; and the German gun in the university reserve was dismounted and sent careering down the slope. It must have been a busy night for students. Their traditional procession through Hobart streets was poor, since the main item, dense quantities of smoke to be released in Franklin Square and dealt with by a gaily
attired Fire Brigade, was nobby by police, who souvenired the vital canister before the procession left the University.

During the procession, some office workers who had not enjoyed their keyholes being filled threw flour-bags, fruit, cotton-reels and so on, which students took in good part, ‘and regarded as opening a promising avenue for future occasions’. The Mercury found some of the placards in the procession rather too suggestive, but enjoyed the fun. That evening, at Mock Commem, a gowned student caused surprise and amusement when he rose and presented the Mercury with a large brass plate, which had disappeared from its premises some months earlier. With sarcasm, since the Mercury often criticised students, the speaker thanked the newspaper for its ‘strong support and championship of our cause’. Students also performed a ballet ‘clad in abbreviated blue and scarlet frocks’, satirised such institutions as the local radio station and federal cabinet, pilloried many identities, and took in the audience at the close with a false National Anthem.

The following year the procession lapsed, as no one was willing to organise it, but students made up for this with raucous behaviour at Commem: ‘earth-shattering explosions of the gas bombs and the staccato crackle of the jack-jumpers... the ceiling of the Town Hall was scarcely visible through a dense veil of smoke; ... a grisly and gory sheep’s head dangled above the heads of the Professors; [and] the roar of artillery mingled with the tooting of motor-horns, the coughing of the audience in the front stalls, and the protests from the stage’. The Professorial Board fined the Union £20 and reminded the SRC of an undertaking of 1925 by which the Union accepted responsibility for the good conduct of students. Naturally no student of 1931 could remember this, and in any case they decided that such a guarantee was useless, as Union officers could not be responsible: ‘it was only natural that a large body of students, once inside the hall, would do things that were entirely unpremeditated’. The Professorial Board recommended that students should be banned from Commem, though they could go if they promised the registrar to behave.

After this ban, Commens became orderly, and students put their efforts into Mock Commem, which was highly successful in 1932 and 1933. The Mercury reported tolerantly that though some jokes were on the broad side, they rarely descended to crudity. Students showed a complete disregard for the feelings of well-known citizens with ‘surprisingly clever’ satires, for example a skit entitled ‘Colonel Mullen and his boy friends’ about the Hobart police. Dick Clive and the rest of the boat crew composed and sang a song which referred to ‘Mr Les Bian’, for which they were hauled over the coals by Professor Morris Miller: ‘there was a tendency to go more below the belt from one year to the next’.

Some items, admitted Togatus, mildly horrified some sections of society, and the SRC agreed that Mock Commem would be censored. Then the University Council decided to suppress it. ‘We were very cross’, recalled John May. ‘The powers that were, were pretty stodgy.’

The following year, 1934, was a low spot in Union and student activity, with no Mock Commem and poor support for the play. But a chess club was formed, about a dozen women invaded ‘that home of misogamy’, Christ College, for a debate, and the annual ball was the best so far.

Student spirits could never be entirely squashed.

A livelier spirit is evident in almost all student activities from 1935 onwards, as the effects of the Depression began to lift. Students recall that the University itself was a friendly place, with amicable relationships between students and staff, though a good deal of hard work. A reasonably high percentage of students (four out of his Engineering year of six, recalled Lindsay Whitham) were on scholarships, and these in particular had to produce good results. Most students thought that the quality of teaching was high, with some excellent lecturers, others good, and only a few poor; though one student teacher commented that university was little more than a glorified high school, with little
academic depth and limited reading requirements. Small classes, especially in subjects like Law and Engineering, meant individual teaching. Student complaints of poor teaching could have a result. If one wanted a distinction, there would be one or two questions from another text. This lecturer, appointed in 1901, read the same lecture notes each year, and took no interest in students. In 1937 a group of students formally complained that they were paying for the lecturer teaching and not receiving any, and walked out of the job; he was rumoured to have been sacked.

Students commented that on the whole they had good relations with the authorities. The chancellor and vice-chancellor are seldom mentioned, and the main authorities were the registrar, Alan Preshaw, usually easy-going but conscious of his position and slightly authoritarian; and the Professorial Board, usually through its spokesman Professor Taylor, rather abrasive but not too bad on the whole.

The way the University was organised affected students, by making social activity more difficult. Engineering and some Science subjects were taught at the Technical College, several blocks away, and Engineering students in particular tended to congregate there. Law students were mostly articled to solicitors in town, so only appeared at the University for lectures. Most Arts and Commerce students were part-timers with full-time jobs, and lectures were given in late afternoon or evenings. Hours were long: in Engineering, nine to five except for Wednesday afternoons, which were kept for sport, and also Saturday mornings. So students had little time or inclination to gather at the University, where in any case there was no real place for them, with the women's common room so small and the men's so uninviting.

There were other divisions between students, though contemporaries are not united on how strong they were. Some students saw themselves as 'gilded youth', coming from wealthy families, the products of elite schools, without the need to mix with other students as they had an enjoyable social life among themselves. 'There was no reason to know the others', said Reg Cane. 'We had a wonderful life. Taffeta frocks, tails, Riley and Wolseley cars, weekend cottages, laughter and clean fun.' Such students were often found in the rowing crew and rifle club ('it was the right thing to do') and were pleased to be part of the British Empire. Most did not have parents who had been to university, and they tried rather self-consciously to act the part of university students, smoking pipes while having deep discussions, and planning the pranks which had been traditional student activities since the Middle Ages. 'It was a serious business, being a university undergraduate.'

Other students noticed no divisions, with products of high schools such as Victor Burley (SRC president), Lilian Ault and Lindsay Whitham denying it; they had friends from both areas and felt the student body was very harmonious, 'all one happy family' as Victor commented, though Lilian thought some division was discernible at dances. Lindsay thought divisions were more likely to be between older and younger students, with the seniors looking down on the small fry. This is borne out by repeated attempts to make freshmen do fagging duties in the common room, which did not work due to passive resistance by freshmen. Other divisions were between sporting and non-sporting people, and between men and women. Many men studying Engineering, Science or Law, where female students were rare or non-existent, only saw women undergraduates at dances. Students from the north, where little was known about the University, could also suffer: two Engineering students arrived at the University to find that they had not been told about compulsory drawing classes, which southerners had already done. They had to catch up in their spare time.
Christ College, 1935: one of the centres of Union life. Back: Lance Luck (theolog), Bob Thollar (theolog), Peter Wood (SRC), Alan Briggs (footballer), Geoff Reading (editor of Cactus, SRC), John Bushby (SRC, play producer), Grey Edwards (SRC). Centre: Will Verrall (theolog), John May (theolog, editor of Togatus, SRC vice-president), Malcolm Downie (theolog), Cedric Cowling (theolog), James McGrath, Jack McGrath, Don Gee (SRC president), Paul Edwards (SRC). Front: Peter Crisp, David Barclay (SRC), Roy Fagan (SRC president), Canon Barrett, George Hodgson (SRC president), Marcus Crisp (rugby player), Brian Mattingley (SRC).

Another division was between Christ College and others. There was no real gathering place at the University, and Heathorn's Hotel, and 'The Nook' cafe where students met for cinnamon toast and coffee, were not official centres, so Christ College was the main place where numbers of students congregated — sometimes to the irritation of other students, 'day boys' as College students called them. 34

The College held twenty-one students. Some students who lived in Hobart went there, presumably for the corporate life, and Roy Fagan recalled a 'very enjoyable residence'. So did all other students interviewed; 'we were a very happy family' is a typical comment, and Canon Barrett, the warden, was universally popular, tolerant and understanding. 35 Many Union office-holders and active students lived at Christ College: in 1935, for example, five residents were theological students or 'theologs', so not Union members; five did not hold office; but eleven were at various stages in their university careers Union executives, SRC members or other notables such as Togatus editor or producer of the annual play. Three were past, present or future SRC presidents.

Christ College began the year with initiations for freshers, recalled John May. There were grilling sessions, where students were led in one by one and sat in the 'electric chair', on a cloth, under which was a sheet of metal with nails 'just put through a little bit', and a battery, which gave you 'a bit of a shock if you were too slow with your answers'. In the peanut race everyone was face down on the floor, and had to push peanuts with their noses to the other end of the room. Freshers had to perform at a concert, give talks on
various topics on the Domain on Sunday afternoons (a recognised place for people to speak from soapboxes), and carry out tasks, such as measuring a city block using a saveloy, or crawling across an intersection with a saveloy in the mouth to polish the boots of the policeman on traffic duty. *Togatus* often mentions the initiations, commenting, for example, that efforts to imitate a rose in bloom were exceedingly poor.36 There was some feeling that initiations went too far, and at the 1936 AGM of the Christ College Students' Club a motion was proposed that they be abolished. After considerable discussion, the cross-examination was abolished, but the concert remained, if only, as one student said, for the supper which always followed it.37

Women felt that men were fortunate in having a college. Female students from outside Hobart had to find board, some in Westella, a mansion in Elizabeth Street which was run as a women's boarding house by stalwarts of the Country Women's Association, or in private board. Maida Williams recalled that she hated her board, but it did have the advantage of being near Christ College. This meant that men liked taking her out as it was not far to walk her home, and she would be invited there to play tennis on Sundays, the only day women were allowed on the premises, and could even enter men's rooms. 'Wonderful Mrs Barrett [the warden's wife] would come in when I was in a friend's room taking tea, "Are you all right, Mr McGrath?", as if I were about to rape him!'38

Although there were so many ways in which students could be divided, there were also reasons for union: the fact that they were at university, only enjoyed by a small minority; and some joint activities, the main one being Commem week antics, which 'drew us
together like nothing else could, inspired in our breasts a common spirit, be it ever such a tiny spark. Commem activities were often rowdy and ribald, but generally undergraduates were well-behaved and respectful of authority, and of course well-dressed, with the men in suits and ties and the women in frocks and hats. Lindsay Whitham pointed out that many students had to behave: scholarship holders, student teachers and law students in particular had to toe the line in order to keep their scholarships, pay or jobs. The Union tried to be another force uniting students. It was embroiled in controversy in 1935, over a statute which would give it legal status. The statute, drafted by the vice-chancellor, gave University Council control over the Union, as no Union regulations would have any force until they were approved by Council, and the SRC would exercise supervision over the conduct of its members while they were in university precincts or at Union functions. An Extraordinary General Meeting of the Union rejected the main clause, though accepted SRC supervision over students. Council refused to pass the statute. Possibly this gave the Union an incentive to action, for from this time onwards it was more lively. The SRC was not dominated by one person, for no president or other office-bearer remained for much longer than a year. All presidents and most office-holders studied Law or Engineering, with only the odd Science or Arts student, and no one from Commerce. John May sat on the SRC in 1936 and 1937, and commented that 'it had much the same character as everywhere else at the University, unpretentious, unorganised, friendly, without set-ups and political worries. We worked things out among ourselves, with no formal meeting procedure. It was a very pleasant life... It all ran fairly smoothly'. Apathy was a problem; 'it was always a drag to get people doing things'. Maida Williams commented that when she sat on the SRC she felt 'very adult. People behaved in a very

'The tin shed': exterior shot of the men's common. Peter Green stands centre.
adult manner at meetings... we were trying to keep the students in a body, to give them an identity'.

The Union was keen to promote student communal life, mainly by obtaining better common rooms. The men's 'tin shed' in the yard was isolated, small, shabby (with an armchair stuffed into a broken window) and therefore underused; even the University Council referred to it as 'practically an outhouse'. For a time it was decorated with hundreds of empty beer and wine bottles suspended from the ceiling, like stalactites. The women's room was comfortable but very small, but this was not really relevant to the debate, however, as women did not play a major role in Union life, and 'the common room' always meant the men's common room.\textsuperscript{3}

The problem was made clear when people at IVs saw other universities' much superior accommodation ('everything was bigger, and our little tin shed was pathetic') and IVs in Hobart showed up local shortcomings. The University recognised this, and revived the proposal to build new common rooms, but public outcry because plans impinged on the Domain meant that Parliament rejected the plans, and the Union was left with a 'ramshackle corrugated iron atrocity, filthy, inconvenient, and, for a University, disgraceful'.\textsuperscript{4}

The situation was complicated by the possibility that the University would move to a new site; was it worth building a new common room? The Union tried to negotiate with the government and the University Council. The premier said the University would not move, and promised help; but the University Council believed the University would move, and refused to do anything.\textsuperscript{45} A Union Meeting decided to go no further with building a
new common room, but then the AGM decided to build one, a one-room brick edifice with a cafeteria at one end. Plans were actually drawn up in 1939, but war intervened.46

The Union was encouraged to fight for such amenities from 1937, when Don Gee was Tasmania’s representative at a meeting which formed the National Union of Australian University Students, NUAUS. This aimed to provide closer co-operation between Australian students, and to press for student autonomy in their own affairs, and consultation by university authorities in matters which concerned them.47

From now on, NUAUS was a part of Union life, though it had little impact on the mass of students in the early years, only ‘slowly stimulating us’.48 It encouraged students to question the lecture system (with no result, but several articles in Togatus); it started cheap holidays for students; it provided student identity cards for those going abroad. There was some criticism that it was not doing enough, but Union heavies always defended it. Tasmanians played an important part in NUAUS, and in 1939 Tasmanians were elected president and secretary.49

A major victory from NUAUS policy was a student presence on University Council. Though some of the older members wondered why students wanted this, Council agreed surprisingly quickly, possibly as it had already happened in other states (always a powerful argument). So the SRC president or vice-president could attend meetings and address Council when asked, though not vote. Moreover, a Joint Advisory Committee consisting of Council and Union representatives was formed to confer on matters of common interest.50

The first person with the ‘delicate’ job of student observer on Council was the president, Victor Burley. ‘I wasn’t allowed to speak unless I was questioned’, recalled Victor. ‘But they were quite polite to me. I was a bit of a rebel, but I was in attendance, and I felt I had to behave!’51 The next observer, David Chambers, said the task was difficult, as he had no vote, could only address Council with permission, and was prohibited from reporting back to the SRC on matters discussed in committee, which most items were. This nullified much of the advantage of having him there. After saying this, he attended a meeting where six Councillors criticised student behaviour at Commem, so his meetings cannot have been very enjoyable, or particularly helpful to the Union.52 The Joint Advisory Committee discussed the common room and drafted the Union statute, which was passed without difficulty in 1939.53 So, although the situation was not ideal, students were officially discussing matters with the authorities. It is noticeable that the Joint Advisory Committee, where real discussions took place and the results often assisted students, was of more benefit than attending University Council meetings.

The ‘students’ referred to above were all men, for women still played little part in Union affairs. An advertisement for Commem in 1938 asked for humorous articles, verse, jokes and skits for a special issue of Togatus; and concluded: ‘Wanted, also: — 20 SALESWOMEN. This is something the girls can do’.54 All women interviewed, however, said they never felt inferior to men, and many people commented on the camaraderie between the sexes.55 ‘No one looked down on women at the University; that never came into it’, said Maida Williams. ‘A group of us inhabited the women’s common room and no one put us down… I felt I could stand up and look anybody in the eye.’ A shyer girl like Daphne Powell commented that it took her a year to venture into the women’s common room, and she felt on the fringe of university activities; she was involved with the Student Christian Movement, but the Union was not important to her. She felt lucky to be at the University, knowing that her parents had made sacrifices for her to go there.56

Loyal Lord and Cynthia Johnson, both Science students, commented that the main area where women were disadvantaged was all-girls’ schools, where Maths and Science were not taught, and both had to start some science from scratch at the University.
Sometimes Loyal was the only woman in a class, and she did have some tricks played on her. She drove a Morris Minor to the University and parked it in front of the main building — there was plenty of space, as there were only six or eight cars. Once she tried to drive off but found that though the wheels turned, the car did not move. Looking up, she saw boys lining the windows, laughing: they had put a log of wood under her back axle so the wheels were a centimetre from the ground. A male friend would help her with her work, but knew how to make her experiments act unexpectedly, until her mother threatened to make him pay for stockings ruined by acid burns.57

Women did sit on the SRC, as the women’s representative, and representatives of the entirely female sports of hockey and basketball. Charlotte Dennis, hockey representative in 1936 and 1937, commented that the men did not treat the women very well, ‘because they all wanted money to go rowing, and we had to fight for the money we got, and there were only three of us... it was mostly a man’s job, but if we had a complaint they’d listen’. In University generally, she said, there was equal treatment: ‘we sat in the same lecture rooms, and there were so very few of us’.58 This was certainly the case; in 1937, the first year when figures are available, there were 392 students enrolled, of whom 126 were female, but the vast majority of the 392 were part-time. Full-time students, the backbone of all university activities, only numbered 49, with 32 men and 17 women (35%). The next year the proportions were more even, 31 men and 25 women (45%).59 But even though this was nearly half, the SRC was overwhelmingly male, and there were no female candidates for the executive positions.

Though most women came to university to further their education, or, in the case of Loyal Lord, ‘for something interesting to do’, a certain number were ‘only there for social reasons’, dances and finding an eligible husband. ‘We had to put up with it’, as Charlotte said. Such girls usually enrolled in Morris Miller’s courses, Logic and Psychology (said to be the easiest) and were often fashionably dressed; more serious students often dressed down on purpose. Husband-hunting behaviour did not often lead to pregnancies, however; Charlotte could only remember one case when a couple had to get married, and that was ‘shocking’. Reg Cane observed that having sex was ‘not done’, and he could never remember males even discussing it. Other students made similar remarks, and commented that many students were unsophisticated.60

Men students did act when a job generally done by university women was given to outsiders: the secretary of the tennis club asked outside women to organise a function for Mock Commem. Only students must be involved! thundered Togatus. We must not introduce aliens into our affairs. Women and some men were outraged, letters of complaint were published, and henceforth only female students organised such things.61

When it came to increased representation on the SRC, however, women had to help themselves. In 1937 ‘Shophound’ reported in Togatus that moves were afoot in the women’s common room to establish a modicum of equality of the sexes on the SRC.
'Auntie Shophound strongly disapproved and sternly reprimanded the dear girls. As I said to them — as if any woman could fill any important position in the Union as well as those great, big, strong men. Why, the idea's ridiculous!'\(^{62}\)

Despite Auntie Shophound’s tongue-in-cheek advice, the moves went ahead. Traditionally, committees running activities which included women had to consist of one woman and three men. At the AGM in 1937, Ralph Harry moved that they must include at least one but not more than two women, which was some improvement. June Goddard moved an amendment: they must include at least one woman and one man. The proposals created a good deal of interest as to the capabilities of women, ‘whether they pick soft jobs or are stickers’, and the chairman took a strong line with his motor horn. Finally June Goddard’s amendment was carried, so women achieved a measure of equality. The first woman to hold an important Union position was Megan Griffiths, editor of *Platypus* in 1937; two years later, Maida Williams was editor of *Togatus.*\(^{63}\) *Platypus* appeared in 1937 and 1938, and contained literary articles by both students and staff members.

Meanwhile there were moves to improve the position of Teachers’ College students. There had been a little united action, but in 1937 a teaching student wrote to *Togatus,* saying how difficult it was for student teachers to enter into Union activities. The Union responded by allowing two teaching representatives, one a woman, on the SRC. Other attempts to try to close the rift found little success; for example, *Togatus* promised to publish College material, but then its size was decreased, so there was no room.\(^{64}\)

Such failures by the SRC did not go unnoticed as they might have done in the past, with the appearance of a staunch critic, Geoffrey Reading. ‘He gave Don Gee [president] and the rest all hell for a while — he was a stirrer!’ recalled Arthur Watchorn, vice-president in 1938.\(^{65}\) Reading criticised any aspect of student life which he thought needed it, and put forward motions, for example, that SRC meetings should be open to all members, which was passed at the 1935 AGM — though the meeting also passed a motion of complete confidence in the president, despite Reading’s objection.\(^{66}\) Reading himself was a member of the SRC, so was in a good position to see what was wrong. Why did the SRC spend so much on sport, particularly the Boat Club, ‘that swollen Union leech’, and the moribund Athletics Club, and why did the Football Club gain money when its estimate was nothing more than a guess?\(^{67}\) There was ‘unseemly’ wrangling about which sports were to get money for IV, ‘like vultures round a corpse’: the SRC should not consist of representatives of sports teams, whose loyalty was to their sports, but of general representatives of all students, with sports administered separately. Roy Fagan commented that IV sport did not lead to intellectual growth: the money could have been used for a union building. Reading complained that several SRC members had nothing to say; they then defended themselves vigorously. At the 1938 AGM, he moved that money for IV sport be limited to £200 a year (£335 had been spent that year) which was carried. Reform of the SRC was in the air.\(^{68}\)

Though there was some cause for complaint in too much money going to sport, this area was an important part of student life. Sport revived considerably after the Depression years. Only one team went to IV in 1934, but three did so in 1935 (including two women’s teams) and this was the pattern for the rest of the decade. Charlotte Dennis recalled going to IV with women’s hockey in 1936, the first time this team had gone for six years. ‘It was wonderful.’ She and another girl were billeted in the wealthy suburb of Kirribilli, and were very well looked after. The team had a rough trip to Sydney and did not play well at first, but on the final day they defeated the top team, Melbourne, and removed their chance of the premiership. ‘It was very dramatic’, said Charlotte, her pleasure still evident over sixty years later.\(^{69}\)

At least one contest was held in Hobart each year, except for the disastrous year of
1937. In the May holidays, women’s tennis went to IV for the first time since 1929; rowing, which had not been granted money, raised it themselves and also went away. In the September holidays, football and basketball planned to go away, and women’s hockey IV was to be held in Hobart for the first time. Charlotte organised it, but at the last minute travel was limited because of an outbreak of polio, and all IVs were cancelled. ‘It was terrible. They said if we held it and anyone got polio I’d be responsible.’ The next year Tasmania hosted the hockey IV; the home team, already A grade premiers, won the competition, the only Tasmanian team to do so in the late 1930s. Togatus commented that hockey was by far the most successful university sport. A cricket team began in 1938; that year football was the first club to employ a paid coach, but rugby disbanded for want of players. Athletics also declined, but the ski club grew to fifteen members.70

The other inter-varsity competitor, debating, was a popular activity but, after the success of earlier years, did not win at IV. Once again, women participated, with women’s teams at home, and Joan Courtney-Pratt and Megan Griffiths in inter-varsity. John May was twice a member of an IV team, and said that although they were trounced, members enjoyed very much the contact with other universities. In 1938 Togatus described debating as one of the most active clubs, with weekly debates keenly contested. Later in the year two Negro debaters arrived with their Russian coach, and caused a great deal of excitement, with their infectious, scintillating wit; but New Zealand debaters, brought over the next year by NUAUS, were disappointing.71

A second highly successful club was Drama. After the potboilers of the early 1930s, the club turned to more serious fare, and in 1936 put on The Wind and the Rain, ‘a delightful comedy of student life in a Scottish University City’, wrote Togatus. The play was an outstanding success from all points of view, notably financial, and the profits went to the Blind, Deaf and Dumb Institute and the YMCA, a sensible move which meant that these bodies provided good audience support. The play was also performed in Launceston. The next year a thriller, A Murder has been Arranged, was produced for the first time by a student, Jack Bushby, and the club also produced Mock Commem. There was no play in 1938, but 1939 saw Housemaster by Ian Hay, again produced by Bushby and very enjoyable, at least for the cast.72 The drama club’s early playreadings had fallen away, but revived, to considerable effect — a film about blood was for some reason part of one, and while watching it a male student fainted.73

The Student Christian Movement, a continuation of the Christian Union, continued to be very active; Maida Williams commented that its activities were more exciting intellectually than her university course, and SCM ‘captured the hearts and minds of some of the best university people... it was intoxicatingly exciting’. Others did not join; as Victor Burley said, ‘I didn’t like having my beliefs dictated to me’.74 The Evangelical Union died out, and the Newman Society, first mentioned in 1936, was small and seldom mentioned in Togatus.75 Various associations were run by university staff, with students welcome: the Classical and English Associations, and the International Relations Club, which held lively discussions, there being plenty of material for this in the 1930s. The Engineering Club continued, with excursions, lectures, and its extremely successful annual ball, complete with a Pashometer, which measured ‘pashing’ (kissing) and worked on the colour of your shirt if male and frock if female. In 1938 and 1939 other faculty clubs were founded, for Commerce, Science, Chemistry and Law students.76

It is easy to follow the activities of the clubs and societies, for they were comprehensively covered in Togatus, which was in excellent shape in these years, eagerly read by students.77 During the Depression it had not been particularly lively, but in 1936 John May became editor. It seems unusual for a theological student to edit a university paper, but John remarked that no one said much about this; people were glad someone
was willing to take it on. John had no experience, but produced an interesting paper. The committee wrote most of the articles, said John, and he published almost everything that was submitted, partly to fill the pages, and partly because ‘it wasn’t for me to censor what was said’. There were many articles on current affairs, literature, and general subjects, such as Japanese culture, and an interview with the famous pianist Eileen Joyce; as well, some articles were exchanged with other university papers. John’s pacifist ideas were strongly stated (‘Johnny was a theological student and you’d expect that’ commented Charlotte Dennis) and there was some controversy, shown at the AGM that year, where a motion disapproving of increased expenditure on defence was hotly debated, and finally defeated. More controversy arose through the activities of Geoffrey Reading, nicknamed ‘Blue’, who wrote in Togatus as Horatio Blewbaum.

Reading, a Christ College student, was ‘a flamboyant character, very able’, ‘very strange’, ‘a devil, rather fun — but you wouldn’t put your sister too close to him!’ ‘We were all dazzled by his insolence and difference’, said Charlotte; and to many girls he was a heart-throb, good-looking, tall and dark, writing poetry, poetic-looking — ‘we all swooned about him’. ‘I rather liked him’, recalled Victor Burley more prosaically. ‘He had something to tell you. You mightn’t like it but he was worth listening to.’ Maida Williams admired ‘Blue’, but after her Christian upbringing, thought ‘he’d gone beyond us… he seemed to have stepped out of our world and was irrelevant to it… — but he did set us an exciting role model’. Reading wrote poems and articles, criticising middle-class smugness, challenging the existence of God, trying to shock and startle people into response. He succeeded, and Togatus was much enlivened. John May said he was not so much dazzled by Reading as riled, but he ‘had to let him have a go’ and published everything Reading submitted except one article,

a pretty bad-tempered and ill-chosen blast against the university authorities, pretty rude. It wasn’t blasphemous or dirty, but it was ill-mannered, a bit extreme, a bit too much. I didn’t see him before I left it out, and I was off his visiting list for a while afterwards. But I thought it was worth while to let him have a go in Togatus… we had enlarged it that year, and I depended on Geoff to fill in the space. Some complained to me about his articles, and said it was a bit off, but others didn’t worry.’

(John also recalled that Geoff was unpopular when he arrived, seen as too big for his boots, so another Christ College student ‘got some hair clippers and cut a mohawk track over Blue’s head. That just fed his rebellious spirit. He liked to shock’.)

The following year the editor was Ralph Harry, president of the Student Christian Movement and another competent editor, so much so that the circulation of Togatus rose by 30%. He commented that his main policy was persuading people to write contributions, but he did this to good effect, introducing new columns such as ‘Man in the Street’ (supposed discussion with this personage about university affairs) and ‘Shophound’ (a woman’s view). Though there were complaints that the SCM received too much attention, the newspaper was successful, with Harry coping wittily with criticism.

Controversy arose about suggested reform of the lecture system, with fewer dictated notes; and Professor Taylor’s comments.

Taylor, Professor of English, was considered an excellent lecturer. At this time, John May recalled, the Catholic Church was keen to answer anything it saw as criticism, and some Catholic students felt that Professor Taylor was guilty of vulgar sneers and falsehoods against the Catholic Church in his lectures and in a Togatus article. The Catholic Archbishop, the Anglican Bishop, the Mercury editor and other public figures such as Father O’Donnell, a Catholic priest, criticised Taylor and urged that steps be taken to
restrain him. Most students supported Taylor and/or the idea of free speech, and a Union Meeting was held to show solidarity. A cry was orchestrated, referring to the First World War, when O'Donnell had been interned in the Tower of London for making treasonable remarks:

Where was Taylor?
In the trenches!
Where was O'Donnell?
In the Tower!84

The President of the Union, Don Gee, made a lengthy public statement protesting strongly against any restraint on freedom of speech.85 Forty-four students wrote to the Mercury stating that they had found nothing in Taylor's lectures to which they could make objection, and many wrote to Togatus supporting freedom of speech and/or Taylor. The University Council upheld the Union's position and freedom of speech was retained.86 It was perhaps the first time that a statement from the Union had been given prominence in the local press.

Controversy continued in 1938, again over Reading's activities. He was infuriated when Togatus censored 'bloody' from a poem of his (which, even when censored, was criticised as 'grossly offensive... filthy blasphemy')87 and, as well as editing Platypus for the year, started his own newspaper, Cactus. The first issue set the tone: Reading raged against false morality, hypocrisy and intolerance; a society built upon the sands of deceit, sham and mockery, the 'sexual perverts who taught us desperate untruths in Sunday School'; bureaucratic Christianity; 'the morons, the philistines, the reactionaries'. 'From the ranks of the radicals is derived all creative efforts', and Cactus would interest all those whose minds have not been unduly warped by conventional post-natal conditioning. Then there was the article entitled 'Why I shall not fight', which said among other items that if Red Cross nurses (the heroines of the First World War) were unreasonable, they deserved to be raped.88 Reading said he expected to make enemies: he did so.

Cactus continued on this path, coming out just after Togatus and criticising it, the Union, the SRC, the University and society generally. 'The usual bilge about the spiritual value of Intervarsity sport'; 'Togatus should be with the ashes of long-dead things'; women should be able to have children without living with a man; women students should not be allowed to take part in Mock Commem (if men were not capable of running it, there should not be one); Anzac Day was the glorification of a miserable campaign; a hysterical meeting of the University Council demonstrated that grown men can be ten times sillier than undergraduates; virginity is not the coinage that buys ambrosia; Heaven is the most pernicious invention of men's mind and so on.89 This, said Harry, stimulated Togatus to be accurate, and produced a flood of correspondence; but he resigned, whether because of Reading's activities is not known. The new editor, Tom Hutchinson, was not criticised so much, though Reading still found his targets; for example, the Union drew up a roster for freshmen to clean and tidy the men's common room, and was accused of tyranny. Reading's writings ranged from what seem justifiable criticisms, such as this last, to smug tirades against anything he saw as deserving censure. He was congratulated for stirring up Togatus and the Union, and undoubtedly did this.89

Some students enjoyed Cactus, some were alternately amused and annoyed. One even put out an issue of Anti-Cactus, rebutting Reading's claims.91 Many people in the community objected to Reading's comments, and eventually some University Councillors attempted to suppress Cactus, though the Professorial Board refused to support them, saying the offence was a breach of good taste rather than discipline. The threat to free speech overcame any dislike of Reading's criticism; a Togatus writer admitted that he did
not like Reading’s poetry, ‘but the worst that can be said is that it is modern’, and in this situation all differences had to be put aside. If disciplinary action was threatened against anyone who dared to criticise the administration, the University would be in the vanguard of fascism. The Union AGM took the unusual step of congratulating the Professorial Board on its stand in defence of free speech, though an amendment was added to the motion, that those present did not necessarily approve of Cactus. The Mercury and University Council members did not succeed in disciplining Reading, but meanwhile Cactus had become wilder and wilder in tone, full of obscure diatribes. Reading left the University without finishing his course, and Cactus disappeared in 1939. On the whole, Reading escaped lightly from his challenge to authority; one wonders how much this was due to people being entertained rather than horrified, and how great a part was played by his acceptable background (ex-Launceston Grammar); would a scholarship student from a high school have been allowed such licence?

Controversy also arose over that perennial problem, student behaviour at Commem. After Mock Commem was banned in 1934, the SRC promised the Professorial Board that its tone would be raised, and it was again permitted. The 1935 show was described as fairly clean and of a high standard (though parts were still open to objection, said the Professorial Board), and the procession was excellent. In the 1936 procession, John Green (Rhodes Scholar) drove an improvised tank and gave the Fascist salute, and Ted Giblin (Union president) in a chariot was dressed as Haile Selassie, the Abyssinian Emperor, and wore a placard stating that he was ‘Highly Salacious’. At other processions during these years a lorry was fitted up as an operating theatre, with men in surgeon’s gowns and dead rats and cats (a local surgeon had been questioned about operations at the Royal Hobart Hospital); tram points were filled with sand, so that the trams could not go down to Sandy Bay; students tried to lasso policemen on point duty; shopgirls were captured and persuaded to join the parade. The governor’s wife, Lady Clark, used to drive herself into town in a small car and park wherever she liked, so one student dressed up in a fur coat, drove a small car into town and parked right in the centre of a busy intersection, got out and walked into a bank; ‘nothing showy, but it was very funny’. He reappeared, drove off and joined the parade. On another occasion a smoke bomb was let off in the public toilets in Franklin Square, and this was most satisfactory; men rushed out in various stages of undress, and a mock fire brigade had great fun putting out the ‘fire’ and drenching them. ‘[The procession] was lots of fun’, said Charlotte Dennis, and the Mercury reported ‘gales of laughter’.

In 1936 Mock Commem was under-rehearsed but enjoyable, though two ‘particularly crude’ items were received in gloomy silence. John May commented that Mock Commem was ‘a bit bawdy, but not as bad as all that — it was more snide, allusive stuff’. He dressed up as Professor Dunbabin (a rotund and long-winded professor) in a suit of his father’s and a pillow, took off the way Dunbabin handled his spectacles, and delivered a short and ponderous paper on which was the more attractive of film star Mae West’s legs; Dunbabin took this in good part. At other times, the Physics lecturer, Miss Lowenstern, was referred to as Miss Lowen Stern and Highen Bra; Prof. Shatwell was the hero of a song which started ‘Come Kenneth, put away the knife and leave alone the rabbits’, an allusion to his merciless attitude to less able students (rabbits) who had expected to be let through; while the chancellor, with the imposing name of William Joshua Tilley Stops, was referred to as ‘Willie Jostle’em Tillhe Stops’. The prime minister, Joe Lyons, ‘had a bad time, with all those children’, and the premier’s brother and attorney-general Eric Ogilvie, who spent years trying to get through Law, was called ‘Eric, or Little by Little’. Students were still not permitted to attend Commem, and this passed peaceably.

Mock Commem was even more successful in 1937. Geoffrey Reading said he obtained
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Student humour in Mock Commem program, 1937. Students sent up royalty, governments, the university authorities and staff, and middle class morality generally. Some recalled how daring it was to include 'IT-IS APIS POTITIS'.

Item 8.-- A little She-ing Interlude

or Murgatroyd and Winterbottom at the
Winter Sports.

"IT-IS APIS POTITIS."

Kindly lent at great inconvenience by R. L. Dunbabin.

"And now for a quick one." (Dr. Fidget).

nothing from it, but Togatus defended it as providing scope for originality, joyous relaxation, beneficial competition, informal student activity, development of personality, and a chance of raising funds (to send the rowing team to IV) and showing the public the advantages of a university education. It was obviously popular, as hundreds were turned away, and the show ran for two nights.\textsuperscript{96}

There was some consternation when it was realised that the day of the procession clashed with the king's coronation, so the procession was turned into a Mock Coronation procession, complete with the monarchs, the Duke and Duchess of Windsor, Nazis and so on. The premier, Albert Ogilvie, had just introduced traffic lights, so two Engineering students, Lindsay Whitham and Dave Tudor, made a 'reasonably accurate scale model' with red, green and amber lights, but at the last minute had to change the colours to red, white and blue, to fit the general theme. They were planning to go ahead on a motor bike and hold the lights up at each intersection, but the motor bike proved unavailable and Lindsay supported the lights on a dray. 'I had no idea how rough a ride you get on a solid-wheeled dray — I was trying desperately to stop the lights from falling over.' There was a plan to change the 'Keen's Curry' sign to 'King's Corry', but only one student turned up on the hill in the darkness to move the white stones.\textsuperscript{97}

Hitler and Mussolini again took part in the 1938 parade, which raised money for the victims of the polio epidemic; students also put a sign 'Constipation Camp' outside the Franklin Square toilets. The Mercury described Mock Commem as clever, laugh-provoking, and witty, an unqualified success, though with one vulgar item. For the first time it was put
INTERVAL

Item 10.— Conferring of Degrees.

"O yearly it happens that some victims must be failed,
I've got a little list, I've got a little list,
Of society offenders who might very well be nailed,
I've got them on my list, I've got them on my list."

"The Mikado."

The Chancellor ....... .... ........ Willie Jostle'em Till he Stops
The Registrar ....... Col. John-Thomas by perm. of Lady Friends
The Governor ....... .... .... By permission of Miss McLennon

"Hotspots from History." (Smith's Weekly).

APPENDIX 2.

The Profs. are sitting in a row, in a row,
They look impressive but we know, yes we know,
Tho' they seem such sober intellectual folk,
They're really nothing but a joke!

There's Prof. Shatwell so pugnacious,
There's Macaulay so fallacious,
Theres' old Dunny who's a rival for the students' love
But where, but where, are all the rest, all the rest?
There's Pitman, nothing but a pest, but a pest,
And King at home a-Running world affairs,
And Taylor saying of his prayers.

Yes, our Profs. are all peculiar,
Do not let their learning fool yer,
But remember that the best in life is beer,
good beer;
So come then, let us sing our song, sing our song,
And let the show go right along, right along.
Will stage Commem with all its usual fun,
And have you laughing till we're done.

on in Launceston; some performers could not get away, and at the last minute Lindsay was told to take part in the men's burlesque ballet, and could not get into step with the others. 'It brought the house down — they thought I was doing it on purpose.'

'Unqualified success' was not an appropriate description of the reappearance of students at the official Commem ceremony. Men's overcoats were long then, and in 1938, recalled Lindsay Whitham, he and a friend used theirs to cover a kettle drum, slung between one pair of legs. Lindsay had drumsticks up his sleeves, and when the official procession entered the room Lindsay's friend started to play the drum. Professor McAulay was amused, but others were not. (Prof. McAulay was also amused when his car, a baby Austin, was lifted bodily on to the footpath by students after Commem.) This was not condemned, but when students let off tear gas, hidden inside tennis balls, the University Council asked the Professorial Board to report on students' behaviour not only at Commem, but Mock Commem and the procession. David Chambers told Council that some 'vulgarism' was due to a small minority of students and could be controlled, and the SRC apologised and suggested a revue instead of Mock Commem, but refused to punish those responsible or to name the culprits. Controversy raged, as the University Council considered expelling a student concerned; letters complained of tear gas; and others said no one was hurt, the diversion was welcome, and Council had lost its sense of proportion. Eventually the Professorial Board recommended that Mock Commem be banned for a year, and the University Council banned the
procession. Geoffrey Reading and another student were fined by the Professorial Board.  

As before, much of the reaction of the Council and Board was because the University was funded by the state, and student antics brought up the argument that if this was all the University could produce it was not worth taxpayers’ money. Students realised this, and thought it was because the University was too cut off from general life. The public did not realise what went on, except for commem pranks, so students should try to show other sides of university life. A public debate and a radio debate on Fascism went over well and the SRC decided to try to increase enrolment. Students also called on the graduates and the University Council to do something to raise the reputation of the University.

This was a chance for the SRC to show real leadership. In the past the SRC had not really had more of a role than giving out funds and answering criticism of students; Marcus Crisp, a Law student who was also working in a solicitor’s office, commented that he never had much to do with the Union, which did not seem particularly important. There was more activity in the later 1930s, however, with Reading’s activities stirring interest, and some very lively Union Meetings.

Before the 1938 Union elections, Togatus stated that ‘we’ want the Union to be a more powerful body, the SRC to cease being a mere business executive unit, and take a more active part in welding students together.

The Commem parade about to set off, 1938. Either Geoff Reading or Harry Lewis is Hitler, top, with Tommy Simpson as Mussolini beside him, both giving a fascist salute. The ‘Ericists’ were presumably a send-up of the Attorney General, Eric Ogilvie. Arthur Watchorn stands right, and sundry other students wear an assortment of clothes including floral knickers, and play on the trombone, tuba, trumpet and drum. The students ended up at the Belvedere for a dance. Also present were some German officers from a warship in port, who took offence at seeing their Fuhrer satirised. Either at this Commem or later, Harry Lewis spent the night in jail after impersonating Hitler. Photograph courtesy of the Mercury.
and initiate a better Union life. The elections were well attended, and the new president was David Chambers, who wanted no encroachment on student liberty, a new common room, a revue, and a vital SRC. The AGM agreed to employ a paid part-time secretary, and spend £200 maximum on inter-varsity sport, and instructed the SRC to act on its decision of the previous year, to start a drive for increased enrolment at the University; Togatus hoped that the new SRC was ‘composed of the stuff from which leaders and reformers are made’.

Financial problems arose, however, so no IV teams could be sent away, and the size of Togatus was reduced. Otherwise, the SRC seemed to manage well, and Togatus praised it for emerging from its chrysalis, with vigorous discussion about many topics. Moves went ahead to gain statutory recognition and therefore a legal position, which this time came to fruition; Teachers’ College students who did not attend lectures gained the right to join the Union; plans to build a common room went ahead; after questions as to why fifty or so official guests or ‘deadheads’ were asked free while students had to pay, the annual ball was made free for students, which was a great success; and two inter-varsities were held in Hobart, also with great success. David Chambers started a publicity committee to combat prejudices against students.

The Statute gave the University Council power to remit Union fees, but granted the SRC power to discipline students (which it first asked for in 1937). These powers were used later that year, when two students were brought before the Council and accused of vandalising the men’s common room, by breaking the bakelite plate of the door and burning a hole in the door with a poker. The men were each fined 10/-.

The SRC did not have to act in the case of Commem activities, as Mock Commem and the procession were banned. The only chance for students to entertain themselves was by pranks. When the Mercury received cables of important news, it placed them outside its office, for the enlightenment of citizens; Bob Baker had been chosen as that year’s Rhodes Scholar and knew he should watch his step, but he and another student could not resist writing out a false cable, which announced that German troops had crossed the Polish border at a fictitious town and war was imminent, and putting it outside the Mercury office. The governor, Sir Ernest Clark, took a poor view of this, made a vehement public statement and, to the horror of many students, tried to deprive Baker of his scholarship.

Baker was known for his wildness; he was one of the few men the women threw out of their common room, after he had partied too enthusiastically; but there was a general feeling that ‘a Commem joke on slow old Hobartians’ was taken too seriously.

Another prank was at the Union AGM, seen as a permissible time for antics. A certain student who still wishes to remain nameless drilled two holes in a bench in the Physics laboratory, where the AGM was held, put nails through so they were just sticking up, and soldered to the bottom of the nails a circuit which included a battery and a car horn. At the meeting, by moving the toes of his shoes, he could blow the car horn, which was gratifyingly effective. (At the 1990 centenary of the University, the student was pleased to see that the nails were still in place.)

During all this activity, Togatus was at the vanguard of progress, as, for the first time, the editor was a woman, Maida Williams. ‘I didn’t choose to be editor... [I] was literally pressed into service’, she wrote. ‘Sex didn’t come into such offers — there was a job to be done and ability to do it guided choice.’ Maida ran a competent paper, reporting fully and entertainingly student activities, condemning the Professorial Board (for refusing to allow a revue), encouraging the publication of Teachers’ College articles, and continuing a progressive policy of clearing the public mind of prejudice towards students, praising the success of the play and the Commerce Society’s radio talks. Controversy arose over the relationship of Togatus to the SRC; Togatus said it was the SRC’s official organ and would
stand behind it to the last ditch, though it would try to support all shades of student opinion; but it was criticised as being SRC propaganda.\textsuperscript{111}

Overall, the Union had consolidated its position since its new constitution of 1925. It ran student affairs reasonably smoothly and worked reasonably well with the authorities; sporting groups and clubs had developed; \textit{Togatus} was a successful student newspaper; with the introduction of ideas from NUAUS, students had achieved gains such as a student observer on University Council; reform of the SRC was in the air; and in events such as the Taylor controversy, student views were taken seriously. As in the 1920s, major topics were decided at Union Meetings, of which seven were held during the decade, with an average attendance of \textit{48}.\textsuperscript{112} This enabled some, but not much, input from the student body. AGMs were more popular, with an average attendance of \textit{72}, and larger numbers to discuss some topics: the Teachers' College debate in 1931, women on committees in 1937, a new constitution in 1939.\textsuperscript{113} In 1938 and 1939 the rather serious presidents of the SRC were trying to establish a more serious view of students generally, to change altogether the image of light-hearted pranksters which was encouraged by Commem activities. All this activity, however, was interrupted by the outbreak of war in 1939.
Chapter 4
The Second World War, 1939–1945

During the late 1930s interest in the international situation was evident among students. The International Relations Club discussed many issues, debates were held, any strong stand by authority was criticised as fascist (such as the SRC trying to make freshers fag in the common room, and the University Council trying to suppress Cactus), fascists were satirised at Mock Commem, and people put forward both pacifist and militaristic views in Togatus. There was no sympathy for any fascist regime, and no anti-semitism; for example, there was no comment when George Israel joined the lecturing staff.

There were some refugees from Europe, recalled Brian Wilson. One student was German, his Jewish parents having escaped from fascism. He spoke good English and was well accepted by other students. One day students were talking about their antecedents, and this man said, 'My family is very mixed. My father is Alsatian and my mother is Pomeranian.' There was a roar of laughter, which puzzled the student until the joke was explained; from then on he was nicknamed 'Doggie'.

In 1939 war was clearly imminent. Maida Williams attended the national SCM conference, where students recently returned from Europe warned that war was coming, so there was an undercurrent of tension. Back at home, several issues arose. The SRC passed president David Chambers’ motion to form an Officer Training Corps in the University, but there were protests that this was not democratic, encouraged war and was snobbish. In any case it was not government policy, so did not eventuate. Thirty-four students did join Voluntary Aid Detachment units to learn first aid and car driving, presumably seen as acceptably democratic, and some enlisted in citizens’ military forces.

There was also debate on the formation of a national register containing information about citizens. The Student Christian Movement held a discussion on the topic, which attracted over thirty students, 'a large attendance for one club to muster'. The general feeling was antagonistic, reported Togatus, with the register described as a menace to democratic rights and civil liberties.

Although the international situation was threatening, during 1939 Togatus was mainly concerned with the arrival of New Zealand debaters, the annual play, and inter-varsity contests. Such concerns continued over the next two years, when there was little danger to Australia and most warfare was taking place in remote Europe. There was almost universal support for the war effort, however: Togatus printed articles about the war, students were urged to work hard and support it, and at the 1940 AGM students agreed that the Union was wholeheartedly behind the government in the war effort. This support was reiterated at a meeting of the Professorial Board and Union representatives, at which students were asked to do voluntary work such as civil defence and air raid precautions. About thirty enlisted. Another contribution was research, of which there had not previously been a great deal. Supplies of optical instruments from Germany and England were cut off by the war; Physics Department members volunteered to make some, and the Optical Annexe was formed in the university grounds. Many second and third year students, male and female, assisted to make prisms for gun sights, polishing surfaces flat to within a hundred-thousandth of an inch. This ‘very tricky’ work kept people busy for hours.

Other students did work of differing kinds. Brian Wilson, studying Chemistry, was ‘roped in’ as a gas identification officer, and lectured at schools and businesses. He also recalled weaving camouflage nets. Peggy Seager, a full-time student, was asked to help out
by her old school, Friends, which like all schools was having difficulty finding teachers, so she taught full-time and went to university part-time. Students, perennially hard up, worked when they could, and Cynthia Johnason was employed as a ‘computer’ by Professor Jaeger, calculating figures for three hours a day. The pay was welcome, as Cynthia paid her own university fees. Later she undertook research on charcoal, involved in making producer gas.10

Many male students were not allowed to enlist as they were doing important work, but they were ordered to join home units. At the end of 1941, all Engineering students were sent to Melbourne to be part of the Melbourne University Rifles, as their vacation employment. To their embarrassment, they were all made acting sergeants, even those who had never shouldered a rifle.11 Lindsay Whitham joined the Royal Engineers, where training was not rigorous; the war was remote and there was no sense of danger. The captain was a lecturer in Economics, the sergeant-major helped his wife run a hat shop, the corporal was a lawyer, and Lindsay, the only one with an Engineering degree, was a sapper. One day the sergeant-major called for volunteers for that night’s guard duty, and as he called out ‘Six till eight’ Lindsay realised that if he did not volunteer quickly he would be on in the small hours, so he agreed to ‘Eight till ten’. As the men fell out, the sergeant-major whispered to him, ‘That’s the advantage of a university education’.12

Other male students were permitted to enlist, and a constant trickle left; two or three members resigned from the SRC every year to join up. The situation was different from the First World War, as the government controlled enlistment. Many occupations were reserved, particularly in vital industries, research, and science and engineering training. Frequently those who were ‘manpowered’ out of the forces were disgruntled, for there was a widespread desire by men to ‘do their bit’. A public service cadet studying science, who joined the Navy, was manpowered back home, to his disgust, and Lloyd Harris wanted to be off — ‘lots of my friends had gone... it was the thing to do and it was exciting’. As a Science student he was reserved, so could not go.13

Because of the manpower regulations, there was no feeling that men who stayed behind were slackers and shirkers, as in the First World War; people knew they must be doing some important work at home. The only hint of difficulty came in a light-hearted Togatus article about buying film, standing in a queue where snatches of conversation included, ‘When are they going to start?’ ‘I haven’t got a camera’ and ‘What is that man doing up in front? Wouldn’t you think he would be away somewhere winning the war or something?’14

The University supported the war effort, proudly stating in 1941 that it had firefighting, demolition, police and stretcher-bearing squads (male) and first aid squads (female), and students had helped dig shelter trenches.15 Similarly, following NUAUS policy and probably its own instincts, the SRC was completely behind the war effort, cancelling the 1940 inter-varsity contests and donating £100 of the money saved to the Commonwealth Government for the war. It bought War Savings Certificates and formed a War Savings Group (with limited success), the proceeds of Union functions were given to charities, such as Red Cross, and money was raised for the International Student Service, which helped students suffering as a result of war. Female students started a war fund, raising money by direct giving, bridge parties, dances, knitting bees and play readings; many also did voluntary war work, for example at the Claremont Convalescent Hospital in their holidays. The SRC also followed NUAUS policy in trying to obtain bursaries for deserving students to attend university (to make the most of the nation’s resources) and protesting against too much research work in munitions by students.16

Although inter-varsities were cancelled, NUAUS still held annual conferences, and in 1941, largely due to the work of Tasmanian delegate Rhona Connery, put on a National
Union Drama Festival for the first time. Conferences, and later the NUAUS's national student newspaper, kept Tasmanians in touch with the national scene all through the war.\textsuperscript{17}

Controversy arose at home when a conservative member of the University Council suggested that faculties which were of no use to the war effort be closed, particularly Arts, Commerce and Law. \textit{Togatus} strongly opposed this, defending students' loyalty and listing activity already undertaken: research work, donations to government and charity, and men joining up.\textsuperscript{18}

Controversy also arose in \textit{Togatus} and the NUAUS over the extent to which students should support the war. The SRC secretary said supporting the war should not be part of Union policy, and many letters agreed (free speech) or disagreed (we can't allow the secretary to white-ant us). NUAUS discussed much the same idea: should we maintain our universities much as they are and maintain the culture for which we are fighting, or should we put our effort into the war (and less into non-essential areas) lest we lose all our culture? The Tasmanian Union tended to hold the former view.\textsuperscript{19}

The Union was, in fact, busier with its own situation than the nation's. Reform of the SRC had already been suggested, and in 1940, largely due to brilliant Engineering student Geoffre Courtney-Pratt, a new constitution was adopted, under which the SRC consisted of eight members, all elected. From 1941 a budget was presented (before this, finances had been rather ad hoc), so instead of the 'wild battles of former years' over funding, there was an atmosphere of 'complete fairness' as the SRC became an 'impartial tribunal', wrote \textit{Togatus}. The situation was 'entirely revolutionised'. How much change this really made is debatable; nothing major is immediately obvious, the SRC was not totally impartial and there were still battles over funding. To encourage student support, a Union handbook was printed from 1940; \textit{Togatus} was made free for students; and another innovation was a second-hand book exchange for students.\textsuperscript{20} The Union did, however, make some demands to the university authorities: for the student observer on Council to have voting rights, to provide more scholarships and bursaries, and to stop encroaching on student prerogatives, while it tried to improve housing for students.\textsuperscript{21}

Policy statements made by candidates at the 1940s elections indicate the extent to which students supported the war. Of twelve students, six supported the war and six said nothing; the six patriots were elected and only two of the remainder. There were other unusual aspects of the election. For the first time, a woman (Rhona Connery) stood for an executive position, vice-president, and came second out of four. The president was a newcomer. For years, SRC presidents had been Law students, seen by some not only as too serious but as using the position to help their careers, so some engineers decided to elect one of their number, Ross Alexander.\textsuperscript{22}

Ross, handsome and somewhat flamboyant, was an effective president, for example insisting at the AGM that policies not people be criticised. He did cause one controversy. The rifle club could not obtain ammunition for its .303 rifles, and asked for money to buy miniature rifles. As these would be of little use in wartime, the SRC was doubtful, and Ross was overheard to say that the rifle club 'won't get a leg in anywhere if I can help it'. \textit{Togatus} was filled with letters supporting one side or the other, but the SRC had to give the club its money in the end.\textsuperscript{23}

Another question which caused heart-burning was heating in the common rooms. The students were fond of sitting around their open fires and toasting crumpets and, when the authorities replaced the fires with gas heaters, students complained bitterly. They were particularly angry as they had said they did not want gas fires, and were ignored; but the 'cheerless' gas fires were there to stay. Possibly the authorities were swayed by the fact that battles for the position in front of the fire in the men's common room were causing wear
and tear, though Ross defended them as one of the best indoor sports the University had to offer.\(^{24}\)

The authorities also showed themselves unsympathetic over the use of the library for dances, complaining that dances meant heavy expenses for lighting, and dust being thrown up. Cynthia Johnson thought they had reason: ‘we made a terrible mess, because we stirred up the dust. They were very brave to let us use it... It was a lovely room to have a ball in... People disappeared all over the place, lots of nooks and crannies’. All students praised the wonderful Union balls and dances in the Library.\(^{25}\)

Ross Alexander left the University to join up in 1942, and the next Union elections were revolutionary. Possibly inspired by the engineers’ action the previous year, women decided to elect one of their number, and persuaded Cynthia Johnson to stand. Cynthia was a Science student, by now working full-time on research, and a star basketball player described as among the sixteen best players in Australia; she was also the great-granddaughter of the first vice-chancellor of the University, George Clarke, and her father, Eric Johnson, sat on the Union committee in 1908. She had been elected as a general representative in 1940. Though she considered common-sense and a sense of humour more important than a policy, she stated that she wanted to carry on normal student activities as effectively as possible, encourage societies to prevent the University from becoming ‘merely a shop for degrees’, and support NUAUS.\(^{26}\)

There were four candidates for the position, the other three being male, but Cynthia won on primaries, a rare achievement for any president (and proving wrong those who
have assumed that she was only elected because the men were away at the war). Her election as the first woman president of the Union was announced ‘amid a storm of applause’, wrote Togatus, but Cynthia remembered that Annual General Meeting differently. Naturally she wore her best, short-sleeved dress, but when she went to the desk to speak, she found that the male students had covered the desk with something which produced slight burns on her bare arms. ‘That was seen as a great joke, hilariously funny.’ A female president was new, commented Cynthia’s vice-president Charles Miller, but ‘everyone knew everyone, and there was no angst. Cynthia was well known as effective and capable’.27

Cynthia took her position seriously, considering that she was there to look after the welfare of students. She made sure she knew all students’ names, and welcomed newcomers — by this stage some students were coming from the mainland to obtain a university place. If students were in trouble, staff would tell her, and she would do what she could. (Male presidents did not mention this; presumably staff were more likely to bring such cases to a woman’s attention.) Cynthia tried to encourage student life and to bring the University and Teachers’ College together, but found this was difficult, as people were so busy with study and war work, and Teachers’ College students had their own activities. She was an excellent president, and when she retired her untiring efforts and outstanding personality were praised, the first time a president’s efforts had been mentioned in such a way. Students remember her as ‘very efficient, very good’, ‘marvellous, a real leader’.28

As president, Cynthia represented the Union at University Council meetings, and was floored when a stalwart Council member, Mrs Tommy Murdoch, stated impressively, ‘I wish to ask Miss Johnson how are the students?’ Cynthia found some response and could not remember taking any other part in Council deliberations; a fairly uninspiring level of interest by Council in students.’29

Student life, however, was lively, if somewhat reduced. Togatus remained interesting, with exchange articles from mainland papers, controversies such as that over the rifle club, and articles on national topics such as the Angry Penguins literary debate. Charles Miller was editor in 1941–42; it was unusual for an engineer, but Charles was doing English I as an extra, so had some literary background. He was ‘an independent sort of person’ and wrote a few editorials which did not appeal to the authorities. One heading was meant to be ‘We Back Down?’, but the question mark was inadvertently left out, so the article read as if universities did not support the war effort, and Charles was taken to task by Professor Taylor. On another occasion, the reporter at Commem, Kath Corven, did not think highly of the governor’s jingoistic speech, supposedly the highlight of the ceremony, so the Togatus report covered the rest of the day in detail and ended, ‘The Governor also spoke’. This is a typical student act of the time; they made their opinion clear, but in a way which the authorities could ignore. Charles encouraged people to express their opinions and was a strong supporter of freedom of speech, questioning the need for so many government wartime controls.30

All students interviewed said that despite the war and the hard work they enjoyed these years at university immensely. The standard of lecturing was generally maintained. Jim Harris remembered Professor McAulay (who was so absent-minded he often had to be told what class it was) throwing a matchbox against the wall, telling students he did this so they would remember it: the Queen Mary was in harbour, and the matchbox contained enough nuclear energy to drive it to London. Nuclear energy was new in 1942, and the students could feel at the forefront of knowledge. Peg Seager recalled Morris Miller, ‘a dear old thing’, gentle and kind, and concerned for students’ welfare, urging them not to worry about exams, and if necessary make up their own questions and answer them. Taylor
was his brusque self; by now there were some Catholic nuns in the classes, and he called them ‘virgin lilies’, which some students found offensive. The nuns, said Peg, ‘didn’t bat an eyelid’. At the other end of the spectrum some girls still came to university for the social life, and Peg remembered one, from Launceston, who was asked to comment on some academic point, but was completely lost for words and ended up shouting ‘Bum!’ at the top of her voice.31

Some sports like athletics and the rifle club died out, but men’s hockey began (it was played on the north-west coast and a team was formed when enough north-west coasters arrived). Other sports continued, and several skiing weekends were held. Students stayed in a cottage at Fern Tree, carried their skis to the pinnacle, skied all day on the excellent snowfield ‘over the back’, then skied down the road to Fern Tree, and enjoyed convivial evenings.32

In 1940 the University authorities finally allowed the Union to stage a revue. A continuation of the old Mock Commem, this was ‘the work of the Union as a whole, being written, acted and produced entirely by students’. Containing songs and a male ballet, the revue had a loose plot with characters from round the world, including Hitler, Chamberlain, Churchill, Stalin, Daladier, Chiang-Kai-Shek, ‘the Grand Poofta of Patagonia’, and a few women, such as Unity Mitford. ‘Everybody who could do anything was roped in’, and most full-time students were involved, recalled Charles Miller who, though no actor, came on stage holding a harp. ‘We had a wonderful time’, recalled Kath Corven, who could not sing in tune so was put in the back line. Cecily McKinley was choreographer and realised that she taught students wrongly; she was trained in classical ballet but ‘they wanted eyes and teeth and bums and tits’. Despite this, and the somewhat varied talent, the production was a success, and even the Professorial Board described it as ‘very satisfactory’.33

In 1941 a similar revue portrayed the Seven Ages of Man, from schoolboy to death, put on, recalled Brian Wilson, ‘by some Christ College students, who wrote a few in-house skits — a production for students by students’. In one skit, four fellows came on stage wearing sheets as nappies and singing about being babies — ‘I thought it was hilarious’.34 This revue too was reasonably successful, though Togatus questioned what things should be revued? Politics as in 1940, home events as in 1941 — the progressiveness of this was doubtful. In another aspect the revues’ attitudes can be challenged: they were clearly male dominated, though at least women took part, which had not been the case in Mock Commems. Revues continued Mock Commem’s bawdy tradition; in 1941 the Union president, Ross Alexander, made a brief appearance (he was a poor actor) in a police court scene, where he was accused of taking a girl’s honour. His reply was that he had tried to get her honour back (get her on her back), the sort of quip the University Council did not take kindly to.35

Other student activities included a procession, in which Harry Lewis appeared as Hitler and spent the night in jail; and a marathon drinking contest, where Geoff Hood, later Union president, tried to ‘immortalise his name by drinking an unprecedented amount of beer’. More acceptably, Commem itself passed quietly with no student disruption: ‘the time for such undergraduate activity seems to be well in the past’. The only echo of past excesses was that when the procession walked in, the Wedding March was weakly whistled from the back benches.36

Students enjoyed their usual social life of balls and dances, and the drama club put on a play, though both it and debating suffered from a dearth of experienced members. Drama could not obtain enough males in 1941 and cancelled the play; debating, the one club to go to IV in 1941, only obtained a team with difficulty. It included Elizabeth McPhee from Teachers’ College, who commented that it was difficult debating in front of an
The team were state champions so often, recalled Cynthia, that it became boring. The uniform, red with a blue band or vice versa, was provided by the University, and the girls provided their own white shirts, black bloomers, black stockings and black sandals.

The Student Christian Movement, the largest club in the University, continued to be lively, discussing subjects such as the poor treatment of Aborigines, though some members disapproved of the language in the revue. They seemed overly pious to some other students. The International Relations Club died, apparently from apathy, but a new activity began after a visitor, Dr Koo of the worldwide Student Christian Movement, said universities must lead the way and students must have opinions. Togatus thought he was right—most other universities had Radical Clubs where issues were discussed. So the Discussion Club was formed with great enthusiasm, dealing with topics such as conscription.

The remoteness from war felt in 1940 and 1941 was to change. The October 1941 issue of Togatus barely mentioned the war and was concerned with the Union elections, the appeal to aid the International Student Service, and the basketball team winning the state premiership. Then came the Japanese advance and the fall of Singapore, and the first issue of 1942 was vastly different. ‘We face the possibility of conquest by a greatly superior foe. Before you read my words invasion may have begun.’ Men were wanted for stretcher bearing and fire squads; writing in Togatus for the first time, the vice-chancellor urged students fulfil their tasks to the utmost; all students were told what to do in an air raid; Christ College students spent Saturday afternoons digging trenches in the potato patch and were enrolling in the Civil Defence League or the Air Raid Precaution group. The government was to use universities to ensure a supply of people with qualifications needed.
THE UNIVERSITY AND TOTAL WAR
A JOB TO BE DONE

Now that we have the opportunity of a year's study before us it is vital that we understand the University's place in Australia's mobilisation for total war. In the following article Professor Taylor, Chairman of the Professorial Board and Acting-Registrar of the University, tells us the duties of the University's staff and students.

We face the possibility of conquest by a greatly superior foe. Before you read any words invasions may have begun. The whole man and woman power of Australia, even if fully used, may insufficient for adequate defence of our country. The need for dig trenches, for adequate defence of our country, the University's staff and students.

The student attitude to the war changed also. 'We felt that everybody had to contribute', commented the Union president, Cynthia Johnson. 'Everybody had a certain conscience, you had to look as if you were doing something. You weren't quite as irresponsible as you might have been. Everyone knew someone in the forces.' She herself became engaged to the previous president, Ross Alexander, before he joined the Navy (much to the surprise of their fellow SRC members, who had thought them arch-enemies). Other students shared her feelings about the war: 'we felt we had to join things'. After a skiing weekend Cynthia and another student were seen carrying their skis down Macquarie Street, not a good idea as students were meant to be working hard and assisting the war effort -- 'we couldn't be seen to be having fun with the war on'.

One of the main things people noticed in early 1942 was a drop in the number of students. Many men had left, either to join the forces or to undertake war-related research, and government manpower directions meant that there were fewer students at the University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FT (men) (women)</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
<th>Total (men) (women)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>68 47 21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>434 288 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>74 52 22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>452 283 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>70 48 22</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>438 265 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>74 48 26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>360 189 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>91 67 24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>388 191 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>93 70 23</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>407 232 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>128 99 29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>504 305 199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FT = full-time
TC = Teachers' College students doing part-time university courses
PT = other part-time students
Exempt = students exempt from attending lectures (often teachers finishing their degrees extra-murally)

The fall in 1942 was in part-timers, and the number of full-time students actually rose;
still, students of the period always comment that the number of students dropped, possibly because people were busier with war activities and their presence was not so obvious.  

People also noticed war precautions. A Japanese reconnaissance plane had flown over Hobart in early March, and air raids were a possibility. All students interviewed commented that they were not really afraid — ‘we felt very remote from it really’ — but the university authorities did their bit to the full. Trenches were dug in front of the building, blackout requirements were enforced, and Commemoration was cancelled as large meetings of people were thought inadvisable. The general tone of the University was ‘stern’.  

The authorities ran into trouble over trenches, and Professor Taylor complained that the SRC shirked its responsibility. He called for volunteers to dig trenches, but out of the 54 male full-time students, there were only two volunteers. The SRC offered to assume responsibility, but after four weeks the trenches were still not dug and the Professorial Board had to step in and threaten strong disciplinary measures. Lloyd Harris, secretary of the SRC, remembered this as one of his most tiresome tasks. He had to organise working bees, which were ‘a futile exercise. In the remote event of a Japanese invasion, I wondered what the hell good they’d do, little trenches outside the door’. Brian Wilson, one of the diggers, said people looked on the work as more of a party, eating sandwiches and drinking coffee, and swinging a pick occasionally. Cynthia Johnson recalled that people were unwilling to dig because the ground was extremely hard, and they knew that the trenches would just fill with water and were ‘pretty hopeless’.  

The university authorities, who did not have to wield picks but did have to answer to the government, could take a different view from students; and students worked things out for themselves, not following unthinkingly the official line.  

The ‘stern’ atmosphere, demands of war work and fewer students meant a decrease in student activities: ‘we quietened down a bit’, ‘we were constrained’.  

With petrol rationed, transport was limited (though people tried to get round this: Graeme Ingles ran his car on a mixture of petrol, kero and cider, which was fine on the flat but not up hills). The Freshers Welcome dance was held as the SRC thought it so important, but other functions such as the annual ball were cancelled, and some sports clubs found it difficult to gain enough people; football was in trouble for playing non-Union members, though eventually it was allowed to field five, and tennis and debating vanished.  

One good result, however, was the long-desired closer co-operation with the Teachers’ College. Both institutions were suffering, and, strongly encouraged by the SRC under Cynthia Johnson, combined for drama evenings, dances, and some sports such as hiking.  

