



THE DEVELOPMENT OF TERTIARY EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA, 1939-1979

by

J.T. HYDE, B.A. (HONS.) DIP. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (JHU BOLOGNA).

**Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department
of Politics, University of Adelaide, July 1983.**

Awarded 16/12/83

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	ii
Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction	viii
Chapter 1: Education and Hegemony	1
<u>Historical Development</u>	
Chapter 2: The Development of Australian Tertiary Education to 1939 (a) Developments to 1890 (b) 1890 - 1939	19
Chapter 3: An Introduction to the Post-War Period (a) Commonwealth Involvement (b) Constitutional Responsibility (c) Financing Tertiary Education	67
Chapter 4: The Political Context, 1939 - 1979 (a) From War to Reconstruction (b) Pressures for Growth (c) Expansion and Contraction	112
Chapter 5: Education, Economics and Hegemony (a) Education as Investment (b) Education and the Economy (c) Education in the Hegemonic Process	146
<u>Reports of Commonwealth Committees of Inquiry</u>	
Chapter 6: The Walker Report, 1944	205
Chapter 7: The Murray Report, 1957	226
Chapter 8: The Martin Report, 1964-65	279
Chapter 9: The Williams Report, 1979	345
Conclusion	425
Bibliography	435

Chapter 2 was published as "The Development of Australian Tertiary Education to 1939", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1982, (Melbourne, 1983)

SUMMARY

Within the development, of tertiary education in Australia in the post-War period, there are four committees of inquiry which clearly have played a central role. These are the Interdepartmental Committee on Education (1944), the Committee on Australian Universities (1957), the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (1964-65), and the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training (1979). These become known as the Walker Committee, the Murray Committee, the Martin Committee and the Williams Committee after their chairmen. It was these inquiries which ratified and legitimised policies for tertiary education which enabled both diversification and centralisation of the system. An examination of the reports of these committees occupies a major section in this thesis. It is preceded by an examination of the political and historical context in which the committees of inquiry were situated.

The thesis opens with a chapter which deals with the theoretical issues dealt with in the study. In particular, it outlines the way in which the hegemonic process develops and operates, stressing that it is neither singular nor static, but constitutive and based in a network of individual institutional hegemonies within society. The relationship between tertiary education and the hegemonic process is discussed. This chapter provides the theoretical underpinning on which the study rests.

Following this, the thesis consists of two distinct parts, each containing four chapters. The first deals with the historical development of tertiary education in Australia. A background chapter covering the period up to 1939, when the study proper commences, illustrates how the growth of tertiary education was anticipatory, in that the changes recommended proceeded rather than followed or reflected

economic developments, and was linked with the struggle to establish bourgeois hegemony in Australian society. The tenuous leadership of the bourgeoisie in the face of a military-squatter alliance, and later, working-class militancy, led to specific developments in the universities. The next three chapters deal with the period from 1939 to 1979. In chapter three, general developments are reviewed. The growth of Commonwealth involvement is traced and the issues of constitutional responsibility and financing tertiary education are canvassed. Chapter four deals with the political context in which development was situated. The period around the Walker Committee, which was an integral part of the post-War reconstruction machinery determined the broad directions in which tertiary education was to develop, with diversification, growth and increasing Commonwealth involvement becoming evident. The period around the Murray Committee and up until the Martin Committee, saw an intensification of the pressures for growth of the tertiary education system, and the development of clear sectionalisation of it. From the Martin Committee until the Williams Committee, the system as a whole experienced a rapid period of growth followed by a rapid period of contraction, both of which strained the resources available to tertiary education and the relationships within and between the sectors. Chapter five examines some of the major issues which arose in the course of general debate concerning tertiary education and its role in the hegemonic process. The areas canvassed are the relation between education and the economy and the notion of education as an investment, both of which occupied a considerable portion of the debate.

The second major part of the thesis deals with the four committees

of inquiry. Chapter Six, which deals with the Walker Report, is much shorter than the following three chapters for two main reasons. First, the Walker Committee was a confidential committee, the findings of which were never officially released. It has been since, however, the subject of a study by Tannock, and because he has published many of the major documents concerning the Committee, less time has been spent in this study than might otherwise have been necessary. Chapters Seven and Eight deal with the Murray Report and the Martin Report. Both are approached in a similar manner. The two committees, along with the Williams Committee, called for public submissions as well as met with interested parties during the course of their deliberations. The papers of the two were available, which allowed a more comprehensive analysis to be undertaken. In each of these two chapters, the deliberations of the Committees, the submissions to them, their reports and reactions to the reports are dealt with. Chapter Nine deals with the Williams Report. It is rather less comprehensive than the preceding two chapters, as the papers of the Committee, as distinct from the submissions to it, were unavailable for analysis.

The conclusion, of course, follows the second part of the study.

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been the result of more than 'simple' academic effort. My association with colleagues in postgraduate students associations, at the University of Adelaide, and nationally, and with academic colleagues through my membership in the vigorous committee system of the University of Adelaide, has been invaluable. It has given me insights of which I might have otherwise been unaware.

Some people need specific mention. Harry Medlin has provided lively debate and friendly, yet critical, example. Doug McEachern and Brian Abbey have been able and helpful supervisors.

The staff in each of the Manuscript Reading Room of the National Library of Australia, the Australian Archives, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, the Barr Smith Library and the Australian College of Education, Melbourne, in every instance cheerfully provided the assistance I needed.

The support of Don Anderson, Virginia Kenny, Grant Harman, Stephen Murray-Smith and Paul Nursey-Bray was invaluable in gaining special access to those documents held by the Archives, National Library and C.T.E.C. John Bannon very kindly allowed me long term access to related papers.

I owe a great debt to my fellow postgraduates in the Politics Department for their friendship and support.

Christine Hill and Tina Woods were indispensable colleagues whose technical proficiency enabled final production of the thesis.

Christine, Alice and Sophie had to live through it all.

INTRODUCTION

Political and historical discourse in Australia in the post-War period, and especially in the last fifteen years, has tended toward two modes. The first, and most common, is traditional, bourgeois and, because it purports to deal with data which is objective, empiricist. Its antecedents, as the mainstream of such discourse, had set the parameters within which the discourse proceeded, adopting those facts and events which could be integrated into bourgeois conceptions of politics and history, and dispatching less notable events to the dustbin of history.

The second had suffered in the anti-intellectual and anti-theoretical climate in Australia. Its growth in popularity during the post-War period was concomitant with, and to some extent dependent on, the growing sophistication of Australian society as it became less isolated. Political economy was able to trace its roots in the intellectual past in Australia through Fitzpatrick, Irvine and other Australian intellectuals and academics who emerged from the mainstream both to challenge and sharpen the dominant interpretations of Australian historical and political development. The development of political economy was in many respects a reaction to the complacency which had overtaken bourgeois scholars after World War II. Its empiricism stemmed from this.

Both modes of historical and political discourse have recently been challenged by another mode which has strong links with the second, yet has moved from a primary concern with economics to a more general analysis which recognises both the central place of economic structures and the relatively autonomous position of other structures in political and civil society. This mode might be described as political and

cultural history. Its links with the Left ally it with political economy, although its less restrictive nature allows a much broader scope and ensures that a tension exists in the related analyses of the two modes. The work of those intellectuals and academics on the Left who have been concerned with reinterpreting the history of Australia's development from this perspective is becoming more mature and more accepted. This study is a contribution to such a reinterpretation. The development of tertiary education in advanced industrial societies in the post-War period has played an important role in maintaining bourgeois hegemony. There is little doubt that this is so in Australia, where tertiary education has been the subject of many inquiries, of continuous review through statutory bodies established solely for that purpose, and the recipient of increasing proportions of the nation's resources.

Within this development, there are four committees of inquiry which clearly have played a central role. These are the Interdepartmental Committee on Education (1944), the Committee on Australian Universities (1957), the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (1964-65), and the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training (1979). These become known as the Walker Committee, the Murray Committee, the Martin Committee and the Williams Committee after their chairmen. It was these inquiries which ratified and legitimised policies for tertiary education which enabled both diversification and centralisation of the system. An examination of the reports of these committees occupies a major section in this thesis. It is preceded by an examination of the political and historical context in which the committees of inquiry were situated.

The thesis opens with a chapter which deals with the theoretical issues dealt with in the study. In particular, it outlines the way in which the hegemonic process develops and operates, stressing that it is neither singular nor static, but constitutive and based in a network of individual institutional hegemonies within society. The relationship between tertiary education and the hegemonic process is discussed. This chapter provides the theoretical underpinning on which the study rests.

Following this, the thesis consists of two distinct parts, each containing four chapters. The first deals with the historical development of tertiary education in Australia. A background chapter covering the period up to 1939, when the study proper commences, illustrates how the growth of tertiary education was anticipatory, in that the changes recommended proceeded rather than followed or reflected economic developments, and was linked with the struggle to establish bourgeois hegemony in Australian society. The tenuous leadership of the bourgeoisie in the face of a military-squatter alliance, and later, working-class militancy, led to specific developments in the universities and the non-university technical education institutions which were to shape perceptions of the role of tertiary education in the future.

The next three chapters deal with the period from 1939 to 1979. In chapter three, general developments are reviewed. The growth of Commonwealth involvement is traced and the issues of constitutional responsibility and financing tertiary education are canvassed. Chapter four deals with the political context in which development was situated. The period around the Walker Committee, which was an integral part of the post-War reconstruction machinery determined the broad directions in

which tertiary education was to develop, with diversification, growth and increasing Commonwealth involvement becoming evident. The period around the Murray Committee and up until the Martin Committee, saw an intensification of the pressures for growth of the tertiary education system, and the development of clear sectionalization of it. From the Martin Committee until the Williams Committee, the system as a whole experienced a rapid period of growth followed by a rapid period of contraction, both of which strained the resources available to tertiary education and the relationships within and between the sectors. Chapter five examines some of the major issues which arose in the course of general debate concerning tertiary education and its role in the hegemonic process. The areas canvassed are the relation between education and the economy and the notion of education as an investment, both of which occupied a considerable portion of the debate.

There are some issues which have not been widely canvassed in this part of the study. Most notable is the area of Federal-State relations, which often occupies a good deal of space within such discussions. It is not, however, central to the argument of why the tertiary education system plays the role it does in the hegemonic process, but is more concerned with the intra-class struggles of the bourgeoisie. This thesis makes reference to the issue when appropriate, but does not dwell on it. The discussion of constitutional responsibility illustrates that the bourgeoisie as a class have hegemony within the legal/constitutional areas, and disputes within it relate not to the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony vis-a-vis the working-class, but the dominance one fraction of the bourgeoisie exercises within that class. In addition to this area,

there is little or no discussion on the relation between tertiary education and women, aboriginal people, minority and disadvantaged groups. These are all extremely important areas. They are not excluded through thoughtless neglect. On the contrary, each deserves a major study of its own.

The role of the statutory educational commissions, and committees of inquiry established by State governments has also been excluded as a major topic in this study. Once again, each could be the topic of an individual study. While each played an important role in the hegemonic process, the four committees under examination set the parameters within which they operated.

The second major part of the thesis deals with the four committees of inquiry. Chapter six, which deals with the Walker Report, is much shorter than the following three chapters for two main reasons. First, the Walker Committee was a confidential committee, the findings of which were never officially released. It has been since, however, the subject of a study by Tannock, and because he has published many of the major documents concerning the Committee, less time has been spent in this study than might otherwise have been necessary. Chapters seven and eight deal with the Murray Report and the Martin Report. Both are approached in a similar manner. The two committees, along with the Williams Committee, called for public submissions as well as met with interested parties during the course of their deliberations. The papers of the two were available, which allowed a more comprehensive analysis to be undertaken. In each of these two chapters, the deliberations of the committees, the submissions to them, their reports and reactions to the

reports are dealt with. Chapter nine deals with the Williams Report. It is rather less comprehensive than the preceding two chapters, as the papers of the committee, as distinct from the submissions to it, were unavailable for analysis.

The conclusion, of course, follows the second part of the study.

One comment is required on the language in the study. Many of us have been aware in recent years of the sexist nature of much of our language, particularly that dealing specifically with power structures. Every attempt has been made to remove the necessity for sexist language here. There is one exception. The concept of 'manpower planning' is one which has exercised educationalists during the period under review, and the term is included in many of the reports and debates concerning education. It is to be hoped that the term 'labour force planning' will be that more acceptable in the future. However, in this study the other term has been used to retain some fluency in the discussion where reference is being made to the reports. It is used with an awareness of its faults, and a hope that it will become obsolete.

Chapter 1

Education and Hegemony

Introduction



For a society to survive it must ensure the continuance of the conditions of production which underlie its existence. The production process of a mode of production is the operation of productive forces within definite relations of production, and if the conditions of production are to be maintained, the productive forces - that is the physical means of production, and labour power - and the existing relations of production must be maintained. The relationship between education and the continuation of the conditions of production is twofold. It effects both the reproduction of labour power, and the maintenance of the existing relations of production. The education system assists in imparting the values which embody the essentials of the mode of production on which the society rests, through its position in civil society,¹ the autonomous nature of which makes it a valuable agent in the process to maintain the hegemonic dominance of the mode of production. Because of this role, crises in the mode of production act upon the education system. This is not to say, however, that the education system is a simple reflection of economic developments, for as Hall noted,

Social formations do not consist of an articulation of modes of production alone, but always sustain superstructural relations - the political, the juridical, the ideological. And, because these are not the mere efflorescences of the 'base', they have pertinent effects: they have the effect of further complexifying the constitution of classes.²

Branches of the superstructure mediate within the economic sphere - the base - and are themselves mediated by 'practices' (traditions, class forces) which may be within the society that has developed around specific economic developments, but not of it in any simple way, and thus relatively autonomous from the mode of production.

Nevertheless, the superstructure remains essentially part of the society, and the importance of its different branches is related to the

requirements of the maintenance of the class relations upon which society is based. In capitalism, the role of the civil society in promoting the discontinuous network of specific institutional hegemonies which make up the hegemony of the bourgeoisie is differentiated among its various branches. Within this, the education system has considerable importance. The routine practices of the society are imparted and the sorting of individuals according to the roles they will play is completed before students reach the tertiary level with its sophisticated ideological exposure, and, concomitantly, opportunity for access to the bourgeoisie. Tertiary education provides the fine tuning. Hegemonic dominance depends to some degree on the success of the education system in fulfilling its role. While it is successfully promoting in specific and complex ways the acceptance of a society divided into fundamentally antagonistic classes and the legitimacy of production based on private property and private profit, or on forms of supportive state intervention and negation of conflicts through administrative procedures, its hegemonic function will be a success.

The relation between education and the maintenance of the conditions of production is twofold. First, education effects the continuance of more or less labour power. The major agent for this is the payment of wages, which ensures the physical means of existence for workers. However, it is not sufficient to provide only for the material means for the maintenance of labour power. With the development of the capitalist mode of production, reproduced labour power must be correspondingly developed, that is become increasingly skilled and specialised. The second, and more important factor is the role of education in the hegemonic process. The transfer of dominant culture, values and material practices ensures that individuals are directed toward specific positions within society which are acceptable (in most cases) to capitalist institutional requirements, and those who have 'best' articulated their

responses to the dominant culture, values and practices are rewarded. It is particularly this function which gives the education system its importance, for in this context it is the branch of civil society which reproduces intellectuals, especially at the tertiary level.³

Blake suggests that in an advanced capitalist society like Australia "anti-intellectualism is partly the expression of the spontaneous elemental reaction of the worker against his own cultural deprivation."⁴ The dominance of bourgeois hegemony is a principle reason for this, which is both a result of the suppression of alternative and oppositional cultures and ideologies, and a means of suppression. Gramsci noted that the development of education with the development of capitalism illustrated the importance of intellectual categorization and specialisation in the suppression of working class ideology and culture in an attempt to maintain its own hegemony.

Parallel with the attempt to deepen and broaden the 'Intellectuality' of each individual, there has also been an attempt to multiply and narrow the various specialisations. This can be seen from educational institutions at all levels, up to and including the organisms that exist to promote so-called 'high culture' in all fields of science and technology.⁵

The notion of hegemonic dominance by one class in society calls into question the role of the state, the functioning of civil society, and the role of the intellectuals of each class. Advanced capitalist society is not merely a simple set of relations between the bourgeoisie and the working class. It is complexly stratified with these contradictory relations inherent in its very institutional structure, but these complex relations are mediated by other important factors.

While the superstructure is relatively autonomous from the mode of production, it nevertheless provides the conditions for the existence of society and for its maintenance. It does this by maintaining the dominance of the bourgeoisie; in political society (the state) by repressive and legislative means, and in civil society by ensuring the

provision of ideology and the means for its hegemony in the society. The state which on the one hand provides the legal conditions and coercive underproviding for the maintenance of society, on the other, is itself legitimised and protected by the hegemony of the mode of production, which is realised and maintained in civil society. While this relationship exists, the state and civil society stand apart from one another, and the relation between the latter and the economic structure is even more attenuated. The state, notwithstanding its autonomy, has a more direct relationship with the interests of the bourgeoisie through its repressive functions. Civil society, with its concentration on persuasion and consent, contains, to a far greater extent than either the economic structure or the state, forces which may be in, but not of, the society, that is, emergent or residual of different modes of production.

It is this factor which is of importance with relation to the role of education in civil society. In modern capitalist societies, the hegemony of the bourgeoisie is so pervasive that it constitutes what Williams noted as

a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world. It is a lived system of meanings and values-constitutive and constituting-which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move in, in most areas of their lives.⁶

However, Gramsci noted that

in order to provide for renewal, revitalisation, reproduction and defence of hegemony (a continuing and constitutive process because of differences and contradictions that have to be negotiated at each specific conjuncture) civil society must

provide the widest base possible for the selection and elaboration of the top intellectual qualifications - i.e. to give a democratic structure to high culture and top level technology...[a necessity]...not without its disadvantages; it creates the possibility of vast crises of unemployment for the

middle intellectual strata, and in all modern societies this actually takes place.⁷

The level which this base reaches on the institutional hierarchy in education may, in fact, become a threat to bourgeois hegemony which will necessitate a new series of criteria for selection similar to that which occurred in Australia in the late 1970's.

Hegemony

In developing the theory of hegemony, Gramsci was dealing with the problem of alienation and class power in the resilience of capitalism by extending it from the alienation of the worker in the economic sphere, which had been Marx's central concern, to the cultural sphere. Marx had shown decisively that in capitalism the alienation of the worker was more than between that of individual and the physical means of production, but encompassed a division between the worker and knowledge. He had also clearly recognised the need for the bourgeoisie to exert its hegemony.

Each new class which puts itself in place of the one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aims, to represent its interests as the common interest of all the members of society...The class making revolution appears from the very start...not as a class but as the representative of the whole of society.⁸

Gramsci developed this notion, showing that while the forces for hegemony were generated by the economic structure, they were legitimated in the superstructure, particularly in civil society. In this way, he gave a real meaning to the dialectical process which Marx had identified by giving a decisive function to the superstructure. The dialectical process of capitalism was now extended to the relationship between the economic structure and superstructure.

By extending the notion of alienation to the cultural arena. Gramsci's theory of hegemony overcame the difficulties involved in the notion of ideological domination by which a class relied on formal,

articulated and often abstracted beliefs, to impose its own consciousness on subordinate classes, thus denying them the possibilities of their own consciousness, or forcing them to continuously struggle against it. Instead, hegemony provided for the unconscious consent of subordinate classes to bourgeois ideology, which was presented as common sense and constituted the whole lived social process. The dialectical nature of the hegemonic process, as it continually renewed itself while combatting emergent and residual forces, gave a decisive function to the notion of consciousness. The decisiveness of the intellect and ethico-political factors in the creation of consciousness in Gramsci's work illustrated its crucial position in the hegemonic process. It was class consciousness which enabled the bourgeoisie to extend its hegemony throughout society. It was also class consciousness of other classes which constituted the major threat to that hegemony, through the potential materialisation of consciousness into practices which were alternative or oppositional to the dominant practices of society.

This obviously has important consequences for the role of education in the hegemonic process, in transmitting those values and meanings which will reinforce the consciousness of the bourgeoisie while combatting that of other classes. Raymond Williams suggested that creativity - a central factor in the development of consciousness - was one of the central themes of Marxism. He suggested that in Marx consciousness was seen as an integral part of the material social process, and as such the production of ideas was part of the production process.⁹ The role of the education system in the production of ideas, particularly in tertiary education where research is a central function, assumes an important position in the hegemonic process, which makes its control critical, especially over curricula and selection procedures.

The development of a hegemony is the result of a struggle between emergent and existing dominant contradictory forces until one ideology

prevails economically, politically, intellectually and morally, until all questions posed in the struggle are in its terms. It is, in practice, a struggle which may be discontinuous between institutions and spheres of society, resulting in an ongoing and constitutive process. The political society which emerges must develop into more than an organ of the ruling class, since its legitimation depends to some extent on how it satisfies some of the demands of other classes in the society.¹⁰ From this, the state has an important role to play in the maintenance, and indeed the establishment, of hegemony. It both guarantees the conditions and sanctions within which a hegemony is maintained, and is itself legitimised by that hegemony. The development of bourgeois hegemony in Australian society in the early to mid nineteenth century resulted from the struggle between two emergent forces, the bourgeoisie and the working class, an artificially induced situation in which the existing military governments of the Australian colonies and their squattocracy allies were pushed aside with the creation of a liberal-bourgeois state by more advanced interests in England. Even with this period of 'statolatory', the establishment of bourgeois hegemony was not consolidated for some time because of a bitter struggle between conservative bourgeois elements with their roots in the squattocracy, and the industrial-urban bourgeoisie. The initial victory of the latter rested substantially on an alliance with the working class, which was not able to be discarded until the depression of the 1890s solidly entrenched the bourgeoisie and severely weakened working class interests. Bourgeois hegemony was established and maintained especially through Federation and the drafting of a constitution without representatives of the working class, and the legal cannons of the liberal-democratic state became the framework within which the Australian society of the twentieth century developed.

Raymond Williams pointed out that the establishment of hegemony was not sufficient, since hegemony was not a system or structure to be

equated with formal state institutions, but a process. It could not therefore be singular or passive; instead it was constituted through the realised experiences, relationships and activities of individuals and classes, and needed to be continually renewed, defended and modified, if it was to be maintained in the face of resistance, pressures and challenges from both residual and emergent forces in the society.¹¹ If they were to remain dominant, the practices, meanings and values which constituted the hegemonic process had to be able to selectively incorporate into that process those traditions and emergent forces which supported, or accommodate moderate alternative cultures (and in so doing discredit or suppress those which threatened it). The most obvious way in which the hegemonic process operated with respect to existing practices was to refer to them as 'the tradition' or 'the significant past'. It was the selectivity in the process which was critical, with only certain practices being emphasised while others were discarded, leading to the construction of apparent unities and continuities that excluded contradictions and differences.¹²

In advanced capitalist societies, the continual selection, reinterpretation and dilution of liberal-democracy in the political sphere, and the separation of politico-cultural and economic spheres (embodied in the neutral state and private control of the means of production) constitute the important factors in the bourgeois hegemonic process. The pressures upon the development of Western capitalism which resulted from the need to accommodate at least some of the interests of the emergent working class, emphasised the importance of democratic traditions in these societies.¹³ The importance of Gramsci's work on hegemony rested in his recognition of the realities of liberal-democracy, that it was an explicit form of consent which reduced the need for overt coercion from the state which characterised earlier societies. As Raymond Williams noted,

The true condition of hegemony is effective self-identification with the hegemonic forms: a specific and internalized 'socialization' which is expected to be positive but which, if that is not possible, will rest on a (resigned) recognition of the inevitable and the necessary.¹⁴

Equally though, Gramsci illustrated that as a continuing social process, the resignation of the working class to the 'reality' of bourgeois ideology in the hegemonic process was the very factor which allowed the emergence of potentially hegemonic forces. The dialectic of the hegemonic process lay in the struggle between the existing bourgeois hegemony and an emergent working class potential hegemony.¹⁵

This was, of course, not a new thought in Marxism. In Capital, Marx wrote that,

At a certain stage of its development [a mode of production]...brings forth the material agencies for its own dissolution. From that moment new forces and new passions spring up in the bosom of society; but the old social organisation fetters them and keeps them down.¹⁶

Until Gramsci, however, the way in which the emergent forces were contained was held to be by coercion and ideological domination (leading to false consciousness) without any adequate explanation of the ways in which this was accomplished. Gramsci saw that the contradiction inherent in the development of the working class, which at the same time had to be contained in the economic sphere and accommodated in political society, allowed for the democratic development of emergent forces which could overcome bourgeois hegemony and produce dynamic social and structural change.

A social group [class] can, and indeed must, already exercise 'leadership' [hegemony] before winning governmental power. (this indeed is one of the principle conditions for the winning of such power); it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to 'lead' as well.¹⁷

Such a conception returned Marxism to its Western and idealist origins, for while it was conceived in Marxist terms and on Marxist premises, the

notion of hegemony moved beyond more conventional Marxist categories, giving as it did an importance to cultural renovation and the extension and development of a restricted liberal democracy, to a true democracy in all spheres of society. Bourgeois hegemony was based in democracy, and its contradictions would allow for a democratic conquest by, and democratic maintenance of, a working class hegemony.¹⁸

Education and Hegemony

The role of the formal education system in the hegemonic process rests in providing the basis by which individuals and classes in the society are trained to identify with the dominant values, practices and concepts of the ruling class. Like other facets of the hegemonic process it is active and constitutive, linking the skills it transmits with concepts within which they operates and the values which form the basis for those concepts. In doing so, the education system provides much of the training for the ability to participate in other sectors of the material production process and the production of ideas. In advanced capitalist society the continuing legitimacy of education is important for the education system provides one of the strong links between the economic structure and social-political structure-the superstructure-in the minds of students.¹⁹ This link is, of course, essential to the hegemonic process. Marx argued extensively that inherent in the process of commodity production was the reproduction of social classes. But, as Gramsci pointed out, the worker "is not specifically characterised by his manual or instrumental work, but by performing this work in specific conditions and in specific social relations".²⁰ The acceptance of these conditions and social relations without bourgeois resort to overt repression is the result of a successful hegemonic process, and to some extent, relies on the link provided by the education system between the society and the individual.