Other areas continued active. The Discussion Club invited a conscientious objector to speak, as people wanted to see what he would say and argue with him, but he was so pathetic that everyone was kind to him. Later the Club ran out of enthusiasm, and its demise came when a gas fire was left on at the end of a meeting. The Professorial Board wrote that the Discussion Club could not be allowed to use the room; Cynthia, as Union president, replied politely that the gas fire had been left on for under ten minutes, and staff had been known to leave gas fires on for days, so the punishment was too drastic. The Board was annoyed at the implication of staff negligence and demanded an apology, the SRC decided that there was nothing in the president’s letter which warranted one, and the president explained the matter to the Joint Advisory Committee. The matter dragged on after she had retired, however, with the Board refusing to allow any student body to use university rooms until an apology was sent, which eventually occurred. The Board insisted on censoring the Union’s annual report, omitting a sentence which ran: ‘It is regrettable that at a time like this Union officials should be compelled to spend so much valuable time and energy in petty quarrels’, but leaving the comment that hoped for closer co-
operation between the Union and the Professorial Board, whereby student difficulties
could be met with a greater measure of success. (Looking at the letters today, the Board
appears to have been quite unreasonable.)

In the place of the Discussion Club, the New Club was formed, with informality the
keynote. Members enjoyed a weekend at Fern Tree with skiing, discussion and singing,
then a discussion on the sub-conscious mind, but the New Club disappeared at the end of
the year.

The SRC was drawn into the Discussion Club fracas, as it was in any case where students
were in trouble. It had a difficult year, trying to keep student activities going, but with a
smaller income. The Union ran the Tasmanian appeal for the International Student
Service, putting on a variety show and a slide evening. By the end of the year it was
reporting an increased interest by students in Union affairs, with eighty at the AGM.

As always, controversy brought interest, and late in 1942 the Union strongly opposed
the formation of a private schools sports association for former pupils, declaring that it
wanted to break down anything that promoted class distinction. This was despite the fact
that at least four members had gone to private schools themselves but, as Cynthia Johnson
(ex-Methodist Ladies College) said, ‘You didn’t ask which schools people went to. If you
went to a private school, you shut up about it’. The exception was some Hutchins old boys,
and the sporting move came from them. Togatus reported this controversy and the gas
fire fracas in full, despite being reduced to a single sheet of thin paper due to war
restrictions. With Platypus defunct, Togatus also put out a literary issue, with eleven articles
and poems by students.

The Union also supported the one large university function that year, a combined
church service in the Anglican cathedral, to make up for the lack of Commem. Students
and staff in academic dress formed the procession, and the prayers were led by the
president of the Student Christian Movement. Even Cynthia Johnson, not a church-goer,
thought the service ‘very successful’. The service was repeated in the following two years.

Another active area was NUAUS, whose committee tried to defend students’ rights as
well as supporting the war effort. It developed a plan: all faculties to continue, no
curtailment of lectures, no lowering of standards, but co-operation in civil defence and
help for ex-students in the forces to return to study. Late in 1942 Cynthia Johnson was
elected its vice-president, the first woman to hold the post and a considerable victory for
the University of Tasmania, but shortly afterwards she joined the army and had to resign.

With so many people in the forces, some areas were particularly hard-hit, and over the
summer of 1942–43 there was a call for students to help with fruit picking. Peg Seager was
part of a group which went raspberry picking on a farm at Gardener’s Bay. ‘I’ve never
worked so hard in my life!’ Raspberry picking entailed much bending over, the farmer was
very suspicious and kept checking their buckets in case they eked the raspberries out with
stones, and the girls worked from dawn until they could no longer see, about nine o’clock
at night. They then had to dig up potatoes for supper, risking spiking their feet in the
dark. Accommodation was primitive, and the pay was minimal (but any money was
welcome). Then Peg and another girl were sent to an apricot orchard in the Derwent
Valley, which was ‘heaven’ in comparison. ‘We were treated like princesses, baths run for
us’, the accommodation was far better, and apricot picking involved no bending.

When the girls returned to their studies, they found that the threat of war was receding
— by October 1943 even the authorities allowed that there was little danger of invasion.
Over the next three years, activities gradually revived. In sport, a swimming club was
formed so that students could use the Education Department’s Tepid Baths; the first
athletics meeting was held for five years; and the men’s hockey team played in its first
premiership. The only two teams to continue strongly right through the war, however,
were football and women's hockey, and the only non-sporting club to do so was the Student Christian Movement. The International Relations Club was revived, and in 1943 the debating, discussion and drama clubs were united in the 'D' Club, which met weekly at first and, as expected, put on debates and plays, and a revue in conjunction with the Hobart Repertory Society. Lloyd Harris, Union president, was in the male ballet, an event which fifty years later he prefers to forget. The Hot Jazz club came into being, the Music Club played quieter classical music, and in 1944 the annual ball was revived after three years.

Togatus continued to function, usually with two editors, a man and a woman. They tried to inject life into the newspaper, and always encouraged controversies. In 1943 there was that ever-popular subject, religion; democracy; immigration (a right-wing article by a student provoked many replies); and an article about women, 'Reflections in a Beer Glass', which accused women of being worried if they were not admired by all males; there were several irate replies. One issue of Togatus has, in pencil, the names of people who wrote articles: out of 27, one editor, Peter Sprent, wrote ten (37%), the committee as a whole wrote half, extra-university sources contributed three, and seven other students wrote the rest. Clearly the committee had to write much of the material.

In 1944 Togatus was more serious, with long articles explaining the government's new living allowance to needy students (very welcome), and articles about the war. Graeme Ingles, a co-editor, said that the policy was 'the usual one — be outrageous'. He and the other editor, Stephanie Fountain, were members of the SCM, but they were not extreme, and their main aim as editors was to attack apathy. There was an attack on religion and a long response from Catholics; controversy over whether the Hot Jazz Club was too loud; and a questionnaire among students, which showed, not surprisingly, that they thought university should be free, with more government support, and that controlling bodies should have a majority of members from the teaching staff and students. Problems aired included lack of student accommodation. There were few problems in running Togatus, recalled Graeme; contributions came in reasonably well, and deadlines were met successfully.

One letter asked, 'What sort of university is this?' All suggestions for progress were vigorously opposed by the University Council and/or the Professorial Board, many subjects like Philosophy, Biochemistry and Music were not taught, so it was not really a university at all. Unusually, the chancellor himself replied, not very convincingly, telling interested students to join the University Senate when they graduated. At the 1944 Union AGM students passed a motion asking the University Council for student representatives on faculties, and for faculties to discuss overloaded courses, lecturing methods, and timetables. Council refused.

On a different plane, Togatus became less conservative, and reprinted 'broad' jokes from mainland student newspapers — just under the chancellor's letter. For example:

Conversation overheard in a car parked in Crawley forest:

"O, John, let's not park here."
" " " " "
" " " "
" " "
" "
""

The state of the University during these war years was described (and possibly exaggerated) in two articles. One complained that Togatus was dull and not original, and
an ex-editor replied that the University was at fault: there were few clubs, almost no social life; 'hardly a simmer among us. We say nothing. We think nothing... How many of us ever break away from orthodoxy... anyone who does think for himself and speak his/her mind is immediately dubbed "Red" (or still more sinister — “Ah, ardent S.C.M.”?)... Shake off this apathy now, before it is too late!' 

Lloyd Harris, elected president of the Union in 1943 (although by this time he had his degree and was working as a demonstrator) agreed that it was a quiet period. His duties were not onerous, as ‘we didn’t consider there were issues we should take up... We were a pretty docile lot’. He found the authorities co-operative and benign, and life quiet on the whole. He enjoyed enormously living at Christ College and when he was elected commented that Christ College’s old position was being re-asserted, as four members of the SRC lived there (including his brother Jim; he thought it was the first time brothers had been elected together).

As during the First World War, Union activities appear to have been quiet, presumably because men were away and because of the gloom thrown over the nation by the seriousness of the situation. The SRC minutes show a quiet year on the whole, though there were a few controversial meetings, over whether a donation should be given to the International Student Service; whether Man magazine should be provided for the men's common room (there were some objections); and when Peter Crowcroft said that knowledge was the only thing of value with the world in its present state. Early in 1944 the authorities proposed setting up a Volunteer Defence sub-unit, but Lloyd said the danger had passed; should students 'play at tin soldiers' or concentrate full time on seeking truth?'

Controversy arose over control of Togatus; should it be by the SRC or the publications committee? The SRC was accused of trying to stifle free speech; it replied that it thought there should be some guiding principles for Togatus, so that these were not left to the committee each year. There should be adequate coverage of Union affairs and student activities, and Togatus, as the Union’s newspaper, should further Union policy. The SRC decided to revive Platypus, its literary journal, which appeared that year; half the contributions, said the editor, came from Science and Engineering students, and it was highly encouraging to see them break away from the limitations of a technical training.'

By this time student housing was a problem. The war had meant less building, and accommodation was scarce and expensive. Urged on by NUAS, a Union subcommittee made up a list of boarding houses, and the accommodation problem was probably one reason why the Union sent delegates to the Associate Youth Committee of Tasmania in 1944. Some of its thirty delegates were aged over sixty, and Union delegates were doubtful about its success, but among its proposals was the erection of student hostels. A sure sign that student spirits were reviving was trouble with the men's common room, where the gas fire was broken once too often and further action was contemplated. Then there was trouble at the 1944 Annual General Meeting, where a student tampered with air raid precaution equipment. The university authorities told the SRC that they had to keep the meeting in order or they could not use the Physics lab, and the student was fined £1, the maximum the SRC could impose. There were other pranks. Prof Jaeger lectured after a professor who liked the lecturer's desk to stand on the right, and as Jaeger liked the desk on the left he used to carry it across every morning. He also tested concrete cores and left the used cores outside his lab, so one morning some students arrived early and filled the desk with cores. Jaeger went to lift the desk, strained, went red, and lifted the lid. Seeing the cores he laughed; ‘he was highly respected after that'.

A new spirit was evident as 1945 progressed, and the war was obviously coming to an end. Under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme, about a dozen ex-
servicemen came to University, and the number of students rose 25% to 504, with more than a hundred full-timers for the first time. Larger numbers meant student life expanded. The first issue of Togatus described freshers having acorn fights in lecture rooms, and the revival of the Law Students Society, now that Law had twenty students. The Engineering and Commerce societies, skiing and tennis revived, and there was the first overt political activity at the University with the formation of a Labor Club, with much difficulty, and, far more easily, a Liberal Club. (The SRC had refused to allow the Australian Soviet Friendship Society to affiliate in 1942.)

Once again there were antics at Commem. The 1944 ceremony was quiet, but in 1945 a procession was held. It came down Elizabeth Street and played soccer with a kerosene tin at an intersection, then decided to besiege Westella, a girls’ hostel, and capture its flag. It only obtained a garment ‘pink and trimmed with lace’, and Matron defeated further attempts. The procession went down Elizabeth Street, removing several cars in the way, then attacked the buildings of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, but was defeated by fire hoses. Students then enjoyed the Commem Ball. Meanwhile, students were allowed to sit in the three back rows at the official ceremony, and cryptic notes mention the presence of a mouse and a ‘fur-lined model’ and the notable appearance of the usherettes. Otherwise, remarked Togatus, Commem Day passed as usual, ‘unobtrusive and gloomy’.

Togatus was rather conservative this year. An editorial told students that they were judged by their clothes, and while part-timers were well dressed, because they came from their offices, full-timers appeared with polo-necked jumpers, ‘fireside swotting jackets’ and unshaven faces. The university football team had recently taken the field wearing six differently coloured types of guernsey! ‘Give it some thought, gentlemen.’ The editors claimed to have a higher standard than in previous years (not instantly recognisable to this reader) due to a marked wakening of interest among students, and there were lively articles from Roger Jennings, who complained that the SRC misspent funds on Togatus, dances, trophies and oranges for sports clubs, which should be spent on inter-varsity. Togatus did, however, include a gossip column, which reported items like the state of various student romances (‘blissfully happy’, ‘not quite what they used to be’, ‘very promising’). The writer was praised for ‘never failing to embarrass, insult and otherwise cause trouble’, and one student was so enraged that he threatened to sue.

The SRC was quiet under president Peter Crowcroft, another older student with a reputation, fairly rare among students and disapproved of by many, of being something of a ladies’ man. General representative ‘Chick’ Chen commented that ‘the SRC was not concerned with terribly much’. He tried to drum up support for social functions, but even this was an uphill battle; ‘the place wasn’t very lively’. The SRC’s financial position was poor, and it decided to charge for Togatus, which caused vigorous debate. It did send
hockey and debating teams to inter-varsity, and Peg Seager recalled that the hockey trip was 'fun — we were a very vigorous team'. The SRC tried to change the time of examinations, without success. Plans had been going ahead since 1943 for the new university on the rifle range site in Sandy Bay, and they included a new Union building, to include not only common rooms but offices, a cafe and a theatre. The cost was eighteen times that of the building the Union had been planning in 1939. Though plans were made, no action was taken.74

Tasmania hit the national student headlines that year. Tasmania's NUAUS representative was Chick Chen, from a long-established Chinese family in Hobart who were widely known and accepted. 'Chick was one of the boys, quite a lad, a real extrovert', recalled Lloyd Harris. In his policy statement, Chick said that during his residence in the faculty of Law he had obtained insight into the 'rackets, apathy, and autocracy' existing in the University, and thought it needed 'taking down and deboring'.75

There had been earlier complaints, notably by Cynthia Johnson in 1941, that NUAUS conferences contained too much talk and too little action. After attending the NUAUS conference in 1945, Chick complained in Togatus about students who spoke for the sake of talking, and were 'stubborn, stupid, self-confident, and childish idiots'. Time was wasted, by one student body in particular, debating petty points when more important matters urgently needed investigation. 'Never in all our conjoined lives have we heard so much unadulterated bullo!' The Sydney SRC complained to the Tasmanian SRC, which said their letter was 'full of taurology' and declined to publish it or take further action.76 Chick also caused interest by asking the SRC if he could write to South African universities supporting the abolition of the colour bar there. The reply was that with the White Australia policy in force Australia was hardly in a position to do this, but he could write if he desired.77

In 1945 Togatus hardly mentioned the war, which by now did not affect the University much, and which was covered by the daily newspapers. The day of Commem was the day the war ended in Europe, recalled Brian Wilson, and students 'whooped it up' at the Commem Ball that evening. Even more enthusiastic were the celebrations when the Japanese were defeated and all war ended. Students put a piano on a truck and drove round the town 'playing and singing and carrying on, every now and again visiting offshoots of the brewery for refreshment'. Later, Brian and the wife of a lecturer stood on the bar of the Imperial Hotel, singing a bawdy song, with everyone else yelling and shouting. 'It was such a release from tension. Everybody had relatives or friends who were away in the war.'78
Chapter 5

The University is invaded by ex-servicemen, 1945–1949

Once the euphoria of the war’s end was over, university students finished the year quietly. Student activities were at a low ebb; men’s hockey was the only really active sports club (but with difficulty: Doug Saul recalled that if you didn’t get a lead in the first half you lost, because you ran out of puff — students had no time or facilities for training); the only general club to maintain its activities throughout the war was the Student Christian Movement; there was no revue and little debating. The main activity was the start of the move to Sandy Bay, with some scientific departments housed there in ex-army Musset huts.1

The University had major problems. With student numbers increasing, despite the move to Sandy Bay there was overcrowding; and with a move possible, little was spent on maintenance so everything was run-down. The male students’ lavatory even lacked a roof. Students regarded pre-war teaching staff as ancient: one sixteen-year-old girl was stunned by her first lecture from a doddery prof, and another filled his lectures with ers and ums, so that students filled in time by counting them, or drawing ‘Er graphs’, or reading books on their laps. Other lecturers were described as muddled, boring, ‘hopeless’ or dry, though some were appreciated.2

The next few years brought enormous changes. Some (but not all) of the new young staff had new lecturing styles, encouraged students to question, and brought a new atmosphere. Returning students really noticed the change.3 Then in 1948 the Teachers’ College amalgamated with the University, which brought in students from different backgrounds, often less wealthy and only able to go to university through Education Department studentships, and who diluted the upper-middle class tone of the pre-war university. But the largest immediate change came from the influx of ex-servicemen.

In 1945 there were 504 students, of whom 38% were full time. Women were 39% of the total. These figures changed dramatically the next year, with the arrival of 218 ex-servicemen. The Commonwealth Government encouraged them to undertake training, paying fees and a living allowance, and the number of students rose to 694, a third ex-servicemen. Most were full-time, so the student body was larger, with far more full-timers (63%) and fewer women (29%). Almost two-thirds of the students were full-time males, and the situation remained much the same for the rest of the 1940s. With more full-timers, the lack of facilities was even more of a problem than it had been before.4 Another change was that most students received financial assistance, either through studentships, as ex-servicemen, or from the new Commonwealth Scholarship scheme. About 60% of students received financial help from 1948 to 1951.5

All students interviewed commented that the huge influx of ex-servicemen had a marked effect. Most of the men themselves said it was not particularly hard to settle down; it was something that had to be done and they did it. Most worked hard, appreciating the chance to gain qualifications — ‘getting an education was a real bonus’, ‘we had a greater incentive to get on with it’ — and their results were considerably better than average. They noticed no gap, or only a small one, between them and students straight from school; ‘we were used to coping with all sorts of people’. Tom Errey commented that ex-servicemen brought a wave of more radical thought to university life.6
For their part, younger students looked up to returned men, who were older, wiser, and had the glamour of being heroes — Ken Hudspeth, who had won three DSCs, was greatly admired. Women especially were attracted to ex-servicemen, who were more mature, knew their way around, and often had some money. Doug Saul summed up the attitude of younger students: 'We were the rabble. No, we didn’t mind. You’re brash enough then not to mind'. No one reported resentment of these heroes. Chick Chen was the only ‘civilian’ in his year of Law in 1946, where even the professor, Shatwell, had been in the Navy, and was renowned as the boxing champion of the Queen Mary. ‘They were all back together, and we didn’t learn much Law’, said Chick. ‘Someone would say, “Do you remember...” and away they’d go with their martial experiences.’ Rodney Wood was also the only civilian in his year of Law, and was amazed at ex-servicemen’s capacity for drink. But ‘they were very good to us younger people'; the class would go to Heathorn’s pub for a beer after lectures, and after a while the others would tell seventeen-year-old Rodney, kindly, that he had had enough and should go home.7

Younger students often mentioned how they admired returned men’s disregard for authority: they would ‘cheek the staff’, which for students straight from a rigid education system was exciting. ‘The young fellows could tell them to go jump, and they did’, said Chick. From the ex-serviceman’s point of view, ‘we talked to the staff man to man’, said Ralph Southorn. The rule was that part-timers could only do two subjects per year, but he wanted to do three and told the staff so; he won his way. Older ex-servicemen in particular did not engage in student pranks, which seemed a waste of time. ‘We were law-abiding citizens. Those things flowed over our heads. We couldn’t see the point in them.’ Arthur
Watchorn, busy with sport and social life in the 1930s, came back with a different attitude and worked hard. He and many other ex-servicemen were married, which gave them a more serious purpose in life.¹

To these men the University Union was ‘fairly remote’, but many younger ex-servicemen became involved, and dominated the SRC for the next six years; it was one period when there were fewer than usual reports of student apathy. On the whole, ex-servicemen were more experienced in the ways of the world, and less likely to put up with incompetence in the management of student affairs.² In 1946 the SRC, elected in 1945, contained no ex-servicemen. Members were busy organising more common room space in sheds vacated by departments now at Sandy Bay, and common rooms in Sandy Bay; there was controversy over whether to charge for Togatus (finally defeated), who should control Togatus, and, with inter-varsity sport starting again, the old problem: how much Union funding would go towards it? There were also complaints that the University needed liberalising, with too much emphasis on technical education rising from the war, overloaded courses, poor standards of English and old-fashioned lecturing methods; and drama at a Union Meeting where one man called another a ‘blasted twister’ and was forced to apologise.³

In June 1946 ex-servicemen formed the University Services Association and asked to affiliate with the Union. The SRC refused, on the grounds that not all students were eligible to join. Togatus strongly criticised the SRC for this: over two hundred students were eligible, far more than for, say, women’s basketball, and there was no trouble about that club being affiliated. The SRC strongly censured and fined the Togatus editor, Bevan Josceline, for these remarks.⁴

Politics were mixed up in this fracas; the Labor club was small, but the larger Liberal club included the SRC secretary (Brendan Lyons) and the Togatus editor.⁵ At the SRC elections candidates often stated their political position. The new president, voted in with an absolute majority, and nearly three times the vote of the next candidate, was an ex-serviceman, president of the Liberal Club, and secretary of the University Services Association. He was balanced by the vice-president, Alf Parsons, president of the Labor Club. A letter in Togatus accused the president of being a potential dictator. He was trying to secure all power, using ‘tricks’ to become president of the Liberal party then the Union. ‘Fellow Union members wake up to this “Big Fellah” before it’s too late! Throw him out or curb his power!’⁶

Exactly what happened with the SRC in 1947 is not clear. In late 1946 the Togatus editor, Ann Jennings, criticised the president and asked the SRC to take disciplinary action, but a motion to this effect was lost. Early in 1947 Alf Parsons resigned to take up a job. The SRC’s main issue was the level of support for inter-varsity, and grants to clubs were cancelled or reduced. The last SRC meeting for two months was held on 7 May 1947 and no minutes are extant. Togatus made little reference to Union matters, but in May it stopped publication; there was a suggestion that the SRC had suspended it, but Ann recalled that she ran out of money — she was so naive that she did not know when the financial year ended.⁷

Clubs were incensed that money for IV was cancelled, and at a Union meeting carried a motion 44-23 ordering the SRC to reallocate it. This was not done and, at another meeting, a motion expressed complete lack of confidence in the SRC, as it had failed to reallocate the money, held no meeting for two months, and suspended Togatus. After discussion the last clause was removed, and the motion was carried.⁸

The only explanation of this comes from a letter to Togatus by Doug Padgham. Union members had dismissed the SRC: ‘we heard a great deal of talk about how hard they worked, and under what difficulties, but we saw nothing accomplished… only Miss McRae
had the necessary intestinal fortitude to tell her fellow representatives they were loafing, and the students solidly supported her. Exactly what went wrong is not clear, but Janet McRae was the only SRC member re-elected in 1947, so the SRC became an almost entirely new body under ex-serviceman Doug Padgham as president. Doug recalled that like most ex-servicemen he was mainly intent on getting his degree, but 'it became evident that many students thought that the SRC was out of touch with their needs and devoting most of their energies to sporting activities... I could see many ways in which the SRC could become more relevant to student needs, which apparently struck a chord, and I was elected'.

The AGM was exciting, for the ex-president moved that Janet McRae did not possess the confidence of the meeting as NUAUS secretary, and 'a spirited exchange took place in which several members threatened to deal forcibly with [the ex-president]'. He was criticised as dictatorial and unconstitutional; as he had submitted no notice of motion, his action was 'quite in keeping with his unprincipled actions in his capacity as President'. The motion was lost 'in spite of frantic counting for “Aye” votes'. The ex-president did succeed in having a Sports Union established to run sport, independent of the SRC and with half the Union's finances.

With the election of Doug Padgham, Union politics entered a more stable phase. He was president for two years, and was followed by equally responsible ex-servicemen Lance Haslope and John Cruickshank. Older and wiser, they ran a firm ship and were much admired, though their capacity for drinking shocked some. Younger students described Doug as 'a great man', 'a revered figure'; to ex-servicemen he was 'a good bloke'. Like Doug Saul, he was a Liberal supporter, and SRC heavyweights tended to be Liberals in these years. However, the Union was not highly politicised, commented Doug; he enjoyed singing left-wing songs with Janet McRae, a Labor supporter. The University was not as polarised as the general community on political issues.

The introduction of the Sports Union was only the start of constitutional wrangling. There were two old problems: should SRC members represent different interests or students generally? and, how should sports be run? A separate Sports Union, and later the Clubs and Societies Union, did not work, and in 1949 they were subordinated to the SRC. There was more change. In 1945 an SRC of ten were all elected; in 1948 only the president was elected, and fifteen of the sixteen members represented different sections: men, women, part-timers, faculties, and even Staff. But the staff representative in particular 'causes embarrassment' (though it was well-liked Gerald Firth, 'very fatherly'), so after more change, in 1949 students voted for president, secretary, eight general representatives, and the presidents of the Sports Council and the Clubs and Societies Council. Another question was compulsory voting. This was introduced in 1948, and the next year there was a record vote of 65%. But the SRC could not realistically discipline those who did not vote, so compulsory voting could never be implemented.

In 1948 and 1949 the SRC did solid work, moving from a mainly social role to providing services. Freshers were helped: Nigel Bills and Christobel Mattingley rewrote the handbook, making it lively and humorous, and Orientation Week introduced them to university life, with a Union Meeting, a welcome by the vice-chancellor, a picnic to South Arm with surfing, softball and 'refreshments', and a tea provided by the Student Christian Movement. The SRC ran a second-hand text book stall, and a scheme to help find housing, in short supply in the post-war years. It pressed for a women's hostel, with eventual success, but requests for sports grounds, a full voting member on University Council, a new method of marking, and non-compulsory attendance at lectures won no success. Some smaller requests, such as improvements to paths and library hours, were granted. The SRC co-operated with the authorities in surveys of student health and in
trying to attract more students once the flood of ex-servicemen died down, but opposed the establishment of a university regiment. On the home front, Malcolm McRae undertook the ‘herculean’ task of reorganising the Union’s administrative system.23

One achievement was obtaining a partial roof for the men’s lavatory. In 1948 Brian Wilson told a Union Meeting that it was difficult to manage when holding an umbrella, and the Union should ‘move heaven and earth to get a roof over the men’s lavatory’. He donated a guinea, on the condition that the structure be known as the Wilson Memorial Roof. This was carried, but work was not even partially completed until 1950; the move to Sandy Bay loomed, making other work seem a waste.24

In these years, recalled Doug Padgham, ‘we got on fine with the university authorities... It was all amicable... There was so much upheaval in the University, growth and change, that it was impossible for it not to go well, and they had enough to keep their hands full and so did we’. Perhaps surprisingly, the SRC and students generally did not complain much about poor facilities; pretty well everything was run-down after the war, and the probable move meant it was hard to justify expenditure on the Domain site. More common room space did stop immediate criticism: the Union was given all the tin shed complex in the University grounds. (This had a porch, where students liked to sit and watch the entire university world go by. The first there could sit on the wide waist-high wall, leaning back against the building in the sun, an enviable position which Tony Manley demonstrated with enthusiasm in 1999.) So facilities did not create a problem, and neither did finances. Despite the increase in student numbers, extra activity meant SRC finances were fairly hand-to-mouth and at one stage the treasurer reported them in ‘a sanguinary precarious state’, but generally they seemed adequate; the Union always ran at a deficit but no disasters occurred.25

On a national level, there was the question of Tasmania’s relationship with the National Union, which like everything else revived after the war. New issues arose, such as affiliation with the world student body, the International Union of Students, run by left-wingers and centred in communist countries. Tasmania ratified the National Union’s

Typical Sandy Bay photograph: the Union building, 1946–1959. This contained the usual amenities of the time, men’s and women’s rooms, table tennis equipment and a small canteen.
decision to disaffiliate from IUS, though some disagreed, arguing that it was better to stay affiliated and try to influence what was happening. The National Union sent long lists of motions for ratification; long Union Meetings ratified most but not all.26

The SRC supported the National Union in raising funds for World Student Relief (as ISS became). There was controversy: should funds be spent on inter-varsity sport, seen as either a luxury when people were starving, or a necessity to bring some life into the University; or should they go to World Student Relief? Many Student Christian Movement members pushed for the latter, and after heated debate, a referendum agreed. In later years, however, supporters restrained their efforts to fund-raising.27 One money-raiser was a Miss University competition, held despite some feminist opposition.28

In 1947 Tasmania hosted the national student congress, which gave a chance to meet national leaders, though few locals attended. Tasmania was in bad repute with other universities due to a 'completely negative attitude' to the National Union, and this came to a head in 1948, with lively debate over whether Tasmania should disaffiliate, on the grounds that the National Union was expensive, too idealistic and communist-influenced. Arguments against isolationism and parochialism carried the day, and the Union remained affiliated.29

Such debate fuelled the authorities' fear that communism was flourishing in universities. There was considerable interest in the question: the Political Science society debated communism before a packed hall, with addresses by representatives of the Liberal Party and the Communist Party, and later a second speaker addressed the society on the topic, before a large hostile audience. In 1947 the University was accused of being a hotbed of communists, and several people were reputed to be communists, including

Men's ballet from the second Old Nick revue, Red Hot. From left: Rodney Wood, John Renney, Ron Fisher, Peter Manson, Geoff Watson, Keith Walker, Peter Anstey.
dynamic Economics lecturer Ken Dallas, who looked the part, was left-wing and delighted in keeping people guessing, for example by having a hammer and sickle taped to his old car. 

The question blew up in 1949. There were more allegations that the University was dominated by communists, and the SRC repudiated this, even asking students not to carry placards on the Commem parade which might make matters worse. Doug Padgham recalled that at one stage some public servants came on campus looking for communists. As SRC president and vice-president of the Liberal Party, Doug was taken for a drive by a man who asked him to name communists, but he would not say anything. At the same time, Doug discouraged extreme right-wing activity; 'we were trying to throw cold water on it in both directions, and the weapon was ridicule'. 

Such issues promoted vigorous Union life, and there were two or three Union Meetings a year. The largest attendance was 88 when the SRC was dismissed; there were 85 at another lively meeting on stopping gambling in the common rooms, lost after heated debate. AGMs had an average attendance of 49. These figures indicate that interest in Union matters was confined to a smallish group. However, about 7% of the student body attended the AGM; in 1999, 0.5% did.

As well as debating serious issues, the SRC encouraged social life. With so many ex-servicemen, beer was mentioned in the minutes for the first time: for picnics, for a trial Disorientation Week (not repeated for many years), and in 1949 for a 'rort' for the retiring SRC and friends. One member voted against it, but a note on the minutes revealed that he turned up and consumed some beer.

The SRC had tried several times to revive the revue. In 1947 Brian Wilson stood for election to do this, and persuaded the SRC to give funding and set up a committee, which decided to stage the revue in the Theatre Royal and employ a professional producer. Keith Jarvis, a well-known theatrical personality, agreed to take on the job, on the understanding that he would be paid if the revue made any money. There was more inspiration when the Old Vic visited Hobart, and Sir Laurence Olivier and Vivien Leigh agreed to address students. Not only were they charming and gracious, but their visit led to a name for the revue company, as Brian recalled. He was dancing with Janet McRae at the Freshers' Ball, talking about possible names, and the combination of the Old Vic visit and the fact that the first scene of the revue was set in Hell made them both say at once: 'Old Nick!' 

'Anybody who could do anything was roped in', recalled the choreographer, Cecily McKinley, who made the students work hard; they were not allowed to 'muck around' or ad lib, but had to dance properly, with the humour coming from the situations and costumes. Keith Jarvis was an excellent showman and entrepreneur, and was able to turn his hand to anything — costumes, make-up, props, scenery, script-writing, as well as direction and production. The show, Smokin' Hot, aimed to 'entertain and amuse, not to offend', and concentrated on 'good dialogue, good settings and good production'. Cast member Doug Padgham recalled that it was 'a wow... highly political, roasting members of parliament, the University Council, doctors, everybody'. After the austere years of the war, such an irreverent show caught people's imagination, and it was a great success. Right from the start, Old Nick gained a reputation of being exciting and daring, as well as having magnificent parties: people in it were 'the fast stream'.

The SRC made one attempt to control Old Nick, suggesting that the 1949 title, Red Hot, was not suitable, but they did not try again. Red Hot (set in Russia, and sending up anti-Communism) was extremely successful, 'wonderful!', 'excruciatingly funny', or as the review read, 'a treat of swiftly-moving vaudeville comedy, laughs galore, winged wit and subtlety'. A parody of Swan Lake in particular was well received: 'wave upon wave of uproarious laughter shook the house to its foundations', and the next item had so many
clever rhymes, subtle allusions and stinging criticisms, wrote the reviewer, that the audience was glad when the interval brought relief for their aching ribs. Among those sent up was Mrs Jackson, who ran the Theatre Royal pub, and appeared as Mrs Jackski, in an enormous fur coat. She was so enchanted that she gave the cast a keg of beer for their final night party. Rodney Wood recalled that her feeble-minded son was also sent up, ‘something that would not be done now’.

‘There wasn’t much happening in the years after the war, and all of a sudden [Old Nick] blossomed out’, said Brian Wilson. Doug Padgham thought it his greatest achievement in two years as SRC president. Everyone interviewed praised the revue: even ardent members of the Student Christian Movement loved it, and those lampooned generally took it in good part. Only one, the Superintendent of the Royal Hobart Hospital, objected to a song sending up his opposition to free medicine. Old Nick had three other advantages: it made money, it was a unifying influence among students, and it showed the university community in a good light, as clever and irreverent but not too bawdy.

This was not always so, for the old problem of bad behaviour at Commem reappeared. Straight after the war Commem was quiet, though there was an excellent joke one year. Peter Crowcroft was friendly with a typist in the University office, and obtained a copy of the official program. He and some friends printed a spurious program with the names changed in ‘sometimes rude ways’. They kindly volunteered to give out programs to the audience, so when the chancellor called out someone’s name to receive a degree, recalled Brian Wilson, ‘it might be William Bloggs, our program would say Billy the Kid or whatever. There was a roar of laughter from the mob, and those on stage were utterly puzzled as to what they were laughing at. It was one of the best gags ever.

In 1948 students revived the traditional parade, with a clever satire on the free medicine scheme. John Cruickshank had a large old Austin tourer, which happened to look like the Government House Austin, so Peter Wenn dressed up as Lady Clark in a wig, another student dressed as the governor, and with John driving, they preceded the parade, waving graciously. The crowd was entirely taken in and waved back enthusiastically. Later, however, the parade deviated from the approved route, some students’ behaviour was called disgraceful and deplorable, and one was fined (the SRC paid this).

This minor difficulty was only the forerunner to the next year. To start with, there were pranks the night before Commem. Cigarettes were still rationed, so Christine Richardson dressed as a Czech immigrant and pretended to be lost, to distract police while Rodney Wood and others stuck a huge sign on Chick Chen’s father’s cigarette kiosk: ‘Today, 5000 Turf Cigarettes’. When Chen turned up for work, the queue stretched down the street and round the corner. Another sign was put on Brownell’s department store: ‘Early Sale! Pants Down! Come in at your convenience!’ Jeff Scrivener and four friends prepared two huge signs for the front windows of Charles Davis’ store: ‘Please Don’t Complain of the Service’, and ‘There Isn’t Any’. Next morning they were furious to find that the police had taken them down — ‘as if the police had the right to take down our signs!’. The place for Hobart matrons to have morning tea was Heidi’s coffee shop. Through an acquaintance in the Health Department, Rodney Wood obtained a closure notice, which he put on the door: ‘Closed on account of measles’. At the Commem parade he wore a grotesque mask and carried a foghorn, and burst into the coffee shop, honked the horn and shouted: ‘Measles!’ Heidi chased him down the street, and he only escaped by clambering on to one of the trucks in the parade.

The parade was successful, so everything was reasonably acceptable, but trouble erupted at the Commem ceremony, held in the Theatre Royal. A student in a monkey suit
mingled with the procession, and as the sober members sat down, came forward on the stage and scratched himself, to general mirth. Students entering the theatre were searched, to no avail; some in the gallery threw fireworks and flour bombs on to the stage and disrupted the chancellor’s speech. Tony Kearney, the registrar assistant and a man of impressive physique, threw one student out, then stood in the doorway ‘like the rock of Gibraltar’, successfully stopping any more disturbances. However, as people left the theatre a group of students burst into the nurses’ hostel opposite, raced upstairs to the flat roof, and staged a fight, in which a body fell off and toppled to the ground. People gasped and screamed, but it was only a dummy. ‘Great stuff’, said Johnny Walker, who was receiving his degree.

Once more the University Council was appalled, and fined three students. The SRC apologised, and tried to find the names of those responsible by asking people to come forward rather than by using authority’s list; but it also took ‘an extremely dim view’ of the ejection of the student. One student did come forward, by which time the SRC decided that it was too late to act.

Togatus claimed that the event created bitterness and resentment. The attempt to drown out the chancellor was in bad taste, and missiles could be dangerous; but the authorities should not behave illegally. Students should not have been subjected to the indignity of being searched, people should only be ejected by police, and the University Council both charged and judged the students fined.

Togatus was lively in these years, though often in trouble. In 1946 under three editors it was interesting if serious, with articles on politics, Australian poetry, exploration in Antarctica, bushwalking and so on; the next year Ann Jennings ‘tried to make it sparkling’ by encouraging rebellion and inquiry, and controversies on religion and strikes. She was only editor because no one else wanted the job, she said, and she produced only six issues. There were more problems in 1948, with several editors, trouble with finance and printers, only three issues, and criticism for monotonous (i.e. intellectual) articles. Next year saw no issues and Togatus was reported dead. Meanwhile, people wrote witty items on the blackboard in the men’s common room, recalled Johnny Walker. This turned into a new Togatus, with joint editors, himself and John Palmer, producing alternative roneoed issues with the motto: ‘controversy and criticism, satire and sport’.

Togatus had ‘immense difficulties’, including a perennial problem — how much space should go to sport. By June 1948 the partnership was wearing thin, but after the SRC told the editors to agree, resign, or work under an editor-in-chief, they decided to agree. Then there was a storm over a cartoon showing the answer to a crossword clue: a four-letter word ending in -it, often found on the bottom of bird-cages. The answer was ‘grit’, but it created a furore, with the SCM sending a copy of their complaint to every Union club. The SRC told Togatus to exercise more subtlety and decorum, but John Palmer stated grandly that he would not listen to attempts by pressure groups to dictate policy. Palmer was furious when the SRC used money voted for the last issue of Togatus for beer at Disorientation Week. Overall, a Gallup poll showed that students liked Togatus’ breezy style, with jokes, racing tips, crosswords, and controversies over the value of marriage, gambling and communism (‘one of the editors of Togatus has RED HAIR!’). An NUAUS report placed Togatus third among Australian university newspapers, a considerable achievement.

Like Togatus, sporting clubs had their problems, with little time for practice, no sporting amenities, no good coaches, and consequently a low standard which meant that good players went to outside clubs. Some clubs took part in inter-varsities, but usually came last. Women’s and men’s hockey and rugby seemed the most viable; tennis, football, athletics, and women’s and men’s basketball came and went; rowing and cricket faded. There were signs of life in 1949, when rugby came third in inter-varsity, football won its
The more proper groups on campus were outraged after this cover of *Togatus* appeared in 1949.

Local premiership, table tennis started, and to finance inter-varsity, the athletics club ran a stall at the Hobart Show, selling sweets and drinks. With left-over goods they started a small canteen at the University, selling not only sweets but coffee and cigarettes (still rationed), which they obtained from an importer, 'funny brands you'd never heard of'. This was the first canteen for students.\(^{51}\)

It was much the same story with general clubs; the lack of facilities, no meeting place other than the uninviting common rooms, two university sites, all meant lukewarm enthusiasm. SCM maintained its strength; Newman was small; debating was inactive; jazz died out, though music continued (a group of students meeting to listen to records from the Carnegie collection, 'very pleasant'). Both Labor and Liberal clubs came and went;
the Labor Club had the best songs, recalled Doug Padgham, with the Rugby Club a distant second. A Socialist Club formed by Ken Dallas did not last long. Faculty clubs also came and went, though the Political Science club was lively.34

Another lively group was the Glebe Theatre Players, started by the English Department, with a grant from University Council to produce plays studied in its courses. It attracted not only English students (it was accepted that if you wanted to pass English you helped out in Glebe Theatre Players) but those who were interested in serious drama rather than the vaudeville of Old Nick. In 1949 Jeff Ransley took a play to inter-varsity, successfully.35

As seen throughout this chapter, ex-servicemen played an important role in student life, and they introduced a major change: criticism of the University itself. Through Togatus, students started to complain about out-dated lecturing styles, though criticism was not too strident, and Tasmanians realised that they were fortunate to have smaller classes than the absurdly large levels at some mainland universities.34 The new Diploma of Education course, ‘slapped together’, came in for considerable criticism by students who were not afraid to be outspoken.36 Christ College, with many ex-servicemen, maintained its reputation. Freshettes were warned about ‘Christ College wolves’ — to the obvious delight of Christ College men. The new warden was a cultured English gentleman who tried to turn the College into an English academic institution; he was rather perplexed, thought David Mattingley, though students went along with him. ‘I was vice-warden, which

Tasmania University men’s hockey team, 1948, after winning the southern and state premierships. Back: Geoff Benjamin, Neville Parsons, Ian Tanner, Lance Haslope, Derek Waters, Don Tuck. Front: Max Martin, John Waterhouse (captain), Colin Johns, Dennis Turner, Jack Dean.
sounded wonderful but wasn’t.”

So, although student life in particular had some problems in reviving after the difficult years of the war, new types of student, particularly ex-servicemen, brought life with them. ‘The University was still small, most people knew one another quite well, many people got involved in all kinds of student activities, there was a lot of fun and good humour’, wrote Janet McRae. Some traditional student activities remained somewhat depressed, but Old Nick and Glebe Theatre Players, some clubs and societies, Commem, and lively controversies over the SRC, lecturing, politics and other topics showed that there was considerable life around the place. Students recall this period with enthusiasm: ‘great years’, ‘a very exciting time’. Doug Padgham, for example, was so bewitched by university that he did not want to leave, and stayed doing research for several years. It was an introduction to the even more exciting, and more fraught, period of the 1950s.
Chapter 6

The Lull then the Storm: the 1950s

The new decade opened in a dramatic fashion. At the ‘most sensational general meeting ever’ the president, Lance Haslope, moved a motion that those present be treated to dinner at Hobart’s leading restaurant. As students showed no interest in Union affairs, this motion would shake them out of their lethargy. The motion was passed, and successfully created consternation (though those present paid for their dinner themselves), and for some years there were few complaints of student apathy.

After the recent changes, from 1950 to 1955 university life was stable. The number of students remained the same, about 690, though 1955 saw a record 783. Full-timers averaged 57%, a drop as the number of ex-servicemen fell (to only 3 in 1955), and women 27%. Fewer ex-servicemen also meant only about half the students received assistance, mainly through Commonwealth Scholarships and Education Department studentships. The number of extra-mural students fell to 9% in 1955 (from 27% ten years earlier), as student teachers increasingly obtained a degree as part of their training. About a third of students were part-timers, usually mixing study and employment.

The University’s physical situation also remained stable, with many scientific departments at Sandy Bay, and humanities at the Domain. As far as the Union was concerned, the University meant the Domain, where almost all Union activities were established; Sandy Bay students complained that those who ‘dare to set foot on the sacred precincts of the Domain are treated with cold reserve’. One Science student commented, ‘I didn’t think the Union was there for me — it was for the real students, Arts students’.

Togatus tried to include news from Sandy Bay, but found it hard to come up with anything other than reports of excellent research, and complaints of the mud; the most electrifying item was a suggestion that a plant growing outside a professor’s office was marijuana. One long-desired achievement took place in 1950, when, partly due to SRC pressure, Jane Franklin Hall was opened under the auspices of the Tasmanian Council of Churches, to provide accommodation for female students. Its Board was divided between those who thought a hostel with a matron sufficient for girls, and others, predominantly female, who wanted a College with a Principal. Eventually the latter group won.

Jane Franklin Hall was situated in a large house in South Hobart, far from the Domain but reasonably close to Sandy Bay. Girls slept up to five to a room, and shared a bathroom with a shower, bath and toilet, often all in use at the same time. ‘Modesty was the first virtue to fly out the window.’ An extension was built, but even the architect said it was against his principles to design a building for women students; what did women want with the University? Did he want his children brought up by a fool? he was asked. He replied ‘Yes, he did not want his wife cleverer than he was. ‘Jane’ did produce clever women, thanks to a good library, a tutorial system, and encouragement by staff and other students, ‘a secure community of like-minded people’, leading to excellent results, and also a great deal of fun. Accommodation was also available at the Country Women’s Association hostel, Westella, which held 88 girls, a mixture of students and business employees. It had strict rules, appalling food but wonderful companionship. The Girls’ Friendly Society ran a similar hostel, but even so, there was a shortage of accommodation for students, and ongoing SRC activity was trying to find accommodation and pressing for more colleges.

The SRC remained fairly low-key in these years, members commented. It did not have funds for many activities, and much of its work was organising its round of annual events.
Orientation Week was held; the text-book stall sold second-hand and eventually new books; student finances were helped by finding vacation employment; the housing officer helped students find board; money was raised for World Student Relief (later World University Service). Two Miss University quests were held, as it was time, said Togatus, that the 'gorgeous girlies' at university gained recognition. One did this on her own account, by selling kisses in aid of World Student Relief, at four shillings each.

The SRC complained continually that irresponsible members wrecked the common rooms, and repair of furniture was a recurring budget item. Ted Barrett commented that when he became president, the men's common room looked as if it had received its last maintenance before the First World War. The treasurer, Fay Pearsall, found and cashed £125 in Second World War bonds, and the common rooms were renovated, though student misbehaviour continued. The 1955 Union Handbook said that the most popular activities in the common rooms were 'lounging about, hunching over the fire or radiator, bashing the piano and playing table tennis. Or you can just sit and smoke and talk and drink tea and do nothing'. One new amenity was a canteen, which the SRC took over from the Athletics Club in 1950. The caretaker's wife, Mrs Hulme, sold coffee, cordials, sweets, salad rolls, stationery and single cigarettes, and her strong Yorkshire accent added variety, remarked Ted. As before, the SRC made requests to the university authorities, about extending library hours and seating, organising term so national service trainees did not miss lectures, and providing a guidance officer — apparently with little success.

Social life continued, with all events including those famous ingredients, wine, women and song, as one annual report stated. There was speculation about the quantity of beer at these functions, but 'with the gradual diminishing of the number of ex-service students the necessity for this will soon be at a minimum'. Optimistic words! There were square dances, all the rage, functions to farewell popular staff members, and a cocktail party for the Professorial Board, where students enjoyed seeing professors becoming tipsy and telling stories of their student days ('some of them quite surprising!' commented John Cruickshank); this event was not repeated.

Fay Pearsall was co-opted for the job of SRC treasurer, as one of the few full-time Commerce students in her year (most were part-timers with full-time jobs). She set up accounts and disbursed funds, quite glad of the chance to put what she was learning into practice, and Togatus praised her for building up sound financial administration. 'Things sailed along pretty happily — there were no great hassles.' Fay felt she was taken seriously by the SRC, with no discrimination against her because she was a woman. The SRC was a happy group, and meetings ran smoothly, enjoyable social gatherings as much as official occasions.

Unlike the 1930s, when very few Arts students were elected to the SRC, they now dominated: 50% of SRC members came from Arts, 14% from Engineering, 11.5% Science, 11.5% Law, and 7% Commerce or Economics. Elections were sometimes enlivened with pranks, and when someone called Gavan was standing, his friends used the old Keen's Curry trick, and changed the stones so that the words read, 'ACES GAVAN'. On the whole, however, SRCs of the 1950s were serious and hardworking. The result was, said Henry Reynolds, 'I didn't stand for the SRC because I thought that was what the boring people did', and others agreed; the SRC 'just provided a bit of extra cash, and organised things, but was not a major part of our lives'.

Relations with the university authorities remained good. John Cruickshank as president continued his friend Doug Padgham's policy, saying that 'we went out of our way to co-operate with them. We got on well'. Ted Barrett found the chancellor, Sir John Morris, approachable ('He could lay down the law, though he could listen to reasonable argument') and the vice-chancellor, Hytten, 'perfectly reasonable — we had no real
Also continuing from the 1940s was an absence of politics on the SRC, and no SRC members interviewed thought there was any corruption — 'there wasn’t enough money!' The SRC managed on its small budget, and in 1953 actually had a surplus, after years of running at a small deficit. 18

Presidents in this period were all praised. The first three were ex-servicemen: Lance Haslope was 'a natural leader full of resource and initiative', and John Cruickshank was a daring administrator who began several new ventures such as the canteen and buying tubular steel furniture for the common rooms. John enjoyed being president, 'dancing with the governor’s wife at the annual ball and so on’. The Union owned a set of tails used by presidents at these functions; John and Doug Padgham were the right size and could wear them, but Lance must have had a problem, being over six feet tall. In 1952 everyone was saddened at the news of Lance’s death, serving with the air force in Korea. 17

John Cruickshank resigned early to take up a job in Melbourne, and Peter McManus was the last ex-serviceman president. After the 1951 elections Ted Barrett became the first president who was not an ex-serviceman since 1945, and the first Arts representative for even longer. Ted had come late to university, was experienced as president of the Student SRC 1953. Back: Les Wallace (assistant secretary, Arts), John Morris (president Clubs and Societies, Law), John Taylor (housing officer, Law), Bruce Cole (president Sports Council, Engineering, Rhodes Scholar), Keith Mackriell (employment officer, Arts), John Clark (editor Togatus 1954, Old Nick, Arts), George Chatchai. Front: Neal Blewett (NUAUS, publicity officer, Arts), Fay Pearsall (treasurer, Commerce), Ted Barrett (president, Arts), Gordon Jacques (secretary, Engineering), Robin Benjamin (chairman Social Committee, Arts). Between them the group played hockey, soccer, Australian Rules and rugby, and were in Old Nick, Togatus, Chess, Debating, Political Science, Student Teachers and Tramps clubs.
Teachers' Association, and said that he aimed to look after students' interests. He made sure he was accessible to requests; one engineering student, for example, who was on 'prac' at Bronte Park and had been given an oral examination to decide his result, rang and asked Ted to find out who was going to set the exam questions, the lecturer or the professor. Ted found the lecturer testing the strength of concrete blocks in a shed. 'He frowned and screwed up his face and finally said "Tell him to learn up on the Prof's part of the course". We had these odd requests and helped if it was possible.' Though not a member of a political party, Ted was naturally fairly conservative and pragmatic.15

Ted enjoyed being president, though it meant a good deal of work. In 1951 he commented that the new SRC had an average age of about twenty, and 'are in my opinion almost too enthusiastic on their new job. There are I suppose probably two passengers but on the whole it will be [a] hardworking though inexperienced S.R.C.'16 Ted's laconic, efficient style was generally well received and he was re-elected in 1952. He was followed by handsome, 'gorgeous' Neal Blewett, another Arts student and later a well-known politician. Neal 'only had to walk into a room to be acclaimed as president. He had easy charm, a great personality. He was always going to succeed'.17

Neal himself said that by this stage, the old aristocratic student leadership had gone. He and his friends saw themselves as radicals; the SRC was divided, not in a party sense, but between radicals and conservatives. Neal said ruefully that his administration was 'very weak': he was elected on a platform of less administration and opening up the SRC, but 'we were moderates who didn’t go far enough, and by the end we were being attacked...people made [Union Meetings] hell for the president, and exploited the more open system we had set up'.18 In 1954 Malcolm Hills' election started a whole new chapter in Union history, beginning with a huge controversy.

There were, needless to say, many lesser controversies, often involving NUAUS: their demands for money, the huge number of motions sent for ratification. Generally, Tasmania sent teams to the NUAUS drama festival, debating competition and students editors' conference, followed NUAUS editorial guidelines for Togatus, exhibited its student art show, and sent delegates to conferences. Ted Barrett represented Tasmania at NUAUS council meetings and said Tasmania isolated itself from other states, particularly left-wing New South Wales who actually had a Moscow-trained communist in their delegation. In the mid 1950s Tasmania drew closer to NUAUS, with Malcolm Hills on the national executive, and three students travelling to China, Indonesia and Malaya as part of NUAUS delegations.22

The SRC supported the NUAUS scheme for scholarships to Aborigines, though interest was lukewarm at first because, Togatus said, there were no Aborigines in Tasmania. The collection at the 1954 procession went towards this scheme, but generally support was limited.23

Controversy continued over Togatus. In 1950 John Palmer ('brilliant, not a radical') was editor, with Ken Haines as assistant ('the most militant pacifist I have ever met'), and they succeeded in intensely annoying many SRC members. Peter McManus called Togatus 'this bawling child of the S.R.C.'s sleepless nights', with its vitriolic pen and contempt for its parent. 'Even the [academic] staff now shudder to think what will come next.' The SRC supplied money for only six issues, but 'against desperate opposition' a Union Meeting increased this to nine issues. Even McManus, however, conceded that a paper did supply a vital need in student life.24

In 1950 Togatus appeared in printed form, much superior to its roneoed existence in 1949. A previous editor commented admiringly that it breathed vigour, independence and even prosperity. There was debate about conscription, communism, apathy, lecturing methods (stagnant, stultifying, monotonous) and uncomfortable lecture rooms; a gossip
column; and even a clothes column, ‘Sartor’ by John Palmer, ‘a kind of push to get over the hobbledehoy country boy look that so many students had’, recalled Jeff Scrivener, who assisted on Togatus. ‘Sartor’ encouraged smartly-cut sports clothes or a bright blue suit for men, and among women’s clothes praised a tiered lemon ballerina frock, silver nail polish, and bright scarves and accessories. Men wearing corduroy jackets left the unwarned observer aghast, unlike Noel Foster’s smart blue satin tie and wine-red shirt. Togatus reported unprecedented acclaim, with every copy put out in common rooms disappearing.

Christine Richardson joined the staff that year, when John Palmer wrote something she thought was so rude that she had to do something to raise the tone. In 1951 she was editor, and brought up any ill-treatment of students, especially immigrants. A ‘New Australian’ doctor was told he had to pass the final exams and read a book by ‘Whatnameski’. ‘Do you know it?’ he was asked. ‘N.A. (diffidently): “Interesting — I — er — wrote it.”’ Interference with freedom of speech, censorship, claims that the University was a hotbed of communism, the rule that students should attend two-thirds of lectures, deficient courses — all were criticised. By now students all had to serve a term of national service, and this was bitterly attacked by Vivian Smith and Christopher Koch (later noted writers). They appeared in a police court, and Togatus defended them vigorously. Anecdotes show the atmosphere of the period. Togatus reported that a European immigrant and a German student were speaking German in the train, and two factory girls opposite were sceptical: ‘Gam, yer only tryin ter be funny. Yer can’t really speak a foreign langwidge’.

Part of the fun of working on Togatus was that you could go to the little lean-to office with the earth floor for morning tea, which, recalled Graham Clements, was ‘terribly exclusive’. Christine would put on the electric jug, and if the conversation flagged or died down, no matter what the state of the water she would make the tea. Christine loved being editor; it involved a great deal of work, but it was ‘wonderful, a marvellous time’. The SRC annual report commented that Togatus had by now settled down to a vitriolic career and caused ‘indignation and laughter, surprise and pleasure’.

In 1952 the Mercury offered a generous scholarship to the Togatus editor, in return for occasional articles about the University. The first editor to earn this was Lloyd Robson, later a noted historian, and the SRC’s comment on his Togatus was that all five issues caused controversy and irritation, doubtless what Lloyd was intending. In the following year the SRC praised the drive and initiative of the editor, Keith Woodward, an ex-serviceman and a strong character with ‘a lot of get up and go’. He improved finances by gaining advertising, ran a series giving staff views, cartoons by Judy Dean, and articles on a range of topics such as elections, the place of the humanities, and whether students should have a break between school and university. Most thought not, as the University might lose students, men were keen to qualify and get to work, and women might only
have a few years between school and marriage. Another report gave examples of what students did to earn money in the summer vacation: sorting mail, picking fruit or hops, working in factories or shops, teaching and labouring, though none as interesting as the occupation one student recalled, posing almost nude for art classes.30

Another dynamic editor was John Clark in 1954, who published Togatus as ‘The enemy of the people’. He was a ‘serious, crusading editor’, praised for a high standard of writing, and sometimes controversial coverage of university activities.31 National service, apartheid, religion and the royal visit were criticised, theatre, films, music and literature reviewed, cigarette companies, the Education Department and the future of literature attacked. John’s final issue was especially electric, as covered below, and this tradition was carried on the next year by Jill Carington Smith, a well-liked, jolly person who admired Clark and continued in much the same style, and was known as ‘that woman’ to the authorities. Togatus expanded from its unsure days of the 1940s to a lively and controversial newspaper, eagerly read by students. Some were not inspired; to one woman it ‘seemed to be predominantly males experimenting with journalism and stirring up issues’.32 While Togatus was expanding, however, the Union’s occasional literary journal, Platypus, was dying. ‘If a few people are enthusiastic enough to write a Platypus, and then to badger the S.R.C. into spending the money required to publish it, we may have an edition’, ran the student handbook. A couple were published.33

Another popular institution was Old Nick. Remembered fondly by everyone who mentions it (especially a sketch where Edward Butler, as Wee Tin Po in a mandarin gown, shuffled on to the stage bearing a chamber pot and sang a song), the annual revue was always successful. Shy-Knees (1955) aimed to show the thoughtlessness of locals over difficulties facing Asian students, and recorded the adventures of two Tasmanians in China, ‘where they stagger from faux to pas’. In 1953 Old Nicker Tony Cane described the company as a ‘bunch of amiable lunatics who show an appalling tendency to fail exams’. Going in revue needed a minimum of talent and a maximum of versatility, the ability to change in minutes from a girl guide to a baby, an ancient Roman, a soak, ballerina, housewife, Martian and prima donna.34 To outsiders, ‘if one wanted to lose one’s reputation entirely, one joined Old Nick’. Dennis Altman described Old Nick as ‘the most revered organisation on campus, or perhaps just the most self-important: the [Old Nickers] saw themselves as the Bohemian elite, a world apart from the girls with cardigans and the engineering students who joined the Student Christian Movement or the Bushwalking Society... [songs from revue] seemed to us the cynosure of sophistication’.35

Togatus once described Old Nick as a cancerous growth, semi-professional, giving people a bad impression of students as inebriated and dirty-minded. Meant as a joke, this caused a furor. Old Nick members said the company was affiliated with the Union, only financial members were eligible, and Old Nick provided entries in the NUAUS drama festival and other plays, so was not just a vaudeville company.36 Criticism of Old Nick for employing professional producers was endemic, but with less experienced people in charge, the society would probably have died, as did similar societies. Old Nick had other problems, for Fast ‘n’ Lucifer (1958) was considered stale, with too many old hands and not enough students in the cast.37

The other university drama company, Glebe Theatre Players, achieved a spectacular success in 1950 when Alison Wright and Christine Richardson produced The Importance of Being Earnest. So well done was it, recalled Graham Clements who had a minor role, that it was ‘absolute agony trying to keep a straight face’. Ken Haines played Canon Chasuble, and came to rehearsals in his clergyman’s clothes, sitting on the tram with his hands clasped on his umbrella. So convincing was he that one matron told him her spiritual troubles, and he gave her suitable advice. Glebe Theatre Players also held play readings,
especially a well-remembered rendition of Faust: the producer, Beth Tribolet, told Graham she had just the part for him — the Fool, and David Dilger was all the Seven Deadly Sins, as there were not enough people to go round.

Drama was not confined to the theatre, as Union Meetings had their share. On average there were two a year, and Ted Barrett remembered them as lively; everyone was aware of how to run, or interrupt, meetings, especially the ex-servicemen — ‘it made Union Meetings the devil!’ — with constant points of order and dissent from the chairman’s ruling. Some people only came for an uproarious evening’s entertainment. One meeting started in the Philip Smith Hall and adjourned to two different lecture rooms because of excessive use of smoke bombs and rotten egg gas. As president, Ted would organise people to put forward motions while he kept order, which he sometimes had to do with an umpire’s whistle. Meetings were especially lively when finances were discussed, increasing Union fees (achieved twice), and dividing money between the SRC, the Sports Council, and Clubs and Societies. As Edward Butler, president of Clubs and Societies, explained, ‘there were more of them and they always won’. This did not stop many heated debates, resolved, temporarily, in 1953 with 43.25% going to the SRC, 48.5% to the Sports Council, and 8.25% to Clubs and Societies (bearing out Edward’s words).

Finances, control or otherwise of Togatus, how much sport should be in Togatus, better organisation of national servicemen’s training so they did not miss lectures, gambling in the common rooms — all aroused heated debate. Allegations of communist influence at the University were unanimously deplored and denied, and there was uproar when a representative of the Builders Workers Union addressed students, and an anti-communist student tried to move a motion damning the peace movement as communist-inspired. Regulations banning gambling in the common rooms were made and rescinded several times. There was a furore when SRC finances became muddled, due to the treasurer’s inexperience, and when the SRC phone was cut off due to an unpaid bill; minimum qualifications were established for the treasurer. There were some wider issues, and motions condemned the federal government for virtually banning Australians from the Pekin peace conference (held in Communist China), and not allowing a student into New Guinea for research. South African university SRCs were told that Tasmania disapproved of apartheid, and the SRC protested against the wanton slaughter of students by the Cuban dictator Batista.

Militarism was another hot topic. When the Army tried to set up a university platoon, they could only gain fourteen volunteers from 413 male students, though a Union Meeting deplored the attitude of people who pulled down notices about it. More successful was the University Air Unit, though ‘enthusiasm in many male breasts’ came from wanting to learn to fly rather than join the Air Force, with only the Air Flight bombarded with applications. Then three months national service, ‘nasho’, became compulsory. Some students enjoyed it, said Tony Manley, as a paid outside job, where students were well-treated. Others said students hated it, with tough discipline, and real antagonism between university students and the professional army staff.

At the same time that the authorities were encouraging military service, Australia started to become part of the wider world with the entry of Asian and Pacific students to universities. In Tasmania, the first group came from Fiji, Indians coming to study Law. The first, Abdul Lateef, had been headmaster of a school, and had personality and charisma. He was entirely accepted as ‘one of the boys’, and in 1950 was elected secretary of the SRC. More Fijians followed; speaking English, from a similar British background, they fitted in well. SRC policy was to meet new arrivals at the airport to welcome them.

As the Colombo Plan expanded, students started to arrive from other Asian countries, such as Malaya and Ceylon (Sri Lanka). In 1950 a soccer club was started to cater for them.
and immigrants from Britain; the sports of table tennis and badminton were also largely played by Asians. In 1952 the Overseas Students Association was formed, and its spokesman thanked the local community for the ‘kindly manner’ in which they had been received. Asians made their name in some areas: Abbas Koya was captain of men’s hockey, Leong Hong Tan won the men’s singles badminton championship for southern Tasmania, the Asian students won the prize for the best procession float in 1954, and Laurence Wong then Abnash Singal were elected to the SRC; in 1956 Singal topped the poll. John Chooi from Malaya was one of four students who entered Jack Davey’s national radio quiz, ‘Give it a go’, held with great publicity in the City Hall. John won eighty packets of Persil.15

Students appear determined that Asians would be treated well. Maria Minck married an Asian, Abeyesiriwardene; their bridesmaid could not recall any adverse reaction, and another student said that though the wedding was a nine days’ wonder: ‘we all knew Abby — he was a nice bloke’. The SRC deplored racism and the White Australia Policy (though with three abstentions).41 Generally speaking, recalled Christine Richardson, people were inspired by the ideals of the United Nations and excited by the prospect of one world; the revue showed sympathy, and the SRC held a function for international students in 1950 and its first International Night in 1955, with the aim of promoting understanding between local and overseas students. There was still only a small number of Asians, however, and they did not make much impact overall.45

Another group of foreign students were European migrants. They too were generally accepted, though one German student suffered, as a professor was convinced that he was an ex-Nazi and made his university career difficult. He made friends among the students, however, and obtained his degree despite the professor. Several students were in the public eye; flamboyant Jan Locher wrote anti-communist articles for Togatus, and the first European immigrant elected to the SRC was Richard Wielebinski in 1956. Christina O’Farrell commented that people like Jan, who were older and had been through a great deal, ‘made you feel a bit inadequate’.46

The Overseas Students Association reports often complained of inadequate support from members, and this was a feature of a number of clubs. Many tried to encourage attendance by obtaining money from the Union for suppers of sandwiches and cream cakes, ‘always a big event’. Debating was set up once more in 1950 and did flourish, sending teams to inter-varsity. Judy Rudd was in the team for three years, in 1954 the only woman in any university team, and in 1955 Tasmania triumphed by coming second. Debating was encouraged by a visit from ‘handsome and gifted’ American debaters, who defeated a team of locals in the packed Town Hall, then were entertained at one of the most successful parties the SRC ever held.17

Of other clubs, the Student Christian Movement was lively, ‘exciting’, with many speakers at the forefront of new ideas like ecumenism. Neal Blewett said members saw themselves as Christian Socialists against the Catholic Right, though the SCM did work with the Newman Society, holding combined symposia. Members of the Music Club enjoyed listening to records and ‘triumphed over the forces of reaction’ by presenting live artists in 1951.48

There was little political activity at the University, but there was a short-lived branch of the Democratic Labor Party. After the 1955 split in the ALP, which occurred in Hobart, the largely Catholic DLP was formed. Bruce Poulson recalled that in early 1956 Catholic students founded what they were told was the first branch of the DLP in Australia. The twin daughters of Senator Cole, the one DLP senator, were a great asset, and the branch held meetings and talked about policy.49

Many faculty associations were active. The Student Teachers’ Association was irate when the Director of Education forbade a mixed weekend camp, even though a
chaperone and staff member had agreed to attend. More successfully, the Association worked for a pay rise. Ted Barrett, the president, told the Department that student teachers found it hard to make ends meet, and those in Launceston were paid more than those in Hobart; on the Director's advice he asked the Teachers' Federation to take up the case, and achieved the rise — an interesting lesson in how these things were done. Four representatives went to the Teachers' Federation state conference, where assessing teachers by skill marks out of ten was debated; students spoke strongly against it and swayed the conference, a heady experience for young people. The Students' Association also protested against the poor standard of the Diploma of Education course — only one lecturer gave students the slightest idea of 'what to do when we were in front of a class'; lectures were 'absolutely awful'; 'dreadful'; 'rotten'; 'as far as learning how to teach, it was a total waste of time'. All in all, the number of clubs rose from eleven in 1950, to sixteen in 1955, including newly-formed Choral, Socratic and Literary groups. In the next few years they were joined by the Radical and Socratic societies, but most of these groups were ephemeral. Even more so was the Aesthetic Club, a joke by Henry Reynolds and Bruce Poulson, who filled out a form for assistance from Clubs and Societies and under 'Aim' put 'to be decadent'. Clubs and Societies said this was outrageous.