The legitimacy of the education system and the role of education in the hegemonic process have come together in advanced capitalist societies. Even so, the two remain distinct. Legitimation ensures that the education system is acceptable as a means of transmitting social and material values and skills. The hegemonic function of education is the actual transmission of them. The former is achieved by equating individual material and moral improvement with national economic growth and, at the same time, with education.²¹ The latter is achieved in a number of ways. For the majority of students it has a class confirming role, which it pursues through the restriction of educational opportunities or the raising of barriers to opportunities. These work by laying blame for failure on students unable to overcome the barriers, which are held to be 'objective' standards. This role is reinforced. For working class children some or all of the values, language and culture of education tend to be distinct from those of family and environment. For other children, these factors increasingly coincide with everyday non-school life.²² Political and ideological factors in the form of 'fundamental values' and 'essential principles' are stressed by the education system. These give rise to the 'selective tradition' noted by Raymond Williams, and are, as Miliband points out, "those which are sanctioned by the dominant forces in society".²³

Even though the legitimation of the education system and its role in the hegemonic process remain distinct, the two are linked by the function the system has of sorting individuals into class positions. This is not a rigid function, for while the class position of a student's parents frequently has a major role in determining the class position of the student, the education system provides one of the main avenues for social mobility for individuals in relation to class. Miliband points out that,

it may enable more working class children to reach 'the top'. But this, far from destroying the class hierarchies of advanced capitalism, helps to strengthen them. The infusion of new blood into the upper layers of the economic and social pyramid

may present a competitive threat to individuals who are already there, but it is no threat to the system itself.²⁴

Such social mobility, in providing positive examples of success, legitimates the education system and plays an important role in the hegemonic process. The flexibility of the sorting process includes not only cross-class social mobility, but also intra-class mobility, a function which is of possibly greater importance, for it increases the illusion of individual progress with fewer dangers to individuals occupying more 'senior' class positions. Gramsci noted that,

The multiplication of types of vocational school thus tends to perpetrate traditional social differences; but since, within these differences it tends to encourage internal diversification, it gives the impression of being democratic in tendency.²⁵

He also pointed out, democracy did not mean the chance to become a skilled worker. Instead, it should provide the chance to rule, and an education system should help equip individuals to do so or be able to chose those who do.²⁶

The Hegemonic Functions and Tertiary Education

The role of institutions in the tertiary education sector-in Australian, the universities, the colleges of advanced education, and T.A.F.E colleges-is important for the hegemonic process. It is here that the majority of intellectuals are educated. Because they are dealing substantially with people who fill middle-level and senior positions in society, the function of these institutions is less with the sorting operations of primary and secondary schools. Nevertheless, this role is clearly important, not so much in the initial sorting process, as in re-inforcing its results, as the differentiation both within and between institutions suggests. Miliband noted generally that,

as higher education spreads, so does an old distinction between the institutions which provide it assume a new importance. Some institutions offer much greater facilities of every kind

than others, enjoy a much higher prestige than others, and are much more likely to provide recruits for the command posts of society. These establishments, entry to which naturally requires more stringent qualifications than others, are much more likely to be accessible to upper- and middle-class students than to working class ones.²⁷

With increasing differentiation of the tertiary sector has been an increased concern over the issue of autonomy for both institutions and individuals within them. While the two are not synonymous, there is general recognition, at least within the British and Australian contexts, that academic freedom - the latter - is more easily safeguarded if the former is also assured. Individual academic autonomy is important for the development of a potential hegemony, for the continual investigation over a wide range of issues which it promotes offers challenges to accepted principles, and thus to the maintenance of the hegemony of dominant ideas in society. On the other hand, it is essential for the long-term maintenance of hegemony, as it offers a means for renewal, revitalisation, defense and modification. It is part of the dialectic of the hegemonic process.²⁸ Usually, however, autonomy contains little threat to the maintenance of hegemony. The majority of those academics 'protected' by academic freedom are what Gramsci termed 'traditional' intellectuals, and their freedom of speech and investigation are voluntarily exercised within the context of advanced capitalist society. While there is some genuine dissent, Miliband points out that,

it is much more often the case that both university authorities and teachers endorse the context, are part of it, and exercise their autonomy in ways which are congruent with that context, not because they are compelled to do so but because they themselves are moved by conformist modes of thought.²⁹

Nevertheless, tertiary education institutions have come increasingly under the scrutiny and control of governments, which through funding regulations are able to exercise considerable authority over research projects, teaching areas, student numbers and academic working conditions. While there has usually been no overt threat to individual

academic freedom, there have been cases of threats of institutional autonomy which ensure that the context in which autonomy is exercised is maintained.

The increasing control by governments of tertiary education was predicted by Marx who recognised that the development of capitalism could produce the need for labour educated and skilled to such a level as to recognise and oppose the exploitative nature of capitalist social relations. Bowles and Gintis suggested that this situation has been reached in those advanced capitalist societies which have moved toward 'mass' tertiary education.

It is simply impossible for higher education to conserve its traditional liberal arts structure and to transmit useful high-level skills to students without, at the same time, developing some of the student's critical capacities and transmitting some of the truth about how society operates.³⁰

The consequence has been the increased vocationalisation of tertiary education. In Australia, pressures have been evident in the universities, in the establishment and expansion of the advanced education system, and the rapid expansion of technical and further education.

Such measures are meant to ensure that tertiary education continues to operate within and for the hegemonic process. The role of research in the production of ideas gives to tertiary education an importance beyond that of education in general, especially where the production of ideas interacts and fuses with the material production process. The autonomy which enables bourgeois hegemony to be renewed and revitalised also permits threats to the hegemonic process where those individual intellectuals concerned do not accept the context in which autonomy is usually situated.

Conclusion

The establishment and maintenance of the hegemony of a dominant group in society is an active, constitutive and differentiated process.

The conditions which apply in advanced capitalist-democratic societies, more than at any previous time, illustrate the dialectic nature of the hegemonic process. The dialectic between the representative democratic basis of the hegemonic process and the authoritarian nature of the ideology that it promotes in capitalism both limits and makes possible challenges to bourgeois hegemony. In particular, it allows for democratic challenges and a democratic consolidation of potential working class counter-hegemony. The fluid nature of the relationships between the component parts of society reinforces this characteristic of the hegemonic process. The ambiguity of the 'boundaries' between the economic structure and the superstructure, and within the superstructure, between political and civil society, illustrates the active constitutive and differentiated nature of the process which provides the legitimation of society, its mode of production, social relations and ideology.

The role of the education system, and particularly tertiary education, in the society and the hegemonic process, is no less active nor ambiguous than other components and factors. The very nature of the hegemonic process, directed toward the survival and regeneration of the society, removes the possibility for inflexibility and rigidity of the education system. The importance of its sorting functions and the transmission of those values and skills which enable individuals to participate in the social relations of production provides the flexibility in which ambiguity toward the hegemonic process is able to develop. The historical development of education in democratic-capitalist societies illustrates its role in the process for the establishment and maintenance of bourgeois hegemony, and the ambiguities which may enable alternative and oppositional practices to that dominance to develop.

FOOTNOTES

1. The term civil society has undergone a change in meaning since it was first used in the 18th century. This tends to confuse its usage. While it may not be entirely satisfactory it is not the purpose of this thesis to invent a new term. Here it is used to describe non-state 'institutions' which form part of the superstructure (and which may or may not overlap with state institutions).
2. S. Hall, "The 'Political' and the 'Economic' in Marx's Theory of Classes", in A. Hunt (ed), Class and Class Structure, (London, 1977), p.55
3. The role of intellectuals in the hegemonic process is an important one, for intellectuals are those individuals who articulate the ideas and interests of the class to which they belong. Gramsci noted that while everyone has an 'intellectual' capacity, those who actually perform the functions of intellectuals in society can be divided into two groups. The first are 'traditional' intellectuals, from whom are drawn the majority of senior state personnel and the 'professional'. The second are what Gramsci terms the 'organic' intellectuals of each class. These may also be members of the same professions and occupations as the 'traditional' intellectuals, but as Smith noted,

are distinguished less by their professions, which may be any job characteristic of their class, than by their function in directing the ideas and aspirations of the class to which they organically belong.

G.N. Smith, "Introduction to 'The Intellectuals'", in Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith (eds and translators), Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, (London, 1976), p3.

According to Gramsci, as each new class comes into being it finds intellectuals already in existence - the 'traditional' intellectuals - who, while maintaining their autonomy, are quickly absorbed by the hegemonic process and perform necessary administrative tasks for the dominant class. At the same time as each new class comes into being, it produces its own intellectuals - 'organic' intellectuals -

which it creates alongside itself and elaborates in the course of its development, [and who] are for the most part 'specialisations' of partial aspects of the primitive activity of the new social type which the new class has brought into prominence.

A. Gramsci, "The Intellectuals", in ibid., p. 6.

4. J.D. Blake, Revolution from Within, (Sydney, 1971), p.99
5. Gramsci, "The Intellectals", p.10
6. R. Williams, Marxism and Literature, (Oxford, 1977), p.110
7. Gramsci, "The Intellectuals", p.11
8. K. Marx, The German Ideology, p.62, Cited in D. McLellan, The Thought of Karl Marx, (London, 1974), p.151

9. Williams, Marxism and Literature, pp.59-60. He cited Marx's example of the effect of specific technique training in contrast to training for abstract 'ideas'.

We presuppose labour in a form that stamps it as exclusively human...What distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he creates it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement.

K. Marx, Capital, Vol. 1, pp.185-186

10. A. Gramsci, "The Modern Prince", in Hoare and Smith, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, pp.181-182
11. Williams, Marxism and Literature, p.112.
12. Williams' most succinct statement is in R. Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", in R. Dale, G. Esland and M. MacDonald, (eds), Schooling and Capitalism, (London, 1976), p.205 (this article was originally published in New Left Review). For an extension of the argument, see Williams, Marxism and Literature, pp.115-116. One of the most important factors in the selection is the concomitant reinterpretation, dilution and emasculation of those elements which are 'traditional'.
13. This is not necessarily the case in all capitalist societies, particularly those of the Third World where colonialism imposed capitalism on very different traditions. In advanced capitalist societies, however, struggles ensued around, for instance, welfare state issues, arbitration and the development of labour parties.
14. Williams, Marxism and Literature, p.118
15. See G.A. Williams, "The Concept of 'Egemonia' in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes on Interpretation", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. XXI, no.4, October-December 1960, p.594.
16. K. Marx, Capital, Vol 1, (Moscow, 1970) p.714.
17. A. Gramsci, "Notes on Italian History" in Hoare and Smith, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, pp. 57-58.
18. See Williams, "The Concept of Egemonia", pp.588-594.
19. See M. Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism, (New York, 1974), p.2; and T. Rowse Australia Liberalism and National Character, (Malmsbury, 1978) p.53. The notion of a link between the economic structure and the minds of students, and the transmission of skills, should not be viewed simplistically. The link is not a direct one providing specific occupational training in terms of specific skill training. These are more likely and commonly part of participation in the actual production process. Instead, the link concerns the context within which skills are transmitted, and the values which form the basis for that context. It is training in the social relations of production (through assessment, routines, authority structures etc) not so much in the material production process which the education system provides.

20. Gramsci, "The Intellectuals", p.8
21. There is some degree of latitude in interpretation here which allows for the variation in support given the different sectors of education by the bourgeoisie.
22. R.W. Connell, Ruling Class, Ruling Culture, (Cambridge, 1977), p.176 in Chapter 8 Connell reviews relevant literature. See also R.W. Connell et al, Making the Difference, (Melbourne, 1982), passim.
23. R. Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society, (London, 1978) p.217.
24. ibid, p.41
25. A Gramsci, "In Search of the Education Principle", in Hoare and Smith, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, p.40
26. He went on to point out that the culture of non-working class children confirmed their schooling as preparation to rule. If working class students were to participate in the emergence of an alternative hegemony they would therefore have to work much harder at learning how to adapt bourgeois education to the 'production' of working class intellectuals, rather than be absorbed by the system.
ibid, pp. 42-43
27. Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society, p.41
28. Gramsci recognised this.
- It seems necessary that the hard work of research into new truths and into better, more coherent, and clearer formulations of the truths themselves should be left to the free initiative of individual scholars, even if the very principles which seem most essential are continually put to the question.
- A. Gramsci, Il Materialismo Storico, (Turin, 1955), p.18, in Williams, "The Concept of 'Egemonia'", p.595.
29. Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society, p.227
30. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, (New York, 1976), p.206.

Chapter 2

The Development of Australian Tertiary Education to 1939

Introduction

Accounts of Australian education have suggested that the growth of mass public education has been the result of two factors. First, mass public demand in the wake of the development of an industrial society which gave the working man more leisure, a rising standard of living, and an appreciation of the benefits of education. Second, the concern of more enlightened sections of the upper class for the welfare of the working class. The development of education is seen as concomitant with the development of the liberal democratic state. Other accounts have linked educational development with the development of capitalism in a more direct way. They suggest that schools developed with factories, wage labour and work dependence as agents of socialisation, and for basic skill transmission, in the face of the declining influence of the church, family and artisan. This chapter traces the development of tertiary education in Australia until 1939 to show that neither of these accounts is adequate. In doing so it is necessary to outline the economic and social development of Australia. The development of tertiary education cannot be examined in isolation. This examination shows that the educational system was not developed to service the needs of the developing economy but in anticipation of economic benefits.

Between 1830 and 1860 Australian economic growth was rapid, as the convict settlement of the preceding period was transformed into a society with the world's highest per capita real product in 1860. Until 1890 the economy continued to grow with the development of capital intensive and highly productive industries in all sectors, primary, secondary and services. In 1890 Australia probably had the highest standard of living in the world and one of the most developed economies. A higher percentage of its labour force was employed in services and the tertiary sector than any other of the capitalist economies at this time. But from 1890 until 1939 Australian economic growth was severely retarded in

comparison, and periods of high growth during these years usually represented recovery from recession or depression. The depressions of the early 1890s and around 1930 depreciated Australian living standards seriously enough so that per capita and per worker growth rates did not reach the pre-1890 levels until the late 1930s. However, Butlin suggested that the situation in Australia with regard to economic growth is not this clearcut, but had to take into account a number of local peculiarities. He explained;

Limited opportunities for structural change, an advanced technology in natural resource utilization, a relatively complex and sophisticated business organization, large-scale enterprises in major sectors of the economy, a very high rate of capital formation: these are the conditions from which a study of Australian growth since 1890 begins.¹

Writing in the 1940s, Fitzpatrick identified an aspect of the Australian economy which Butlin and his contemporaries de-emphasized; the role of the state in Australian economic development. He suggested that one of the most remarkable facets of this development was not Australia's growth as a manufacturing nation, or the fact that control was substantially in the hands of British finance capital, but that

A special interest attaches to recent Australian economic development not so much by reason of these great accomplishments as because of a remarkable change in a related sphere - that is, the bearing of public enterprise on private enterprise.²

He identified two periods of large scale public enterprise growth - 1788-1825 and 1911-1935 - both of which ended fairly summarily when it "appeared that they limited or might limit the scope of profit-seeking private enterprise." He continued "The retirement of the government from public enterprise, then, is easily understood as an incident of a public policy usually subservient to private direction"³ but stressed that state involvement in the economy must also be seen in terms of carrying the burden of non-profitability (transport and communications), arbitration, and the continuing transfer of social services from private

employers to the public sector. McFarlane emphasized the role of the state in creating favourable conditions for capitalist expansion during the period from 1860-1890,

In 1885-6...it was local government expenditure which countered tendencies towards depression. Railway construction and residential building were prominent factors in offsetting fluctuations in 1866, 1878, 1882 and 1885.⁴

Carnoy, and Bowles and Gintis have directly related the development of education in the United States to the growth of capitalism and the efforts of an emerging industrial bourgeoisie to establish its hegemony in society.⁵ As Carnoy put it;

the movement for public education in the United States began in the industrializing northern states under pressure from reformers who represented the views of a growing bourgeoisie. Local industrialists saw schooling as a means to offset the disruptive social conditions of factory life; some institution was necessary to provide the moral guidance and control which the church and family had supplied in pre-capitalist society.⁵

Bowles and Gintis analysed the integration of the United States higher education system into the capitalist economy as it became more technologically advanced and organisationally complex.⁶ For Australia, Connell posited a similar development: formal education

became more specialized with the development of technical education around the end of the nineteenth century, for the purpose of supplying the skilled workforce needed for industrial production...in the twentieth century [universities] were reintegrated through the development of state secondary schools as a pathway towards administration and the professions.⁷

It is doubtful that as direct a link between a developing Australian capitalism and the education system can be illustrated as it can for the United States, or as Connell would have it, in Australia.⁸ This is especially so in relation to both higher education and technical education. Encel suggested that where industry is important for export earnings, higher education in the technologies is especially valued. He cited the United States, France and Germany in support of his case.

Where, as in Australia, primary industries - mining and agriculture - are the main source of foreign earnings, he suggested that higher education was less valued and therefore in less demand. He also concurred that the development of higher education has almost invariably followed the attempts of a new ruling class to establish its hegemony. In China and pre-industrial Europe, universities or their equivalent were established by the aristocracy for the education of the ruling elites, but with the growth of industrialization, higher education was coopted in the interests of the bourgeoisie. In Australia the results of these two factors were affected by the egalitarian nature of the young Australian democracy which qualified the nature of the universities in particular. They were forced to move away from the concept of totally elite institutions and become more the professional schools of Australia, a shift which was exaggerated by large-scale state employment of the professions.⁹ Encel's interpretation is open to several criticisms. For the period under review, it is not true that government employment of professionals was a significant factor, given that most professional graduates were either in medicine or law and went into private practice, or were in engineering and were employed in the manufacturing sector. Secondly, the development of highly utilitarian and vocational universities went hand-in-hand with their extreme elitism, conservatism and purist notions in terms of course content and standards.

Murray-Smith illustrated throughout his major work on the development of technical education in Australia¹⁰ that much of its impetus was anticipatory rather than dependent on existing conditions. Partridge suggested that the development of the universities owed as much to their strong relations with the contemporary development of the British redbrick institutions (and British capitalist development) as to the local environment. This was especially so, given their detachment from most other institutions of Australian society - the political

parties, trades unions, industry - which were mostly anti-academic and anti-intellectual.¹¹ Within this context the development of higher education reflected the conflicts in the Australian ruling class between the squattocracy and the emergent urban based industrial bourgeoisie, and the organisation of this part of the education 'system' represented to a large extent the influence of the former, while course development, the latter.¹² The controversy which surrounded the establishment of the older universities was decided in favour of the conservatives, but by the 1860s, this group had been replaced by industrial interests. The moves by the universities into medicine, law and engineering reflected this. From then on, the attitude of the bourgeoisie to the universities was ambiguous. On the one hand, they saw them as providing initial professional training only, while on the other, they were anxious to ensure that the elite nature of the institution with its specific social tasks survived. This led to the phenomenon already noted; that "they were overwhelmingly teaching institutions and especially preoccupied with undergraduate teaching,"¹³ with extremely conservative philosophies and practice.

The rhetoric which has accompanied the development of education in Australia reflected more the anticipatory nature of it in relation to the economy than the actual direct links which characterized it in the United States and the United Kingdom.¹⁴ As Murray-Smith pointed out with regard to technical education;

Technical education originated as much (or more) from liberal and radical ideas on the proper place of the working classes in the new society that was being painfully structured as from any pragmatic response to industrial or agricultural needs.¹⁵

Arguments for the development of mass public education and its extension, albeit meritocratic, borrowed heavily from British experience and rhetoric - liberal idealism underpinned with concern for the values of private property - in contrast to the more pragmatic, economic concerns

of United States reformers.¹⁶ Nevertheless, argument in support of education ranged over both concerns, and was never more than a thinly disguised argument for the strengthening of bourgeois hegemony in a still politically unstable society. Connell and Irving cited G.K. Holden, a leading liberal business figure of the 1850s, who recognised the potential of the working class and the value of education to absorb it into the political system: "The people may thus be rendered not only a harmless, but a highly beneficial channel of political power...". He went on to warn that "a people truly educated, will spontaneously form its own institutions"¹⁷ (anticipating Gramsci), that if Australia's highly paid workers were not educated and given political liberties, dissent would abound. Austin cited two other types of argument - that concerning human capital, and that of the police function of education - from the Victorian Parliament in the early 1870s:

From a national point of view, therefore, I think we are only doing our duty when we utilize all the material at our disposal, for we may, by assisting to develop the mind of the son of some obscure peasant, enable him to come forth as one of the lights of this southern hemisphere, in letters or science.¹⁸

It is the duty of Government to protect our persons and property from danger. The gross ignorance of the common people is a principle cause of danger to our persons and property. Therefore it is the duty of the Government to take care that the common people shall not be grossly ignorant.¹⁹

On the whole, organised labour, or at least its leaders, supported the moral and intellectual education of the working class, especially during the eight hour day movement, and Palmer suggested that there was little debate on the type of education to be provided, "as though education were merely another form of welfare service, uncoloured by class values."²⁰ That questioning which did occur was usually absorbed by ameliorative measures rather than substantial change; for instance, the introduction of a system of bursaries to overcome trade union demands that financial reasons should not preclude anyone from continuing their

education. This attitude was evident in the development of the Workers Educational Association, which illustrated the use of education for hegemonic purposes, the consolidation of the liberal ideology. While the early history of the Association reflected the political conflicts between the trade unions and the liberal bourgeoisie, Rowse noted that

Labour reformism, the ideology of the Australian working class leadership since before federation, existed ... as a 'benign' variation of the ruling-class ideology, of liberalism.²¹

The founders of the Workers Educational Association had a philosophy which Rowse called "secular evangelism". It was utilitarian, based on the notion of education as an agent for specific moral and civil beliefs, and defined the relationship between the individual civic will and the state as a common good. Their aim was social reform and the inculcation of a social ethic to 'enforce' it. Both its academic and trade union proponents believed that 'socialism' divorced ethics from materialism; they based their arguments on an attack on class consciousness. They argued that social conflict was not class based, but based on cross class ideals, and that if individuals learnt to recognise this, they could then argue rationally.²²

Partridge, in Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, analysed the results of the development of Australian tertiary education and began to explain some of the characteristics it had assumed by the end of the period. The universities were concerned with undergraduate teaching and professional training. Partridge suggested that the development of the universities into postgraduate training and research was inhibited by a number of factors. First, the isolation of the Australian universities from one another and their close British links led to good Australian graduates being encouraged to study in England. Second, the attitude of Australians, who viewed universities as institutions for basic professional training. Third, the lack of an indigenously developed technology which would increase demand for higher education. As a

result, he suggested that "the universities tended to remain purely undergraduate, derivative and imitative, rather unenterprising and unproductive, small and second rate."²³ He summed up perceptively:

If Australian universities have appeared to be exceptionally utilitarian or vocational in spirit, this is mainly due to the character of the society they served. It is a society lacking a wealthy class with a background of education or culture; hence, few students have entered the universities for the sake of the intellectual life they could live there. It is a society which has been on the whole anti-intellectual; not able to see clearly the value of thought or scholarship or scientific enquiry unconnected with concrete social and economic advantages, nervous about argument and speculation which seemed to clash with moral, religious and social orthodoxies; quick to resent professional pronouncements which question vested group interests; and generally inclined to regard the "intellectual" as a creature apart.²⁴

Technical education was also substantially underdeveloped, and accorded a low status in Australia. Partridge suggested that the import of technical skills and technology went hand-in-hand, and was exacerbated by the introduction of tariff protection and the consequent lack of foreign competition. Technical colleges were mainly concerned with the production of skilled craftsmen and lower level professionals to undertake routine technological and managerial work. "In short", he pointed out, "industrially, as in other spheres of social life, Australia has been a dependent and derivative culture".²⁵ Within the system, Partridge noted that the role of the major technical institutions - Sydney Technical College, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, South Australian Institute of Technology, and the Ballarat and Bendigo Schools of Mines - in professional education has been as important as that of the universities, yet they have never been given the prestige of the latter institutions. He suggested that

This is paradoxical in a country which is often accused of being unusually attached to utilitarian or economic values, and where the universities themselves have often been accused of being excessively utilitarian or vocational in their temper and purposes.²⁶

What Partridge did not recognise here, even given his perceptiveness

earlier, was the role of the universities in the process of bourgeois hegemony in Australia.²⁷ In fact, his so-called paradox can be explained in these terms: that although the Australian economy and society were technologically and industrially derivative, there was still a need for the Australian bourgeoisie to maintain its hegemony; hence two types of institutions fulfilling the same or very similar roles in relation to technical and professional training, but with one having an elitist ideology and a higher social status. This system was not maintained exclusively in the tertiary education sphere, but was based on the binary system of secondary schooling, and the esteem which the public at large held for 'academic' high schools in comparison with the technical schools, and its converse, the sense of failure surrounding achievement in the lower status institutions in comparison.