Henry recalled that he, Gerald Johnston and Syd Harrex were discussing the Fabian Society over a morning drink in the Ocean Child pub, and decided to form the Radical Society. Their main activity was to ask controversial speakers to campus, often so they could criticise them. These included Max Bound, a local communist; Tas Bull, who was compelling and dynamic; and Frank Hursey of the Hursey case. Sport was still struggling under the handicaps of no grounds, not enough time, and inadequate coaching; Wednesday afternoons had traditionally been free for sports practice, but even this disappeared. There were complaints that students did not take sport seriously, and 'only played for the beershows'. In 1950 there were thirteen sports teams and 400 registrations, and this grew to 35 teams in 1953, many in table tennis. New or revived sports were archery, mountaineering and, finally, cricket. Results tended to be poor, with good players often playing with outside teams, and other handicaps: the day after the Engineering Ball in 1953, fourteen university teams played sport, and with not one victory. There were financial problems: in 1957 the Sports Council was in such a chaotic situation that the auditor refused to work on the books. The situation was rectified with great difficulty.

About six teams a year competed in inter-varsity, but in the early 1950s, out of 37 competitions, Tasmania came last 16 times, with many other results either not reported, or described as 'poor'. Despite this, inter-varsities were enjoyed. Bruce Cole remembered going to Brisbane with the hockey team, flying in a DC3 which stopped six times on the way, and having a wonderful time with the other teams. Inter-varsities held in Hobart were well organised and often exciting, as in 1951 when John Landy competed in athletics. The odd place was gained, then in 1954 a second and a third, and in 1955 much better results: men's basketball and football came second, John Freeman won the individual aggregate in shooting, and Tasmania finally won a competition. The team played in the grand final of men's hockey, and as the crowd screamed and shouted the captain, John Taylor, scored the winning goal with six seconds to go. Tasmania had won its first IV competition since 1938. A few years later, women's hockey and women's badminton won, but despite these victories there were complaints that students did not take part in inter-varsity competitions seriously and only went for the social life, culminating in complaints of hooliganism by IV teams generally.

As ever, student behaviour at Commem had its exciting moments. After the antics of 1949, the University Council only let students attend if they promised to behave. Ken
Haines in *Togatus* thought there was no point to Commem: speeches were dull, vulgarities of students were stupid, rituals were meaningless, the parade was obscene. However, in 1950 Commem was a triumph. The parade showed wit and originality, and an added attraction was a huge Chinese dragon out of papier mâché and hessian, with, said John Cruickshank who helped make it, 'about ninety people inside'. As the parade progressed the dragon broke away and galloped to the Imperial Hotel, a popular student drinking place: 'someone fed ninety glasses of beer into its mouth, and ninety empty glasses came out the other end'.

The ceremony itself was moved from the Theatre Royal to the City Hall, where it was more difficult to indulge in pranks. Everything went without a hitch, and the vice-chancellor even thanked students for the high standard of behaviour. The next year the SRC decided to offer a prize for the best float in the parade, judged by the vice-chancellor and the registrar, perhaps in an attempt to bring them closer to students. The year was again quiet; rain dampened the parade, and there were only a few pranks the night before, with someone pretending to be a lost Lithuanian to distract police while a sign was put on a drapery establishment, 'Ladies! Skirts going up! Secure yours now!' This was probably the year when, recalled Neal Blewett:

We had a party on a ute who were going to do something wicked, and Libby McMahon was despatched to deal with the policeman. She turned up in an extraordinarily low, almost diaphanous dress, and we dropped her off and put up hoardings and vulgar signs. Libby was to join us after twenty minutes, but half an hour went by and she didn't come, so we got in the ute, and drove round, and here's Libby still with the overly excited policeman. So Rodney Woods jumped off, and said the only Italian words he knew, 'My tiny hand is frozen', and grabbed Libby's hand and dragged her into the ute.

At the ceremony, two students dressed up as a cow, 'with a disgraceful udder made of saveloys', and cantered down the aisle to confront the chancellor, the very proper Sir John Morris. To his credit, he told them calmly, 'I'm sorry, but there's no Faculty of Agriculture in this university'. Some students, led by ex-servicemen, staged a full battle-dress siege on the City Hall, where the Commem ceremony was being held. They were ejected, so smoke-bombed the Franklin Square toilets and set up headquarters there.

Possibly in reaction to this, in 1952 the date of Commem was suddenly brought forward from May to March, and the day was 'the dullest in living memory'. With very short notice there was no parade, and the ceremony itself was 'depressingly silent', the only wit coming when a very tall graduand appeared in a very short gown and someone called out, 'Haven't you heard of the New Look?' The opinion of some at least of the public towards student pranks appeared when Vigilant in the *Mercury* bemoaned the lack of banter: 'university students are not what they used to be'.

Such people were cheered by 'the case of the century', a prank hatched up at Christ College. Two uniformed men came out of a bank holding bags of 'money' (washers), and were attacked by two other men who seized the 'money' and ran off up the street, followed by cries of 'Stop, thief!' and some good citizens, who tried to apprehend them. 'Luckily, in those days we were fleet of foot', recalled Keith Mackriell, one of the 'robbers'. They managed to evade the citizens and the traffic, and crossed the road to where another student, later a prominent politician, was waiting in his Morris Minor. They leapt in, but were followed by a policeman, who threw himself over the back, turned off the ignition, and then and there took them to the Police Commissioner, who said, recalled Keith, 'I'm sick and tired of the lot of you, imagining that because you're at university you can have special privileges. I'm going to get you'.
‘So we went back to the College, and about three weeks later the blueys arrived. Mercifully they had made a mistake, accusing [the driver of the car] of disturbing the peace and [two others] of being accessories — they had it back to front.’ Most of the students were doing Law, where ‘a conviction wouldn’t look too good’, so the students persuaded Frank Neasey, an excellent lawyer, to defend them. Many students supported them and attended the court hearing, where ‘Neasey got us off, and there were great cheerings’. The Bank Raid ‘succeeded in startling the local peasantry out of their lethargy... beyond most expectations’, as Togatus wrote. Some people were furious — including Keith Mackriell’s father, who lectured his son on the lines of ‘you’re wasting my money fooling about’. Some students also thought the prank foolish, because it did involve danger, and the students, if convicted, could have damaged their careers.15

In 1953 Togatus reported that people chewed their fingernails waiting for Commem to be wrecked, but there were only the ‘minor interruptions’ of rattling chains, tootling flutes, rattling rattles and firecrackers, and the parade was successful but quiet. Quiet was not the right word for 1954’s celebrations, with an excellent procession which sent up the Petrov Affair, the Royal Tour and King Farouk. Several students dressed up in togas and proclaimed the People’s Republic of Tasmania in Franklin Square, and ended up in the fountain. The ceremony was once more interrupted, with the chancellor heckled and a group singing ‘Show me the way to go home’; the chancellor suggested that the police do this. On a par with this, in authority’s eyes, were students dressed informally in slacks and casual clothes.16

By this stage the authorities had decreed that the police inspect the parade for decency. Ted Barrett had to arrange this, and recalled that one policeman, a relative of his, told him that a hundred men had applied for the job — ‘they wanted to see it before it was censored!’ He only censored one item. A row had erupted between the City Council and the organisers over the recently-held Bachelors’ Ball, where behaviour ‘plumbed the depths of human decency’, so one float had a balloon at one end called ‘The Lord Mayor’s Ball’, and another entitled ‘His Other Ball’. The policeman eradicated the second balloon.

Ted also recalled one failed scheme for disrupting Commem. Someone entered the SRC office with a tiny bottle, put a drop on the floor and walked out. A minute later a dreadful smell forced everyone to leave. One SRC member managed to get hold of the bottle and sprinkled it about at Commem, but the City Hall was so much larger than the SRC office that the smell was barely noticeable. The only person upset was the perpetrator, who was worried in case the authorities could notice the taint on him when he went up to obtain his degree.17

After the heckling of 1954, the authorities took action again in 1955. On the vice-chancellor’s urging, the SRC passed a motion accepting responsibility for student behaviour and offering to take disciplinary action, hoping that they alone would be responsible for this. The University Council refused, and students were banned from the ceremony. Togatus thought poorly of this: the SRC should not have been put in this position; it was unfair that the authorities had banned students from Commem; ‘friendly chaffing’ was more desirable than an unfriendly silence or half-hearted applause which resulted from the absence of students. The ceremony was undisturbed apart from ‘natal day salutations’ to Professor Tuck. That year’s parade was praised as ‘clever’, with budgies, ‘pawnography’ and the suggestion that the Olympic Games be held in Hobart.

In 1956 Commem was amusing and not dangerous, claimed the Annual Report, but student John Reid recalled things differently. Many ‘nashos’ had returned from the Army with stolen smoke bombs, which they let off in the Commem parade. ‘You couldn’t see the tops of the buildings, there was a pall of smoke all the way up Elizabeth Street. It looked
Photos taken by student Graham Clements of the Commem Parade, 1954. The parade started off from the University, passing under the arch set up for the Queen's visit that year. It included trucks, pedestrians, and men on scooters daringly dressed in women's attire — 'very risqué!' commented Graham.
like Beirut. No one was hurt, it was just Commem, with a let-joy-be-unconfined atmosphere — no one was drunk, it was just high spirits.' It was the year Grace Kelly married Prince Rainier of Monaco, and one float depicted Ned Kelly in full armour, with the title, 'Uncle Ned'.

The next year Commem was over-successful, with many student pranks, but, ran the Annual Report airily, apart from the police court convictions, no terrifically serious damage was done. This referred to three students taken to the police court, one of whom, Jeff Long, was praised by Togatus for taking the rap unselshly when he was obviously innocent. The incident meant that the parade had to be orderly — students had to behave when three of their number were in jail.

One excellent prank occurred in an unspecified year when students stole road signs and diverted traffic from the main road outside the University up on the Domain. Cars ended up in a quarry and there was considerable turmoil. Some pranks went on all year. In 1959 a group of Physics students took over a local radio station, run from an unmanned transmitter. It took considerable knowledge, not so much to take over the station as to disconnect the programme and run one of their own, which they did for eleven minutes, reading out made-up news and so on. Other students thought this a good prank and were quite jealous. Unfortunate Professor Firth was the butt of another prank. He had an old green model T Ford with no roof, and on rainy days he would drive along holding an umbrella. The tail light had no red bulb, so he put a red sock over it. Once some students took hold of his car, removed part of the tennis court fence, carried the car to the court and re-erected the fence, to Firth's fury.

Government House, the peak of the Establishment, was, as ever, a natural butt for student humour. When Sir Hugh and Lady Binney were leaving, they planned a farewell drive round the city, so two students dressed up in a naval uniform and a fur coat
respectively, others dressed as police outriders and drove motor bikes, and the splendid
cavalcade drove round, with the mock couple waving graciously at the populace, who all
waved back enthusiastically. (Lady Binney had already endeared herself to students by
laughing hysterically when the false Commem program was given out some years earlier.)

On a higher intellectual level, Bruce Poulson noted how linoleum patterns for hospital
floors resembled Cubist paintings. Bruce and Jim Menadue framed a selection and held a
cocktail party, ‘which meant sweet and dry sherry’, in the SRC meeting room, asking
people to view the touring Cubist exhibition. The audience greatly admired the paintings.
‘It was part of our culture to “spin”, as we called it, to con people, trick them’, said Bruce.
He and a friend once dressed as professors, and went into a gathering of freshers. Having
asked the males to leave, they told the females they ought to lose their virginity.

Christ College now prided itself on intelligent initiations, so that someone was sent to
find out the prisoners’ diet at the jail, and Tony Manley was sent to get a quote from the
Government Printer for printing filthy postcards. The printer disconcerted Tony by saying
he could not give a quote unless he saw a sample, so the student in charge of the
initiations gave Tony a Spanish postcard of a senor and senorita, saying it was the best he
could do. The printer said, with disappointment according to Tony, that he could not see
anything filthy in it; Tony replied that it was all in the caption but he could not read
Spanish; and the printer grudgingly provided the quote.

People used to ring up Christ College and ask to speak to Christ, but Don Row dealt
well with this: ‘Speaking’, he would say in his impressive deep voice. The butt of humour
at Christ College was an unfortunate vice-warden, an earnest young clergyman not much
older than the students. He was a creature of habit, and used to go to the bathroom to
start running his bath, then return to his room for his bath equipment. ‘It was asking for
trouble.’ Once, after he left the bathroom students whipped in, emptied the water, put a
layer of thick white paint on the bath and refilled it. The only result they saw was a single
white footprint. On another occasion they added to the bath a chemical which is
colourless in a neutral or acid solution, but turns bright red in an alkaline solution. The
vice-warden did not notice until he started to use soap, which is alkaline.

There was considerable interaction between Christ College and Jane Franklin Hall.
The Jane girls staged a raid on Christ College, removing all the men’s left shoes; in a
Christ College counter-raid a Jane girl fell downstairs and became concussed, so raids were
banned. Tony Manley, Neil Batt and Graeme Hetherington were driving home from a
party at about 4 a.m. when Neil decided he could not take Sunday School the next day,
but would leave a note at Jane asking his co-president of SCM to do it. At Jane they
thought she might not see a note under the door, and climbed in the library window to
put it on the notice-board, leaving Graeme asleep in the car. Inside, they thought they
would put the note under the girl’s door, so went upstairs to the wrong room, woke the
occupant to ask for the right room, heard Graeme wandering around calling for them and
tried to shush him, and finally found the right room — by which time a large part of Jane
was awake. Neil and Tony were reported to the vice-chancellor, but only had to face kindly
Prof. Elliott, who merely reprimanded them. The sad part, said Tony, was that nobody
would ever believe the Sunday School story.

Back at the University, the SRC took a dim view of an incident where students threw
snowballs into the men’s common room. They were fined. At the other end of the
student spectrum, a team entered an Inter-varsity Radio Quiz organised by the BBC and
the ABC, pitting six Australian universities against six British ones. Tasmania defeated
prestigious Cambridge in the heat, and was up against Edinburgh in the final. To
everyone’s amazement, the team ‘achieved what most of us thought was impossible’, as
Togatus said frankly, and won.
Students interviewed said that only a minority played up, and most were well behaved. 'No one had the time or money to go too far off the rails... people were not in the mood for irresponsibility. They were there to gain an education or training, they were generally short of cash, they were trying to get through so they could start earning money.' 'Nearly all students were fiercely determined to get qualifications for the plenteous employment available.' Ex-servicemen, though fewer, were still influential, 'a purposeful, dynamic group who brought a self-disciplined dynamism and camaraderie to student life'. A much larger body were Education Department studentship holders, and several students commented on the difference between these students, who were bonded to teach for several years and had their immediate futures mapped out, and others, who were free to take up the careers they wanted.\(^{71}\)

Studentship holders had generally gone to state high schools and often could not have afforded to go to university without a studentship, and felt that they were lucky to be there. By the early 1950s they were well represented on the SRC; in 1953 Ted Barrett (president), Fay Pearsall (treasurer), Les Wallace (assistant secretary), Neal Blewett (NUAUS secretary) and Keith Mackriell were all studentship holders from high schools, and for six years presidents were all in this position (Ted Barrett, Neal Blewett and Malcolm Hills). Les Wallace thought the 'traditional aristocracy' did not take student politics so seriously, and Fay commented that studentship holders did not feel any different because they came from less wealthy backgrounds. You could tell from people's clothes whether they had money, but there was no division between the groups.\(^{72}\)

As before, women students said they received equal treatment with men. 'We were a feisty lot', commented Christobel Mattingley. Neal Blewett commented that 'women were treated equally, not from ideology but because it was natural'. Most males agreed, but Jeff Scrivener said that though men could profess to believe in equality and believe themselves that they did, it was possible not to act as if they did, and there was unconscious discrimination: the description of female students as 'studentettes' or 'gorgeous girlies' suggests at least condescension by some.\(^{73}\) Many women came to university young, sixteen or seventeen, 'very green'; they led sheltered lives, lived at home, and had little money for entertainment or clothes. They enjoyed university, but sometimes remained in the group they had known at school, or groups such as Student Christian Movement, whose members came from the same background. 'We enjoyed a lot of innocent fun', commented Ann Lilley. Some enjoyed a social life of balls, dances, social evenings and club entertainments, but all agree that behaviour was usually proper. A highlight was going to the Imperial Hotel for a silver service supper, toasted raisin bread and coffee beautifully served. Girls rarely drank except for the occasional glass of wine, and they dressed neatly; no woman wore trousers. 'Women were treated as "ladies"', said Ann, a member of the SRC. Students were mainly under twenty-one, the age of majority; 'the staff generally saw themselves as in loco parentis, and were protective of women, genuinely'. They liked to see them as young girls, however. Ann Jennings married young and became pregnant; there were objections by the University Council at having a pregnant woman on campus, and not much understanding from male staff members. (The staff was overwhelmingly male; in 1955, of 75 academic staff, four were female.)\(^{74}\)

There was some harassment of female students by staff, and a university tale told for decades began in this era. Over the years the female figure changes but the male lecturer does not, and the story goes that he was sitting next to the student at a tutorial, and placed his hand on her knee. She jammed her knee against the table, very hard, so that he could not remove his hand. This is not a myth; one student who had heard the story was rather surprised to find, sitting next to the lecturer, that his hand was on her knee. She tried to jam her knee against the table but felt she did not do it very well; nevertheless, he removed
his hand, and she took care not to sit next to him again.  

The first possible indication of official encouragement of women came when Ted Barrett said he hoped that one or two women would be elected to the SRC. This was not as idealistic as it appears. ‘There was no real interest in the present sexual waffle... for too long there had been a succession of treasurers who didn’t really understand how books should be kept. Fay [Pearsall] as a commerce student did, and we got her elected.’ So much for positive discrimination at the University of Tasmania in 1953. Neal Blewett, however, commented that women were treated equally on the SRC, as many men came from co-educational schools and found this behaviour natural.

Christine Richardson commented that ‘we were a naive generation, and anything to do with sex was very rare. Generally speaking, there was no sex before marriage’. Most people interviewed, men and women, agreed with her, though a few said there was some sexual activity. At the end of the war one student travelled to Sydney to a National Union conference, and was ‘shocked to my bootstraps’ when the other Tasmanian delegate took a woman with him, and shared a bedroom with her; in the 1950s two office-holders in the Student Christian Movement had to get married. ‘The shock!’ recalled another member. Besides moral disapproval, sex had its problems; girls were afraid of becoming pregnant and knew little about contraception, and men found it was difficult to obtain condoms, as most pharmacists frowned on selling them to young men, and only the very brash dared buy them. The few shotgun marriages or abortions were noteworthy, resulting in gossip and scandal, and some pity. Looking back, girls say how wonderful it was that men could take them out for the pleasure of their company, with no sexual pressure.

A few girls were thought ‘fast’. One created a stir by gaining a Union grant for a club before it was realised what she was doing. She put placards up around the University for the Free Union of Culture and Knowledge. Another attended the Artists’ Ball (a fancy dress affair run by the Art School at the Technical College, and the social event of the year) wearing nothing but a fur coat, which she took off for the judging; she was quickly whisked away by the horrified organisers. More typical of students were Christine Richardson, who attended the ball as the Begum of Oudh in a pair of curtains and a fur coat, and her partner Rodney Wood as Count Dracula, with blood-stained fangs. Even this was too much for several of their friends, who declined to go in the tram with them to the ball. Christine recalled that in her first year she refused to say something she thought rude in a Glebe Theatre Players’ production, but she coped well with being editor of Togatus. ‘I didn’t like the idea of fluffy feminism.’

It was the era of the New Look, and Christine was proud of her suit in dark green wool, with a nipped-in waist and a swing skirt. Though few men wore suits to lectures, jackets and ties were the norm, and good manners were expected. Ted Butler was late for a lecture one day, and Professor Triebel started off, ‘Ladies and gentlemen — and Mr Butler...’ Professor Kurth, very proper, told a student wearing an open-necked shirt that he expected a better standard of dress, and suggested a tie. The student cut a tie out of newspaper, to which Kurth remarked calmly, ‘It’s not quite what I had in mind, but I suppose it’s an improvement’. Henry Reynolds remembered that Gay Overton was the first woman to wear slacks to university. She also smoked, and she and three other girls shared a flat, where, outsiders thought, life was one long party, ‘scandalous, risque, daring’. Student parties were great social occasions; people were just starting to go to restaurants which provided real coffee and exotic flavours like garlic; ‘it was a party-going, drinking social life’. Most clubs held many parties; the Football Club, for example, had a party every Saturday night and often during the week.

Many students were the first in their families to attend university, able to go because of growing post-war prosperity and Education Department studentships. Some remembered
reading books about university life, and trying to recreate what they saw as the ideal student existence, 'Bohemian, French, existential, Sartre', 'exciting intellectually'. 'We were questioning how to live, how to be. We tried to be almost Renaissance figures - poets, sportsmen, writers, lovers, religious, political. We smoked Sobranies, tried to seduce women, experimented with alcohol — there were no other drugs.' Judy Rudd recalled that her friends smoked black Sobranies, and Vivian Smith wore a beret — 'we knew he was an intellectual, partly due to the beret'. Bruce Poulson edited *Diogenes*, a student literary paper; there was no shortage of copy, he recalled, as everyone wanted to write poetry or short stories. A couple of wealthier students formed a setting for a 'colonial version of *Brideshead Revisited* — a large house, flash cars, hedonistic parties. Dennis Altman recalled 'would-be existentialists, who had read Sartre or... sipped wine from tea cups or even, it was rumoured, smoked an occasional reefer'. One radical wore a black shirt, smoked French cigarettes, and aimed to write poetry on the Left Bank in Paris. (He ended up teaching in Smithton and marrying a local girl.)

There was a serious side to the Bohemian life. Some pregnancies resulted not in shotgun marriages, but visits to Melbourne for abortions or self-abortions, which led to at least one death and one sterilisation. There were a few suicides among young men, some over homosexuality, which was not much discussed or even realised. This problem continued, though it was not often mentioned publicly; in 1965 a report noted three confirmed student suicides in four years and numerous attempts. One student was known to be homosexual, and a professor would start lectures, 'Ladies and gentlemen—and Miss X'. Other students thought this cruel, and commented that although for many, homosexuality was a strange world which they did not know much about, the student in question was well accepted.

Whatever the exact aim of students, by the 1950s the austere years of the war and post-war period were over, and a new spirit breathes through student publications and activities. 'The University was exciting, a wonderful environment. We were encouraged to question... There was the euphoria that we were the generation who were never going to let war happen again. Everything was getting better all the time... We were a bit starry-eyed about making a contribution to society.' There was an optimistic atmosphere, and a feeling of reconstructing the country, helping to build up Australia after the war. 'It was the brave new world — we were going to set the world to rights.' People stood for the SRC because they wanted to help, felt they could contribute. Keith Mackriell, not long from England, revelled in the freedom of Australia. Tony Manley commented of his first term at university: 'It was very exciting — the SRC was exciting, *Togatus* was exciting, playing hockey was exciting, Old Nick was exciting'. 'I was always dying to go [to university], and it was everything I thought it would be, and better', said Judy Rudd. The years had been successful both for the University and the Union, and the 1953 Annual Report commented that the SRC 'can become a very real force in the life of this university'. With the election of Malcolm Hills as Union president in 1954 this happened. Malcolm, like Neal Blewett and Ted Barrett before him, was an Arts student, an Education Department studentship holder. Strongly anti-communist, he was an ardent Labor supporter, idealistic and serious, with integrity and principle, committed to developing student facilities. Confident and competent, he ran meetings well and spent three years as SRC president. He was prepared to strike out for his beliefs.

There was reason for strong student discontent, which had lain dormant for years. Conditions at the Domain were poor; nothing was done, because the University was going to move entirely to Sandy Bay, but little was done on this front either, and the University remained divided.

At the Domain there was one small Union Building, no place to store equipment, no
cafeteria, and only a tiny canteen. The men’s lavatory was not completely roofed, the
urinal had been broken for years, and neither the men’s or the women’s lavatories had
light or hot water. There were no sports grounds except for a tennis court and a basketball
court; Tasmania was the only Australian university without an oval. Accommodation was
totally inadequate, with sixty college places for 700 students. The library did not have
enough space for students or books (though the librarian had a copy of Lolita, then
banned, in a brown paper cover, and would lend it to students). Lecture rooms were
uncomfortable, poorly lit and poorly heated. Postgraduates and researchers were housed
in tin sheds. The complex was, wrote Dennis Altman, 'a rambling collection of old, under­
heated and badly maintained buildings which could have housed a Dickensian
reformatory more easily than a university'.

Meanwhile, there were only a few scientific departments at Sandy Bay, housed in
temporary buildings. In 1949 the government allowed money for the move, but little was
done. In early 1954 people suggested it would be better to expand on the Domain than
move, but public opinion was so entrenched in favour of keeping the Domain for the
people that there was no real alternative to Sandy Bay.

The Sandy Bay site was pleasant, recalled one student. Maths was housed in 'nicely­
painted' weatherboard huts; it was near the bush, and the student liked to think that there
were only three roads to the west between it and the next outpost of civilisation in South
America. The Union Building was a small hut with a canteen and a table tennis table, so
amenities were in much the same state as on the Domain.

The University's division between three sites (some lectures were given at the
Technical College) made for great difficulties. It was hard for students at Sandy Bay to take part in Union activities, and much time, energy and money were spent in travelling between the sites. Bruce Cole studied Engineering at Tech and the Domain, and Maths and Physics at Sandy Bay; when students had a lecture at Sandy Bay the caretaker bundled them into his van, which had no seats, slammed the doors and roared off. Constant travel round ‘the eternal triangle’ was disrupting, Bruce recalled.  

There were few complaints, for various reasons. Conditions were generally run down after the war. Ex-servicemen and studentship holders felt lucky to be at university; the army and school had often been worse, and David Dilger’s Latin class at Hobart High was held in the woodshed. Private schools were often little better, and Tony Manley, ex-Melbourne Grammar, said conditions at the Domain were not too bad. Even those who did think conditions were appalling, that ‘everything was inadequate’, were much more likely to put up with things than act. Division between sites defused any possible tension.

There were few radical students who might have taken up the cause. Student leaders were middle of the road, if not conservative: no Togatus editor or SRC member was further left than a moderate Labor supporter. The only radical was Tom Errey, an ex-serviceman.

A protest against conditions at the University, October 1954. Students picketed a University Council meeting, demanding a united university and accusing Council members of being fascists and dinosaurs. The hidden placard reads: ‘Welcome! to the Chancellor of the world’s poorest university’. Colin Lane front centre. Photograph courtesy of the Mercury.
who arrived in 1950, and found that the only institution to express even slightly radical ideas was the Political Science society. He wrote articles for Togatus, but ‘there were some fairly doughty Catholic right-wingers and I think they worsted me’, he said with a laugh. Did he convert anyone through his articles? ‘I think it unlikely!’ In any case, Tom was more concerned with world politics and issues like freedom of speech and conscription than domestic concerns, so was unlikely to show interest in university conditions."

The situation blew up quite suddenly at the end of 1954. Academics also had grievances, of poor pay, poor working conditions, and various academic matters; they complained, and encouraged students to do so. Under energetic Malcolm Hills, the Union urged the University Council to consider staff salary claims, and to complete the move to Sandy Bay. Conditions for staff and students were the worst in Australia, said Togatus. A Royal Commission was necessary."

The Union request was delivered by a representative, who was kept waiting one and a half hours then treated rudely. An unprecedented extra issue of Togatus (paid for by some staff members) not only criticised this, but revealed that a grant of £369,360, appropriated in 1949 for the move to Sandy Bay, had not been used. In the first known protest by Tasmanian students, the SRC decided to picket the next meeting of University Council. Signs were made: ‘WE DEMAND... A Reunited UNIVERSITY, 'WHO ARE THE GUILTY MEN', 'WELCOME! to the CHANCELLOR OF THE WORLD’S POOREST UNIVERSITY'. Students — including at least one woman — were rounded up, some put on fake beards to show how antiquated the Council was, and they stood outside the meeting room."

There was no immediate result, but the Togatus issue created a stir, and the university authorities demanded an apology, saying facts were misrepresented. It was the summer holiday, but some SRC members sent an apology, for confusion of the words ‘appropriated’ and ‘authorised’. After two hours of argument the SRC voted to ratify it, and to publish the apology in Togatus. A dramatic Union Meeting of speeches, interjections, amendments and gag motions, counting and recounting of votes, resulted in a resolution, carried 32 to 29, that censorship of Togatus would not be tolerated and the letter-writers should be censured. There was more drama when the 1955 editor of Togatus refused to publish the letter.

Meanwhile, the publicity generated by the complaints led Parliament to institute a Royal Commission into the University, at which four students gave evidence about amenities, scholarships and Togatus. The recommendations of the Royal Commission entirely justified complaints: an immediate move to Sandy Bay; bringing Union facilities up to the standard of other universities; reconstruction of the University Council, including a student with voting powers; student advisers; student accommodation; sports grounds; ‘everything we asked for’. Togatus pressed for immediate implementation, but the State Government and University Council were not so enthusiastic. This put the SRC in the difficult position of trying to co-operate with the authorities to gain its Union Building, but also of criticising them when they were too slow in implementing the report.

Although the 1944 plans for the University included a Union Building, it was not high on the University Council’s priority list. So Malcolm Hills went to the Premier, who promised a £ for £ subsidy, up to £25,000. This was the key achievement. Cosgrove later said he did not think the students could raise this, but they formed a committee and started work. The University Council was furious that the students had gone behind their backs, but they could not afford more bad publicity so reluctantly went along with the idea. Students were greatly helped by the lord mayor, Archibald Park, the bursar, Geoff Harrison, and the registrar, Tony Kearney.

The prime minister opened the appeal at the annual ball; staff held a stall; the lord
mayor donated a pony to be raffled; Christmas cards were designed and sold; students picked apples; Psychology students held a radio survey; overseas students held an International Ball; graduates and businesses were approached. Graham Clements recalled Malcolm Hills’ ‘remarkable efforts... [he] used a technique of persistent nagging to extract donations from Tasmanian businesses in order to help finance the Union Building at Sandy Bay. Malcolm seemed to me to be quite oblivious to any waves he made in the Hobart Establishment in this process’. The only group which did not back the building appeal was the University Council, in particular the vice-chancellor, Hytten. He was unpopular with students in any case as he was perceived as weak, not prepared to stand up to the University Council.

The building appeal not only raised money but was a much-needed unifying force in the Union. The SRC’s annual report stated that at times, schisms in the SRC and the Union had threatened total collapse, in ‘the most difficult year yet encountered by an S.R.C.’, but the Union became a united force behind the building appeal, under the dynamic leadership of Malcolm Hills. The Union was also helped by having its first full-time paid employee, Rae Wiggins. A clerk in the Supreme Court, Rae was also studying Philosophy I (‘I’m blowed if I know why!’). She found copying wills boring, and was pleased when Val Smith, the Union secretary, asked her to work for the Union, as she thought it would be more interesting. She proved extremely efficient, and, since she was a Union member, was co-opted as treasurer, always a difficult job to fill as so few students had any experience. Rae’s devotion, competence and capability were praised from the start of her career with the Union in 1956. She did a Commerce degree part-time and was elected treasurer year after year.

Hills was Union president for three years, and by November 1956 had succeeded in the huge task of raising £25,000. The main item was a raffle, with extremely good prizes including three cars. Despite a petition against it on moral grounds, the raffle raised £10,000, and in April 1956 plans started for building. Progress was slow, both in this building and in the Sandy Bay move generally, and the SRC urged more action, eventually sending a deputation to the premier. By this stage the University Council had started to implement some of the easier recommendations of the Royal Commission, among which was a student representative with voting rights on Council itself, though Council insisted that this be a graduate, against student wishes. The students elected Peter McManus but, at his first meeting, the chancellor and vice-chancellor enraged students by querying his election, on ‘self-conceived legal technicalities’. Legal advisers found no justification for their complaint. Togatus printed a scathing description of the University Council meeting, showing the vice-chancellor caught out lying, and McManus subjected to severe and unjustified criticism by councillors.

The editor of Togatus in 1956 was Jim Brassil, ex-president of the Sydney SRC, serious and able, like Malcolm Hills strongly anti-communist and pro-Labor, a member of the ALP. He was most impressed by Malcolm Hills, ‘an outstanding student leader’, and thought the Union contained many people of principle. Even more of a crusader than previous editor John Clark, Brassil had the attitude that ‘anyone in the establishment is up to something undesirable for the masses’, and his Togatus was afterwards seen as a benchmark. It strongly criticised the University Council, the chancellor and the vice-chancellor for their actions: failing to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission, failing to expedite the move to Sandy Bay, trying to gag free speech, and disregard for regulations when they appointed an outstanding lecturer to a hastily-created chair to stop him leaving. Jim was also the undergraduate representative on University Council, which he said was part of the Establishment, with many members antagonistic to him. They told him he should not attack the University as this would harm it: his view was
that the University they were producing was not worth saving.103

As editor of Togatus, Jim was heavily involved in the Orr case. Sydney Sparkes Orr had been appointed to the chair of Philosophy in 1952. From the start, opinion about him was divided, with people describing him variously as charismatic, interesting, idealistic, sleazy, self-obsessed, demanding or harmless. He was active in the SCM, and once addressed a retreat, talking round a campfire about the compatibility of Christianity and free love. 'It shocked us! We didn't know how to thank him at the end.'104 Many student leaders approved of Orr, a leader in the fight to improve conditions, but the vice-chancellor, Hytten, strongly disapproved. He was investigating three complaints about Orr, when early in 1956 Reginald Kemp alleged that Orr had seduced his eighteen-year-old daughter Suzanne, one of Orr's students. The University Council held an inquiry and found Orr guilty of seduction; Orr resigned on the condition that he receive six months' salary; Council refused to accept this and summarily dismissed him.105

Togatus and some SRC members supported Orr, claiming that the University Council had denied him natural justice in not allowing him legal advice and not hearing his case; that Orr was being victimised for standing up to Council, especially in the campaign for the Royal Commission; that there was an establishment plot against Orr. There was also a feeling that other staff members behaved similarly with impunity. 'The Orr case wasn't about sex, that was almost irrelevant, but it was about breach of contract, academic freedom, natural justice, procedural fairness, power misused or subject to abuse', said Law student Lindsay McDermott. Like many students, Lindsay saw Orr as the underdog, and support for him as part of a general anti-University Council stance.106

Other students supported the university administration, because they thought it was right, disapproved of Orr, wanted to keep on its right side, or did not want to make trouble. 'I was never satisfied on the merits of the case either way', wrote Val Smith, who was more interested in finishing the Union Building: because it was needed, to prove Council sceptics wrong, and to keep faith with the many local people who had supported the Union. Rae Wiggins said she did not really know what was going on. 'It seemed to be such a cooked up job that you wouldn't know what were the facts. I didn't know Orr, and I couldn't say I was for or against him. I had enough to do anyway.' There was also reluctance to discuss the case because of the sexual aspect, and 'invisible pressure from family and church not to become publicly involved'. Some people felt disgust with the whole thing: Tony Manley thought that 'in the Orr case, most of the parties involved behaved badly at least part of the time'.107 With strong feelings on either side, the case split the University. The Union took no notice of the fact that Suzanne Kemp was a Union member. Even forty years later, some are reluctant to talk about the issue. Professor Carey summed up the case: Orr should never have been born, should never have been appointed, and should never have been dismissed.108

Tony Kearney, later registrar, looked back on the Orr case as an example of students upholding freedom and fighting a worthwhile battle109 but at first, student reaction was muted. Malcolm Hills and Jim Brassil, the student leaders, thought it was against the interests of the Union to become involved; the SRC minutes do not mention the case until 1958, and the SRC was always divided about it. Orr's dismissal was reported in Togatus, but there was little more about the case until in September the Socratic Society invited him to address them. Orr had been banned from campus and Hytten refused to allow the Society to use a room. This attempt to stifle free speech incensed Togatus, which from then on was strongly behind Orr. 'As editor of Togatus I gave it pretty hot and strong', said Jim. 'Only a handful of students ever criticised me face to face for the attitude Togatus adopted.' Meanwhile, Orr had appealed to the Tasmanian Supreme Court, which rejected his action, and he took his case to the High Court.110
Six or seven students wanted to give evidence in these court cases, but Jim and Malcolm were reluctant to encourage them, thinking it could be bad for their careers. The first one who did give evidence, Jan Locher, was 'torn apart' in court; another was prepared to say that he had had sex with Suzanne Kemp, so destroying her innocent image, but Malcolm and Jim dissuaded him, thinking he would be 'destroyed', and the evidence could be ruled irrelevant. Jim commented that he and Malcolm were surprised that so many students were prepared to risk their careers for a principle. He added that much about the Orr case will never see the light of day; the whole case will never be known. Efforts to persuade him to publish his memoirs are unavailing.

The Togatus issue of 27 November 1956 was largely taken up with the Orr case. The editorial stated that members of staff had no more security of tenure than a 'gut-runner' at the abattoirs; every attempt was made to destroy the credibility of students who were subpoenaed by Orr; 'if the Council ever deserved the respect of the University it purports to control it certainly lost all standing it may have had by the procedures it has permitted and, indeed encouraged'. The news that Hytten's term as vice-chancellor had been extended was not welcomed, given Hytten's continued opposition to the Union's building appeal, his attempts to have the Mercury scholarship for Togatus editors suspended, and his 'general autocracy'. Suzanne Kemp was portrayed as 'a thoroughly unsatisfactory witness', 'psychotically upset, highly imaginative, obsessed with sex'. This became known as 'the famous issue' of Togatus.

The Mercury opposed Orr, and in March 1957 students reacted angrily when Orr's house was stoned but the Mercury refused to report it. In the first off-campus demonstration by University of Tasmania students, some marched into Hobart, enunciated the freedom of the press outside the Mercury office, and distributed two thousand pamphlets which gave their view of the case. The demonstration was orderly, but the police took offence at a placard which read 'Democracy or Police State?', and conducted students back to the University. Not all students supported the demonstration, however, and Togatus reported indignantly that some passed abusive remarks in a bus in which Orr was travelling.
The editor of Togatus was Sydney Harrex, ‘amiable, if somewhat bohemian’, literary and poetical, and just as pro-Orr as Jim Brassil. In both these years Togatus was serious, with many articles on such subjects as academic freedom, international affairs, literature and surrealism. Brassil was congratulated by the SRC for the courageous manner in which he edited Togatus, and his drive and initiative in protecting students’ interests. There was other news in 1957: floods caused by the heaviest rain for years, which badly disrupted progress on the Union Building at Sandy Bay; criticism of the unchallenged rule of those in power in the Union; amusement when at an SRC meeting Val Smith was kidnapped by hooded Ku Klux Klansmen; short-lived relief when Hytten was replaced as vice-chancellor by Keith Isles (he also attacked Orr). But Orr dominated the year, and there was criticism that Togatus was used as a weapon in a personal feud against the University Council and Hytten in particular; Harrex and Brassil had gone close to contempt of court (one Brassil editorial was headed ‘Our VC is no decoration’) and prejudiced the position of the Union and all students. Their attitude was that they were acting on principle.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the attacks on the newspaper, the Mercury scholarship for the editor of Togatus was withdrawn.

The authorities tried to castigate pro-Orr students, though never directly. Bruce Poulson wrote pro-Orr articles for a mainland paper, and some staff told him he was going too far, though this only made him more rebellious. If pro-Orr students committed other misdemeanours they were firmly castigated. Once Bruce and Henry Reynolds were caught in a girl’s room at Jane Franklin Hall, and this was taken seriously by the authorities; people from the north were reluctant enough to send their daughters south because of the Orr case, and in the 1950s it was appalling for young men to be caught in a girl’s room. Several staff stood up for Bruce and Henry, and nothing too grim eventuated; but their action was treated more seriously than that of Neil Batt and Tony Manley, who were not Orr supporters. ‘So it should have been!’ said Tony.

As part of the saga of Australian universities, 1957 saw the Murray Committee’s inquiry into their condition. The SRC made a submission, and once again an official report justified complaints: the state of the University of Tasmania ‘almost beggars description’, with intolerable conditions for staff and students: the Domain was shocking, the library appalling, Sandy Bay a jumble of old army huts, and corporate life impossible, so it was no wonder that many Tasmanians went to mainland universities. Overall, the Murray Report described university’s role as educating the undergraduate, pursuing research, and standing guardian to intellectual standards and integrity. It proposed Commonwealth funds for building. Togatus urged the state government to take maximum advantage of Commonwealth offers of money, which would mean a complete removal to Sandy Bay in three years.

The University Council took little notice, and at the new vice-chancellor’s first meeting, Councillor Harold Solomon attacked the SRC and Togatus, claiming their criticisms of Morris, the former chancellor, were responsible for his death, and complaining about Togatus’ coverage of the Orr case. Togatus challenged Solomon to a public debate, which he did not take up.

Malcolm Hills finished three years as Union president in 1957, having made his mark by raising funds for the new Union Building. The new president, Val Smith, a Law student, continued his work. He had a full-time job, was studying part-time with excellent results, worked backstage with Old Nick, played football and basketball, played cards all night, and as well as all this was SRC president for three years. He was an outstanding administrator: competent, efficient, and so good at working with the authorities that the SRC thought he was doing deals with the University Council without consulting them, though the deals were always for the benefit of students. ‘We were continually annoyed,
and we continually censured him for acting without prior consultation with us, and he would accept it with good humour and ignore it,’ said Tony Manley. It was fortunate that Val was so competent, for it was a hard time to take over; in the middle of the Orr case, strained relationships with University Council, and the move to Sandy Bay. The 1958 Annual Report talked of a year of great difficulty, not only for the SRC but for the University as a whole.¹²²

Orr lost his appeal to the High Court, but the case was taken up around Australia and internationally. By this time the Kemp aspect had been marginalised, and the issues were whether academic staff could be dismissed in such a manner, and if not, what security they had; and the struggle for free criticism against an illiberal administration. Togatus, much of the SRC and many others backed the Orr side, and the chair was black banned by the Australian Association of Philosophers. Many people wanted the University to set up an enquiry to clear the air but, despite many requests, not only from the SRC and NUAUS but from churches and citizens’ groups, the University Council said two Courts had thrown out Orr’s appeal and the case was closed.¹²³

By this time another aspect had developed, which reduced student sympathy for Orr. With the University of Tasmania criticised around Australia, and the chair of Philosophy empty, the reputation of the University suffered and students were afraid that the standing of their degrees would be diminished.¹²⁴ The SRC and Togatus still felt that this was the University Council’s fault, but there was a growing desire to end the case. The 1958 Annual General Meeting debated the Orr case, and after five amendments were suggested, a motion was carried urging Orr to bring his action before the Courts so the status of the University could be restored, and the question of his innocence determined.
A second motion was carried suggesting more security for academic positions, but one proposing that sexual relations between a professor and a student be not used as grounds for dismissal, was lost. The nineteen motions and amendments, and much discussion, show how divided students were.125

The SRC was also more cautious than before. When Orr sent them a letter in September 1958, they replied noncommittally. In October, however, they decided that a new inquiry into 'this sorry business' was necessary, to show that Orr had been denied natural justice. The University Council rejected this, and refused to allow a student representative to speak on the topic.126

The Togatus editors for 1958 were Christina O'Farrell and Tony Manley. Christina applied for the position out of idealism and an interest in journalism, and for 'a bit of fun'. Though she and Tony sometimes held opposing views, both being argumentative by nature, they had been very close friends, recalled Tony, but had now split up. They applied separately to be editor and were not pleased when the SRC made them joint editors. Their articles were described as non-controversial, dealing with topics such as integration in American schools; a questionnaire showed that only 14% of male students and 23% of women were non-smokers, which was seen as bad, as it encouraged tuberculosis. Tony said they would have liked to have been controversial, and reprinted an article from Honi Soit criticising Anzac Day, 'but the local RSL was too sensible to rise to the bait and it was ignored. It was most upsetting to be ignored'. Tony and Christina resigned in May, due to pressure of work and an awkwardness in working together. Christina was rather disillusioned by that stage, with the Orr case and the attitude of the University.127

Togatus introduces the Union to freshers, 1959: fun, booze, rotary, radicalism, sport, and a little Christianity (obscured) and literature (dropped to the ground)
The new editor, Bruce Poulson, had no experience but, as the same student assistants continued and the printer was helpful, there were no great problems. A keen supporter of Orr, his policy was to give an alternative view to 'SRC orthodoxy', to give a fair go to Orr, because he thought the *Mercury* would not, and to make *Togatus* more intellectual and interesting, with less about NUAUS and overseas issues like apartheid, which he considered not relevant to Tasmanian students. Orr was eager to get Bruce on side, and was often on the phone. He even came to the house to wake Bruce up, which appalled Bruce's stern Irish Catholic mother. Bruce's issues of *Togatus* were controversial; the registrar tried to confiscate one, and another angered Val Smith by suggesting corruption in the building of Hytten Hall. In October Bruce was dismissed by the SRC because he overspent the budget and supported Orr too vehemently; the SRC said that his 'startling' first issue gave a minority opinion only.127

The SRC itself had had a vehement year: criticism of members not doing their jobs and domination by the executive, long meetings till 1 a.m., bickering about the constitution, and a fiery clash of personalities. Jill Solomon, daughter of Councillor Solomon who had so heavily criticised the SRC, was herself criticised, especially when she took up a full-time job and rarely attended meetings; enfant terrible Michael Hodgman resigned and took the opportunity to criticise others; there was the Great Key Scandal when two members of the executive changed the locks so the secretary could not enter his office; Union Meetings censured various SRC members and forced the secretary to resign, and later censured the SRC itself.128 Such tension in the Union was not surprising, given the difficult situation.110

Meanwhile, Commem became Students' Day, and at last student antics disappeared from the Commem ceremony. On Students' Day, issues of *Togatus* (called 'The Murkury' or 'The Mockery') were sold to raise money for police boys' and girls' clubs. The Police Commissioner wrote to the SRC saying that festivities were the most pleasing for years; he had obviously not heard of the kidnapped tram, and the bus that ended up on Mt Rumney, commented *Togatus*. The SRC forced three students whose gas-bomb had damaged a woman's stockings to pay for them, and severely reprimanded one, an SRC member who should have set an example.111 (Bruce Poulson described the kidnapped tram episode: Peter Mudford, a well-known student, studied a manual on tram driving and planned to stage an accident with a car and 'corpse' so the driver and conductor would get out to look, and leave the tram free for him to drive. Many people came to hear about this, including the authorities, and when Bruce and a group of friends tried to board the tram en route to see the fun, the conductor would not let them on. Peter was persuaded to try the stunt later, so the accident was staged, the driver alighted, and Peter drove the tram out towards Springfield. Power went to his head; he drove too fast and the tram left the rails outside Ogilvie High School. Students jumped off and either hid behind a hedge or ran away over the Ogilvie oval, chased by police. No one was caught, or hurt.112)

The main work of the SRC, however, and particularly of Hills and later Smith, was to complete the new Union Building. It was started in August 1957, and though there were many trials and tribulations such as floods and building delays, Val Smith maintained a firm supervision of the project, the foundation stone was laid in May 1958 and the building was completed early the next year. Val recalled that price increases meant a funding shortfall, which was solved by putting the banking facilities in the new Union Building out to tender. The National Australia Bank was the successful tenderer, and agreed to pay the first five years' rent in advance. 'The cash problem was solved!' The bank manager was 'legendary' Charlie Dyer, a keen supporter of the Union and helpful to many students in trouble. 'His unsecured lending practices were unorthodox to say the
least, but he had an uncanny knack of picking good risks', wrote Val. 'I cannot recall him ever being let down by a student through default.' The Union Building's site was a triangle cut off from the main group of buildings by what seemed a minor road; Malcolm Hills favoured this because other universities had usurped Union Building sites, and Tasmania seemed safe in its triangle. Use of the road grew, and the Union asked for an overpass, with no success.131

This was not much of a worry in 1958, and there was excitement as the Union Building neared completion. It was going to be the most modern in Australia, another way in which Tasmania could show, as it had been trying to since the 1920s, that it was as good as mainland universities, and the Union prepared to start 1959 at the new site. The way in which it had been achieved, however, as well as the Royal Commission and the Orr case, meant that the Union had been pitted against the university authorities. In the period up until 1954, there had been very little tension between the two, but the later 1950s set the scene for decades of more or less marked antagonism.
Chapter 7

‘Please Don’t Conform’: the growth of dissent, 1959–1965

The move to Sandy Bay was a watershed, not just a move from site to site, but a paradigm of enormous change in the whole University: from a traditional Oxford-style building to 1960s square boxes; from small and cramped to large and spacious; from the War and its aftermath to the baby boomer generation; from Anglo-Saxon dominance to a growing multiculturalism; from wide acceptance of the Korean War to questioning the Vietnam War; generally, from the old to the new. Even the dances changed, recalled Bruce Poulson; at the Domain it was the Pride of Erin and the Barn Dance, waltzes and foxtrots, but at Sandy Bay it was rock and roll and the Beatles. The old Bohemian dream changed: Sobranies and existentialism gave way to marijuana and left-wing idealism.

There were a few regrets at leaving the dilapidated Domain — though Lindsay McDermott commented that the Gothic building was more in keeping with ancient traditions of learning than red brick — but generally people liked Sandy Bay which, though not beautiful, was roomy, modern and comfortable, ‘like a palace after a pigsty’, the place for a fresh start after the recent upheavals. ‘The “New University” is more than a collection of buildings’, Togatus told freshers at the start of 1959. ‘It has become the ideal of a new beginning. In recent years the University of Tasmania has been rent by dissension arising from the Royal Commission and the Orr Case... it is to be hoped that the bracing atmosphere of Sandy Bay may enable... staff, students and administration to work harmoniously together.’

The Union Building was the main edifice at Sandy Bay in 1959, and most academic departments were accommodated in Army huts. The rest of the University moved slowly. Chemistry and Engineering were completed in 1960, the Library in 1961, Arts in 1962 (after a much criticised three and a half years), Physics and Maths some time later, and only in 1963 were all lectures given at Sandy Bay. New departments were Agricultural Science (1963) and Medicine (1965). So for most of the period from 1959 to 1965 the University was still divided, but the Union was at Sandy Bay, centred in the new Union Building.

This was much praised, as ‘spacious’, even ‘luxurious’. It contained three common rooms, with the Main Common Room large enough for dances, films and Union meetings; reading, music, table tennis and meeting rooms; a cafeteria; offices for union executives; and scope for extensions, such as a theatre. Togatus enthused about the excellent services: good, inexpensive meals in the Refectory or Ref, the fine parquet dance floor in the Main Common Room, and the good facilities.

All these services were run by the Union. On the Domain it had been a small body with few organisational responsibilities, and changes were needed to equip it for its new role. Two years previously, Malcolm Hills and Val Smith travelled to Western Australia to study the organisation of its students’ union, and in the light of what they saw, the Union’s constitution was revised. The Union Building Management Committee was established in 1958, with five representatives from the SRC, and five from Convocation, University Council, staff and administration. It ran the Union Building competently for years. In similar situations, other unions often ran into trouble; the fact that the huge enterprise of erecting the new building, moving in and rapidly developing the Union into a large
business enterprise ran smoothly was a real achievement for the Tasmanian Union, and for president Val Smith in particular.3

The other large new building in 1959 was Hytten Hall, a secular college with accommodation for 120 male students. It was not completed without controversy. Many students disliked Hytten and opposed the hall being named after him, so on the day before the foundation stone was laid, a group tried to steal it. They were told that the stone was in the bush around the site, 'and we were looking for it, trying to break into the sheds, when someone said, “The cops!” and we all ran away', recalled Henry Reynolds. 'The editor of Togatus printed the headline “HYTTEN STONE SET”, with the S of Togatus just before it, so it read “SHYTTEN STONE SET”. He, or someone else, folded the paper before the S and slipped it under Hytten’s door. That was very daring for the time.'1

This was only the first problem. Hytten Hall was designed with sixty single rooms, but it was realised that a profit could only be made if two students were in each, so students were cramped. Togatus criticised the building as an expensive botch, looking like a stable outside and a hospital inside. Board was expensive, students were few, and by mid-1959 Hytten Hall was losing £200 a week. In 1960 there were 90 students, however, and when popular lecturer George Wilson became warden, the situation improved. Hytten Hall developed into an ‘aggressively secular’ college whose students were known for their pranks. In 1961 it became the first college in Australia to have its own barbecue, built because of its ‘healthy informal air’ and because it was so much easier to clean up after functions involving alcohol."}

The women’s college, Jane Franklin Hall, also provided enjoyable student life, but with differences. The library, tutorials and general encouragement (in Swot Vac there were hot scones for morning tea, and nightly visits by the principal armed with sweets) resulted in a 90% pass rate. Initiations included being chased by a ‘husband’ down Elizabeth Street and staging a reconciliation on the post office steps; dressing as a ghost and terrifying the audience in a cinema; dressing as a night club singer and entertaining the patrons of Coles cafeteria. The principal was helpful, providing the getaway car and even bail on one occasion. There were traditions such as academic gowns at formal dinners, chapel services, courting in the summerhouse, throwing fellow students in the fishpond, the annual waterfight with Christ College, and the Golden Rule: ‘No-Man- Shall-Put-One-Foot-On-The-Jane-Franklin-Hall-Stairs’. By the 1960s, about 18% of the students were from overseas.6

Jane Franklin Hall expanded to 47 beds by 1964, by which time Hytten Hall housed 116; Christ College moved to a ‘concrete mausoleum’ behind Hytten Hall, housing 50 students; in 1963 a Catholic college, St John Fisher opened nearby with 33.7 So there were more students living on site, and a corporate spirit might develop, inspired by the Union Building. Nevertheless, the first couple of years after the move saw a decline in student spirits. ‘The move from the Domain was deadening’, recalled one student. ‘I loved my year on the Domain, but it was boring at Sandy Bay.”8

Togatus was full of complaints. The old spirit had died: ‘Where, oh where is this search for truth and zest for knowledge?’ There were no ideas at University; instead there were weak candidates for SRC elections, pious platitudes in Togatus, Union Meetings lapsing for want of quorums, the death of the Film Society, the failure of the Uni revue, and no Togatus editor for part of 1960. Clubs wallowed ‘in the Sargasso Sea of student apathy’, a Newman Society mission and lectures by a famous poet were ignored, an audience of thirteen greeted Dean Griswold of Harvard’s lecture on segregation in America, an air of ‘intellectual putrefaction and decay’ pervaded Union activities, and the petering out of social life resulted in anti-social activities and ‘a minor wave of senile delinquency’, which led to regimenting regulations by the university authorities. ‘Things couldn’t be worse
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than they are', said Togatus. There was one sign of some sort of life, however: the freshers' river cruise was described as less childish than the previous year, and indeed a letter claimed it was an orgy of drinking, petting and lewd singing. 9

The failure of the Uni revue was part of the on-going saga of Old Nick. Since 1948 all Uni revues had been produced by Keith Jarvis, who had moved to Sydney. He returned each year for the Revue, but some thought him out of touch with the local scene. There were also financial disagreements. The 1958 revue was not a great success, and Old Nick split between those who wanted Jarvis back and those who did not. His supporters won, but many people pulled out and the 1959 revue, Foul Play, had the smallest cast ever and was a disaster. 10

There was little improvement generally in 1960: lack of spirit in sports clubs, an alarming failure rate, 'stubborn apathy' towards the SRC, and a lack of radicalism. Togatus said the University was dead, with no one arrested or charged on Commem Day, no editor or president sacked, and no one before the Union discipline committee. It was fine to look like a student by wearing corduroys and heavy jumpers, smoking and drinking, but you had to have ideas as well. Everyone was sick and tired of hearing people talk about student apathy. 11 Michael Hodgman, editor of Togatus, wondered melodramatically whether students were better off than in Nazi Germany. 12

There were some lights in the darkness. Dances came back to life; a pensioner was hit by an egg in the Commem parade, which was some sort of action; and Old Nick dispensed with Keith Jarvis and staged an extremely successful revue in 1960. Beet-Nick was a 'non-stop show of satire and wit', a standard by which later revues were judged. Stephen FitzGerald was outstanding as Alexander Borgia, and the skit 'God's Little Acher' 'named the unnamable and spoke the unspeakable'. 13

Another beacon was that agnostics John Reid and Barry Walker formed the Rationalist Society, aiming to counter the strong influence of the religious societies. They asked well-known communist Max Bound to speak, held a forum on South Africa, asked awkward questions of a Jesuit who addressed the Newman Society on birth control, and were seen as a sign of returning life. John realised, however, that many rationalists were from religious...
Old Nick highlighted the Orr case in its very successful revue *Beetnick*. From left: Sally Pedley, Janice Power, Brian King, Stephen FitzGerald, Margaret Cameron.

homes, often the children of clergymen, and the society was very much a Protestant organisation in style, though not in ideas. John and his friends were also notorious for a much-talked-about prank. Sir Edmund Hillary, conqueror of Everest, arrived to take an Adult Education camp at Mt Field East in 1960. He had claimed that the yeti was a myth, so John, with fellow Physics students Beryl and John Phillips, decided that a yeti would peer out of the bushes at him. They made a papier mâché mask, huge and grotesque, which with two sheepskins and an old fur coat dyed black became a yeti suit. On the back was a sign, ‘Hillary is a myth’, and John Reid, tall and good at shambling, was inside. ‘From about a hundred metres away it really looked like a wild thing’, he said.

Sadly, the weather was atrocious and Hillary’s party did not go to Mt Field East, but so as not to waste the costume, John wandered about near the road, armed with a club. ‘My feet were freezing in sandshoes, and I couldn’t see because the eyes were in the wrong place and my glasses were fogged up anyway, but I was shambling along.’ At one stage a child toddled down, so John lurched towards him with a roar, and the child raced off, shouting, ‘Muumm!’ John always wondered if the child told his parents he saw a yeti, and they answered, ‘Don’t be silly, they don’t exist’.

Back in Hobart, a garden party was held at Government House, so John wore the yeti
suit there, gaining entrance via adjoining paddocks. He wandered round the party, but this was not as much fun as the Mt Field episode. 'People looked through me as if I wasn’t there. They seemed to think: “I am at a government house garden party and this thing doesn’t exist.”' ‘An unfeeling guest accosted him with a raised parasol... a gentleman in a morning suit addressed him by name... ’ ran the report in *Togatus*, and finally a policeman removed his club and the top of the outfit and turned him out on Domain Road, wearing only the fur trousers. The yeti outfit appeared at student parties for years.13

So university life and traditions were kept alive by some, and there was another piece of good news: students did behave better in their new Union Building, and there were no more reports of students trashing the place. The SRC continued to work hard to build up student facilities. With funds from the Australian Universities Commission, Stages 2 and 3 of the Union Building were completed, providing an extension to the Ref and a second floor on the main section of the building. When Val Smith left the SRC in 1960, after two years as secretary and three as president, he was thanked for the immense amount of work he had done in the construction, equipping and administration of the Union Building, which was unrivalled in Australia.16

By the mid 1960s the Union Building contained many facilities. The Refectory overcame teething problems and catered not only for students but for outside functions. After years of small losses it first made a profit in 1964, under its successful and popular manager, Mrs Watt. The small Mixed Shop opened in 1963 and sold groceries, newspapers, stationery, some clothing and University pennants, ties and badges. It provided a dry-cleaning service and shoe repair, and ran the Union’s academic gown hire service. The Union leased out a bank branch and a barber’s shop. In 1964 the *Mercury* reported that the barber, Helmut, was losing business due to ‘Beetle’ haircuts, a form of unkemptness common in those of low intelligence; the Union reacted angrily, saying very few students had Beatie haircuts.17

Another new service was providing housing and vacation employment. Pat Quilty, elected to the SRC in 1963, came from Western Australia where the student body helped find students jobs. When he found the Tasmanian SRC was doing nothing, Pat started a similar scheme, assisted by the government employment service. By March 1964, 65 students had been found jobs, and the next summer student jobs ranged from Santa Claus to a barman at Zeehan. The former housing service had died, and as accommodation was often difficult to find and all colleges had waiting lists, Pat surveyed the cost and quality of accommodation. In 1965 the Union started a short-lived housing service, leasing houses and subletting them to students. It also hoped to start a student health service, but this remained a dream.18

Management of these facilities provided much more work for the Union, so in 1963 Lindsay Brown was employed as executive officer. He had run his own business as a motor tyre retreader, and was employed to manage the Union’s business enterprises, at this stage the Refectory and the Mixed Shop. As time went by he implemented policy, as students were often away, especially over summer, and someone had to do it; he also assisted the Sports Council to buy equipment. He was praised as efficient and capable, and said he really enjoyed these years. A further employee, of the University not the Union, was the Yeoman Bedell, Mr Kelly, who kept order and discipline in the Union Building. He quickly gained the confidence of the students and there was no trouble from students or outsiders in or around the Union Building, reported the Union Building Management Committee.19

Some problems did arise. In 1964 the committee made an optimistic submission to the Australian Universities Commission for nine years of development, including an extension to the Ref, a ballroom, office block and theatre. The Commission was
unimpressed and only the Ref was extended.

There were also difficulties with the university administration. In 1964 relations were tactfully described as 'on the whole, quite cordial'; what this meant was that the University was finding *Togatus* a thorn in its flesh. It had earlier threatened to stop helping to pay for cleaning, lighting and heating the Union Building if the SRC persisted in 'wasting money' on the 'scurrilous red rag' (even though the Union Building provided services for the whole University). The SRC did persist, and had to raise the Union fee, but this made it financially independent of the University, 'vital for a students' union' according to the Union Management Building Committee's annual report (written by the Union president).20

Until 1960 the president was the competent Val Smith, whose main interest was the Union Building and student services. He and Rae Wiggins ran the affairs of the Union, recalled SRC member Lindsay McDermott, and 'we left it alone. They knew what they were doing'. There were only occasional protests by some SRC members. After three years in the position, Val did not stand in 1960, and 'genial sportsman' Peter Hall was elected. Peter had reorganised the football club, which had been a shambles, and during a Chemistry lecture, someone said to him, 'You're going to be the next president of the SRC'. Peter knew nothing about the SRC, but he was elected in 1959 and duly became president the next year. He thought Val Smith was behind his election. Val had everything running so smoothly that there were no real dramas, he recalled. Meetings were business-like, and Rae Wiggins was an efficient treasurer. There were no radicals on the SRC, and there was so much to do and so much physical change with the new building that there was no time for politicking. 'We weren't focussed on that side at all.'21

Tony Manley, SRC member since 1956 and enthusiastic Old Nicker, was elected in 1961. He had previously stood for president four times without success, 'and I was sick of it and wasn't going to stand again', but the University tried to gag *Togatus*, and Tony felt that the other candidates were not strong enough to stand up to the administration. Tony had a wide knowledge of meeting procedure and was extrovert and 'way out' according to Peter Hall. Tony's own version was that he was similar to Val Smith: 'I know what's good for people better than they do. I feel an obligation to do things for people for their own good, whether they want it or not... noblesse oblige'.22

In 1962 Tony was an Australian delegate to several international students' conferences. He also visited Burmese students in their Union Building, 'a real cloak and dagger affair' as the Burmese government was trying to repress students: a month afterwards, army tanks flattened the Union Building. Just before, in Jakarta he had been arrested on suspicion of conspiring to assassinate President Sukarno. The editor of *Togatus* published a photo of Tony as an angel in Revue and reported that he had been arrested for 'acting as a go-between for vicious Bible smuggling cartels', and that the Union narrowly decided not to send a telegram to Sukarno, deploring his action 'in (1) arresting Manley and (2) releasing him'.23

Most unlikely to be arrested on any charge was the next president, Rudolf Plehwe, a serious, conservative student who habitually wore a three-piece suit to University and carried a furled umbrella. People were amazed that he was interested in student politics, and 'it says something for the student body that he was elected president', commented Patti Warn. A hard worker, Rudolf combined well with Rae Wiggins to keep the Union running smoothly, and was president for two years. He was praised for his great achievement in finishing the Union Building and setting up services. At the end of this period, 1964, there had been reasonably conservative presidents of the Union for seven years.24

By no means all members of the SRC were conservative, however. Dennis Altman was
elected to the SRC in 1961. His family were Russian and Austrian Jews, and Dennis was born in Sydney in 1943. His father worked as an engineer with the Hydro, and Dennis grew up ‘in the cosy world of middle-class Hobart’, and was rather surprised when a university friend commented that he had been lucky to grow up surrounded by books and pictures. He ‘threw himself into the self-importance’ of student politics and was well known as an excellent debater, becoming vice-president in 1963. Occasionally he was in trouble for playing chess during an SRC meeting and behaving in a frivolous manner, but he took important affairs seriously, urging more intellectual activity by the SRC (and nominating eight candidates at one election to try to bring this about), pressing the vice-chancellor for a medical school, reporting on the Union’s electoral system, writing an excellent report of the Orr case for NUAUS, and capably leading the Tasmanian delegation to NUAUS conference. He eventually became national vice-president of NUAUS, and also represented Tasmania at IV debating; he and Rudolf Plehwe were called two of the shrewdest and most eloquent politicians to have dominated the SRC.25

Lindsay McDermott had a different background from most other Law students, as he had been to a state school and came from a strongly trade union family. When he first stood for election to the SRC, he recalled, he lost by one vote. He considered asking for a recount, but his friend ‘Tank’ O’Rourke was horrified. ‘Christ, Linds, don’t do that!’ he said. ‘I voted for you four times!’

Lindsay was elected later in 1959 and became the SRC’s radical leader, often wearing black trousers and an orange shirt. Val Smith was in charge, however, and took little notice of radical ideas: Lindsay said his claim to fame was getting a direct cab line in the Union Building, hardly a startlingly radical achievement.26

Bruce Poulson also served under Smith. He found the emphasis on the Union Building boring, and did not stay long. Clubs and Societies Council was more interesting, and his work as editor of Togatus. Similarly, John Reid thought student politics ‘a major charade’, and found his positions as president of the Sports Council, business manager of Togatus and returning officer for the elections more interesting. He mastered the Hare-Clark system, and had to cope with a fictional candidate put up by Hytten Hall gaining enough votes to take a seat.27

Des Fearnley-Sander was part of a group doing Physics III in 1960. They spent much time working together unsupervised in laboratories, and decided to form a club, then to stand for the SRC. Three were elected, including Des. He recalled that although their motivation was ‘hardly one of high idealism’, once on the SRC they took it seriously. There were interesting meetings and debates, and the SRC was well run by experienced people such as Val Smith, Tony Manley and Rae Wiggins. It was just as well, said Des, for otherwise ‘we were a bunch of kids’.28

From 1959 to 1965 only seven women were elected to the SRC and most sat for only a short time. The exception was Patti Warn, who was elected in her first year. Friends on Old Nick and Togatus suggested she stand, as they thought it a good idea to have someone sympathetic to them on the SRC. Patti remained on the SRC for four years and found it an invaluable experience, ‘working in a quasi-political organisation’ where she found out how meetings worked, how to write reports, how to argue, and a rudimentary knowledge of budgets — ‘great preparation for life in the real world, and for many of the jobs I did later... I enjoyed it enormously’. Like most members, she was not a member of a political party. Patti was surprised to be asked if there was any discrimination against women: ‘if you were interested and able, there was no reason why you couldn’t take part’. She directed Orientation Week, was business manager of Togatus (not such a great achievement as it sounds — in one year Togatus had six business managers), and represented Tasmania on many NUAUS delegations.29
All these people agree on some aspects of the SRC. People took it seriously, even if they had not done so beforehand. One report said that the reasons for standing varied from a desire for glory, or to help students, to political ideals, but once elected, no member acted in self-interest in the writer's experience, and all had a 'genuine and honest desire to serve the Union'. The SRC was 'remarkably competent', 'surprisingly responsible', people said frankly. Relations with the university authorities were 'invidious', though there are few examples of difficulties. The SRC was not politicised and few members belonged to political parties, though John Reid thought it was divided, between the conscientious and the incompetent. There was no corruption, though there was some carelessness. When he became Sports Council president, John found a stack of raffle ticket butts which had clearly not been put in the raffle draw, and SRC members often went over their budgets, though more through inexperience than dishonesty. In 1964 the SRC was enlarged to eighteen members, elected by the Hare-Clark system.

Taking the SRC seriously was not invariable, however, and Togatus reported some colourful activities: policy speeches punctuated by fervent German drinking songs and Hitler salutes, Nazi rallies outside the Ref, and 'David Fielding's incomparable cream bun speech' in 1964.

NUAUS continued its previous role of encouraging local activities, sending many resolutions to be ratified, holding conferences, and running a travel scheme. The SRC did not always pass NUAUS resolutions but in general accepted its leadership, and when there was discontent with NUAUS extravagance and politicism, and some mainland unions threatened secession, Tasmania refused to join in. An 'infamous ticket dedicated to
disaffiliation from NUAUS' was soundly beaten at the elections. Part of the reason, of course, was that SRC members enjoyed going to NUAUS conferences on the mainland. Patti Warn said NUAUS conferences were 'wonderful. [They] got you out of Tasmania and you met wonderful people from other States... there were some scheming machiavelian student politicians of the first order, but there were some terrific people'. Patti was a member of an Australian NUAUS delegation to Papua-New Guinea, which she found 'tremendously interesting'; Nigel Roberts was an Australian representative at the Fourth Asian Regional Co-operation Seminar in Manila, which he found 'extremely interesting'; Heather Meredith went to Israel on a similar trip. She was more cynical: 'I don't know that it added anything to the welfare of the world. They were junkets — we thought of them as junkets... I suppose there was some merit in all that linking up with people from other countries, looking outwards.'

NUAUS was much involved in the continuing saga of the Orr case, on his side. In 1959 the situation was that Orr had run out of legal avenues but was gathering support. Orr supporters saw the case as being about 'whether the University could act in such a summary and arbitrary manner'. All the permanent Law staff resigned over the issue; religious leaders and NUAUS urged the University Council to reopen the case, and the SRC reaffirmed opposition to Council, with only Rae Wiggins dissenting. In 1960 the Federal Council of University Staff Associations censured the University, and this, combined with the Philosophy association's ban on filling the chair, and the publication in 1961 of W.H.C. Eddy's book Orr, which presented Orr's case at length, meant a good deal of outside pressure on the University Council.

As far as students and the SRC were concerned, enthusiasm for supporting Orr, never total, dwindled as his fervent supporters finished their studies. Lindsay McDermott, a supporter, thought the majority of students were not: they did not want the case to interrupt their studies, they did not want to alienate the authorities and get into trouble, they wanted to finish their degrees and start their careers. The SRC tended to be more pro-Orr and in 1959 most were Orr supporters. At an anniversary connected with JS Mill, the Rationalist Society asked Orr to speak, and he read Mill's essay 'On Liberty' to a crowded meeting of 150 students. Some were disappointed, but one was strongly influenced by 'the wonderful summary of small liberalism'.

In 1960 Togatus was edited by Michael Hodgman, whose father was Orr's counsel, so not surprisingly it was strongly in favour of Orr. At the end of the year a writer complained that most people were no longer interested, and the issue was only kept alive by older students. The publication of Orr brought comments such as 'everyone is heartily sick of it'. Farrago published a supplement about the case, strongly pro-Orr, talking of the University of Tasmania's 'pathetically low standing'; this brought reaction from the SRC, which complained to NUAUS, and Togatus, which felt it was poor conduct towards fellow-students. 'Petrov' wrote that the three thousand copies of Farrago sent to Tasmania would mean that 'Hynten Hall will be right for toilet paper for the next six months'. More seriously, Tony Manley wrote a balanced account of the whole case, stating that the Farrago supplement made unjustifiable assertions; gross exaggerations did not help. Similarly, Donald Horne in the Bulletin said there had been prejudice and bigotry on both sides from beginning to end, and psychoic ramblings about fascist conspiracies or blackguarding the University were no use; people should try to be more detached.

In this year it was suggested that Orr address students, to the discomfort of the SRC which by then did not wish to take sides. Eventually it decided to ask the vice-chancellor's opinion, which Togatus castigated as gutless political expediency. Orr arrived, and spoke to a crowded and generally sympathetic meeting. The SRC dinner that year was going along well, it was reported, until someone proposed a toast to Orr. Peter Boyce and his
wife arrived at the University in 1962, and found the academic community sharply divided, so that it was hard for a newcomer to know what to say. 'We felt it was consuming the local community in an unhealthy way, like the Dreyfus affair.' The situation worsened; by 1962 students could not complete a major in Philosophy, and a visitation by the governor, Lord Rowallan, did not help.\(^6\)

By this time the SRC, though generally pro-Orr, or at least opposed to the University Council's action, was worried about the University's reputation, and anxious to have the case settled. It was working hard for this behind the scenes. Dennis Altman, who believed 'without much passion' that Orr was a victim but also wrote that it was a cause celebre 'which I did not fully understand', recalled that every year at the NUAUS conference there would be a debate, and some mainlanders, 'flushed with the righteousness of the case', wanted a total ban on all staff appointments in Tasmania. 'I made a passionate speech about the injustice this would heap upon the students of Tasmania', and the ban was avoided.\(^6\) Mainland feeling, especially that the Union was not sufficiently against the administration, was shown as late as 1964, when a Sydney paper claimed that the editor of Togatus had been sacked because he covered the Orr case with too much enthusiasm. This appears to have been untrue, a beat-up by mainland media.\(^6\)

The SRC published A Short History of the Orr Case, a summary of Eddy, to inform students, but did not allow it to be sold. In 1963 the SRC refused to allow the Rationalist Society to invite Orr to speak to students, and when a Union Meeting agreed to a strike to express dissatisfaction at the vacant Philosophy chair, another meeting was held which agreed to postpone the strike indefinitely, as it might jeopardise negotiations. Only a small vigil was held. The negotiations bore fruit, and a settlement was proposed to Orr. Fervent people on either side were dissatisfied and the deputy chancellor and five leading members of the University Council resigned in protest, but most people including the SRC were extremely relieved. 'Most of us felt it was a great victory', wrote Dennis Altman. Orr did not accept the settlement, but it had been offered, and to all intents and purposes the Orr case was over. Dennis Altman summed up the case for NUAUS: the settlement was necessary for students' welfare, and the SRC had played a small but valuable part, and had managed to stop NUAUS coming out too strongly on Orr's side.\(^1\)

Orr finally did accept a settlement in 1966, and died shortly afterwards. By this time nobody on the SRC knew much about the case: most had been in primary school when it broke out. It was decided to send condolences to Mrs Orr; and the case was finally closed. It was something of an anti-climax, ran the report to NUAUS: some students felt cheated of their favourite cause.\(^6\)

As is clear, Togatus was much involved in the Orr case, but it did have other interests. In 1960 Michael Hodgman tried to establish a forum for discussion. The royal family was criticised, Princess Margaret's wedding sent up, state aid criticised, and not only Orr but Aboriginal rights were defended. Michael retired due to ill health and radical Lindsay McDermott drifted into the job, as he recalled. 'It was enjoyable, not a huge amount of work. I wrote 80% of the copy myself, including some letters to the editor. We used to borrow controversial articles from mainland papers. I published some articles for no reason.' He attacked censorship, and urged that Tasmanian Aboriginal carvings be cared for.\(^1\)

Grant Hannan was a lively editor in 1961, the most radical so far, discussing controversial issues such as the White Australia policy, moral rearmament, segregation in America, the space race and apartheid. Some thought he went too far, and he had to apologise to the Mercury at one stage, probably for the comment that the Mercury showed 'the most extreme bias possible' and got its facts wrong. Grant urged students not to let the spirit of the Domain die, and not let swish surroundings frighten them into bourgeois
respectability; the familiar hubbub of excited talk, broken intermittently by noisy and even raucous debate, should still be heard. He looked forward to a time when the University would be completely democratic and run by students, and urged readers to 'Be a Radical'. In the Union handbook he urged students to write for *Togatus*: be reactionary if you must, but 'please don't conform'. Peter Hall, Union president, said he had no trouble with *Togatus*, which was 'an outlet for those who wanted to do that sort of thing. The *Togatus* lot were a bit like Old Nick, volatile and sometimes eccentric. Some were eccentric to the nth degree!'" 

Even more outspoken, though not as intellectual (more from sloth than lack of ability, according to his friends) was Jim Frayle, editor in 1962. He published a Dictionary of University Language, which showed that beards were fashionable, and the non-conformist was described as shaving every day, not wearing a duffle coat, not drinking, living within his means and achieving High Distinctions. Smoking dope was mentioned for the first time. Jim courted trouble: a photograph of Christ on the cross entitled 'IS THIS — Samson Agonistes, Brian King [who had played Christ in an Old Nick production], A Commonwealth Bank Ad?' caused a storm of letters; there were complaints of unauthorised consumption of alcohol in the *Togatus* office; some SRC members tried to censure him for publishing an 'obscene' poem by AP Herbert; and at an SRC meeting Jim was provoked into resigning. He organised the first University of Tasmania song book, and when asked to include no obscene songs, gave an obscure reply."

Patti Warn recalled that during this year the *Togatus* staff were preparing a spoof edition to sell at Commem, when a mainland journalist rang up and offered a great story which no one on the mainland would publish because it involved the English landed gentry and the governor of Tasmania; was *Togatus* interested? The story was published: Lord Rowallan's son was engaged to the former George Jamieson, who had had one of the world's first sex changes and was now known as April Ashley. It was printed on the front page, but early next morning the police arrived and pulped the edition. Jim hastily disappeared to an *NUAUS* editors' conference in Adelaide, leaving a few nervous staff in the *Togatus* office, recalled Patti, 'wondering if they would be sent down over the incident'. The university hierarchy was 'hugely unimpressed' but nothing happened; the April Ashley story remained newsworthy for years."

Jim returned the next year until replaced by Rowland Harrison, who said homosexuality should not be a criminal offence, and covered topics such as the Profumo affair, neo-nazism, race and Catholic political groups.*

*Togatus* gives an excellent picture of Union life. In 1961 the AGM was rather trying, with many noisy arguments over reports and finances, and at its next meeting the SRC had an explosive debate on gambling in common rooms. A violent issue of *Cactus* put out on the eve of the SRC elections apparently stopped Rudolf Plehwe from standing as president. A Union Meeting in early 1962 was advertised as 'a chance to see the SRC squabbling in public... come and heckle'. The next year, two members resigned over 'gross malpractice and corruption' (they were accusing another member of trying to get his supporters elected to an *NUAUS* delegation). *Togatus* had betting prices on the SRC elections, but was embarrassed when a candidate put at 100/1 was elected. A Union Meeting failed to override the elections, though votes had been interfered with after they were cast. There were 32 candidates in the 1964 election, with two groups, Old Nick and United Action, which *Togatus* called Animals versus Christians. Apparently the Christians won. The SRC was not greatly improved; one meeting lasted eleven and a half hours, and 'brought the sordid side of student politics to the surface'. The 98 issues discussed included the Orr case, finances, discipline, the appointment of Lindsay Brown, and the editor's resignation from *Togatus*, though which was the most sordid is not apparent."
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There was not so much discussion at the Sports Council, which had little power as important decisions were made elsewhere. Most income went on affiliation fees, which were fixed. John Reid, ‘the least sporty type imaginable’ was the bushwalking representative, and stood for president as he thought the previous incumbent ran meetings badly and he could do better. ‘My aim was to finish by 9.45 or 9.50 so we could go and have a beer at Travs.’ In 1960 three sporting IVs were held in Hobart and brought criticism of rowdiness, bad behaviour and gross ill-mannered conduct, which damaged relations with the community. Peter Hall, who organised the football IV, rejected the claim: the boys made their own fun, mainly drinking in pubs, and the main thing Peter remembered was that at the all-male dinner, a South Australian stood on the table and recited ‘Eskimo Nell’. Later, however, a mainland football team, returning from IV in Perth, decided to have a party on the plane and lit a bonfire in the aisle. IV football was banned for years.

There was little sporting success, though Peter was chosen in the All-Australian universities football team that year. The next year Togatus reported that athletics, women’s hockey and men’s basketball were floundering, but bushwalking, rugby and soccer were vigorous, cricket was finally accepted in the Tasmanian Cricket Association, men’s hockey was powerful with five teams, baseball had started, and table tennis, bankrupt in 1959, was financially sound. During a financial crisis the Sports Council held Sports Week to raise money, trying to show IV as a charity. This failed, but the crisis was overcome. In 1965 the Ski Club, whose one-roomed hut at Mount Mawson had often housed twenty people, built a magnificent new hut which boasted insulation and heating.

Clubs and Societies also ran successfully, though with some controversy. The Council’s main role was allocating money to affiliated clubs, and from 1962 to 1966 there were 39, a third from faculties, and others in religious, dramatic, political, national, musical, literary or general categories. Sixteen existed throughout the period, others died, and new clubs were started or revived.

The 1963 Annual Report commented that many clubs were little more than names, and only a few were really active. Representatives were often vigorous at Council meetings, especially at challenging other clubs’ requests for money, and challenging bogus clubs. Bob Goninon, the president, was angry when a group calling itself the Christian Temperance League succeeded by a ‘pseudo-serious’ application in affiliating; this was overridden by the SRC who realised that the perpetrators were a group of ‘confirmed elbow-benders’. He spoke strongly at an SRC meeting (John Reid, one of the culprits, was an SRC member) saying that Clubs and Societies had been put in an easily ridiculed position. John recalled that the group planned to ‘spread the truth about alcohol’ and ask leading Evangelicals to speak. Their motto was ‘Drink it up and get rid of it’.

More serious trouble erupted in 1963 with a rift between Indonesian and Malaysian students in the Overseas Students’ Association. The Malaysians left, formed their own club and asked to affiliate. After much discussion, the constitution of the Overseas Students Association was rewritten so no one national group could dominate, and the SRC instructed Clubs and Societies that this was the only overseas organisation eligible for affiliation. Clubs and Societies censured the SRC in the strongest possible terms, and asked the SRC to ascertain its feelings before passing motions about it. Eventually not only the Malaysian, but Hong Kong and Indonesian students’ groups were affiliated.

This problem led to another. The Malaysian club had members who were not Union members: but should they pay for the facilities they used? Should all non-Union members of affiliated clubs pay? Eventually it was decided that they should pay the same amount as the Union gave to Clubs and Societies for each member.

This amount was becoming far too small, especially if any help were to be given to
Scene from Old Nick’s play *Lysistrata*, with the caption: ‘Athenian magistrate (Charles Calvert) expresses delight in the rape of the female choragos (Anne McDonald) by a Spartan soldier (John White). *Togatus* used this photo for years to illustrate any kind of debauchery, from SRC infighting to University Council behaviour.

travel to inter-varsities (far more easily given to sports teams), and Clubs and Societies finally persuaded the SRC to increase the amount per head. It was time that people realised that cultural activities were just as important as sport, ran the Annual Report, not for the first or last time.55

As before, the self-proclaimed most energetic club was Old Nick, which had its ups and downs. *High Sobriety* in 1961 was a ‘good hard-hitting satire, thoroughly enjoyable and extremely humorous. It showed a healthy left-wing viewpoint, which indicated progressive
A highlight of the season for Old Nickers was taking the revue to Launceston, and the 1965 cast and crew (*Infra Dig*) are clearly enjoying their visit. From left, as accurately as possible: Phyllis Burns, Peter Bloomsfield, Mick Maddock (later Adam-Smith), Wendy Overton, Bil Dowd, Simon Hirst, Rags Phillips, Bev Moore, Julie Costello, James Alexander, John Vanderberg, Peter Conrad, Tim Thorne, Ivan Ackeroff (joke) Saltmarsh, Gladys Wilson.

thought and clear thinking', according to *Togatus*. The author of 'A Challenge to your Decency' thought otherwise, saying the revue was filthy, disgusting and immoral, but the reply, 'A Challenge to your Reason' said revue attacked corruption rather than condoning it, and did not attack spiritual matters. *Togatus* enjoyed writing about a spectator at an Old Nick play who brought rotten eggs and accidentally sat on them. Apart from the revue, Old Nick put on other plays, often ultra-modern.

In 1962 a less successful revue provoked another 'blood and guts struggle' over who ran Old Nick, and a purge resulted in a new committee and great success. *Sin-thirteen* in 1963 had wonderful material to send up, with a royal tour and the Common Market, and *Vote No* in 1964 provided 'good clean filth'. Old Nick roared with laughter when a local radio station refused to play two advertisements

Tasmania University Choral Society members join their Melbourne counterparts at inter-varsity, 1964.
as unsuitable; they contained quotes from Mark Twain, 'Familiarity breeds contempt — and children', and Harold Mencken, 'Democracy is also a form of religion; it is the worship of jackals by jackasses'. The departure of many old faces in 1965 brought a fall from great heights, slipshod finances, and a weaker revue. Part of the problem was that three other dramatic groups existed, including Intercol, students from the four colleges who produced plays.57

Another vigorous group was the Choral Society, large enough to put on a performance of Iolanthe.58 The religious clubs were strong, and in 1964 the SCM and Newman held a successful joint mission, 'Quo Vadis Mate'?59 Political clubs re-appeared, but were short-lived: Labor and Liberal clubs, the Australia-Soviet Friendship Society, and the Independent Left, seen as either the 'biggest collection of ratbags in the University or the home of future cabinet ministers'.60 The Literary Society continued to publish the magazine Diogenes. Debating was revived, with teams performing well at IV. Amanda Howard selected for the Australian team, the first woman and the first Tasmanian to gain this honour. The 'most successful debate ever' was held in 1964 in a packed Main Common Room, staff versus students on the topic 'The Beatles should be exterminated'.61

Not so much a club as a NUAUS activity was the World University Service, which raised money for students in underdeveloped countries, usually by a 'slanderous and obscene' revue. Controversy raged over whether it should hold a Miss University quest in 1962, but in later years the quest was held without questioning. Also questioned, by religious groups at the University and the national WUS conference, was raising money by 'sales' of women in the Ref, but the organiser, Richard Farmer, said that if the money was not wanted he would take it to the races. Money was also raised by a tote on the SRC elections, and WUS sponsored visits by diverse people such as Santamaria, DLP protagonist, and John Burton, who spoke on the Peace Movement. Peter Boyce chaired the lectures and recalled large and mostly receptive audiences.62

The Union published annual handbooks to introduce students to the University. In
1962 John Reid wrote the editorial, which gives a good picture of student life:

Now that you attend the University you will find that you have a much greater degree of freedom than you ever had at school. **greater freedom means greater responsibility** (and what is more important it means - - - Drink! Women! Parties!) You will have to discipline yourself not to miss lectures and not to snore too loudly in the lectures which you attend. You will have to exert the supreme effort of will necessary to resist those tempting parties in swot vac. Before you came to University you were probably aware that the failure rate at the first year level is extremely high. There is, callow fresher, one very clear and well understood reason for this — the examinations are much too difficult! However you are already at a distinct advantage in attending a small University such as this one. For example, classes are a reasonable size and there is a high degree of staff student contact. Why, Professors often drive their students to the Bellerive sand dunes late at night and take them picnicking at Kingston.

A University is more than bricks and mortar (this one was once a good deal less), more than lectures and examinations: it is a society within Society, a Family, an Ethnic Group. A student can only become a satisfactory member of this group by joining with other students in the extra curricular activities such as coffee drinking and raving on and of course the activities provided by the societies and sporting clubs. Any education student who would like to fill in time between prac. teaching sessions and who would like a trip to King Island or Queenstown may care to join the Revue Company and become an Old Nicker. Many people regard this as a sink of Iniquity and Vice but they are often sadly disappointed after they have joined. Incidentally the Editors are interested in interviewing good looking Freshettes with nice legs. (We have nothing to do with the Revue, we would merely like to meet good looking freshettes with nice legs).

Students are expected to wear the Uniform: cotton or corduroy trousers, big sweaters, desert boots. Ties are not permitted except when worn by Law or Commerce students. Engineers may wear sports coats but only if they have leather patches on the sleeves.

Seriously, and in conclusion, we would suggest that in the eyes of the community at large, the University Student is not the little Tin God he is sometimes wont to regard himself. There is nothing very marvellous about being an embryo-intellectual or even an intellectual... the thing which really matters in every man and woman is to be a human being... University life may help you toward this end.

After six months here you many find yourself bored and disillusioned. You may realize by then that your lectures are insipid, your fellow students immature and apathetic, and the University, a hotbed of religious bigotry. On reaching this, the correct conclusion, there are three courses of action open to the average student. They are known as “the Tavern,” “St: Ives,” and “The Traveller’s Rest.”

So sexism was rife, and the typical student was shown as male, with a fairly slack attitude to study and enthusiasm for drink; but the good points of the University are apparent. It was small, there was a fairly vibrant student life, and students were beginning to think themselves part of the general community, not a privileged caste. The reference to Bellerive was a dig at Orr, who berated John for it. John was also in trouble with the SRC
Commem parade through crowded streets of Hobart, 1962.

for going over the budget; 'we were young and inexperienced, and the blocks for the cartoons were more than we thought... it was all a bit of a shambles'.

Dennis Altman also described the student culture. Before Vietnam and the counter culture radicalised and unsettled his generation, people grew up more slowly, and most students lived at home. 'Sex was still mysterious and largely unspoken', and almost entirely heterosexual; it was not generally realised that Dennis himself was homosexual. 'Homosexuality was a word one looked up furtively in school dictionaries, and the only homosexual I knew of was, it was said, the man who worked at the main bookstore in Murray Street and wore too much after-shave.' One girl told him she had an affair with a lecturer, and girls occasionally visited Melbourne for abortions; more common were sudden marriages, and he attended three in his last year at university.

There were echoes of the Bohemian aims of some 1950s students; Altman noted that they were mentioned in revues, but 'I'm not sure that I had any idea what these terms meant despite reading Camus and wearing a duffle coat'. Beet Nick had a Sartre script, which Old Nick pinched, said Tony Manley; 'we made sure by the way we did it that everyone would find it funny, even if they weren't into French existentialism... half of us in it didn't know what some of the jokes meant'. Another point made by Altman was that there was little anti-semitism in Hobart; Jews were so rare that the occasional comment was more likely to be one of wonder than of antagonism.

One complaint rarely made in these years was of student apathy, though it emerged on occasions. The generally active student spirit was shown at Commem, now called Students' Day. In 1959 the Mercury carried letters denouncing the behaviour of students in the parade, but the next year, all seemed quiet. The proceeds of the parade went to the relief of local floods, crowds flocked to watch it, and no one was arrested or charged, which was seen as a sign of either boring respectability or student maturity.

In 1961 a small group of students moved to abolish the parade, but were defeated, and Togatus was furious that the Mercury reported this wrongly: there was not a large group wanting abolition, and the writer hoped the parade would be the noisiest ever. The Mercury could start worrying when students held a May Day parade, and should stop being hypocritical; flour bombs were first thrown the year before by Mercury employees at students, and what about the soot bomb that came down from the Mercury building? Advice was given to bystanders: don't feel concerned when hit by a flour bomb, but think of the laughter you are causing those around you. Start to feel concerned when there are no parades and no room for the individual, and conformity is the order of the day, as in Nazi Germany. The parade went ahead, and the vice-chancellor thanked students for the
Many thought that recent parades had been ‘pathetic’, and in 1962 the SRC held a scavenger hunt, the brainchild of John Reid, who heard about it from a student at New England. John and Grant Hannan made out a list of items and points to be gained for them, such as a bus, with more points if it contained a driver; Superintendent Fletcher’s trousers without him inside (if he was inside, the trousers gained a minus score); plates from legal and medical firms; a politician’s false teeth; a Communist Party membership card; Welcome to Hobart signs; Union president Tony Manley’s hat. The list included advice for those arrested: do not resist, have a witness with you in the police station, get someone to bail you out quickly. Bail would be paid by the Students’ Day directors.

John and Grant did not think of possible legal consequences or disaster, and the whole idea was outrageous, said John thirty-five years later. A particular mistake was not limiting each group to one item, and by the end of the night there was barely a doctor’s plate left in Greater Hobart, as teams worked out that they were the easiest source of points. Many students took part, the evening went off successfully, the winning team drank its prize of a dozen bottles of beer — and then trouble started.

Doctors were outraged at the theft of their plates, and letters in the press complained that sick people had not been able to locate doctors. John gathered the plates, trying to ignore those that had been scratched, and spent a day putting them back, with the help of a phone directory and the obvious marks where the plates had been on buildings. One doctor asked if John was responsible and said if so, he would resort to physical violence; John replied innocently that he was just putting the plate back. The community club which had installed the Welcome to Hobart sign was upset at its disappearance and threatened prosecution, but fortunately the sign was discovered in time in a shed at the back of a student accommodation house. Tony Manley, who was about to go overseas to student conferences and wanted to take some of his hats, was furious when they disappeared, and ‘laid down the law’. The Scavenger Hunt was talked about for years, but John never organised another.

After this fracas, in 1963 the SRC held a chariot race and returned to the old parade, banning flour bombs except at the end, and asking shops en route for protection money. Shopkeepers objected, but the parade itself, with twelve floats, the Franklinette marching girls, and a 55-metre long dragon made by Malay students was successful. As far as pranks went, Charles Davis’ department store was tolerant about detergent in its fountain but did not like smoke bombs let off inside the shop; Christ College students printed and sold fake decimal currency; and the only real mishap noted by Togatus was that paint put in the railway fountain gummed it up and led to a court case. Inspector Billings was particularly helpful to students.

As the 1964 Students’ Day dawned, Togatus said proudly that it was the bane of the police, the terror of shopkeepers and the humiliation of civic dignitaries. Inspector Billings once more co-operated, the Transport Department reacted interestingly to fake traffic survey forms put on cars, and there were good floats on topical questions; but the day was marred by ‘the most deplorable incident in recent years’. A bun-eating contest turned into a bun fight, and Inspector Billings was covered with flour and cream and became ‘extremely irate’. He was ‘somewhat pacified’ and his uniform was dry-cleaned, but Togatus thought the student public image had sunk to its lowest ever point, and ‘prospects of a parade next year seem dim’.

The next year’s activities, however, were the most notorious for years. Somehow the SRC obtained permission for a parade, which had nineteen floats and eighty marchers. There were large crowds and plenty of flour bombs, but the townspeople enjoyed it. ‘At least I think they would rather we had it than not had it.’ Twelve teams took part in a sedan.
Togatus was in strife after this send up of Australasian Post was published in 1965.

Chair race to Cat and Fiddle Square, where an official opening had students acting as TV personalities and the bishop. All went well till a smoke bomb was thrown, which annoyed shopowners. A newspaper send-up, Australasian Pist, offended many citizens. Zebra crossings were painted around the University, an obscene ornament was fixed to the railway fountain, but most memorable was 'the best student prank in Australia for many years', the removal of the Speaker's chair from parliament house. The police said if it were not returned the parade would be banned; it was returned, but there was no action against the culprits, possibly because the authorities were aware how much the incident had
Student Commem prank: for years, students criticised the Mercury for its right wing views, and in 1961 some managed to hang this sign on top of the Mercury building.

amused the public. There was action against six students (including a future Public Prosecutor) for throwing flour bombs and exploding crackers, and they were fined small amounts by the SRC discipline officer. Ashton Calvert, an organiser, reported that the day was enjoyed by all, and without smoke bombs and flour bombs the parade would not be nearly as enjoyable for students or spectators. ‘Boisterous, fun days’, as Peter Hall recalled.

By comparison, Commem Balls could be very proper affairs, as was reported in 1964. The ball was held in the Town Hall, with floral decorations, Don Wilson’s band, and a supper of crayfish, chicken, small cakes and fruit salad and cream at 10/- per head. The vice-chancellor was much impressed by the sophisticated and civilised way in which the ball was run.

Other pranks occurred over the years. A chemical which smells strongly of vomit was put in a cinema, which was closed for a fortnight, with considerable financial loss. Law students tried to launch a rocket on Mt Nelson, intending to claim it was a UFO, but ‘it was a dismal failure, much to the hilarity of the Science and Engineering students’. Other pranks occurred over the years. A chemical which smells strongly of vomit was put in a cinema, which was closed for a fortnight, with considerable financial loss. Law students tried to launch a rocket on Mt Nelson, intending to claim it was a UFO, but ‘it was a dismal failure, much to the hilarity of the Science and Engineering students’.

The Union mostly condoned pranks, but was more positively involved in more serious issues. In 1962 it joined the Youth Council of Tasmania, set up to give young people a voice and possibly to provide some housing, but this was run by older people, ‘neither for nor by youth’ and eventually the Union disaffiliated. It also showed no sympathy for the suggestion that a college of the University be situated in the north, agreeing (for once) with the Professorial Board that this was inadvisable until there were 3000 students in the south.

All Australian universities were concerned about high failure rates, a worry since the 1950s, but more severe in the 1960s. NUAUS encouraged activity in this field, and the Union appointed an education officer, who reported in 1965 that students failed up to 64% of subjects they passed at matriculation. A survey of student opinion showed that
morale was low, many courses were thought of low quality, and it was vital to train lecturers in the art of lecturing. The Education Faculty was particularly criticised, as it had been for years. A meeting of students was organised; the response was overwhelming, with concern at the low quality of courses and the harmful effects on education as a whole.28

Patti Warn, SRC member, compiled a report 'on how appalling Dip. Ed. was': it was flabby intellectually and did not prepare students for teaching in front of a class. Students wanted better training. The SRC endorsed the report and copies were sent to University Council, the Professorial Board and the Education Department, which embarrassed the Education Faculty. There was no notable improvement, but Patti was victimised; she failed one senior lecturer's subject, failed a supplementary examination, and next year failed it again, even though she was NUAUS education vice-president at the time, preparing a submission to the Federal Government on tertiary education concerns. Almost everyone passed this subject, and Patti was a very able student.29

Patti was among those who were concerned with social and political problems, in Australia and world-wide. Such issues had arisen from time to time in the Union's history, but in the early 1960s interest grew considerably, as it did in other universities and some areas of the general community. There were several reasons. A radical view had always been seen by some as integral to a university; Tagatus often encouraged this, and praised the Old Nick revue in 1961 for its 'healthy left-wing viewpoint'.30 There was growing familiarity with people from other nations, particularly Asians. Though Asian students were few, their number was growing and they were well accepted. Visiting student delegations created interest, with Indonesians in 1959, Indians in 1960, and Japanese in 1963. The Japanese were given a 'typical students’ Friday night', going to a pub, a Union dance, a party, then an espresso bar at 4 a.m. They were 'knocked out' for most of Saturday.31 Tasmanian students also became aware of other nationalities through NUAUS-sponsored travel schemes, which some students joined; in 1963 eight students went to New Zealand, five to India and one to Japan.32

NUAUS was the main influence in politicising students, partly through such schemes, but mainly by sending a stream of information, resolutions to be considered and requests for action. Until 1962 almost all the Union's concern over national and international issues came through NUAUS, though this concern was not necessarily repeated in Tasmania. When in 1960 NUAUS asked the SRC if any action was being taken on the South African situation after the Sharpeville massacre, the reply was that 'there was nothing which we could do about the matter', and only two people turned up to a meeting. The SRC did write to American students supporting their stand against racial segregation, and supported the South African Committee for Higher Education with donations; a Union Meeting opposed a hanging in Victoria, and students doorknocked for World Refugee Year.33 Students also raised money for students in underdeveloped countries through World University Service, as they had done for years, but this was more in the nature of attending often very enjoyable fundraising activities for a worthy charity than tackling controversial issues. When the odd issue arose from another source, it often did not create much interest; for example, the SRC opposed a Committee for Aboriginal Rights as it was said to be a communist front.34

Interest increased with the Brenner case of 1961. This was not initiated by NUAUS; John Reid and Dennis Altman proposed a motion that the SRC deplore as undemocratic the Federal Government’s refusal to give a reason for its decision not to allow Joachim Brenner to enter Australia to take up a position at Adelaide University. (Brenner had been a member of the Stern Gang, supposedly Israeli terrorists.) The SRC discussed at length whether it had the power to discuss this motion, and finally passed it, 12 votes to 3. A Union Meeting also passed it, and therefore agreed with the principle that this type of
issue was the concern of the Union. Tony Manley later found that because as president he chaired the SRC and Union meetings, ASIO opened a file on him, as he was informed by a friend in the Defence Department. The Union expressed its opinion by sending letters to members of the Federal Government.56

Next year, encouraged by NUAUS and, again, Dennis Altman, the White Australia policy came under attack. Speakers addressed students on the topic at Union Meetings; the prime minister, Menzies, refused his invitation, probably wisely since Senator Marriott who defended it was given ‘a very rough deal’, but Gough Whitlam of the ALP was warmly received. A referendum where 464 students voted showed that 330 were in favour of relaxation of the policy (i.e. allowing non-European immigration) and 116 were against. To have a third of all students voting, and 71% of them, or 23% of the student body, in favour, shows a relatively high degree of political awareness and progressive thought. In 1963 the Mercury reported that students were in favour of a ‘brindled Australia policy’ but ‘the best thing about University students is that you don’t have to take any notice of them’. The SRC strongly condemned the Mercury and declared its intention of implementing a policy of confrontation towards its owners. This was carried, but, probably fortunately, not put into practice. Instead, the Mercury surprised the SRC by printing a statement and letter attacking its comment.57

Student activity increased from 1963. Patti Warn recalled that ‘there was a thread of dogoodism running through the SRC’; some from religious societies, more from the spirit of the times, demonstrated by Kennedy exhorting young people to ‘ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country’. People inspired by such ideals were being elected to the SRC: not only Dennis Altman and John Reid, but Pierre Slicer, Heather Meredith, Nigel Roberts, David Brownlow, Dan Coward, and Patti herself. From 1964 presidents came from this group, and that year Pierre Slicer was elected, strongly supported by ‘the Altman clique’. Mercurial, strong-minded, witty, casual, ideological, he told students that they were future leaders, and society looked to them for new ideas, deciding values, and protecting the freedom of the individual. The community did not teach these concepts, and the Union provided facilities ‘for a deeper education’ which would be applied later ‘for the betterment or worsening of our fellow men’. Traditional mores had produced two world wars and two continents were in a state of turmoil; students should not unquestioningly follow their elders.58

Slicer nominated the next president, Nigel Roberts, an ex-South African studying Political Science. Nigel stood for the SRC in his first year because he was intensely interested in politics (and, again, friendly with Dennis Altman). He was helped by his understanding of the Hare-Clark system; when he asked people to vote for him, they often said they were voting for someone else, so Nigel asked them to put him second.59

The idealism of people like Roberts and Slicer was reflected in Union activity. In 1963 the SRC opposed apartheid and narrowly passed a motion opposing the visit of the South African cricket team, as it was chosen on the basis of race. It ratified an NUAUS resolution disapproving of the South Vietnamese government’s oppression towards students, the first mention of Vietnam. The SRC sponsored the formation of a South African Studies Group, which held a Sharpeville Remembrance Day and a vigil, and developed into a general human rights movement. Its formation was held to be ‘symptomatic of a new interest in student affairs’. The movement gave talks, surveyed old age pensioners’ living conditions and held an Aboriginal Week.60

In 1964 the interest in Aborigines grew. Ten years earlier there had been no interest in NUAUS’s activities for Aborigines, but in 1964 the SRC paid for three Togatus reporters to investigate the conditions of Aboriginal descendants on Cape Barren Island. This was the first time anyone had shown such interest, recalled Patti Warn; ‘there was a sense in which
we “rediscovered” Tasmanian Aborigines’. The reporters deplored the Aborigines’ lack of opportunity, and suggested land development, or a move to the mainland where work was available. The report aroused much interest.90

_Togatus_ did much to raise students’ consciousness of social problems. As well as the Aboriginal article, it surveyed and reported on student housing (deplorable — a register of boarding houses was needed), prostitution in Hobart (the law needed overhaul) and Jane Franklin Hall (good on the whole). The editor, Malaysian Tunku Abdul Aziz, was praised for tackling other controversial issues, from equal pay for women and racial discrimination to overcrowding in the library. Aziz resigned, citing pressure of work, and Heather Meredith became editor for the next eighteen months. She was frank about her policy as editor. ‘Aims, policies — we wouldn’t have known what they were! I suppose I had some kind of an ad hoc idea about what I thought the paper should look like... I came from a [Quaker] family that asked a lot of questions, were always questioning the government, and that was part of the general atmosphere.’91

In 1965 _Togatus_ undertook surveys of Hobart’s cultural life, religious societies and tourism, discussed whether Tasmanians were inbred, Aborigines’ problems, homosexuality (for the first time), the republican movement and Amnesty, and provided forums on Vietnam and conscription, giving all points of view.92 There were also visiting speakers, and the year saw Kim Beazley senior speak on Aboriginal rights, Peter Wilenski of NUAUS give a controversial talk on apartheid, and an address by Aboriginal activist Charles Perkins.93

Action resulted. In 1964 the editors of the satirical magazine _Oz_ were sued for publishing obscene material, and one, Richard Walsh, gave a ‘classic’ address from the Ref steps. This created much interest, as did a method of fundraising for him, ‘auctioning our choicest ladies’. (Patti Warn, one of those auctioned, hastened to say that this placed no responsibilities on the women.)94 The Human Rights Movement held a protest against apartheid. Dressed sedately in academic gowns, students held an all-day vigil outside St David’s Cathedral and handed out nearly five thousand pamphlets.95

There were several developments in 1965. One was that Abschol, the NUAUS group which aimed to help promote Aboriginal education, finally took off in Tasmania, with Heather Meredith as director. Also receiving support after some unproductive years were NUAUS work camps. Nigel Roberts and eleven other students renovated three houses on the Davenport Aboriginal Reserve in South Australia. Nigel described this for _Togatus_, and also reported that some ‘schools’ run by fringe religious groups were merely brain-washing children with Christian propaganda; that of two government officials, one was mostly drunk and the other believed that Aborigines were inferior; that racism was

![Polite protest: students hand out anti-apartheid pamphlets in a city street, 1964.](image-url)
By this time, Australia was not only fighting in the Vietnam War, but conscripting soldiers who could be sent to fight there. Opposition, negligible at first, was growing, encouraged by NUAUS. In 1965 the Union held a successful Teach-In on Vietnam, at which the audience filled the Ref and the Main Common Room. At NUAUS’s request a referendum was held; the 400 respondents were a quarter of the total number of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conscription</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US fighting in Vietnam</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>206</th>
<th>51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia fighting in Vietnam</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>183</th>
<th>46%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-one men who had been conscripted filled in the questionnaire.

So a quarter of all students replied, and of these, about half agreed with America and Australia fighting in Vietnam and with conscription; but there was a vocal minority opposition. As this minority grew in the next few years, it provided the base for the period of the most activism in the Union’s history.
Chapter 8

The Heyday of Activism, 1966–1972

The Generation Gap, widespread use of the Pill, liberation, demonstrations, flared jeans — the late 1960s were a different era from what had gone before. The earlier 1960s had seen the beginning of this movement, but young people were still relatively quiescent. From 1968 there was widespread student protest and rebellion, in Australia and round the world.

In the 1950s and 1960s Australia was ruled by a seemingly permanent Liberal government. There was stability and security, jobs were plentiful, the standard of living was rising, and people appreciated this after the hardships of depression and war. Many students of this period comment on how glad they were to be at university, how unlikely to complain. Even the Orr case, though arousing strong passions, did not lead to large demonstrations, and the University administration came through with its authority challenged but intact. The issues of the early 1960s such as apartheid and Aboriginal rights did something to raise student consciousness, but they did not fire up large numbers, and protest was well-mannered.

By 1966, children born after the war, baby-boomers, were coming to university. Taking a prosperous society for granted, finding the old security boring, many agreed with those who criticised the failings of society: paternal authorities who told them how to think, middle-class hypocrisy and smugness, unfairness, injustice, discrimination. Causes such as opposition to the Vietnam War, Stalinism, imperialism and racism aroused them, and again and again, people talk of how idealistic they were, how passionately they felt about such issues, how little they cared about money or personal ambition. Some leaders saw themselves as in the forefront, yeast to ferment change, and they gained many followers. And the economic security of the times meant 'we could be as bad as we liked and still go out and get jobs'. The shortage of teachers meant that even students who failed could get well-paid jobs in schools.

There was also rebellion against the way of life of their parents, so predictable, stable and patriarchal. Earlier generations were self-consciously respectable, said Stephen Alomes, whereas 'our aim was not to be respectable, to challenge the establishment values.' The exciting new youth culture included sexual freedom with the introduction of the Pill; freedom of movement with more cars; freedom of lifestyle with more students in flats; plentiful stimulants, with beer and cheap wine in flagons joined by marijuana. It was the era of folk music, guitars, long hair, black eye-makeup and white lipstick, miniskirts, flared trousers, platform heels. Part-time jobs and living allowances from scholarships supported this way of life. The typical student, said Togatus, wore jeans or cords, a skivvy and desert boots, a roll neck sweater and a beard, and enjoyed sex and booze; the respectables, Law and Medicine students, wore suits and ties. The Individuals were would-be wild types with long hair and no shoes; they lived with married women, went to debauched parties and prided themselves on being individuals. 'Which group do you conform to?'

Students agree on how enjoyable this was. 'It gave me great pleasure to “épater les bourgeois”,' wrote John Tully. 'This could take many forms, including walking round the city in bare feet with the arse hanging out of my jeans, having long hair etc.' Arguing politics in the ref and the pub was far more interesting than going to official tutorials, and students were sure they were right. 'We were young and we knew all the answers', said
John White. 'We never queried it.' 'Full of righteous indignation', said Rod Scott. Of course the Vietnam War was wrong; of course Aborigines should be given equal rights; of course more money should be spent on education; of course the older generation had no principles but were acting from conservative expediency. 'Everyone was progressive — you couldn't not be, because of the way the issues were presented', said Ted Best. But even so, many students were not particularly interested and not politicised; protest never involved a majority.

Various influences did encourage the politicisation of at least some Tasmanian students. Well-publicised student rebellion in places like California and France showed possibilities. NUAUS sent directives, speakers and requests to protest, and, as always, Tasmania could not be less active than mainland universities. With improved communications and travel, it was easier for NUAUS to inspire. Some leaders were among the increasing number of students from the mainland (it was easier to get into the University of Tasmania than some mainland universities). But the most important influence was the Vietnam War. It was impossible to escape war scenes, on TV, in newsreels and newspapers, on broadsheets in the Ref. When Australia was first involved, the government line was largely accepted and the war was popular, but gradually resistance built up. Horrific scenes of people being bombed, propaganda as to why the war was unjust, negative information about the oppressive South Vietnamese regime, combined to convince a growing number of people that Australia should not be fighting in Vietnam.

Then came conscription, which meant that 10% of twenty-year-old men had to join the Army and could be sent to fight in Vietnam, although they could not vote. A combination of idealistic opposition to the war itself and a fear that you or your friends would be forced to fight provided a strong base for a nationwide movement against the war. 'It was in the air, in the water, on TV, at uni.' Then, if you were opposed to the war, you realised, or could easily be convinced, that the federal Liberal government and state Labor government were acting in the same way on other issues. There was a desire to get involved in virtually any political activity, thought Michael Stokes; 'give them the excuse and they'd do it, on the road, Vietnam, apartheid. It was all good fun'. Ros Haynes, vice-principal at Jane Franklin Hall, noted the difference the Vietnam War made: there were sit-ins, freedom songs, and for many it was their first political involvement, the exchange of apathy for activism. Jack Lomax and several others put forward a motion at a Union Meeting in 1966 against the Vietnam War and conscription; Jack spoke to the motion, but had only said two or three sentences before he was interrupted with, 'Piss off, you Commie bastard!' and 'You Pommy shit!'. He could not go on speaking, and the motion was lost. A year later, the same motion passed with unanimous applause, the change in feeling was so rapid.

As seen in the last chapter, in 1965 about half the students approved of conscription and Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War, though a large number of students had no opinion. This figure declined in later years, when no student had any excuse not to be aware of what was happening: the issue polarised the nation.

At the same time, Jack Lomax commented, there was still a large degree of idealism about university life; he took a long time to get over the feeling that this was where learning and truth resided. He wrote a scathing article in Togatus about one of his lecturers, and someone commented that he had better be careful as this man was marking his Honours thesis. 'I said, "Things don't work like that", and the other person laughed. Of course they did work like that, and I got Third Class honours.'

As seen in the last chapter, in 1965 about half the students approved of conscription and Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War, though a large number of students had no opinion. This figure declined in later years, when no student had any excuse not to be aware of what was happening: the issue polarised the nation.

In early 1966 the student body was fairly conservative, and an SRC motion condemning sending conscripts to Vietnam was defeated 5–6. Togatus observed that the Union had never been quieter. This did not last, for the year developed into the start of six years of protest.
Activity started almost at once, with ‘laughter, blood and passion’. NUAUS proposed a national Education Work-Out, where students would take a day off lectures and work in schools, to create public awareness of the ‘crisis in education’ due to insufficient funding. Two ‘stormy, hilarious and preposterous’ Union Meetings hotly debated whether this should be supported and whether lectures should be missed; eventually the Work-Out replaced Students’ Day, when there were never lectures.

On Work-Out day, about two hundred students went to schools and performed tasks such as cataloguing, painting and repairing books. SCM members gave religious instruction, and two students from ‘Tanzia’ and Indonesia gave talks on their countries. ‘We were wonderfully conservative, all those students rolling up to work in schools’, commented Nigel Roberts, the Union president. ‘It was all very responsible, and students were seen as working for what they believed in.’

Nigel, idealistic (told by an unsympathetic Union member to ‘get down off your high horse of idealism’) and South African by origin, strongly opposed apartheid. The South African government jailed the president of the South African Students’ Union, who had been protesting against apartheid; so when the South African ambassador visited Hobart, the Union organised a demonstration outside a reception for him. About fifty students waved placards and shouted, embarrassing people like the Anglican bishop who by being there were tacitly supporting apartheid.

This was a local action, but NUAUS encouraged others. One was a national library sit-in to highlight inadequate library facilities, but the SRC decided to hold a press conference instead, as the Professorial Board was unlikely to give permission for a sit-in. Passions were more strongly aroused over Vietnam. A Togatus survey showed that more students than before were in favour of Australia’s presence there (57%), but more were opposed to conscription (60%). Only 10% would vote Labor, 45% Liberal, and a high 38% did not know (the voting age was then twenty-one). Encouraged by this, the Liberal Club censured the SRC when it decided to support an NUAUS National Day of Action against sending conscripts to Vietnam, and called a Union meeting, which decided 133–123 not to support it. Another, even more crowded Union meeting reversed this decision.

On the Day of Protest, eighty students in academic gowns handed out pamphlets in the streets. Citizens generally accepted them quietly, though some ‘vocal intolerants’ used bad language, and the SRC reported with pride that the Tasmanian protest was the most orderly in Australia. Eight members of the Liberal Club also handed out pro-conscription leaflets. Nigel Roberts stated that the Union had escaped from the narrow confines of existing solely for the benefit of students to embrace a broad, liberal philosophy which reflected students’ growing social awareness.

This manifested itself in two co-operative schemes, a staff-student co-operative which opened a shop, and Union-organised tutorials; both lasted only a short time. Three long-running local issues were also brought up: the road dividing campus, the shortage of
accommodation for students, and the standard of lecturing and high failure rate. The SRC prepared a survey on lecturing standards which showed that improvement was needed, but only one department took any notice, Geology under Professor Carey — and this, noted Togatus, was the one department which did not need change.12

Speakers were given the chance to radicalise student opinion. One was the leader of the federal ALP, Arthur Calwell, as Nigel Roberts recalled:

He was a useless dodo, and he made an atrocious speech. It was against conscription and he should have had the students eating out of his hand, but he spoke so badly he didn’t. I was down the back, and I thought, poor dreadful man, I’ll ask a Dorothy Dix even he can answer. I can’t remember what it was, but he replied pompously: ‘We of the Australian Labor Party do not think, and never have thought —’ and he paused for breath. The audience packed up. He never did finish the sentence.13

The next year, 1967, saw little in the way of protest; the Union president, Ted Best, was more interested in good management of the Union’s resources. Another Togatus survey on Vietnam shows some change in opinion over three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American involvement in Vietnam</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian involvement in Vietnam</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscription</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opposition to the Vietnam War and conscription had grown, though over 40% still supported Liberal policies. Togatus kept up its coverage on Vietnam, and a Vietnam supplement had two articles supporting the war and six against it.15

It was in 1968 that protest about the Vietnam War and conscription grew, though this was only the main area of protest. Radicals like Charles Wooley, John Tully, Nick Beams, Dennis Rider (nicknamed ‘The Ogre’) and Peter Conrad were elected to the SRC, and influenced Union policy; others on the SRC like John White and Andrew Lohrey were sympathetic. Events were organised to inspire students. A Forum on National Service
Protest against National Service at the Department of Labour and National Service, 1969. The top photo depicts students being removed by police. Togatus gave the lower photo the caption, 'Denied effective participation in government students are forced into civil disobedience'. From the expression of the girl at left, protest could be enjoyable.
A student is arrested at the protest, 1969. For years *Togatus* used this photograph to illustrate police brutality.

had nine speakers including staff and one student, Peter Conrad. ‘There is such a thing as student power, and the forum showed that we have the spirit in this University’, wrote *Togatus*. ‘If you think this is a call for revolt: it is.’ Then Jim Cairns spoke against conscription, ‘the most charismatic person I’d ever heard’, as a student reported.6

On 8 July, Tasmanian students staged a sit-in against conscription in the Department of Labour and National Service building. This received nationwide coverage. It was approved by the SRC (though the SRC noted that it did not speak for the Union, as some elements favoured conscription) and organised by John Tully and Nick Beams. Both were short-sighted and too vain to wear glasses, recalled John, and as they walked towards the building, they thought they saw crowds waiting to participate; but they were only bushes. Sixty students met in a nearby car park, and after some debate as to what to do, forty entered the building and ensconced themselves in the reception area. The office staff, reported *Togatus*, were bewildered. The students had a supply of pamphlets, so one, James Alexander, went outside to deliver them to passers-by:

> People would walk past and take one — some screwed them up and threw them on the ground. A young soldier in uniform and his mother came towards me, and I thought, ‘Here’s trouble’, so I didn’t offer them a leaflet, but she asked for one. She looked at it and yelled a bit, and the soldier grabbed hold of my corduroy jacket and threw some punches at me with his other hand, but the jacket was loose enough for me to back away inside it and not get hit. There were ten police in a row watching and taking photos.

> Then the mother went behind me and started hitting me over the head with her handbag, and two police were told to sort it out. They told the bloke, that was enough, go away, and told me that if I did that again I’d be charged.

Q: Were you scared?
A: It was all very exciting.

Students inside the building were told to leave or they would be arrested, a few did so, then ten burly policemen (some of whom had removed their identification numbers) began to push the students downstairs, with some ‘startling brutalities’: one girl was dragged by her hair, a boy was flung down the stairs and crashed into iron gates, another
student was kicked in the small of the back. John Tully was kicked and shoved down the stairs, and thrown sprawling on to the footpath in a daze. He, Nick and Jo Beams and several others were arrested. This demonstration made the front page of the *Australian*, a rare event for any Tasmanian activity. The police were full of moral outrage, said John, but in later sit-ins they were more restrained, and one who had removed his number was disciplined.\(^{17}\)

Nine days later a protest meeting was held, 'undoubtedly the most significant demonstration of what a university is all about that has occurred here for many years'. Three hundred students marched from the University to Franklin Square and listened to speakers, and *Togatus* was incensed that this received little media coverage, because it was peaceful, while the incident in town was widely and hysterically reported, because it involved violence.\(^{19}\)

This was the first protest march for John White. He and his friends were rather nervous as they marched along Sandy Bay Road and turned into Davey Street, past the Trades and Labour Council building. Out in front was a large group of aggressive-looking men from the Waterside Workers Federation, a tough union. 'We marched up level with them, and they looked even more aggressive, and I was scared. I recognised one, a campaigner for my father in the 1950s, and as we got up to them he said, “Do you mind if we walk with you?” It stunned us... We were expecting violence, and they swarmed in.’ It was probably this march which Rod Scott remembered as 'a really heady time'. When students started to flour bomb police, police grabbed one and threw him in a police car. He opened the door on the other side, got out and ran home.\(^{19}\)

It was probably after this march that students put on an exhibition in the City Hall, showing a Vietnamese village after bombing. Andrew Lohrey recalled making huts out of long grass he picked from the riverside at Granton. ‘I made them up — they were supposed to be Vietnamese houses, which were burnt, with bits of bodies made out of polystyrene and burnt clothing, and we had a recording of planes coming over and bombing, and smoke... It was a lot of work.’ It was, however, very impressive to students.\(^{20}\)

After the sit-in, Nick and Jo Beams, Norm Andrews and John Tully were released on bail and were walking home, trying to work out where to go next, disgusted by the conservatism of the ALP. Earlier that year, in the student parade, conservatives were enraged when a girl appeared as a North Vietnam guerrilla being subjected to water torture; the ALP complained, and also argued against the sit-in. So the ALP was no use, and John and his friends were repelled by Stalinism, so did not join the Communist Party. Instead, they formed a branch of Students for a Democratic Society, which had a central idea of participatory democracy. To other students, SDS appeared exciting, wild and radical; most did not join, thinking it too extreme, but there was a feeling of pride that the University had its radicals, just like Paris and California. SDS was not without the vices of the time, however, and once held a kissing stall to raise money. Female members either volunteered or were persuaded to kiss all comers for pay.\(^ {21}\)

There were two other protests that year. Three girls held a Sleep-out in Franklin Square to protest about the lack of student accommodation; they found passers-by friendly, and a policeman even brought them some breakfast, but this was not a fashionable cause and they did not gain much student support.\(^ {22}\) More popular was Abschol’s Land Rights Vigil, to arouse awareness of the Gurindji land claim: it involved about 180 students, and lasted thirty-six hours. Students gave out circulars and collected money, and at night sang songs to John Tully's guitar. *Togatus* thought more students should have attended, out of the 3000 at university: ‘University students have the intelligence to realise the justice of the aboriginal land claims. They should also have the courage to publicly stand up for their principals [sic], in spite of the jeers of fellow-

---

\(^{17}\) This was the first protest march for John White. He and his friends were rather nervous as they marched along Sandy Bay Road and turned into Davey Street, past the Trades and Labour Council building. Out in front was a large group of aggressive-looking men from the Waterside Workers Federation, a tough union. ‘We marched up level with them, and they looked even more aggressive, and I was scared. I recognised one, a campaigner for my father in the 1950s, and as we got up to them he said, “Do you mind if we walk with you?” It stunned us... We were expecting violence, and they swarmed in.’ It was probably this march which Rod Scott remembered as 'a really heady time'. When students started to flour bomb police, police grabbed one and threw him in a police car. He opened the door on the other side, got out and ran home.\(^{19}\)

It was probably after this march that students put on an exhibition in the City Hall, showing a Vietnamese village after bombing. Andrew Lohrey recalled making huts out of long grass he picked from the riverside at Granton. ‘I made them up — they were supposed to be Vietnamese houses, which were burnt, with bits of bodies made out of polystyrene and burnt clothing, and we had a recording of planes coming over and bombing, and smoke... It was a lot of work.’ It was, however, very impressive to students.\(^ {20}\)

After the sit-in, Nick and Jo Beams, Norm Andrews and John Tully were released on bail and were walking home, trying to work out where to go next, disgusted by the conservatism of the ALP. Earlier that year, in the student parade, conservatives were enraged when a girl appeared as a North Vietnam guerrilla being subjected to water torture; the ALP complained, and also argued against the sit-in. So the ALP was no use, and John and his friends were repelled by Stalinism, so did not join the Communist Party. Instead, they formed a branch of Students for a Democratic Society, which had a central idea of participatory democracy. To other students, SDS appeared exciting, wild and radical; most did not join, thinking it too extreme, but there was a feeling of pride that the University had its radicals, just like Paris and California. SDS was not without the vices of the time, however, and once held a kissing stall to raise money. Female members either volunteered or were persuaded to kiss all comers for pay.\(^ {21}\)

There were two other protests that year. Three girls held a Sleep-out in Franklin Square to protest about the lack of student accommodation; they found passers-by friendly, and a policeman even brought them some breakfast, but this was not a fashionable cause and they did not gain much student support.\(^ {22}\) More popular was Abschol’s Land Rights Vigil, to arouse awareness of the Gurindji land claim: it involved about 180 students, and lasted thirty-six hours. Students gave out circulars and collected money, and at night sang songs to John Tully's guitar. *Togatus* thought more students should have attended, out of the 3000 at university: ‘University students have the intelligence to realise the justice of the aboriginal land claims. They should also have the courage to publicly stand up for their principals [sic], in spite of the jeers of fellow-
students and the general public*.23

Media coverage also came from a dramatic incident concerning an ASIO spy. A civil liberties meeting in Sydney heard that an agent of the Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation was spying at the University of Tasmania. The *Mercury* reported that Union leaders confronted the man, who admitted being a spy. The SRC moved quickly, and told the *Mercury*, whose reporter followed the student leaders to a dramatic confrontation at the man’s flat. The man left Hobart within two days. SDS ran off a leaflet and changed the Keen’s Curry stones to the man’s name; the SRC regretted that SDS had published this without evidence that he was actually spying, and Dennis Rider wrote in *Togatus* that the man was not a spy but a ‘bone fide’ student; but ‘we shall continue the never-ending struggle to rid us of the dreaded ASIO scourge’. SDS members picketed the ASIO office, opposite the police headquarters. It was ‘like poking an ants’ nest’, said John Tully. ‘Cops with cameras swarmed all over the roof of the cop shop. A butcher in the shop below ASIO put a dish of offal in a tray in his window and labelled it “brains for students”’.24

The introduction in 1969 of the Crimes Act, which made it a crime to encourage or assist anyone to break the law and avoid conscription, brought an excellent cause for protest. In February SDS held a nation-wide protest, which in Tasmania meant 42 people handing out ‘Don’t Register’ pamphlets. Six were arrested and five found guilty.25 The SRC organised a march against the Crimes Act, but successive Union Meetings censured the SRC for organising it, voted that there should be no Union action on public issues unless there was time for the Union to overrule the SRC, then recommitted the censure for the march, 40–20. The march was held, with police approval. Two hundred and fifty students, followed by three carloads of police, walked from the University to Franklin Square, where Jim Cairns addressed them and Nick Beams was arrested, protesting that distributing leaflets was a basic human right.26

The SRC had fewer radical members by now, but it did help radicals organise a New Left Teach-In, by providing mainland speakers. There were 200 in the audience; it was described as both a success and a flop. Radicals were, however, unsuccessful with a motion at a Union Meeting to make the Union Building a safe haven for conscientious objectors.27 There was more protest: another land rights vigil involved two hundred students, and a smaller group picketed a city corner and dug a hole in the asphalt footpath, supporting the Rorovani people of Bougainville against Conzinc Rio Tinto and the Australian Government.28

A small but eye-catching demonstration occurred in May, when neatly-dressed, angelically-looking Nick Beams of SDS presented the governor with six tomatoes, stating: ‘Sir Edric Bastyan, I present you these six tomatoes as a symbol of the kind of regard with which your office is now held’.29 This was the swansong of SDS, which had always been dogged with personality clashes. Jack Lomax recalled that it was set up without anyone knowing much about the parent body, and he agreed to be president; but he discovered that the American SDS were terrorists, so resigned. Dennis Rider was furious and called him a ‘Stalinist gnome’, but it was the end of SDS. ‘Left wing resistance is still high’, reported *Togatus*, but the SRC refused to acknowledge the death of the North Vietnam president, Ho Chi Minh, or send a wreath to his funeral, and also to express solidarity with those struggling against Israeli oppression. A motion that members should not quote from the works of Chairman Mao was lost, presumably on the grounds of freedom of speech. The Left continued trying to influence people, and Jack Lomax and Nick Beams had a printing press for hand-outs. They would send copies to the police, and if they were passed, write others, until the police said, ‘If you hand this out, we’ll have to arrest you’. Then, said Jack, ‘we knew we had got it right’. The printing press was hard to operate and the hand-outs were always too black or too faint, so their appeal was limited.30
NUAUS still sent resolutions for consideration, and in September three crowded and heated Union Meetings refused to support the National Liberation Front, or raise money for North Vietnam to rebuild schools destroyed by bombing, but did declare the NUAUS office a sanctuary for draft resisters. The SRC narrowly voted to disassociate itself from students who joined others in burning the American flag, to protest against the Crimes Act.31

Education was another debated topic, inspired by the energetic chairman of the Education and Welfare committee, Geoff Batten. A questionnaire showed most students thought the quality of lectures and tutorials was inadequate, and preferred that assignments be taken into account in marking, as well as exams; students pressured the Professorial Board over these questions. Students were interested in the wider sphere of education, presenting Parliament with a petition asking for an enquiry, and supporting four candidates in the federal election. They obtained only 1650 votes, but wonderful publicity.32

So 1969 was lively, but 1970 proved the year of the greatest student demonstrations. Two marches were held for the Vietnam Moratorium campaign, which aimed to stop Australian support for the war. In May, a thousand people left the Union Building and marched into the city, where numbers swelled to about three thousand. Fifty people who approved of the war walked a hundred metres ahead of the main march. The Mercury gave them the headlines, but was more sympathetic to the main march than in the past, describing it as orderly and including not only students and unionists but politicians, professional people and 'housewives with prams'.33

The second march was held in September, mainly organised by the successor to the SDS, the Revolutionary Socialists League. An opposition group, the Indo-China Defence Committee, caused debate at several Union Meetings, but a motion to support the Moratorium was passed. The ICDC organised a counter march of 68 people; the Moratorium left the Union Building with about 800 people, which swelled to 4000 thousand at Franklin Square. Bystanders cheered or jeered, and the marchers sang 'We Shall Overcome', encouraged by Dennis Rider with a loudspeaker on a truck. Two people were arrested, one for tearing down a Moratorium sign, and another for carrying a sign with indecent words. Again the Mercury was reasonably sympathetic.34

Meanwhile, the Togatus editors, in Melbourne for an NUAUS conference, were involved in demonstrations mainland-style, when the university administration building
was occupied by students. Good material for articles, noted the editors.\(^5\) Though probably as large a percentage of Tasmanian students protested as on the mainland, because the University was smaller this meant smaller numbers, and nothing like the sometimes violent activity of the mainland, let alone the rest of the world. The executive officer of the Sydney University Union talked of ‘these violent times... these days of student rebellion against authority’, and saw the enemy as mob rule by the dissident student minority, who wished to break down the established order and refused to acknowledge their responsibility to society.\(^6\) There was only a pale imitation of this in Tasmania, though there was drama when John Tully was arrested for firing a gun at the Department of Labour and National Service building. This, said John later, was a quixotic action designed to ‘épater les bourgeois’. He spent four months in prison.\(^7\)

Peter Boyce, lecturer in Political Science, thought Tasmanian students were not naturally radical. Monash, the radical university, would send envoys to try and stir up Tasmanian students, but they did not achieve much response. Neither did Catholic organisations such as the National Civic Council, which favoured the Vietnam War and tried to counter radical trends.\(^8\)

In contrast, local protest was about The Road. Ever since the University moved to Sandy Bay a road had divided the Union Building from the rest of the campus. While the road remained minor there was not much danger, with only intermittent requests from the SRC for an overpass or underpass. By 1970, however, suburban growth meant the road was to be developed into a major artery, Churchill Avenue. Danger for students increased, and Peter Pierce and Dennis Rider formed a Road Committee. In March there was a minor road accident, and at the end of a Union Meeting, which debated laws about abortion and marijuana, about a hundred students streamed out, in heavy rain, and sat on the road. Police succeeded in clearing the road 45 minutes later.\(^9\)

The University Council were told that students had a legitimate grievance which should be corrected, but no one wanted to foot the bill, and the University did little.\(^10\) As far as students were concerned, the rest of the year was a saga of five more sit-ins, many Union Meetings, no help from the Minister for Road Safety (who said students should be in lectures or the library, not on the road), and some trouble. At one sit-in two bus drivers tried to plough through the students, and the president of the Law Students’ Society urged one driver to ‘run over the bastards’. He defended himself by saying that the organisers of the sit-in were not themselves sitting on the road. The sit-in organisers denied that they were manipulating students; all decisions had been passed at Union Meetings and the Union was developing into a responsible and cohesive body; was the SRC redundant? The vice-chancellor, Sir George Cartland, entered the fray, ‘nervously’ addressing a Union Meeting. He told them of the administration’s efforts, showing, said Togatus, no positive achievement. At the end of his speech a student presented him with a tray of tea and scones, which he accepted with ‘a forced smile’. Togatus thought Sir George had showed the futility of moderation. Then a girl was knocked down, and there were heated feelings and a large sit-in; but still nothing happened. What could you do when you had a legitimate cause and the authorities took no notice? asked Togatus.\(^11\)

Even more action, was the answer of some, and in 1972 a group of students formed SIVRAR, Students in Violent Revolt Against the Road. ‘The ultimate aim of our movement is the destruction of the road!’ they wrote to Togatus. ‘It is proposed that our movement will be completely unstructured, our brothers will be bound together only by the common thirst for violent action!’\(^12\)

On the evening of May Day, SIVRAR set alight garbage tins containing petrol on Churchill Avenue. The next day they had a sit-in, with a barrel and barricades on the road. Forty students sat on the road; the police arrived, and arrested a student; a car was rolled
on to the road to block it; the crowd grew; the police waved cars towards the crowd. Demonstrators sat down, and the police tried to remove them, with unnecessary violence, said Togatus; students were kicked, punched and dragged by the hair. A gravel lorry threatened to drive into the crowd, but a policeman forced him to reverse. A sensible superintendent arrived and negotiated with students, and the demonstration ended.

This was generally seen as a success: fine weather, solidarity, excitement, 'a colourful old time', though Togatus warned students against alienating public opinion by cap stealing or making snide remarks during the National Anthem. Seven people were arrested, but they were put on good behaviour bonds or charges were dropped. An article in Togatus described the court case, replete with a drunken magistrate and police deals: students had to plead 'to a lesser charge one hadn't committed, to avoid prosecution for a more serious charge one hadn't committed either' or run the risk of having to provide a long, costly defence."

SIVRAR organised a second demonstration, with another barrel and band. A car and tyres on the road were set alight, and the fire brigade doused the fire and a number of students. A second barrel was tapped; the water was

The driver of a truck, incensed by the road being blocked, tries to drive through the crowd at the protest and is only just stopped from doing so by police.
Students set fire to tyres on the road. 

continued about an overpass, underpass or road diversion.