Developments to 1890

Prior to 1850, attempts to establish an education system, especially at the post-school level, were sporadic and to a large extent, unsuccessful. Most were centred on technical education, since the elite was either transitory, based in England, or able to provide an English education for its children. Even though there was little industry in the colonies, their political and social development was determined in part by clashes centring on the availability of a trained workforce.²⁸ Early attempts to found mechanics institutes on the emerging British model failed because of a lack of support from employers, who still looked to England for skilled labour. In 1827, the Van Diemen's Land Mechanics Institute was successfully established in Hobart, and in 1833 the Sydney Mechanics' School of Arts finally began operations - first moves for its establishment had been made as early as 1826. Both Connell and Irving, and Murray-Smith suggested that these attempts were aimed more at cultural than technical education, Connell and Irving argued that

From the start education of the people had a cultural rather than a technical rationale: it was believed that the improvement of 'Learning and Morals' went together. Schooling was part of the effort at moral reform and social control, exactly parallel to the evangelisation of the convicts; and it was supported by the colonial governments, and supervised by the Church, for precisely this reason.²⁹

Murray-Smith suggested that the early attempts at education in the colonies were definitely the product of

an awareness by the established forces in the community of the possibility of intellectual and political challenges which might come from the new liberal middle-class, or from some element of combination, or even conceivably from both together.³⁰

Nevertheless, the most successful proponents of post-school education were middle-class protagonists, who based their arguments on economic concerns around the shortage of skilled labour in the colonies, and the need to develop Australia's natural resources. They were members of the developing urban industrial bourgeoisie, wanting to move away from the authoritarian government of the convict colony and its rural based pastoral elite, without the dangers of working class agitation and militancy. Their economic concerns, like those of their successors in the field of educational development and reform, were essentially anticipatory; and their underlying concerns were fundamentally hegemonic:

The emphasis was always on the acquiring of some knowledge of the principles upon which industrial techniques were based. Yet even here it is apparent, from the heavy overburden of moral and intellectual theory which was heaped on the mechanics institutes, that they were viewed as serving ends which went far beyond considerations of scientific and technical education.³¹

The Economy

During the decades prior to 1860, the economic development of Australia began a subtle yet significant shift away from the pastoral base which was its major characteristic. In part this was due to the development of the pastoral industry itself, which benefitted from an

inflow of British capital, and encouraged the growth of related urban industries. While the growth of manufacture and industry was slow and uneven, as early as 1820 skilled labour shortages had become apparent. Increased British investment in the 1830s encouraged this trend, resulting in both official free migration schemes and demands for educational facilities. At the same time, the Australian working class, especially skilled workers, began organising to protect themselves from a dilution of the labour market through immigration. Immigration itself further encouraged the development of an urban based, industrial sector, with demand for housing, consumer goods, and services. By the early 1850s, the urban-based bourgeoisie began to seriously challenge its rural-based pastoral counterpart, and in education the debate surrounding the establishment and development of the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne were significant in pointing up their differences.³²

1860 to 1890, the first long boom in Australian economic development, can be characterised, according to McFarlane as: "rapid and highly stable growth" in production, volume of trade, total capital formation level, and overseas borrowings; a workforce approximating full employment; private and public capital formation concentrated in labour-intensive projects; a high import rate; and, less dependence on pastoral production and more on expansion in transport, building and services.³³ Australia's ties with British capitalism were most important; British capital continued to sustain domestic capital formation throughout (and after) the period via private bank and finance company channels, and through government loans; the supply of both technology and skilled workers from the United Kingdom, together with local labour and savings, gave the impetus to economic bouyancy. The most significant development was that of the mining industry, particularly gold, which increased export earnings, capital accumulation rates, and immigration (which substantially eased the labour shortage);

all of which

allowed Australia to escape the traditional bottlenecks of a low marketable agricultural surplus, lack of savings and skilled labour shortage - the 'vicious circle' factors for low development levels in other countries.³⁴

Education

Concomitant with the development of the economy was the development of a complex urban society, fairly open in comparison with British and European societies, with a high standard of living and relatively skilled workforce. As a result, the rhetoric of the ruling class was based on harmony of interests. As Ely noted, "This meant that the political problems which progressively arose involved conservation, rather than radical change",³⁵ especially as the industrial bourgeoisie attempted to enlist the political support of the organised working class in the struggle for dominance against the pastoral bourgeoisie. Before the success of urban industrial interests in developing centralised and compulsory state education systems in the 1870s and 1880s, and the involvement of the state in technical education, education had been a function of the churches and local philanthropists. Moves to secularise education at all levels also reflected bourgeois conflict, not because of any anti-religious bias on the part of the industrial bourgeoisie, but because the churches represented deep class divisions in Australian society which had to be neutralised.³⁶

With the granting of self government, the nature of the Australian state was changed in favour of the industrial bourgeoisie earlier than might otherwise have occurred. It was based on the British experience, and anticipated developments in the colonies. Connell and Irving suggested that

The British government, as well as the colonial liberals, understood that the structural pre-conditions for liberal democracy now existed: a weak gentry and working class and a strengthening bourgeoisie. The introduction of responsible

government, therefore, occurred not only in the context of a reorganisation of imperial relationships but also of a change in the balance of class forces within the colonies.³⁷

The state's administrative functions changed and became more accountable and tightly controlled with the development of ministries in the civil service. The groundwork was laid for the emergence of the 'neutral' state which was to be so important in the development and maintenance of bourgeois hegemony in Australia. The 1880s saw important developments in class formation; the working class became more organised and class conscious; increasing urbanisation and the development of the services sector of the economy brought about a growth of the petty bourgeoisie; and, large sections of the petty bourgeoisie accepted liberalism and its 'programme' of an alliance with the working class. Australian liberalism shared the view of the irrelevancy of class barriers, seeing society as a whole organism with each individual interdependent. One of its main commitments was to equality of opportunity; it was, therefore, possible to argue that technical education would have two effects - the reduction of class barriers, and the general educational well-being of the working class. According to Murray-Smith, technical education

admirably fitted the prevailing wisdom - a dialectic which held on the one hand that there was no contradiction between individual morality and the profit system and on the other that neither was there a contradiction between the raising of the intellectual and social status of the worker and at the same time having an eye to the production line and the increase of economic prosperity.³⁸

'Statism', based on the notion of the neutral state, was the result of liberal dominance in the colonial Parliaments. It was extended to education in the 1870s with the development of state compulsory primary education, and state involvement in technical education.

The extension of education in Australia was based on three main lines of argument. First, the 'ignorance' of the working class as economic and political dangers to democracy. Second, nationalism and its

economic value was stressed. Finally, the usefulness of a trained workforce was emphasised. Initially, the hegemonic argument - the first - was the most common, reflecting the tentative strength of the industrial bourgeoisie, but as economic development progressed, and its position became more secure, more economic justifications were employed.³⁹ However, hegemonic concerns underwrote the economic justifications. Education was seen as an ameliorative reform. The alliance of the liberals with the working class, and the consequent limitations that this imposed, ensured this even when the arguments for its extension were at their most economic. Suggestions that arguments were distinct and unrelated misinterpret the nature of the economic arguments - in fact they give them too much credence in relation to current economic development. The cooption of working class leadership strengthened the unity of the positions. This is best illustrated by outlining the growth of technical education in this period, the major growth area in post-school education. While this section relies heavily on the definitive work of Murray-Smith for information, the argument pursued here reorients and extends his.

Technical Education

At the beginning of the period, the potential economic growth which was beginning to be evident, was accompanied by a change in the rhetoric of justification for the development of technical education. The emphasis on morality which had characterised earlier periods gave way to stress on the needs to educate the working class if democracy was to survive in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Citing the Illustrated Journal of Australasia of April 1857, Murray-Smith noted:

In a democracy, a writer of 1857 tells us, educated men may well continue to direct affairs, but the mass must be "possessed of a proper amount of intellect and self-control" in order to withstand "the wild oratory of the disaffected".⁴⁰

This movement in rhetoric underlined the need for education as a prerequisite for the political alliance between the liberal bourgeoisie and the working class. By it, the foundations of the notion of education for social mobility were laid, (which were fundamentally different from earlier moral premises of educating workers in their station in life not above it). On the other side of the alliance, those working class leaders prepared to accept it were also advocating the development of technical education: the working class according to Labor politician C.J. Don in 1859, should

realise the immense power they would have if they cultivated the faculties with which they were endowed. Let books and circulating libraries go hand in hand with the short-time movement; let working men cultivate their noblest faculties, which would flourish hereafter in immortal Youth, when the bodies they tenanted had passed for ever from this sublunary scene.⁴¹

As Murray-Smith pointed out, "The history of the mechanics institutes is largely a history of the clash of interests between these two motivations".⁴² He also suggested that

There is no doubt whatsoever that the 1860s saw a deepening of the conviction among decision-makers and opinion-makers that education was a social benefit which both humanity and self-interest dictated should be spread as widely as possible.⁴³

Economic circumstances during the period contributed to the growth of technical education. By the early 1860s the mining industry faced problems with a labour shortage and the change from alluvial to underground techniques which caused a crisis between the means of production (increasingly inadequate in the long-term), and profit and efficiency (which would be adversely affected by structural changes in the short-term). At the same time, the goldfields attracted labour from urban manufacturing industry as well as generated demand for manufactured goods. This, together with the decision in Victoria to adopt tariffs, created a demand for skills and technical education. However, with the

decline in employment as the mining industry reoriented with falling output and less labour-intensive technology, and the subsequent slackening in local demand for manufactures, the employment situation was reversed. This situation did not lessen demand for technical education for, although employers could get unemployed skilled workers at the same rates as apprentices, liberal politicians began to propose the use of technical education to offset unemployment. As Murray-Smith noted;

It is at this point that the economic demands for government intervention in support of manufacturing coincide with repeated and emphatic expressions of concern at the demoralising present and aimless future facing Australian youth.⁴⁴

The interest that both the urban based industrial bourgeoisie and its mining based colleagues showed in technical education reflected less the economic development of Australia, than concern in England over the growth of industrial standards in Europe and in the United States. The British government had expanded technical education as one way of trying to regain British technological superiority. Similarly, English factory legislation also provided for the use of technical education to ameliorate youth unemployment, a practical and socially desirable solution, since it played both a police function and a training role. Arguments in Australia for the development of technical education were an extension of the British debate, and in the Australian context, anticipatory. Murray-Smith referred to it as "the umbilical effect".⁴⁵ It is suggested here that it illustrated the attempts of the Australian bourgeoisie to consolidate its hegemony in a society still without rigid class (or even fractional) boundaries.

The development of technical education in this period was partly in response to demand from both urban industrial interests and mining interests. In Victoria, this was more pronounced than in New South Wales. In the former colony, the industrial interests were represented by the Technological Commission, the establishment of which was a

political rather than an 'organic' response from within industry. Mining interests were represented in the various schools of mines which were established from 1871 (although demands for technical education related to mining had been current for some years including in the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Mining of 1862-63). The first institution was at Ballarat. The schools were established as a result of initiative from within the industry, which had developed a strong identity. Even so, the Ballarat School of Mines experienced the problems of, on the one hand, serving the practical (albiet anticipated) needs of an established industry and the ideological needs of that section of the bourgeoisie based in mining. As Murray-Smith noted:

On the one hand a resolution was passed as early as September 1871 enabling students of the University of Melbourne to become "honourary members" of the Ballarat school; on the other hand the school, at almost the same time, was forced to lower its standards to the extent that it instituted inferior-grade certificates "for that large class of practical workers in our mines who possess neither the time nor the previous education to enable them to qualify for professional certificates of a highly scientific character".⁴⁶

In New South Wales at the same time, the urban based industrial bourgeoisie had a stronger collective identity, and technical education developed under government patronage to a greater extent than in Victoria. This was to be an important factor in the development of technical education in New South Wales. The colony's manufacturing base was less consumer oriented than that of Victoria, which significantly affected attitudes toward technical education. Murray-Smith suggested;

Manufacturing and industrial activity in NSW was more important in the general economic conspectus...and, while not quantitatively greater than in Victoria, seems to have been more effectively concentrated in areas significant for technical education.⁴⁷

Significantly, while no less anticipatory in New South Wales than in Victoria, the arguments for technical education were far more utilitarian than moral where manufacturing interests were more cohesive and developed.

Education and Social Control

Toward the end of the 1880s, with liberal industrial interests consolidating their hold on the Australian state, liberal attitudes in relation to working class education, including technical education, began to be questioned. There was compulsory primary education and official support was given to scientific and practical subjects at all levels of the system. Together, the liberal notion of the neutral state which led to economic and educational 'statism', and the demands of the electoral and political alliance between the liberal bourgeoisie and the working class, led to a more sophisticated political and economic situation. This entailed increased leisure time, the growth and development of both manufacturing and mining, the growth of the role of government, and as a result an increasingly regulatory role for the developing bureaucracy. It was coupled with a rapid growth in population. Debate on technical education reflected the more secure position of the industrial bourgeoisie, and became less concerned with the moral questions which had been part of the early attempts at hegemonic persuasion. The new emphasis on education extended into 'middle class' areas, and the universities, and while no less anticipatory, was less concerned with social theorising and more with practical needs. That liberal hegemony had successfully penetrated the Australian working class (at least at the leadership and organisational levels) was illustrated by contemporary rhetoric. However the working class was not completely united in support for technical education in the circumstances - Murray-Smith cited the Melbourne anarchist journal Honesty in 1887;

Technical education under free conditions is undoubtedly a good thing; but while the workers remain in their present condition of slavery, it can do them really no good, for the whole of the gain is reaped by the capitalist.⁴⁸

Less radical unions and groups were concerned at the lack of employer support for the training of skilled labour and the employment of those

who completed technical education in some form. Nevertheless, most of the organised working class openly cooperated in the operation of workingmens' colleges, schools of arts and schools of mines, and the first Intercolonial Trades Union Congress affirmed unanimously that "a system of technical education is necessary for the whole of these colonies, to enable them to keep their place in the race of nations",⁴⁹ an unambiguous acceptance of liberal bourgeois hegemonic argument.

Murray-Smith suggested that the importance of technical education as a social theory

perished because the emotional and intellectual forces which constructed it as an instrumentality of social growth came, in the course of a few years, to look on technical education less as a self-contained department for an identifiable social class than as an ideology for modern man, a kind of crucible for the alloying of the aspirations of the whole community.⁵⁰

Murray-Smith should have also recognised that, with the anticipated needs of the industrial bourgeoisie to proletarianise the Australian work-force,⁵¹ the justification had to become more extensive and sophisticated, and at the same time more utilitarian, if the industrial bourgeoisie were to consolidate and extend its hegemony. The new arguments for technical education and its extension can be divided into four major groups; economic nationalism; the development of Australian industry; the place of technical education in ameliorating youth unemployment; and the hegemonic argument for refinement of the national character. The first two were anticipated economic benefits, the third (which led from them) re-emphasised the police function of education, and the latter was openly hegemonic in promoting conservative liberal ideals. Both the anticipatory and hegemonic concerns of the industrial bourgeoisie are evident. First, their economic concerns, for development and the opening of export markets, were marked by their close relationship to British rather than local developments - Murray-Smith's umbilical effect. Second, the concern for poor local training

opportunities and standards was an effect of the actions of the industrial bourgeoisie, which intensified, in a number of ways, the division of labour in a competitive developing economy. These were moving from craft production with its internal training provisions, to factory production; relying on already skilled workers (for example, through immigration) rather than the relatively more expensive process of providing training facilities; and instituting systems based on increased profitability (for example, public company organisation) rather than more traditional paternalistic family relations.⁵²

The Universities

The development of the universities continued in this period almost in contra-position to the development of technical education at the post-school level, for they were academically conservative and elitist, serving the professional and hegemonic concerns of the bourgeoisie. The University of Adelaide was established in 1874, and the University of Tasmania in 1889. The first moves to establish a truly national university were made in the 1880s. All the universities were active in both opposing the extension of professional post-school technical education outside their control, and the establishment of degree level courses within the universities. While the University of Melbourne introduced an engineering course in 1860, it was not as Blainey put it, to "redeem the university in the eyes of the community"⁵³ but a non-degree, professional course aimed to ensure that the University retained its position as a viable mechanism for industrial bourgeois hegemony. The University did not establish a Chair in engineering until 1882, nor introduce a formal degree course until 1893, a situation Murray-Smith suggested shows "a deep stratum of philistinism beneath an overlay of concern for technical education."⁵⁴ The University of Sydney similarly opposed the extension of control for post-school

technical education to the Sydney School of Arts, and engineering courses were not established until the early 1880s. The eventual acceptance by the universities of some responsibility was within the parameters already noted⁵⁵ and the class based division of post-school technical education into sub-professional and higher education professional courses developed.

By the 1890s, tertiary education had developed a pattern which was to remain intact until the implementation of reforms recommended by the Martin Committee in the mid-1960s. There was a separation between the universities and the technical colleges, which reflected their different roles and functions in the developing Australian society. While the period up to 1890 was one of flux in the relationship between the different components of tertiary education, the period from 1890 was to be one of consolidation.

1890-1939

The Economy

The period from 1890 to 1939 encompassed two severe depressions and World War One. It has been described as the long trough in Australia economic development. While over the whole period growth occurred, it was not continuous. It was experienced in limited occasions of rapid increase interspersed among economic downswings. McFarlane called it a "crisis-ridden phase" which was characterised by high unemployment and "stagnation in real wages, associated with stagnation in output per worker and rising price indexes."⁵⁶ The unemployment rate during the period never fell below 5.2 per cent of the work-force and experienced peaks of 10.8 per cent in 1896, 11.4 per cent in 1921, 30 per cent in 1931 and 10.2 per cent in 1939. It was not until the second half of the 1930s that growth rates achieved those of the 1880s, and wage rises remained minimal until just before the end of the period. Butlin

suggested that while at the beginning of the period the economy was strong in per capita terms, it contained serious weaknesses which retarded economic growth rates, especially hidden costs in both the primary and secondary sectors from pre-1890. Together with continuing high population growth, this resulted in limited technical advance, slow per capita growth and slow structural change, a situation accentuated after World War I by restraints on the world market.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, he pointed out that it would be a fallacy to assume that there was no growth or structural change, noting that the growth of manufacturing industry was "the one sustained increase in product and input shares in the pre-1914 and the interwar years",⁵⁸ and that trade and transport, while following manufacturing, tended to match its performance. This was confirmed by Cochrane who noted that the depression of the 1890s caused structural changes from pastoral production toward manufacturing industry, including those related to developments in agricultural production, and which were encouraged after Federation by the establishment of the Australian common market. While manufacturing industry remained small scale and consumer oriented, with its growth usually extensions of existing industry (at least up till World War I), it grew strongly, with an increased investment value of more than 50 per cent by 1910.⁵⁹

The decade after Federation was one of rapid economic development, and was one of three terms in which industrial growth was an important factor in the process between Federation and 1939. Even so, prior to World War I, the Australian economy rested on capital intensive agriculture and mining, with manufacturing industry mainly domestic, related to primary production and consumer demand. While World War I was not a time of industrial prosperity, it did force a reorientation of the Australian economy. This development, together with the diversification and expansion of existing secondary industry led to a consolidation of

the industrial base which enabled the first half of the 1920s to develop as another term of growth, as did the increase in tariff protection.

Butlin suggested that

In the fifteen years after the end of the war, Australian tariff levels rose rapidly to enlarge the shares of the local market for Australian manufactures, attract direct industrial investment and to provide artificial conditions raising factor rewards in manufacturing relatively to the other areas of the economy⁶⁰

and pointed out that between 1907 and 1928-29 (with most of the increase from 1919) tariffs doubled.

The high growth rates of the first half of the 1920s were accompanied, however, by overinvestment and reliance on high export earnings from primary industry, which resulted in a saturated market, and falling demand from 1925 created the conditions for bleaker economic times. Cochrane noted that between 1928-29 and 1931-32 almost 25 per cent of factory workers lost their jobs⁶¹ and manufacturing industry underwent a forced rationalisation. According to Boehm, the growth of the manufacturing sector following the depression "was the major dynamic element behind the growth of total employment"⁶² and economic recovery. In 1939, its value was over 40 per cent more than at the beginning of the depression (compared with an increase in the 1920s of only 30 per cent), and efficiency - the output per worker - increased considerably.⁶³

Education and the State

The development of tertiary education in this period was very important. The bases which shaped its character after World War II were consolidated during the period. At the beginning of the 1890s, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Hobart all had Oxbridge type universities, and technical education was flourishing in a political climate based on an alliance between liberal and radical bourgeoisie, and the working class.

While the universities were elitist, and all but closed to the majority, technical education at the post-school level had expanded under the liberal ethos to encompass further education. Murray-Smith said:

technical education received support from the petit-bourgeois and working class as well as the middle class. To the former it provided the only available channels of post-primary education, both in general subjects as well as in a number of specialities needed in a society rapidly growing more complex. To the latter it provided a road to dignity and advancement and, more particularly, a means to control the dilution of the skilled trades and the exploitation of the labour of young people.⁶⁴

Under the aegis of liberal 'statism', government control of technical education became stronger, (for example, in NSW the absorption of the Board of Technical Education by the Department of Public Instruction), which had important implications for later attitudes to technical education. While the argument for tighter government control rested on liberalism, it reflected a change in attitudes which was to become significant by the turn of the century. Connell and Irving suggested that the move away from old liberal values toward more utilitarian ideals came with social problems which arose out of the Factory Acts and compulsory education. Educators came to accept a responsibility to combat these problems, and so set the tone for education as a scapegoat for economic ills which persists up to the present.

Educators...began to blame the factory system for the breakdown of 'social responsibility' and embarked on an unrealistic campaign to provide educational solutions for problems arising out of the exploitative relations of production (a tendency that has continued in educational circles until the present day).⁶⁵

The liberal-working class alliance which had prompted the extension of education had worked mainly in favour of the bourgeoisie, for it did not question its leadership in any significant way. Instead it gave it breathing space in which to establish its hegemony in Australian society. In particular, this was true in education. Ely pointed out that, up to the early 1890s,

The educational privileges of elite groups in Australian society were never seriously questioned or undermined. To a significant extent, those educational opportunities which were offered to the upwardly socially mobile were designed both to fulfil the expectations and aspirations of the mobile groups and to serve and secure the positions of the socially privileged.⁶⁶

The shift away from the liberal view of educational functions was encouraged by the depression of the early 1890s. The division of labour, and the failure of the liberal-working class alliance to prevent its overt appearance, necessitated an approach more in line with reality. Liberalism had failed to gloss over the class divisions of Australian society, and as Murray-Smith pointed out with regard to technical education, "...education divested itself of its nineteenth century trappings of 'improvement' and 'opportunity' and was viewed as the handmaid of 'national utility'".⁶⁷ One of the outcomes of the depression was a shift in the political climate and the assumption of power by a coalition based on mining and pastoral sections of the bourgeoisie. While it was still necessary to continue the cooption of working class leaders into the system, the old liberal bourgeois-working class alliance was for all intents and purposes, laid to rest. Working class demands for relevant education were passed over in favour of more industrially related technical education, without the old liberal arts component. The new emphasis was on nationalism - the need to strengthen the Empire - which was clearly related to the free trade aspirations of the non-industrial bourgeoisie. Ely suggested that

Educational developments at the turn of the century reflected the social distinctions in the minds of the elite groups in the Australian colonies. The changes allegedly introduced to improve national efficiency and survival in the international trade race, also reflect the steelchords in the silken thread uniting Australia to Great Britain and empire: immigration, trade and investment.⁶⁸

These developments, which had been foreshadowed by tightening government controls in education, and continued with the ascendancy of

the conservative bourgeoisie, reflected the changing needs of the capitalist state in Australia. The liberal bourgeois period, with its liberal-working class alliance, was no longer necessary with the consolidation of bourgeois hegemony in Australia. Its success in stabilising the political arena was evident before the Depression, which finalised the change to a new method of ensuring bourgeois dominance. While both were couched in terms of democracy, and included the cooption and incorporation of working class leadership into the system, the maintenance of hegemony, rather than its establishment meant that the bourgeoisie was less inclined to compromise with the working class. Labour was forced to cope with an increasingly partisan state, especially as trade unions and the fledgling Labor Party grew. For instance, at the beginning of the 1890s the Victorian government extended the Masters and Servants Act to cover breaches of contract in the industrial areas, thus attacking workers' rights to strike, and as Shaw noted, the courts were also anti-labour. At the beginning of the industrial disputes of the 1890s, the NSW Chief Justice referred to striking shearers as

a closely knit band of criminals with commissariat arrangements, firearms and ammunition devastating sparsely inhabited country, holding the few inhabitants in terror and compelling honest labourers to desist from work.⁶⁹

Technical Education

In education, the changes in the concerns of the bourgeoisie toward hegemony, meant the denial of the extension of knowledge beyond those specialisations that were considered necessary for an adequately trained work-force. The rhetoric of national prosperity and progress as it was presented, was based on two assumptions. First, that societal rather than individual needs demanded integrated education, (reflecting both the need for proletarianisation and the embourgeoisment of the Australian work-force). Second, the idea of social homogeneity, which as

Murray-Smith pointed out, "in an expanding industrial state calls for more rather than less differentiation of the functions of individuals and classes."⁷⁰ It was a short step from here to the adoption of anti-intellectual and demeaning forms of technical education aimed at directing people to specific occupations, in a crude form of manpower planning. The new role of technical education was narrow. Ely suggested "It was conceived, not as a vehicle for individual improvement, so much as for the well being of an industrial economy."⁷¹ Through narrowly vocational education (among other ways), the bourgeoisie

intended that the state should merely produce value for public money; namely a productive workforce, but nonetheless a workforce. The elite sponsored opportunities for vocationally oriented education which nevertheless would keep the children of the lower orders on the outer tracks of society, in the workforce. It was never intended by them that Jack should be as good as his master.⁷²

The new rationale for technical education was legitimated by a series of reports over the first decade of the twentieth century, each damning the situation of technical education, starting with the Victorian Fink Commission, with similar enquiries in New South Wales in 1901, Tasmania in 1904, South Australia in 1905 and Queensland in 1909. Murray-Smith said of the Report of the Fink Commission:

The Fink Commission...expressed, in as sophisticated a form as was possible at the time, the pressures at work to abandon the old democratic ethos of state education in favour of a redefinition of the distinction between working class and middle-class education.⁷³

Of the New South Wales Report, which laid a base for educational reform aimed at creating a strict meritocracy based on a labour aristocracy, he suggested it was

the ultimate expression in Australian educational history of the belief that the schools are relevant only insofar as they subserve the aims of society, that they are to be viewed as the core of the apparatus of nation-building, and that they affect the individual only to the extent that the individual himself is a component in a larger scheme of things.⁷⁴

However, for some time the conservative alliance in politics pushed the industrial question to one side, and tertiary education, particularly in the technical sphere, languished.

Renewed interest in technical education in particular, came with a temporary revival of the liberal-working class political alliance toward the end of the first decade of the century. The rise of the Australian Labor Party had been encouraged by the defeat of organised labour during the 1890s depression, and the overt use of the state by the bourgeoisie in their own interests. Shaw noted that

The conviction was widespread in labour circles that the strikers had not been beaten in fair fight, and that only the intervention of the governments, in their endeavour to maintain law and order, had brought victory to the employers.⁷⁵

The growth of the ALP saw participation or full government in most States during the early twentieth century, and in 1904 the world's first national labour government was formed. The rise of the ALP threatened bourgeois hegemony. According to Connell and Irving, it was combatted, inter alia, by eliminating patronage from the Public Services to promote and revitalise the idea of the neutral state, absorbing working class intellectuals and leaders through the state's administrative arm, and through such organisations as the Workers Educational Association, absorbing reformist labour demands in the name of economic efficiency, and, attacking working class culture as either subversive or irrelevant.⁷⁶ Initially the bourgeoisie had been seriously split on how to handle the situation, hence the return to dominance of the pastoral interests during the 1890's and the first years of Federation. The industrial bourgeoisie reasserted its hegemony confidently, with a more sophisticated method of working class absorption. Murray-Smith suggested that

Employers began to build on the idea of creating an aristocracy of labour which would offset the gains of mass unionism; of creating a reservoir of skilled workmen who would be impervious to political manipulation [sic] and who would stand fast in

times of unrest: such men "will not trouble themselves much about unionism when science has taught them how to stand alone".⁷⁷

By the end of the decade, technical education was being described by the Director-General of education in Victoria, Frank Tate, as "an industrial question", and Murray-Smith also pointed out the development of a phenomenon which has become a standard theme in Australian education;

What now starts creeping into the debate is a significant new point: that since national efficiency is at stake, it is unfair of the state to expect employers to train skilled workers: they should be produced at public expense for the benefit of industry.⁷⁸

More interest began to be taken in professional and technical education at all levels, especially as lower level post-primary technical education began to be rejected by the working class in favour of the elitist academic secondary schools which were beginning to flourish. Post-school technical colleges had junior high schools attached to them in Victoria. The Commonwealth became involved in university education for the first time in 1910 with the establishment of the Institute for Tropical Medicine, prompted by economic concerns rather than by existing health concerns; "concern for the problems of settlement in the vast, unoccupied tropical half of the continent".⁷⁹ As Ely pointed out, at all levels "'Vocational' education was designed to train a workforce which would remain a workforce".⁸⁰ The old liberal ideal of the redeemable 'man' was no longer fashionable.