People recall the road issue in different ways. Many enjoyed the fun, the cop-baiting, the barrels. ‘There was a sense of theatre’, said Mike Aird. ‘It was part just fun, and part a real issue.’ Michael Stokes thought it ‘petty and silly... a bad case of people... manipulating things to big note themselves’. ‘Great times!’ said Vicki Schofield. ‘Frances Bonner and I sat in the Togatus office and took photos — we were too scared to be out there! That was great, fantastic.’

Road demonstrations were the main protests of 1971 and 1972, but other causes continued, mainly opposition to the Vietnam War. Another national day of protest was held, there was a Teach-In, and a well-attended Union Meeting discussed the topic and was televised. As the secretary told the national union, ‘they voted to keep Australian troops in Vietnam and not to recognise the P.R.G.; then they voted to collect money and sent it to the people of Vietnam via the, you guessed it, P.R.G.’ (People’s Revolutionary Government). The motion about sending money to North Vietnam also caused heated debate on the SRC. A Moratorium march was well supported and the crowds were less hostile than in the past. During the year there were also sit-ins at the Department of Labour and National Service, a telephone disruption campaign and a ‘fill in a falsie’ campaign, asking people to fill in false registration forms. Two student draft resisters were tried, and received good support, with a rally outside the court and many spectators inside. When the whole gallery rose on the entrance of one of the students, the judge became jittery and put off the trial, which then lapsed — perhaps the most successful piece of student demonstration. Protest continued in 1972; after the AGM, students burnt an effigy of Nixon and let off fireworks, but Togatus pointed out that effigy burning upset some people and was a strange protest against violence.
Apartheid was again an issue; the South African squash team stayed in Hobart and the Union organised a vigil and demonstration outside their hotel. "The local constabulary were considerate enough to arrest the requisite number of people to give good press coverage." 49

There were also local topics for protest, particularly the flooding of Lake Pedder for a hydro-electric dam. General protest against the destruction of wilderness for Hydro development was growing and there was much sympathy on campus. Students were prominent in the formation of the environmental United Tasmania Group, in marches, and supporting UTG candidates (including Kelvin Scott) in a state election, and the Union gave the Biology Society money to help save Lake Pedder. 50

Aspects of the University were also criticised. Education students reported discontent at an all-time high. A Professorial Board committee was enquiring into the faculty, and students prepared a submission saying much of the course was irrelevant with little connection to practical teaching, and the standard of lecturing was poor. The submission was supported by the SRC, but, as had happened before, the students who signed the submission all failed a subject in Dip. Ed. Criticism of Dip. Ed continued in 1972, with students 'terminally crapped off' and a group formed to establish an independent, student-run, de-structured alternative. 51

Other departments were criticised, particularly English, and a Togatus article was entitled 'How Not to Introduce Uni Courses in Science'. The University as a whole was described as a bastion of autocracy and tradition, the academic mind as empty and barren. Student attempts to participate in university administration met little encouragement. In her SRC election speech in 1972, Frances Perkins summed up this view: entrenched bureaucracy made most student initiatives meaningless, and student representatives were mere tokens. 52

So the period from 1966 to 1972 was one of much protest against a variety of ills, from local to international. Most involved small numbers of students, but a few involved a reasonable percentage of the whole student body. Students who did take part gave various reasons. Most did not come to university as radicals but were influenced by other students, whom they met by joining active groups such as Old Nick, and by getting to know them in classes and tutorials. My own diary shows what influences prevailed and what part the Union could play.

I arrived at university fresh from a middle-class, Liberal-voting family and a sedate all-girls' school. In first year I worked hard, played hockey, and daringly went on two
demonstrations. In a second year History tutorial I met the Union vice-president, Stephen Alomes, who 'made me go' to a Union Meeting, where there were about thirty students. 'No-one takes any notice of the Union... so it is asserting its authority by closing the Ref Mon & Tues.' Friends persuaded me to take part in an Old Nick play, *Marat-Sade*, set in a lunatic asylum: 'I haven't enjoyed anything as much for years'. 'Disgusting copulation scenes' were 'modified, thank goodness' into a stylised mime, but 'fortunately' my partner had cut his head in the Abschol Jelly Dive so did not want to be too active, and we agreed to perform this scene unobtrusively. The play 'went off marvellously' and we took it to the inter-varsity drama festival in Canberra, an exciting trip of parties, drinking and theatre. A university lecturer told my mother, 'I see your daughter has joined Old Nick. That'll add a year to her uni career'.

Entrants in the Miss Uni competition were interviewed 'by some ghastly radio announcer who typified non-university people's attitude to the University — the kids having fun & misbehaving' — when of course it was all much more serious. In July I and hundreds of others watched the Apollo moon landing on a television in the Main Common Room, one of those scenes people remember well.5

Joining Old Nick meant meeting radical people, and their influence showed. I filled in false National Service registration forms, handed out election pamphlets for Education, was elected Old Nick wardrobe mistress and joined its debating team, which meant virtually impromptu debates on the topics 'People who live in glass houses shouldn't' and 'The Eunuch has more'. Although I wasn't entirely sure exactly what a eunuch was missing, Old Nick defeated an ALP team, one of whose members debated by doing an imitation of Hitler and running out of the room. We were in the final against the Animals, who included Kelvin Scott, on the topic, 'It's better to be in'. Kelvin was in the Australian debating team and it was no great surprise when the Animals won.56 Feeling excitingly rebellious, I also went to an ALP cocktail party for Gough Whitlam, and heckled at a political meeting addressed by Liberal candidates and the prime minister, Gorton.57

The next year started with a Paint-In and Revue in Orientation Week. I found an ALP meeting 'v. interesting indeed', and took part in the Commem Day parade on the Old Nick float.58 Another Old Nicker, Lee Hughes, asked me to share a flat, and from then on, life was one long and enjoyable party, with part-time jobs to pay the rent.59 I was one of six

The Mr Uni quest and Royal Drag Ball, 1970. John White, later a well-known politician, spruiks at the microphone (with Vietnam Moratorium posters in the background). He did not win the quest. John Honey on right.
female judges in the Mr Uni quest, where the men, in drag, were judged on Appearance, Dress, Makeup, Charm, Femininity and Sex Appeal. Mr Uni was crowned with cream at the May Day Royal Drag Ball, where everyone had a wonderful time, drinking, eating and dancing. Next day, 'Up at 9.00 for hockey feeling v. seedy'. Meanwhile I was acting in and wardrobe mistress for the Old Nick revue, which meant organising 128 costumes and making a good many. 'Cut out frantically while Lee passed me food.' The costumes were finished late on the afternoon of opening night. I had a boyfriend, so 'thank goodness I don't have to try & con off one of the cast as well as wardrobe!' Revue went off very well, with many excellent parties.

I was in the audience when Dennis Rider tried to break the Australian drinking record of 61 beers in 11 ½ hours; sadly someone gave him a piece of greasy chicken and he fell by the wayside. Lee stood for the SRC in June, and topped the poll. Lee and Geoff Batten persuaded me to stand for the SRC, as Chairman of the Social Action Committee. The clinching argument was that if SRC meetings lasted long enough, members were given a free meal. 'Geoff dictated an impressive policy, which I copied down & handed in.'

My opponent came round and we established friendly relations. On the day, 'I gave short pithy speech re duties & what I would do (by Leeanne) & then had questions & answers (prepared by John Reid & Peter Gilchrist)'. These had been cooked up in the Ref amid a good deal of merriment. John asked, 'Do you think that there should be a closer and more intimate contact between graduates and the student body?', to which I answered, 'That's a penetrating question, Mr Reid. I should attempt to deal with that question when it arises'. There was loud laughter at this joke, which we all thought extremely witty, and I was elected.

Two sides of Union meetings: a 1972 meeting with a sea of faces and various hands raised in favour of a motion, and below a quieter meeting for which the Yearbook gave the caption: ‘The Union: Frightening or feeble?’ Most people are Old Nickers, probably dragged from their table in the Ref to make up a quorum. From left: Barbara Kemp, Jean Hyndman, Sue Hartigan, Val Schier, Steven Meredith, Clare Cowling, —, Margie Miller, Tom Banks, Vicki Baxter, Rick Howroyd (front), rest unknown.

Sadly, my diary related that I found SRC meetings dull; males tended to orate at length, people chain smoked, and there were no great issues. Once when the meal was over I went home, as in five hours only six of the eighteen agenda items had been dealt with. I organised work for Freedom from Hunger for my portfolio; other third-term activities were watching the Tasmanian team win the final of the Australian universities debating; helping two Old Nickers, John Reid and James Alexander, sell a banned book (probably Portnoy's Complaint); and doing some work. Rather surprisingly I passed all my subjects and graduated; I attended the SRC cocktail party, and at the December SRC meeting resigned, as I had decided to go overseas.

As shown by this experience, the SRC was moderate in this turbulent period; academic Peter Boyce thought it was a sober, responsible organisation which stopped things getting too out of hand. Presidents were not radicals, and though there was a good deal of personality conflict, Michael Stokes thought this was because the SRC attracted people interested in politics, who, because issues were often trivial, ‘played the game of personalities’. Members enjoyed having their say, and meetings often lasted far into the night. But despite some arguments, the SRC ran the Union reasonably well. There were few financial
problems (1969 was a 'bleak' year but once there was a small budget surplus), and all members interviewed denied that there was any corruption. There was incompetence, and the system was open to corruption because 'the way it was run was so slack'; but there was a sense of trust, which proved adequate. Money could be spent irresponsibly, however, particularly by NUAUS. Mike Aird recalled that NUAUS asked him to find out if there were Omega bases in the Fingal Valley, so he hired a plane to look. 'It was all legitimate, but we shouldn't have been able to do it. There were loose finances and decision-making processes, and not much accountability.'

There were a few radicals on the SRC, which made for lively meetings, but far fewer than on many mainland SRCs. One radical push, Australia-wide, was for reform of the SRC, first making it more open-ended, achieved under Bob Graham in 1968, then abolishing the SRC altogether and running the Union through regular, even weekly, Union Meetings. There were more Union Meetings in this period than at any other time and sometimes they were weekly, but the SRC was never abolished and by 1972 concern was voiced that the Union could not see the picture clearly, and that left-wing students could manipulate Union Meetings. At the same time complaints continued that the SRC was inefficient and that there should be a paid president to run things. This was rather unfair, as several extremely competent presidents ensured that Union services ran well and that the Union Building was extended to cater for the growing number of students—though the Union never succeeded in gaining a theatre, an aim for years.

One issue which did not arise was complaints about compulsory Unionism or the Union fee, possibly because up to half the students were on scholarships which paid compulsory fees, so they did not realise they were paying them. Neither were there many complaints about student apathy, as students were more active than usual. This made the university administration wary of students, so that not only did they put riot bars on the administration building in case of a student occupation, but they were at some pains to conciliate the moderates. According to Togatus, the administration were so afraid of radical Dennis Rider succeeding in being elected president that they made sure a moderate candidate stood against him (though this is not borne out by any evidence). This wariness did not mean, however, that students made real gains. Mike Aird recalled complaining about the appalling architecture, and was put on a university sub-committee, which talked at great length about growing ivy; Mike did not attend any more meetings. Student leaders reported that they obtained a reasonable hearing from the administration, and their 'sensible, non-belligerent' and 'careful but constructive' attitude (read by some as toadying) meant no open breach and 'a degree of understanding', unlike the situation at some mainland and overseas universities.

Members of the SRC mostly stood because they were interested in politics or felt passionately about issues such as equality in education, though some had less glorious reasons. They generally took it seriously, and enjoyed the experience. 'It taught you a lot about organisation', said Lee Hughes, later a senior public servant. 'It was very good training in terms of politics', said Mike Aird, later a politician, who made the mistake of thinking hard-core Labor people would always vote for a fellow-member of the ALP.

The first president in this period, Nigel Roberts, was extremely impressive, according to his secretary, Ted Best. Many members were idealistic and inspired by issues; James Alexander stood because he disagreed with the SRC abolishing Commem Day, which students enjoyed. Most members were moderate, some were left-inclined, and two were members of the Liberal Club. There were four women including able people like Patti Warn and Heather Meredith (who married Nigel), and good administrative staff. 'The reason why we were able to do things like the Teach-In [on Vietnam] was that there were no management problems', said Nigel. 'The Union was so well run by the adults [Rae
Wiggins and Lindsay Brown], who knew far more than we did about such things. But they didn't try to take over, to push students to one side.71

The main issues of the year were national and international, but some were local: trying to take over the bookroom, run by the University and criticised for its high prices; criticising the Professorial Board for excluding from exams students who did not pay library fines; the lack of accommodation, especially for women; and the low standard of lecturing.72

Togatus criticised the SRC that year for being petty and drab. Where were the colourful personalities of the past? There were few candidates, and talented people who did stand were often not elected. Fewer than half the students voted and there were no contentious issues. Nigel replied that SRC work took a great deal of time, with many menial tasks like stamping envelopes, and people were after all at university to get degrees. Austra Rozensteins, an SRC member, replied more hotly: members were not court jesters, what did colourful personalities achieve? The SRC had to be responsible and was no place for hysterical outbursts. The AGM, however, justified Togatus, as only twelve people came, ten of them SRC members. This was said to be the greatest victory ever for apathy.73

The new president was elected unopposed: Rowland Harrison, editor of Togatus. 'A well known smoothie' according to Togatus; Rowland was a good chairman, according to Ted Best. His preoccupation was taking over the bookroom, which the Union achieved in early 1967 after protracted negotiations with the University. It had to be organised and staffed, a big job. Other local issues were the price of coffee in the ref, which caused heated argument, as did the issue of installing a television in the Union Building. The Yeoman Bedell's advice was sought on the old topic of gambling in the men's common room — there was no casino, and a good deal of gambling went on. The Yeoman, Tom Kelly, was competent and kind, and liked by students. He thought there should not be too much interference, but people should not lose too much money, and undertook 'to keep a fatherly eye on the card playing fraternity'.74

There were criticisms that the SRC was divided into factions, and was at an 'apathetic non-dynamic all time low', as Togatus wrote in its usual exaggerated way. 'Anarchy forever!' But there was a 'real election', the most open for years, with two candidates for president and sixteen for the seven general rep positions. They included a 'great ALP clique' of whom Dennis Rider, John White, Andrew Lohrey, Rod Scott and Peter Conrad were elected, bringing a more radical element.75 Another newcomer was Ken Newcombe, passionately interested in NUAUS and Abschol, and the new president was Ted Best, on the SRC since 1965. He stood out of curiosity, and because not many Science and Engineering students were members. Once elected, 'I was hooked. I didn't expect to be, but I found it most interesting'. Dennis Rider ran against Best, with the slogan, 'Rider is Better than Best' — an error, said John White, one of Dennis' supporters, because using an opponent's name gave him publicity. With so many radicals the SRC was more polarised, and there were more issues, more strongly argued. Ted was a conservative, but was liked even by radicals for his tolerance and fairness. 'I was naturally inclined towards the administrative side', recalled Ted. 'The SRC wasn't split through ideology as much as on an inclination for activity, administrative or political.' By now the Union was big business, running the Ref, the Mixed Shop, the Bookroom, 'and I felt that you couldn't afford to play round. Some members of the SRC were more interested in social and political activity. Trying to get a balance was tricky... There was gradually growing dissension within the SRC, but it was never that bad, compared with other universities on the mainland... You had to have a thick skin [as president], but that was the nature of the game'. Radicals often tried to push the boundaries, and debates were as much about seeing how far they could go as about the ostensible topic. Togatus reported catcalls and
name-calling, and verbal conflict between Harrison and Conrad, often of a homosexual nature; but later commented that the SRC was at its best for some time, with Best efficient, Conrad brilliant if an egoist, White an angry young man, Lohrey ‘very popular for a first year student’, and Newcombe the strong, silent type. Rod Scott said that he stood for the SRC because ‘it seemed like a good idea at the time, and you didn’t need many votes to get on.’ He played basketball, and thought the other players voted for him. ‘Peter Conrad and Dennis Rider were the manipulative power makers’, he said. ‘It was a rapid learning curve after I was elected. It was a heap of fun. We had SRC dinners, where the alcohol was sparkling burgundy, probably just cheap red wine carbonated, but we all thought it was wonderful. We drank huge quantities of it.’ There were great debates at meetings, as people disagreed about subjects ranging from Vietnam to the price of coffee in the Ref. Rod remembered one particularly ‘big and nasty’ debate on whether the SRC would send medical aid to North Vietnam; in the end it agreed to, but discussion was very heated.

Rod Scott commented that the SRC was at its best for some time, with Best efficient, Conrad brilliant if an egoist, White an angry young man, Lohrey ‘very popular for a first year student’, and Newcombe the strong, silent type. Rod Scott said that he stood for the SRC because ‘it seemed like a good idea at the time, and you didn’t need many votes to get on.’ He played basketball, and thought the other players voted for him. ‘Peter Conrad and Dennis Rider were the manipulative power makers’, he said. ‘It was a rapid learning curve after I was elected. It was a heap of fun. We had SRC dinners, where the alcohol was sparkling burgundy, probably just cheap red wine carbonated, but we all thought it was wonderful. We drank huge quantities of it.’ There were great debates at meetings, as people disagreed about subjects ranging from Vietnam to the price of coffee in the Ref. Rod remembered one particularly ‘big and nasty’ debate on whether the SRC would send medical aid to North Vietnam; in the end it agreed to, but discussion was very heated.

John White, son of a Labor politician, stood because he was flattered that Peter Conrad and others asked him to. He was already in Old Nick, which was a centre of activity, and Peter was aware of him and ‘wanted to stop conservatives running the University’. Ted was a good president, said John, an excellent administrator, and arguments were amicable. The SRC had its left and right wings, but it was easier for the left as those who were unaligned tended to go towards them, ‘so if we had a reasonable argument we’d usually win’. Andrew Lohrey, another new SRC member, had only reached grade nine in secondary school at St Mary’s, and had worked on painting the Sydney Harbour Bridge and on cattle stations and mines. He arrived at the University aged twenty-six, and enjoyed himself immensely, writing about sex and politics for *Togatus*, joining the ALP and standing for the SRC. He thought Ted Best a fine president, but became tired of the SRC, the everlasting arguments, and the complaints about things, and only stayed for one term.

One everlasting argument concerned the Union administration. Lindsay and Rae preached fiscal responsibility, and were seen as the enemy, said Rod Scott, ‘just there to be a blight on people who wanted to do wonderful things and rule the world. Rae was smarter than all the rest of us put together, and I think she thought it was her lot in life to put up with them, and they’d be gone after a year’. Most students agreed that Lindsay and Rae knew what they were doing, and were acting responsibly, but some thought they interfered too much with Union policy. Rae said she became tired of meetings that went ‘on and on and on’. It was very difficult to write up minutes; ‘a lot of them were BSAs! [bullshit artists] If I thought the students were doing the wrong thing, I’d say so... I tried to keep things level. I’d say, “The money’s not there to spend”. I felt I had to keep things going, protect the whole thing from wreckage.’

Complaints against union executive officers were general, however. ‘In these days of student rebellion against authority, even the Union-appointed executive officer seems to attract the anti-authoritarian arrows of the volatile, voluble minority’ as the executive officer of Sydney University Union said. Peter Hay commented that attacks on Lindsay were partly ‘left libertarian arrogance, and contempt for professional functionaries’; Andrew Lohrey said students needed enemies, ‘and when we weren’t fighting the Hobart City Council about the road, the American and Australian government about Vietnam, or the University administration, we were fighting Rae and Lindsay... [Lindsay] was seen as an ineffectual manager and Rae was seen as a Machiavellian witch pulling strings. Neither stereotype was correct!’ Lindsay and Rae were told that there was a hit list with their names on it, ‘but we weathered the storm’, said Lindsay.

For much the same reason as complaints against the Union administration came...
complaints against the university administration, seen as hidebound, autocratic and out to prevent students from making the University a haven of enlightenment. The vice-chancellor, Sir George Cartland, an ex-colonial administrator, was seen by students as an antiquated relic of the Empire, and, simply by virtue of being vice-chancellor, 'evil personified'. Those students who had anything to do with Cartland, however, report that he was invariably polite and would listen to them, and after reading the material, even the present author, who as a student thought Sir George the epitome of the old-fashioned ruling class against whom free-thinking students were naturally pitted, is forced to admit that Sir George did a good job of steering the University through a difficult period with the minimum of problems.2

The other powerful figure was the registrar, Tony Kearney, who said that he and various other administrators consciously tried to establish a good relationship with the Union. 'We kept our ears to the ground, and we maintained a good relationship with the SRC, especially the president. I made a point of meeting newly-elected presidents and getting to know them... By and large the presidents were civilised, intelligent, and easy to get on with... We had no problems accepting the SRC, though we didn't always agree with what they did.' The administration supported the Union for several reasons: they did not want to have to provide the Union's services themselves, and they thought it a good safety valve for students. Students commented that Kearney knew absolutely everything going on in the University and ruled the administration firmly; and since he supported the Union, this was all in the Union's interests. This attitude by the university administration, and the fact that the University was small and students not on the whole as radical as many mainland counterparts, meant that the whole institution including the Union came through this difficult period reasonably intact, without the conflict of other universities.3

At the beginning of 1968 there was a string of resignations from the SRC, but there were more radical newcomers: John Tully, Nick Beams, Charles Wooley, as well as Bob Graham and Marguerite Hamilton. John stood because it seemed natural; he came from a staunchly trade unionist family, knew that people needed to organise for their rights, and was well read in left-wing literature. There were motions that students should not earn money in strikes as this hurt workers; to abolish exams; not to provide information about students to the Department of Labour and National Service; to buy a socialist periodical for the Reading Room; and to appoint a (short-lived) civil liberties officer, as well as opposition to conscription and the Vietnam War.4 Despite problems, Ted Best could claim many achievements for his year as president: a good year for the Bookroom, administrative reorganisation, a successful Orientation Week and Students' Day after several years of drought, cordial terms with the university administration.5

The president elected in 1968 was Bob Graham, who had been president of the students' union in Armidale and was in Tasmania to do Honours. Like Ted and Nigel, he was older than most students. He stood for the SRC because he was interested in politics, and found Tasmanian students felt far more strongly about causes than those at Armidale, which was very conservative. Bob supported a left philosophy and agreed with many ideas of the activist students, but often felt they 'supported the right ideas for the wrong reasons' and disagreed about methods. Some were members of his executive, which made things difficult for him, said Ted Best in Togatus. But Bob often sympathised, thinking people like John Tully idealistic, really believing that poverty was wrong.6

During Bob's term the SRC called for more student representation on University Council; subsidised flu injections; criticised the education system as authoritarian and repressive (Best dissenting); criticised 'perverted' initiations at Christ College; and discussed SRC reform, and the abolition of Students' Day as it made students look like 'mindless fools'.7 The difficulties of running a divided SRC were apparent, however:
Togatus fulminated about machinations, manipulations and backstabbing, and even the Annual Report talked of ‘the present low ebb of the SRC’. The SRC three times failed to gain quorums for Union Meetings to discuss its reform, and finally took matters into its own hands and held long and tiring debates, ran a report. The debate became too much for Bob, also doing Honours, so he resigned. Togatus sympathised: affairs of the Union made being president ‘extremely rough sailing’.

Michael Stokes was another SRC member who resigned. He stood for the SRC early in 1969 because he was interested, and became secretary. After receiving complaints from overseas students (pressed by the SRC treasurer, Salehuddin), the executive wrote a letter alleging racial prejudice by government departments, and sent a copy to the Leader of the Federal Opposition. Department heavies came to investigate, and reputed evidence evaporated; Michael felt the executive should have checked the evidence and had bungled things, so resigned.

The new president was Patrick Flanagan, elected unopposed. He also had a difficult run, with many SRC members extremely vocal. No sooner was he president than he had to chair two rowdy Union Meetings; Togatus overran its budget and the police seized an issue; SRC reform was still a question; there were long meetings with inane motions such as ‘That this SRC encourage Clive Wilmot to accept the Jewish faith’; and correspondence with the university administration over student housing, representation on University Council and course fees met with ‘little or no satisfaction’. Pat was a ‘gentle sort of person, not aggressive’; ‘a really nice person, who didn’t have many political axes to grind. He just wanted to do a good job’.

Patrick left university at the end of 1969, and the president for the next two years was Kelvin Scott. ‘Really capable’, ‘competent, organised’, ‘very bright’, ‘very nice’, he was a moderate, conciliatory president. An anarchist deplored the state of the Union: the President supported law and order (‘the man is mad!’) and Togatus was so right wing it would not offend a church group. Under Scott there was a new professionalism in Union organisation and the SRC was more harmonious, though there were still lively meetings. At the beginning of 1970, for example, a Togatus article questioned the need for the Administrative Secretary to attend an NUAUS conference in Melbourne; the secretary was an SRC member’s wife, confusion arose, and the member was accused of assault. A heated SRC meeting followed which ended in the member resigning.

SRC harmony was helped by the fact that it contained fewer radicals. Most SRC candidates stood on policies of increasing services and reforming SRC structure, but Dennis Rider and Nick Beams stood on radical policies. Nick stressed ‘the irrelevance of most of today’s [university] courses to today’s problems’, and opposed the power of the capitalist class to control students’ lives. Dennis said radicals were the essential activist catalyst in the Union, ‘no matter how long & hard the fellow-travellers of the fascists and assorted coolies of the pen of imperialism might wail and gnash their teeth’. He wanted to ‘expose, engage in struggle with, and triumph over the greasy papier mache pseudobureaucrats skulking in the portals of the structurally moribund SRC... to work for a socialist university controlled by students-staff-uni workers... down with those who would deny the genuine control of one’s environment. Towards the University Soviet! Smash capital!... OUST TO THE PHILISTINE LEGALISTS!’

Neither Nick nor Dennis was elected, and the next year Togatus reported that all radical leaders had gone to bourgeois activity, Rider to the capitalist employment market, Nick Beams to the public service and John Tully to marriage. Although there were vocal SRC members like Geoff Batten, there were no more extremists; neither were right-wingers elected, such as the candidate who wanted to offer staff membership of the Union. The new attitude appeared in the first 1970 elections, when there were 51
candidates, only eleven serious. Platforms ranged from abolishing the SRC to having salad rolls in the Ref. One abolitionist and one joke candidate were elected. There was the usual huge turnover of SRC members (in the two years Kelvin was president, the fifteen SRC positions were held by 43 different people, including three women), and Kelvin was supported by some strong members like Lee Hughes, vice-president, and Sue Hope, secretary. The SRC could point to many achievements. It continued to push the University authorities for permission to have a bar, a medical service, and more student representation in governing bodies. The move to restructure the SRC continued, and more committees were set up, often due to NUAUS influence: Social Action, Education and Welfare (later split in two), Activities, Travel and Overseas Students.

No one really knew what Social Action was meant to be doing; some wood was delivered to pensioners, money was collected for charity, then the portfolio was quietly abolished. Education assisted students with grievances, and pushed for a centre for higher learning to improve the standard of lecturing, and increases in services such as a counsellor (achieved in 1971), a doctor, and a loan service. Welfare tried unsuccessfully to introduce the national union’s insurance society. Activities was ‘shaky’. Four groups toured as part of a national student tour, but they were often ‘sprung on us’ with little notice, and there was nowhere to stage them. The only possibility was the Upstairs Ref, but this was expensive, there were no toilet facilities or stage, the stairs were too narrow to carry gear up, and it would not open on Saturday or Sunday. Travel was the most active portfolio, organising homestays in other places. Overseas Students were also active, with over three hundred members, and functions and cultural shows organised.

A major topic of debate was student housing. The Union had made intermittent attempts to provide housing, but there had never really been adequate provision. For years the SRC had been pushing for more student accommodation in colleges, and in 1967 the Burton-Clarke committee had concluded that more housing was vital, especially for women. Jane Franklin accommodated 83 women and the newly-opened Catholic
women’s college, Ena Waite. 11

In 1969 a bequest of $4000 was left to benefit female undergraduates, and the Union thought it should be used for housing. By now, however, colleges were less popular, seen by students as restrictive and expensive. In 1970 there was a critical shortage of accommodation, but even so, Jane Franklin had vacancies and Christ College went co-ed to try to boost numbers. The Union wanted a new style of accommodation, bedrooms round central living areas, where students had more independence. They also planned to buy houses and rent them out to students. Meanwhile, money was made available for housing by the Australian Universities Commission and University Council decided to build a women’s college, though the colleges had vacancies, the student intake was levelling off and people wanted independent accommodation. The SRC persuaded the administration to defer building the college, but was not given help to put its own plan into action. So although there was a great deal of talk about accommodation, nothing was done, and as before, students went to college or found flats themselves. 57

Tagatus summed up the situation. Colleges were expensive, with a lack of privacy and poor food. Flats were idyllic but hard to come by. A survey showed that 61% of students were dissatisfied with their accommodation. To get a good flat, wear a suit to the agents, don’t say you’re a student, lie about your age if under twenty-one, and take a ‘wife’. 58

The SRC had more success with its business enterprises, though there were difficulties. In 1969 all ran at a loss, but generally a small profit was made. When the bookroom was taken over there was a forecast that it would be a white elephant as it was ‘overstocked with useless books’. The first year’s trading was good, but problems increased: theft was easy, widespread, and hard to stop, costs were rising, and frequent changes in lists of prescribed books meant it was, indeed, overstocked with useless books. The 1969 deficit meant prices rose, and a Union Meeting criticised it as too expensive. In 1971 it made a bare profit, and the next Annual Report could only describe it as ‘reasonably successful’. 59

The Ref, though more successful, also came in for some criticism, with students wanting lower prices and extended hours. Overall, students were satisfied and some profit was made, and the ‘Ref ladies’ on the staff were popular. The Ref was the main meeting place for students, and there were caustic comments about those whose main interest was Ref rather than academic courses. 60 The third enterprise was the Mixed Shop, which ran quite successfully and was seldom mentioned. 61

More often mentioned, in fact at the forefront of activity, was NUAUS (which in 1970 became AUS, the Australian Union of Students). As seen above, NUAUS inspired much activity in international issues, and Nigel Roberts, NUAUS vice-president, commented that Tasmania had a good reputation, more involved and enthusiastic than some larger universities.

NUAUS activity meant the SRC and sometimes Union Meetings debating motions; joining in nationwide protests; sending delegates to NUAUS conferences; and taking up activity in special areas. The motions and protests have been described already. Selection as a delegate to NUAUS conferences was highly prized, for this meant a free trip and the fun of not only the conference but its associated parties. ‘My recollection is mainly of drinking a lot’. said Rod Scott. ‘[One mainland delegate] drove his Harley into the conference room and rode around. He was a real leftie, a real radical.’ Lee Hughes found NUAUS conferences wonderful, though Tasmanians were still laughed at because of the Orr case. She had only been out of Tasmania once before, and the conferences had new ideas, exciting people, and good parties. ‘Thanks to my Old Nick training I could keep up with some quite good drinkers without disgracing the state, and my bridge playing skills were in demand... I developed the attitude that if you were at a national forum and you were from Tasmania, you might as well go for broke, because no one would take any
Quests such as Miss Freshette angered Women's Libbers. *Togatus* portraits Miss Freshette 1968, Irena Mrozowski.

NUAUS had for years encouraged activity in WUS, World University Service. At first this involved raising money, with enjoyable, if sexist, activities such as auctions of women, Miss University and Mr Hairy Legs quests, and balls. WUS provided 'a focal point for a bevy of beautiful birds and tremendously successful social efforts', ran a report. In 1971 WUS Week included a fashion parade, Miss University quest with five candidates, and the WUS ball, a financial disaster. To raise money for Miss Old Nick, James Alexander organised a Volkswagen crammed with seventeen people trying to mount the Ref steps, and made a successful attempt on the world egg-throwing record; one egg was thrown 213 feet.

One entrant in Miss University was Miss Women's Lib, who took in a goat as a contestant, to show up such contests. This caused a problem, which was cleared up, ran the report to AUS: 'Miss Uni. quest (ugh)... it is not likely that there will be any such thing next year'. It was, but WUS was becoming more serious, raising money for Bangladesh by a 26-hour fast, and helping an African refugee in Arts II.

Money was also raised by visitors such as the Wizard of Melbourne Uni, a good comedian. Most speakers brought over by NUAUS were more serious, on topics ranging from draft dodging and Palestine to the Hindu Concept of God and survival into the twenty-first century, both of which obtained large audiences. Not all speakers were left wing: Don Chipp spoke to a large and eager audience, 'as large as Don Dunstan's much to the chagrin of the local Labour people', and was entertaining and reasonable — 'thank God the other Liberals aren't like him'.

Abschol was another NUAUS initiative, raising money to assist Aborigines. A vigil was held in 1968, and next year Ken and Marte Newcombe visited Cape Barren Island. They sparked renewed interest, and Abschol protested against moving islanders when they did not want this, set up a committee of senior islanders, and raised money to create work there. Abschol was the most active group in the Union, and created good publicity in newspapers for the cause.

In 1970 Ken Newcombe attended a national conference, where there was a split between Black Power, and those Aboriginals who agreed to work with whites. In Tasmania Abschol moved to have Truganini's bones decently interred, and set up a kiln and potter on Cape Barren Island. Bill Mollison in the Psychology Department was researching Aboriginal family trees, and in 1971 the first Tasmanian Aboriginal conference was held. Leadership then moved from white students to Aboriginals themselves. Nevertheless,
Abschol and the Union had played an important role in bringing recognition to Tasmanian Aboriginals.

Recognition also came to women, as part of the international women’s movement. Women’s Lib was at first small, but in 1971 received Clubs and Societies endorsement. There was some hostility, recalled Vicki Schofield; Women’s Lib were going to have an all-women function, but had to cancel it because the right-wing Monarchist Society criticised an all-women’s function as discriminatory. Women’s Lib wanted a women’s common room, objected to activities like Miss Uni, wrote a special women’s issue of Togatus, started a women’s library, did abortion counselling, sent delegates to the first Women’s Lib conference in Sydney, and pushed for child-minding facilities. Despite some hostility, there was achievement: sexism disappeared from Togatus, Miss Freshette and Miss University faded out.

After years of few or no women on the SRC, in 1972 four were elected: Jenny Reid, Treasurer, Vicki Schofield, who aimed to set up the creche; Helen Ross, first female president of the Sports Council for many years; and Frances Perkins. They were effective, and at the first meeting after they were elected, the SRC agreed to use the term ‘Ms’, then not widespread. Frances Bonner did not stand, but was powerful; she ran campaigns for other women, and wrote a column in Togatus, Lucrezia Borgia. This witty collection of observations was compulsive reading. ‘Lucrezia Borgia was terrific’, said Mike Aird. ‘We’d wait to see who would get nailed. She was a strong feminist, and the blokes always copped a serve.’

Part-timers were another group making their voice heard, though with less success. There had always been those who felt that part-timers should not pay a full Union fee, because they took longer to get their degrees so paid more over the years, and because they often were not in a position to use Union facilities. In 1970 a group of part-timers called a Union meeting, and after more Union Meetings, motions passed, claims that meetings were unconstitutional due to obscure rules — a melodrama, according to Togatus — a referendum was held. Part-timers gained a majority of votes, but not the two-thirds necessary to change the constitution, so they continued to pay full fees. Gordon Grant, one of the part-timers, recalled trying to hold Union Meetings, dashing from town in the lunch hour only to find that the SRC secretary had forgotten to put up notices, so the meeting had to be cancelled because there was not enough publicity.

Kelvin Scott retired in early 1972, and the new Union president was Julian Amos, who though not in a political party himself was surrounded by strong Labor and environmentally minded SRC members. Julian stood on a policy of improving services, so the SRC increased the Union fee and set to work. They gained the University’s agreement to a gym, a creche, a medical service and a student loan scheme, after years of negotiations; helped Law students set up a legal referral centre; made the Union Building a safe haven for conscientious objectors (the most radical activity of the year, as it was defying the law); stood up for Union autonomy against the Professorial Board; released statistics on failure rates; and tried to move closer to the newly-established College of Advanced Education. The Union’s new environmental policy made the major parties in the state election incorporate conservation in their policies, said Amos. There were more activities: speakers, lunch time concerts, films, dances, Union nights (concerts), pottery and drawing classes. The SRC heard that at one Union activity a window was broken and nineteen dozen glasses had gone astray, ‘but the main thing was it was a very successful evening’.

The power of students, especially in an atmosphere where the administration was wary of them, is shown by one episode. The Union ran a campaign against the vice-chancellor, alleging corruption; some people thought that Peter Boyce, a lecturer, was sympathetic,
and Julian Amos and Mark Leggett showed him a vitriolic Togatus article they were going to print. 'I knew I was a goner', said Peter. He told them he could not comment, but they had been seen and the vice-chancellor was informed. 'They were young, inexperienced, and they wouldn't know what trouble they were bringing to me.'

The SRC was furious when a new chancellor was appointed, alleging irregular activity: candidates had only two weeks to put in nominations and a likely contender was away; the chancellor was appointed at a meeting of University Council when four of the five academic members were away; the announcement was made to the press before the University. The Royal Commission said the chancellor should have experience of universities, but the man chosen was a pastoralist with only rural interests since 1946. The SRC put out a press release to this effect, with no effect.

By this time the activism of earlier years was declining, and Togatus complained that student apathy reached epidemic proportions. In the elections, five portfolios were unopposed and only five people stood as general reps. This was due, it opined, to a non-stimulating environment of concrete, brick and glass.

Togatus was lively in these years. In 1966 Salleh Ben Joned included articles on such subjects as student protest, God, anarchism and Vietnam. Some SRC members thought Togatus was 'too literary for the ordinary peasant', but on the whole Salleh was congratulated. He resigned, and three editors produced the last three issues, which included criticism of the English Department, which became endemic. Sexism reared its head, with photos of a nude woman; however, the seven Miss University entrants were well covered up (it was winter).

In 1967 Roger Hodgman and James Nockels produced ten issues, mainly covering campus news but with other articles. Their guide to the University commented that the registrar was the real power, the University Council was 'a collection of nonentities', and Rae Wiggins was the real power in the Union. Togatus' tone was left-wing but not rabid, articles were interesting, and one would have said this was a competent year, except that the volume was mistakenly numbered 38 not 37 (there is no Togatus volume 37).

Radical editors appeared in 1968, and the first was Peter Conrad. John White had had a few poems published in Togatus, but did not know Peter, and was surprised when he
asked him to be deputy editor.

'I thought he must have read my poetry, and I asked why he wanted me. ‘You’ve got a car, haven’t you?’ he said. ‘Yes, but what do I have to do?’ Peter said, ‘I will write it, and you will take the galleys to the printer’. I was so astounded that I said yes.

The Togatus office was the place to be, said John, ‘where things happened and character assassinations took place’. Peter plotted: ‘Who should we run for this? who for that? He was never committed to the ALP but he had a strong social conscience — don’t let the conservatives get away with it’. He gathered a group of radicals on his staff, but did not always see eye to eye with them. Once, recalled John:

there had been tensions about who would run for NUAUS secretary, which meant a trip to the mainland. Conrad and [Dennis] Rider were both going for it, and they came face to face in the doorway. Rider was taller than Conrad, and he looked down on him and said: ‘You’ve got dandruff’.

Conrad said: ‘Better than halitosis’.

Under Peter Conrad, Togatus was unashamedly left wing and radical, with articles on LSD, sexual intercourse, pornography, international student protest (always justified) and Black Power. It was also sexist, with ‘Bird of the Week’ photographs; tasteless, with a man vomiting on the front cover; and used to push the editor’s views, attacking ‘Lame Duck Lindsay’ [Brown], praising some people and criticising others. Dennis Rider, editor from July, continued in the same vein, condemning genocide and the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and extolling masturbation, Don Dunstan and ‘the New Ideology’.

‘They [Peter and Dennis] ran it as a private little newsletter and bagged everybody they wanted to. It wasn’t meant to be factual.’ But there was a considerable victory: Togatus won the annual prize for small Australian university newspapers.

Dennis continued in 1969, urging students to stand out and

This 1969 cover of Togatus caused uproar, and copies were seized by police. It is hard to say which outraged the public more: female nudity, interracial relations, or the use of the Union Jack. The couple were Salleh, the editor of Togatus, and a ‘well-known uni bird’. The next issue of Togatus advertised itself as Pure White.
strip bare all that is wrong; 80% of students were unthinking oafs, schooling was not orientated to critical awareness. As political editor he appointed John Tully, who said universities should disseminate radicalism, so Togatus would criticise society and encourage activism, unlike the Mercury and other bourgeois claptrap. Right wingers were welcome to send in their stuff — ‘it sends them up anyway’. Dennis resigned in March, and Ken Newcombe edited two supplementary editions. There was dissatisfaction, and Andrew Lohrey and Salleh Ben Joned were appointed on a policy of reforming Togatus.

Both had wanted to be sole editor, and were annoyed when the SRC appointed them joint editors, so they published alternate issues. For his issue Andrew took photos, including Bird of the Week, wrote articles, persuaded his friends to write articles, and did the layout. Politics and education were his favourite topics, and he also put out a send-up of the Mercury, with a lead story by a real journalist saying that the scheduled royal visit would not take place because the organisers had muddled Tasmania with Tanzania. Strife came with Salleh’s issue, a ‘color supplement’, with a cover photograph of Salleh, nude and dark-skinned, lying on top of a blonde and nude ‘well-known Uni bird’. They were covered from the waist down by a Union Jack. This photo was taken in order to shock and raise a stir.

It succeeded, though it is hard to see whether mixed-race sex, nudity, or the use of the Union Jack offended people more. A charge of obscenity was laid, police seized 500 copies, the printer appeared in court, but the case was adjourned. The issue concluded with a back-cover photo of a Coke machine disgorging into a urinal. This too drew protest, from Coca-Cola.

Andrew produced the next ‘All White Pure Edition’, with articles on venereal disease and student sex problems. The ninth issue was a ‘porno-revolution’ supplement, about student protest. But costs had risen dramatically, especially as Salleh’s editions were very long. Andrew resigned, and the only further Togatus that year was a special Education Campaign edition, with money ‘extracted’ from the SRC.

In 1970 the Department of Posts and Telegraphs laid down conditions for Togatus to be registered as a periodical, mainly having no material ‘on the borderline of obscenity’. The SRC was annoyed but had to agree. The editors that year were Andrew Lohrey and Peter Pierce, who promised to include only 20% non-original material, have twelve issues, and emphasise university topics.

The first issue was criticised for consisting of vicious personal attack, uninformed bias, pure malice and plagiarism, lightened by sex and alcohol. Articles were about Union heavies and activities of the left, and there was a survey of pubs.

Andrew Lohrey resigned, and after heated discussion, the SRC decided that as the two had been appointed as co-editors, Peter Pierce must resign. History honours students Charles Wooley and Richard Howroyd became editors. The office was a complete mess, Rick recalled, but the editors were given a budget ‘and told to get on with it’. They roped in their friends and held discussions over a barrel at the pub. ‘We were looking for interesting stuff, and we aimed to shock people.’

One Sunday morning, recalled Rick, Vic Korobacz told him to come to the Union Building. ‘He’d got the Christ College boys in a pyramid of bare arses up the steps beside the Ref, and Hans Tsheppera, who was a photographer, took the photo. Hans said if there weren’t enough bums I’d have to join them, but luckily I didn’t have to.’ Togatus complained self-righteously that the Mercury refused to make a block of the photo. ‘There were no reasonable grounds for this refusal. The photograph was not obscene. Bare arses can be seen any day of the week at your local newsagents. Besides, it was not the “Mercury’s” province to censor.’ The photograph went missing in any case. A photo which did appear was of John Tully in court, taken by Hans who smuggled in a camera. There was the by
now habitual photo of a nude woman, though Rick said it was difficult to persuade a photographic firm to blow it up.\textsuperscript{122}

Rick and Charles resigned when exams neared, and though there were suggestions that \textit{Togatus} was a propaganda rag and economically wasteful, Jerry Fabinyi and Dennis Rider became editors. Their articles included a list of scores for seducing women. Despite so many editors, \textit{Togatus} did produce the stipulated twelve issues a year, for the first time in fifteen years. A summing up of the year spoke of Jerry's 'bourgeois individualism' and called Charles a class traitor, Andrew an 'ageing A.L.P. hack', Peter 'disastrous', and Dennis a 'petulant betrayer of the Left'.\textsuperscript{123}

Change came in 1971 with a full-time, paid editor. As the first, Stephen Alomes, wrote with some justification, \textit{Togatus} had been under the control of a small group, and had scrappy layout, often biting and personal but not searching criticisms, many reprints, and little about the University except gossip. He wanted to build up a sense of student identity and encourage consciousness of counter-culture. Stephen took the job because he was at an impasse academically and was interested in student politics. The first issue had a nude woman on the front; when challenged about this in 1999, Stephen gave the justification that he also printed a photo of a footballer taking a mark. He included articles on subjects ranging from the youth revolution and women's lib to the emptiness of politics. There were supplements on the environment and the cultural revolution, and excellent cartoons by student Vicki Raymond. One reader thought Stephen 'ran it as his own show, and pushed his own views' but this applied to many editors; he did produce 24 fortnightly issues, far more than in previous years.\textsuperscript{124}

There were eight applicants for editor for 1972, and Mark Leggett, another local student, was chosen. Under him the office was a hive of activity. Mark was environmentally minded, and 'we ran the UTG electoral campaign out of the \textit{Togatus} office'. There were many articles on topics such as contraception, politics, zero population growth, drugs and nuclear testing. A major coup was a column by Lucrezia Borgia, 'the most prolific, witty, incisive and ego-destructive cover of the Union ever' (as described above). A survey showed that about 75\% of students thought \textit{Togatus} a success, liked frequent issues, supported the policy of only using four letter words occasionally, and thought no interest group was prevented from writing. Money ran out so there were only 22 issues, but 'we had fun without too much trauma'.

One article criticised the vice-chancellor, George Cartland, saying he was right wing, authoritarian, aloof, uninterested, that the University needed an administrator of liberalism and initiative, and giving names of two staff as contributing to the article. This caused a stir and 'knives are out for the staff'. This was one of the year's successes, thought Mark: others were that articles came from over fifty people, 'we got on T.V. three times', helped the UTG, published 'epochal' articles revealing corruption in the fishing industry, and found Lucrezia.\textsuperscript{125}

\textit{Togatus} had rather less to write about in these years, in that Commem celebrations — or Students' Day, or one year Scrub Day — were less enthusiastic. In 1966 activities were replaced by the Work-Out, although the Engineers' Society did hold a chariot race into the city; in 1969 there was nothing because no one could be found to organise anything; but other years had a variety of events.\textsuperscript{126}

Every year saw a Scavenger Hunt. In 1967 three students were arrested for 'busnapping' MTT buses, and a letter from Government House thanked students for returning the standards and enclosed a donation. The next year was possibly the zenith (or nadir) of all Scavenger Hunts, a chance, said \textit{Togatus}, for the time-honoured sport of cop-baiting. Reports of students liberating garden gnomes, sheep and Archbishop Young brought police to the Union Building; they started taking names and addresses, someone
Commem parade activities. Top: 'One of the more subtle floats in the parade', 1967; centre: another entry which successfully outraged the public; below: Jane Franklin girls marching in the 1970 parade.
let the air out of a police car tyre, someone else threw a flour bomb, ‘police hats appeared in student hands’, a student was arrested and the ‘battle of Churchill Avenue’ started. It raged for an hour, with smoke bombs, a barricade across the road and people arrested, until police called off the assault. 127

Then repercussions started. Students had gone too far, admitted Togatus; 99% of the police were reasonable, but some idiots smashed the concrete bases of traffic lights and lit a bonfire. It was not all bad news, for some people had been co-operative, such as Archbishop Young and the premier, who lent a suit, and students who returned sheep and goats. 128

Later scavenger hunts were, as admitted in 1970, ‘not a roaring success’, though the Army were ‘quite nice’ when they received their cheque for damages. In 1971 the organising committee gave advice: safety should not be jeopardised and items like wind socks should not be removed; nothing should be damaged; people rather than inanimate objects should be the trophies; think about possible prosecution. This advice was not obviously taken, for next year’s hunt was ‘a depressing reminder of what can happen when people miss the point’: quality not quantity was the keynote and little imagination was shown. ‘The saga of repercussions continues unabated’ reported Togatus some time later, and the SRC decided to discontinue the hunt. 129

The traditional parade also petered out. It was criticised as dull, lacking spontaneity, and only four were held. The liveliest was in 1972, when Paddy Hodgman on horseback added class for the Monarchist Society, the Old Nick float belched smoke, and everyone cast off all pretence of collecting for charity and threw flour bombs. All were amused until a bucket of cold water from the Hytten Hall float doused a young girl. The pretence of collecting for charity was not taken seriously; in 1968 the grand total of $7.20 was collected, and even that was stolen. 130

There were few pranks in these years — though the SRC noted that the zebra crossing painted outside the Union Building was hard to remove — and a more typical activity was giving the president of the Union a beer shampoo. Even drinking competitions declined. Numbers of competitors dropped from up to forty in the Iron Man, to seven in 1971, and none for the Iron Virgin ‘in these days of women’s lib’. Competitors had to drink two beers (eight ounces for men, six for women) in twelve pubs, eat two cold pies and scull more beer. In 1972 the Iron Man was described as ‘as usual a bit animal... words cannot express the animal acts in the beer-garden’. Other Students’ Day activities were a raft race in 1968 and an occasional ball, but overall, the SRC thought the activities lacked student support. 131

They themselves were not totally behind Students’ Day activities, largely because they were the ones who had to cope with the repercussions and pay for damages, and in 1970 they passed a motion censuring the organisers of the scavenger hunt for Students’ Day prank, 1966: ‘swimming races’ in the very shallow, ornamental pool outside the Arts Building. (The grassy slope behind became the site for the Stanley Burbury Building.)
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Top left: Dramatic publicity for the 1967 revue, Casinova. Back: Leeanne Hughes, James Alexander, Anda Isaks, Margie Miller, Greg Farquhar (Maynard), Buck Williams; front, Steven Meredith and Lorraine Oakes.

Top right: Voluptuous scene from the 1969 revue Frood: Barbara Kemp, Robert Smith, Vicki Baxter.

irresponsibility in causing reputable students to commit illegal acts. Flour bombs in particular were a problem; the SRC were told by authorities to ban them and tried to do so, but students always threw them and the SRC was blamed. The old idea of Students' Day 'jolting society out of its self centred securities' (1967) had given way to the aim of inspiring students to 'better and greater things', and giving the organiser a laugh (1970) in an orgy of drinking and misbehaving, possibly because students were doing other things like demonstrating to show their deeper views. At the same time, demonstrations hardened the attitude of authority to student pranks. In the good old days there had been a high degree of tolerance and they were seen as just high spirits, but when students were demonstrating against the government, their actions became politicised and serious, the sense of fun was gone 'and it was completely different'. The politicisation of a large section of the student body caused the decline in other traditional student activity.

Clubs and Societies, however, continued much as before. In 1970, 32 showed some sign of life, though there was criticism that many were 'just facades'. Old Nick remained strong, a centre of student activism. Some radicals tried to make the revue preachy, recalled John Reid. 'It was resisted, but only just — it would have been the end of Old Nick. Old Nick was satire, never left or right, never preached. It was about deflating pomposity.' One script, for example, had a woman and her 'son', a man in drag and pregnant, coming to the Department of National Service. The mother railed at the official: How dare you call up my daughter Robin, she can't march in her state; the official was apologetic, a misunderstanding, I'll cross her name off the list; and as the pair walked away, the son took off his wig and pillow and said, 'Thanks, Mum'. Political groups flourished: the ALP was strong, and others included Students for a Democratic Society, Vietnam Study Group, Peace Action Committee and Revolutionary Socialists League on the left, and the Indo-China Defence Committee and the Democratic Reform Club on the right. None lasted long. Other clubs came and went, such as Folk, Tasgoons and the Charismatic Group (new style Christians).

A new portfolio was local Overseas Students Service Director. Asians tended to keep aloof from involvement in university politics, from fear of persecution and victimisation, and Peter Boyce recalled the Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister telling Malaysian students in Hobart not to come home with any hifalutin Australian ideas about environmental pollution. Their organisation ran successfully, however, with over three hundred members in 1972. The Union tried to help them, by defending them against government prejudice, and by serving Asian food in the Ref. John White, president of Clubs and Societies, said he tried to give clubs, particularly those like overseas students', what the clubs themselves thought they needed, not what the committee thought they needed, so clubs could run themselves as they thought fit. Then Paul Storey organised the Mickey Mouse Club and asked for money, and following this line of argument, Clubs and Societies had to give it to him. The Club asked the prime minister, Billy McMahon, if he would be president; there was no reply. The funds, said John, were probably spent on members' living allowances, but here he wronged the Mickey Mouse Club; in 1971 they gave away free coffee outside the Ref in protest at high prices.

John also recalled how Clubs and Societies, and the Union generally, tried to help students. Through a contact in an airline office they arranged concessions for young women who had to go to Melbourne urgently for abortions, and they gave advice about contraception. Some students turned up with their fingers going black, and this was finally diagnosed as scurvy: students away from home were in flats with no idea about nutrition, living on toast.

Scurvy was rare, however, and most students were reasonably healthy, especially if they played sport: Tasmania had a higher percentage of students in sports teams than any other
university. Hockey was the most popular, with ten men’s teams (more than any other university) and eight women’s. In 1972 the women had four teams in A grade and of the southern squad of 28, 20 were from Uni. Football, basketball, fencing, cricket, soccer, rugby were also active, to judge from reports in *Togatus*. These told of triumphs on the field (cricket was in the A grade finals in 1968 for the first time, hockey won the state premiership, rugby finally won a game this season) and off: men’s basketball’s piano-mashing party, team love-ins and ‘uncountable aftergame drink-unders’; two hockey players turning up to umpire on Saturday morning in dinner suits after a ball; rugby’s trip to the West Coast, where McGrath won the drinking competition by sculling a full jug in 15 seconds.\(^{136}\)

The great achievement, however, was going on IV. With 21 universities, wins were rare; in 1966 the Boat Club surprised many people, ran the report, by winning, and men’s hockey won in 1969, but Tasmania’s victories were mostly in other areas. Women’s hockey won the award for the noisiest team in 1967, and the year before kept up their reputation off the field with a tally of ‘65 blokes’. Women’s netball won the drinking cup, ‘a keener competition than all our matches combined’, men’s hockey bemoaned losing their drinking cup and were already in training for next year; and both men’s and women’s badminton praised ‘our superlative powers in the fields of socialising’, and thought that coming third was pretty good, considering the permanent state of inebriation of both teams. Not surprisingly, there were complaints that IV was a waste of money, spending 25% of the Sports Council budget on ‘one big booze-up’.\(^{137}\)

With so many players, facilities were inadequate. From 1970 onwards, the Sports Council and SRC pushed for a gymnasium, and when Julian Amos became Sports Council president, he established a personal fitness centre, pushed harder for the gym, and provided more equipment for all students. There were also attempts to make something of land at Olinda Grove, bought for playing fields but not yet developed.\(^{138}\)

Overall, the impression of these years is of some student radicalism, but more of high spirits and enjoyment of traditional student activities: drinking, sport, socialising. Students quite enjoyed seeing what the few radicals did, but most were not prepared to be too rebellious themselves. Tasmanian activists paled beside mainland and overseas students, and sensible leaders like Kelvin Scott had not too much difficulty in ensuring that the Union and students generally passed these inflammatory years reasonably calmly. For students from conservative Tasmanian schools, the amount of protest at the University was ‘exciting and radical’;\(^{139}\) for the administration it was no doubt sometimes alarming; but compared with other places it was only moderately lively. This meant that the Union came through this period with relatively few problems, having provided enough leadership in radical issues to suit most students and enough responsibility to suit the university administration: no mean feat.
Chapter 9

‘It all costs money that the SRC should save’, 1972–1979

The year 1972 ended positively for the Union. The new programme of activities had been started, the financial position was good, the general situation was stable. With the election of Whitlam as prime minister, for the first time since the 1940s Labor was in power federally, and it looked as if most of the aims of student protest over the last five years were about to be implemented: Australian troops brought home from Vietnam, university fees abolished, eighteen year olds given the vote, and a more progressive/left-wing attitude generally.

Although in this sense 1973 was the start of a new era, in another it was a continuation of the previous year. Kelvin Scott had been a moderate, politically unaligned, but Julian Amos, president in 1972, was similar to later presidents Duncan Kerr and Bill Bowtell, in that all were moderate Laborites, with a Whitlamite programme of expansion of services, and all went on to careers in the Labor Party. There were differences, of course: Julian, an efficient administrator, was mainly interested in services, and was excellent at running Union Meetings, good for the public face of the Union; Duncan, the most interested in politics, was the radical, coming to Union Meetings in a Che Guevara beret, smoking cigarettes in a cigarette holder; Bill was a good public speaker, interested in social activities.

In the 1950s the Labor party had been conservative and trade unionist, unlikely to appeal to many students, as Arthur Calwell’s visit in the 1960s showed. With the arrival of politicians like Gough Whitlam and Don Dunstan, it became far more glamorous. Among students, the right ‘weren’t in the hunt’, said Gordon Grant. ‘They weren’t worth taking seriously — there weren’t very many, and they never had anything to say except support for federal governments when they were Liberal.’ Only the odd right-winger was elected to the SRC, where debate was mainly between the left and the ultra left. The president was usually moderate; even if he stood for a more extreme policy, once in power he realised both the limits of what he could do and that achievement was easier if he co-operated with the University, and moved to a more central position. Challenging this was a succession of small extremist groups, such as the Socialist Youth Alliance and the Socialist Labor League.

‘It was a very tumultuous time’, recalled Duncan. There was a tremendous sense of engagement and debate, and great change in society, stemming not only from Labor’s energetic new policies (such as more money for education) but from ideas of personal freedom and fulfilment, dislike of conformity, wide availability of drugs, and the end of the old conservative hegemony. Student politics reflected the general turbulence, and Duncan commented that being president was like being a Canadian lumberjack balancing on logs in the water. To his left was the counter culture, often evident in Togatus, which was strongly environmental, feminist and left wing; to his right was the large group of conservative students who still saw university as mainly a stepping stone to a career and were not very interested in politics or the Union. Duncan estimated that his support came from the large ‘sex, drugs, rock and roll’ group, and from Labor moderates.

Wanda Buza recalled the general atmosphere. She ‘probably’ stood for the SRC because she had a crush on some man, or it seemed like good fun; it was the time of
parties where people lay around on waterbeds (very fashionable) and smoked water pipes, under posters with entirely non-committing messages like, 'I go my way and you go your way, and if perchance we find each other in life, that's beautiful'. There was a Union Meeting about whether industrialists should be allowed to colour margarine so that it looked like butter. 'A fabulous time', said another SRC member, Michael Clarke.

The fabulous times did bring problems, partly caused by the very Labor government many students had wanted. Many people found major change hard. Pillars of the establishment like the vice-chancellor and the registrar found, commented Bill Bowtell, that people they thought would never hold power now did so, and it was difficult to adjust. Youth continued to be generally opposed to authority, possibly less so in Tasmania than in more radical centres, but it helped increase the general instability. At the same time, world-wide inflation made Union finances difficult; and the opening of the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education at Mt Nelson, just up the hill from the University, meant that the number of students at the University fell, despite the abolition of fees. The College appeared to some students to be superior to the University, as it had clearer career opportunities and was not burdened with the University's staff situation, which included some poor teachers and a preference for research rather than teaching.

This period saw the beginning of Bob Cotgrove's career on the SRC. A keen cricketer, he was roped into becoming president of the Sports Council, then was told that this meant he was a member of the SRC. Meetings were held on Sunday afternoons, starting at 1.30, so Bob went along for his first meeting, glad that he did not have anything on that afternoon. At about six, he recalled, a motion was put forward to adjourn for dinner; it took about an hour to debate, and then members did adjourn, had dinner, and returned. The meeting finished at 3.35 a.m. after 83 motions had been discussed with heated debate. Despite these exhausting meetings, Bob found little difficulty fitting in; he had studied Political Science, was opposed to the war in Vietnam and was in tune with the left-wing policies of the day, so he could without difficulty avoid offending the ruling Union elite, to protect Sports Council interests.

Bob thought the Tasmania University Union was in many ways more genuinely revolutionary in translating Labor ideals than mainland unions. At mainland cricket IVs, Bob would check out the union in his host university, and found that they were often constrained by powerful university administrations, who ran things and gave students little say. The only place where they could be really radical was student newspapers. In Tasmania, the SRC was relatively powerful, and the university administration more sympathetic: the Joint Advisory Committee treated students' views with respect, the bursar, Graeme Briggs, was generally on students' side, and the vice-chancellor, Cartland, was careful not to push his own way and would often go along with student requests when they were put in a reasoned manner. Tasmanian student leaders were less radical than many on the mainland, more inclined to cooperate with authority. Many had their future careers in mind, and were not trying to overturn the system. The result was less radical excitement than on the mainland, but more power to the Union and probably more progress in providing student services. Even so, some students did think the university administration had too much say in the Union; in effect they held the purse strings, as the Union's Finance Committee was a mixture of Union and university reps (and the university reps, older, more experienced, and usually sitting on the committee for years, had a great deal of influence), cheques had to be countersigned by the university bursar; the welfare officer, Michael Clarke, was seen by some as implementing university policy in the Union, and overall 'the SRC felt that it was being shadowed'. The Union was not openly constrained by the University, as Bob had seen on the mainland, but the University had so much influence that unless students were really prepared to stand up for their rights — as happened later — the University could be seen as in effective control.
Julian, Duncan and Bill stood on policies of making their mark by improving services. A major innovation was the child care centre, suggested from 1967 but knocked back as unnecessary. With the emergence of Women's Liberation, a stronger campaign was fought. In 1972 the main enthusiast, Vicki Schofield, welfare officer on the SRC, applied for funding under a new Federal program. The next year, students who needed child care held a heated meeting, and in response the SRC hired a large house for a temporary child care centre. Women mowed lawns and painted walls, and Julian Amos helped by building a fence. Vicki, a trained nurse, ran the centre, which was licensed to take twenty children and had a staff of six. Trained staff were rare, but Vicki emphasised not just care but development, and employed mothercraft nurses, a nursery nurse from England, and the first man employed in child care in Tasmania.

Opposition came from other child care centres, 'who didn't like a group of feminists setting up a child care centre and teaching little girls to be little boys'. There was a whispering campaign against the centre, though Vicki managed to stay ahead. She spent much time counselling women who felt guilty putting their children in child care. The Commonwealth money was used to build a state-of-the-art child care centre at the University, which was licensed to care for sixty children and opened in 1975, to wide acclaim. In both old and new buildings, the Child Care Centre was very successful.7

Child Care was part of the Welfare portfolio, which continued to expand under Vicki's successor, Michael Clarke. A Student Loan Scheme lent students up to $50 for rent, books, clothes and so on, with easy repayment terms. After talking about it for decades, the Union finally started a student housing scheme, where they leased twenty houses from landlords, and sub-let to about forty students. This too was popular, though some students abused the system by not paying rent, skipping the premises, or squatting. Nevertheless, the scheme grew considerably.8 The Whitlam government not only abolished university fees but began the Tertiary Education Allowance Scheme or TEAS. At first it was difficult for students to qualify, and Michael was involved in submissions aimed at easing the terms of the allowance. He was also involved in a sit-in at the Library, when the librarian cut opening hours over Easter. The vice-chancellor and the registrar came to see what was going on, and the students persuaded them that their cause was just, so they told the librarian to increase hours.9

The co-operative attitude of the university administration was also shown in the student welfare system. They employed a student counsellor and an employment officer, and were prepared to extend this. The Union decided to employ a welfare officer itself, and chose Michael Clarke, but there was some opposition on the grounds that he had set up the job and should not have been appointed to it (in hindsight Michael agreed, but said he did not think anything of it at the time). A Union Meeting dismissed Michael; a recision meeting failed to gain the necessary two-thirds majority, but Michael was then employed by the University, who also employed a doctor and a nurse for student health, and a sports officer. By 1975 the University had a network of experts for student welfare.10

Activities also expanded, notably with the Sound Lounge, where students could relax and listen to music. It was expensive to run, but very avant garde, a popular achievement for the Union. A full time activities officer was employed, the Union opened an Activities Centre, and Activities forged ahead. Films were shown, bands played at Union Nights, a variety of speakers ranged from a didgeridoo player to an Ananda Marga representative, and classes or 'learning exchanges' were held for students, in fashionable subjects like tie dying, yoga and jazz ballet. 'My favourite recollection is a West Indian Steel Drum band playing on the Union steps' recalled one student. Weekly wine and cheese evenings for mature age students, and tutorials for all students, attracted little support and ceased.11

Much appreciated by students was cheap two cent photocopying; there were vending
machines for stamps and contraceptives; and a printing service was set up. The trading ventures were running at a loss, but the SRC was operating on a deficit budget and this was not a great worry. The SRC took up a number of concerns with the university administration: more student representation on university boards, particularly the Arts Faculty which was staging a last-ditch stand against this; the introduction of Sociology; moving the site of the new Teaching and Learning Centre, which the University wanted to put on the lawn between the Library and the Arts Building. Students liked lying around on the lawn between lectures, but space was in short supply and the lawn had to go. The expansion of services made for an exciting time, part of the general attitude of expansion of the heady Whitlam years. However, student activism declined; with Labor in power federally, there was less to demonstrate against, and the spirit of the times was changing. Even in 1972, recalled Peter Hay, 'we were aware that it was becoming harder to keep up a strong head of broad based activist steam'. The road, which was not an ideological issue, was a last ditch attempt to keep

One of the few rallies of the mid-1970s, telling the government that the student living allowance was too meagre. Kim Beazley was Minister for Education, Gough Whitlam Prime Minister, the Tasman Bridge had just collapsed, and one sign is as relevant now as then: 'Independence at 18 not 25'.