The anticipation that Britain's loss of industrial leadership would have serious repercussions for Australia once again illustrated the umbilical effect in the economy and education, where British ideas and demands were again reflected. The objective of creating the specialised rather than the diversified 'man' was encouraged by the inclusion of obligatory technical education into a number of industrial awards, the first in June 1908 in the NSW Amalgamated Society of Engineers where all

new employees were compelled to study two nights a week for two years, and by a 1911 Victorian Royal Commission on labour shortages which also recommended it.⁸¹

The idea of a utilitarian education system being harnessed for national development and progress was accepted by the ALP and other organised labour leaders. As Murray-Smith noted "Political labour was not interested in a specifically working class educational policy",⁸² especially as its political survival was seen to depend on the usual premise of labour and social democratic parties to show their fitness for holding office by continued compromise with the bourgeoisie. That the ALP had gained office so early in Australia showed the depth of conflict for hegemony between the industrial and conservative bourgeoisie. The actions of organised labour were a measure of the success of the former. Intellectuals openly justified the division of labour;

Along with the development of industrial means of production has come the minute subdivision of labour that requires from the few the ability to direct, and from the many the power to do some small thing,⁸³

and employers were openly promoting the division of education;

While we should all like to be bosses there must be workmen, and we should beware of so training those workmen that they would be too big for their work...overeducated to such a degree that they would be above their positions.⁸⁴

Murray-Smith argued that

The 'end of liberalism' has been commonly seen in terms of the labour-capital clash and the increasing polarisation of class interests. It may also be seen however, in the diversification of the Australian economy and the movement from the occupational to the social stratification of the people.⁸⁵

As his material showed, the two are opposite sides of the same coin. The labour-capital clash and polarising class interests were obscured by the victory of the bourgeoisie in the clash, and the success of their strategy to ensure the consolidation of their hegemony in Australian

society. The intensification of class divisions was hidden by the acceptance on the part of the leadership of the working class of bourgeois arguments of national survival, development and progress. The development of education up to World War I was one measure of this.

The Effects of the War

World War I played an important role in the development of manufacturing industry in Australia and in promoting state involvement in Australian society. It highlighted moves made toward education for national survival, strengthening and extending government involvement and control (now at both Federal and State levels) over education. The redefinition of technical education in the light of this atmosphere changed its character considerably. Much of it moved into the school arena proper, and that left to tertiary education was in the main, professional and elitist. The ALP in government and in opposition, by acting in the 'national' interest and disavowing working class interests in education, acted in the class interests of the bourgeoisie, which in turn was not interested in education per se but in the production of cheap and relatively skilled labour. Tertiary technical education became to be seen not as a concomitant of a modern industrial society, but in terms of an agency by which manpower planning could be exercised. Even here, arguments for education were anticipatory, a recurring theme, and should be seen in the light of industrial development behind high tariff barriers (and thus without the imperatives of high skill or efficiency), and the continuing import of skills and technology through immigration and foreign investment.

The Federal government's involvement in tertiary education in 1910 and again in 1913 were forerunners of the moves which were intensified by the War and continued in the post-War period. Its decision to establish the Institute for Tropical Medicine was economic. Tannock pointed out

that its extension was economically based -

The decision to increase the scope of the Institute was greatly influenced by a resolution passed by the Australasian Medical Congress in Sydney in 1911, recommending an organized inquiry into the various aspects likely to affect the establishment of a working white race in Australia⁸⁶

- the old argument of national survival (in rather crude racist terms). The Institute was brought under direct government control. He suggested that it was an important event because

It was the first significant attempt by the Federal government to promote medical research, an activity which would greatly involve it with Australia's universities during the next fifty years...it was the first example of co-operation between the Australian universities and the Federal government on a project which was seen to be of national importance.⁸⁷

The pre-War rigidity of the universities in relation to tertiary technical education, which Murray-Smith argued emphasised the production of scientists and ignored the needs of industry,⁸⁸ gave way in the climate of education for industrial development. The then Labor Prime Minister, Hughes, established an Advisory Council on Science and Industry in 1916, justified in terms of national development and defence. It had strong links with government, industry and the universities, and aimed to stimulate science education. In 1917 the Council proposed to subsidise the universities directly through capital equipment grants for science research, and although this was not accepted by the Government, it increased pressure on the Commonwealth in relation to expanding its role in tertiary education in the post-War period.

The Post-War Period

In the immediate post-War period, the development of tertiary education was boosted in two ways. Both were concerned with the needs of industry rather than with an overall balanced development of all areas.

The first was through the repatriation schemes. In the technical education section three major problems arose: the reluctance of

demobilised soldiers to join the scheme; a shortage of equipment and skilled teachers; and, the difficulty those completing courses had in obtaining employment. These problems were exacerbated, and technical education outside the universities suffered as well, by the fact that the Scheme introduced a duality into the technical education system. The Commonwealth argued that it could not fund the State systems for Constitutional reasons, and a separate system of temporary institutions was established which were phased out as the Scheme ran down, leaving little residual benefit to the existing system. In the university section of the Scheme, few benefitted because there were few returnees who had either matriculated or started a course immediately before the War. In addition, benefits were restricted to those who were under twenty on enlistment. Even so, the benefits were generous and were the first system of Commonwealth scholarships.

Nevertheless, the Vocational Training Scheme was of importance not so much in terms of numbers - only 16533 out of 300,000 returnees took advantage of it - but because it introduced the Commonwealth to funding non-university technical education, and either to paying fees or subsidising the recurrent expenditure of the universities (where the University of Western Australia charged no fees). Tannock said of the Scheme:

In principle, the Vocational Training Scheme was remarkably farsighted, and introduced elements into Australian education which were quite revolutionary. Its chief weakness...lay in its limited application, so that, ultimately, only a relatively small proportion of those men who needed it were able to take advantage of it.⁸⁹

The second way in which tertiary education was boosted in the immediate post-War period was the once again anticipatory call for an extension of high level technical and professional education to serve foreseen economic growth. Again the argument was utilitarian. The most important development was the creation of the Institute of Science and

Industry in 1920. In a prophetic and perceptive speech, the Minister in charge of the area, Groom, justified it;

It is certain that henceforth the most powerful nation will be, not that which possesses the most extensive territory, not that which has the largest population, but that which is most industrious, most skillful, best educated, most capable of utilizing all the means and forces that science can place at man's disposal, and which enable him to triumph over matter. The greatest producer among nations may become the foremost power of the world.⁹⁰

The importance of the Institute was its role as the fore-runner to the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, which was established in 1926. The CSIR had close contacts with government, industry and the universities, and was influential through its consultancy status to the Federal government in educational affairs. According to Tannock it had three important influences in relation to tertiary education. It allayed the suspicions of the States and the universities in not impinging on their educational autonomy. It consolidated the developing direct relations between the Commonwealth and the universities, showed the availability of Commonwealth funds, and how the interests of the universities could be served by accepting them. It stimulated tertiary scientific and technical education by increasing funds available and providing a higher status to it.⁹¹

Commonwealth Involvement

Commonwealth involvement in tertiary education steadily increased in the latter part of the 1920s and the 1930s. In 1926, the Royal Commission on Public Health had further justified Commonwealth involvement in its recommendations that the Federal government should, for all intents and purposes, take over all health education. It recommended Federal endowment of a Chair of Preventive Medicine at the University of Sydney, the provision of

training at postgraduate level for health officials and the provision of funds for increased medical research. The Bruce-Page government established the Federal Health Council under Commonwealth domination to ensure an increased Federal role in health education at all levels. In the 1930s, the establishment of the National Health and Medical Research Council gave the Commonwealth extra leverage in medical education and research. Probably the most direct influence of the Commonwealth in tertiary education before 1939 however, was the development of an education system in the ACT. Both the McCallum Committee of 1926 and the Garran Royal Commission of 1927 recommended the establishment of a university in Canberra, although there was dispute over its style - Oxbridge or redbrick - and its purpose - national or local. The Canberra Public Service Committee pressured the government, which began negotiations with the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne for external course exams to be held in Canberra, granted scholarships for Canberra students to State universities, and proposed the establishment of a University Extension Council to provide local tutors. The change of government in 1929 to the ALP saw a more receptive climate develop. The Canberra University Association negotiated an agreement with the University of Melbourne, which was approved by the government, and the Canberra University College began teaching operations in 1930. The establishment was important because it directly influenced the Public Service and thus governments, it gave the Commonwealth direct involvement in university affairs, and it stimulated the development of Canberra as a centre for national education and research.

From the Depression to 1939

The Depression from 1929 severely affected education in Australia. Expenditure on education fell on average 25 per cent

during 1929 to 1932 compared with pre-1929 levels, and for capital expenditure the decrease ranged from 50 to 90 per cent.⁹² It had immediate and important effects, for the Depression both pointed to the inadequacy of the technical education system in particular, and revived similar arguments to the old liberal notions of education's role. Murray-Smith suggested that the depression illustrated the extent of the direct relationship between the economy and education in Australia:

Indeed, insofar as any nexus can be discerned in our history between the economic base and the phases of growth of technical education, we can say that technical education has responded in particular either to periods of excessive economic optimism or to periods of economic crisis. By the middle of the 1930s the technical education systems of the states were largely being used for ameliorative and welfare purposes.⁹³

Technical education was revitalised in anticipation of economic benefits by re-introducing further education elements to it and lessening the role of occupational prerequisites. Tannock pointed out that renewed interest in the revival of old liberal ideas, as well as recognition of the inadequate training role that education (particularly its technical sector) was providing, stemmed from direct political concerns, which in fact threatened bourgeois hegemony; "the fear of the consequences of depression-induced political and social unrest then prevalent in Australia".⁹⁴ The Depression also encouraged an already evident change in bourgeois attitudes to education which recognised the important role of education in absorbing the working class as economic development came to produce a more complex society.

From 1914 specialisation had resulted in working class disenchantment with the limiting factors of technical education with regard to social mobility, which led to mass demand for less specialisation and more traditionally academic education.⁹⁵ By far the most important spokesman for this trend was Robert Menzies, who from 1928 to 1934 was a member of the Victorian Parliament. Bessant, citing

Menzies in Victorian Hansard, said,

Menzies regarded the function of schooling as not merely to inculcate 'a technical efficiency that will enable them to earn a living', but to produce in every citizen 'some degree of a broad and enlightened intelligence'.⁹⁶

Menzies' argument differed from the classic liberal notion of education as an individual good, but was based on the development of a national character. It was essentially elitist and hegemonic. (In 1932, he supported cuts to education, while supporting and, in fact, achieving in 1933, increased grants to the University of Melbourne for the appointment of a full-time Vice-Chancellor.) It reflected interests of the industrial bourgeoisie following the industrial growth of the 1920s, and the anticipated high growth of industry after the Depression. It was linked to the development of industry behind tariff barriers which, while not initially encouraging educational development, increasingly recognised the need for enhancing skills at both labour and middle management levels. Butlin noted that

Closely linked with tariff policy, a wages policy that increasingly recognised margins for skill increased the attraction of labour training and the addition of higher skills to industry.⁹⁷

In addition, the argument based on national character gave an ideological justification for increased moves by the Commonwealth into the education and training sphere.

The most significant development with regard to Commonwealth involvement came in 1936 when the States unanimously requested the Federal government provide a substantial capital grant for, and undertake a commitment toward recurrent funding of, technical education. It was followed by a Commonwealth/State conference in which the States argued that education was a national as well as State concern and therefore a national responsibility. Thus, Federal involvement through contributions to financing education was seen as a right of the States, though in terms

only of permanent financing not permanent control. While the Commonwealth rejected most of the States' arguments, two very important developments occurred. First, the State Grants Youth Employment Act of 1937 by which the Commonwealth directly contributed to technical education for the first time. Second, the establishment of the Australian Education Council which, while not including Commonwealth membership, provided the States with a powerful and influential educational lobby. But even given these developments and the recovery of the Australian economy from the Depression during the latter part of the 1930s, the Australian education system, particularly the tertiary sector, was poorly developed and, compared with similar systems, badly off. Shaw noted that in 1939 Australian education expenditure was only £1/16/- per capita compared with rates per capita in the United States of £3, the United Kingdom of £2/8/- and New Zealand of £3/6/-.⁹⁸ The situation in the tertiary sector - the universities and technical colleges - was extremely bad, as the Murray Report in the mid-1950s was so forcibly to point out.

Conclusion

The development of education, particularly at the tertiary level, in Australia up until 1939, followed the development of the Australian society as one which was complex and industrially based, but which was essentially derivative rather than innovatory. Educational development reflected this. Its premises were those of the British industrial bourgeoisie, and its impetus anticipatory and hegemonic rather than directly economic. The lack of insistent economic demand on the education system in these years resulted in the lack of a coherent national system of tertiary education, serving the needs of a strong national bourgeoisie or strong national industries. Where industrial development occurred, more often than not it was highly protected from foreign competition which might have resulted in more urgent demands for

a better education system. As it was, Australian educational development occurred in anticipation of the future, or with police and welfare functions, to ameliorate the past and safeguard the hegemony of the capitalist state.

Murray-Smith suggested:

Of course it would be ridiculous to say that there have been no distinguishable economic change-points in the development of Australia, but we can at least say that the relative (but not absolute) lack of clearly defined nodal points has meant that ideological factors have had more play over considerable sectors.⁹⁹

The most important years in the establishment of the tertiary education system were those before 1890, years of high economic growth and relative affluence in Australia. The most important years for the development of the system, however, were the years of relative economic stagnation which followed the depression of the 1890s. These were times of sporadic economic development in generally depressed conditions. During the period changes in the Australian class structure, with the rapid proletarianisation of the Australian work-force, were evident. It was accompanied by 'embourgeoisment' of the work-force, and the growth of the role of professionals and middle-level management. The liberal rhetoric which underwrote the establishment of tertiary education, gave way to utilitarian concerns, and educational development was concentrated on technical and professional sectors. Significant occupational shifts occurred toward more highly skilled technical and professional areas.¹⁰⁰ For the establishment years, Murray-Smith suggested

attempts to explain the evolution of technical education in Australia ... at this period must accept as their starting point not an objective statistical, economic and technological base from which it might be expected that the impulse to technical education might spring, but the shape that ideas, sometimes only remotely fashioned by surrounding reality, took in the minds of men.¹⁰¹

What he never quite came to grips with was the role that technical education played in the establishment of bourgeois hegemony in Australia,

although his work pointed to it. The role of the universities was in this period more obviously so.

With the onset of the 1890s depression, Murray-Smith was able to identify a phenomenon which was to be recurrent, at least in technical education, in the future. He noted

the strong demand that prevailed and intensified in the latter part of the eighties did not express the needs of a developing and diversifying industry so much as a 'depression effect' noticeable throughout the history of technical education in Australia. During times of unemployment and economic crises not only do skilled workers retain their jobs longer than unskilled, but there is a tendency for wages in the skilled trades to hold their level long after others have started to slip.¹⁰²

After 1900, education services increased significantly, although this was mainly due to the establishment of universal state secondary education, and in the tertiary sector what little growth occurred was concentrated mainly on technical and professional training. The universities, at least in the first years of the century, continued to resist pressures for more utilitarian courses, and when they accepted a major role in tertiary professional and technical education, it remained differentiated in its status, if not standard, from that offered by technical colleges. University education continued to be primarily hegemonic. Right up until the close of the period under review, it remained an elitist and essentially closed system to the majority of Australians, which safeguarded their autonomy and their position in the hegemonic process.¹⁰³

During the twentieth century to World War II, Australian economic development, especially insofar as it relied on the growth of manufacturing, occurred in conditions which were not encouraging for the extension of the tertiary education sector. There were three periods of industrial development. The decade immediately prior to World War I and after the rationalising effects of Federation. The 1920s, in post-War conditions. The 1930s, as recovery following the Depression took place.

In all three periods, high tariff barriers protected Australian industry which, in addition, relied less on local initiative than on foreign capital inflow aimed at taking advantage of them. McFarlane pointed out that "New technology outside the agrarian sector...has been sustained mainly by foreign capital inflow"¹⁰⁴ and that tariff barriers had two important effects for education. First, foreign capital inflow was accompanied by imported industrial techniques, production licencing and skilled labour immigration. Second, Australia was isolated to some extent from much foreign technology because of the predominance of British capital imports. The first meant that demands for locally produced skilled labour and therefore technical education were slight. The second, because of the relative backwardness of British technology in comparison with the more recently industrialised countries, ensured that local technological sophistication remained at a low level, with, once again, slight demand for technical education. Butlin commented similarly:

Direct investment of foreign, especially British firms, in the early 1920s gave an initial stimulus to the necessary new technology. Employment and investment, for a time, rose very quickly until skill limitations and the emergence of excess capacity in many areas emerge to plague most of the new enterprises until the Second World War. Relying to a large extent on British technology, entrepreneurial and managerial skills and, more generally, on the importation of British mechanical equipment, Australian manufacturing in any event tended to follow British industrial practice. Given the interwar lag in British technology behind the best practice elsewhere, it seems probable that this new Australian industry began similarly committed to backward technique.¹⁰⁵

Boehm noted that while in the 1930s the Australian labour force became more skilled, it was not as significant as it might have been for education because the level of skill of the workforce was "receiving considerable assistance from the establishment in Australia of the branch factories or subsidiaries of overseas enterprises."¹⁰⁶ But perhaps the most significant factor affecting the level of demand for tertiary education, was not so much the growth of the economy on the whole, as the growth of those areas of the economy which were to become important in

the post-World War II period, for which in the interwar years, however, there was little demand or indeed recognition of the need for education and training. Shaw pointed out that by 1939 the level of the contribution to the national income of primary industry and manufacturing had fallen compared with even the pre-1920s levels.¹⁰⁷ The services revolution, with its considerable implications for the growth of tertiary education, had begun. World War II caught Australia unawares with regard to its tertiary educational needs, especially in the technical and professional areas.

The development of tertiary education had only a tenuous link with Australian economic development. This link was one of anticipation of the economic benefits of educational development. As such its role was hegemonic, with its rationale based in the stabilisation and maintenance of bourgeois ideology in a developing Australian society. An examination of the period until 1939 illustrates this. The absence of a more direct link becomes obvious as an examination of educational development proceeds.

FOOTNOTES

1. N.G. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development, 1890-1965", in C. Forster (ed.), Australian Economic Development in the Twentieth Century (Sydney, 1970), pp. 283-5, and pp. 293-5. J.A. Dowie, "The Service Ensemble", in ibid., p. 208. For recent developments in Butlin's theory of Australian economic development, especially "colonial socialism", see N.G. Butlin, A. Barnard and J.J. Pincus, Government and Capitalism, (Sydney, 1982).
2. B. Fitzpatrick, The British Empire in Australia, 1834-1939, (Melbourne, 1949), p. 271.
3. ibid., p. 269, and p. 274.
4. B. McFarlane, "Australia's Role in World Capitalism", in J. Playford and D. Kirsner (eds.), Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique, (Ringwood, 1972), p. 44.
5. M. Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism, (New York, 1974)
6. S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, (London, 1976), Chapter 7.
7. R.W. Connell, Ruling Class, Ruling Culture (Cambridge, 1977), p. 184-5.
8. The development of a skilled labour force in Australia relied far more on immigration. Educational development in Australia at all levels was far more concerned with the anticipated economic benefits it may have had, and hegemonic factors such as policing and socialisation.
9. S. Encel, "The Social Role of Higher Education", in E.L. Wheelwright (ed.), Higher Education in Australia, (Melbourne, 1965), p. 11ff.
10. S. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education in Australia; with special reference to the period before 1914", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Melbourne University, 1966, 3 Vols., passim.
11. P.H. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, (Sydney, 1973), p. 129.
12. I. Westbury, "The Sydney and Melbourne Arts Courses, 1852-1861", in E.L. French (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1961-62, (Melbourne, 1964), passim. See also K.R. Campbell, "J.D. Lang and the Establishment of the University of Sydney", in R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1970, (Melbourne, 1970).
13. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress.
14. There are, in fact, quite serious objections to the Bowles and Gintis thesis and similar theories. Most apparent is their reliance on localised examples, whereby a direct link between capitalist industrial development and educational development can be identified. However, the extrapolation of the link to other regions of the United States and the United Kingdom when analysing educational developments there does not take into account the lag in industrial development. The lag is equally as identifiable in the

Australian case. In these cases, the development of education did not proceed as a necessary component in industrial development. It either preceded it - was anticipatory - proceeded for policing reasons - was hegemonic - or was pursued to ensure socialisation in capitalist social relations.

15. S. Murray-Smith, "Technical Education in Australia, 1788-1914: A Select Bibliography", in R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1967, (Melbourne, 1968), p. 211.
16. For the United Kingdom see, R. Williams, Culture and Society, 1780-1950, (London, 1960), chapter 6, particularly pp. 112-4, and The Long Revolution, (London, 1961), Part Two, chapter 1. For the United States see, Bowles and Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, chapter 6, and Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism, p. 235, especially their references to Horace Mann.
17. G.K. Holden, cited in R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, (Melbourne, 1980), p. 183.
18. A.G. Austin (ed.), Select Documents in Australian Education, 1788-1900, (Melbourne, 1963), pp. 199-200.
19. Lord Macaulay cited in ibid., p. 203.
20. H.G. Palmer, "Elitism in Education and the Radical Initiative", in E.L. Wheelwright and K. Buckley (eds.), Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism, Vol. 3, (Sydney, 1978), p. 191.
21. T. Rowse, Australian Liberalism and National Character, (Malmsbury, 1978), p. 41.
22. ibid., pp. 44-50.
23. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 124.
24. ibid., p. 129.
25. ibid., p. 148.
26. ibid., p. 146.
27. Menzies, for instance, was quite open about the hegemonic role of the universities in society. In a speech at the Canberra University College, in 1939, he listed the important functions of a university: pure culture and learning, including "so-called useless scholarship"; training for the professions; preservation of real values, through liaison between academics and the "good practical man"; the centre of research; training of the individual character of graduates through intellectual rigor; training political and social leaders; and, as keeper of freedom, embodied in academic freedom to pursue, unfettered, the search for truth. See R.G. Menzies, The Place of a University in the Modern Community, (Melbourne, 1939), pp. 11-30. See also, B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed.), Melbourne* Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977), p. 78.
28. Murray-Smith, "Technical Education in Australia", p. 212.
29. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian Society, p. 64.

30. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 48.
31. ibid., pp. 53-4.
32. See Westbury, "The Sydney and Melbourne Arts Courses", and Campbell, "J.D. Lang and the Establishment of the University of Sydney".
33. McFarlane, "Australia's Role in World Capitalism", p. 35.
34. ibid., p. 39.
35. J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p. 39.
36. ibid., pp. 16-19. See also Fitzpatrick, The British Empire in Australia, p. 99 for a comment on the foundation of the University of Sydney.
37. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, p. 110.
38. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 314.
39. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 27.
40. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 88.
41. ibid., p. 92.
42. ibid., p. 102.
43. ibid., p. 166.
44. ibid., p. 169.
45. ibid., p. 169.
46. ibid., p. 202, citing the Annual Report of the Administrative Council, 1872.
47. ibid., p. 344.
48. ibid., p. 281, note 36.
49. ibid., p. 371.
50. ibid., p. 387.
51. See Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 10ff.
52. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", pp. 324-5.
53. G. Blainey, A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne, (Melbourne, 1957), p. 22, cited in Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 119.
54. Murray Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 331.
55. See above, p. 27 and p. 28.
56. McFarlane, "Australia's Role in World Capitalism", p. 36.

57. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", pp. 301-4.
58. ibid., p. 311.
59. P. Cochrane, Industrialization and Dependence, (St. Lucia, 1980), p. 2.
60. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", p. 312.
61. Cochrane, Industrialization and Dependence, p. 3.
62. E.A. Boehm, Twentieth Century Economic Development in Australia, (Camberwell, 1971), p. 129.
63. A.G.L. Shaw, The Economic Development of Australia, (Melbourne, 1965), pp. 163-4.
64. Murray-Smith, "Technical Education in Australia", p. 227.
65. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, p. 206.
66. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 36.
67. Murray-Smith, "Technical Education in Australia", p. 232.
68. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 38.
69. Shaw, The Economic Development of Australia, p. 105.
70. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 731.
71. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 53.
72. ibid., p. 54.
73. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 736.
74. ibid., p. 822.
75. Shaw, The Economic Development of Australia pp. 123-4.
76. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, pp. 202-7.
77. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 761, citing Liberty and Progress, Vol. 1, no. 6, 1904, p. 146.
78. ibid., p. 760.
79. P.D. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia in Education Since Federation, 1901-1968", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1969, p. 12.
80. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 57
81. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 842 and p. 861.
82. ibid., p. 844.

83. Speaker at the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, Brisbane, 1909, in ibid., pp. 850-1.
84. Speaker at the Engineering Association of N.S.W., 1908, in ibid., pp. 847-8.
85. ibid., p. 884.
86. Commonwealth Yearbook, 1922, p. 1010, cited in Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government", p. 13.
87. ibid., p. 14.
88. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 880. He misreads the hegemonic role of the universities compared with other technical training institutions.
89. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government", p. 107.
90. Cited in ibid., p. 47.
91. ibid., pp. 65-6.
92. ibid., p. 183.
93. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 1016.
94. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government", p. 187.
95. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 1018.
96. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p. 80.
97. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", p. 312.
98. Shaw, The Economic Development of Australia, pp. 173-4.
99. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 173.
100. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", p. 317.
101. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education", p. 406.
102. ibid., pp. 417-8.
103. B. Bessant, "The Erosion of University Autonomy in Australia", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 27.
104. McFarlane, "Australia's Role in World Capitalism", p. 47.
105. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", pp. 313-4.
106. Boehm, Twentieth Century Economic Development, p. 129.
107. Shaw, The Economic Development of Australia, p. 164.

Chapter 3

An Introduction to the Post-War Period

The period 1939-1979 was one of substantial Commonwealth involvement in tertiary education, which had been continuing on a sporadic but increasing basis since 1910. World War II, however, provided the catalyst and the justification for a more substantial and permanent presence on the part of the Commonwealth. Initially, this grew out of the unpreparedness of Australia at the beginning of the War and then was associated with the Commonwealth's belief in a dynamic post-War economy and recovery, before becoming underpinned by economic growth through the 1950s to the early 1970s. The Walker, Murray and Martin Reports were all presented in the framework of expansionary economics, with education being at one and the same time both a necessary prerequisite and a product of that expansion.

World War II provided a critical break in the economic development of Australia. Butlin suggested that its contribution to the economic expansion which followed was indirect, since that depended to a large extent on external factors. However, severe wartime restrictions curtailed pre-War industries, rationalising and drastically running down plant, while wartime production redirected investment into new industries such as chemicals, steel, minerals, services and the like. This had two important effects in relation to education.

Under wartime control a higher degree of rationalization and concentration of these newly expanded industries was achieved. To service this wartime manufacturing, measures to dilute the skilled work force by removal of trade union barriers to entry and, at the same time, to provide for training in industrial processes, had the fundamental effect by the end of the war of greatly expanding the basic skills in, and familiarity with, manufacturing techniques.¹

The result was a general rise in the level of skill in the Australian work-force, and a demand for an even higher level.