Advertising all the excitement of the Sound Lounge, 1976.
radical mass student action, and after that there were few causes which students would demonstrate about. The environmental group was enthusiastic, and demonstrated against the flooding of Lake Pedder, French nuclear testing in the Pacific and Omega bases in Australia, but only attracted small numbers, though the SRC supported them. New allowances schemes were close to students’ hearts, but a National Day of Solidarity in favour of the government paying Union fees as well as abolishing fees did not gain much support, and though students might have been expected to demonstrate in favour of raising the TEAS allowance, which was below the poverty line, a rally held in conjunction with the new Tasmanian College of Advanced Education on Mt Nelson attracted only 250 students.13

There was a blast from the past in 1976, when old radical John Tully enrolled for Dip. Ed. and resuscitated the moribund Students Teachers Association. This campaigned for curriculum changes and a greater student say in running the faculty, and responded to an AUS call for a student strike, with many student teachers stopping work for the day. The Education Faculty had tried to improve the Dip. Ed. course in response to earlier complaints, but their efforts had little effect and annual complaints about irrelevant courses, poor lecturing and a general failure to prepare students for their careers continued (amply justified, in the author’s experience).14

At the same time, there was little opposition when the Prince of Wales visited the University, though a writer in Togatus did deplore the SRC throwing off its socialist principles and rolling out the red carpet. Bill Bowtell, in a neat suit, accompanied him around the site, and each department chose students to attend a garden party at Christ College. The author was one of two students from History; we wore old clothes to show we were not going to kowtow to royalty, and were carefully kept from nearing the prince by his impeccably polite suite.15

Although there were many achievements, there were also problems. Though in 1972 SRC members recall amicable meetings, with passionate debate but little ill-feeling, in later years the SRC became more polarised and Union politics more murky. An early example was the 1973 Union Ball, held just after Gordon Grant was elected president. It was organised in carefree student manner, with no proper budget, money spent lavishly on décor and three bands, and only eighty tickets sold, and the organisers advertised that free drugs would be handed out. The head of the Drug Squad, Inspector Cashion, investigated the claim, and was told that it was a joke — the joints would only contain a

In 1974 the Prince of Wales visited the campus, and was shown around by Union president Bill Bowtell, left, and president of the Sports Council Bob Cotgrove, behind Bill. Not all students dressed up to see the Prince.
herbal mixture. (His informants knew this information was false.)

At the ball itself, wrote Lucrezia Borgia in Togatus, ‘everyone was either stoned or drunk, and a good time was had by all’. There were allegations that the committee let their friends in free (three hundred people attended), alcohol was misappropriated, money was used to buy drugs, and, said Michael Munday, not enough drugs had been given out for the money available; ‘people were furious because they’d been ripped off’. A Cactus sheet complained; Gordon pronounced the unfashionable view that money spent had to be accounted for, and at a ‘horrific’ Union Meeting moved a vote of no confidence in the ball organisers. A second Union Meeting carried a vote of no confidence in him, and the SRC set up a committee to investigate, widely known, even by its members, as the Whitewash Committee. People grilled about the authorship of Cactus found this menacing, ‘a witch hunt’, ‘very unpleasant’. The committee duly found that there had been mismanagement but not misappropriation, and concluded that outsiders might have brought drugs to the Ball, and that the president’s reaction was questionable. The issue ended in Gordon resigning, saying he could not condone irresponsibility and lack of accountability. People describe it as a nasty episode, which put them off Union politics. It was, said Gordon, ‘an education in organisations’. The general view is that he was honest and decent, but ‘too straight’ for the times.

The new president was Duncan Kerr; left wing Labor and revolutionary, though not enough for some; he was advised in Togatus that he must be seen to be a heavy, seen to have ‘screwed every good-looking or horny chick on campus’, smoked joints, thrown rotten Tasmanian apples through the window of the American embassy, and poured rusty drink cans through the front doors ‘of that most evil of Multi-National Corporations, Coca-Cola’, an interesting description of fashionable activities at the time.

The SRC was heavily Labor-oriented, with nine of the fifteen members in the ALP, but after the ball episode it was less amicable than before, prone to ‘petty infighting’. Duncan said he tried to blend members together ‘at a time of highly contested mainstream political activity’: extreme left, left and right, counter-culture. Finances were becoming a worry, but there was a strong dislike among students of raising prices. At one stage Duncan closed the Ref because he could not allow it to go on running at a loss. ‘Almost everyone demanded my scalp, and I survived a very rowdy Union Meeting.’ The Union was behaving increasingly irresponsibly in this way, said Duncan. It was difficult for people imbued with the spirit of flower-power when the cold hand of financial responsibility appeared. ‘It was a testing time ... all very volatile.’

Politics brought problems. There was a federal election in 1974, the first one at which eighteen-year-olds could vote. Togatus printed much information, mainly pro-Labor; the rival candidates addressed students; and the SRC executive pledged that the Union would support the ALP, because its policies helped education, the environment and the community. One of the biggest Union Meetings for years passed both a motion of support for the Labor candidate, and a censure motion of the executive, though Labor supporters pointed out that this was at the end of the meeting after many students had left. On a lighter note, the Old Nick revue that year was called Goughspell, though it was to open just after the elections, and Old Nickers joked that if the Liberals won, it would have to be renamed ‘Snedspell’ (Billy Snedden was the Liberal leader).

Duncan’s heir and the next president was Bill Bowtell, a Labor party member, interested in politics. He too described these years as turbulent but exciting. ‘We all grew up in an atmosphere of vast expansion, an explosion in funding’, but by this time, 1974, the Whitlam government was in some trouble, and the changes set in train by Whitlam had brought not only the new Jerusalem but change and instability. AUS pushed its left wing views — Bill was denounced as too left wing in Hobart and too far right at AUS.
meetings — and sent a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organisation to address Tasmanian students. ‘It was like visitors from Planet Neptune. They were seen as killers and terrorists.’ Some Zionist students also flew down, TV cameras appeared, the Palestinian addressed the students, half of them approved and half did not, ‘everyone was at each other’s throats’, and Bill carefully stood out of the way behind the cameraman and showed him where to film.

Bill continued to expand services, starting extensions to the Union Building and continuing the process to resolve the road dispute, but his real interest was in activities. ‘I was a bread and circuses person. I wanted to give the students something new and entertaining.’ The printing centre was finally opened, and there was a range of interesting speakers, such as Jim Cairns and Peter Wherret, for whom Bill enjoyed holding lunches; ordinary students complained when they saw grand dishes carried through the Ref to Bill’s lunches upstairs. Then, because the bridge was down and the road to the airport circuitous, Bill hired a helicopter to take him to the airport to go to AUS meetings. ‘We teased him about that!’ Bill, however, managed the Union competently and was an excellent public speaker. The secretary, Yvan Dufour, recalled that Bill was fair-minded, ‘trying to defuse and smooth over the internal bickering of the SRC’. Through all these years, however, a problem was looming in finances. The Tasmania University Union was not alone in this; most Western countries suffered financial difficulties. ‘No one worried about [deficits], anywhere’, said Michael Clarke. ‘The money would come, and we could always raise the [Union] fee.’ ‘Financial constraints were considered to be almost a right wing plot to stop you from doing things, from fulfilling your grand vision’, said Bob Cotgrove. ‘There was the feeling that the University was expanding, the whole world was expanding, you could go into a deficit, and everything would pay for itself in the long run.’

Through the turbulent years after 1968, under presidents like Ted Best and Kelvin Scott, finances had never been a worry, and they were fine in 1972. The SRC had a deficit budget, but the trading ventures ran better than expected so no loss was made. In 1973, however, not only did all trading ventures run at a loss, but the number of students actually dropped, so the Union’s income fell. Inflation made this problem worse, especially as wages rose; the Union intensified things by decreasing fees for part-timers.

Yvan recalled that when Gordon was president, the Union administration suggested a Union fee increase, citing rising costs in the Ref as the reason. Gordon refused and after much discussion and several Union meetings, a committee was formed to look into the Ref’s management. Yvan, an unusual student in that he was French, was on the committee. Answers were hard to get, and when they did appear, were ‘patchy, inaccurate and, in few instances, simply misleading’, and mistrust grew.

In the last period of Duncan’s presidency, there were many hectic Union Meetings about finances. The Finance Committee refused to allow the Union to budget for a deficit; and students showed at Union Meetings that they did not want the obvious answer, a fee rise. Yvan Dufour, SRC secretary by this time, said that no student at the time ‘would have identified the fact that inflation was well and truly underway even if we had tripped over it!!! ... what happened with the Union’s finances was never perceived at the time to have something to do with “inflation”’. Togatus printed a song which described the Annual General Meeting on Monday (‘we weren’t getting truth at all’), the President walking out of the Tuesday meeting, manoeuvring on Wednesday (‘Both sides mended fences and found people yet to con’), the Thursday meeting which knocked back a fee rise, the SRC’s retaliation of closing the Ref early and stopping cheap photocopying, and motion after motion of dissent on Friday. The chorus of the song ran: ‘Oh, it all costs money that the SRC should save’. Togatus claimed that the SRC was degenerating into
President Bill Bowtell addressing a hostile crowd which thinks the SRC is not treating the Ref workers well, Ref steps, June 1975. Gordon Grant stands left.

The next president, Bill Bowtell, inherited this difficult situation. He found the deficit appalling, though most student unions were in a similar state. There was 'heated discussion' over finance, and whether to go ahead with expensive extensions to the Union Building; Union Meetings voted to halt them, then rescinded this decision. Early in 1975 the SRC was told that the financial situation was much worse than had been expected. Despite this, it raised the allowances to the executive, but decided to return to the University the bookroom, which was losing money, and cut Ref workers' hours and jobs. The 'Ref ladies', who would often give needy students free meals, were beloved by students, who strongly supported their stop work meeting. The changes were rescinded. At the same time, a writ was served on Togatus for defamation; this was settled out of court, with the Union paying out.29

Bill wrote in Togatus that this was a dreadful week, with the writ, the stop work meeting, and a dramatic Union Meeting. Two students, Phil Ryan and John Brady, had organised a petition to the vice-chancellor, objecting to compulsory Union membership and asking that students pay a smaller fee, $35, for services. They collected 890 signatures, and the Union Meeting was called to debate motions that the fee be reduced. The motion failed to gain the two-thirds majority necessary to pass.30

Another long-running issue came to a head. Over the years there had been criticism of Lindsay Brown, the executive officer, and of Rae Wiggins, the Accountant. Gordon Grant recalled that when he was president in 1973, 'nobody could understand the accounts... [they] weren't presented in the way you'd expect them to be. We couldn't see what was going on'. In 1974 Rae resigned, and Lindsay was made Accountant as well. He worked hard, was totally honest, and did everything he could to help the Union, according to Michael Clarke, who worked closely with him. 'Lindsay was competent and well intentioned, very sympathetic to most of the political agenda of the mainstream students', said Duncan Kerr. 'His misfortune was to be the person who came to represent conservative bureaucracy at a time when conservative bureaucracies were highly unpopular.' Bill Bowtell agreed. 'He became something of a fall guy over the problems when you don't want to increase revenue but you want to keep your services... the SRC and the Union were forced to face realistic facts, and there was a bunch of them who made Lindsay the scapegoat.' Tony Manley put the disagreement down to a row about the personal insult and disharmony, and Duncan said the Union faced a critical position.28
powers of the SRC (students) and the Union Building Management Committee, dominated by Lindsay; Sue Northeast thought Lindsay ‘despaired of erratic SRC’s and so took more responsibility himself’.31

So there were two views: that Lindsay was doing a good job; or that he had too much power, was too close to the university administration (who were, of course, the enemy) and that students did not know what was going on with their money. When finances grew difficult, the second view prevailed, and some students saw problems as Lindsay’s fault. (Union administrators were having similar problems in many universities.)

In 1974 the SRC discussed the position of the executive officer, and a motion to dismiss him was lost. The next year a committee was set up to enquire into his position. When it asked for $500 without saying what this was for, Bill resigned, saying this was financial irresponsibility. ‘I resigned because I thought I had the numbers [to be re-elected]’, he recalled. The committee then said the executive officer had failed to fulfil his duties.32

So the situation was that the financial position was poor, some students were pushing for a smaller fee, Lindsay Brown was under attack, the president had resigned, and the SRC was criticised for trivial faction fighting and an obsession with its own internal problems rather than students’ rights. As well, after protests about the previous election, the SRC decided to have elections run by the Electoral Office. The two candidates for president were Bill Bowtell and Phil Ryan, a leader in the push for voluntary unionism and a smaller fee. A Liberal, from John Fisher College, Phil was strongly supported by the college vote, and won. The elections were not hotly contested, however, with seven people returned unopposed and only eleven candidates for the other positions.33

Phil, entirely new to the SRC, was an inexperienced, well-meaning, right-wing ideologue, according to Michael Clarke. He had changed his mind on voluntary unionism, he told Togatus, and claimed in one article that he both supported the $35 fee and thought the $80 fee necessary. He was in a difficult position, for the SRC was heavily Labor-oriented, and increasingly it was Phil versus the rest. Phil took to acting without the SRC’s approval, offering the University space in the Union Building, and presenting his petition for reduced Union fees to the vice-chancellor. The University Council replied by setting up an Ad Hoc Committee to look at union membership and fees. A resolution to dismiss Lindsay Brown was carried, but not put into effect by Phil, the SRC voted to help the ALP in the 1975 federal elections with dissent from Phil, and Phil insisted on holding a referendum about part-timers’ Union fees in breach of the directions of the Finance Committee and the SRC. The SRC said that he should not give press interviews or chair Union Meetings, and should resign, and at one SRC meeting the vice-president took the chair and refused to give it to the president.34

In defence of Phil was the argument that he had been elected on a campaign of reducing the fee, that the referendum had shown that a majority of students agreed with him, and that the SRC was doing what the Finance Committee wanted rather than students’ desires, so was dominated by the Committee and, indirectly, the administration. It was irregular for an SRC to stop its elected president chairing Union meetings or giving press interviews.35

In April 1976 Phil noticed that no SRC member except himself had paid a Union fee, as the university administration had sent out the notices late. The Union constitution said that anyone who had not paid his or her fees by 1 April should resign, so Phil sacked seven members. The SRC decided to ignore this and carry on, and one member sued Phil for wrongful dismissal; Phil sued him in return. Phil refused to attend meetings, but without him, little was done. The SRC asked for elections, but Phil refused to sign the commissions, and the returning officer refused to act without the president’s agreement. Finally, elections went ahead with only the other executive members’ signatures. There
were many complaints in *Togatus* that the Union was disintegrating, inactive, given to petty squabbles and faction fighting, neglecting students' interests, incapable of functioning properly. The financial situation was not good either, for in 1976 all trading ventures ran at a loss, from the bookroom ($22,500) to the Ref ($14,400), the Mixed Shop ($1516) to the second hand bookstall ($551). 36

The University was becoming worried, and the registrar sent a memo to University Council members that a special meeting was needed to discuss the Union, whose situation had not been a happy one for the past eighteen months to two years. Nearly every submission to its Ad Hoc committee showed the need for restructuring. The Union was not alone in having problems, however, for the University itself had economic woes. As far as the students were concerned, the Union seemed dull, not run down but not vibrant. 'It just existed.'

Meanwhile, there was a saga about Union Building extensions. With student numbers increasing, these were planned from 1972, and some money was obtained from the Universities Commission. In 1974 Michael Munday tried to withdraw Union support, and the Union and SRC passed motions to stop the extensions; the opposition argued that the Union was irrevocably committed, and the extensions went ahead. 38

The SRC elections also went ahead, the returning officer accepting commissions signed by the rest of the executive, despite Ryan's protests. There was one advantage of the turmoil: in past years many candidates had been elected unopposed, but in 1976 all positions were contested, with 26 candidates (including only one woman). There were two tickets, Michael Munday's Reform ticket, which was more to the left, and a Liberal ticket headed by Richard Mulcahy, a political maverick who had moved in a year from president of Labor Youth to a close association with the Liberal party. The elections were lively, with both sides campaigning vigorously; Mulcahy even issued a writ against Munday for
defamation in his election material.\textsuperscript{39}

Michael Munday had trained for the Catholic priesthood, been an abalone diver, and started studying Law in 1973. At first he disapproved of compulsory unionism, but when he saw that power really lay with Union Meetings, ‘I fell in love with it, because to me it was the ultimate form of democracy, an organisation truly controlled by members’. He was appalled by the SRC, however, which was too co-operative with governments and the University, and seemed an offshoot of the Labor party, with ‘continual handing down of the mantle from Amos to Kerr to Bowtell’\textsuperscript{40}.

Michael was an excellent orator, able to sway virtually any audience, and the Union Meeting was his forte. His way with words is clear when he tells his own story, with great enthusiasm. After his 1974 activities he went overseas, and on his return was furious to find that the Union Building extensions had not been stopped. A committee to look into the issue was formed, with Michael a member. He told the University that the Union was owed interest on the money they had handed over for the extensions, which had been sitting in the bank, threatened legal action, and obtained the large sum of $38,000. Overall, Michael was suspicious about the Union’s financial situation, claiming that problems were due to too much money being put into reserves. Moreover, at this time, due to the vacuum of power in the Union, Lindsay Brown was effectively running it, which to Michael was usurping students’ authority. He stood for president, on the platform of destroying the bureaucracy, and sub-committees where the bureaucracy dominated, the Union Building Management Committee and the Finance Committee.\textsuperscript{41}

A general anti-Liberal attitude, and Michael’s flair for public speaking, meant he won the election comfortably. ‘Michael Munday was a delightful president, with a disregard for the formalities of life, vigour, excitement, charisma that appealed to the students of the time’, said his treasurer, Terry Ewing. ‘He wasn’t one for dotting the i’s and crossing the t’s, but he had the ability to communicate with any audience.’ Tony Manley described him as personable, putting into practice ideas which had been around for years with nothing happening; Nick Sherry said he had ‘flair and stature’. Bob Cotgrove admired his larrikin streak, which led him to ‘push the boundaries, open the door’, and his sense of purpose. ‘He could get things done... he really tried to expand things for students’. Bob saw Michael as part of the 1970s ‘romantic, ideological, naïve’ generation, ‘doing our bit to change the world’. Michael himself said he was a bulldozer, as this was the only way to get things done, and in \textit{Togatus} gave students this advice: education is only gained through total experience, university often limits rather than extends, question everything.\textsuperscript{42}

Nick Sherry, ardent Labor, was introduced to Michael in the ref over a cup of coffee. They agreed that ‘the Union was in a mess’, and decided to put up a Reform ticket. Once again, a left-wing SRC was elected. \textit{Togatus} criticised the
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elections: ‘rarely in history have so few stuffed up so much in so short a time with such dependable regularity’. Nominations were closed too soon; candidates were nominated when they were not financial union members; 10% of the electors were not on the rolls; Mulcahy used too much professional electioneering, and Munday played hard on the activist image. Even worse, Phil Ryan was claiming that because he had not signed the election commission, the elections were not valid. He locked the president’s office against Michael, who broke the door down, so Phil called the police and accused Michael of breaking and entering.13

‘SRC chief inherits trouble’, ran a Mercury headline shortly after Michael was elected. ‘Varsity vortex — Who runs what?’ There were industrial trouble, threats of a takeover by the university administration, and election challenges, as well as existing financial difficulties. Michael, however, told the Mercury he could sort out these problems. ‘I know where the trouble is and we are going to rectify it’.14

The industrial trouble came because Michael had carried out the SRC’s decision to dismiss Lindsay Brown, and Lindsay’s union members in the university administration were refusing to handle the Student Union’s mail, money or phone calls. By this stage an Election Tribunal, headed by the chief Commonwealth Electoral Officer, had judged the SRC elections valid, though Phil was still claiming they were not.15

Michael had already obtained the interest from the Union Building Extension money, and he obtained an undertaking from the vice-chancellor that the Union controlled the Union Building. He then went ahead with installing a bar, which the SRC had been talking about for years, and of which the University Council did not approve.16

Then Michael toured the houses the Union sublet to students. He was appalled at them: holes in floors, plumbing that did not work, and no attempt by the owners to fix defects. The worst were managed by a man who refused to give the name of the owner: a title search showed that they were owned by a prestigious member of the university community. Furious, Michael went on TV, showing the cameramen the worst houses, and naming the owner (though the ABC blipped this out). The SRC passed a motion condemning the owner and the manager.17

So Michael had accused a prominent university personage of being a slum landlord; he sacked the executive officer and staff were on strike; Phil was saying the SRC was not properly elected. Michael then attended his first meeting of the University Council. ‘When I was presented... there was stony silence. I was persona non grata there... I was as popular as a pork chop in a synagogue.’ Council did hear that the University’s solicitor thought the election valid, however, so that was one problem solved.18 The Brown problem was solved too, after compulsory meetings with his union and a hearing at the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, which found that he had been correctly dismissed. Phil was placated; the SRC passed a motion of no confidence in him, but this was later rescinded. Michael stood up for him, saying it was wrong for the SRC to take away the power of the elected president to chair Union Meetings and speak to the press, and the SRC apologised to him. The prominent university personage, who Michael thought really did not know the state of the houses he leased to students, was assuaged by being voted patron of the Union.19

Nevertheless, finances were in a difficult state, and in August the treasurer, Terry Ewing, informed the SRC that there was likely to be a loss of $60,000 for the year because of increases in wages. The worst loss came from the bookroom, which the SRC had been talking about selling for years. In the early 1970s, Michael said, ‘I’d figured out their marketing code... the mark-up was incredibly high, and they didn’t deny it. So I took this back to the Union.’ They voted to sell the bookroom, but when Michael returned, nothing had been done. Michael opened negotiations with a bookseller, Birchalls, who agreed to
sell books at below the bookroom price, employ the bookroom staff, and pay rent.\textsuperscript{50}

There was room for the bar in the Union Building extensions, and Michael set about establishing it. A licence could only be obtained by setting up a bar club, and to get members, Michael persuaded Websters, who ran the travel agency, to donate a return trip to London. A student-only raffle was held, where $5 bought membership of the Bar Club and a chance to win the trip. This gained enough bar club members, and two interim managers were appointed, students from halls of residence. With experience of bars, and the student attitude that 'I've paid my Union fee so I'm entitled to freebies', Michael set up a novel system, a computer bar, which kept an absolute record of everything sold. The bar, said later president Richard Flanagan, was the basis for the Union's subsequent prosperity, the one area which made substantial profits.\textsuperscript{51}

Meanwhile, Housing had been reorganised. Leases were only renewed on houses Michael found suitable, and he reported to the SRC that about forty houses were leased at minimum rent increase and maximum quality increase. Housing was managed by a university employee, Barbara Sattler, who was much-liked by students. In the long term, the SRC wanted to buy houses, which would then be capital assets, and lease them to students, and Michael obtained a large loan on generous terms from the state government for this purpose.\textsuperscript{52}

Michael intended that the bar, with its captive audience of keen students, would finance his other ideas, of cheap food and drink in the Ref, cheap housing, support for child care and other student needs. He also thought that the Union did not need the reserves which had been built up, because it had a guaranteed income under the University Statute. Terry Ewing was prophesying a large loss and wanted to put prices up, but Michael refused. The National Bank manager agreed to honour Union cheques if the reserves were run down, so Michael used them to finance his improvements, while waiting
for the bar to make a profit. He also suggested that the finances of the Union Building extensions be investigated, and thought of taking this to court.55

Another area of change was the Union’s administrative structure, which the SRC was determined to reform. Michael Clarke took a plan for this to University Council, which the SRC condemned as a usurpation of the autonomy of the Union. It stated firmly that the governing authority of the Union was outside the ambit of Council, and any action outside Council’s stated powers would be unlawful and resisted by all lawful means. A Select Committee of the University Council had reported on the Union’s administration (move all possible responsibilities to the University, abolish the Union Building Management Committee, president should be full-time, no need to accumulate reserves), so the SRC set up a committee to look at this report, and report itself on the Union’s administration. Meanwhile, Michael Munday became temporary executive officer.54

One might have thought all these activities were enough for the SRC in the busy months after the elections, but there were other activities. In international issues, members condemned the South African government for racism, the Rhodesian government for guerilla warfare, and the visits of nuclear powered ships and right-wing Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore to Tasmania; they opposed uranium mining; they supported a national strike for an increase to the TEAS allowance; on AUS’s recommendation they appointed a women’s officer; they gave $100 to the Cannabis Action Committee, and decreased union fees for postgraduates, part-timers, and medical students who studied off campus. They paid staff a bonus, and held two Christmas parties for orphaned children.55 All in all, in the five months after Michael Munday was elected president an amazing amount was achieved.

This achievement continued the next year. The Ref was done up and, against the advice of his treasurer, Michael reduced prices, feeling that the Ref was a service the Union should subsidise. By June the Ref was making a profit. The Mixed Shop was reorganised and the manager was dismissed, but it still did not perform well. Union facilities were opened one night a week for part-timers. A Union mart was set up where students could sell items, for example pottery. The Union supported a TEAS rally, the
largest demonstration since Vietnam days, and opposed a loan scheme which would mean students went into debt. A sub-committee persuaded the University not to exclude various students from enrolling. Michael pressed to implement his idea of buying properties for Housing, and there were lengthy negotiations, but the project was eventually stymied by opposition on the SRC. Michael also wanted to set up a laundromat for students.56

In March the Committee on Union Restructure made its report. Of the trading ventures, the Ref was running efficiently and its problem was that its prices were too low, a deliberate policy. The second hand bookstall lost money but was a useful service; it should be run for a shorter time. More rent should be charged to tenants, the travel agency and the bank. So finances were fair, though some areas should be tightened. Politically, the Union was governed by committees which had broken down, meeting irregularly, often lacking quorums, and with poor record keeping. The Committee recommended that the Union Business Management Committee should be abolished and a restructured Finance Committee (with more student representation, seven out of nine) should take over its functions. Other committees should meet monthly. The president should be full-time, paid a salary, and the secretary should be part-time, and act as secretary to all committees. The position of executive officer should be abolished, and his work shared between the president, secretary, treasurer, and a part-time accountant. The Union accepted these recommendations, which meant that in effect Michael Munday ran the Union. The new Finance Committee was established, and all committees met regularly.57

An election was held for the restructured Union. Michael stood for president, opposed by a candidate who admitted he only entered so there would be competition. There was general praise for the improvements Michael had brought (from University Council as well as students), and he won easily. The new SRC was different from the old, in that for the first time for years, there were two female members. Michael thought they brought in a feminine influence 'which went a long way towards the destruction of the macho element on campus... it was very strong in my first term as president'. (In fact, one woman had publicly accused the SRC of sexism.) Another newcomer was right-wing Eric Abetz, who brought about a Liberal resurgence.58

Eric too was horrified when he arrived at university and found that Union membership was compulsory. He also found that Liberal influence was not strong. 'The feeling among

In the Ref, 1976.
Liberals was that campuses are left wing, we've got to play along with it or we'll marginalise ourselves, and I said, "Let's change their minds, not carry on as de facto left wingers." He stood for the SRC as a Liberal and a member of the Christian Union. The Liberals were resurgent generally, and Eric was, in appearance, bearing, manner of speaking and ideas, similar to Margaret Thatcher, so successful in Britain: 'The Iron Lady of TUU politics'. After his appearance, the Liberals again became a force in Union politics.59

Virtually the opposite of Michael, Eric became a staunch opponent of his policies. He was particularly appalled with Michael's attitude to drugs and alcohol. The SRC would put on a barrel in front of the Ref; as Michael said, 'I considered that students getting roaring drunk in the bar sometimes allows them to get in there and say the things that they really feel deeply about, and quite often just the social reaction that takes place with a little bit of alcoholic lubrication in my opinion was a good thing'. Drugs were bought for the Union Ball: 'the money was allocated through the Activities committee, and the dope was purchased, and a whole set of people sat in the Board Room and rolled the numbers, which were then dropped on the ballroom floor when the lights were down during the dancing, and it was announced that someone had been dropping drugs on the floor while the lights were out'. The SRC voted money to the Cannabis Action Committee — 'it was very plain that the University itself knew we were very much pro cannabis' — and Michael was known to enjoy smoking dope; he addressed a rally supporting legalising marijuana. There was drama when the president of AUS arrived, and when Michael picked her up at the airport, they were both searched for drugs. (Nothing was found.) Those who did not believe in the drug culture opposed it. Michael once heard a noise outside his office, and saw Eric Abetz and several others kneeling there. 'What are you doing?' 'We're praying for you, Michael.60

Some problems surfaced. Lindsay Brown took the Union to court, but accepted an out of court payment. Some students owed Housing rent; Michael had a policy of allowing people not to finish their year's lease once exams were over. The Union paid outstanding rent, and Housing was losing money. The bar was, however, the main trouble. Monthly reports showed that far less money was coming in for beer than there should have been, beer income for April being 49% less than expected, and the bar was making heavy losses. Michael found that the computer bar was being turned off, and sacked the managers. A professional manager was appointed in July, and the bar started to show a profit.61

Losses from the bar threw out Michael's calculations; bar profit should have subsidised other services such as the Ref and housing. These enterprises were instructed to break even. Michael thought once profit started to appear, problems would be solved, but in the meantime, trouble loomed from another source.62

Michael and other students were opposed to some methods the Drug Squad used, such as students strip searched, doors kicked in. When Michael's house was searched, 'everybody in the house had dope, but it was all put down to me.' He was arrested, but with his knowledge of law 'I knew I was bloody safe as a house'. A couple of weeks later, a TCAE student told him he had been found in possession of cannabis and given an unsigned statement which said he had bought the drugs from Michael. He did not know Michael, 'just wanted to get out of it', and signed. Michael taped him telling his story. This happened on two further occasions, people who did not know him asked to sign statements saying they had bought drugs from him, and they too told their stories on tape.63

Michael was determined to tell this story, and wrote an article for Togatus, 'Is There Justice in Tasmania?', which accused three members of the Drug Squad of corruption, using material from the tapes as evidence. The men served a writ for libel, and an emergency SRC meeting stated its confidence in Michael, the Togatus editor, and the
Publicity and Publications chair. Eric Abetz was the only member to vote against the motion. Later he was complaining to a colleague, who said, 'If you think you've got the support, call a Union meeting.' 'How do I do that?' asked Eric. 'Look in the constitution.' So Eric called a meeting. 'In those days I stuttered and stalled at the microphone', but the meeting passed a motion condemning those who published the article, and instructing the SRC to apologise. It was the first Union Meeting Michael had been unable to sway, and at a second there were not enough votes to rescind the motion. People who voted against him said that their they did not think the article true, did not know, or thought people should not treat Togatus as a personal fiefdom and make allegations which, even if true, were defamatory and exposed the Union to legal actions. Michael described how he gave the tapes to his lawyer, who listened to them and passed them to the Solicitor General; he instructed the police to pick up the three officers named in the tapes, and dropped the case against Michael.64

Meanwhile, Michael was disgusted at the Union condemning him; his wife was expecting their first child so he felt he had to go back to work to support his family; and he could not remain president of a Union which had instructed him to apologise, and at the same time be a defendant in the court action. He resigned — Eric Abetz claimed just after assaulting him. Michael admitted the assault. 'I gave him an open handed cuff under the ear, I'd just had it. I'd wanted to do it for years. It would have been after the Union Meeting, I would have been in a state of high excitement and anger, because to me it was manipulation of forces pulled in from the colleges by Eric.' The SRC condemned such violence, but thanked Michael for the initiatives implemented during his term of office.65

Although Michael believes strongly that his financial plans would have come to fruition in 1978, others saw problems. He and Nick Sherry disagreed in Togatus, Nick claiming that the future of the Union was threatened and that it had already spent half of the next year's Union fees, Michael saying that carrying a $40,000 capital deficit was 'highly moral', and that deficits in running costs in the bar and housing were being rectified. From July there had been comments about the 'current adverse financial situation', and motions were passed to restrict spending. All enterprises were told they must break even, and there was concern about excess expenditure on the bar. The SRC was considering buying the Mt Nelson motel, and Ref prices were decreased, though the Union fee was to be increased.66

At the election held after Michael's resignation, there were a record seven candidates for president. The victor was Terry Ewing, who had been treasurer, but resigned because he did not agree with Michael's financial activities. Terry was an Economics student, not a member of a political party, and stood on a platform of financial responsibility. Sue Northeast was also elected, and remembered 'financial devastation. There was stunned disbelief in how anyone could run a bar and make a loss, with a captive audience. The bar was packed every night'.67

Terry said that prior to Michael being president, little was done. 'Michael knew that unless he did something, nothing would happen. He could confront it and do it'. He saw problems as arising from Michael's generosity and low prices, because students naturally wanted this — 'it was just what was going on federally'. As president, Terry found the financial position daunting, with the Union technically bankrupt, and the University discussing whether they should take over the Union's assets. He worked out that the union fee had to rise, which had to be approved by University Council; for this to happen, he had to give an undertaking that there would be proper financial control. 'I had no idea how I was going to do it.' One good thing, said Terry, was that 'the Liberal and Labor parties on the SRC decided that it wasn't their time, and let me get on with it. Politics had to take a back seat. People were running their own agendas too and several had their
careers in mind, and they didn’t want to run the Union at a difficult time. I got a pretty good ride’; or, as David Traynor said, ‘I let Terry get on with the show’. The editor of Togatus, though a Communist, also supported Terry, who was by no means left-wing.

Terry saw himself as a benevolent dictator, ‘and that’s what the Union needed’. Even a political opponent, David Traynor of the ALP, agreed: ‘I suppose that’s what you need when you’re sortiag out the finances.’ Terry cut the SRC’s financial allocation by half, which caused a bunfight — ‘it was the first time they realised what economics was all about’ — and members thought Terry was outrageously dictatorial, but the Union did make a profit. Other members thought Terry was rather blunt, but that he ran a tight ship, and ‘did a fantastic job financially’.

Over the Christmas holidays Terry looked at each area in turn, and made changes. He felt that the staff in the shop were not up to scratch, so dismissed them, hired a new manager, revamped the shop, and put in new stock. The Finance Committee asked him to justify refurbishing the shop: ‘I couldn’t, but it had to have a facelift’. Fortunately, the changes meant the shop did make a profit. Similarly, Terry dismissed the bar manager, closed the bar for a week while he found another, then ‘reopened with the right man in the right spot, and they could see the benefits’. The travel agent had paid no rent since August 1975, and this was rectified. The Ref received a revamp so that it was ‘more like a lounge room’, the quality of food was assured, prices rose somewhat, and there was increased turnover.

Like Michael, Terry was dissatisfied with some houses the Union was leasing. He refused to renew many leases and reduced the scheme to about thirty houses, with rooms for about 120 students, telling landlords they had to decrease their rents but they would get a guarantee that their rent would be paid. Soon Housing was running smoothly, though it was much smaller than in the past.

Activities had shrunk, but from March an activities officer was employed, and by the end of the year Activities were being hailed as the greatest success; ‘at long last students have once again become involved and can see their union fees used’. There were Wednesday Bar Nights, folk nights on Friday; five mainland artists, films, pottery classes, speakers, and dances, with the reputation of university dances and balls ‘improved beyond recognition’. The SRC also protested to the University against holding exams in swot vac and on Saturdays, censured the past president largely for acting on his own authority and not consulting the SRC, and stood firmly behind compulsory union membership. This issue arose because the Western Australian and Victorian governments were trying to bring in voluntary membership. Eric Abetz’ motion calling for voluntary unionism was discussed at a Union Meeting described as the best for years, with four hundred people and hot but rarely personal debate; VSU was rejected. In any case, the state Labor Government said it would not legislate to provide voluntary unionism.

At the June elections, Terry stood on his record. When he became president, there were record trading losses, disapproval from the University Council, a writ issued against the Union, Activities had collapsed, the SRC was criticised for allowing unauthorised expenditure, and there was a bank overdraft of $90,000. By April, there was a surplus in all trading areas. Terry was re-elected. Eric Abetz continued as a general rep, and commented that the atmosphere on the SRC was good; you could always have a cup of coffee or a beer with Nick Sherry and others, ‘and talk and joke about who won and why’.

Terry continued his policy in the second half of 1998, when trading enterprises continued to make a profit, and the Union ended the year with a surplus. The SRC supported a rally against cuts to education by the federal government, and this was successful; by now the TEAS allowance was only 58% of the poverty line.

Late in 1978 there was trouble over the Child Care Centre, which Terry handed over
to the University. His argument was that because so many places were reserved for students (42% were children of students), who only attended 32 weeks a year, the Centre was making a loss. The SRC, being mostly young single males, was not particularly interested in the Child Care Centre, and Terry felt that the Union should not be running it: it did not have the expertise, it could not afford to subsidise it, and child care was the responsibility of the government or the University. Student parents were annoyed and claimed that the SRC had ignored a Union decision to support child care, and dissatisfaction was expressed at a Union Meeting, but the handover went ahead. Once the Child Care Centre was taken over, the Union provided a subsidy for student parents.\footnote{77}

All in all, Terry presented the Annual Report with 'distinctly more pleasure than last year'. It had been a period of consolidation, and a record in that for the first time for many years the Union did not become involved in legal action of some kind. There had only been three Union Meetings, and results showed that the Union was prepared to accept compulsory membership, but not become involved in contentious moral or political issues, for example voting for no policy on abortion. The SRC had been diligent if fiery, and the 'intense bitterness' of 1977 had largely disappeared. Enterprises had a strict break even policy, $82,000 profit had been made, and for the first time for many years, no overdraft was necessary at Christmas. (Michael Munday wrote to Togatus saying that this profit was as he had planned.) In retrospect, Terry commented that he had an excellent executive. For the first time for years it included an Asian, Satwant Calais, who had great integrity. 'I called him Black Man and he called me White Trash, and we'd yell at each other up the corridor and the students would be horrified.'\footnote{78}" Unlike many SRC presidents, Terry did not go into politics; he is now a highly successful businessman. Several people commented that he was the first economic rationalist on the SRC.

The New Year brought trouble, however. When Michael Munday was working as executive officer he was paid a minimal salary, but in September 1978 the Union executive agreed that Terry should be paid a higher salary. After the Brown affair, the Industrial Commission handed down an order which imposed wages and conditions on every area of Union business, including the rate of pay of the executive officer. When the rest of the SRC realised the salary that Terry was receiving, they were furious that the executive had agreed to this without informing them. This story is difficult to disentangle as there are no SRC minutes; however, the upshot was that the executive all resigned. Terry commented that he did not see the political implications, Nick Sherry said the executive had to follow the Industrial Commission ruling, but should have told the rest of the SRC. Sue Northeast thought that if it had been asked the SRC would have agreed to the salary; it was the absence of information which upset them. Eric Abetz was appalled, and co-sponsored a motion with Graeme McCulloch, extreme left wing, to censure the executive, one of the few times they worked together. Sue Northeast was elected Acting President: 'I was perceived as not too extreme, socially acceptable. Safe.'\footnote{79}

This was only the first drama of 1979. Many aspects continued as before; Housing leased twelve houses and three flats; Activities continued lively, the SRC fought for longer library hours, as it had so often in the past. After the resignations there was an election, and Terry Ewing was re-elected, showing that students as a whole did not see him as culpable and had faith in his ability. The tickets were Labor or Open Government; Liberal; Uranium Group; and independents, including Terry and Andrew Wilson, the treasurer.
Student life continued despite politics: the Rugby boys chose this photograph to illustrate their section in a 1970s Yearbook.

Though the new SRC was Labor dominated, many Labor activists were not elected, like Graeme McCulloch and Harry Derkley, but newcomers included Eugene Alexander and Sue MacKay.

Students commented on the elections in Togatus. They voted for Terry because he had done a good job, or 'better the devil you know than the devil you don't'; for Open Government because they liked this idea; they didn't vote because they didn't like the candidates, or because 'students can never run anything'. Someone voted for the females because 'we need more women'. (Two were elected.)

The next drama was AUS secession. During the 1970s, AUS was dominated by extreme left wingers; the major officers were criticised in Togatus in 1976, for example, as freaky radical feminists or pseudo communists who lacked any real ideological base. There were also criticisms that AUS did nothing for students. In the early 1970s it had several success (abolition of tertiary fees, introduction of TEAS) but it had no success in increasing TEAS and was much concerned with international issues, such as supporting the Palestinian Liberation Organisation, where many students either disagreed or were not interested. In 1974 the SRC decided to pay AUS only $1 per student, not the $1.50 they demanded, and the Union's affiliation with AUS was questioned.

In 1977 AUS had problems, 'wallow[ing] in a miasma of faction fighting, financial disasters, secessions, political attacks, bad press and writs'. Its problems were made worse by the demise of AUS Travel, which many students thought the only real benefit it provided. In Hobart, Michael Munday commented that AUS was falling down in providing services, and questioned that the Union was getting value for the $10,000 it paid AUS. In hindsight, he said that AUS did nothing for students, and by its domination by the extreme left and its infighting, had created antagonism in the very people who would normally support it.

The next year AUS tried to mend matters, and its annual council saw nine twenty-hour days of 'motions, amendments, dissents, hysteria, boredom, caucusing, scapegoating, hilarity and enervating trauma'. Part of the hilarity came when Eric Abetz of Tasmania gave a talk at the Women's Forum about the oppression of men. 'It was very funny', he
recalled. 'They were so over the top, saying the mere fact of a man standing back to open a door was part of the oppression of women. I said that people hold doors open... to show respect. I was never afraid of saying what I thought’ — even attacking feminism in front of ‘freaky radical feminists’. In reaction, AUS Council considered discussing Tasmania under ‘international problems’. 

By now, students thought either that if AUS was dominated by the extreme left, ‘so what?'; that despite AUS’ problems, a national union was essential to fight for students’ rights — ‘they were doing a lot of ridiculous things, but the way to fix it was not to get out of it’ — or that students gained nothing from AUS. Liberal governments saw their chance to crush opposition, and partly due to their encouragement, more student unions seceded. By early 1979 even Labor stalwart Nick Sherry thought the TUU should secede, and Eric organised effective propaganda using the wilder motions AUS had passed, such as opposition to World Series Cricket (on the grounds that it was an attempt to turn a noble sport into a multi-national corporation), and supporting violence, by the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe. A rowdy Union Meeting voted against secession, but Abetz pushed for a referendum, in which the Union voted 58% to secede, despite the AUS president himself campaigning around the campus. So 1979 saw the end of Tasmania’s forty-two years of association with the national union.

With Eric as spokesman, the Liberals came back into prominence in these years, after a decade of lying low. ‘The Liberals wanted to identify with what they believed in, and being soft on lefties didn’t make them want to be involved’, he said. His support base was the Liberals themselves, the Christian Union, Catholic students, and the colleges, where ‘the students were young and red-blooded, and they didn’t take kindly to left wing propaganda. They were relatively easy to mobilise. If I talked about the referendum or the election, I needed 50% plus one of about 20% of students. So if I could command 10% support on campus, I’d win.’

Labor people were not happy about this, and reprimanded Eric when they could, several times for ‘scurrilous publicity seeking’. Eventually he was sent before the Discipline Committee for having brought the Union into disrepute, by saying the SRC used gutter tactics. It was the first time for years that the Discipline Committee had sat, and it contained an SRC member who had seconded the motion that Eric be disciplined. Eric attacked this, and also ‘got stuck into them on the issue of free speech’, and the case was dismissed.

In the 1979 Annual Report, Terry Ewing commented that finances were much better, though rising prices were a problem. The Ref, bar, housing and welfare were going well, but the real success, as in 1978, was Activities, which had seen bands big and local, three film festivals, barbecues, craft classes, speakers, and a ‘ripper’ of an Annual Ball, much enjoyed although the beer ran out. By this time, however, the Union had been reorganised, which makes a good stopping date for this chapter.

Over the decade there had been other activities. The atmosphere of the time meant that the colleges were widely seen as restrictive, and liberated students lived in flats. Jane Franklin Hall in particular had trouble with vacancies, and after a good deal of agonising and trepidation, decided to let in men. The move took root slowly and Jane remained female dominated for some years, but it was eventually successful. Meanwhile, Christ College also went co-ed. By 1979, however, the colleges were still in some difficulties.

Sport had a better decade. Traditional sports such as basketball, rowing, cricket, football, hockey, rugby, skiing, soccer, table tennis and badminton continued. Some sports faded, such as fencing; some came and went, such as volleyball and hang gliding, but other newcomers flourished, such as gymnastics, rock climbing, sailing, surfing, and the Asian sport of takraw. Women joined men in sports such as rowing. Many new sports, like

Sport was moving into recreational areas as well as team activities. The Recreation Officer superintends a bubble ball, 1977.
gymnastics, only took root after facilities were provided, and this was the main aim of the
Sports Council, which achieved the gymnasium and a sports pavilion, hockey grounds at
Olinda Grove on Mt Nelson, and better ovals and netball courts at the University. Because
the Union did not have this sort of money, finance had to come from the University and
the Australian Universities Commission, and because the University was not particularly
interested in sports facilities, 'we had to push them', said Bob Cotgrove, president for
years. Fortunately the vice-president, Jon Burns, worked in university administration and
was friendly with the Bursar, Graeme Briggs, who was sympathetic, 'so Briggsy would tee
up the University and Jon would report to the Sports Council'. The University also
employed a sports officer from 1975, and he assisted the Sports Council's aim of providing
not only for competitive sport but for recreational sport, so that more students could
participate. 90

Though there were many new universities and Tasmania was one of the smaller and far-
flung campuses, there were victories at inter-varsity in men's hockey and rowing, while
football, cricket and women's hockey won state premierships. As in past days,
misbehaviour was a problem (though women hockey players were praised for being good
humoured, helpful and courteous), and people questioned spending so much money on
sending teams to inter-varsity, 'more or less always regarded as a Bacchanalian festival'.
Inter-varsities, and the drinking competitions and other activities associated with them,
continued nevertheless.91

Clubs and Societies presented a less stable picture, as clubs came and went at a much
faster rate than with Sports. From 1973 to 1979, 91 clubs were affiliated, but only fourteen
lasted throughout the period. Six were faculty societies such as Engineering, but there
were also Labor and Liberal clubs, Old Nick (whom a premier threatened to sue for
defamation), Islamic, Malaysian Students, Photographic, Bridge, and a newcomer in 1973,
the Tasmanian University Music Society. Ephemeral clubs included left-wing groups such
as the Socialist Youth Alliance; environmental (Uranium Action); religious (Latter Day
Saints); music (Blues and STUF), national (Laotian), and undefinable societies such as
Goons, Monarchist, Apathy, Collegiate Association for the Research of Principle, and Pythagorean. There were minimal requirements to form a club, which could then get financial support, and a notable new club was the Aardvarks, ostensibly set up for the preservation of aardvarks but really for drinking. Its constitution stated that it had to dispose of one barrel per term minimum. In 1979 for example, the Aardvarks had a fact-finding mission to Maria Island, where people ate satay, drank beer and ‘discussed the plight of the aardvark’. Clubs and Societies’ funding was not meant to be spent on alcohol; instead it went to ‘catering’.

As usual, Clubs and Societies provided money, disaffiliated clubs which did not attend meetings, tried to stop clubs overspending, and tried to get more money from the SRC. Problems included what to do when two people each claimed to represent a club; dealing with a club alleged to be using extortion and blackmail to get money; and stopping the president addressing meetings as Gentlemen when there were women present.

Togatus was, as would be expected, inclined to the left during the 1970s. In 1973 the editor was Ian Sherrey, a strong environmentalist, and students were told a great deal about the iniquities of mining companies and nuclear power, and given advice about sex, growing your own dope, making carrot burgers, feminism, yoga, and music (it was the year of Nimbin). Togatus exposed corruption in state politics and the fishing industry, and criticised the Poisons Act as giving too much power to the police: it was the only media outlet in Tasmania to do so. There was criticism, however, that Togatus ignored university topics, though the editor told the SRC that local content was either not forthcoming or not publishable. Ideas of what was not publishable varied, and there was much indignant talk of freedom of speech when the printers refused to handle a graphic article about masturbation.

In 1974 Frances Bonner, the only female editor in years, promised to concentrate on university issues — the Teaching and Learning Centre taking away the students’ lawn, the tyranny of exams — but other topics loomed large; in Tasmania, the UTG and woodchips, and on the international scene, Watergate, Iran, feminism and the world-wide economic crisis. The first federal election where most students could vote brought out a great deal of election material, mostly, but not all, pro-Labor. The following year, Alban Johnson was a member of the Socialist Youth Alliance, and saw Togatus as a major weapon in the fight for student rights. He attacked imperialism, capitalism, arms sales, apartheid, the patriarchal family and US foreign policy, and in the University the appointment of a ‘shaky right-wing’ academic, and dull, unstimulating courses; the Ref was a better place to learn. Alban was criticised as having a ‘pathetic adulation of all things left’, and opposing the Liberal president Ryan, who unsuccessfully tried to sack him. His defence was that only left-wing groups bothered to submit articles. This was one of the years when those attacked, in this case a policeman, issued a writ against Togatus, which had to pay out.

Harry Onsman operated on much the same lines in 1976, telling students to write in if they did not want to read ‘Marxist-Trotskyist crap’. He preferred politics to culture or news; Togatus could not be unbiased, no paper was; but he tried to be fair, and he showed this by printing ‘unreadable articles’ about the Moonies (an idiosyncratic cult), because they were submitted by Union members. For once, a Togatus editor praised the number of contributions members produced, and that year’s Togatus was one of the most interesting, with Lucrezia Borgia back in fine form, and humorous/serious articles on Union, state and national affairs. Onsman offered to let groups have their own supplements, and religious groups, feminists and the Tenants’ Union did so. There was a feeling that Togatus should co-operate with the TCAE paper, Feral, and two issues of Feratus were published; but problems arose. Feral was larger that Togatus, there were writs out against it, and anyway there was a good deal of ill-feeling between the University and the TCAE, so co-
In 1974 Togatus published a board game for freshers, which shows what was seen by the Togatus staff as acceptable actions for students — joining Old Nick, proposing motion at Union meeting, leading protest against Ref prices, and so on, rising to the heights of being recognised by the Ref staff in the street.
In 1978 the Annual Engineers Commem Day Challenge Race was for home-made aeroplanes, which did not, fortunately, have to leave the ground. Pictured is the victorious Geology machine, which had a red and yellow body and wings, red tail and red and black propeller, and pilot Stanley in required flying suit.

The year 1977 brought several changes. Because of budget constraints, Togatus, which had been weekly, appeared much more rarely, with only ten issues that year and fewer in subsequent years. The editor, Chris Aulich, was mainly interested in literature, so Togatus was 'much more heavier'. Not only were there poems and short stories all year, from writers such as Tim Thorne and Geoff Dean, but Chris obtained a grant to produce a literary supplement, with contributions by sixteen well-known writers. There were the by now usual articles about the environment, drugs and politics, the latter two topics culminating in the article which accused three members of the Drug Squad of corruption, and led to Chris' departure.

John Lamp in 1978 was a communist, and had to work with the right-wing chairman of Pubs and Publications, Eric Abetz. John saw himself as the student voice, unlike past editors who had pontificated about the state of the Union and launched crusades, causing turmoil and dissatisfaction. Eric agreed: Togatus was going back to what it had been in the good old days, not the drug and Labor polemics of past years. At the end of the year John reported that he and Eric had surprised everyone, including themselves, by forming an effective team. Togatus was indeed interesting that year, with international, national, local and university issues aired fairly. The next year's editor, Mark Wolff, was another keen environmentalist, and featured feminism, civil liberty, unemployment and trade unionism, again in a fair way. He also provided useful articles, telling students how to run meetings and keep books. Overall, Togatus in the 1970s was likely to appeal to students. Long reprints from other papers were not so noticeable, and there were many interesting articles. Of course, editors had good material, with events in the Union, state and federal
politics and the new ideas of the period about the environment, feminism and so on; of all periods, the 1970s should have produced the most interesting student newspaper, so it is not surprising that it did so.

Despite all the activities of the 1970s, there was often a lack of interest in the Union, shown by the often small number of candidates standing for election, the many members elected unopposed, and the small number of voters. Several reasons have been proposed for this. One was the sometimes murky nature of student politics, which alienated and disillusioned many; several people said that events around the Ball of 1973 stopped their interest in politics. Another was, as several other people said, the very victory of students in achieving assessment not only by exams, but by continuous coursework. No longer could you bludge all year and swot madly for exams and pass; continuous assessment meant working more all year, with less time for other activities which might include the Union. Disillusion with often-criticised 'petty infighting' and factionalism on the SRC also caused apathy. But perhaps the heightened interest in previous years was the aberration; criticism of students' apathy was endemic through most of the Union's history.

One student showed apathy clearly in a letter to Togatus. Students were criticised for it, but the oppression of Russian Jews or Tibetans 'doesn't affect me or my pocket'; he or she lived comfortably on TEAS, did not have freedom infringed by ASIO or the KGB so police oppression was not a worry, held few views except on university subjects, and was only there to obtain a degree then a good job. 'Why should I care about other people's problems when they don't care about mine?' Who wanted to get involved in petty union politics? 'It's not my business, as long as I'm not interfered with.' So this student was only concerned with problems which directly affected him or her, a depressing view to idealists but one which was probably typical of many, perhaps most, students.

Apathy showed in two other in two areas. There were fewer rallies and protests; most were about TEAS, a matter vital to many students. Protests had no effect, and the value of TEAS declined. There were some smaller protests, and Eric Abetz recalled one where Labor students marched on the Liberal party headquarters. Only a few students arrived and they soon disappeared, put off by the many police cars in the street. They did not

The Engineers had won the race for years, so the Geology team is triumphant after the win. They are off to celebrate at the Kingston Hotel, where there were sculling races, eight ball and so much drinking that 'no one but the Geologists could remember who won'.

175
realise that the cars were waiting to be serviced at the police mechanic shop next door.\textsuperscript{102}

By now, riotous behaviour at Commem had also died out. Usually there was a chariot race on Commem day, though in 1978 an aeroplane race was held. Planes did not have to fly, but they had to have 16 square feet of wing, an aerodynamic tail, a propeller, three wheels, a braking system, a black box and a pilot in a complete flying suit. Not surprisingly, there were only three entries, from the more technical faculties of Geology, Engineering and Physics. The ‘Engies’ had won the race for years, but this time the Geologists were victorious.\textsuperscript{103} High spirits were also shown on Activities Day, often held at the end of third term, with egg throwing, car lifting and planking, in which teams of four used two planks like skis to cover a certain distance, often up stairs. Car lifting usually meant cramming as many people as possible inside a volkswagen; when the gun was fired, the people clambered out and carried the car to the finishing line.\textsuperscript{104} Scavenger hunts were also held; though students enjoyed these activities, their behaviour was usually acceptable to outsiders, and the only complaints noted were long-suffering neighbours of the Union Building saying there was too much noise in the bar.

Overall, from 1973 onwards there was not a great deal of activity as far as the outer world was concerned, and a great deal of internal confusion. However, the Union came through the vicissitudes of the 1970s intact, and did not run into the deep trouble of some unions on the mainland. This was some sort of triumph in itself. Nevertheless, problems in Tasmania had been severe enough for steps to be taken to minimise them, which meant change from 1979.
Chapter 10

Consolidation in the 1980s

Change came to the Union in the 1980s. It actually began in late 1979, when Bill Shelley arrived as administrative officer. An experienced businessman, Bill had reservations about students when he started. Many friends told him he would never be able to put up with them, but he found them ‘very good to work with’. They also grew to like Bill enormously, finding him easy to get on with, prepared to listen, with a good sense of humour. He identified with them rather than the University, which was remarkable, said Richard Flanagan, as Bill had more in common in age and outlook with university administrators. ‘It was an extraordinary achievement for a businessman in his sixties to have empathy with kids in their twenties. Bill became almost a cult figure.’ ‘You could never find a stronger supporter of students’, said Andrew Wilson. People praised Bill as a good administrator and hard worker, aiming to guide rather than push, and good with his staff. He was particularly interested in helping overseas students, and enjoyed flying their national flags on the Union flagpole. At the same time, he was so unassuming that when cleaners once refused to clean the toilets, he did the job himself.1

Gaining an administrative officer was not enough, and the president, Terry Ewing, said firmly in the 1979 Annual Report that reconstruction of the Union was needed. The SRC had shortcomings in trying to run Union finances, and the constitution was hopeless, hindering rather than helping. The SRC had been almost exclusively concerned with financial and administrative problems, now resolved; it was time to look at the Union’s structure.2

Many people had suggested how this could be improved, since inadequacies had become apparent in the mid 1970s. The old system of the SRC running the political aspects and the Union Building Management Committee running the trading areas had worked well, until students saw the Committee as wresting control away from them in the 1970s, and it was abolished. Should another such body be established? Should the Union be split into the Union itself and the SRC, as in most Australian universities? Who should have ultimate power? The University was worried about the ability of the Union to run its finances; opportunity for change came when the Union had to extend its facilities to cope with an influx of students (see below). The University said it would only guarantee a loan to pay for this if the Union was restructured.3

Tony Manley, involved in the Union since 1955 and now undergraduate representative on University Council, thought the Union should not be split, but needed the experience of professionals. He had liked the old system, and suggested a Board of Management with, as before, a mixture of students and representatives of the university and the Union administration, with students numerically dominant. The Board would run trading areas, Union staff and finances; the SRC would be in charge of matters affecting students, such as entertainment and politics. In 1980 an interim Board of Management was set up, and became permanent from the next year, when David Traynor and Andrew Wilson wrote a new constitution. Safeguards ensured student control, and in theory the SRC held ultimate authority, though in practice this lay with the Union executive, which made day-to-day decisions and ‘really ran the show’. It was accountable to both the SRC and the Board, as a further safeguard against an irresponsible president. Later, the Union said frankly that the Board of Management was instituted as a check on some of the excesses of the SRC. Changes to the regulations had to be approved by both the SRC and the
Students voting at a Union election, 1981.

Board, which 'slowed people up'; Activities and Overseas Students had higher status; and sexist language was removed, which appalled one of the professors on the Board.4

For the first year of the new era, Terry Ewing remained president, but he was disillusioned with the SRC. He thought the Union fee should be raised, but was overruled by those who argued that TEAS had not been increased so students could not afford to pay more. With part-timers paying pro rata, and decreasing student numbers, this meant the Union’s income was falling. Terry felt that the new SRC was dominated by the left; Togatus reported tension between Liberals, Labor, and Terry in the centre; and after two exhausting years as president, he did not stand for re-election in 1980.5

Student politics were at an all-time low, reported Togatus, and students’ lack of interest in the Union was shown when the president, secretary and treasurer were all elected unopposed. The new president, Peter Kaliniecki, had not sat on the SRC before. A leather-clad bikie and flamboyant, intelligent debater, he was the (vaguely) ALP candidate. The secretary, David Traynor, was moderate Labor, and worked well with the treasurer, Andrew Wilson, and vice-president, Sue Morrison née Northeast, another ALP member. They aimed to provide more services and competent government.6

This trio really ran the Union during this year, as Peter was ‘in for the fun of it’ and not interested in administration, and annoyed the rest of the executive by not attending important meetings, such as University Council. Andrew and David even asked him to resign, and Sue often represented the Union at university committees. Then alcohol disappeared from a union function, and was found under Peter’s bed, so a court case eventuated. Peter had not stolen the alcohol and was acquitted — what a pity to destroy the legend, said Togatus, but even Peter could not drink forty wine casks and 23 gallons of beer — and he finally resigned when an SRC meeting clashed with the Bathurst 1000. He went to work at the Purple Flamingo nightclub in Zanzibar, and David Traynor became president, elected unopposed.7

David, secretary then president, and Andrew Wilson, treasurer then president, dominated the Union for four years, 1980–1983. Though David was a member of the ALP and Andrew was independent, they worked together well. Both were ‘trying to do the right thing by the student body and act responsibly’, said Bob Cotgrove. David was ‘a responsible social democrat’, and Andrew had entrepreneurial flair and a good grasp of
issues; 'a delight to work with, with Terry [Ewing’s] good financial management, but had
a bit of charisma... you couldn’t help but like Andrew', said Sue Morrison. Andrew said
that he had seen the Union being run very politically and felt it was not financially well
managed, and that he could help turn this round. Terry Ewing had started this process,
but more was needed. Togatus said that under these two presidents, the Union went from
a rather disreputable affair to a businesslike powerful organisation recognised as caring
for students."

Andrew and David were helped by the fact that successive SRCs contained few extreme
members. This was typical of the 1980s, said David, when ‘everything came into the
middle’, and Togatus complained that too many candidates were moderate. What
happened to ‘good old fascists and commies’? And there was not enough hair on
candidates — what happened to the student stereotype? Only Andrew looked radical, ‘or
his beard does’.19 Andrew said that his SRC was fairly evenly divided between Labor and
Liberal, and issues were often decided on the votes of the three or four non-aligned
members. He felt it was an advantage to have a non-aligned president. On many issues,
such as longer library hours, the SRC was united; generally it was not polarised, and
though there was ‘stirring’ there was no bitchiness, recalled David.11

Andrew aimed to re-organise the finances. Intelligent and an excellent manager, he
was so competent that for the only time in its history, the Union was able to reduce the
Union fee, to $100 then $95. Taking inflation into account, this was half what it had been.
The reduction appalled some members of the University Council who thought you should
never reduce fees, recalled Andrew, but he argued that with the Union run more
efficiently it could afford to do so. He wanted to have the lowest union fee in Australia,
but Western Australia were bequeathed a large sum and reduced theirs further. With Bill
Shelley’s help, Andrew redirected the manner in which the Union raised its funds, with
the aim of making the Union self-sufficient. Services were used for the whole year, and
revenue-producing services were boosted, so that for example the Ref moved into
catering. By the end of Andrew’s term, only about 20% of the Union’s funds came from
Union fees.10

The question of services was made more urgent because of a growth in student
numbers. In 1981 some areas of the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education moved to
the north, but some amalgamated with the University, either moving down the hill or
remaining at the Mt Nelson campus. Amalgamation brought the Union a thousand new
members, and meant services had to be expanded. Mt Nelson had had poor services, so
the Union started a cafeteria, photocopying, a bank and other services, and at Sandy Bay
extended the Union Building. All this work, not particularly interesting to the average
student, meant endless committee meetings. There were still complaints from Mt Nelson
of neglect, probably partly justified: as one SRC member, Steve Price, said, ‘It didn’t make
any difference when we amalgamated with the TCAE. We ignored them’.12

There was also work in Housing. Hytten Hall had closed in 1980, so college
accommodation decreased to 526 beds for an increased population of about 5000
students. Accommodation was short, and the Union Housing scheme grew from 90 beds
to 180 in 1981.13

As would be expected under competent direction, the trading enterprises ran well.
The bar made a profit, the shop extended its services and included a post office, the Ref
continued to serve good cheap meals. One of many smaller services was a TUU diary; the
legal referral centre was resurrected; the Union history was written.14 A long-term
development plan was formed, something new for the Union, and the first items were
implemented, such as setting up a second Printing Department to produce Togatus and
other publications.15
Activities had a varied career. In 1980 'the road was a bit rough... things just didn’t run smoothly'. Alcohol disappeared, few people came to the ball, and Activities had an image of being run by ratbags. The next year, Andrew Butler arrived from Mt Nelson as the Union’s first full-time Activities Officer. Concerts had been held in the Upstairs Ref, but when someone noticed the pillars downstairs moving another venue had to be found, so the Activities Centre was enlarged to hold 1500 people. With this excellent venue, 1982 was an extremely successful year with national bands such as Midnight Oil and Cold Chisel, and the Union became known as the major rock promoter in Hobart. There were dances and films, and Activities stated proudly that the year had run smoothly financially, 'without any outrageous failures'. There were problems, however: someone sold bootleg tickets for the Cold Chisel concert, the crowd of two thousand was far too many, Government departments cracked down and ordered expensive improvements. There were other activities — Togatus commented that in earlier years radical feminists would

'Chisel at the TUU!!!' runs the caption. Cold Chisel was one of the best known bands in Australia in 1982.
have turned the hose on Andrew when he held a wet T-shirt competition — but on the whole 1983 was not a great year. Forged tickets were sold to a Theatre Restaurant evening so genuine patrons missed out on dinner; the Ball lost $6000 and was called an outdated concept, and even Togatus thought a wine-cask drinking competition tasteless. (The winner downed the cask in 59 minutes.) By mid-year, Activities was in debt.

The Union was more active in standing up for causes involving students, though the executive realised that the days of mass mobilisation were over when they worked out that if they did hold a mass mobilisation, only ten people would come. Other ways of protesting were found. TEAS was a problem; in three years the allowance stayed the same and the cost of living rose by 34%, so the Union held a soup kitchen to underline students’ poverty. TEAS was increased, but the maximum was still below the poverty line. Fees were introduced for international students then those undertaking second degrees, and the Union ran low-key protests: there was not a great deal of student support, as most were not affected. Restrictions on eligibility for TEAS, and a loans scheme — meaning students started their careers in debt — saw more protest. A Union Meeting condemned these measures, and the SRC set up a Student Action Committee which held a fortnight of activity. This had little effect, said one of those involved, Alan Shaw, but it did introduce some young students to campus politics. Then the government cut general university funding. The Union held a strike and negotiated with the Staff Association about cancelling classes, gaining some support. A succession of speakers addressed students in the Activities Centre, and there was a good response. ‘We looked busy and responsible’, commented Sue Morrison; however, there was no result.

Meanwhile, local conditions also brought protest. In 1980 the state government announced that not all bonded Education students would be employed; students protested and the decision was reversed. In 1982 the issue blew up again. A student committee was formed to fight and achieved a partial victory, and the government even told the Union it ran a most effective campaign, but the issue continued. Eventually the battle was lost, as the Education Department stopped providing studentships for trainee teachers, after fifty years. In retaliation, the SRC ‘sacked’ the government minister concerned from his position as patron of the Union. This generated much publicity. The Union did succeed, through a ‘study-in’ (students remaining in the library after closing hours: they could not in fact study because the staff turned the lights out) in persuading the university library to extend its hours; but as David Traynor said on the radio, ‘It’s not Vietnam War stuff’.