Following World War II, Australia experienced an economic boom - often referred to as the Long Boom - along with other industrialised capitalist countries. Once again, external factors played a major part

in the Australian experience. Industrial production grew with only slight fluctuations in the trade cycle, high tariff levels promoted large foreign capital inflows, labour and capital concentrated in mainly foreign owned or dominated areas, all with the support of a steady growth in world trade and a minerals boom. Like all major capitalist governments, successive Australian governments adopted Keynesian economic rhetoric, committing themselves to full-employment, and government intervention for demand management in relation to trade cycle troughs. The Curtin Labor Government's White Paper, Full Employment in Australia, which was released in 1945, laid the groundwork and set the directions of the policies of the Long Boom,² although, as McFarlane pointed out,

From 1949 to 1971 the Liberal Party allowed the moderate boom that Australia experienced to proceed with controlled inflation, even at a certain cost-eroded social security, a lower economic growth rate than was feasible and so on.³

The Menzies Liberal Country Party Governments steered away from a more controlled economy, and the boom proceeded in Australia in spite of, rather than because of, Government policies.⁴

The Long Boom was realised to a large extent in manufacturing. It was here that the Government gave most support, with tariff protection, immigration, technological support and the encouragement of foreign capital investment. From a productivity rate in 1948-9 some 20 per cent below the national average, by the early 1960s the rate was well above.⁵ Butlin noted that;

Re-equipment and expansion of plant in the fifties and sixties provided opportunities for Australian manufacturing to 'catch up' on foreign technology and to utilize the available and increasing skills of the work force.⁶

With the growth of the manufacturing sector, the services and tertiary sector also grew. Dowie noted that while Australia had, proportionately, one of the world's most developed services and tertiary sectors in the last decade of the 19th century, during the 20th century it had fallen

well behind other comparable countries. Whereas Canada and the United States had crossed the services threshold in the 1930s, Australia did not reach this position until the 1960s when it

only just followed the United States and Canada across the 'service economy' threshold and reached the point where only a minority of the work force was employed on commodity production.⁷

While the growth of the manufacturing, services and tertiary sectors had a substantial effect on the development of tertiary education in Australia, government economic strategy throughout most of the period created two important economic problems which were to effect adversely the economy and, as a result, Government support for services such as education. McFarlane suggested that the economic strategy created inefficiencies in resource allocation in industry, as well as retarding consumption and public social investment potential, so hampering improved productivity.⁸

Internationally, the Long Boom was based on the wartime destruction of capital, which promoted a widespread technological reconstruction and expansion of industrial stock and investment, United States political and economic dominance of world markets, and the integration of the Third World as a cheap source of raw materials into the world market structure. All three factors faltered in the early 1970s, highlighting the problems inherent in Australia's economy. In August 1971, the Bretton Woods agreement was abrogated, resulting in massive and inflationary international liquidity, which encouraged a record capital inflow into Australia in 1971-2, putting severe inflationary pressures on the Australian economy. At the same time the international trade cycle 'bottomed' causing recession, which was intensified in Australia by anti-inflationary Government policies. The international and domestic inflationary pressures led to increased working class militancy, declining industrial profitability, and the establishment of commodity

production cartels as a response.⁹

In Australia, the onset of international economic instability coincided with the return to power of the ALP, which embarked on expansionary social policies, including increased support for education. Its strategy was based on continued economic expansion, and its policies were impeded by both the domestic and international economic pressures and problems. While initially inflation had been seen as a temporary phenomenon, by the mid 1970s it became clear that its causes lay deeply within the economic structure. The conservative parties regained government in 1975, but not before the Whitlam Government had introduced strongly deflationary economic policies which seriously threatened the continued expansion of services like education. The Fraser Government which followed intensified the strategies introduced in the last six months of Labor government. Public spending in general, and tertiary education support in particular, received reduced support, and government resources were redirected from social investment toward the private sector.

Commonwealth Involvement

Prior to 1939, the Commonwealth's largest grant to tertiary education was in 1937, when it spent £30,000 in the six existing universities for research. By 1956, just before the Murray Report, the Commonwealth provided 30 per cent of university funds,¹⁰ while between 1964 and 1974, public education expenditure increased in real terms by 150 per cent generally, and by 424.6 per cent for tertiary education.¹¹ In 1974, the Whitlam Labor government assumed full responsibility for higher education funding, and substantially increased support to the Technical and Further Education sector of tertiary education. Commonwealth involvement also saw the development of an accompanying bureaucracy: the Universities Commission was established in

1943 and extended in 1945; the Commonwealth Office of Education was created in 1945; regular grants to universities were begun under the States Grants (Universities) Act in 1951; the Australian Universities Commission was created with the original Commission becoming the Commonwealth Scholarships Board in 1959; in 1965 the Advisory Committee on Advanced Education, which became the Commission on Advanced Education in 1969, was set up; the Department of Education and Science replaced the Commonwealth Office of Education in 1967; the Advisory Committee on Technical and Further Education was established in 1974; and became the Technical and Further Education Commission in 1975; in 1977, the A.U.C., the C.A.E. and the T.A.F.E.C. were subsumed by the Tertiary Education Commission. In addition to these, various research funding committees were established to service tertiary education. More generally, the Commonwealth Teaching Service, the Schools Commission, and the Curriculum Development Centre were also established.

Although the Commonwealth had been involved on a small scale in tertiary education since 1910, the demands of first the War, and then reconstruction, ensured bipartisan support for an extension of the involvement after 1939. The A.L.P., in government from 1941 to 1949, and then for three years from 1972 to 1975, proceeded with some certainty, while L.C.P. governments were more piecemeal in their concern.¹² The Curtin Labor Government set the style for Commonwealth involvement with the establishment of the Walker Committee in 1943, and intervention from then on followed a pattern of expert committee, establishment of administrative machinery, and formulation of guidelines. Using this format, the Menzies L.C.P. Government, with the A.U.C., established a statutory commission to administer the Commonwealth's interests, which began a practice that continued throughout the period. Matthews and Fitzgerald suggested that it was established by default, for political

considerations:

In 1959 there was no Commonwealth department competent to determine how to apportion the money which Sir Robert (then Mr.) Menzies proposed to give to the universities. In any case, it was politic that a quasi-judicial legitimacy be conferred on the process. It seemed natural in the climate of opinion of that day that a body consisting predominantly academics be set up to adjudicate the claims of rival institutions. A logical extension of this approach was the establishment of the Australian Commission [sic] on Advanced Education in 1967 to provide for colleges of advanced education. Therefore, a tradition of professionalism, of statutory commissions of independent experts was established almost by default.¹³

The tension between the two approaches was to become evident later, with the establishment of the Department of Education, especially after 1972, when the Department, as a result of Labor's policies, became more powerful.¹⁴

The history of Commonwealth involvement in tertiary education in Australia is essentially bipartisan, though with some differences in degree and emphasis. Although at the beginning of the War, Government leaders were saying that "the Commonwealth Government could not see its way to assume financial responsibility for grants for the purpose of education",¹⁵ the accession to power by the A.L.P. in 1941 ensured that the educational needs of Australia at war were met. In 1942, J.J. Dedman, Minister for War Organisation of Industry, announced that the Government intended "to regulate admissions to certain key faculties and provide scholarships to enable students to study in those particular subject areas."¹⁶ However, while the demands of the War had prompted action in this area, financial assistance was not only offered to students in faculties the graduates of which had an obvious role to play. The A.L.P.'s commitment to social equality ensured that students in more general faculties were also eligible because, as Dedman said, their studies were not only useful "but because cultural studies and higher education should be preserved."¹⁷ In February 1943, under the National Security Regulations, the Universities Commission was

established to administer the schemes. One of the most significant aspects of the U.C. was its direct relations with the universities, bypassing the States which had nominal responsibility for them. One of its senior officers noted;

It is not generally appreciated that the Universities have been consulted in regard to all matters and their advice has been taken on most matters, and that in large measure the Universities have been responsible for carrying out detailed work in regard to both reservation and assistance.¹⁸

As a result, the universities began to expect direct relations between them and the Commonwealth. The more they were included at a national level - for instance, through meetings with either Dedman or Chiefly - the more they began to see themselves as national, and not State institutions.

The universities were also included in planning for post-war reconstruction. In November 1943, "following a conference between Chifley and the Vice-Chancellors"¹⁹ the Government announced that the Financial Assistance Scheme would be extended at the end of the War to cover returned servicemen and women. The Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme was officially launched in June 1945, and, according to Tannock, "subsequently developed into the greatest single education program in Australian history".²⁰ The Scheme had far-reaching effects. It boosted the numbers of students in the universities. It was the basis for continuing Commonwealth student assistance programmes. It resulted in a massive transfer of resources from the Commonwealth to the State technical education systems in the form of new buildings and equipment. It substantially increased the numbers of skilled workers available.²¹ Perhaps most importantly, it established an expectation by the States, the universities and the public, for considerable Commonwealth input into tertiary education. The continuation of the Financial Assistance Scheme and, in fact, the growing Commonwealth involvement was one of the major outcomes of the

recommendations of the Walker Report. The Walker Committee was established in 1943, and reported in 1944. It sealed the issue of Commonwealth involvement in education in the post-War period. Evidence of the acceptance of Commonwealth involvement was quite widespread. For instance, the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee released a document in 1946 calling for increased Commonwealth assistance for research.²² It outlined what were to become familiar arguments in support of the universities during the period under review. It argued that training for research was best undertaken in post-graduate conditions; all university teachers must have access to research facilities within their institutions; teaching without research leads to a sterile academic environment; only by increasing research funding would Australia attract world class research; and, because the States could not afford to fund both teaching and research, the Commonwealth must intervene. The A.V.C.C. proposed that the Commonwealth make a general grant for research, to be used by the universities as each saw fit, and to be administered by the A.V.C.C., that is bypassing the States.

Perhaps the most important evidence about changed attitudes to the issue was the speech by Menzies, then Leader of the Opposition, to Parliament in July 1945.²³ He moved to the effect that: the House recognise the prime importance of education; attention be given to secondary, rural, technical, university and special adult education and qualifications, status, and the payment of teachers; the Commonwealth increase its financial involvement; the Commonwealth and the States establish a joint commission of enquiry into education facilities, their extension or amendment, and to recommend how the Commonwealth should increase its aid. He said;

My primary purpose is to direct the attention of the Parliament and the nation to the vital importance in post-war reconstruction of a revised and extended educational system in our country, and to suggest to the Government that a commission should be set up in co-operation with the States in order to map out a plan for such reform.²⁴

His attitude was exactly the opposite to that of his Government of the early war period. This was because

our experience, particularly in the last four years, has shown that we cannot combine progress with security unless the general level of the trained capacity of our people is very high indeed.²⁵

He cited as examples of need; rural and technical education, where he advanced arguments of national interest and economic efficiency; pre-school education, because of the need for women to return to the workforce; adult education, where he anticipated later ideas of recurrent education; and universities, which he compared unfavourably in both participation rates and standards with those overseas. Although his arguments were almost entirely directed toward economic justifications for increasing Commonwealth involvement in education, he suggested that these factors were all part of "education for citizenship".²⁶ For the first time in the public wartime debates on education, (though certainly not for the first time in Australia) the hegemonic arguments for increased Commonwealth involvement were aired. Finally, in direct contrast with his later stand on the Martin Report, he argued for involvement in teacher education, through both industrial and educational avenues.

Dedman, who replied for the Government, supported the arguments that Menzies used, but opposed the motion. His reply was essentially a catalogue of the Government's record which he argued already covered most of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He also announced the acceptance of the Walker Report, announced that he proposed to join the State Ministers' Education Council (to form the Australian Education Council, which in fact did not occur until the late 1960s because of later LCP opposition to Commonwealth involvement), stressed the Government's intention to hand over its wartime educational developments in technical education to the States, and expanded on his recent

announcement of the establishment of the Commonwealth Office of Education. The C.O.E. had been established earlier in the year. It was attached to the Department of Post-War Reconstruction, and had the functions of advising the Government on all its educational programmes, as well as its relations with the States, and its responsibilities under international treaties.²⁷ Its establishment was the subject of some concern. Dedman said;

I desire to make it clear that the Government does not intend that this Office of Education should take over any of the activities which are being exercised by departments of the Commonwealth... or any activities in the educational field which are now undertaken by the State Governments.²⁸

The positions taken by Dedman and Menzies in 1945 reflected two important stands: first, the bipartisan support for some form of Commonwealth involvement in, especially, tertiary education; and, second, the role of Government and Opposition in the cautious approach to States rights which the former, regardless of political complexion, continued to take in the post-War years.

In 1944, the Commonwealth had put a referendum to the electorate to give the Government power to pay Family Allowances. The referendum failed. The Government, which had already announced that it would continue the Financial Assistance Scheme under the powers it expected to obtain, went ahead and legislated for it under the Education Act (1945). A High Court challenge to similar legislation threw the Government's plans for future education support in some doubt. In 1946 a further referendum was put, which included provisions for the Commonwealth to be able to pay benefits to students, thus gaining its first specifically educational powers under the Constitution. (Although it based its future actions in part on an interpretation of this provision which gave it direct power to act, successive Governments, both A.L.P. and L.C.P., continued to view education as primarily a State responsibility.) The Constitutional amendment of 1946 enabled the Commonwealth to proceed with

its proposals on student financial assistance. The interim Financial Assistance Scheme was converted in 1949 into a permanent Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, to operate from January 1951, the date at which the interim scheme was due to end.

Also in 1949, the Government established a committee under the chairmanship of Professor R.C. Mills (Chairman of the U.C.), regarding university financing, and the extent to which the Commonwealth should contribute to it. Before it could report, and before the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme was put into operation, the Chifley Labor Government was defeated following the bank nationalisation campaign, and the Menzies L.C.P. Government came to power. Menzies accepted the establishment of the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, and it continued virtually unchanged until the introduction of the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme by the Whitlam Labor Government in 1974. The scope of the Mills inquiry was broadened slightly by Menzies, and it reported in 1950. As a result, the Government introduced the States Grants (Universities) Bill to Parliament in 1951, the first formal, continuing commitment by the Commonwealth to education. Nevertheless, in 1952, the A.V.C.C. released a paper on the very poor position of the universities. It argued that the 1951 grants merely postponed the crisis facing higher education, and called for a national inquiry into the universities.²⁹ The inquiry call did not receive support from the Government, which for the next four years was more concerned with anti-Communist propaganda, and its own electoral instability, than education.

In 1956, with no warning, Menzies announced the establishment of the Murray Committee. The Committee reported in September 1957, recommending strong Commonwealth support for the universities. The Government accepted the Report in full. As a result, the universities received a substantial boost to their funding. The Government also converted the old Universities Commission to the Commonwealth Scholarships Board and

established, in line with Murray's recommendations, the Australian Universities Commission (A.U.C.). Reaction to the Report was favourable from almost all quarters, with any criticisms being directed at the Government for taking so long to recognise its responsibilities. The establishment of the A.U.C. meant that the Government had a formal, bureaucratic commitment to higher education, or at least the universities. It was to lead to an increasing involvement on the part of the Commonwealth, and to increased Commonwealth control over tertiary education funding. This was notwithstanding the Commonwealth's assertion that education was a responsibility of the States, an issue it did not contest, and which it provided for in legislating its interest through Section 96 of the Constitution, and not through the power given to it in Section 51 (xxiiiA) by the 1946 referendum.

While the Murray Report had a considerable effect on the Commonwealth's involvement, it also had the effect of highlighting the problems of the whole tertiary education sector. From 1957, and especially with the introduction of the A.U.C.'s triennial recommendations, issues surrounding tertiary education became increasingly political. The Menzies Government was forced onto the defensive, and into a position of making gradual concessions which increased its commitment. In March 1960, the journal of the Federal Council of University Staff Associations, Vestes, printed two articles from Cairns and Forbes, which illustrated the growing rift between the Government's and the Opposition's policies on Commonwealth support for tertiary education. Forbes advanced the Government's position on educational responsibility:

The Commonwealth Government has taken the view that Commonwealth aid to university education is supplementary to State aid and financial provisions from other sources.³⁰

Of the A.U.C, he said "its recommendations must be within the bounds of

practicability",³¹ that it should recommend support for the universities within guidelines drawn from the Government's financial policies. On the other hand, Cairns launched a strong attack on the Government's handling of the university issue, and on university authorities for their acquiescence in the face of Government policy. He argued that the A.U.C. would have to become a vigorous protagonist for the universities, given the Government's abrogation of responsibility in the face of Treasury opposition to increased Commonwealth support. He suggested that government guidelines should not be accepted by the A.U.C., but that it should recommend on the needs of the universities and let the Government make the decisions and take the responsibility for the levels of support given to the universities. He continued:

Some people feel that to embarrass a Government is being political. But is it not also political to avoid embarrassing a Government when it should be embarrassed? Is it not conservative politics? If the Government leaves the decision on University needs to the Treasury, and if the Treasury decides to give about half of what is needed, should not the Government which permits it be embarrassed? University authorities may not like embarrassing Treasuries and Governments but they have a responsibility to Australia as well.³²

In 1961, the Government bowed to the pressures for an extension of the Commonwealth's involvement, at least in tertiary education, with the appointment of the Martin Committee. Its brief did not extend to the other sectors - primary or secondary - but was directed to those areas within the tertiary education sector which had not been addressed by the Murray Committee. It was also to address problems which had arisen since the Murray Report. Even so by 1962, the Government was well under attack, both from the Opposition, and from within the higher education sector. Whitlam, then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, encapsulated the debate in Parliament. He suggested that education, as a whole, was in a deplorable state, and that even in the post-Murray universities "there are alarming signs of stress".³³ The social effects of inadequate Commonwealth support had led to continuing university fee increases,

resulting in undesirable social effects of further isolating them from most people. Nevertheless, he was critical of the Government for concentrating its efforts solely in the universities, and ignoring the bases of education, the schools and the technical colleges. He said;

For all its protestations about its desire to ensure an adequately skilled and trained population, the Menzies Government refuses to do anything really constructive about tackling the problem at its root - in the schools and technical colleges.³⁴

In a similar manner to that of Menzies in 1945, though less supportive of the Government than Menzies had been, Whitlam called for a comprehensive national inquiry into all aspects of education.

Notwithstanding the Government's rhetoric, the existence of the A.U.C. operating in the light of Government guidelines meant that the Commonwealth exercised, through financial measures, growing control over the development of the universities. In 1963, in a speech to Parliament, Forbes as much as admitted the fact of Commonwealth control, suggesting that the Commonwealth controlled development, even though the States contributed most of the funding. He put it bluntly;

If anyone in this Parliament or anyone in the country believes that any Commonwealth Government would make substantial sums of money available directly for something as important as education without having some say in the way in which the money was spent, I confidently assert that he is living in a fool's paradise.³⁵

In 1964, the Commonwealth formally recognised the importance of its involvement, with the appointment of Gorton as the first Commonwealth Minister for Education.

Also in 1964, the report of the Martin Committee was finally presented. The Government was far more reticent in accepting its recommendations than it had been with those of the Murray Report. It rejected recommendations for increased Commonwealth involvement through stronger coordination provisions, or for involvement in teacher education. But it did accept the notion of a new set of institutions

within the higher education sector, and the subsequent increase in Commonwealth commitment that would flow on from their establishment. Though presented in August 1964, the Government did not release the Report until April 1965. It provoked a spirited attack by the Opposition over the Government's handling of the Report. Cairns charged the Government with "enormous complacency" about the inadequacies of education,³⁶ and accused it with being out of touch with demands for education:

The response of the Government to the report...cannot be described as too little too late. It is worse than that; it is too little all the time. There is an urgency about the needs of education in this country that the Government has never really sensed. It is satisfied with the commonplace and it is inspired by the conventional. Its response to the Martin Committee's report is disappointing and depressing.³⁷

Once again, he repeated calls for a national inquiry, along the lines rejected by all governments since Menzies own call in 1945. In spite of the Government's rejection of a large part of the Martin Report recommendations, Commonwealth involvement now had an impetus of its own driven to some extent by the political exigencies of the day. By 1966, Gorton was finally attending meetings of the A.E.C., and in the election campaign of that year, the new Prime Minister, Harold Holt, promised aid to the States for teacher education. Gorton, on the Commonwealth's role, said;

even in the States, education is tending to become, in effect, a partnership between the Commonwealth and the States. The States have the prime responsibility, particularly in primary and secondary schools, but the Commonwealth is now sharing with the States in financing tertiary education and is making a direct contribution to secondary education.³⁸

He left no doubt as to the Commonwealth's intentions in relation to its involvement, with a statement on the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Advanced Education:

In order to ensure that the money we provided was spent on proposals which had our approval, and which would assist towards establishing the kind of colleges the tertiary

committee had in mind, we adopted an advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Wark, to confer with the States and colleges on proposals and to advise us as to which proposals should be supported, and the degree to which they should be supported.³⁹

In 1967, the Commonwealth's interest had grown to the extent that the Education Division of the Department of the Prime Minister was converted into a separate Department of Education and Science, with Gorton as its Minister.

Between 1967 and 1972, when the L.C.P. was defeated and the Whitlam Labor Government came to power, the involvement of the Commonwealth became increasingly important in the tertiary education sector. While the Government took no new initiatives in the area, the recommendations of the A.U.C. and the Commission on Advanced Education (to which the Advisory Committee was converted in 1969), steadily increased the amount of the Commonwealth's contribution. The unplanned nature of Commonwealth involvement led to some disquiet in the States and education circles. In 1969, the Armidale Conference on Planning in Higher Education was held at the University of New England. It was attended by the then Commonwealth Minister, Fraser, and a number of leading State politicians, as well as educators and administrators. States' rights were represented in the conference papers by Hughes, the N.S.W. Minister for Public Works (a Liberal), who outlined the disadvantages of increased Commonwealth involvement.⁴⁰ One of the major themes of the conference, however, was (for an increasing, if not dominant, role in higher education by the Commonwealth.) Participants were generally not concerned by an overcentralisation of power in the Commonwealth, but with calls for the Commonwealth to take over completely higher education funding. While the conference produced a series of recommendations, the Commonwealth continued to act in a defensively ad hoc manner in relation to the issues. Fraser had said at the conference, "I am sure that the seminar will produce many a valuable and fresh idea which I, for one, will study

objectively and with great interest."⁴¹ Yet, by the time the conference papers were published, their editor expressed his disquiet at the attitudes of both the Commonwealth and the States, quite pointedly:

The publication of the papers some three years after the conference is justified largely by the fact that while leading educationists have continued to stress the validity and urgency of the recommendations, governments have remained inert and indifferent. It took the Commonwealth government minister of the day [Fraser] some months to acknowledge receipt of a telegram advising him of the recommendations.⁴²

Within the political sphere, the Opposition was more attuned to the disquiet. By the early 1970s, the A.L.P. was committed to the abolition of tertiary education fees, total Commonwealth funding of higher education, the establishment of an Open University, and the extension of the advanced education sector to encompass teachers colleges and serve rural areas. In the field of education generally, it was committed to national inquiries into technical and further education, and the primary and secondary schools sectors. The party was committed to the establishment of commissions of independent experts as advisors, in a manner similar to the A.U.C. and the C.A.E.⁴³ The A.L.P. came to office in December 1972, and almost immediately began to implement its policies. In March 1973, the Open Tertiary Education Committee was established. In April, the Advisory Committee on Technical and Further Education was set up. It separated the Department of Science from the Department of Education, and substantially expanded the latter. It established an interim Schools Commission. The Government announced that from the beginning of 1974 it would assume full responsibility for the funding of the universities and colleges of advanced education, would abolish fees for entry into them and technical courses at TAFE colleges, and would introduce a universal Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme to replace the old merit based Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme. It also gave a grant of \$3 million to the universities to supplement student emergency loan funds. Beazley, the new Commonwealth Minister, identified

the provision of education for "poor scholars" (sic) as an aim which "happens to be of major interest to the Government",⁴⁴ and wrote later that "It was the aim of the Labor Party to carry through a revolution of access to education".⁴⁵

The Government's initiatives meant a rapid increase in Commonwealth expenditure and involvement in all education sectors. Anderson pointed out that;

Expenditure by the Commonwealth on education almost doubled in 1973/4, and again in 1974/5, rising from \$443 million in 1972/3 to \$1,672 million in 1974/5. Of that \$1,672 million, \$552 million was spent on universities, \$393 million on CAEs and teachers' colleges, and \$574 million on schools, pre-schools and child-care.⁴⁶

Aid for TAFE institutions was also increased by 350 per cent, from \$19 million in 1972-73 to \$71 million in 1974-75.⁴⁷ He also noted that Commonwealth expenditure on education still only represented about 10 per cent of the total Australian expenditure. The importance of the Commonwealth's moves lay in two directions - the takeover of responsibility and the increase in support - for as Segall and Fitzgerald noted, the former did not ensure the latter:

The takeover of tertiary education did not in itself involve the federal government in increased expenditure... whereas the states would previously have used their general purpose funds to match Commonwealth grants for tertiary education, they would now receive the entire amount as specific purpose grants under Section 96 of the Constitution.⁴⁸

The continuation of increasing Commonwealth support for tertiary education was based in the assumption held by the Labor Government that economic growth would continue to be strong in Australia. By 1975, this assumption was in some doubt, as Australia entered an economic recession, along with almost all the industrialised world. The recession seriously effected the Government's perception of its ability to continue to act as it had done, and education policies, along with those in a number of other areas of health and welfare, were to some extent curtailed. One of

the first casualties of the new approach was the Report of the Open Tertiary Education Committee, which was tabled in Parliament without debate, in February 1975. Although Beazley's statement, which was incorporated into the Hansard, read in part, "I consider this report to be a major contribution to educational thought in Australia. It will be a force in opening up additional opportunities for all Australians",⁴⁹ and although it was accepted by the A.U.C. and the C.A.E., the Report was promptly shelved, and no decision taken on its implementation.

The other major casualty in the tertiary sphere was the system of triennial funding, which had been in operation since the acceptance of the first report of the A.U.C. Smart pointed out that in the reports issued by the A.U.C. and the C.A.E. in 1975 for the 1976-78 triennium, the total cost of the recommendations was almost \$3.5 billion.⁵⁰ Triennial funding was suspended. Smart suggested;

It appears that these staggering figures led the Prime Minister to decide that a Tertiary Education Commission (T.E.C.) must be established to co-ordinate and rationalise the funding and development of the university and college sectors.⁵¹

Before the Government could carry out its announced merger of the two commissions, it was defeated following the Kerr dismissal/Whitlam.

The period from 1975-79, beginning with the Labor Government's tightening economic policies, and continuing under the Fraser L.N.C.P. Government, was one of stabilisation of tertiary education, and within the tertiary system,^{of} some contraction in higher education institutions. Since the 1974 decision on total Commonwealth funding, the Federal Government had, in practice, total control in the higher education sectors. Support for universities and colleges came to be seen much more within the context of total Government priorities rather than an addition to them. In May 1976, and June 1977, the Government guidelines to the A.U.C. and the T.E.C. were reflected in the reports of the Commissions, which recommendation tying enrolments to current levels. The new

Government had extended the A.L.P.'s plans for a T.E.C., and had merged all three tertiary commissions, the A.U.C., the C.A.E. and the T.A.F.E.C. in late 1976. O'Byrne and Lindsay commented on the changes of policy:

Whereas government policy prior to 1975 was to fund according to the advice of the Commissions on need, the current procedure involves the specification of a level of funds consistent with the government's broad fiscal policy, after which the T.E.C. apparently adjusts its assessment of needs to produce a level equal to that which can be financed by the level of funds provided.⁵²

Consistent with the new government attitudes was the establishment in 1976 of the Williams Committee. Its establishment also reflected the growth in Commonwealth involvement in education, for its brief included all sectors of the tertiary system and related areas of secondary education. It was specifically directed away from investigating funding arrangements. In Fraser's words, however, it was especially to investigate "the broader problem of the relationships between education and the labour market",⁵³ pointing to the integration of the Government's policies on education within its total concerns.

By 1979, tertiary education was no longer held in that special regard with which the universities had been favoured, at least rhetorically, by Menzies at the outset of continuing Commonwealth commitment in 1951. Carrick, then Federal Minister, made the change in attitude perfectly clear:

The cost of tertiary education is substantial. In a climate of economic difficulty it is inevitable that governments will seek to ensure that significant outlays of funds are properly expended. Value for the dollar is demanded by the community at large which provides the funds. Institutions and individuals must be held accountable.

Personally, I hold strongly to the view which I have expounded in the Parliament on a number of occasions, that there should be the minimum of intervention in the decision-making of a tertiary institution - but this must be consistent with efficiency.⁵⁴

Constitutional Responsibility

Successive governments in Australia, both Commonwealth and States, have asserted that constitutional responsibility for education rests entirely with the States. Education was not mentioned in the Constitution, and was therefore deemed to fall into the residual powers which the States retained. Calls for increased Commonwealth involvement have always been met with either rejection, or political caution, even at times of substantial increases in that involvement. The period under review opened with calls for a transfer in part of in total of responsibility for education to the Commonwealth. It closed with the Fraser government exercising an unprecedented amount of control over tertiary education, while calling for the States to re-accept their responsibility for at least a part of the costs. Initially, during the War, and in the immediate post-War period, the States did not resist Commonwealth moves for increased involvement. By the time that the Menzies Government introduced continuing funding in 1951, the States had requested Commonwealth intervention because of their own inability to cope with the increasing financial demands of tertiary education. By 1974, the power of the purse was a sufficiently well established fact of political life. Commonwealth involvement had pushed the cost of tertiary education well beyond the capabilities of the States, and the Whitlam government's decision to assume full responsibility for funding the universities and colleges was welcomed. Ely suggested that;

With minimal quibbles about states' rights, the involvement of the Commonwealth in tertiary education has entailed the setting up of centralized administrative structures and the regularization of academic enterprise in Australia.⁵⁵

Nevertheless, there was debate which centred on where the constitutional responsibility for education in Australia resided.

While the Menzies U.A.P. Government had rejected Commonwealth involvement at the outset of the War, by the time the Curtin Labor

Government began to regulate entry into the universities, and propose Commonwealth aid for technical education, the non-Labor parties were essentially in support of at least limited Commonwealth involvement. Even so, in 1943, the National Security Regulations, which provided the basis for the Commonwealth's intervention into university affairs, were the subject of the first test of constitutional responsibility for education. A potential student at Sydney University, J. Drummond, challenged the right of the Commonwealth to establish a quota for entry to specific courses. The High Court ruled that the Commonwealth had no rights with respect to education, but that responsibility lay with the States. The outcome of the judgement was averted by administrative procedures, and the quota system remained. The decision did, however, effect the Government's future policy.

Notwithstanding the High Court ruling, support for the notion of some Commonwealth commitment continued to be bipartisan. In July 1945, Menzies in his speech in Parliament, asserted that, while he was not raising the question, there was no doubt that the Commonwealth could legally act:

There is an agitation in some quarters for the transfer to the Commonwealth of the constitutional power to make laws with respect to education. I do not propose to discuss that, because, in my view, the problem is urgent, and it should not be considered upon the basis of some more or less remote constitutional responsibility...There is, however, no legal reason why the Commonwealth should not come to the rescue of the States on the matters that I am discussing.⁵⁶

He suggested either Section 81, dealing with general purpose appropriations, or more likely, Section 96, would provide the means to do so. Menzies reluctance to address himself to the problem was illustrated by an exchange with Dedman, regarding the establishment of the proposed national university:

Mr. Dedman. - The Leader of the Opposition may be particularly interested to hear that it has been suggested to me that, because the Commonwealth Government has no powers in relation to education, it might not have the power to establish a

university with the authority to confer degrees. I do not know whether that constitutional point has occurred to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Menzies. - I hope that it never will.

Mr. Dedman. - If a constitutional problem of that kind does arise, perhaps the right honourable gentleman will assist me to overcome it.

Mr. Menzies. - I shall, with the greatest pleasure.⁵⁷

The Government was proceeding with its policies with much the same assumptions. Hook, a senior officer of the U.C., suggested that the Commonwealth could act under Section 81.⁵⁸

The doubts about the use of Section 81 were confirmed in November 1945, when the High Court upheld a challenge to unlimited use of its provisions with regard to Pharmaceutical Benefits. The decision threw into doubt the payment of Commonwealth Scholarships, since their payment could not be covered by Section 96 which provided for payment to the States, not directly to individual citizens. In the meantime, the Walker Committee recommended to the Government that it seek a constitutional 'head' of power in relation to education. In 1946, the Government proposed, along with a number of others, an amendment to Section 51 of the Constitution, which would give it power to legislate with respect of benefits to students. Section 51, placitum xxiiiA was accepted at the referendum, and the validity of existing Commonwealth education programmes was clarified and assured. The scope of the powers conferred by Section 51(xxiiiA), however, has not been tested, either by the Chifley or Whitlam Labor Governments, or by any of the conservative governments of the period. Menzies, for instance, introduced Commonwealth commitment to the universities through the States Grants legislation under Section 96, in 1951, and all successive governments have done likewise. In 1957, while presenting the Murray Report to Parliament, ^{who?} he said;

we are not promoting any idea that the legislative power over education should, by a constitutional amendment, be transferred to the Commonwealth.⁵⁹

At the same time, however, he recognised the problems of leaving the issue to the States, virtually accusing them of neglect; "it would be unfortunate for the universities themselves if the balanced conception of higher education came to be regarded as out of date."⁶⁰

On the other hand, the A.L.P. argued that the Commonwealth, by virtue of Section 51(xxiiiA), had much wider powers over education. For instance, Birch pointed out that;

There was, however, no doubt in Dedman's mind that the 'benefits to students' provision gave the government a broad constitutional power in education and this power would have been utilised after 1949.⁶¹

Evatt, Attorney-General at the time of the amendment, said, as Leader of the Opposition, in 1953;

the Commonwealth government cannot say it is powerless in the educational field...Under the social services power of the Constitution, we can provide benefits to students, and we are not restricted in connection with either the benefits themselves or the standard required to qualify for them.⁶²

In 1958, he was equally as unequivocal, when he told Parliament that the benefits to students provision empowered the Commonwealth

to make educational grants, this Parliament being responsible for them. It is not, therefore, a question of divided legislative power and responsibility; direct power and responsibility reside in this government.[sic]⁶³

In 1962, Whitlam accused the Government of refusing to face up to its responsibilities;

No statistic can really measure the frustration and disillusionment of those who have waited in vain for the Commonwealth Government to stop sheltering behind the Constitution and to accept its national responsibility for education.⁶⁴

Other commentators were also concerned with the Constitutional problems facing education responsibility. Prest argued that the Commonwealth had latent powers for education under its defence, external affairs and immigration powers, and through convention, under Section 96. He argued

that the separation of powers was not as clear cut as might have been assumed when the Constitution was framed.⁶⁵

Partridge, who identified the responsibility issue as one of the most serious facing education, suggested "the Commonwealth acknowledges no responsibility for education, or for its present condition, except when it pleases."⁶⁶

Tannock and Birch have made a number of studies of those constitutional factors and High Court judgements which have some bearing on education. Tannock suggested that the Commonwealth's decision to seek a Constitutional amendment in 1946 was its most significant initiative in relation to education during the 1940's.⁶⁷

First, it meant that the judgement handed down by the High Court in the Drummond case was no longer decisive in determining constitutional responsibility for education. Second, it made more specific the Commonwealth's educational powers by establishing a head of power directly relating to students. Birch argued that the Commonwealth had educational powers prior to the addition of Section 51(xxiiiA) in 1946; through the External Affairs powers in Section 51(xxix), and by convention through the provision of Child Endowment.⁶⁸ Through examination of High Court findings which might have some bearing on a judgement on Section 51(xxiiiA), which has yet to be tested, he suggested that the most pertinent judgement was that relating to the British Medical Association's challenge to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Act in 1949. Birch said;

If the definition of 'benefits' stated by the judges in the B.M.A. Case is applied to the 'benefits to students' provision, the list could embrace all the facets of a normal education system. If buildings, facilities, teachers (including training facilities), scholarships and the like are benefits to students, it would follow that the Commonwealth has the power to provide them all. Moreover, the Federal Government has the power to appropriate finance for the purposes of exercising its power.

It is clear that the Federal Government has the power to provide benefits to students. Interpreting 'benefits' along

the lines indicated in the B.M.A. Case enables me to say that the Commonwealth could establish and maintain a system of education. But it must also be said that students cannot be compelled to accept the benefits offered to them. A Commonwealth system of education would not have the compulsion which is built into state systems.⁶⁹

From Birch's examination it seems reasonable to assume that the Commonwealth has education powers. It does not seem likely, though, that it has exclusive power, but that in the event of any High Court challenge the most likely outcome would be a more formalised arrangement of sharing responsibility, probably in a manner similar to the existing situation.

Financing Tertiary Education

It is generally accepted that prior to World War II, Australian tertiary education was in parlous state, and that even the support given to it during the War by the Commonwealth did little to rectify the situation in which it was placed. With the continuation of the demands which had arisen, especially in the immediate post-War period, the Chifley Government established a committee of inquiry, under the chairmanship of the chairman of the U.C., Professor R.C. Mills, to address the problem of university funding. (The problems confronting the technical sectors outside the universities were not tackled until the Martin Committee in 1961-4, and the Kangan Committee, 1973.) The Committee reported to the new L.C.P. Government in 1951. The report resulted in the introduction of the States Grants (Universities) Act in August 1951, the first ongoing Commonwealth commitment to the universities. Even though Menzies claimed that it did not interfere with internal university affairs, the results of the new funding mechanisms had widespread implications for both the States and the institutions. Bessant pointed out that the provision to fund on a £1 for £3 basis meant that to qualify for maximum grants, "the universities were forced to dramatically increase their tuition fees and the state

governments to step up their grants".⁷⁰ Commonwealth funds were also only available for recurrent expenditure, so that costs for capital works required to house and support increased enrolments and research demands had to be carried, in addition, by the States. The weaknesses in the new methods of support prompted the A.V.C.C. to assert, in a report released soon after their introduction:

But even this substantial improvement in the finances of the Universities has not placed the Universities on a sound footing or enabled them to plan the developments necessary with any confidence.⁷¹

The report went on to recommend increased levels of funding for the universities, the establishment of long-term planning mechanisms for existing and new institutions, a Commonwealth committee of inquiry, and an investigation of the respective roles of the Commonwealth and the States with regard to the universities as national institutions.

This and other calls for a national inquiry were to go unheeded for the following five years, and the difficulties to which the A.V.C.C. had drawn attention continued to plague the universities. In 1956, Menzies appointed the Murray Committee and its report recommended a sizable increase in the commitment of the Commonwealth in financial terms to the universities. It did not, of course, recommend on the other areas of tertiary education. While its recommendations did not foresee any change in the method of support for the universities - the States Grants Act - the Report was generally seen as heralding in a new era in their development. Nevertheless, the reception of the Murray Report was not wholly acclamatory, especially by the early 1960s as the effects of its implementation were felt. Johnston commented that "The critical problem of the immediate future, however, is not money but people - too few to teach, too many to be taught",⁷² and Wheelwright believed that -

The 'blood transfusion' of Commonwealth finance as a result of the Murray Report has prevented the total collapse of the system, but has done little to improve the quality of university education; the cheeseparing approach of the

Australian Universities Commission is to be deplored.⁷³

Such criticisms were not directed at the Report, but at the Government's lack of follow-up and/or the responses of the universities. Jardine echoed the Partridge critique of the universities:

The dependence of universities on outside sources for their funds does not necessarily mean that their policy will be dictated by non-academic considerations, but they have not so far shown much disposition to do anything except accept their money gratefully and spend it as they are told.⁷⁴

Notwithstanding these criticisms, the methods of funding tertiary education, as opposed to the levels of funding, did not change significantly between the implementation of the Murray Report and the assumption, in 1974, of total Commonwealth responsibility for financing the universities and colleges of advanced education.

The level of funding did, however, increase during the period. The Williams Report stated that public education expenditure as a percentage of the G.D.P. had risen from 2.1 per cent in 1956-7 to 5.8 per cent in 1976-7, and that the Commonwealth's share of this expenditure had risen from 2.6 per cent to 42.1 per cent.⁷⁵ The increase was more the result of political decisions than any planned attempts at improving the quality or amount of education. In a submission to the Martin Committee in 1962, Karmel pointed out that, while Australia was well represented in senior high school participation rate comparisons with other industrialised nations, it was very poorly represented in those relating to tertiary education. On a list of 23, it ranked 15th in 1960-61 in terms of G.N.P. expenditure. He suggested that the relatively low level of Australian spending on education was even more serious than it appeared, since there was a high proportion of the population in relative age groups, taking the expenditure per student even lower. He also noted that Australia was the only country listed which did not have a target for education growth. Karmel recommended that much more be spent on education.⁷⁶ By

1976, by then chairman of the Tertiary Education Commission, he pointed out that, while resources per student had risen

the increased use of educational resources has not been spread evenly over the community, and some groups participate in education much less than others.⁷⁷

Segall and Fitzgerald suggested that the method of Commonwealth funding of education produced inequities which placed certain sections of tertiary education in a more privileged position:

The matching requirements for tertiary education grants limited the choices available to the states, since they had to commit themselves to supporting a three-year program without knowing what increased revenue they would have at their disposal. A Treasury official in Western Australia commented that 'although agreement is eventually reached between the Governments on a programme that the States can support, Commonwealth participation does have the effect of putting tertiary education in a privileged position when priorities are assigned'.⁷⁸

While educational resources may have been unevenly spread, creating privilege and inequity, these results were more relative than absolute.

Philp, in 1970, identified a downturn in Commonwealth support for tertiary education over the previous decade. He suggested that this was related to short-term increases in expenditure as the recommendations of the Murray and Martin Committees were implemented, but warned that the absolute necessity of a large injection of funds would recur if moves toward the standards set by the Committees were not continued.⁷⁹ By 1972, Williams suggested that standards remained below those recommended by the Murray Committee, and that escalating costs and inflation were making it difficult for the universities, especially the older ones, to retain the advantages gained from the Murray recommendations. He forecast a rise in expenditure per student if the downward drift were to be stopped. He also suggested that Commonwealth government funding was insufficient, particularly in general supplementary grants, which did not cover the total rises in recurrent costs, and which were not applicable to capital expenditure. He noted that government cuts in recommended

funding had meant that real expenditure had been falling since a peak in 1968 and expenditure per student was below the level recommended in both the Third and Fourth Reports of the A.U.C.⁸⁰

With the 1969 election campaign, Commonwealth funding of education had become a serious political issue, and the A.L.P. adopted a policy of total Commonwealth responsibility for tertiary education funding, and substantial support for other educational areas through a Schools Commission. The near victory of the A.L.P., and continued restrictions on funding ensured that it remained so. There was a swell of support for the notion of total Commonwealth funding.⁸¹ With the election of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1972, funding for education underwent a major change in line with ALP policy. In particular, university and college of advanced education funding passed to the Commonwealth, and the college system was enlarged with the inclusion of teacher training institutions. As noted, Commonwealth expenditure on education doubled in 1973-4 and again in 1974-5, by which time the total cost to the Commonwealth of the universities was \$552 million, and of the colleges was \$393 million.⁸² Continuing recommended levels of funding at these rates from the A.U.C. and the C.A.E. led the Government to merge the two to achieve a rationalisation of expenditure. Such moves were not isolated in the education sectors but were part of the Government's response to the recession that occurred in 1974-5. Triennial funding arrangements were also abandoned and the reports of the A.U.C. and the C.A.E. for the 1976-78 triennium were not accepted. The Fraser L.N.C.P. Government on its election in December 1975 continued the restrictions on education funding and brought the T.A.F.E.C. into the new Tertiary Education Commission along with the other two commissions. Guidelines for expenditure were issued in 1976, restricting growth in the universities and colleges, with the effect of transferring resources to technical education. University enrolments were to be limited to the 1976 level,

and those of the colleges, to 1977 levels. Derham noted in 1978 that from the early 1960s, the universities in particular, did not receive anything like the lavish treatment that had been publicly perceived:

The actual real expenditure on university effort, whether measured by reference to cost per student, by reference to staff/student ratios in different disciplines or by reference to the percentage of the gross national product put to university education (discounted for the increasing number of students involved) the actual commitment to universities did not change significantly. In fact in the last six or seven years the cost per student and the commitment per student has been declining. What we did was to provide more for more people and we did it at a remarkable rate of development.⁸³

While this does not take into account the development of the advanced education system, it does illustrate the difficulties with which the universities were faced. The restrictions placed on the colleges were perceived to be even stricter.

The development in 1976 of the practice of Government guidelines to the Tertiary Education Commission was, according to Lindsay, a decision which

fundamentally changes the nature of the Commission by removing it from its position as a buffer between institutions and governments and establishing it firmly as an agent for implementing government policy.⁸⁴

The guidelines were directly related to the problems of coordination which, far from being the fault of the commissions or the institutions, resulted from the rejection by the Menzies Government of the Martin recommendation to establish an Australian Tertiary Education Commission. The actions of the commissions, however, exacerbated the problem in two ways. First, they did not develop effective informal lines of communication which would have enabled them to offer consistent advice to governments. Second, they did not resist government policies which impinged on their independence, or which attempted to blame the education system for problems, such as unemployment, which were clearly not issues over which it had control.⁸⁵ The centralisation of power away from the

commissions toward departments of government continued with the establishment of the T.E.C. Bessant suggested that its role appeared to be to implement the Fraser Government policies in spite of the recommendations of the Councils, a situation particularly apparent in relation to manpower planning policies, where it was

difficult to escape the conclusion that the T.E.C.'s efforts at labour market forecasting have been dominated by government pressure to provide a justification for the Federal Government's tertiary education policies. In this way the T.E.C. is now functioning in much the same way as any department of government.⁸⁶

Birrell suggested that this situation could, in fact, be seen from comparing the Sixth (and last) Report of the A.U.C. which had not foreseen any significant restrictions facing continued development of the universities, with the First Report of the T.E.C. He noted that the prognosis of the A.U.C.

was suddenly challenged during 1976 and 1977 when Commonwealth funding for higher education was cut back, enforcing reductions in projected enrolments.⁸⁷

In the last five years of the period under review, education funding remained a political issue, but in different terms from those of the expansionary period. Much of the debate centred on the redistribution of resources in tertiary education. In official terms, the universities and colleges were experiencing a steady state after a period of expansion, while to many in higher education the debate was cast in terms of funding cuts, rationalisation and restriction. While Carrick, then Minister for Education, was reported to have admonished an interviewer - "Don't come talking to me about cuts in education, because they simply don't exist" - and denied that funds had been cut - "year by year by year, contrary to any other country in the free world, education funds in Australia have expanded in real terms"⁸⁸ - such statements did not take into account the Commonwealth/State differentials, nor the differences in funding for the various sectors. In the same year, Williams, latterly chairman of

the latest committee of inquiry, pointed out that

Few people realise that in the universities real recurrent grants per student per Faculty reached a peak in 1968, or that since 1975 there has been a reduction of about 10 per cent. Nor do many realise that there will be a further reduction of about 2 per cent in 1980, still more in equipment grants.⁸⁹

He continued:

Real expenditure on research per member of academic staff has fallen markedly since 1970 due to the squeeze on general recurrent grants, and special research grants, the failure of ARGC grants even to keep place with inflation and the reduction of support from 'industry boards'.⁹⁰

The Williams Committee recommended that both recurrent funds and research funds should be restored to 1975 levels for the universities.⁹¹ The guidelines issued by the Government to the T.E.C. for 1978 and the 1979-81 triennium, pegged expenditure for the universities and colleges at real 1977 levels, but in the 1978 document, it was announced that supplementation was to apply only to the recurrent components of the grants, thereby reducing, in real terms, their value.⁹² The T.A.F.E. sector received a boost of 10 per cent in each of the guidelines, with a supplementary amount of \$50 million being added to proposed capital expenditure by the Government for the 1979-81 triennium.⁹³

Conclusion

Australian tertiary education institutions have been the subject of serious criticism from a number of sources throughout the period 1939-1979. Perhaps the most consistent critic, and one of the most sympathetic, was Partridge but he was not, by any means, the only one. While there was massive expansion in the post-War period, especially after the Murray Report, criticisms were constant in their concern for lack of support by governments, and lack of initiative, standards and diversity among the institutions. Partridge suggested that "None of the universities, and few individual scholars in pre-1945 Australia, could be said to have had a national status",⁹⁴ and Murray-Smith argued that



It would hardly be too much of an exaggeration to say that technical education would hardly have existed in Australia at all, by the time of the Second World War, but for the fact that the technical colleges had been established in the 1880s and 1890s in the full flood of a confident liberal-national optimism, and that forty years later it wasn't practicable to unestablish them again.⁹⁵

Ashby noted wryly, during a visit to Australia in 1942;

Did you know that in the Commonwealth of Australia only 1.7 persons per thousand are in universities and 3.8 persons per thousand are in hospitals for the insane? It is about twice as likely that you will go to a hospital for the insane as to a university; more than twice, because you have to pass a matriculation examination to get into the one, but not to enter the other.⁹⁶

After the implementation of the Murray recommendations, Rowe, formerly Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, released a book which was scathing in its criticism of that university in particular, and Australian universities in general. He accused them of refusing to face problems if solutions might be unpalatable, of reacting violently to criticism from others while refusing to undertake self-criticism, and of falling down on their ideals.⁹⁷ Predictably, the book was received badly, both for its anti-democratic and elitist nature, but more often in the vein which he criticised. Nevertheless, by the end of the period, Australian academics themselves were almost as outspoken. In 1977, Wheelwright suggested that "most Australian universities have become stultified and constipated by hierarchy, specialisation and careerism", and that "As for most Australian Vice-Chancellors, they are a pathetic lot, and carry little weight in the community."⁹⁸

Partridge suggested that the underdeveloped state of tertiary institutions at the beginning of the period was due to the isolation which they faced, along with the nation in general, the derivative nature of Australian society and its institutions, and the lack of importance attached to and esteem given to, them. He said that "The community appeared to have little interest in them, except as 'service stations', as professional training schools."⁹⁹ The 'service station' concept was

one that caught on as a descriptive, and mildly critical term. Ely suggested that the theme running through increased support for tertiary education from 1939 has been that of professional training and economic demand. The Universities Commission and the Financial Assistance Scheme, bipartisan support for Commonwealth involvement, the Murray and Martin Committees, the subsequent reports of the A.U.C. and the C.A.E., were all examples of assumptions based on these themes.¹⁰⁰ Developments from then, especially since 1975, could be reviewed in the same light. Tannock believed that there was, because of the prevalence of these attitudes, and the factors identified by Partridge, "a certain inevitability about the Commonwealth's march into State educational institutions during the war,"¹⁰¹ and after. It was commonplace in discussions of tertiary education that the most important factor in its post-War development was its rapid expansion, in terms of both numbers and institutions. According to Tannock, post-War developments meant, for tertiary education, centralised control in the Commonwealth with respect to both the States' systems and individual institutions, a loss of much institutional autonomy, and a tendency for levelling of status between institutions.¹⁰² While there was little debate that those, or similar effects had occurred, there was some contention on the desirability of such outcomes.

In 1963, Partridge identified a number of factors which he believed had affected the universities, in particular, to that date. The trend toward national independence and growth - the breakdown in the isolation of the nation - and the subsequent maturity of Australian society was the most important. He suggested that the universities had reflected this growth and maturity in size, standards of teaching, depth of research, originality and initiative. He saw them interacting far more with the community at large, drawing on invigorating social and political movements in society.¹⁰³ He also noted the other side of the coin,

that governments had become far more interested in what the universities taught, and the problems that this posed with respect to future funding, support, and institutional autonomy. He questioned whether the universities would be able to withstand such pressures, and overcome such problems:

Or will this process have the long-run effect of making the universities less independent - more conformist, more utilitarian or "functional", more fully professionalized? Will the result be that the universities will be more subject to political and administrative pressures than they have been in the past?¹⁰⁴

Although he did not answer the question, by 1965 he wrote, while identifying three major post-War trends in tertiary education

the development of tertiary education is now being planned predominantly from the point of view of the function of education within the economy, or, at least, from the point of view of its function within the wider social system.¹⁰⁵

He identified the other two major trends as increasing Commonwealth centralisation of control, and the growing notion of a system of institutions rather than a series of autonomous universities and technical colleges. He went on to suggest that the Australian situation would become increasingly planned along these lines.