Students were more fired-up over environmental issues: the Liberal government was pressing ahead with dams, seen as destroying wilderness, and protesters, including many
In 1983 the Liberal Club invited Robin Gray to speak at the Stanley Burbury Theatre. Over a thousand students used this as a chance to protest against Gray’s policies, particularly against building more dams.

students, blockaded access to the construction site on the west coast. The Union was not involved, but in 1983 the Liberal Club invited the premier, Robin Gray, to address students. A newspaper article quoted Bill Shelley as saying there were rumours that eggs and tomatoes would be thrown at Gray, and students would be violent. Shelley denied saying this, and Togatus exposed a member of the Liberal club as the fabricator. In the event there was no violence, though over a thousand students came to hear Gray; he spoke competently, but the vast majority of the crowd was against him.20

Voluntary student unionism was a major issue from 1980. Liberals resented the fact that student unions were often dominated by Labor and protested against Liberal policies, so pushed for voluntary membership, which would destroy student unions as they would not have funds to continue. Their argument was that unions did not provide worthwhile services, and compulsory membership was undemocratic; the opposition argued that unions did provide important services and that, because attendance at university was voluntary, union membership was voluntary.21

In 1980 the state Liberal opposition introduced voluntary unionism in parliament, but were defeated after heated debate. In 1983, under a Liberal government, the issue surfaced again. Voluntary unionism was never popular among students, and candidates in favour did badly in elections; Liberal students failed to get it accepted at the Union AGM and lost a power struggle on the SRC. The government announced that it would introduce it, but University Council backed the Union, and persuaded the government to set up a form of voluntary unionism: students could opt out of membership, but still had to pay the fee, renamed the Services and Amenities Fee. Few students took this alternative, only 55 students in 1985, for example. Both Council and government praised the Union for its sound financial management in recent years, and said they strongly supported the Union. Togatus reported that some students thought the Union had sold out, but if the Union had not been willing to compromise, parliament could have destroyed it.22

As the end of the Traynor-Wilson period approached, they were praised: the Union was more efficient, providing some of the best facilities in Australia for among the lowest fees. Andrew had done more for the Union than anyone else, said Togatus. He had calmly and
conscientiously worked at making the Union a worthwhile organisation. Andrew himself said he had tried to build up the Union’s resources: now, if students wanted something to happen, they had the resources to do it. In a media article, he stated that the main aim of the Union was to cater for the non-academic needs of students. There were few problems, though there was the criticism which frequently comes to an efficient body: dullness. ‘The worst they said was that I was boring’, said David. ‘I was doing boring things [like rewriting the constitution], and I had short hair.’ As often happened when the Union ran business enterprises efficiently, Togatus thought that it was too much concerned with business instead of the interests of students. Some criticism came because Andrew was older (twenty-eight), conventional and responsible, not a dashing leader, and there were complaints about the student body being apathetic and egocentric under the “middle-aged” Old Guard. Bob Cotgrove thought Andrew was regarded with suspicion by some because he was willing to compromise to get results. ‘The radicals had gone, and it was all about responsibility and management being accountable.’ There were no scandals for, as Steve Price said, Andrew ‘was the sort of guy you don’t have scandals with’.21

In the 1983 elections there were, for a change, three candidates for president, and one was a woman, the first in decades. She ran as an independent and there was also a candidate from the Wilderness Society, but the winner was an archetypical dashing student leader, Richard Flanagan. A PhD History student, Richard had already been in the news for trying to paddle a canoe across Bass Strait. His New Labor group promised to turn the Union from ‘a creche for the social autistics of this campus, a mecca for those possessing nothing in common with fellow students... a pack of posturing political eunuchs’ to a body which acted for students — even then it was noted that Richard had the ability to ‘turn a phrase’.25

Richard had not sat on the SRC before and had, he said, the traditional contempt for the Union, which was seen as dull. ‘We were a pretty lively generation... it was a great time to be young.’ It was the height of Green activism; Labor had just been elected federally; there were exciting times in youth culture, with big bands, punk rockers, and rebellion against the establishment; there was euphoria, a fresh spirit. Richard and his team had ‘the absurd ambitions of the young. We wanted to politicise students on issues that mattered to them’. Activism was successful — blockaders had stopped the dam on the Franklin River — and ‘things seemed possible’. Richard was ‘the last breath of the 1970s’, said Tony Ryan: idealistic, determined not to be seduced by the establishment, colourful, flamboyant. ‘Exactly the right person for the TUU’ said his secretary, Alan Shaw; ‘what the Union was about — high profile, assertive, exciting’, said his Activities Officer, Charles Touber.35

Richard headed a New Labor ticket, New because he felt that the state Labor party was discredited by building dams. New Labor was influenced by the Green movement and by the Italian Communist party, especially by their theatre of politics, holding big spectacles. ‘We wanted to link culture and politics, make cultural events political to raise consciousness.’ Communism had little influence: one SRC member was Charles Bound, son of a well-known Communist, who thought New Labor should be the vanguard of the proletarian revolution, ‘and we weren’t’. New Labor’s slogan was ‘Students First’. Most New Labor members had not been on the SRC before, which gave them a fresh approach, ‘more in tune with the student body’.37

Richard proceeded to show that the Union ‘really does work for students’, and ‘revitalised support and enthusiasm [with] bold and imaginative initiatives’. He introduced free dental and optometrical checks, and a second-hand clothes and book shop run by St Vincent de Paul; he tried to set up a health food shop, but this proved too
expensive. The unisex hair salon planned by the former regime opened. Cheap word processing was organised for students, in conjunction with the University. A weekly market was started where students could sell their products. When the Art School moved to the Jones and Co. building on the wharf, the Union started a cafeteria and social space for students, and tried to set up a tavern, but this was defeated by local hoteliers.28

The SRC realised that without a national voice, students were not in a strong position. Richard visited mainland student activists in Melbourne, but found them, depressingly, torn apart by Labor factional politics. As a step towards a new national body, the Union formed a joint organisation, the Tasmanian Union of Students, with other tertiary students.29

Activities were moribund, and Richard was determined to ‘put fun back into the campus’. The Activities Officer reported that Richard ‘put the knuckles on the accountant’, and money was found for many functions, from international comedy acts and national rock bands to ‘happenings’ on the Ref steps on Friday afternoons. Most popular were multi-entertainment nights, where several activities happened simultaneously, such as rock band concerts, a revue in the bar, videos and films, and almost a thousand people would turn up. They ‘put the Union at the centre of popular culture in Hobart’. As well, Richard revived Orientation Week, which had almost died out. To provide venues, the SRC undertook a building programme — extending the bar, the Activities Centre, and the shop. Bill Shelley and Richard were not impressed with each other at first — ‘the hippie punk greenie type’ and the conservative businessman — but once they realised that both wanted to help students, they worked well together, developing a deep affection which remained strong until Bill’s death.31

The new SRC pressed for academic reforms, such as anonymity in exams, and opposed students having to have their essays typed. To make themselves more accessible, they held ‘bar afternoons’ where students could talk to them in the bar. ‘The Union burns with excitement’, reported Richard, and even a Liberal opponent acknowledged that he had succeeded in injecting life and vitality into the Union.32

At the same time Richard, a History student, was conscious of the past, and the SRC
tried to imbue students with a sense of the Union’s history, displaying old photos, and naming rooms after former luminaries. There were other reminders of the past. Richard said he had never heard of the Orr case, but as soon as he became president he never stopped hearing about it, and people tended to pride themselves that the shadow the Orr case had cast over the University had finally lifted. This was not the case: Suzanne Kemp, the student in the case, tried to re-enrol and was blackbanned by the Union, showing that a good deal of sympathy still existed for Orr, or, alternatively, opposition to the university administration.

All this achievement was not entirely easy. Richard told Togatus that as ‘none of us knew the system’ they pushed too hard initially and their actions were misinterpreted as dictatorial, whereas they were only ‘well-meaning idealists who weren’t playing the game in the manner people had in the past’.

The main controversy involved Togatus. Later editors said that in 1983 Togatus was more scandalous and political than before, but the real problem for Richard was that another candidate for president was on the Togatus staff, and he felt Togatus was too biased against him. He attacked it: weekly publication meant inferior work was published; better editing and layout were needed; Togatus was run by an elitist clique with little student content and was overly critical of the Union. ‘We did not want to control Togatus as we believed in editorial independence, but we did expect that the parameters we did set would be adhered to’, wrote Alan Shaw, and the SRC agreed to suspend Togatus and reform it. Both Richard and Alan later admitted that this was a mistake. Togatus gathered support on the principle of free speech; the staff put out an underground edition defending themselves; the SRC put out its own similar bulletin; and a Union Meeting reversed the SRC’s decision and reinstated Togatus.

A Committee of Enquiry was set up and in 1984 Togatus became a larger, less frequent publication under Tony Ryan, who had edited the TCAE’s Feral successfully in the 1970s. At Richard’s suggestion, Tony was made senior editor with two talented students as his assistants. Tony was ‘very left’ but willing to listen to anyone, and Richard praised the way he lifted the standard of Togatus. He was, however, ‘fearless’. ‘It was open season on women at the time’, said Tony: they had been treated harshly by the courts, and it looked as if a man who had strangled a woman would be let off. Tony printed a short article. On legal advice he had the column overprinted with black slabs, and, said Richard, in the Ref the next morning ‘all the Togatuses were gone and the entire Ref was holding it up to the light trying to read it — you could read what was blacked out’. On his office desk were two writs for defamation: the matter was finally settled out of court almost two years later.

An article in the Mercury in 1984 commented that students were bringing politics back on the agenda. Richard, Tony Ryan at Togatus and Richard’s protege for president, Andrew Scott saw deficiencies in student radicalism of the 1960s. It was seen as romantic idealism, but was really based on self interest, such as not wanting to be conscripted. Contemporary students were not interested in questions like divisions between Maoists and Trotskyites, but in fundamental and pragmatic issues of social justice such as inadequate living allowances and housing. The erosion of living allowances and education funding, and the uselessness of protest about this, had led to a defeatist spirit, but a new militancy was emerging, as shown in the campaign about student housing. Why be interested in repression in Bolivia when you can see repression in Australia? asked Richard.

He was involved in several protests. The first was against cutting studentships for student teachers. An effigy of the premier was burnt on the Ref steps, as a flamboyant media event, but students did not support the rally well, and the press focussed on the effigy and the free beer. Richard said he learnt from this that ‘just because we thought
something mattered, we wouldn’t get automatic support'. The next cause was a law which gave the same penalty for being caught with equal amounts of either marijuana or heroin. This time the SRC built up student interest with articles in the press then held the rally, which was much more successful. The law was changed.

Housing was a problem, and once again the SRC roused interest with publicity, giving the media photos of a student living in a cardboard box. The student actually wanted to live there, but the photos were effective in building up sympathy, a rally was successful, and Richard obtained a large grant from the state government for student housing, which was used for buying houses and provided sixty new places. A huge achievement, commented Alan Shaw.37

The Union also supported the establishment of an Equal Opportunities Officer, and contributed to the establishment of sexual harassment complaints procedures. Overall, the odd hiccup was far outweighed by the success of Richard's many initiatives, and there was widespread pleasure when he was chosen as Rhodes Scholar. It was thought poor that opponents censured him for not attending the SRC meeting on the night of the announcement.38

Despite his success, a month before his term expired, Richard resigned. There was division on the SRC, and Labor was ‘rolled’ for extravagance by Liberals and independents, who criticised Richard for not observing the rules of procedure. Richard resigned, saying he did not feel it worthwhile to advocate progressive and beneficial policies to find himself obstructed through vanity and jealousy. Later, he said that he realised that as president 'I was no good at politics — I didn’t have a political bone in my body... I wanted to crash through or crash, and that’s not how student politics works'. He saw himself as a failure, but others say that under his presidency the Union was regarded nationally as one of the leading student bodies. In Tasmania, said his successor Kim Loane, Richard was regarded as having stirred up many activities and encouraged ‘a lot of good stuff’.39

Elections were held, with every position contested for the first time in decades. There were four candidates for president: Liberal, Labor, Socialist and independent. Andrew Scott, Labor, was defeated for president by Kim Loane, independent, who had been president of the student club at Jane Franklin but had no Union experience. He saw himself in the same mould as Andrew Wilson, offering steady, financially sound
government. Andrew Scott commented that his own policy that the SRC should be a rubber stamp for executive decisions ‘went down like a lead balloon’ and Kim deserved to win, as he ran a good campaign.40

In 1985 the Union handbook described the Union. The SRC was its pivotal body; its failings were ‘legion and legend’, it was the home of personal vendettas, political dealing and puerile political games, but when it did throw its weight behind an issue, such as housing, it was very powerful. The Board of Management was often seen as reactionary, but was more progressive than the SRC; however, it rarely went against an SRC initiative. To implement change, you had to overcome enormous inertia — reform in the Union ‘has been described in similar terms of difficulty as pushing Mt Wellington around’ — but it did occur. Kim was an approachable president. The bar held fabled Friday night rages and had the cheapest and most outrageous drinks in Hobart; the Ref was good value, a ‘mystical shrine dedicated to talk’; the hairdresser catered for all tastes, from the coiffured heads of the Ref ladies to the carefully cut Che Guevara beards of posing militants; the Sound Lounge provided refuge from the hard realities of the University; the Law School’s free legal referral service was popular with students; Activities threw lavish entertainment nights. Many other services were described, and a supplement for women encouraged female students to report any discrimination or harassment and to stand for the SRC, because of 28 student representatives on various boards, only five were women.41

Several people commented that it would be difficult for anyone to follow Richard Flanagan, and Kim himself said he was less favoured on the SRC because he was less spontaneous and exciting. Inevitably he was seen as right wing, commented Tony Ryan, but in fact he was ‘dead centre’, and not political. Richard left a legacy of greatness, said Kim, but also debt for his projects, and spending had to be curtailed; but the SRC and especially the executive recognised this, though the strong Labor contingent on the SRC sometimes pushed for more spending on welfare. Critics said this meant that the SRC was weak, and power passed to the Union staff and the Board; others said the SRC was not too polarised; Kim thought his SRC well balanced. Alan Shaw, Labor, said Labor members felt that Kim had won the election fairly, and ‘most of us were more than happy to work with him... he was a really nice sort of guy’, though he had problems in that he had little experience or vision in the Flanagan style. Anna Campbell, also Labor, thought opposition was not so much to Kim but to the ‘barefoot hippie’, the most radical member, who ‘made us debate for eight hours on whether we would send a letter to the UN
condemning the Russian invasion of Afghanistan'. There were complaints when the SRC passed such motions: critics said that not all students agreed on these topics, nothing could be achieved, and it lessened the SRC's credibility as they had no power to do anything.42

A major topic, recalled Kim, was university fees. When Fraser was Liberal prime minister there was always the fear that he would re-introduce them, but he did not. In 1985 the Labor government did. It took everyone by surprise, consumed everything, and was the one topic on which the SRC was united. Kim and his SRC worked hard to oppose fees, writing a report on their impact, holding a rally, and lobbying. He was disappointed in the support from students; 'there was a general perception that it wasn't going to happen', and besides, the introductory level was small, only a $250 administration fee.43

There was also a demonstration against the Poisons Act, which increased police powers to an extent many people found unacceptable. The Union obtained representation on the Professorial Board and the appointment of university Ombudsmen, and dealt with a housing crisis. Kim bundled the vice-chancellor into his old car and took him for a tour of 'a derelict building the university rented as student accommodation... so he could see how disgusting it was'.44 A great achievement was that Adelaide University ran a survey which found that Tasmania's Ref was the cheapest university cafeteria in the country, with every item below the national average. Coffee, for example, cost 40 cents a cup, a real bargain. These prices were possible because catering activities subsidised student prices.45

Two SRC members, Jo Blows and her partner Rick Shaw, were keen to put out an Alternative Handbook, with students' views on courses and lecturers. Kim was not so enthusiastic, but 'we went through with it', and it was extremely successful; an example, said Kim, of something only a few people wanted but which everyone eventually praised. It was criticised as being written from a small sample (238 questionnaires), and some academics threatened to sue or thrash Charles Toubier, president when it appeared, but it was 'eagerly snapped up', and it was appreciated by the university administration. It
showed that students judged on serious rather than frivolous attributes. Generally, only esteemed lecturers were mentioned, praised for being brilliant, approachable, witty or interesting, though some others were criticised as dull, bombastic or confusing. Comments varied from: ‘Don’t miss her lectures — go along and be inspired and watch how she in turn learns from her students’ (Margaret Scott), to ‘Not too many years pass without a student petition being passed in about this lecturer. It’s a disgrace to the Department’, about possibly the most detested lecturer in the University. As ever, Education received ‘total condemnation’ as being appalling, ‘incredibly bad’, ‘a hotchpotch’, ‘a gross waste of money’.41

The 1987 Alternative Handbook used far more surveys (1340) and rated many staff out of five. Marks ranged from 1.0 to 4.8. The Handbook makes an interesting and witty read; moreover the detested lecturer of the year before had ‘packed himself off to a redoctrination camp’, so perhaps it was having an effect. In 1988 a number of lecturers were rated higher than before, and even the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee Working Party reported that student evaluation of teaching was valuable.42

Because from 1985 the SRC remained in office until the end of the year, Kim Loane’s SRC was in power for eighteen months. The start of 1986 saw another varied SRC in power. The president was Charles Touber, who had already been Activities Chair under Flanagan. Independent but a member of the Labor Party, handsome and dashing, Touber sang in the band ‘The Fabulous Beagles’ and had brought great verve to his position; Pimp reported that the rest of Activities ‘reckon they’re sick and tired of prize-women off Charlie Touber’. Charles ran on an Independent ticket under the slogan ‘Students Not Factions’, and encouraged prominent students to run with him. He wanted to raise the Union’s profile, make it relevant to students, and give it a position in the community. His Independent ticket did so well that he had supportive SRCs with little infighting, which gave him a chance to achieve his aims. On his election, he said that after a quiet year, the Union was held in contempt and he wanted it to gain credibility and clout. Alan Farrer was administrative officer, Bill Shelley having retired, and Charles reported that the Union was well run, with SRC meetings more productive than before, discussing issues pertinent to students. Unlike some administrators, Alan ‘didn’t feel threatened by students running the policy side of things, and respected the separation of powers... He didn’t get involved in personalities’.43

The year started well, with Charles, a born performer, making Orientation Week a great success. The first multi-entertainment night saw eight live bands, videos, films and comedians. Activities continued to be successful, with excellent bands such as Painters and Dockers; after Charles’ two years as president he became Activities Officer and continued to organise a great range of functions.44 But Charles had ideas far beyond revitalising Activities. Finances were in a healthy state and he was determined to expand services.

At the start of 1986 the Union was plunged into an accommodation crisis, caused, said the Union, by the university administration — ‘has it lost its mind?’ Accommodation was in short supply generally and for years there had been crises in March when students could not find flats, but it was worse in 1986 because the University had been heavily recruiting students from the mainland and telling them that cheap accommodation was available. The Union housing scheme had a waiting list of 188, and the University had to put up sixty of its recruits in hotels, while a letter campaign to householders pleaded for beds. The Union was alone in Australia in running its own housing scheme, which had grown to 260 students. Once the immediate crisis was over in 1986, the scheme was overhauled and improved, to try to solve the long-term problem, and March 1987 saw the first ‘non-crisis’ in housing for many years. The Union wanted to set up an International
House for more accommodation and applied for Bicentennial funding, but did not receive this.\textsuperscript{50}

Child care was another problem, with the Union ‘inundated’ with requests in 1985 as the university child care centre did not have enough space. Despite university opposition, the Union hired a house and set up a child care co-operative, run by the Activities Officer with parent help. In 1986 the house merged with the Family Day Care scheme. Another achievement was a condom vending machine: these were illegal in public places, but one was installed anyway, on the argument that this was common sense and needed to be done.\textsuperscript{51}

The Union also established a hire service for tools, appliances and camping equipment, and condom vending machines; began (so it claimed) a loan scheme and a legal referral service (both started several times before); opened a non-smoking area in the Ref; kept pushing for anonymity in exams, which the Professorial Board was reluctant to grant; and set up a health food shop. An increasing number of students sought aid from the Union, possibly because increased publicity made its services better known: the Union had a weekly hour on radio and regular features in the \textit{Mercury} and \textit{Examiner}, as Charles wanted to take the Union to the community. Although the university administration was unenthusiastic about some of these ideas, Charles said the Union had a productive relationship with them.\textsuperscript{52} (They could hardly criticise the Union on financial grounds, having spent $90,000 on a new logo which did not prove successful, and $9 million on renovating the Centre for the Arts, which served five hundred students.\textsuperscript{53})

Despite having Labor affiliations, Charles had stood as an independent, saying he would run an apolitical SRC. There were some complaints that the Union did not make political pronouncements and was too conservative, but Charles said that in areas such as Reagan’s Middle East policy the Union could have no tangible input. He believed the SRC should deal only with issues affecting students, and the SRC had passed a motion agreeing to this. It was, however, an organ of positive change, and in this way the most radical and militant ever, pursuing progress and reform. SRC members were responsible representatives and not doctrinaire poseurs. Money should be used now, not ferreted away. With these views, Charles was the heir of former activists like Richard Flanagan: use money

Charles Touber with the winner of the chariot race, who very sensibly wore a wet suit for the occasion.
now, provide services, and do so with energy and enthusiasm. He was different from Richard, however, in that he ‘wasn’t as brave, or confronting. I had more of a lobbying approach’. Richard commented that ‘Charlie captured the spirit of the age, and gave people what they wanted’.54

The fight against tertiary fees continued, with the first, a $250 administration fee, introduced in 1986. Charles said there were three alternatives: to do nothing, which was unreasonable; to boycott the fee altogether, which he did not think would gain enough support to work; or to urge students to defer paying the fee until as late as possible, to make students’ point of view known. This was most successful, with 80% of students cooperating (though many would probably have done this anyway). The Union held a colourful wake for the corpse of free education, with students dressed in academic gowns conducting a service round a coffin.55 One small Union could not do much on its own, however, and this inspired Charles to act to form a national union.

AUS finally died in 1984. Alan Shaw, Labor, attended its last conference, expecting to be educated in how ‘real’ campus politics were run, but found it ‘a revelation... how not to do things... their inability to actually do anything and what was really surprisingly immature political skills was a huge surprise. I went back to TUU thinking that being able to discuss something with, say, Tim Stops or Donald Morris [Liberals] over a quiet beer or game of 8 ball was a much more effective way to achieve something’.56

Kim Loane was one of six Tasmanian delegates to attend a national student convention later that year, but described it as ‘a bitter, destructive faction fight... what I got into in Hobart was nothing beside the national scene — it was a real eye-opener’. It was divided into extreme left (25%), left Labor (35%), right Labor (20%), Liberals (14%), extreme right National Civic Council (8%) and Independents (8%), with no hope of agreement. These seemingly insoluble problems were overcome, and Charles was praised as the prime-mover in establishing the National Union of Students in 1987. He did this mainly by using his flair for publicity to stress that ‘the student movement shouldn’t consist of disparate tribes contradicting each other’, and that students needed a national voice.57

Charles, the whole executive and others, a total of ten SRC members, were re-elected
unopposed for 1987, and more new moves resulted. A Disabled Grant Scheme provided the disabled with money to offset their additional costs in attending university, and was copied by other unions. A weight loss and fitness programme tried to improve students' health. The Union Building was extended, and the sports pavilion, a project which had been languishing for years, was finally achieved by the University and the Union. After a referendum showed overwhelming student support, 'five years of battle' concluded with anonymity in exams achieved, when the Professorial Board had to agree in the face of rational argument and strong student support. Even the SRC minutes were written in an informal style which encouraged people to read them. Moreover, all this was achieved with fiscal restraint, and the treasurer congratulated portfolio holders: no area had exceeded its budget by an unacceptable amount. Even Publications and Publicity approached its budgeted figure, for 'the first year in living memory'. Part of the reason for financial success was that the services and amenities fee now stood at $145, a considerable rise from $95 in 1983, but still among the lowest in the country.58

By mid-1987 the Union claimed that it had transformed itself from an irrelevant political debating club to an apolitical organisation committed to giving value for money, and had done much to eradicate traditional apathy and gain support from its members. Charles commented that he had finally come to understand the machinations of university politics, which were 'not as sinister as people make out', although there was much white-anting and criticism, but this was a hazard of the job. There were compensations: he told an amusing story of a senior university bureaucrat turning up drunk to inspect the child care facility. Charles led him up a slippery slope, and he fell into a muddy pool and was unable to get out. Charles commented that he did receive criticism, especially at the end of his period as president. His group had been so dominant electorally that there was a backlash, and 'I reacted by being a bit aggressive and non-inclusive — I was used to getting my own way'.59

The Mercury reported that elections for the 1988 SRC were among the hottest ever. Two factions vied for control, the Independent Students, and the Anti-Fees Action Ticket, who claimed that the Independents had too weak a stance against fees, and were led by a member of the socialist group Resistance. It was an unnecessarily unpleasant campaign, with both sides accusing the other of smear tactics. Broadly speaking, they were Right and Left, and the Anti-Fees group campaign was enough, said one commentator, to scare enough moderates into voting to ensure that the Independents swept the board, under president Ross Clennett. In the following year a similar SRC was led by David McGrath. Both were well-liked but did not have such strong characters as some other leaders; but, thought Louise Sullivan, 'it was a hard time to be effectual'.60

The Union needed some better management, for there were financial problems; losses in the Ref and the bar, and paying for extensions begun in 1987, the most expensive project the Union had undertaken. There was a major overhaul in 1988, and Bill Shelley returned to his old job from retirement until a new executive officer, Amanda Given, was appointed. Young, dynamic, and an excellent organiser, she made major changes, extending financial accountability, introducing strategic planning, removing waste, boosting trading, and increasing the fee. Accountability was needed; in 1982, Dick Friend at Togatus noticed the way nothing much was said if people overspent their budgets, and Annual Reports show that this frequently happened.61

These two years saw a number of achievements. In academic areas, the Union achieved a formal appeal procedure for academic grievances; persuaded the Faculty of Economics and Commerce to rescind its computer fee for students; fought for a suitable relocation of the Conservatorium of Music; improved facilities for medical students; and lent money to the Entrepot Art Products Co-operative which sold artists' materials for students. Short
courses were offered in areas ranging from Yoga to Basic Motor Mechanics. A Contact Centre was opened so that students had access to all Union services in a central area. An AIDS awareness program started.

The main thrust of student politics, however, was protest against university fees. The administration fee had only been the thin end of the wedge, and the Labor government introduced much higher fees in the Higher Education Contribution Scheme. This was dear to the heart of Resistance, and they tried to take over organising the protest. 'It all got very tribal', commented SRC member Louise Sullivan, with NUS sending organisers over and various factions disputing.

Another player was the Tasmanian Union of Students, which came to the fore and did a great deal to organise protest. There was a stop-work meeting, where students were informed about the new measure, then a large anti-fees rally outside the casino, where the ALP was holding its national conference. The rally attracted two thousand people 'and our point was very clearly made', though there were no changes to the fee. To enlist as many people as possible, the Union formed the Tasmanian Education and Training Coalition, which included students, education and training unions and other interested groups. In 1989 the Union took part in a National Day of Action against tertiary fees, when Bob Brown spoke to students on the Ref steps. That year the amalgamation of the University, the TSIT in the north, and the Australian Maritime College was suggested, and the Union concentrated on fighting for the best possible outcome for students, winning representation on the governing body, setting up a Students' Working Party to air the student point of view, and negotiating a 'hands off' stance so that institutions were only concerned in issues which directly affected them (i.e. many other bodies could not interfere with the Union). By now the Union employed a Research Officer, which made such work much easier. 62

The failure of protest after such a great deal of work led to many activists being burnt out, and quarrelling continued, with one 'huge disaster'. At a huge Union Meeting an SRC member accused a Tasmanian Union of Students office bearer of financial impropriety; there was naivety but no impropriety, thought Louise Sullivan, but the person was censured and the Tasmanian Union of Students faded, exhausted by organising the protest. Then there was a graffiti campaign against several SRC members, accusing them of taking money. She felt 'totally out of my depth' in 'the most horrific, destructive, nastiest time ever... there was no sense of togetherness on the SRC'. 63

She did however, have one major achievement, the appointment of a women's officer. By the 1980s the feminism of the 1970s had waned, though the SRC endorsed the principle of equal opportunity, and a male bastion was stormed when the first female Rhodes Scholar was chosen in 1984. A Women's Group lapsed, but after the National Union of Students was formed in 1987 it inspired the formation of a Women's Committee, which announced that it was not made up of radical feminists. It was not enough for some, and in 1988 a group of women formed a Women's Collective, and Louise suggested appointing a women's officer. She received good support from the men, but, dishearteningly, the two other women on the SRC opposed her. Nevertheless, Soula Houndalas was appointed, and worked closely with the NUS women's officer, Brigid Freeman. Brigid was the leader, producing a magazine and T-shirts, and went on to become the first female president of NUS. The second women's officer, Kath Gelber, was elected as a member of the SRC. There was much debate: did this discriminate against men? would women's position be further marginalised? Women's Officers were involved in a great deal of consciousness raising, and produced a feminist issue of Togatus. They held Bluestocking Week, with films, forums and publicity for women's issues, debated abortion in the bar with a group of Right to Lifers, and took over the glassed-in section of
In 1988 students marched to the ALP national convention at Wrest Point to protest about funding cuts to education.

the Ref as a temporary women’s room. During this period there were few women on the SRC, generally only one or two, and few female candidates. Sue Morrison recalled that some men were condescending to her, though she was vice-president; they were usually from the extreme left or right.61

Kath Gelber also helped individual women. One complained of sexual harassment by a lecturer, so Kath went through the appropriate channels, and eventually the lecturer was cautioned, a satisfactory outcome. Some girls felt that some college initiations were sexually abusive; Kath made an official complaint, and was assured that this would not happen again. The Collective was lively, the work was exciting, and Kath felt she was breaking new ground, especially with the new wave of students arriving each year, many of whom had not come in contact with feminism before. She also felt that the presence of the Collective made people think twice about some activities, like wet T-shirt competitions.65

Kath was also a member of Resistance, a socialist group. In the early 1980s there was no socialist party, but in 1982 a branch of the traditional Trotskyite group Resistance was formed. Richard Flanagan was impressed and joined: Resistance sent out an organiser, did consciousness raising, had intelligent speakers, and in the days before SBS, provided an alternative to the general right-wing media. For some time it was small, weakened by an acrimonious split between its core and sections of the Peace Movement, but it put up candidates for the SRC and in 1985 the first was elected. Many students shunned Resistance: a survey showed that Resistance’s articles were one of the least popular features of Togatus, and one writer commented that being linked with it was a political death wish. Some students saw Resistance as containing older people, professional agitators rather than ‘real students’, not so much interested in student issues as in promoting socialism. Louise Sullivan was irritated when a Resistance member of the SRC criticised her for ‘studying... they said my heart wasn’t in it because I wasn’t committed... I felt I represented the true students’. Resistance persevered, fighting strongly against tertiary fees, helping to organise demonstrations, putting out much publicity, and it became well known.66

There was more change to the political scene. In the 1970s, as seen above, debate on the SRC tended to be between the left and the ultra left, but from the late 1970s there was a general shift to the right. Under Eric Abetz, the Liberals had become stronger, and for several years SRC elections were fought between Labor and Liberals, with some ephemeral parties such as the Philosophy Party and the Uranium Group, and a number
of Independents. The Liberals were not numerous, however, and the two main groups were Labor and Independents, not an organised group but usually about the centre of politics, who often joined Labor on social issues, and dominated the SRC under Andrew Wilson. There were some prominent Liberals such as vice-presidents Tim Stops and Donald Morris, but the Liberals were not so interested in campus politics after Eric left, and from that time there was less of an organised Liberal presence on the SRC. 67

There was also less of a Labor presence. In the early 1980s there was a traditional campus Labor group, who did well, said David Traynor, 'because we had our act together. We weren't well organised, but we were better than the others'. Even in the early 1980s, however, Labor students realised that the pro-dam state Labor policy meant Labor had little appeal to many students. When Alan Shaw joined, the Labor Group had fewer than ten members, and started attracting membership by organising visits from 'leftish people', not just politicians; 'we were very careful to divorce ourselves from the Party, mainly because we did not want to be a part of it'. The Group expanded to about fifty. Richard Flanagan continued this trend with his New Labor, as described earlier; then in 1985 Labor's own party introduced tertiary fees. Labor did badly in the 1985 SRC elections, and from then on Labor-minded people stood as independents (such as Charles Touber) or gave their group another title, such as the Anti-Fees Action Ticket. Charles commented that he thought a political party platform was too narrow, as political clubs were tiny, with no relevance to most students, who did not want to see the Union as an extension of groups 'which weren't part of uni life'. In these years the Independents were dominant, with Charles followed by Ross Clennett with his Independent Students, David McGrath, and the Better Management Team in 1989. Left-leaning parties mostly did badly in elections, and student politics was dominated by those of the centre or centre right. However, like Labor, the Liberals did not use a party title. The most successful SRC politicians claimed to be apolitical, representing all students, concentrating on student issues, and Alan Shaw calculated that by the mid-1980s members of political groups were outnumbered by others, such as the Navigators, a Christian society. 68

Another group in the arena were Aborigina1s. Aboriginal students requested a room

Function at Christ College, now open to men and women.
for themselves in 1985, and three years later June Sculthorpe, an Aboriginal lecturer in Education, was appointed Aboriginal Tutor/Counsellor of the 25 Aboriginals on campus. David Allie, a mainland, was the first Aboriginal to stand for the SRC. He failed to attract many votes, and commented that there was ‘a lot of negativity about dark or Asian people going to uni. We were looked on as being token’. The group wanted to raise the Aboriginal flag on the Union Building in NAIDOC Week, David recalled, and the Union was very co-operative, but the vice-chancellor at first disagreed. He changed his mind, and this was the first time the Aboriginal flag flew in an Australian university. David said he had a good two years at the University, and Charles Touber in particular was very supportive. ‘We had a freedom of expression which had never been seen before. We could speak up, and people took note.’

Also assisted by the Union were postgraduates. They had been forced to join the Union in the 1970s, and in the 1980s the Union finally did something to help them. A postgraduate society was formed, and in 1982 a referendum agreed to add a postgraduate representative to the SRC. One was elected, but over the next few years there was little enthusiasm and not always an election. The situation was better organised from 1989, when the postgraduate representative sat firmly on the SRC, a Postgraduate Committee was organised to provide services, and a handbook was printed.

Overseas students also saw the Union as supportive. The Union helped them protest against fees being introduced then increased, and the 1981 constitution gave the Overseas Students Committee equal status with other committees like Education. At first numbers remained small, under a hundred, but the Committee produced an Overseas Students Handbook and held International Evenings and soccer tournaments. The 1983 International Night included Irish jokes from an African, and a Japanese sumo wrestler with beach hat, zinc cream and tinnie; two years later nothing went right from the start, but the audience ‘rollicked in laughter at our shambles of a display and in the end it turned out to be a uniquely enjoyable night!’ In 1987, with strong encouragement from the University, there was a great increase in international students, to 370, and the committee became even busier, with sports, food fairs, camps, bus trips and help to individuals.

SRC members comment that the overseas students did not take much part in Australian politics, and they mostly only served one term. The most active was Mohamed Ali, vice-president in 1984. His election caused amusement, as he was a slight man from the Maldives, with the same name as the famous boxer.

There were eleven individual national clubs, ranging from All African to many Asian and Pacific countries, and even Greek/Australian. Clubs and Societies had their usual story of a great many clubs, over a hundred, many ephemeral, as students took the advice of the 1985 Handbook on ‘how to rip off the Union’: get fifteen or more people, form a club, become affiliated, and ‘spend money on yourselves’.

The ‘legendary’ Aardvarks continued, and one described in Togatus how the society’s military wing, Varkler Youth, held the Varkland Rally, annexing the beer garden at the bar to voice their displeasure over the treatment of the Lesser Rhodesian Aardvark by the Zimbabwe regime. Adolf Varkler whipped the rally into a state of near frenzy. The Aardvarks also had a spiritual branch, the Hare Varkners, and a disciplinary task force, Savark. There were complaints about a lack of taste in Aardvark functions, but the End of Termite Ball was a resounding success, and put the society in the black. It even had a song:

Vark on! Vark on!
With your snouts in the air
And you’ll never vark alone.
The Aardvarks 'summed up a certain spirit of the age', thought Richard Flanagan. After a few years they died out, but their place was taken by the Furry Animals Appreciation Society, which aimed to help members have a good time and 'act crazy without being arrested', through surfing and beach parties, car rallies, barbecues and video nights. As well, the Viking Society aimed to recreate aspects of Dark Ages life with feasts and tournaments; the Psychedelic Daytrippers were a 60s music club; the Lithuanian Studies Society was self-explanatory; the Men’s Group was a short-lived answer to the Women’s Collective; LAMBDa then GUSTO were groups for gay students. Other clubs included Renaissance Universal and the Society for Creative Anachronism. The Mature Age Students held wine-and-cheeses, though, as Steve Price commented, at many such functions the cheese was not all that prevalent. Old Nick continued, with the slogan ‘Fun! Finesse!! Frivolity!!!’ Revues were mostly successful, and in 1980 Old Nick broke the Australian record for reciting all the works of Shakespeare (52 hours, 27 minutes) with the proceeds going to Red Cross.

As usual, the Societies Council saw hot debate about which club received which money. One meeting was described as having ‘customary snide remarks, character assassination and time consuming banter’ as well as back-stabbing. In 1980 the SRC attacked Societies, when two Liberal members persuaded the SRC to disaffiliate the Proutist Society because it was involved in disreputable activities such as painting slogans on walls. The Proutists said that all they were doing was trying to raise student consciousness, which Liberals and Labor did too, and there were protests that disaffiliation was denying intellectual freedom, but the Proutist Society died out.

Sports were also lively. There were traditional activities, like complaints that too much money went to rowing, and new ones, like kick boxing and parachuting. Bob Cotgrove, president or vice-president of the Sports Council for eleven years and the best known sporting identity on campus according to Togatus, said that by the 1980s the cost of major team sports had grown far beyond the capacity of the Sports Council to fund them, and they had to raise more money from their players and fund-raising activities. This lessened
their dependence on the Union, and the Sports Council catered more for recreational, individual activities like sailing, hang gliding and canoeing, for the 80% of students who did not play team sports.78

In the early 1980s several IVs were held, and ‘once more we were able to demonstrate that there is no better place than Hobart for having a well-organised and memorable good time’. Tasmania won the rowing IV in 1986, for only the fourth time in its history. Change came to the whole idea of IV, however; Bob saw cricket IV as a major part of club activities, but later administrators saw it as frivolous and even negative, upsetting the discipline of the team, and the importance of IVs generally lessened. By this time, too, the old idea that clubs had a closed membership had gone and anyone could play for any club, which meant that many people came to university already tied to other clubs, and university clubs had a higher percentage of non-university players.79

The Sports Council was also involved in getting better sports facilities. One major effort was the sports pavilion beside the oval, which took years to build, mainly because of funding problems, but did eventuate. Attempts to finance a swimming pool failed, but the tennis courts were floodlit and squash courts were built. In 1983 the Sports Council noted that the University was more and more abdicating its responsibility for financing sports facilities and there were comments such as, ‘Without the Union, the University would hardly exist’.80

In 1984 Bob Cotgrove was chosen as manager for the only tour of England by an Australian universities cricket team. He found it difficult to blend the players into one team, not realising the antagonism between NSW and Sydney universities, and between Western Australians and the rest. Then at Oxford and Cambridge they were all treated like colonials, and Bob’s players behaved like ockers as a defensive mechanism. Nevertheless, ‘we had a bloody good time!’ and Bob enjoyed being asked to play in the Oxford-Cambridge Invitation XI with famous players like Colin Cowdrey (Australia won).
Tasmania was visited by the New Zealand universities men’s hockey team which drew with the locals, the only game in their Australian tour which they did not win.81

In 1983 the Sports Council set up a Sportsman [sic] of the Year award, which went to Jane Forrest, who represented Australia at badminton, and won bronze at the Commonwealth Games. This was a far cry from what Bob described as the normal scene, 'the usual melees of teams struggling each week to put down the barbarians of other teams in local Hobart competitions and the bun-fights of on-campus inter-faculty and intra-mural contests'.82

The usual melee was a good description of the scavenger hunt, which was revived in 1981 after three years. The Hobart City Council was irate when its superloos were pinched, one team brought in two very young and embarrassed policemen, another rode a horse into the bar, people ate dogfood, there was plenty of nudity, the judges made sure that teams won points for buying them drinks, a great evening was had by all and not too many laws were broken, wrote Togatus. The next year the hunt was 'quiet but refined' with no nudity, and was criticised as tame. Items included an Argentine soldier, the meaning of life, a Togatus staff member bound and gagged, and an obscene act. With only a few minutes to go, one team obtained this item by jumping on the Activities Officer and removing his clothes, despite his loud protests.

In one scavenger hunt Bill Shelley showed his worth, recalled Andrew Wilson. Andrew Butler, who was organising it, refused to let Andrew Wilson, the president, see the list of items, of which one was commonwealth car number plates. He thought only a few would appear, but students brought in huge numbers from all over Hobart. The hunt coincided with a Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Melbourne, and the next morning the commonwealth police were on the phone: were students stealing the plates so they could disguise cars in Melbourne and cause trouble? Bill calmed them down, defused their fears and promised to take the plates back; he did get every one bar one back to its car.83

There were complaints in 1984 that some items were in poor taste (a used tampon, a re-enactment of a notorious murder), but there were also achievements: over the past years there had only been two arrests, and the rank acts had gone and teams had to be clever instead. Events this year included people cleaning Ref tables wearing nappies, and a high speed chase from the airport when a team failed to get away with a baggage trolley.84

Chariot races continued, usually won by Engineers. In 1986 Togatus described activities.
The car park was sealed off at 7.30 a.m., and the chariots were inspected; Education was disqualified for lack of a control braking system. The media and police arrived and the race started. The Engineers won in the record time of 5 minutes 48 seconds, with Agricultural Science second and Law third. Economics crossed the line on two wheels after losing other wheels in a controversial incident with Engineering, and Surveying collided with them on the finish line. There were howls of protest as the trophy was presented; Economics lodged an official protest; the Engineers lodged a similar protest; there was an on-the-spot hearing; race stewards and bystanders were attacked with a fire extinguisher; the Engies were reinstated as winners, and stewards and organisers were subject to a torrent of abuse, media interrogation and general bedlam. They decided to revise the rules for the next year.85

Tasmania University Boat Club, IV victor 1986, with their trophy. From left: Jonathan Jones, Craig Newbon, Andrew Palmer, Gavin Wakefield, Craig Rosevear (obscured), Stewart Walters, Richard Sampson.
If you thought Union politics was silly how about these photos of Bruce Goodluck, Peter McKay and Peter Hodgman disporting themselves at the Scavenger Hunt" ran the *Togatus* caption, 1984.

In the 1982 Scavenger Hunt, a member of the *Togatus* staff bound and gagged was worth 75 points. Rebecca Hawkes, the business manager, was bound and gagged twice, "being dragged protesting loudly and kicking violently into the Union Bar each time", as *Togatus* reported.
Planking continued, with the World Championship in 1983.\textsuperscript{86} The Iron Man was usually held, though by 1986 it was no longer a pub crawl. Instead, it was an Orientation Week activity, and competitors had to scull glasses of beer, eat foods ranging from jelly and cooking oil to raw sausages and raw eggs, do somersaults and roll down a hill. There was a gap in the Iron Woman competitions after 1980, and when it was revived in 1989 it was criticised as horrendous and degrading to women. This appears to have been the last Iron Woman contest.\textsuperscript{87}

Only one traditional student prank was recorded in the decade. In 1982 there was a rumour that the Liberal Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, would address students on the Ref steps about the re-introduction of tertiary fees. Resistance organised a demonstration in case he turned up, and put up a poster ‘Throw Fraser the Warmonger Out’, which the Liberals tried to tear down. Liberals and Resistance taunted each other. Then a large white limousine drove up, with a business-suited man inside waving languidly to the crowds. The chauffeur opened the door, and ‘out stepped a jackboot-wearing, sunglasses-brandishing Secretary to the PM’. He gave a long speech on the government’s policies, with Dalek intonations of ‘We will exterminate’ where appropriate, such as after mentioning Aborigines and the Opposition, and the crowd became aware that it was, wrote Togatus, ‘another coup for Old Nick’.\textsuperscript{88}

Togatus continued through the decade. In 1980 it was criticised as too left wing, but the editor, Gwen Egg, justified herself by saying that if she only received left wing articles that was all she could publish. She was criticised by Catholics for an article on contraception, but pointed out that it was a reprint of a previous article which had caused no trouble; it was in fact extremely mild, and was reprinted in 1981 with no complaints. In 1982 and 1983 Togatus was well received, with a variety of interesting and original articles, though several law suits were threatened. An in-house printing department was established, and Togatus was produced weekly from 1983.\textsuperscript{89}

Dick Friend was editor of Togatus in 1982. He was an enthusiastic environmentalist but did not emphasise this in every issue, and produced an interesting Togatus. He found it
Above: Chariot race entrants, 1982.

Below: Chariot Race leaving the University, 1980s. Some bystanders are dressed in plastic bags for protection.
difficult to gain contributions from students, as editors had complained since Togatus began, and tried to involve the whole university community, including academics, arguing that the talent was there and might as well be used. He published special issues on topics such as Antarctica, and sought material not only from students and staff but from involved groups such as the Antarctic Division and Greenpeace. Dick gave a paper on this at a national student editors’ conference, and found that everyone had the problem of a lack of student interest.

Dick resigned to take up another job, after organising his last issue for printing. It included what he thought were inoffensive and hilarious cartoons of private parts of members of the Geography Department, in the style of a well-known cartoonist, Pickering. The printers questioned the Union, and several SRC heavies took it on themselves to change the issue. Dick was furious: the issue still went out under his name, but his work had been changed. The SRC had the attitude that ultimately they were in control.90

The most widely read column in Togatus was by ‘The Scarlet Pimpernel’ or ‘Pimp’, who commented on Union and University events: nothing but ‘lies, innuendo and distortion’ according to Eric Abetz, ‘feared through the length and breadth of the university’ according to Pimp. He/she reported ‘sordid details of University life’ such as apparently useless construction works when departments faced cuts, and the arrival of staff fresh from the asylums of the United Kingdom, Europe and Asia ‘and occasionally from our own local back blocks’, fifth rate ‘droids’ who retard our minds; scandal in the Union — ‘it’s Union embarrassment time again’ — such as refusing to pay student employees the minimum wage, spending money without SRC approval, and those portfolios which did nothing; and other stories such as ‘twistings and turnings’ in the Liberal Club. Several articles were printed with large areas blacked out, there were threats of law suits, and early in 1983 Pimp was condemned by the SRC. Pimp’s defenders claimed that the SRC wanted Togatus to be a vehicle for their views, and were scared of criticism.91

More trouble in 1983, when Togatus was temporarily closed down, is described above. Togatus started 1984 with a new format: longer, monthly publication and three editors, a
senior experienced one and two student assistants. The senior editor was Tony Ryan. He enjoyed 1984, but found 1985 the best year. The SRC was worried that he was too left wing, so put Peter Jennings as assistant editor to balance him. 'They were right': Peter was an intelligent conservative, radical Jessica Adams continued from the year before, the SRC merely kept a close eye on finances and did not interfere, and the result was a lively paper.92

There were three editors again in 1986: Tony, Georgina Fragouli, proud of her Greek family and a good writer, and Geoff Tooth, a protege of Charles Touber. Tony pioneered desk top publishing in Tasmania, and through this later was later employed by the university. He tried to find out what students wanted, he said, though this was difficult. He persuaded several Asians to contribute, and printed articles on Islam, though there was controversy when the vice-president ordered him to stop them. The Islamic Society objected, the SRC said there were to be no more Togatus issues that year, and the staff produced a bootleg issue.93

Togatus had a shake-up in 1987, with three new, inexperienced editors, Rory Ewins, David Brewer and Leanne Hills. They announced that they would publish anything interesting, but no ‘religious waffle’ because nobody read it except the converted. A survey showed that politics, sport and ‘radical stuff’ were disliked, and humour, band reviews and a cartoon by Rory were popular. This excellent cartoon, about a platypus called Ralph, was later printed in book form by the SRC.94

In 1988 Togatus was fortnightly once more, and praised as lively, but the next year the Publicity and Publications chairperson criticised Togatus as shoddy and haphazard, with no relevance to the Union; the whole structure needed a review.95 By this date, Togatus had become a magazine rather than a newspaper, appearing monthly, with general articles rather than information about the university or the Union.

In control of all the varying activities of the 1980s was the Union, but the Union was made up of several parts. Once the SRC was divided from the Board, recalled David Traynor, it became at once far more political, virtually overnight, as people discussed welfare, education, protest and progress. He and others enjoyed this, but not everyone

Iron Man contest, 1986. This seems to be the spaghetti eating section. Jonathan Jones centre.
The Pimp complained that the Upper Ref was closed to students because politicians were being entertained to lunch there, and tried dramatically to force the issue, 1983. Anna Campbell, persuaded to stand in her first year because Labor needed another girl on the ticket, found SRC meetings boring, with so much endless talk. The Labor Group had caucus meetings where they were told how to vote, of which Anna disapproved, though she voted as instructed if her vote was going to make a crucial difference. Once Labor faded out caucuses did too, but SRC meetings could be given over to infighting, and Togatus described one SRC meeting as ‘hours and hours of pretty meaningless verbiage’. Sometimes the SRC was given over to infighting.96

Those who sat on the SRC and the Board noted the difference. The Board was more conservative: it contained university representatives, it dealt with naturally more conservative areas such as finance and administration; and the more conservative students tended to stand for it. Those used to heated SRC meetings could find the Board ‘deathly boring’. It was well conducted, and run responsibly. The university representatives believed in the value of the Union, mostly took students seriously, and tried not so much to dominate as to assist, ‘trying to help us do exciting and good things that were sustainable... they helped us as much as you’d ever want’. Anna Campbell for one preferred the meetings as they were more tightly run with less ‘bullshit’. A natural conservative like Kim Loane found the Board ‘tremendous’, and a natural rebel like Richard Flanagan also found them ‘straightforward. They didn’t see themselves as a rubber stamp by any means, but as a check and a balance. We never had the problem of deranged egos as we did on the SRC’. Students thought the Board took students seriously, with no sense of the University trying to control students, though Sue Morrison added that this was easier for older, more experienced students, and not as easy for first or second years. Charles Touber commented that he and Richard Flanagan could overrule the Board, but it needed a strong personality to be able to do this.97

Alan Shaw was cynical. ‘Yes, we were treated well by the “grown ups”, but they were very keen to run the TUU as a sound business. They did indeed have a huge amount of power and at times it would have taken someone very strong to stand up to them.’ There were no huge differences of opinion, ‘but I think that was perhaps because we all knew what the roles of the SRC and the Board were’. He thought a few decisions did indicate some contempt towards students. When Tony Ryan’s article in Togatus led to writs for
Rory Ewins wrote a very successful cartoon strip about a character called Ralph the Monotreme for Togatus in 1986.
defamation, the decision to pay out was taken with little consultation with student members of the Board, some of whom were less keen about the payment.99

There was one example of dissension between the SRC and the Board. The Housing Committee was responsible to the Board, but the SRC thought it should have input and asked that the Housing Committee be a joint SRC-Board venture. The Board replied that when Housing had been run by the SRC it had made a loss; that no committee could serve two masters; the SRC said the Board should take direction from it as ‘the SRC is the sole determiner of policy in the Union’. A referendum supported the SRC, and a joint Board-SRC meeting agreed on a compromise, with the Housing Committee responsible to both SRC and Board in different areas, but some criticism of the Board continued: it was getting rabid, building monuments to itself with so many capital works such as doing up the bar.99

One Union tradition which waned in this decade was the Union Meeting. In 1985 Tim Stops reported to the SRC that many students wanted Union Meetings restored. Since the new constitution had been adopted in 1981 there had been only one, which restored Togatus. Settling issues by ‘number-crunching’ on the SRC just worsened that body’s internal dissension; issues should be for all students to discuss. They rarely were, though occasionally there would be one over a major issue, such as allegations of impropriety. Charles Touber commented that he distrusted Union Meetings because they could be so easily hijacked.100

Students also sat on the University Council, which some students found intimidating, but most presidents found ‘great fun’ or ‘good’. Outside representatives sometimes gave students support, and they could wield more influence than academics. For a change, there were few complaints by students about the University Council in the 1980s. There were also few complaints about the vice-chancellors, and such varied people as Andrew Wilson, David Traynor, Richard Flanagan, Kim Loane and Charles Touber found their vice-chancellors helpful and co-operative.101

As usual, student politicians generally enjoyed their Union experience and found they learnt a great deal, about running meetings, practical politics, and life generally. It was hard work: Andrew Wilson studied part-time, played several sports, held down a job and estimated that he sat on forty university and Union committees while he was president. Richard Flanagan quoted an editor of Togatus, Jessica Adams, as saying she received more education on the Union side of the underpass than the University side. ‘Being on the SRC was learning about life, learning about running a business, the politics of running meetings, a heap of things’, said David Traynor.102

So where did power lie in the Union, between the University Council, the vice-chancellor, the Board, the SRC, the executive and the president? Ultimately it lay with the University Council, but as Council had the Board in place to stop trouble and there were no great conflicts, this relationship was not tested. Kim Loane thought the executive had the power: ‘For me to get anything done, the critical meeting was with the executive’. Charles Touber agreed: ‘You could do anything if the executive was on side’. Andrew Wilson thought power lay mainly with the president, and many presidents speak as if this were the case, with varying input from the rest of the executive. Sue Morrison pointed out that who had power depended on personalities; some presidents seized it, some like Andrew Wilson preferred making decisions in a group, and some like Peter Kalnieciki virtually abnegated power. There were sometimes complaints in Togatus that either the Board had too much power, the Union administration had too much power, or that the Union was becoming too professional with not enough student input, all ways of saying that student influence was lessening. As the Union grew, with higher student numbers necessitating more staff, more income and a higher level of business activity, it was likely
that this would happen.¹⁰³

The few claims that the Union administration abused its power do not seem to be justifiable in the 1980s. Bill Shelley in particular was generally praised for the way he implemented student desires, and many people speak well of Alan Farrer. One accountant was not so popular, and Alan Shaw recalled how in the early 1980s this person summarily decided to stop funding one of the Union’s councils. ‘The reason was overspending but at no stage was the relevant council chair involved. Well, you can imagine the reaction that one got!’ The funding was resumed. Charles Touber commented that the Union needed to achieve the difficult balance between accountability on one hand, and stifling student life, innovation and excitement, which could mean that the Union lost its heart.¹⁰⁴

Many people claim that there was less student involvement in the Union in the 1980s. ‘We weren’t all that involved with the Union’, said Jonathan Jones, who had little to do with it in his student years. ‘People were too busy with their lives... the general population was more interested in having a good time and passing exams. We wanted to get our degrees and get a good job.’ Many students’ main non-academic interest at university was a sporting or social club, hockey or Old Nick, rather than the Union. One of Jonathan’s friends became treasurer: ‘the political scene was so small that if you showed a little interest, they’d get you to stand and you’d be elected unopposed’. Sue Morrison, involved in the Union from 1977 to 1981, noticed the change. Students moved from an external focus in the 1970s to be more inward looking, mainly concerned about getting a job; ‘there was more increased collective selfishness’. Charles Touber, however, said that students’ priorities had changed and their ways of expressing themselves had changed: when there was an issue which concerned them like university fees, students would join a protest. The 1970s had been more geared to ‘flamboyant outbursts’, but when you were paying for your course, you ‘can’t afford to muck round’.¹⁰⁵
Togatus recorded similar complaints. Students had a disinterest born out of self-concern, said a letter writer in 1983, and another writer put this down to an elitist education system reverting to a strong class basis; unemployment after graduation; survival in a hollow society hostile to creativity and intellect. In 1989 the student body was described as boring, apathetic, immature and yuppie. Those involved in the Union agreed that most students were not very interested. ‘Students weren’t particularly interested in the Union’, said Steve Price. ‘They were happy getting on with their lives without us annoying them.’ Alan Shaw started life at uni believing in ‘the romantic vision from the 60s and 70s, and was bitterly disappointed to find out campus life was intensely selfish, with very few people bothering to think about life other than study, and raging on Friday nights’. He felt that students, like most people, only became involved when something affected them directly. Bob Cotgrove thought that student politics was less exciting. ‘They’d given up their ideas of changing the world. They were more sober.’ He saw Richard Flanagan as the last example of a 1970s student politician, and Richard himself said that when he returned to the university in the late 1980s the mood had changed. ‘No one believed they could achieve anything except as an individual. They aimed to get a career, in the Keating manner.’ Dick Friend, returning to the university after a decade, found students ‘not so keen to get involved in things, not interested in taking up issues’. He put it down to the economic climate, knowing that getting a job was difficult, ‘it’s a dog-eat-dog world out there’. This was not confined to Tasmania, but was a problem for all university unions. Tasmania actually did well in voter turnout at elections, with 20–25% of students voting; some bigger mainland universities were struggling to reach double figures, recalled Alan Shaw. And this was the 1980s: in the 1990s the economic climate became even more difficult, university fees increased and there were more challenges for the Union.

‘Blos’ made regular appearances in Togatus.
Chapter 11

Diversification and development in the 1990s

The 1990s have been a decade of diversification for the Union in a variety of ways. The greatest change is that, quite suddenly, women have played an equal role with men. Ever since the Union started, it has largely been the preserve of white Caucasian males, with one or two, or sometimes no, women on the SRC, and only the one female president in 1941. Even in the mid 1980s there were only a few women involved; but in 1989 there were eight, and from then on, at least a third of SRC members have been women, and more than half in some years.

This change came partly because of the establishment of the women’s officer and Women’s Collective, which was left-leaning; partly as a reaction by conservative women to this; and partly as a reflection of the general atmosphere. Overall, in the 1990s, 47% of the 151 SRC members have been women, there has always been a woman on the executive, and of eleven presidents, six have been women: ‘there was a feeling around for a while that if you wanted to become president, you had to be a woman’. At last, at elections ‘there’s a real move towards seeing people just as candidates, not specifically as women. It’s finally becoming ingrained that female candidates are just as worthy as males’.

Another change has been the emergence of non-Caucasians. Since the first overseas students arrived at the end of the 1940s they quite often sat on the SRC, and in the 1960s an overseas representative was added to this body; but in the 1990s two overseas students, Pravin Ram and Gilbert Astorga, were elected president. Others have sat on the SRC in various positions, seen just as students, not as international students. During the 1990s the SRC has been further expanded, with an environment officer, a sexuality officer to represent homosexuals, lesbians and bisexuals, and representatives from outlying campuses (Art School, Clinical School and Conservatorium).

Postgraduates also played a larger role. Initially, there were few postgraduates at the University, and when numbers did increase after the war, they were mostly employed as tutors, and seen as part of the staff. The Union was in practice for undergraduates; a rule stated that graduates could pay a life member fee (usually two years’ union fee) to reduce their fees while undertaking further degrees. In the 1970s under the Whitlam government the number of postgraduates rose further; not all had tutoring work, but most had scholarships, and still felt part of the staff. The Union argued, however, that they used Union facilities and were still students, so they should pay the union fee. After a great deal of discussion and argument, it was decided in 1976 that after paying four years’ union fees, students were life members.

In the 1980s numbers continued to rise, and the relative value of scholarships fell, so postgraduates were more in need of the Union’s services such as housing. A postgraduate association was formed in 1981 and affiliated with Societies Council, but it was mainly a social group, holding wine and cheese functions. It fluctuated in enthusiasm. A postgraduate representative was added to the SRC in 1982, but there was little activity until the postgraduate association was firmly established in 1989. By this time, postgraduates formed about 20% of students.

When the Union became incorporated and overhauled its regulations in 1991, postgraduates were required to pay a reduced fee. Postgraduates vigorously opposed this, but were not organised enough to use their numbers to protest. By way of recompense the
postgraduate council was given a small budget, but not enough to achieve anything spectacular. From 1995, postgraduates were required to pay full fees, but as a trade-off, they were given 4.2% of Union fees to run a council and employ an officer. The postgraduate council consists of a representative from each school and a president, who is elected by the whole student body. The council and the officer have lobbied the University to gain seats on decision-making bodies for postgraduate representatives. They publish a handbook and newsletter, hold social functions, run seminars on topics like thesis writing, help individual students with academic complaints, and feel they have developed a postgraduate culture and identity. It is planned to include Honours students in the postgraduate council.

There have also been efforts to make outlying campuses feel part of the Union, always a problem because they are so physically isolated. The Art School is the largest. Originally part of the TCAE, it moved from Mt Nelson to splendid new premises in Hunter Street in 1984, at which stage it had five hundred students. The Union provided a cafeteria and social space, and took over Entrepot, a shop providing art supplies which students had originally started; it sponsored exhibitions of students' work and held major functions such as a ball. At first the relationship of the Union with Art School students was 'shaky', but it improved. Art School representatives have been enthusiastic; many Art students have been involved in Union enterprises and the Union has a recognised presence there.

The Conservatorium was also part of the TCAE and, when Mt Nelson was vacated, students wanted to move next to the Centre for the Arts. The Union lobbied for this, but the Conservatorium was established in a city site in 1993. The Union set up a catering service and tried to assist students, for example with thesis workshops, but there were problems: the 'Con' with only about 150 students was small and felt separate, and it was difficult to get students interested. 'They're so apathetic I wonder why we bother', said the 1999 Con representative. This was made worse by poor treatment by the University, so there is 'no leader, no leadership, no direction, no morale'.

Since the 1970s, fifth and sixth year medical students who studied off campus had complained that they did not get value for their Union fees. The fees were decreased, and in the 1980s the Union tried to improve facilities for students at the Clinical School in central Hobart. From 1995 a representative was elected to the SRC, and the Union improved its services and tried to establish a presence, but again there are problems, with a small number of students who are off campus part of the time.

The other group of students are those at the northern campus. When the University amalgamated with the TCAE in 1990, the only areas not amalgamated were the Union and the northern Students’ Association. This was less powerful and had less impact than the Union, and for some years the two bodies had poor relations; at times the Association even refused to pay money it owed through complicated arrangements about students who studied in both north and south. From the mid 1990s relations have improved, and Paddy Dorney, president of the Association, commented that the relationship is not competitive but positive in most cases. With four thousand students, Launceston is almost exactly half as large as Hobart.

There have also been problems with relations with the national union, with reiterated complaints that NUS was expensive ($31,560 in 1998, $4.75 per student), riven by factions, a 'Labor students' junket', 'a waste of space', 'arrogant', 'a power trip for some people' which brought minimal benefits: free education was still being eroded. NUS was blamed for sending campaign material too late to be useful, sending inappropriate material, and sending too much, and the state office was criticised for not functioning effectively. But others argued that students need a national union: it is more efficient for NUS to undertake research used by whole country, 'we need to be able to lobby the federal
Protest against Dawkins' cuts to university funding, 1990.

government, and we couldn't do it on our own', and the question of NUS disaffiliation has never seriously arisen.7

A major NUS activity is organising protests, of which there were plenty in the 1990s. In the federal arena, cutbacks to university funding affected the whole University, and a number of protests have been held involving students and staff. Protest marches which include the vice-chancellor are an amazing sight to staff who were students in the 1970s, and remember when the vice-chancellor was seen as the enemy. Information has been disseminated at federal elections about the education policies of various parties, and forums have been held.

NUS held a number of National Days of Action: about university funding; student allowances (TEAS, then Austudy, then Common Youth Allowance); fees, particularly the Higher Education Contribution Scheme, as conditions became more and more difficult for students; and the recurring issue of Voluntary Student Unionism. Some protests were well supported in Tasmania, others not so well.

In 1996 protest organisers were innovative. NUS announced the traditional National Day of Action in May. A common item of clothing in the Tasmanian winter was a flannelette shirt, often bought from op shops, so to show student poverty the Union held a Flanny Day of Action — those who forgot would probably wear a flanny anyway. 'We encouraged people to wear them, and put on a bit of a freebie with Eric Abetz and other speakers', said the president, Anthony Llewellyn, and Togatus reported that mainland unions were highly impressed. Eric, who had criticised compulsory unionism when he was on the SRC, continued to do so. 'We got back at him when we had another protest and there was an unorganised sit-in in his office', said Anthony. 'He accused students of breaking things and harassing his staff. He got on the telly and had a go. It made the focus of the protest change from our message to his complaints, which was a pity, but we got our
message across. Another protest where Tasmania took an original line was a national rally against university funding cuts in 1996. Tasmania claimed that as the only university in the state it was particularly disadvantaged, and under the slogan 'Save the University' two thousand students and staff marched round the city waving red flags. This was the largest student rally in Tasmania for over ten years, and the second biggest in the country.

There were some criticisms of how NUS organised protests. Having three a year at designated times meant the issues being protested about were often in the spotlight months before and any sense of urgency about them had gone; and NUS often decided only days before what a Day of Protest would be about. In 1998, the Union only found out about a Candle Light Vigil a few days beforehand, and only thirty students turned up. It was nevertheless
rated a huge success, because it was the second largest in Australia.  

Students were easier to mobilise for protests about local issues. In the early 1990s there were few of these, but from 1996 university funding was decreased drastically. This meant that some local areas had to be cut. Strong arguments could be marshalled against some decisions, and in 1995 the president commented that though the University had a 10% cut, it was far too keen on savage cuts itself. There were protests especially when small departments considered to be running well were in danger. The first was Classics in 1995. Classics students stole the vice-chancellor's chair and sent him a note, 'If you ever want to see your chair again, fill the Classics chair now'; the Union lobbied heavily; there was a good deal of publicity; and Classics was saved, temporarily (it merged with History later, but has maintained its strength). This so impressed the media that they sought interviews with student leaders, and the president thought that the large moderate mainstream student body had been wakened. 'A triumph for students and other supporters... a rare tangible victory', wrote Kate Jackson, giving as reasons that Classics students were 'a dedicated, motivated, very non-apathetic group of campaigners'; a simple but effective strategy was used; and support was gained from academics, which ensured debate on academic committees.  

There were more protests in 1996 and 1997, against closing small departments, shortening the exam period and holding night exams, and amalgamating libraries. T-shirts proclaimed 'Don't Mess With Our Swot Vac, Don' (the vice-chancellor was Don McNicol); the Administration Building was occupied (but this was marred with minor violence, when someone kicked the vice-chancellor's driver); but departments were closed, libraries were amalgamated and the exam period was shortened. Annual Reports commented that students became frustrated when the University would not budge from its stand. A more successful protest was held in 1998 against closing some areas of the Art School. The issue caused widespread concern, community members of the University Council supported the stand of the Union and the Students Association, and a new consultative review was ordered.  

Protests varied in their effect, commented David Wedel. 'You have to protest in the right place, about uni problems at uni and state problems outside, and not too often.' Protests themselves are ineffective, commented Julian Yaxley; the media coverage is the
important thing, and this can misfire. In the 1999 protest against voluntary student unionism, the media concentrated on one pro-VSU student yelling, not the many students who were opposed to VSU. Protest can generate a sense of community but, unless numbers are really large, which does not often happen, it can be ineffective. 'Unless students are feeling politically active, they’re powerless.' Lobbying is the key to success, and Julian thought the Union was best at influencing at a micro level, at committees, by logic. Certainly most Union victories have been of this type. A good example is that the Union succeeded in preventing the University from turning the rugby field into a garden. In many cases, the Union enters battles it cannot possibly win, such as those against HECS; students feel they cannot let such a thing happen without protesting, but have little chance of influencing the outcome.12

The Union has also succeeded, it appears, in solving problems concerning its structure. In 1991 it became incorporated and overhauled its regulations, but a major problem was the position of general manager. Managing a student union, accountable to a group of students in their late teens and early twenties, is not like managing any other business: 'managers didn’t recognise what the Union was about and tried to run a business their way'. One of the managers, Jon Burns, commented that this was a ‘challenging, but not impossible’ situation — ‘the educative and mentoring role is exciting’. Moreover, the managers of the business areas were so successful that some felt that there was not enough for the general manager to do, and there was a troubled period, with some personality conflicts; hence comments in Annual Reports that some people within the Union’s management ‘did not adopt a sense of their own role and contribution’ and thought themselves too important. Kate Jackson reported problems with the executive feeling that some administration members ‘were attempting to take power away from students on the pretence it was necessary to improve the professionalism of the union’. On the other hand, another report commented that when management continually had to deal with new, inexperienced yet enthusiastic students, some clashes were inevitable; and Kate continued that though at the time she felt the Union was an extremely political workplace, having experienced other workplaces since, she feels the Union was not exceptional.13 A basic problem is that students are around for only a year or two and have no experience, while the administrators are there for years and are experienced; moreover, for students the Union is a passing activity, while for administrators it is their livelihood. Some students become power happy, which can be difficult for the professionals; but the Union is, or should be, based on the principle of control by students.