Partridge's analysis was generally supported by other commentators, to a greater or lesser degree. Jones argued in 1974 that the A.U.C. had evolved in such a way as to make autonomy an outmoded concept - the universities "are told what to do and when, and how much it can cost"¹⁰⁶ - and that the C.A.E. had denied the possibility of autonomy to the colleges in its area. Harman suggested that by the mid 1970s the political environment had become increasingly difficult and constrained, with significant power shifts to government, from State to Commonwealth authority, and from commissions to departments, and with a loss of institutional autonomy.¹⁰⁷ Karmel, in 1976, could be interpreted as supporting this view, when he succinctly precised developments over the

preceding decade:

The Martin Report was written in the belief that 'higher education should be available to all citizens according to their inclination and capacity'. The committee rejected the view that there was 'some smaller fraction of the population to which higher education should be restricted'. The interruption to the triennial programme for universities and colleges of advanced education which occurred in the middle of 1975 and the guidelines issued by the Commonwealth government in May 1976, however, suggest that the view rejected by the Martin Committee now more clearly accords with the realities of government budgetting. In both its Fifth Report and Sixth Report the Universities Commission took the view that the size of the tertiary sector was a matter for political decision.¹⁰⁸

As early as 1970, Philp had suggested that Partridge's early 1960s warnings had gone unheeded, and that many of the problems facing tertiary education in the 1970s were due to the lack of initiative on the part of academia in framing acceptable policies.¹⁰⁹ Tannock argued that the lacuna in the universities and colleges with regard to policy proposals, meant that they became dependent on the Commonwealth, "and have accordingly sacrificed a good deal of their autonomy."¹¹⁰

One of the most obvious points in discussion of post-War developments in tertiary education has been that of institutional autonomy. In fact, it was picked out of the early Partridge commentaries, almost to the exclusion of his other arguments, and even Philp in reviewing Partridge's work focussed on it as the main result of them. Partridge, in 1978, was more reserved in assessing the importance of autonomy as an issue:

I suspect that some of the things now often said about the erosion of the autonomy of our universities are often based on a quite over-simplified view of the pre-1950 history of the universities. That autonomy, such as it was, was an autonomy not unconnected with the poverty of the universities, with a lack of government financial and other forms of commitment; and I think also that many people who now speak of the traditional autonomy of the Australian universities perhaps have no conception of what very narrow little parochial oligarchies our universities in many respects were until after World War II.¹¹¹

Other issues, while they have been discussed, have tended to be related

to the issue of autonomy. Some commentators have suggested that some issues have been largely ignored, especially in official debate. Ely asserted that

Reports recommending Commonwealth involvement in tertiary education have exhibited reluctance to come to terms with possible contradictions in educational aims and objectives. Analyses of possible tensions between a 'search for truth' and education for international survival or national efficiency; between education for individual self improvement and educational [sic] for industry; between education for equality of opportunity and education for a pyramid are avoided, ignored, or juxtaposed in seeming harmony.¹¹²

Others have recast the debate in somewhat different terms, which involve different, and often opposing, assumptions: "The continued expansion of educational resources has been choked off by the profit system."¹¹³ What became apparent during the post-War period was the increasing depth and complexity with which issues surrounding tertiary education were viewed by participants and commentators. The development of the debate coincided with increasingly complex debates in other areas relating to Australian society, such as the economy, welfare areas and international relations. It also coincided with the development of a system of tertiary education which moved from a relatively simple one of a few universities and a technical sector based on a joint effort between lower technical institutions and employers, to a system marked by three rigidly structured tertiary education sectors. At the same time, the system expanded rapidly in a manner unforeseen even by the earlier inquiries established to legitimate its development. Of course, one of the most important features in this development was the centralisation of control and the consolidation of control in all spheres of the system, a feature which became central to debate in relation to tertiary education.

FOOTNOTES

1. N.G. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development, 1890-1965", in C. Forster (ed.), Australian Economic Development in the Twentieth Century, (Sydney, 1970), p. 319.
2. See R. Catley, "Socialism and Reform in Contemporary Australia", in E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley (eds), Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism, Vol. 2, (Sydney, 1978); C. Silver, "The Economic Cycle in Post-War Australia", Arena, 49, 1977; B. McFarlane, "Economic Policy", in Roy Forward (ed.), Public Policy in Australia, (Melbourne, 1974); M. Brezniak and J. Collins, "The Australian Crisis from Boom to Bust", Journal of Australian Policy Economy, no. 1, 1977.
3. McFarlane, "Economic Policy", p. 99.
4. ibid. pp. 106-7.
5. Butlin, "Some Perspectives of Australian Economic Development", p. 322.
6. ibid., p. 323.
7. J.A. Dowie, "The Service Ensemble", in Forster, Australian Economic Development p. 208.
8. McFarlane, "Economic Policy", pp. 110-111.
9. Catley, "Socialism and Reform in Contemporary Australia", pp. 21-22.
10. L.N. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 5, no. 1, April 1967, p. 10.
11. D. Tomlinson, "Finance for Education in Australia: Developments 1969-75", Australian Education Review, No. 5, 1976, p. 9.
12. For instance, see D. Smart, "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education, 1964-1975", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. XIV, no. 2, October 1976, p. 236, who pointed out that A.L.P. expenditure increased in real terms in 1973-4 as much as L.C.P. expenditure from 1964-72.
13. J.K. Matthews and R.L. Fitzgerald, "Educational Policy and Political Platform: The Australian Labor Government", Australian Education Review, Vol. 7, no. 4, 1974, p. 57.
14. See G.S. Harman "The Political Environment of Australian Higher Education", paper delivered at a seminar, 21, April 1977, on The Environment of Higher Education: Politics, Consumers, Community" Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland, p. 10.
15. Senator Pearce, Government Leader in the Senate, in I.K.F. Birch, Constitutional Responsibility for Education in Australia, (Canberra, 1975), p. 35.
16. J.J. Dedman, in ibid., p. 38.
17. J.J. Dedman, speech entitled "Financial Aspects to University

- Students", 20 December 1942, in Dedman Papers, National Library of Australia, MS987/5/256-257.
18. E.J. Hook, "The Universities Commission and its Functions", Public Administration, Vol. V, no. 8, December 1945, p. 346.
 19. Birch, Constitutional Responsibility, p. 40.
 20. P.D. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia in Education Since Federation, 1901-1968", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1969, p. 264.
 21. Tannock pointed out that there were only 89,000 skilled tradesmen in Australia at the outbreak of World War II, and that almost 120,000 people were trained under the Scheme, ibid., p. 223.
 22. "Commonwealth Assistance for Research at the Universities", Memorandum by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, University Gazette (Melbourne), Vol. II, no. 4, 27 May 1946, pp. 27-28.
 23. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol. 184), 26 July 1945, pp. 4612-4619.
 24. ibid., p. 4613.
 25. ibid., p. 4613.
 26. ibid., p. 4616.
 27. See Education News, August 1947, pp. 4-5.
 28. J.J. Dedman, CPD (Vol. 184) 26 July 1945, p. 4626.
 29. "A Crisis in the Finances and Development of the Australian Universities", (Carlton, undated [1952?]). The A.V.C.C. had already been quite vocal in relation to falling Commonwealth support. For instance, see A.V.C.C. press statement, "The Financial Position of Australian Universities", 14/11/50, Dedman Papers, National Library of Australia, MS987/7/1799-1820.
 30. A.J. Forbes, "The Commonwealth Government and the Australian Universities Commission", Vestes, Vol. III, no. 1, March 1960, p. 16. X
 31. ibid., p. 18.
 32. J.F. Cairns, "The Government, the A.U.C. and the Universities", Vestes, Vol. III, no. 1, March 1960, p. 13. His views anticipated debate which was to recur, especially in the mid to late 1970's.
 33. E.G. Whitlam, CPD (Vol H of R 37), 6 December 1962, p. 3115.
 34. ibid., p. 3117.
 35. A.J. Forbes, CPD (Vol H of R 39), 19 September 1963, p. 1195.
 36. J.F. Cairns, CPD (Vol H or R 45) 28 April 1965, p. 935.
 37. ibid., p. 933.

38. J. Gorton, The Commonwealth Government in Education, (Sydney, 1966) in D. Smart "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education", p. 243, emphasis added.
39. J. Gorton, CPD (Vol S 32), 21 September 1966, p. 576.
40. D. Hughes, "The Role of the Australian States", in R. McCaig (ed), Policy and Planning in Higher Education (St. Lucia, 1973) pp. 62-75.
41. M. Fraser "Higher Education in Relation to Australia's Needs" in ibid., pp. 20-21.
42. R. McCaig, "Recommendations and Conclusions" in ibid., p. 176.
43. See Matthews and Fitzgerald, "Educational Policy and Political Platform", p. 13.
44. K.E. Beazley, "Whither Tertiary Education?", Adelaide University Graduates' Union Gazette, January/February 1973, p. 3.
45. K.E. Beazley, cited in D.S. Anderson, "Labor's Achievements in Australian Education, 1972-1976", in New Directions in Australian Education, (Carlton, 1976), p. 39.
46. ibid., pp. 33-34.
47. ibid., p. 34.
48. P. Segell and R.L. Fitzgerald, "Finance for Education in Australia: An Analysis", Quarterly Review of Australian Education, Vol. 6, December 1973, pp. 8-9.
49. K.E. Beazley, CPD (Vol H of R 93), 20 February 1975, p. 533.
50. Smart, "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education", p. 274.
51. ibid., p. 234.
52. G. O'Byrne and A. Lindsay, "An Analysis of the Tertiary Education Commission's Case for a No-Growth Policy in Higher Education", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 50, no. 4, December 1978, p. 11.
53. M. Fraser, CPD (Vol H or R 100), 9 September 1976, p. 876.
54. J.L. Carrick, interview, College News, 26/3/79, p. 18.
55. J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p. 127.
56. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol. 184), 26 July 1945, p. 4618.
57. CPD (Vol. 184), 26 July 1945, p. 4627.
58. Hook, "The Universities Commission and its Functions", p. 346.
59. R.G. Menzies CPD (Vol. H of R 17), 28 November 1957, p. 2695.
60. ibid., p. 2696.
61. Birch, Constitutional Responsibility, p. 50.

62. H.V. Evatt, CPD (Vol H of R 2), 2 December 1953, p. 823.
63. H.V. Evatt, CPD (Vol H or R 19), 6 May 1958, p. 1456.
64. E.G. Whitlam, CPD (Vol H of R 37), 6 December 1962, p. 3115.
65. W. Prest "Federalism and Education", in G.S. Harman and C. Selby Smith (eds), Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, (Sydney, 1972), p. 118.
66. P.H. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, (Sydney, 1973), pp. 210-211.
67. P.D. Tannock, "The Development of the Federal Government's Role in Australian Education" in Harman and Selby Smith, Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, p. 29.
68. Birch, Constitutional Responsibility, p. 24.
69. ibid., p. 83.
70. B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977) p. 92.
71. "A Crisis in the Finances and Development", p. 13.
72. G.K.W. Johnston, "The Crisis in University Education", Prospect, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1961, p. 26.
73. E.L. Wheelwright, "Problems of Higher Education", in E.L. Wheelwright (ed), Radical Political Economy, (Sydney, 1974), p. 177.
74. B. Jardine, "The University Sell-Out", Prospect, Vol. 4, no. 3, 1961, p. 14.
75. Education, Training and Employment, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training, (B.R. Williams, chairman), February 1979, Vol. 3, p. 1 (here-in-after cited as the Williams Report).
76. P.H. Karmel, "Some Economic Aspects of Education", Buntine Oration, delivered at the Australian College of Education Third Annual Conference, 18 May 1962, pp. 15-22. This article was treated as a submission to the Committee in the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (Sir Leslie Martin, Chairman), CF 343.
77. P.H. Karmel, "The Education System and the Labour Market", in J.P. Nieuwenhuysen and P.J. Drake (eds.), Australian Economic Policy, (Melbourne, 1977), p. 202.
78. Segall and Fitzgerald, "Finance for Education in Australia", p. 38.
79. H. Philp "The Piper and the Tune - From Murray to the Fourth A.U.C. Report", Australian University, Vol. 8, no. 1, May 1970.
80. B.R. Williams, "The Escalating Costs of Universities", Australian University, Vol. 10, no. 2, September 1972, pp. 109-110.

81. For instance, see Vestes, Vol. 14, no. 3, 1971.
82. see above, p. 85.
83. D.P. Derham, "Universities and Australia", Australian Director, Vol. 8, April 1978, p. 59.
84. A. Lindsay, "National Policy Making for Higher Education", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 38.
85. ibid., p. 40.
86. B. Bessant, "The Erosion of University Autonomy in Australia", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 30, see also A. Lindsay and G. O'Byrne, "Accountability of Tertiary Education at the National Level: A Chimera?", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 27-29; Lindsay, "National Policy Making for Higher Education", p. 40; Harman, "The Political Environment", p. 10.
87. R. Birrell, "External Factors Influencing Education: Some Demographic and Economic Constraints" in T. Hore, R.D. Linke, and L.H.T. West, (eds), The Future of Higher Education in Australia, (South Melbourne, 1978), p. 9.
88. Carrick, interview, College News, 26/3/79, pp. 17-18.
89. B.R. Williams, "Australian Universities to the Year 2000", A.V.C.C. Occasional Papers, no. 2, 1979, p. 11.
90. ibid., p. 12.
91. Williams Report, Vol. 1, pp. 181-182 and pp. 206-207.
92. Report of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, August 1977, pp. 214-216; Report of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, February 1978, Vol. 1, pp. 153-155.
93. ibid., pp. 157-158.
94. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 120.
95. S. Murray-Smith, "Tertiary Education in the Melting Pot", Outlook, Vol. 13, no. 6, December 1969, p. 16.
96. E. Ashby, "The Tenpenny Universities", in E. Ashby, Challenge to Education, (Sydney 1946), p. 66. For interest, in 1979 there were about 3.05 persons per thousand in mental hospitals (S.A. figures) and about 2.2 persons per thousand in universities and colleges of advanced education. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Hospital Morbidity, 1979, (4205.0), University Statistics, 1979 (4207.0), College of Advanced Education Statistics, 1979 (4302.4) and Demographic Statistics, 1979, (3101.0).
97. A.P. Rowe, If the Gown Fits, (Melbourne, 1960).
98. E.L. Wheelwright, "The Higher Learning in Australia", in E.L. Wheelwright (ed), Capitalism, Socialism or Barbarism? The Australian Predicament, (Sydney, 1978), pp. 90-91.

99. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 42.
100. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 105.
101. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government", p. 406.
102. P.D. Tannock, "The Development of the Commonwealth Government's Role in Australian Education", Forum of Education, Vol. XXX, no. 2, September 1971, p. 155.
103. P.H. Partridge, "Australian Universities - Some Trends and Problems", Australian University, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1963, pp. 13-17.
104. ibid., p. 17.
105. P.H. Partridge, "Tertiary Education - Society and the Future", in J. Wilkes (ed.), Tertiary Education in Australia, (Sydney, 1965), p. 6.
106. P.E. Jones, Education in Australia, (Melbourne, 1974), p. 88.
107. Harman, "The Political Environment", p. 4.
108. Karmel, "The Educational System", p. 213.
109. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune", pp. 29-31.
110. Tannock, "The Development of the Federal Government's Role", p. 30.
111. P.H. Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", proceedings of a Seminar on The Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities, University of Adelaide, 6-7 October, 1978, pp. 12-13.
112. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p. 136. See also J. Hyde, "The Structure of Higher Education in Australia", in P. Sheldrake and R. Linke (eds), Accountability in Higher Education, (Sydney, 1979), p. 14.
113. P. Murphy, "The Fiscal Crisis of Higher Education", Alternative News Service, no. 72, 21/3/77, p. 12.

Chapter 4

The Political Context, 1939-1979

From War to Reconstruction

World War II was a watershed in the development of tertiary education in Australia. The outbreak of the War had caught the Government and the nation unawares, particularly in relation to skilled labour, a situation which Tannock suggested arose from a combination of poor support for technical education from the States, and a lack of adequate defence planning.¹ Although some of the States requested Commonwealth support for tertiary education in early 1939, the Lyons Government refused to divert funds from important defence projects. Even when it began to plan the Commonwealth Technical Training Scheme in August 1939, the Commonwealth remained adamant that it was involved in defence planning rather than education. By early 1941, however, following Menzies' election as Prime Minister, the Government's attitude had changed considerably. Holt, then Minister for Labour and National Service, when speaking of technical education, broke new ground regarding possible continuing Commonwealth involvement:

Unfortunately, in the past it has not merited from Federal governments the attention which its importance in our national scheme warranted. We have been inclined to declare that the technical training of young men and women is the responsibility of the States, and a matter with which we cannot concern ourselves...The problem must be treated as a national one...it is my personal opinion that the financing of technical education is a matter which no central government can ignore if it feels that the problem is not being properly dealt with by the States.²

His views foreshadowed those put forward by Menzies in his 1945 statement on education, and underlined the support which the non-Labor parties were to give to the education policies of the Curtin and Chifley governments. However, support for education from the Commonwealth did not come from a concern for education as such, but from defence, national development, and reconstruction interests. The decisions to provide funds for technical education and the establishment of the Financial Assistance Scheme came from the Production Executive, headed by Dedman, although the

decisions were welcomed in the universities and the technical colleges. This is not to say that there were no educational or social concerns related to the decision, for, as Tannock pointed out,

The situation which occurred in 1942 was a golden opportunity for Labor, so rarely in power in Federal politics, to attempt to redress the felt inequities in Australian higher education opportunities,³

which were based partly on "the longstanding Labor bitterness at the inaccessibility of Australian universities to most working class people".⁴

The isolation of tertiary education, and the universities in particular, is a recurrent theme in writings on the development of tertiary education. The universities were isolated within the tertiary education system, and the system was separate from the other parts of Australian society. Ashby, writing in 1942, suggested that it was largely because Australian universities were restricted to the rich, which bred hostility from those people who could not afford to send their children to them. This was not alleviated by employment regulations, especially in the Public Service, which placed an upper age limit on entry to administrative branches of eighteen, thus effectively denying full-time tertiary education to those people employed in a major area promoting social mobility.⁵ Nevertheless, the arguments used to expand Commonwealth intervention and promote wider participation were essentially the same as those used to promote expansions of primary and secondary education. As Ely noted, these arguments based on economics and efficiency, were used by socially mobile groups (represented in part by the Labor Government) to convince the authorities to extend educational opportunities, or by the authorities (the bureaucracy, industry, the universities) in an effort to either increase production or obtain more financial resources. In either case she suggested that "the essential infrastructure of the existing society"⁶ was not questioned.

Nowhere was this more evident than in the bipartisan support that the expansion of a Commonwealth commitment to education received after 1941. Bessant documented the attitudes of Menzies who, while professing to be a "strong supporter of national control of education"⁷ in 1943, acted throughout his term of office in relation to education more from political expediency than his rhetorical commitment to education for citizenship and national development might have suggested. It was also evident from the breadth of support that the extension of the Financial Assistance Scheme attracted, an extension supported by the diverse interests on the Walker Committee, the Universities Commission, the A.V.C.C., and the Australian Teachers Federation.

One result of the use of these arguments was the type of programmes which received support. In the War and the immediate post-War period, the Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme was the major vehicle of Commonwealth involvement and it had, through its development, a number of effects. A substantial expansion of educational facilities occurred and visible government bureaucracy, in the Universities Commission, was developed. Perhaps more importantly, community attitudes were altered. Employers began to expect, in the light of employment subsidies for trainees, the government to provide both training and subsidy. Tertiary education institutions began to rely on Commonwealth support. The expectations of trainees and graduates for tertiary education were passed on to their children and the community generally. In addition, the Scheme began the breakdown of complete on-the-job training, which contributed to the change of attitudes.⁸

Commonwealth Commitment to Martin

By 1951, Commonwealth involvement had become an accepted fact. The Financial Assistance Scheme had been converted into a permanent Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, and the Commonwealth had accepted both

the Walker and Mills reports. The latter resulted in continuing financial commitment via the States Grants (Universities) Acts, whereby Commonwealth funds were channelled through the States to the universities. In 1952, the A.V.C.C. released a report calling on increased support for the universities. While employing the arguments noted above, the document stressed the traditional functions of universities which had been underplayed to some extent in the previous ten years. It noted the important role of the universities in national development and defence, while listing their functions as learning and scholarship, specialist professional training, research, and safeguarding the cultural and democratic traditions of society. Their hegemonic role was stressed;

Indeed the contribution of the Universities to society should not be reckoned only in terms of the professional proficiency of the graduates they produce or the value of their contribution to research but rather in terms of their part in determining and moulding our way of life.⁹

The A.V.C.C. was also concerned with the growing utilitarian character of the post-war universities. The document suggested that the relationship with industry was only one area of interest to the universities, and that if it were to take precedence over their other functions it would have serious consequences. It identified as major areas of concern the extension of opportunity for university attendance and increasing support for the study of the humanities, the neglect of which

if permitted to continue, could undermine the whole concept of University education, which has its very foundation in a liberal rather than specialized training.¹⁰

The arguments employed by the A.V.C.C. were essentially in accord with the rhetoric of Menzies, although the call in the document for a national enquiry went unheeded for the next five years.

Nevertheless, the terms of debate employed by the A.V.C.C. were adopted by the Murray Committee in its Report in 1957. It recommended

further Commonwealth support for the universities generally, and a strengthening of their hegemonic functions, while recognising the important role that they had in the future development of industry. According to Schonnel, there were three reasons for the expansion of the universities following the Murray Report. These were a recognition of their worth, demographic pressures, and utilitarian values:

Australian universities are now providing courses, such as forms of applied science and surveying and pharmacy, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and social work, that are often provided by other institutions in some countries.¹¹

It was this third aspect of the character of Australian universities that drew criticism from Partridge. He suggested that they had been caught up in social demands over which they had no control, and had been far more concerned with meeting them than examining them. He asserted that

They have become public utilities, as has often been pointed out, expected more and more to shape their teaching, professional training and research to serve important ends of public policy, or to apply themselves to what are considered to be important social problems.¹²

He alleged that there was in the universities "little curiosity about the changing character of the society",¹³ "an institutional inertia, and a quite extraordinary rigidity of thought",¹⁴ "a poverty of thought in the philosophy of education",¹⁵ and an

inability to think freely and widely about the character of social change and the changing situation of the universities. I suspect that increasing specialization has something to do with it. Specialization and professionalism are of course the predominant characteristics of contemporary intellectual life.¹⁶

Maclaine also identified the major post-Murray trends in tertiary education as being toward specialisation and professionalism, and noted that there was an overlap in training between the universities and the technical colleges.¹⁷ H.S. Williams suggested that, while the changes had been substantial, tertiary technical education remained very diverse, especially in status, and particularly between the States.¹⁸ He noted

that efforts to change the situation had not been very effective, despite the fact that in some areas (for instance engineering) many more professional qualifications were awarded by the technical colleges than the universities. He also noted the increasing demands from the professional bodies on the institutions, aimed not at the diversity of standards but at the diversity of status. What Williams did not recognise, of course, was the hegemonic function of the status differential between the universities and the technical colleges, although he provided an example of it. He cited the case of the conversion of the Sydney Technical College to the New South Wales University of Technology. Following the Murray Report, the University of Technology became the University of New South Wales so that its 'university' as opposed to its 'technological' character would be emphasised. Only a short time later, the New South Wales Institute of Technology was founded to provide those courses no longer available at the University. He said:

To my mind what has happened in New South Wales is convincing evidence that any institution in Australia calling itself a university will inevitably follow the well defined Australian university pattern and there is no doubt it will cease to provide the particular contribution typical of technical education.¹⁹

While Partridge was critical of the 'service station' or 'technical college' concept of the universities during this period, he was careful to differentiate between a simplistic reading of it and deeper critique of the functions of universities. He argued that in an increasingly technological age, the old 'purist' notion of the liberal university was no longer applicable or relevant, but that universities must recognise and cater for new professional, research and development demands. Related to this, he argued, was the acceptance, almost as an article of faith, of the direct relationship between higher education and economic growth. These two factors - specialisation and professionalism, and

economic growth - had led the universities to a position of total government funding. While not condemning this development, he suggested that the real debate lay in this area, not in the more simplistic concept of the debate. He said:

Not only the universities' financial dependence on governments but also, and perhaps even more important, the general conceptions of public policy which have encouraged the recent growth of the universities, have had the effect of strengthening or underlining...the notion of universities being an integral part of the machinery whereby public policy is carried out.²⁰

This sentiment was one which had been put increasingly with the development of the role of the A.U.C., at times quite strongly. Buckley suggested that the potential of the Commission had not been realised, not because of a lack of vision on the part of the Murray Committee, but because of the attitudes and actions of its Chairman. He continued:

It is time that some responsible university authority voiced publicly the private mutterings about Martin of nearly everyone connected with universities - that he is weak, procrastinating and incompetent, unable or unwilling to put the universities' case. Instead of the A.U.C. making realistic estimates of the universities' needs and then leaving it to the Commonwealth government to make the political decisions as to how much finance should be available, the A.U.C. cuts the universities' estimates drastically to fit in with whatever figure the government decides upon.²¹

Such sentiments came to be expressed even more often by the late 1960s and early 1970s, and then again from 1975, when triennial funding broke down and strict government guidelines were laid down. Partridge predicted that

the universities would be bound to adapt their policies to what they know of the financial and academic policies of the government and the Universities Commission.²²

suggesting that growing government control would have three main results. First, there would be pressures to conform to patterns of growth related to government objectives. Second, there would be competitive pressures between the universities, which would lead to

standardisation. Third, there would be pressures within the universities for departmental conformity to centralised objectives.²³ His predictions were to some extent confirmed by Prest, who suggested that from the third triennium, when the government cut recommended funding by 10 per cent and appointed a public servant as chairman of the A.U.C. instead of an academic, a change in the relationship between the government and the universities occurred.

These two events caused consternation in the universities, since they seemed to imply that grants for the universities would in future be determined more by political and financial considerations than by the objective assessment of university needs.²⁴

The Martin Committee

The structure of tertiary education in Australia was fundamentally changed by the recommendations of the Martin Committee. The Menzies government did not accept the Report in toto, as it had the Murray Report. The sections which were accepted led to the establishment of a binary system of higher education, with defined boundaries between the universities and the new advanced education sector. It continued in the direction set by the Murray Report in moving 'sub-tertiary' courses from the higher education sector, and also established a differentiation between advanced education and 'sub-professional' technical and further education. From the moment of its acceptance, the development of the advanced education sector was based on a contradictory notion. While the new colleges were to be institutions within higher education but with a different emphasis from that of the universities, they were also expected to cater for those students who would not be likely to pass university in 'm' or 'm + 1' years, whose aspirations were not toward university studies, or whose preferences were for professional courses not of a university type. The different emphasis was to be highlighted by the condition which Menzies imposed; that the colleges were not to be degree granting institutions but were only able to award up to diplomas and that

they were not to be staging posts for the creation of new universities.²⁵ Partridge suggested that, following the Martin Report,

It is now a widely-accepted article of faith that everyone who can profit from a period of advanced education should be given this opportunity to have it, and that it is an obligation of governments to ensure that the facilities are available.²⁶

H.S. Williams identified the three major concerns which prompted the development of the C.A.E. sector:

- a) that individuals have a right to the highest level of education within their capacity;
- b) that a highly educated nation is a better nation;
- c) that industry needs a well educated work force.²⁷

This development concealed a subtle shift in the arguments for higher education which had been propounded by the Murray Report, where higher education had been synonymous with university education. Williams did not identify the demands of the universities that a new form of institution be established to relieve the pressures on them which had been highlighted by Murray's acceptance of 'mass' higher education, nor of the demands of industry for non-university higher education for middle level management.²⁸

The Martin report was greeted with far less enthusiasm than had been the Murray Report. While it recommended the establishment of institutions designed to enable the universities to continue their perceived 'traditional' functions, it also recommended the establishment of an overarching commission to coordinate the development of the two types of institutions. Perhaps most importantly, the Report's acceptance of the shift in argument was accompanied by political justifications, which seemingly effected the status of the universities, and so created more ambivalence to it. Partridge noted,

In short, the policy that was recommended by the Martin Committee and accepted by the Commonwealth Government, that of 'de-emphasising' somewhat the role of the universities, of building up the strength and prestige of other institutions and of encouraging a greater proportion of young men and women to look to these other institutions for their higher education, is

in opposition to the mainstream of change that has been flowing since 1945, and will, therefore, be all the more difficult to bring to fruition.²⁹

The Martin Committee had recognised that acceptance of the colleges wouldface an uphill battle, especially if they were to attain status within higher education. While it was made perfectly clear that they were not to be universities - and Menzies made sure of that - they were also encouraged to broaden their intellectual interests to embrace some of the characteristics of higher education. The recommendation that the colleges teach the humanities and the social sciences along with the technologies, reflected a wider community concern. Such inclusion in new institutions which had previously been technical colleges was motivated by three reasons. First, it would enhance their reputations academically if they were seen to be concerned with a wider intellectual range of interests. Second, these disciplines themselves would benefit from the more practical orientation which advanced education would bring to them. Third, technicians with an appreciation of the humanities and social sciences would be better educated.