A succession of general managers all had strengths. Amanda Given, whose work was described in the previous chapter, left in 1992. Jon Burns (1992–1994) who had sat on the SRC himself as Sports Council president, commented that he fixed up the structural, legal and financial problems about the canopy over the Ref steps and involved the student executive more in the operation of the Union. Described as a good operator and a visionary, he planned to extend the Union Building, making it the heart of the campus, but students felt that his plans were too large and expensive and were suspicious. His proposals were attacked at a Union Meeting and defeated by the university administration. There was controversy between those like Jon who thought the Union should move towards private enterprise, and those who did not.

Vicki Buchanan (1994–97) was approachable, put the relationship of the Union with the Board on a more professional footing, and amalgamated all administrative sections into one area, a successful move. In 1997 the union administration was restructured, and the positions of general manager and financial controller were amalgamated. The present holder, Jonathan Jones, is generally praised. A student himself in the 1980s, he is ‘very good with money’, ‘stable, quietly efficient’, ‘caring, understands staff issues’, ‘plays a very
proper role’. Jonathan himself said that he tries ‘to run the place efficiently but keep an air of casualness. My policy is not to make the Union too businesslike. For example, I don’t like staff in uniform much. I don’t want it to be a McDonald’s style organisation, and I don’t think the students want that... You have to work with the students, not try to dominate them.’

The Union has been supported by excellent results from its trading enterprises. The Ref has developed into an excellent facility, with lower prices than comparable places, such as a good lunch for $2. Gone are the days of jokes about dreadful Ref coffee. With the Ref distant from many parts of the campus, the Union started outlets in other areas, and in 1996 moved the Upper Ref restaurant and catering service, Lazenbys, to the centre of the campus. This has been a successful move, with Lazenbys well-patronised, and redeveloped to include the Classics Museum, an interesting use of different university assets. Smaller cafes at the Commerce building, the Art School (particularly highly praised for its excellent food) and the Con have also been successful. The bar had a downturn in the early 1990s, due to economic recession and changes in student drinking habits, but refurbishment and an increase in entertainment — bands, amateur nights, quizzes — led to increased patronage. In 1998, after a great argument on the SRC, the bar reduced its beer price to below the recommended level to match its closest competitor (the Union decided not to subsidise alcohol). Altogether, the food and beverage section of the Union has been extremely successful.

The shop has also been a valuable asset, and in 1990 the post office won the state Agency of the Year award. In 1998 the shop provided graduation services, in a smoothly-run operation which had the added advantage of returning a good surplus. Entrepot, which provides art supplies at the Art School, has also been successful, with regular exhibitions of students’ work.

Student Housing has been another success story. In 1991 control reverted from the University to the Union, and in the next eight years it grew from 310 beds to 380, not just
for single students but for families, short-term as well as long-term, and $5 to $10 per week below commercial rates. This has the added advantage of keeping down general rents. For an extra charge, usually for short-term visitors, a complete service is provided, with furniture, heaters, beds and linen.

Housing took over International Housing, and staff were trained in attending to international students. A 24-hour maintenance hotline operates, and the manager is often woken in the middle of the night to let someone in who has lost his key. The manager is also trained in mediation, for when housemates are having problems. At the start of 1999 an increase in requests for accommodation had staff working flat out, sometimes taking on a new house in the morning and letting out its rooms that afternoon; but Housing kept up with demand. It even returned a small profit. Those businesses which rent areas in the Union Building have also been successful: Birchall’s bookshop, Formula for Hair salon, STA Travel, Commonwealth Bank, ANZ bank agency and automatic teller and Campus Computers.

This description of the Union’s trading enterprises sounds almost too good to be true, but all have run successfully under competent long-term managers, Karen Henderson, Deidre Parker and Judy Payne. With such success, the Board has had good financial results. There was a problem in the early 1990s when a project to cover the Ref steps with a canopy was far more expensive than planned, and the nationwide recession also caused difficulties, with a deficit in 1994, but since then the financial situation has been good, due to good management, expansion and the abolition of a senior administrative position. In 1998 there was a healthy surplus, not really praiseworthy in an organisation meant to be non-profit-making, but in this case due to unexpectedly good returns from the graduation services, and good years for the trading enterprises. And this profit, and level of services, has been maintained while the Union charges one of the lowest fees in Australia.

The various portfolios had ups and downs in the decade. Activities usually organised O week, concerts and amateur nights in the Activities Centre, bar and Ref steps, the scavenger hunt (won in 1990 by the Rabid Daughters of Sporran), chariot race (one year not won by Engineering but by Surveying), three-legged pub crawl (‘now legendary’) and, for the first few years, planking, as well as some workshops, short courses (not very well supported) and forums. The state final of the Battle of the Bands was often hosted. Activities had a low patch in the middle of the decade, but in 1996 David Wedd revived enthusiasm. He tried to bring more variety, such as comedy which everyone enjoyed rather than bands of a specific genre who only appealed to a few. A great success occurred when David persuaded the national radio station Triple J to hold their breakfast show at
Scavenger hunt activity.
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the Ref in O week in 1996, which attracted 1600 people. The afternoon show was also held two years later. From 1997 Activities tried to be more self-sufficient, since if voluntary unionism were introduced, it would be one of the first to go.19

In 1995 the scavenger hunt was not held because of the problem of people’s possessions going missing — ‘everything that went missing in Hobart that week was put down to the scavenger hunt’. David revived it, and tried to break out from ‘just nicking things’. People had to find out information, and the hunt had Michael Hodgman singing badly in the bar, and Rodney Croome, well-known gay leader, singing ‘All My Friends Are Married’. The bar was full of people and the hunt went over well.20

The education committee was mainly involved in protests, as described above, but did put out another Alternative Handbook in 1992, and the education officer commented that the role of the Union as the first point of call for students in trouble expanded. Welfare tended to be low-key. There was some assistance to disabled students with a pool of equipment set up; the University was persuaded to expand the health and dental services; a parenting room was opened; safe sex was promoted; the need for security on campus was highlighted; but the main achievement in many years was printing the Students’ Survival Guide, and one year ridding the campus of feral cats.21

The main thrust of reports from women’s officers is that it was hard to raise enthusiasm. ‘getting a collective going proved as hard as in previous years’. Women held Bluestocking Week, supported International Women’s Day and tried to raise consciousness about feminism, often with special issues of Togatus. They held self-defence classes and a Reclaim the Bar night where all performers were women, objected to ‘harassing or discriminatory’ advertising round campus, and their Blow the Whistle on Sexual Harassment campaign of 1992 was copied on other campuses. In 1997 the opening of a women’s room created controversy; critics said that the clique of women who used it were as intimidating to other women as were men in the bar, but the women’s officer claimed that a diverse group used it. This was a cyclical event, a return to the separate women’s common room of the Union’s first fifty years.22

Publicity and Publications was responsible for an annual diary, the news sheet Daily Bulletin, and Togatus, which usually appeared six to eight times a year. In 1998 Pubs and Pubs brought out a CD of local music, twenty bands for $4, but the main emphasis is on Togatus, by the 1990s more a magazine than a newspaper. There have been some outstanding editors, including Rob Fiddy, Francisco Ascui, Bobby Mitchell and Bruce Paterson. Francisco had just returned from two years’ studying overseas and broadened the focus of Togatus. With Bruce Paterson he founded Siglo, a journal of literature and the arts. This was extremely successful, winning national praise, and eventually obtaining outside funding.

Bruce, editor in 1998, saw Togatus as a useful source of news and comedy, and a watchdog on the SRC and the Union generally. He had a vision of Togatus as an independent press, but it has always had an uneasy or potentially uneasy relationship with the SRC, who pay for it. Bruce had worked with Togatus since 1993, and commented that the change from cut-and-paste to desk top publishing has brought real change. Matthew Kirkcaldie and Alex Lum turned the design around, and the combination of talented student writers, Art School graphic designers and some excellent cartoonists like Kudelka and Chris Kelly have made it a visually and intellectually interesting magazine. The correspondence page has grown and ebbed, with strong cut and thrust in the early 1990s and satirical, farcical and absurd letters and cartoons on subjects like whether goats were discriminated against on campus, by an entertaining writer, ‘Blos’. Togatus has obtained a good balance between student interest and general articles, and is described as one of the most professional student publications in Australia. Students appear to enjoy it, with the
Ref full of people reading it the day it appears, and as in former times, the office has been open till all hours, 'alive with laughter, tears, insomnia, nervous tensions, caffeine and adrenaline'. Tony Manley commented that too often in its history, Togatus has been run by students with little interest in the Union or in students' rights in the University, and has not performed a proper newspaper function, 'or even news magazine!'; it seems that in the 1990s this problem has been largely overcome.23

As in earlier years, the Overseas Students Council was mainly concerned with social functions, holding an annual International Night, welcome party, day trips and sports. It also tried to increase awareness of overseas students, and promoted multiculturalism among them. In 1998, the Union and other unions round Australia protested successfully against a Malaysian government regulation which impeded those who studied Law in Australia.24

The Sports Council saw changes. There were more recreational sports like in-line skating and ultimate frisbee, and some new team sports like gridiron. The latest in the line of drinking clubs, Bush Heritage, was affiliated with Sports rather than Societies. In 1992 sports scholarships were introduced, and recipients included an Olympian, Simon Hollingsworth; the Sportsperson of the Year in 1998 was the University's only world champion, Robert Fahey (royal tennis). In 1993 Tasmania hosted its biggest ever sporting event, the Wild and Woolly Games, with six championships of wilderness sports and over 800 competitors. Another innovation was the Australian University Games, and in 1998 Tasmania won two gold medals. Besides these new events was an old complaint, misbehaviour on inter-varsity, which led to Tasmanian students being unwelcome in Melbourne, but this passed and in 1998 the organisers could congratulate performers since none disgraced themselves on or off the field.25

Fostering sport was one of the first aims of the Union, and in its century of existence the number of sports has risen from three (cricket, tennis and football) to 45 in 1999, with over 3500 members, so the aim has been well carried out. Individual sports have come and gone — cricket and football in particular had their ups and downs, and women's hockey is probably the longest-lived sport, with over seventy years of existence — but as a whole, sport has been a most successful activity. Debate has centred mainly on how much money went to each sport, and whether inter-varsity was valuable or merely an excuse for a drunken orgy, with, as seen above, complaints continuing in the 1990s.

There has also been a great increase in the number of non-sporting clubs, with a maximum of 96 affiliated with Societies in 1997, and six thousand members: dramatic growth from the one club, Debating, of 1899. Annual Reports boasted that Tasmania's
Sports undreamed of when the Union was formed: white water rafting.

Societies Council was one of the best in the nation, with the highest percentage of students involved. Debating continues, one of the most successful clubs; the longest-lived faculty association is the Law Society; and other long-lived clubs are Old Nick, which celebrated its golden anniversary with considerable drama in 1998, and the Photographic Club. Clubs with a long but sometimes intermittent existence include the Christian Union and its descendants, since 1904; the Labor Club under various names since the mid 1940s; and the Music Society since the 1950s. A newcomer in the 1990s which became a student icon was the Plastic Sword Fighting Society. Over the century, debate has centred on discussion as to which club received what funding, and complaints that too much money was going to sport, which has continued from the 1930s to the 1999 AGM. The proportion has become more even: in 1953 Societies received a sixth of Sport’s income, and in 1999 they receive half.

There have been several new portfolios on the SRC in the 1990s. The environment officer, first appointed in 1992, concentrated mainly on establishing recycling through the University, and also won abolition of smoking in the Union Building, use of recycled paper, and an energy audit. From 1997 action moved into general protest, against the ‘Road to Nowhere’, and in 1998 Mat Hines, also a candidate for the Senate, spoke of a long year of campaigning on and off campus. At first the environment officer had a difficult job — in 1992 he wished his successor luck, ‘God knows he’s going to need it’ — but by 1999 environmental ideals are better accepted.

The sexuality officer reported in 1996 that students’ response was favourable, but few were involved, partly because homosexuality was still illegal. The abolition of this law in 1997 was a huge boost to morale, and membership of Q-sok (Queer Society) increased. To celebrate the victory, in 1998 the Queer Collaborations held their conference in Hobart for the first time, and the sexuality officer organised an exhibition and Sexuality Week, which though low key were successful.

Presiding over all this activity has been a range of students on the SRC. The first female president, Joanne Flinn in 1990, resigned to take up another job, and was succeeded by the first overseas president, competent Pravin Ram. Stuart Baird was the first Green president, and was much involved in the canopy over the Ref steps; it was eventually decorated with the logo of a large multi-national company, an odd outcome for an initiative from a Green. Then came a run of women, first Nicolle Michell, a competent, businesslike president, an excellent leader and ‘consummate political animal’, then Shelly Murrell, who had trouble with challenges from males on the SRC and became disillusioned.

Jenny Newman followed, another competent president with leadership qualities. She had sat on the Board and enjoyed the experience, and Nicolle Michell, a friend, persuaded her to stand for president. Jenny, unaffiliated politically, did not expect to win against two male candidates, both of whom spent much time and money campaigning; because she did not have much money, she ran off material on paper from the recycling bin. She was told that students saw the males as too smooth and too political, and she won. It was a difficult time, with the Union embroiled in a court case and the general manager about to leave. Staff were unhappy, with a doctor telling Jenny that unless working conditions were improved there would be another court case: ‘here was I aged 23 having to make decisions that affected their livelihood’. Jenny employed Jonathan Jones as financial controller three days before they both became joint acting general managers.

Jenny realised that because issues were so confidential, she could not discuss them, sometimes even with the rest of the executive. She also had to consult with the architect about doing up the Ref, undertake a review of staff and services, and, when she was sick, people brought cheques to her bedside to be signed, as there were few signatories. One
staff member was arrested for fraud, and the auditors were locked in the Board Room with the Union records: the staff member was well liked and many people found this hard to believe. Fortunately the SRC was not particularly divided, but there were some tenacious males, one of whom tried to censure her because she also had outside employment and the SRC expected full-time commitment ('we did a hatchet job on her', he said). 'Student politics draws people like that, people round that age trying to sort themselves out, push the boundaries.'

That year the voluntary unionism issue blew up. One student, Daniel Muggeridge, refused to pay his services and amenities fee and join the Union, and gained much media attention. The campaign seemed to be run from Senator Abetz’ office (faxes clearly came from there), and the breakthrough came when the executive talked to Daniel; unexpectedly, Jenny found him ‘a really nice guy... he’d been fed one-sided information and was open to listening to the other side’. Legislation was passed which enabled students to choose to pay all their money to the Board, which was seen as non-political; when Daniel was elected to the SRC, he ‘did a great job’. Jenny was often called on to speak to the media, mainly on this topic. She once gave a phone interview in her sleeping bag at 8 a.m. after a party the night before, and another time was called on to give a TV interview with no preparation, when she was merely delivering a media release to the ABC.

The next two presidents were children of Labor politicians, Kate Jackson and Anthony Llewellyn. Kate was a political president, competent, with strong opinions. She did not stand on a Labor ticket: ‘there wasn’t one’. With the spectre of voluntary unionism, ‘there was near paranoia about appearing party political and particularly ALP-oriented. Also, in 1995 Labor was still in power in Canberra and didn’t have an unblemished record on higher education’. Anthony did not stand as a Labor candidate either, and in his campaign emphasised improving extra-curricular activities. He was the first medical student to be president, and the first president for some years who did not have a censure motion moved against him. Both presidents reported harmonious SRCs, Kate even wondering if there was not too much consensus, if the SRC was sufficiently passionate. Her
SRC was dominated by Law students, including four of the five executive, and Kate felt that 'we were a pretty competent and effective group. We didn’t have any significant ego problems to contend with and worked well together'. Anthony tried to get students more involved; for example, faculties had machinery for having student representatives on their boards, but often did not fill these positions, and Anthony tried to ensure that this was done. It was difficult to achieve much, he said, as it took the president some time to work out how things fitted in, and by that time the term was coming to an end.32

Catherine Miller and Anthony Llewellyn were ‘exceptional’ presidents, said old SRC hand David Wedel; Don Chalmers, experienced Board member, praised them for understanding what the Union was trying to do, and running meetings well. In these years the Union was ‘a lot more visible’. Catherine had everyone’s support on the SRC, and the executive worked together well, commented her vice-president, David Wedel. ‘It was a good year. We did quite a bit.’ The next president was Gilbert Astorga, popular with the managers as he let them get on with their work. An overseas student, he was mainly interested in the national union, and was an expensive president, running up an eighth of the Union’s phone bills in interstate calls: ‘the Union needs to be vigilant’. Gilbert moved to a job with NUS. The 1999 president is Bruce Paterson, described by SRC members as ‘a very good president, very fair, very level-headed, very realistic’; ‘really good, an excellent speaker, a good media performer, and on the SRC he likes to try and reach a compromise if there are polarised positions. I find that much more productive, things get done!’ He had stood twice before as a joke candidate, promising students free martinis and pink cadillacs, but this showed him that ‘you have to offer students what they want rather than the standard fare. You need an independent president to guide a sometimes factional SRC, and concentrate on accountable expenditure and services. Students were tired of what appeared to be half-baked protests’.33

Bruce commented that one failure he has noticed in the Union is poor planning, resulting in, for example, numerous moves of SRC premises in the 1990s. (This history has not documented changes in room allocation in the Union Building; there have been so many since 1959 that they would need a book in themselves, and a pretty boring book it would be.) This situation appears to have stabilised in the late 1990s, when the whole Union appears more consolidated. Like Anthony Llewellyn, Bruce feels it is important to involve more students, and has gained acceptance of a class delegate system, where about a hundred student delegates will serve on faculty and school boards. They can have student input in these areas, but also represent student opinion to the SRC, and tell students of Union activity. ‘You can get a whole network of people who can feed back what people want from the Union.’

One complaint is that the SRC is too political, and certainly elections often are. Election tickets were often formed by groups of friends, who wanted to gain votes through the popularity of other members of their ticket, rather than through factional loyalty; ‘it was a personal thing, sharing resources’. But there are complaints of ‘meaninglessly rhetorical and hastily put together tickets’: ‘people form tickets, and things get antagonistic, with people slagging others off. Last year a group ran calling themselves The Ticket, and their main strategy was to publish shit sheets about other candidates. That wasn’t productive… tickets made a big difference to being elected, but it also depends on your personal profile on campus, people from your faculty, and friends you knew from school.’ At the same time, there is some political infighting, and David Wedel commented on how stupid it could get. At one stage, a federal Labor politician would not allow a candidate to do photocopying in his office because the student was in the wrong faction. Tickets are seldom called Labor or Liberal, but have names like Zest, Impact or even Viagra, with the slogan, ‘We’ll stand up for you’. (A few days after the Viagra posters went
up, an agent of a multi-national drug company appeared at the Union and said that the name could not be used, and the posters should be torn down.) In 1999, in contrast with many former years, the SRC contains no Liberals, no right wing Labor, a few left Labor, a number of Greens, a Democrat and many independents, who are mostly left inclined. The Labor dominance, present for decades, has waned. At the 1999 AGM, Labor members sided with Liberals to amend a motion introduced by Resistance, so a more moderate proposal went through. No one heckled, no one was ejected. Only 39 students attended, out of 7963 — but this was 50% higher than in 1998.

As before, there were various groups on the SRC. People agreed that the dominant ideology is left with a greenish tinge, but ‘most people don’t want too much in-your-face politics’, ‘people aren’t interested in politics’, and the SRC ‘doesn’t want to be seen as part of the two-party political system’. A writer in *Tagatus* went so far as to speak of ‘ideological drongoes’. Labor was divided between right and left, and in most years there were some Greens, a few Liberals, a few Resistance, and a large number of unaffiliated members. Several people commented that once people were elected, after a few meetings they moved away from their political stances and voted according to issues. At the fourth SRC meeting in 1998, Ella Haddad asked members if they knew what tickets people had stood on; except for the president, no one could remember. ‘The day-to-day workings of the SRC aren’t nearly as political as election time. I don’t feel like a “Labor member of the SRC”. I’m there because I’m committed to student representation and the union movement generally. There’s no obligation for me to represent the ALP at SRC meetings. I think those members who are Green feel similar.’ ‘Once people are on the SRC they soon forget their tickets and factions. They discover people on the other side aren’t ogres, they can talk to them. SRCs are mostly quite harmonious.’

Some years have had a great deal of infighting, others much less, and at the time of writing there is little: ‘people are on the SRC who want to be there and want to be involved’. Bruce Paterson commented that criticism of SRC members for being political is meaningless; but everyone is political, and people cannot be expected to have no political beliefs. He agrees that most people are there because they want to serve. Since 1990 incoming members have attended training courses run by the administration, and these are helpful. Anna Campbell, an SRC member in the 1980s then in 1998, commented that in the later period the SRC is less casual, less involved in lengthy debates about international issues, harder working on the whole, and takes its role more seriously.

One group who irritates some is Resistance, the socialist youth organisation. Members are sometimes seen as aggressive, more interested in their own agenda than students’ welfare; they try to debate obscure international topics, giving those who question the worth of the Union a good argument; their long debates hold up more practical discussion. Anthony Llewellyn, Catherine Miller and David Williams set up the Education Action Coalition to try to include all shades of opinion and plan protests against education cutbacks. It attracted a broad spectrum of people at first, but Resistance members discouraged others by their long arguments such as over who would take the chair, and in the end no one came but the three organisers and Resistance, who claimed victory. Anthony had to fall back on other presidents’ position, that ‘we were democratically elected and they weren’t, and the chance for them to do anything was at the next election’. At one stage the SRC ran a campaign against Resistance when they tried to take over organising a rally. Phil Hoffen defended Resistance: they work hard for issues like compulsory unionism, they are always visible, and even if you don’t agree with them, at least they are doing something. Bruce Paterson agreed, saying that opposition to Resistance is often a knee-jerk reaction, and what they do has a great deal of worth. He sees Resistance as the part of the political conscience of the Union, and praises their
helpfulness on issues such as voluntary student unionism, not only supporting the Union but being prepared to put in hours of physical work such as putting up posters, and providing numbers at rallies. For the visitor, being handed a leaflet about ‘What would Marx have thought?’ gives people the impression that this is a university where intellectual questions matter.”

The Green political party is relatively young. Though the Wilderness Society gave out how-to-vote cards in the early 1980s, and many SRC members have been Green-inclined, Unitas Greens was only formed in 1998, and put up candidates for the SRC elections on the ticket ‘Keep Left’. It was successful, and the 1999 SRC is dominated by Green influence. 38

Student politics play a lesser role on the Board, which is more structured and formal. It has changed over the decade, becoming more professional and focussed, instead of ‘a place where you had a bit of a chat’. Some students praise university representatives: they could manipulate more, pull rank, ‘trample over us’ but do not, and simply try to ensure that ideas put forward by students are implemented properly. There is the machinery for students to take part, and if they do not, it is their fault. ‘Other Unions would shrink with horror if you told them you had representatives of the University on the Board, but it worked really effectively. We had the right people.’ Anthony Llewellyn pointed out that it was difficult to find academic Board members, particularly women, because the limited number of women academics are on too many committees already. Bruce Paterson has tried to broaden Board membership to include community representatives with other than business expertise, and new members are the Hobart Deputy Mayor Pru Bonham, and the University’s head of counselling, Margie Beasley.

Other students find the Board daunting or intimidating, and feel that the academic members, who have often sat on the Board for years, tend to talk to each other and treat students as ‘silly’, so that students do not have enough power. ‘It’s strange — we all vote on the Board and there are ten of us and three uni reps, but it’s still swayed by what the academics feel is important.’ It is difficult to stand up to a university academic many years your senior in age and experience, who might be marking your exam paper. Bruce Paterson pointed out, however, that ‘they’ve never pushed us in a direction we don’t want to go. They’ve advised us against implementing a knee~jerk policy’. Some students find the Board hard because members insist on proper investigation of ideas which students would like implemented straight away. Bruce thinks the answer is more preparation for new student Board members, so they realise their responsibilities: the Board is liable for anything that goes wrong and is in charge of 82.5% of the Union’s finances. 39

Ella Haddad commented that when the voluntary unionism issue arose, many people tried to defend the Union by saying that this was an inappropriate name as it was not like a trade union, but mainly provided services. She and Phil Hoffen on the Board tried to pull the campaign back towards student representation, which they believed was the Union’s core role. ‘That’s the reason I got involved in student politics in the first place­ because I am committed strongly to the representative role student unions play.’ This was echoed by others. ‘Student representation will always remain the core role of the TUU’, ‘The students are the University!’ 40

Don Chalmers and John Donaldson, University members of the Board for years, agreed with these sentiments. Don commented that the Board kept out of the media, leaving politics to the SRC. University members have tried to make student representatives less casual — when problems arose about the canopy it was realised that everything had been arranged verbally and there was not even a piece of paper in the records — and the Union has had to become a business, not a club. Tensions in the late 1980s have been resolved, and the Board tries to find out what students really want (through surveys) and provide value for money. Jonathan Jones, the Union’s general manager, said that
university representatives are there for moderation, to give advice, and while they do tell students 'what they don't want to hear... there's no anti-student feeling on the Board'. Many people comment that moving the SRC and Board together physically, from separate areas, has had a huge influence in bringing people together. 'It's harder to plot when everyone can see you.'

The University as a whole is also concerned with the Union. Students pointed out that the University is inclined to be generous because it knows the Union does a good job in providing services, which it does not want to have to operate; because support for the students' Union looks good, democratic, sympathetic; and because the Union can deflect student energies which might be spent in less constructive ways. Bruce Paterson is worried that the University and the government are trying to push the Union into a modern private enterprise model, which students reject. 'It's still valid to provide subsidised services to help those who need it.' There is some feeling that the University is also trying to gain more control over the Union's business enterprises. Tension between the Union, which feels independent but is in reality part of the University, and the University, which wants to have at least some control over everything under its umbrella, has existed since the Union was formed and is unlikely ever to entirely disappear.

The Union, being more autonomous than most parts of the University, can play an independent role. Jenny Newman profited because the University was felt to have made a mistake in pushing for a Union appointment which had not worked out, so university members of the Board were conciliatory. On many more political issues they did not want to become involved, as they were there long-term and were employed by the University, so they gave issues to Jenny to deal with since she would leave at the end of the year. Even more interestingly, Jenny recalled a scene where at Academic Senate the forceful vice-chancellor, Alan Gilbert, outlined his plans for Tasmania Scholarships. 'I was new and green, and didn't get something, and I thought he contradicted himself, so I asked about it. You could have heard a pin drop. He went red, and I thought, oops, but I was right.' Jenny found that she would speak on issues and receive no support, but at morning tea members would say they agreed with her; they were too afraid of the vice-chancellor to support her openly. She was one of the few people who felt free to speak at Academic Senate or the University Council; but 'it wasn't good to be too vindictive. I had to choose my issues.'

Jenny hastened to add that she respected Gilbert, who was often supportive. 'He forgave us for being young and making mistakes, and gave us slack. It could have been a lot worse.' Others in the University and outside were also helpful. Most students reported generally good relations with the University, though it is clear from Annual Reports that there have been some problems: everything was 'not plain sailing', there were some differences of opinion on major issues, relations with the University were 'improved', and Anthony Llewellyn praised negotiating first, which led to tremendous gains — instead, presumably, of protesting first.

So where does power lie in the Union? Several people pointed out that the scenario changes from year to year, depending on personalities, but most thought it generally lay with the executive, which meets weekly. The president has respect but has to carry the rest of the executive; the general manager is subordinate to the Board; the SRC can be strong if it has strong enough members, and alternates between division, and agreeing with the executive. 'If the executive agrees with the president and the general manager, you can generally persuade the Board and the SRC that ideas are good.' The University representatives on the Board, and the long-serving managers employed by the Union, are long-term stakeholders who in practice have considerable power, often through giving sensible advice. The Board could exercise power (it manages 82.5% of the finances) but
generally holds back, as it knows that it should not be seen to run the Union; though some said outright that power lies with the Board. ‘If you’re happy with the status quo, it’s not a worry, but if you’re trying to change things, the Board is very powerful. It tries to see itself as non-political, but politics are there and should be recognised. Policy has to go through the Board as well as the SRC.’ There is a movement among some students to try to change the Board, by making all student members directly elected, and by only allowing students to vote (probably constitutionally impossible) as academics are not elected and therefore not accountable. ‘If academics get their way, it is because they are generally making the sensible decision’, commented Bruce Paterson; students are only there for a year, managers state things and it is hard for students to argue against them, said ‘cynic’ Derek Turnbull. Academics are entrenched, experienced, and students only have a year in which to act, said Phil Hoffen.15

In theory, power resides with students, who elect the SRC and some Board members, but students are continually criticised as apathetic. In defence, many point out that there are now far more pressures on students: to pass exams and obtain a job, far more difficult than in the 1960s or 1970s; with fewer scholarships and a tougher financial climate, the pressure to support yourself through university by employment, which means there is little time for protest. The system of continuous assessment, which means in theory that students have to work all year, instead of just before exams, is also blamed for student apathy. Perhaps the end of university as the province of gilded youth (gilded possibly more in an intellectual than a financial sense) meant there were more students to whom traditional student protest was not part of life.

There has been a change even in this decade, with a reduction in student allowances and a rise in HECS. Some see a sense of helplessness, the feeling that ordinary people cannot change anything and might as well not bother trying, the despondency of the 1990s which almost rejects society as a positive force for change. Students in particular can believe that their efforts will have no impact, and that decisions will have no impact on them.46

There are some criticisms of the Union: it has grown too much like a business so students cannot be expected to be interested; it is a ‘toothless dog’ subservient to the University; students are demoralised by the pettiness of factions and the SRC is ‘a nepotistic tribe of troglodytes’; there are no dynamic leaders. Several election scandals did not inspire confidence, and Togatus talked of ‘a crisis of legitimacy’ in 1993. Some think the Union could perform better. It does not have the resources or staff to deal with some issues which affect students, such as widely-disliked lectures by video conference. Change is too difficult to implement, and the status quo remains. And as has often been the case, while the dominant ideology on the SRC is left with a greenish tinge, the dominant ideology of all students is probably more to the right, so the Union is hardly representative. Despite this, it continues to foster debate, and its politics outlive students’ short memories, said Bruce Paterson.47

Complaints of student apathy do not always hold true, and several protests in the 1990s have gained substantial support. As far as the Union goes, the turnout at elections, though above the national average, is only about 20% of the total, and there are always some people elected unopposed. This does demonstrate a lack of support, but there have been complaints about this since the Union started.48 Perhaps the conclusion is that many students are just not interested in student politics, and are happy to have other people running their services and keeping avenues for student representation alive; or, more gloomily, that they do not care whether they are represented or not. The 1999 president, Bruce Paterson, says he has found a great depth of misunderstanding about the Union. Many students are angry about the conditions under which they have to study, and take
Apathy finally enshrined as a platform, 1998 election.

students a voice. It protects the individual student from the dragons of the University, and provides an avenue through which students can state their cases for better treatment. It has built up traditions; not only have there been many parents then children on the SRC (Ann Lilley and Michael Elias, Brian and Andrew Wilson), but in 1998 the fourth generation of one family sat on the SRC — Catherine Alexander, following her parents, grandmother (Cynthia Johnson, president in 1941) and great-grandfather (Eric Johnson, 1908).

Interestingly, probably not so much through Union influence as through changes in general society values, student behaviour has improved considerably since the days of smoke bombs and sheep’s heads at Commem, and in graduation ceremonies in 1998, where twelve hundred students graduated, there was not one instance of misbehaviour. Moreover, SRC meetings are well run; when the chair says, ‘Order, order’, there is order, the agenda is completed in reasonable time, no one shouts let alone hits other members, and all is competent and civilised. The Union has hardly been a hotbed of radicalism during its centenary, not quite Paris in 1968, but it has nonetheless achieved many of its aims. Alan Shaw commented that the co-operation between SRC members of differing ideas, seen so often during the Union’s history, ‘may not conform to any visions of radicalism, but I think... it is infinitely more effective’. The vice-chancellor agreed. ‘During the time I have been associated with student organizations they have probably promoted student welfare issues better than their parent universities, and their members have been more vigorous social critics than have academic staff... Of course they can be a source of irritation, but rather like grit in an oyster than an annoying rash’.

Many student leaders have made genuine efforts to help students; after reading the draft of this book, Alan commented that what really stood out was that ‘regardless of the background of SRC/Board members almost all of us had one thing in common and that was to work for students’. Though SRC members were sometimes criticised for only being interested in their own careers, research has not really shown this to be a major problem
hardly anyone accused even those they disliked of it). During the research for this book, most students interviewed commented on how much they had enjoyed their years at the University, and the Union has been responsible for much of this atmosphere: 'your questions have reminded me how much fun it was much of the time', wrote Union president Kate Jackson. It has played a part in some major issues such as the Orr case. It has provided many politicians and business leaders with their first taste of public activity. Many students think the Union's greatest achievement is a century of student representation, allowing students to voice their opinion to the University, the state government and the national government about issues, both those that affect them directly, and general issues such as apartheid. Apart from actual achievements, presumably the fact that it exists has been some sort of rein on the university administration, though this is impossible to evaluate. What would the University be like without the Union? Students would all be individuals, with no means to act in concert, no way of making their voices heard, and no influence on the university administration, their lecturers, or the government, no way of getting redress for injustice or help with problems.

From a history recently published by the student union of the Uppsala University in Sweden, it is possible to compare the Tasmania University Union with its antipodean counterpart. It was founded in 1849, and had a quiet beginning. The 1930s were idyllic, with the few students an envied romanticised elite. The war brought depression, and a struggle to recover afterwards. Democracy, international cooperation and solidarity were the slogans. From the 1950s the University was open not just to the middle class elite but to everyone, and there was massive growth. In the late 1960s the Union became politicised and everything was questioned, including the University itself; the Union was seen as a good place to start a successful career, though there was criticism that students became chatterboxes rather than serious thinkers. The Union started to provide services like student housing and health, and oscillated between pragmatic questions, and debate on international topics such as apartheid. The 1970s brought far more involvement by women, with the first woman leader in 1976. Sport and the student newspaper have been important throughout the Union's life. In recent decades the Union has been seen as less important by the media and student life has become marginalised, though students are still positive and 'fresh'.

There have been many issues which crop up again and again throughout the Union's history. Misbehaviour at inter-varsity; longer library hours; dissatisfaction with the Diploma of Education course; difficulties with exam timetables. Criticisms continue: if the Union concentrates on providing commercial services, it is too commercial; if it is more interested in politics, it is not giving value for money. But the Union has continued to protect students' interests, and was seen at its best in 1999 when the question of voluntary student unionism arose. This has been an issue intermittently since about 1910.

From the 1970s, when students protested so strongly against Liberal governments' policies (particularly the war in Vietnam), Liberal governments have wanted to introduce voluntary student unionism. Without compulsory fees, unions could not survive. There are various arguments for this (compulsion is undemocratic, unions do not provide worthwhile services) but their opponents see the main reason as the Liberals wanting to crush the source of so much opposition.
In the early 1990s Western Australia and Victoria brought in voluntary unionism, which resulted in the closure of one student union and seriously weakened others. After lobbying from the Union and the University, the Tasmanian Liberal government agreed to strengthen conscientious objection clauses allowing students to remain out of the Union and give all their services fee to the Board for non-political activity such as catering, insurance, commercial services and housing.

In 1998 the issue blew up, with the Howard government announcing that it would introduce voluntary unionism. The main proponents were the Education Minister David Kemp, and Tasmanian Senator Eric Abetz, an opponent of compulsory unionism since his time on the SRC in the 1970s. NUS led a fight against it, and the Tasmania University Union planned for the eventuality, while maintaining a cautious optimism. Independent audits showed that the Union’s income could drop from $1.5 million to $.5 million, meaning massive cuts in services and staff. The Board tried to find ways of funding services without student fees. Almost every Union portfolio was reduced by 10% to provide money for a redundancy fund. There were rallies and protests, lobbying and petitions.

The Union was supported by the whole university society, alumni, administration and staff: ‘we discovered how valuable [student unions] really were when faced with the threat of losing them as a result of VSU legislation’, commented the vice-chancellor, Don McNicol. Don Chalmers was loud in his praise for the Union campaign. ‘They’ve got smart... they put factual submissions to senators and state representatives in federal parliament, targeted contact with the state government, worked closely with the VC — utterly more mature, not a political harangue. It was fought on facts not political ideology.’

The Union’s lobbying had a considerable victory when all parties in the Tasmanian parliament supported payment of the compulsory services and amenities fee. In parliamentary debate, politicians of all shades commented that the fee was reasonable, and provided important services; that it was important for students to have a voice; that
students are not as radical as they were; that the Union is not like a trade union as it mainly provides services; that the Liberals were satisfied with the agreement reached in 1995; 'if you can't be a radical when you're young, heaven help society'.

The Union played an important role in the national anti-VSU battle. It was the first in Australia to obtain support from University bodies, in this case the Academic Senate and University Council, and the vice-chancellor, Don McNicol, was the Australian Vice Chancellors' representative at the Senate enquiry into VSU. It even convinced the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, not a great supporter of 'unions', to make a submission to the enquiry in favour of the Union as a major employer, and criticising the Liberal agenda. The Union itself put in two submissions to the enquiry and was quoted in its report, and obtained vital support from Tasmanian Senator Harradine. After the victory with the state government, the postgraduate officer, Julian Yaxley, encouraged similar action in New south Wales and South Australia.

In May 1999 the Union held a public rally, which attracted about four hundred students, the highest per capita in Australia. The protests and lobbying did their part, there was unrest in Liberal back benches, it was unsure whether the bill would pass the Senate, the issue was overshadowed by GST, and in June 1999 it seemed certain that voluntary unionism would not be enforced. The Tasmania University Union would exist to start its second century of representing students.
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11 Interview with Charles Miller
12 Interview with Lindsay Whitham
13 Interviews with Charles Miller, Cynthia Alexander, Peggy Crisp, Lloyd Harris; SRC 3/6/40, 26/3/41, 2/5/41, 20/9/41 (resignations)
14 Togatus 14/5; interview with Jim Harris
15 University AR 1941; PB 18/4/40
16 Togatus 10/7 (IV), 10/6, 10/7, 10/8, 10/11, 10/12 (ISS), 10/2, 10/9, 10/10, 11/11, 12/6 (women) 11/7 (war savings); SRC 15/4/40, 28/6/41 (charity), 15/4/40, 3/6/40 (IV), 9/7/40 (war savings certs), 3/9/40 (War Savings Gp). 2/5/41, 28/6/41, 9/8/41 (NUAUS policy); interview with Cynthia Alexander
17 Togatus 9/13, 10/2, 10/4, 10/6, 10/7, 10/11, 11/1, 11/5, 11/10, 11/12, 12/1, 13/1, 13/2, 14/1, 14/5, 14/11, 15/1
18 Togatus 10/9
19 Togatus 10/10, 10/11 (support war), 10/2 (NUAUS)
20 TUU GM 8/4/40; SRC 11/10/39, 28/11/39, 6/3/40, 18/3/40 (constitution), 26/3/41, 2/5/41 (budget), 12/10/40 (handbook); Togatus 10/3, 10/4, 10/5, 10/6, 10/13, 11/1, 11/3; Union Handbook 1940 pp. 12, 21
21 TUU AGMs 27/9/39, 1/10/40, 8/10/41
22 Togatus 10/12; interview with Cynthia Alexander
23 Togatus 10/13, 11/5, 11/6, 11/7; SRC 28/6/41; interviews with Cynthia Alexander, Charles Miller, Kate Campbell
24 SRC 9/8/41, 20/9/41; Togatus 11/9, 11/11; interview with Cynthia Alexander
25 Togatus 11/7, 11/11; interview with Cynthia Alexander
26 Togatus 10/11, 11/12
27 Interviews with Cynthia Alexander, Charles Miller; Togatus 11/12, 11/13
28 Togatus 12/12, 10/2, 10/3; interviews with Cynthia Alexander, Pat Neasey (Teachers' College), Peg Crisp, Kate Campbell, Brian Wilson: Lloyd Harris, RB 'Chick' Chen and Brian Wilson agreed.
29 Interview with Cynthia Alexander
30 Togatus vols 11 and 12 passim; 11/2, 11/3, 11/4 (freedom of speech), 11/13, 12/6; interview with Charles Miller
31 Interviews with Peg Crisp and Jim Harris
32 Interviews with Cynthia Alexander, Lindsay Whitham; Togatus 10, 11 passim, 11/4, 11/5, 11/8 (men's hockey), 11/13 (basketball), 10/1, 11/12, 11/8 (ski); SRC 26/3/41 (hockey)
33 Union Handbook 1940 p. 20; Togatus 10/2, 10/4, 10/5, 10/7, 10/9: PB 21/6/40; interviews with Cecily McKinley, Charles Miller, Kate Campbell, Peg Crisp, Lloyd Harris; SRC 11/10/39, 22/4/40, 3/6/40, 9/7/40
34 Interview with Brian Wilson
35 Togatus 11/2, 11/4, 11/5, 11/7; interviews with Ross and Cynthia Alexander
36 Interview with Lady Burley; Togatus 11/4, 11/5
37 Togatus 10/4, 10/11, 11/2, 11/11 (social); 10/6, 10/9, 11/7, 11/9, 11/11 (debating)
38 Togatus 11/13; Union Handbook 1940, p. 17; interviews with Kate Campbell, Cynthia Alexander
39 Togatus 10/1 (IRC), 11/7, 11/8, 11/9, 12/3, 12/6, 12/8; interview with Cynthia Alexander
40 Togatus 11/13, 12/1
41 Interviews with Cynthia Alexander, Peg Crisp, Kate Campbell
42 Interviews with Peg Crisp, Kate Campbell, Cynthia Alexander
43 Interviews with Lloyd Harris, Jim Harris, Brian Wilson, Cynthia Alexander, Peg Crisp, Kate Campbell; Togatus 12/1, 12/2, 12/3, 12/4
44 Togatus 13/1; interviews with Lloyd Harris, Brian Wilson, Cynthia Alexander
45 Interviews with Jim Harris, Doug Saul, Brian Wilson
46 SRC 13/5/42, 7/7/42, 8/6/44, 27/7/44 (football); interview with Graeme Ingles
47 SRC 7/7/42 (debating)
48 Togatus12/9, 12/10; SRC 11/8/42, 22/9/42, 26/10/42, 28/11/42; PB 18/9/42, 16/10/42, 20/11/42, 11/12/42; AGM 7/10/43
49 Togatus 12/9, 12/10, 12/12
50 Togatus 12/4, 12/9, 12/12
51 Togatus 12/12; interview with Cynthia Alexander; it is noticeable that in candidates' profiles before Union elections, Hutchins old boys mention their school and many other candidates do not. See also AGM 14/10/42
52 Togatus 12/12
53 Togatus 12/4, 12/5, 13/5, 13/6, 14/6; interview with Cynthia Alexander
54 Togatus 12/1; interview with Cynthia Alexander
55 SRC 6/12/43; interview with Peg Crisp
56 Togatus passim vols 13, 14, 15; 14/13 (men's hockey and athletics); 13/14 (swimming); SRC 22/10/43 (swimming)
57 Togatus 14/5, 14/6, 14/8, 14/10, 14/11, 15/3, 15/5, 15/7 (IRC); 13/4 and passim, 14
pass, 15/3, 15/7 (D Club); 14/4, 14/6, 14/7, 15/1, 15/3, 15/5 (Het Jazz); 14/3, 14/5 (Music); SRC 8/6/44 (IRC)  
58 *Togatus* 13/4, 13/5, 13/8, 13/9, 13/11 (with pencilled notes, in UTA), 13/14  
59 *Togatus* 14/1, 14/2, 14/3, 14/4, 14/5, 14/6, 14/7; interview with Graeme Ingles  
60 *Togatus* 14/3, 14/5  
61 UC 24/11/44; AGM 12/10/44  
62 *Togatus* 14/5  
63 *Togatus* 14/10, 14/11  
64 Interviews with Lloyd and Jim Harris; *Togatus* 14/1  
65 SRC 14/4/43 (Man)  
66 SRC 8/6/44 (*Platyjms*; *Platyjms* 1944)  
67 SRC 22/9/42  
68 SRC 15/10/44, 25/10/44  
69 Interview with Graeme Ingles  
70 *Togatus* 15/1, 16/1  
71 SRC 7/7/42; 22/9/42 (ASFL); *Togatus* 15/1 (acorns, Law); 15/3, 15/5, 15/7 (Engineering); 15/3 (Commerce); 15/3, 15/4, 15/6, 15/9, 16/5 (politics)  
72 *Togatus* 15/6  
73 *Togatus* 15/7, 15/6, 15/3, 15/10, 16/1  
74 SRC 28/6/45, 29/10/45, 26/11/45 (sell *Togatus*); 28/6/45, 27/9/45 (IV); 29/10/45 (common room, exams); 14/4/43, 10/2/44, 27/7/44 (new Union building); *Togatus* 15/8 (sell *Togatus*); interviews with Chick Chen and Peg Crisp  
75 Interview with Lloyd Harris; *Togatus* 14/13  
76 *Togatus* 11/1 (Johnson), 15/1, 15/8 (Chen); SRC 28/6/45  
77 SRC 27/9/45  
78 Interview with Brian Wilson  

5: The Post-War Years, 1945–1949  
1 *Togatus* 16.1 (hockey); interview with Doug Saul  
2 Interviews with David Dilger, Beth McLeod, Christobel Mattingley, Helen Reeves; *Togatus* 15/13  
3 Interviews with Ken Hudspeth, Hugh Campbell  
4 U of T ARs, 1945–1951  
5 U of T ARs, 1949–1951  
6 Interviews with Hugh Campbell, Jeff Ransley, David Mattingley, Ralph Southorn (quoted); also Ken Hudspeth, Jim Harris, John Cruickshank, Doug Padgham, Keith Walker, Tom Errey; *Togatus* 17/2; in 1946 ex-servicemen won more than half the university prizes and passed 85% of their subjects, against the general pass rate of 70%  
7 Interviews with Rodney Wood, Doug Saul, Chick Chen (quoted); also Brian Wilson, Jeff Scrivener, Christobel Mattingley  
8 Interviews with Chick Chen, Ralph Southorn, Arthur Watchorn (quoted); also Doug Saul, Jeff Scrivener, Ken Hudspeth, Jim Harris, Hugh Campbell  

9 Letter from Janet Pitty (McRae), 1/11/98  
10 SRC 29/10/45, 26/11/45, 27/3/46, 9/4/46; interview with Doug Saul; *Togatus* 15/13, 16/3, 16/4, 16/5, 16/7; TUU meetings 3/12/45, 15/5/46  
11 SRC 24/6/46, 9/7/46; *Togatus* 16/6, 16/7  
12 *Togatus* 15/9, 16/7  
13 *Togatus* 16/10, 16/11  
14 Interview with Ann Jennings; SRC meetings 30/11/46, 19/3/47, 16/4/47, 23/4/47; *Togatus* 1947 passim  
15 Extraordinary GMs 7/5/47, 12/8/47  
16 *Togatus* 17/6, letter from Doug Padgham 8/11/98  
17 AGM 18/10/47  
18 AGM 18/10/47; interview with Doug Padgham; letter from Doug Padgham 8/11/98  
19 Interviews with Jeff Scrivener, Beth McLeod, Keith Walker, Jeff Ransley; *Togatus* 20/3  
20 Interview with Doug Padgham; Doug Saul agreed that ‘there weren’t political divisions on the SRC’  
21 SRC 6/7/48, 6/9/49; *Togatus* 15/13, 16/10, 16/11, 17/6, 19/6, 19/7; TUU meetings 14/4/48, 22/4/48, 20/10/48, 26/7/49  
22 SRC 6/7/48, 6/9/49 *Togatus* 19/6, 19/7; TUU meeting 26/7/49  
23 SRC 17/7/46 (marking); 17/7/46, 6/3/48, 8/6/48, 6/12/48, 28/2/49 (Orientation week); 1/12/47, 6/12/48 (health); 2/5/48, 8/6/48, 28/2/49 (housing); 25/6/48, 28/2/49 (bookstall); 23/6/48 (vote on UC); 19/7/48, 30/9/48, 9/5/49 (regiment); 30/9/49, 20/11/48 (paths); 29/11/48 (library), 1/4/49, 17/6/49, (women’s hostel), 17/6/49 (attract students); UC 27/7/45 (hostel), 28/3/46 (housing); *Togatus* 47/1 (library), 18/1 (Orientation, housing health), 18/3 (bookstall, housing), 19/4 (housing); TUU August 1948 (lecture attendance); interview with Christobel Mattingley; Union handbook 1948; TUU AR 1950  
24 TUU meeting August 1948; *Togatus* 20/8; interview with Brian Wilson  
25 SRC 1/4/49; interview with and demonstration from Tony Manley; interview with Doug Padgham  
27 *Togatus* 15/11, 16/2, 16/5, 16/6, 16/7, 17/6, 18/1, 19/6, 19/7, 19/8; SRC 24/6/46, 17/8/46; TUU meeting 15/5/46  
28 SRC 26/7/48, 9/8/48; TUU AGM August 1948  
29 *Togatus* 17/6, 17/6, 19/1, 19/2; SRC 13/3/49, 14/3/49, 16/3/49,  
30 *Togatus* 15/8, 17/4, 18/3; interviews with Dallas’s brother-in-law Henry Finlay, Henry
31 Interview with Doug Padgham; *Togatus* 19/1; SRC 4/4/49
32 TUU meeting minutes 1945–1949; TUU 12/8/47 (disaissal), 28/3/49 (gambling)
33 SRC 28/2/49, 29/8/49, 11/10/49
34 SRC 18/10/47, 6/3/48, 4/4/48; interview with Brian Wilson
35 Interviews with Cecil McKinley, Doug Padgham, Christobel Mattingley; advertisement for *Smokin’ Hot* among SRC minutes
36 *Togatus* 49/2; SRC 28/2/49; interviews with Cecil McKinley, Keith Walker, Rodney Wood, Jeff Scrivener, Christobel Mattingley
37 Interview with Rodney Wood
38 Interviews with Jeff Ransley, Brian Wilson, Jeff Scrivener, Helen Reeves, Christobel Mattingley, David Mattingley, Rodney and Christine Wood, Doug Padgham
39 Interview with Brian Wilson; the date was probably 1946, as *Togatus* contains a joking reference to a disgraceful program (*Togatus* 16/5)
40 *Togatus* 19/2; SRC 23/6/48; interview with Rodney Wood
41 Interviews with Christine and Rodney Wood, Jeff Scrivener
42 *Togatus* 19/2; interviews with Jeff Scrivener, Brian Wilson
43 Interviews with Keith Walker, Brian Wilson
44 UC 13/5/49; SRC 13/5/49, 17/6/49
45 *Togatus* 19/2
46 *Togatus* 1946 and 1947 passim; 16/1 (politics), 16/7 (poetry), 16/10 (Antarctica, bushwalking); 17/1, 17/2 (religion), 17/4 (strikes); interview with Ann Jennings
47 *Togatus* 1948, 1949 passim; 18/1, 2, 3; 19/1; interview with Keith Walker; TUU AR 1950
48 SRC AR 1950
49 SRC 17/6/49, 21/7/49; *Togatus* 19/4, 19/5, 19/9, 20/1; TUU AR 1950
50 *Togatus* 1946–1949 passim, 19/8 (rugby), 19/9 (football), 20/5 (trounced); interview with John Cruickshank (canteen)
51 *Togatus* 1946–1949 passim, 18/3 Socialist Club; letter from Doug Padgham 8/11/98
52 *Togatus* 17/6, 19/1, 19/2, 19/4, 19/6, 19/7, 19/8; interviews with Jeff Ransley, Christobel Mattingley; SRC 17/6/49, 4/7/49, 18/7/49, 6/9/49
53 *Togatus* 18/2; letter from Janet Pitty, 1/11/98
54 Interview with Keith Walker; *Togatus* 19/5, 19/7, 19/8
55 Interviews with David Mattingley, Jeff Scrivener; Union handbook 1950 (wolves); *Togatus* 18/2 (wolves), 23/8 (Gray)
56 Interviews with Christobel Mattingley, Doug Padgham, Beth McLeod; *Togatus* 16/9; letter from Janet Pitty 1/11/98

6: The Lull then the Storm: the 1950s
1 TUU GM 31/3/50
2 *Togatus* 20/3
3 Figures from University ARs, 1950–1955
4 *Togatus* passim; 23/1 (marijuana), 25/2 (sacred); interviews with David Dilger, Beth McLeod, Jeff Scrivener, Shirley Hofto, John Reid, Neal Blewett
6 *Togatus* 20/2; there were 24 beds by 1955 (25/2) and 35 at Christ College (23/6); SRC 11/5/51, 24/4/52, 12/6/53, 20/7/55; interviews with Judy Thirkell, Frances Parsons
7 SRC minutes passim; *Togatus* 24/4, 28/6 (kisses); Union Handbook 1955 p. 14
8 SRC minutes passim; 12/9/50, 18/9/50 (cautene); Rsh p. 32; TUU Handbook 1955 p. 12
10 SRC AR 1952; SRC 25/11/51; *Togatus* 51/1; interview with John Cruickshank; AR 1950
11 *Togatus* 24/5; interview with Fay Wallace
12 *Togatus* passim
13 Interview with Jeff Scrivener; possibly this was in 1955, when Gavan Feirnoligh was standing, and *Togatus* mentions Gavan and Aces, 55/5
14 Interviews with Henry Reynolds, Bruce Poulsom, Judy Thirkell
15 Interviews with John Cruickshank, Ted Barrett
16 Interviews with Keith Mackrill, Ann Elias, Bruce Cole, Fay Wallace; *Togatus* 24/2 (no interest in party politics), 23/8 (surplus); Tony Manley commented that this absence of politics continued through into the 1960s
17 *Togatus* 51/5, 52/3; interview with John Cruickshank
18 Interview with Ted Barrett
19 Letter from Ted Barrett to John Cruickshank, 13 August 1951
20 Interviews with Tony Manley and Judy Thirkell
21 SRC AR 1954; interview with Neal Blewett
22 SRC 11/10/50, 19/2/51, 15/3/51, 22/5/53, 12/6/53, 31/7/53, 18/10/53, 6/12/53, 8/4/54, 13/6/54, 4/7/54, 5/4/54, 15/3/57 (Hills); SRC AR 1955; *Togatus* 26/10 (China), 27/1 (Hills, China, Indonesia), 26/3 (Malaya)
23 TUU meeting 23/4/54; SRC 15/8/53; *Togatus* 53/10
24 SRC AR 1950; interview with Les Wallace
25 *Togatus* 1950; 20/3 (vigour, uncomfortable, sports clothes, frock), 20/4 (three more issues, unprecedented), 20/5 (stagnant), 20/6 (stultifying, monotonous), 20/8 (scarves), 20/9 (satin tie); Jeff Ransley, Christine Wood and Jeff Scrivener agree that Sartor was John Palmer
26 Interview with Christine Wood; 21/1, 6, 7, 8, 9 (immigrants); 21/9 (COs), 21/1 (langwidge)
Interviews with Graham Clements, Christine Wood; SRC AR 1951

Togatus; SRC 17/7/51, 16/10/51

Togatus 22/2, 3, 4, 5; SRC AR 195230

SRC AR 1953; Togatus passim, 23/10 (students straight from school), 23/1 (employment); interviews with Keith Mackriell, Bruce Cole

SRC AR 1954; Togatus 24/2 (enemy); interview with Tony Manley

Togatus 1954 passim; interviews with Tony Manley, Ann Elias; Togatus 26/1 (Carington Smith)

Union Handbook 1955 p. 19

Interviews with Christine Wood, Graham Clements, David Dilger, Peter Cranswick; Togatus 25/3 (Sky-Knees), 25/5 (Cane)

Dennis Altman The Comfort of Men, Melbourne, 1993 pp. 20–21; interview with Graham Clements

Togatus 23/5, 6

Togatus 28/3, 6; SRC 19/5/58; SRC AR 1957; interview with Tony Manley

Interviews with Christine Wood, Graham Clements, Beth McLeod, David Dilger; Togatus 20/2, 4, 5, 7, 21/2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 22/5, 23/6, 8


Togatus 21/6; SRC 30/11/52; TUU meeting 3/9/51; SRC AR 1951; interviews with Tony Manley, Judy Thirkell

Togatus 20/8; interviews with Jeff Scrivener, Rodney Wood, Val Smith

Togatus 20/6, 20/8, 23/1, 23/2, 23/5, 23/7, 23/10, 24/2, 24/4, 25/1, 25/9, 26/9

SRC 20/7/55; interviews with Judy Thirkell, Frances Parsons

SRC minutes 12/5/50, 20/6/50, 25/7/54; Togatus 25/8; interviews with David Dilger, Christine Wood, Jeff Scrivener, Ted Barrett, Shirley Hofto

Interviews with Les Wallace, Christina Marquet; Togatus 24/2, 24/4 (Locher), 26/9 (Welebinski)

AR 1952, Togatus 20/7, 21/3, 4, 8, 9, 22/6, 23/9, 24/8, 25/5, 9; SRC 18/6/52; interview with Judy Thirkell

Interview with Neal Blewett; Togatus 25/5 (symposia), 21/6 (music)

Interview with Bruce Poulson

Togatus passim; 23/6 (camp), 21/7, 10 (studentship rise), 27/2 (Radical), 27/3 (DLP); Clubs and Societies AR 1955; interviews with Beth McLeod, Helen Reeves, Graham Clements, David Dilger, Ted Barrett, Keith Mackriell, Jeff Scrivener, Shirley Hofto, Fay Wallace, Henry Reynolds, Judy Thirkell, Frances Parsons

Interviews with Henry Reynolds, Bruce Poulson, John Reid

Togatus 1950–1955 passim; 24/2 (beer-shows), 20/7 (400), 23/8 (1953), 24/4 (Ball), 27/1, 2 (SPC); SPC AR 1954, 57; SRC 24/10/54 (Wednesdays), 28/8 (archery), 26/9 (cricket), 28/1 (mountaineering)

Togatus passim; 21/3 (Landy), 25/1 (1954), 25/2 (Cazaly), 25/5 (football, basketball, shooting), 25/9 (men's hockey), 27/8 (women's hockey), 28/5, 7 (complaints); interview with Bruce Coie; SPC AR 1956 (badminton)

Interviews with John Cruikshank, Keith Walker; Togatus 20/3, 4, 5

Togatus 20/2, 4, 5; SRC 12/5/50

SRC 3/5/51; Togatus 21/4, 5, 6; interviews with Neal Blewett, Rodney Wood, Graham Clements; Rish pp. 47–48

Mercury 8/3/52; Togatus 22/1, 2

Interviews with Keith Mackriell, Ted Barrett, David Dilger; Togatus 22/4, 5

SRC AR i954; Togatus 23/2, 4, 24/2, 5

Interview with Ted Barrett

Interview with John Reid

Togatus 25/4, 27/4, 5; SRC 19/4/55; SRC ARs 1956, 1957

Interview with Bruce Poulson

Interviews with John Reid, Graham Clements, Bruce Poulson

Interviews with David Dilger, Brian Wilson

Interview with Bruce Poulson

Interview with Tony Manley

Interviews with Tony Manley, John Reid

SRC 1/12/57

Togatus 26/3, 5; interview with Tony Manley. Other members were William Wolnizer, Margaret Nicol and Peter McCabe

Interviews with Ann Elias, Beth McLeod, Ted Barrett, David Dilger, John Cruickshank

Interviews with Fay Wallace, Ted Barrett, Les Wallace, Keith Mackriell

Interviews with Christobel Mattingley, Beth McLeod, Shirley Hofto, David Dilger, Les Wallace, Jeff Scrivener, Neal Blewett; Togatus 24/4 (girlies), 21/5 (studentettes)

Interviews with Ann Jennings, Helen Reeves, Ann Elias, Beth McLeod, Shirley Hofto, Judy Thirkell; list of academic staff in Union Handbook, 1955, pp. 47–49

Interviews with Beth McLeod, Judy Thirkell, Christina Marquet. This story was told as a current tale at the University in the 1970s, about the same man; author's experience

Togatus 23/7; interviews with Ted Barrett, Neal Blewett

Interviews with Christine Wood, Jeff Scrivener, Chick Chen, Helen Reeves, Jeff Ransley, Shirley Hofto
78 Interviews with Judy Thirkell
79 Interviews with Christine and Rodney Wood, Graham Clements
80 Interviews with Christine and Rodney Wood, David Dilger, Brian Wilson
81 Interview with Henry Reynolds
82 Interviews with Henry Reynolds, Judy Thirkell, Bruce Poulson; Dennis Altman *The Comfort of Men* Melbourne 1993 p. 20
83 Interview with Bruce Poulson; Education Report to SRC, 1965
84 Interview with Frances Parsons
85 Interviews with Christine Wood, Ann Elias, Shirley Hofto, Keith Mackriell, Tony Manley, Judy Thirkell SRC AR 1953
86 Interviews with Tony Manley, Christina Marquet, Henry Reynolds
87 Dennis Altman *The Comfort of Men*, p. 21; Report in minutes of UM, 18/10/54
88 Report in minutes of UM, 18/10/54
89 *Togatus* 54/2, 3
90 Interview with John Reid
91 Peter Hall agreed, and John Reid, a later student, recalled ‘a bus like a meat van’, which did have seats, and steps up the back
92 Interviews with Les and Fay Wallace, David Dilger, Tony Manley, Christine Wood, Ted Barrett, Tom Errey; *Togatus* 20/3, 20/4, 21/4, 21/8, 22/6, 22/7 (Errey)
93 Interviews with Colin Lane, Tom Errey
94 SRC 13/10/54; TUU 18/10/54; *Togatus* 54/10; UC 22/10/54
95 Interview with Colin Lane; *Togatus* 54/11
96 SRC 6/12/54; *Togatus* 55/1, 55/2, 55/3; TUU meeting 15/4/55; UC 22/2/55
97 *Togatus* 25/2, 25/5, 25/6; Report of Royal Commission on University of Tasmania 1955, pp. 11, 23, 41–3, 53; Union Handbook 1960; Rish pp. 44–5
98 *Togatus* 29/1; interviews with Jim Brassil and Val Smith
99 *Togatus* 25/7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 27/2 (Hyten), 29/1; SRC 4/4/56 (Asian Week); UC 22/7/55, 12/8/55; interview with Tony Manley; letter from Graham Clements 12/11/98
100 SRC ARs 1955, 1956; interview with Rae Wiggins
101 SRC 4/4/56, 15/4/56, 21/6/56, 2/12/56; *Togatus* 26/1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 29/1; UC 27/4/56; SRC AR 1957
102 SRC 30/1/56, 5/5/56; *Togatus* 26/1, 2, 3, 4, 5; UC 23/2/56
103 SRC 21/2/56, *Togatus* 26/1, 2, 29/10; UC 27/4/56; SRC AR 1960; interviews with Tony Manley, Jim Brassil
104 Interviews with John Reid, Ted Barrett, Des Fearney-Sander, Tony Manley, Graham Clements, Judy Thirkell, Beth McLeod, Christina Marquet, Neal Blewett
105 *Togatus* 26/2; UC 16/12/55, 24/2/56, 2/3/56, 16/3/56
106 Interviews with Des Fearney-Sander, Lindsay McDermott
107 Interviews with Neal Blewett, Bruce Poulson, Rae Wiggins, Tony Manley, Val Smith
108 Interviews with Michael Roe, quoting Carey, and with Tony Manley
109 Interview with Tony Kearney
110 SRC 13/6/56 (Socratic); *Togatus* 26/2, 4, 5, 9, 11; UC 10/8/56, 28/9/56; interview with Jim Brassil
111 Interview with Jim Brassil
112 *Togatus* 26/11, 27/2
113 *Togatus* 27/2
114 SRC 2/12/56 (drive); *Togatus* 27/8 (amiable); interview with Tony Manley
115 *Togatus* 27/3 (censure), 27/5 (KKK and Isles), 27/11 (Dallas), 27/8 (flood), 27/4, 5 (Commend), 29/1 (general)
116 *Togatus* 27/8; interview with Jim Brassil
117 UC 27/9/57
118 Interviews with Bruce Poulson and Tony Manly
119 SRC 9/12/57; *Togatus* 27/8, 10, 28/1, 2, 4
120 TUU meeting 14/8/57 (good behaviour); *Togatus* 27/5, 6, UC 28/6/56 (Solomon)
121 AGM 14/8/57
122 SRC AR 1958; interview with Tony Manley
123 SRC 8/9/58; *Togatus* 28/3, 6, 7; UC 17/6/58
124 *Togatus* 27/4, 28/5, 6, 7
125 AGM 14/8/58
126 SRC 22/9/58, UC 28/11/58
127 Interviews with Christina Marquet, Tony Manley; SRC 28/5/58, 16/6/58; *Togatus* 28/1
128 *Togatus* 28/7 (Poulson dismissed); SRC AR 1958; interview with Bruce Poulson
129 TUU meetings 21/4/58, 1/5/58, 30/6/58, 15/3/58, 30/4/58; SRC 22/9/58; *Togatus* 26/6 (Solomon; Jill was also criticised in earlier years), 28/2, 3, 5, 7
130 Interview with Tony Manley
131 SRC 19/5/58, 21/7/58 (stockings), 16/6/58 (Smith), *Togatus* 28/4, 6 (Commend)
132 Interview with Bruce Poulson
133 UC 24/4/58, SRC AR 1958; SRC 28/2/58, 21/4/58, 22/5/58, 8/9/58, 22/9/58, 20/10/58; *Togatus* 28/1, 3, 5, 7; interviews with John Reid and Val Smith
134 *Togatus* 28/7

7: ‘Please Don’t Conform’: the growth of dissent, 1959–1965

1 *Togatus* 29/1, 31/1 (pigsty); interview with Lindsay McDermott; *Union Handbook* 1961
2 *Togatus* 29/1, 29/3
3 Rish p. 53; interview with Tony Manley
4 Interview with Henry Reynolds
5 *Togatus* 29/2, 29/7, 29/10, 30/3, 30/5, 31/1; interview with Tony Manley; 1964 *Union handbook*
6 Ewbank and Daintree, pp. 11, 16–17, 19, 25, 26–7; interview with Frances Parsons
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The Tasmania University Union was founded in 1899, to encourage sport and social life among students. Over the next century it expanded its activities to include sponsoring a range of sporting and cultural groups, and providing student services such as the Refectory, housing, a bar, counselling, a shop and health services. It has put the students' point of view to the university authorities and the government, organised student protests and more informal activities such as processions, chariot races, scavenger hunts and Iron Man competitions. In short, it has tried to provide students with all possible services and assistance. This book shows to what extent it has succeeded in its first century of existence.

Alison Alexander, a well-known Tasmanian historian, has strong links with the Union herself. A student at the University of Tasmania for 13 years, she was a member of the SRC (1970), as were her husband (1966) and daughter (1998), not to mention her mother-in-law, father-in-law and grandfather-in-law.