Pressures for Growth and the Problems of Advanced Education

The development of the colleges of advanced education reflected the contradictions inherent in proposals which saw them as institutions of higher education, yet which placed barriers to their development as high status institutions. It reflected the demands of the universities and industry for relief from the pressures on the former and the labour shortages of the latter, while attempting to protect the prestige of the universities. Short supported Partridge's assessment of the differences in philosophy between the Martin and Murray Committees. He suggested that the Martin notion of tertiary level non-university institutions differed substantially from the Murray notion of universities which provided all education at the level of degree and above, while not being

involved in 'sub-tertiary' courses. The division for Murray was in status and level while for Martin it was in function and emphasis. Even given the restrictions that Martin placed on the development of the advanced education sector. Short said of the Murray notion, "such a division of labour was rejected by the Martin Committee and is obviously at variance with the quest for status of the technical colleges."³¹ However, the early development of the colleges of advanced education did very little to relieve the pressures on tertiary education. Murray Smith suggested that a great deal of the developmental problems of the colleges was due to the fact that L.C.P. governments prided themselves on governing with as little planning as possible,³² echoing McFarlane's analysis of Australian economic growth. This sentiment was shared by others. Bessant suggested, that while Menzies looked on the affluence and dominance of the universities within higher education as one of his major achievements, "it was left to others to attempt to rescue the colleges of advanced education and the teachers colleges from the deserts of intellectual inferiority".³³ Short suggested that the development of the colleges proceeded as an administrative convenience, rather than according to a rational plan.³⁴

The attitudes of the universities to the developing colleges was also not conducive to their attaining status or higher standards. Partridge noted that

The universities are not very eager to assist technical colleges to reach the point where they award degrees; they do not want rivals and competitors and they are jealous for the quality or standards of degrees; most university teachers would not be easy to convince that the colleges could reach and maintain the standards they believe themselves to preserve.³⁵

While the motives of the universities were, on the surface, clearly self-interested, support for restricting the colleges to a diploma level also came from within the advanced education sector. Interestingly, however, it was based on assumptions not entirely favourable toward the

universities, for it argued that degree granting institutions in Australia had become remote and self-centred, and that any moves by the colleges toward such a position would isolate them from the community thus diminishing their ability to provide a different emphasis within tertiary education.³⁶ Even when the colleges became degree granting institutions these sentiments remained quite powerful. This was notwithstanding the emergence of an equal but different rhetoric among pro-college elements in the debate, with continued restrictions on the development of the colleges through such things as limited credit transfers with the universities and officially promulgated distinctions in status and research.

By the end of the 1960s commentators were suggesting that the position of tertiary education was as bad as it ever had been, with a lack of government commitment and support, especially in the face of continuing student demands. Murray-Smith asserted that,

Faced with it, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the reforms the 1960s have seen in higher education are illusory and, to a large degree, intentionally deceptive.³⁷

By this time, also, and especially following Menzies' retirement, the Commonwealth had become involved in a piecemeal fashion in partial funding of teachers colleges (a Martin recommendation which it had rejected) and selected funding of secondary education. These uncoordinated developments towards the implementation of the Martin recommendations were accompanied by renewed calls for a comprehensive enquiry into education which had been first raised by Menzies in 1945.

Into the 1970s: Reactions to Inaction

The inaction of the Commonwealth Government in responding to calls for a national enquiry was highlighted by its reponse to the 1969 Armidale Conference. Fraser, the then Minister for Education, was criticised for his complacent attitude toward recommendations drawn up by

a broad group of senior tertiary educators.³⁸ The Conference, which was viewed in education circles as of great importance, was almost entirely unrepresentative of two powerful groups in relation to tertiary education. While invitations were extended some eight months earlier, both State and Federal treasuries were unrepresented, and only one industry representative attended, even though all major employer and union groups were invited. The participants were almost entirely drawn from political circles, education-related government departments, and the institutions. The Conference recommendations revived the Martin recommendation for a single national coordinating commission for tertiary education and proposed the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education to ensure the balanced development of all sectors of education.³⁹ Reviewing the outcomes of the Conference, McCaig interpreted the recommendations as a rejection of the binary nature of Australian tertiary education and its implicit notions of a distinction between practical and analytic individuals. He suggested that they amounted to a proposal for "a unified, integrated and comprehensive higher education system which in turn should be closely integrated with education at all other levels",⁴⁰ and that within higher education there should be a diversity of institutions to provide the range of options that existed within the two sectors. This he suggested would overcome the divisive elements which had characterised the development of a sectional approach to higher education.

Even given McCaig's interpretation, the participants were far from unanimous in their analyses. For instance, Hughes' (N.S.W. Minister for Public Works) paper illustrated the serious differences between the States and the Commonwealth, and between the institutions and governments on what tertiary education was and how it should be viewed. In particular, Hughes was concerned with areas of Commonwealth and State responsibility and constitutional authority.⁴¹ Fraser made it quite

clear that the Commonwealth had control over tertiary education through the Commissions onto which he placed the authority:

The Commonwealth Government should and does leave to the Australian Universities Commission and the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education the detailed examination of proposals put forward by universities and colleges of advanced education. We look to those bodies for the balanced development of tertiary education and expect them to consult with each other and with state governments and with the universities and colleges.⁴²

In addition to the political conflicts involved, there was also evidence of continuing divisive sectoral approaches to higher education. Wark, Chairman of the C.A.E., pointedly warned the universities of their irrelevance:

Many leaders of commerce and industry consider that there has been a too great concentration on education to the graduate level and insufficient attention to the training of technicians. It would not unduly worry them, or me, if there were continuing quotas for the professional courses, provided that there were ample opportunities in the technical courses, preferably with easy access into the higher courses for those with a flair for learning. For it is now generally accepted that many more technicians than professionals are needed.⁴³

He suggested a greater rationalisation between the colleges and the universities, with the latter moving away from professional areas so that the former could develop them. This would enable the colleges to evolve as practical, yet non-utilitarian, institutions, leaving the universities free to develop as institutions of scholarship and research.

Duality and Tension

Debate within tertiary education over the following decade reflected that of the 1969 Armidale Conference. During the 1970s, and especially after the return to power of the Labor Government in 1972, the advanced education sector grew rapidly, and then was faced with rationalisation and contraction. Similarly, the universities experienced a period of growth followed by a government induced squeeze. The cutbacks in the higher education sectors accompanied, and to some extent were the result

of, an increasing Commonwealth interest and commitment to tertiary technical education. The late 1970s witnessed a transfer of real resources away from the former toward the latter. Initially, however, most interest centred on the boundary between the advanced education and university sectors and theoretically, on the differences in defining the roles and functions of the colleges and universities. The issue evinced considerable interest because of the traditional role of the universities in Australian society. The universities and the government attempted to restrict the debate, directing it instead toward differences in emphasis between the sectors. For instance, Fraser as Minister for Education said:

Detailing the differences between the colleges and universities is not likely to be a fruitful exercise; it could create undesirable divisions. But it is clear that the colleges are more vocationally directed; in the main, completion of a college course is an end in itself.⁴⁴

Some commentators stressed the need for cooperation between the universities and colleges on a basis of equality but, even here, there was no opposition to the notion of sectoral differentiation. Batt argued that voluntary cooperation should be based on a recognition by the universities of the worth of the colleges, with assistance being given by the former to the latter to develop into mature institutions. Only in this way, he argued, would institutional status-seeking by the colleges be stopped and the development of a really diversified system of tertiary education institutions be encouraged.⁴⁵

On the whole, however, the debate tended to be accusatory in tone. Short suggested that government statements noted three factors. First, the difference in emphasis, not function. Second, equality of standards. Third, the primary pure research role of the universities and the more limited applied research role of the colleges.⁴⁶ All three points were the subject of contention. Those in universities were inclined to ignore the second, and combine the first and third points in defining the roles of the colleges. Those in support of the colleges tended to concentrate

on the second point. On both sides of the debate there appeared to be an assumption of inherent conflict and competition, rather than cooperation. By the early 1970s, Philp suggested that the development of the colleges had heightened the trend in the universities toward fulfilling earlier criticisms of them as glorified technical colleges, because the binary system was leading to the colleges developing into universities, rather than high status technological institutions, in an attempt to gain status. Even though the government had directed that the two institutional types would be fundamentally different, he observed that "This is unreal; and ignores both history and current social pressure."

⁴⁷ Pyke, in discussing the differences of the two types of institutions, suggested that the tone of the debate appeared "to have emanated mainly from the universities who have been fighting a rearguard action to retain their status."⁴⁸ He suggested that much of the fault in the apparent overlap between the universities and the colleges lay with the former, citing the C.A.E. in support - "at least part of the explanation may be in a changing attitude of the universities".⁴⁹ In fact, the commissions attempted to dull the debate somewhat. The A.U.C. had continually stated that the developing binary system of higher education was a continuum rather than two distinct sectors. Ham argued that the acceptance of the Martin Committee's concept of 'non-university institutions' which had thereby defined the college sector negatively, had in fact introduced a duality into higher education which prevented a continuum. He suggested that the duality was compounded by the official distinction between academic and vocational emphasis which, in addition, was both misleading and difficult to demonstrate in practice.⁵⁰ These factors had led to the impossibility of the equal but different line of argument, since by most measurements the colleges had a lesser status.⁵¹

The Debate on Autonomy: Control or Accountability

Very much related to the debate on the advanced education/university boundary was that concerning increasing government intervention and control in the affairs of the universities in particular. Partridge, who was one of the first to initiate discussion on this area, later suggested that too much had been made of it in a too simplistic manner.⁵² Nevertheless, the debate was a real one. Harman suggested that controls represented a wider movement in society:

The movement of effective power from parliaments to the executive public service and statutory corporations, has been an important phenomenon in the Australian political system over recent years. It can be attributed mainly to the increased scope and complexity of government activity, the operation of strict discipline within the political parties, the failure of parliaments to evolve measures to ensure greater executive accountability, and the development of strong and effective public bureaucracies.⁵³

Partridge had argued some years earlier that moves toward government involvement

will demand a great deal of self-restraint on the part of the Commonwealth; the Central Government has the means, if it chooses to use them, to go a long way in enforcing its own will.⁵⁴

In the early 1970s, Philip had identified the Harman observation in relation to the A.U.C., which he suggested had become merely another government department, recommending in the light of guidelines and decisions already made by the government, instead of being the basis for those decisions.⁵⁵ He suggested that Fraser had subtly shifted the notion of university autonomy through accountability, to a notion of direct accountability. He cited Fraser:

While governments remain responsible for the growth of universities and for the funds that therefore must be provided they have a duty to see that development is balanced - in other words, there must be a recognition that one particular university cannot act in isolation from what all other universities are doing. Priorities must be established.⁵⁶

Philip argued that the trends identified by Partridge in the early 1960s

toward the integration of the universities into the wider public service had been strong during the decade.

There is an increasing tendency to look on the universities as no more than agencies of government and to express surprise - or even horror - when staff or students reject this view, either in writing or in overt acts of some kind or other.⁵⁷

Jones suggested that the expansion of tertiary education masked the growing control of the Commonwealth, together with the maintenance of the elite nature of the universities.

By widening the higher education system, the selectivity of universities seems assured; with massive Federal aid and bodies like the Australian Universities Commission to control financial allocations, effective autonomy seems a thing of the past.⁵⁸

This view was supported by a number of other commentators. Harman noted the growing bureaucracy with powers relating to tertiary education at both State and Commonwealth level. These were not only the various State establishing Acts, education of TAFE departments and coordination authorities, along with Commonwealth commissions and the Department of Education, but also increasingly such departments as the Treasury and the Public Service Board. He pointed out that at the Commonwealth level, tertiary education was faced with a large bureaucracy: the T.E.C. and its councils, the Australian Council on Awards in Advanced Education, the Department of Education, the Academic Salaries Tribunal, and sections of the Treasury, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, and the Department of Employment. In addition, both the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education had a personal interest in tertiary education.⁵⁹ He suggested that, prior to the establishment of the T.E.C., friction between sections of the bureaucracy led to power shifts within it. First,

One consequence of friction between the commissions is that the effective power of the Department of Education has been enhanced. The Department now has a branch largely occupied with reviewing what each of the commissions recommend to the Government.⁶⁰

Second, inter-departmental friction regarding educational philosophy led to the placement of the secretariat of the William Committee in the Department of the Prime Minister instead of in the Department of Education. These developments had led to a general shift of power from the commissions to the departments.

The commissions no longer ask institutions in any meaningful way what they need, and they in turn tell the Government what the needs of institutions are nationally. Instead the Government simply informs each commission how much it has to distribute for one year at a time (not three), and then lets it carve up this amount among institutions.⁶¹

Dufty suggested that the very nature of universities as political and not bureaucratic institutions created problems in their relationship with their environment and the community generally, arguing that,

Not unnaturally, this state of affairs has led governments, as the main providers of funds to the universities, to become increasingly restive with university government and anxious to replace it by a more subservient relationship between the universities and its own bureaucracy.⁶²

H.S. Williams identified some factors why the C.A.E. became a directive, rather than advisory body in the mid 1970s.

The rapidly increasing scale of resource demands, the impact of full Commonwealth funding and its effect on the role of the States, changing attitudes towards tertiary education, a diminishing conviction concerning the assumed benefits of higher education, pressure for resources for other areas of education and other social needs, and growing information concerning current costs and future student demands have all helped to change this situation.⁶³

By 1979, the end of the period under review, there was a strong literature on the Commonwealth's dominance of tertiary education.⁶⁴ Opposition to strong Commonwealth controls come from diverse interests, especially in relation to government rhetoric identifying itself with the community. On the one hand, Derham suggested that without some remoteness from short-term interests, the universities would lose their character, and suggested that the establishment of the T.E.C. illustrated the dangers facing them.

If that edict produces a new Commission which blurs the distinction between the Universities and other more specialized kinds of tertiary educational institutions, then the transfer of governmental responsibility from seven governments to one will have very quickly done something which will in time, do very grave damage to the national interests.⁶⁵

On the other hand, it has been suggested that a simplistic equation of government and community masked tendencies toward centralisation in society which will, in fact, prevent other than dominant interests from representation.

Bureaucratic control, essentially directed at fiscal accountability, tends to view and expect educational results to be quantifiable and easily relateable to economic factors and results. Bureaucratic attitudes are in large part transferred to government thinking and thus play a major role in political decision making. While including government as one part of community, and acknowledging its legitimate right to one form of accountability, it is unwise to assert that a strong governmental role in higher education is synonymous with community involvement.⁶⁶

Bessant argued that the post-Menzie's development of the universities had been away from institutions in the liberal-democratic mould towards utilitarianism, without even a pretense of liberal-arts influence. He suggested this had gone hand-in-hand with the development of a strong college system, with institutions which, in some cases, rivalled the universities in prestige. Whereas Menzie's has resisted the Martin Committee's recommendations to establish an overarching Australian Education Commission, in just over ten years, the Fraser L.N.C.P. Government had established the T.E.C., a move Menzie's would have labelled as levelling. Nevertheless, he suggested that Menzie's, in fact, had set the parameters for the development of tertiary education from the mid-1960s, with the establishment of the A.U.C.. and the acceptance of the Martin Committee proposals for the establishment of an advanced education system. However, his efforts to protect the prestige and status of the universities, which he recognised as a major hegemonic institution in society, ensured that "the fundamental assumptions about

the aims and functions of the universities...will remain the same, at least in the foreseeable future".⁶⁷ Increasing government intervention in tertiary education was, far from being directed against the hegemonic functions of the universities, directed at ensuring its continuation.

Economy or Hegemony: Reasons for Expansion and Contraction

The reasons for increasing Commonwealth control of tertiary education, and the related issue concerning the university/advanced education boundary, were situated within the rationale for the development of tertiary education in Australia in the post-War period. Philp pointed out in 1970 that the proportion of each age group entering the universities was increasing at a slower rate, even though the proportion of each age group completing school was not flattening out but increasing. He noted that this trend was an Australian phenomenon and that other advanced industrial countries were experiencing increasing university participation. The Australian situation did not reflect demand but supply, for notwithstanding the development of the college sector, he suggested,

it appears to be a deliberate government policy to curtail the expansion of the universities - not merely to 'restore the balance' between them and the colleges, but as an end in itself.⁶⁸

Even though other commentators suggested that the flattening growth rate in university student numbers could be explained by the development of the colleges,⁶⁹ Philp put the trend down to changes in government policy, away from what he called the traditional policy of providing places for all qualified matriculants, to one based "partly on inadequate manpower approaches to planning and partly on an elitist philosophy of the nature of universities".⁷⁰ The development of the colleges was not an explanation of why, but a result of these policies, which had been

achieved not by creating alternative institutions, but by restricting university growth and forcing students into the colleges.

While Philp illustrated the hegemonic nature of tertiary education in Australia, he misunderstood the process. On the other hand, Ely argued that educational policy was based in elitism. She suggested that none of the major post-War reports questioned the social composition of students or potential students, even though there was an increase in the order of five times between the Murray Report and 1975. Their response to demands for tertiary education was to recommend the strengthening of a meritocratic system, and an expansion of it, first in the universities, then through the development of the advanced education sector, and finally through the expansion of the TAFE colleges. She suggested that where the reports did address the issue of demand and participation, they did not do so in terms of class or socio-economic barriers but in terms of general population pressure and higher school retention rates. The first attempt to confront the issue in terms other than "a widespread and powerful social demand" was in the first Kangan Report (1974) which she suggested was aimed at stimulating social mobility through Commonwealth involvement in the TAFE sector. Even so, the Report did not question, nor attempt to redress, privilege in tertiary education but instead continued to propose the traditional solution of expansion.

Compromise, consensus and alternatives, rather than confrontation with privilege was regarded as the most appropriate method of extending educational and social opportunities.⁷¹

Similarly, the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Open Tertiary Education proposed comparable solutions. Interestingly, recommendations of this nature were proposed to the Labor Government, which had a policy promoting more open access to tertiary education. The mood encouraged by the rhetoric of the Labor Government gave rise to calls for a new national enquiry, along the lines of the Murray and Martin

Committees,⁷² and Karmel, then chairman of the A.U.C., suggested that tertiary education should be substantially restructured to accommodate recurrent education for those who had been denied access previously.⁷³

By 1975, Australia was experiencing an economic recession. Education, along with other areas of Commonwealth concern, came in for close scrutiny, and the expansionary mood encouraged by the Labor Government's previous stance suffered. The recommendations of the A.U.C. and the C.A.E had led the government to suspend triennial funding, and announce the merger of the two commissions to form the T.E.C. The 1975 change of government forestalled the merger, but the new Fraser L.N.C.P. Government extended the aegis of the T.E.C. by including the T.A.F.E.C. as well. Predictably, the creation of the new Commission produced a good deal of opposition, especially within the university sector. This opposition was quite evenly distributed across the political spectrum. For instance, Ely raised arguments which had been used in earlier debates on university autonomy in suggesting that the T.E.C. would pressure tertiary institutions "to conform to a financial and administrative framework devised by, and acceptable to, federal governments".⁷⁴ She also suggested that the commission represented a further loss of financial independence, and the development of a more utilitarian approach to tertiary education which put institutions in danger of becoming "little more than another branch of the public service."⁷⁵

There was evidence that the higher education sectors of tertiary education were being viewed with less favour, or at least more critically, in official circles than in the period from the War to 1974. In particular, the role of higher education in producing marketable skills had been called into question with the development of some graduate unemployment. In 1976, Fraser announced the establishment of the Williams Committee to investigate post-secondary and transition education. The government was particularly concerned with trends towards

treating the three tertiary sectors in isolation and the consequent boundary blurring that this caused. He asserted;

There is a need for the roles of the various institutions to be clarified. More than that, there is a need to consider how post-secondary education as a whole relates to the needs of individuals and to the linkages between education and employment.⁷⁶

Within the opposition, Batt, Minister for Education in the Tasmanian Labor Government, also expressed some concern over the relevance of tertiary education to the community. His solution, however, was to remove the boundaries between the sectors and completely reorganise the system. He argued that the view that the universities were somehow different from other tertiary institutions was 'mythology' and that they were merely at a higher level maintaining their status through elitism. He suggested that universities were not distinct from other tertiary institutions economically but that their major function was the maintenance of the middle-class and, to a lesser extent, social mobility - that is hegemonic. He opposed the isolation of research and the whole notion of compartmentalisation, rejecting most of the post-War development of tertiary education.

I have always seen the compartmentalisation of education as being undesirable, intellectually, economically and socially. The watershed - the point of failure - was the Martin Report.⁷⁷

Batt's analysis illustrated but did not identify the hegemonic nature and functions of tertiary education in Australia. Instead, he suggested that the faults with the tertiary education system had developed from within.

The structure of tertiary education now reflects the failure of those people associated with university and college education. The failure is a failure of initiative, a failure of analysis, a failure of intellectual enthusiasm. The failure is illustrated by the existence of separate institutions to cater for the needs of those members of the community who were not accommodated by universities.⁷⁸

The political debate about the relevance of tertiary education and its

relationship with the economy preceded public debate within official education circles. Initially this debate identified the Government's changed priority toward tertiary education as one of the main reasons for some change in bureaucratic attitude. Given the period of rapid expansion, followed by the emphasis on consolidation and rationalisation, Karmel in 1976 identified three central questions in the debate. First, should the educational system promote equality of opportunity and, if so, how should it? Second, to what extent was the education system to blame for youth unemployment? Third, were tertiary education institutions giving value for money, and should education be more closely aligned to manpower predictions?⁷⁹ By 1978, he was far more explicitly supporting the argument for consolidation and rationalisation. He argued that the steady state in tertiary education was not in terms of immobility, but, in relation to the expansion of the previous two decades, was a period of re-orientation and consolidation. He put forward three issues to justify the move from continued expansion; demographic factors, participation rates, and political and financial constraints. Predictions of the first were not favourable to growth, with only slight movements in the numbers in the 17-22 year old age group. He noted that participation rates in secondary school were levelling out, although he did expect the differentials in regional, socio-economic and sectoral (public/private) rates to offset this to some extent. He suggested that financial constraints had been a result, not a cause, of the political change of attitude, although he did admit it had been to some extent a cause of levelling enrolments.⁸⁰ The acceptance by the tertiary commissions and then the T.E.C. of the Commonwealth's policies toward tertiary education followed the Karmel pattern. O'Byrne and Lindsay suggested that the 'stable' period was based on the government's political considerations, not on educational grounds. These were the May 1976 and June 1977 decisions to hold student numbers in the universities and the colleges at

current levels. They pointed out that initially the A.U.C. and the T.E.C reports did not attempt educational justifications but cited government policy for funding restrictions. They also noted that the reports of the commissions in 1975, before the Labor Government's restrictions on educational expenditure, gave no indication that the sorts of factors later presented to support the cutbacks were imminent. However, the T.E.C. in its 1978 report had begun to present further arguments than government policy in support of the 'steady state'; demographic factors, levelling participation rates, and manpower oversupply.⁸¹

The rapid change in political and public attitudes between the early and mid-1970s with regard to education was part of a wider political campaign in the face of deteriorating economic conditions. Beazley, the architect of much of the Labor Government's expansion policies, commented:

My experience of the portfolio led me to conclude that if education does not lead to social power, its lack leads certainly to social powerlessness. I therefore find the current campaign to blame education for unemployment to be sinister. It is not, generally speaking, the educated who are unemployed, but the under-educated. It is contemptible to suggest that schools are responsible for unemployment, when a decade ago nobody suggested they were responsible for full employment. If this specious deception becomes a basis of policy, and education is cut back, the first victims will be those most vulnerable.⁸²

The response identified by Beazley was, in fact, that of the Fraser Government. The Government itself was the response of capital to a particular capitalist crisis, and its policy choices represented its strategy in protecting the position of capital in the economy vis-a-vis social factors. Of course, Beazley even though identifying the response did not offer a critique of the system producing the crisis and the response. In this he was not alone.

Conculsion

This chapter has been concerned with outlining the political context in which education developed in Australia from 1939 to 1979. It was a

period in which Australian economic development proceeded at a rate unprecedented, at least since the period 1860-1890. During the period as well, Australian society underwent considerable change, with the effects of World War II, massive immigration and economic prosperity promoting the development of a much more mature and less isolated community. The Long Boom which Australia experienced from the early post-War years until the early 1970s was a phenomenon which was not just confined to the economic sphere, but which also described the development of Australian society in general. While conservative coalition governments held power for most of the period, the parameters of development were, to a large extent, set by the Labor administrations of Curtin and Chifley, at least until the onset of economic recession in the mid-1970s. There appeared in Australian politics an essentially bipartisan approach to most issues, with most differences begin in degree and emphasis rather than of a fundamental nature.

The development of tertiary education reflected the development of Australian society. It too became more mature and more complex. It also became far more visible and relevant to greater numbers of people. To a large extent, these changes resulted from changing attitudes of the value of tertiary education to the community. The attitudes of the conservative parties and the A.L.P. alike were favourable to the expansion of tertiary education, although with some differences in emphases, as was the case generally in politics. As a result, the period from the early 1940s saw a substantial shift in the role of the Commonwealth in tertiary education. Commonwealth involvement and commitment increased quite rapidly under the wartime and post-War Labor governments, then steadily with temporary peaks following the Murray and Martin reports under the L.C.P., and culminated with the assumption of complete funding responsibility by the Whitlam Labor Government in 1974. Needless to say, much of the debate which surrounded tertiary education

centred on concern with this change in powers, from issues of institutional autonomy and control through to those of constitutional responsibility for education.

During the period, universities and colleges of advanced education undoubtedly had become part of a nationwide system of higher education. This was particularly so of the former, which moved from isolation and parochialism to become complex and sophisticated institutions. Partridge, writing in 1978, suggested that with this development, there had been a move from institutions with a semi-private nature to those firmly in the public sphere. While he warned of the dangers inherent in such a move, he said:

This shift in status seems to me to be a direct consequence of those deeper political, economic, social and ideological movements which many of us in universities welcomed when they first began to manifest themselves.⁸³

Those factors to which he referred were encompassed in the changed attitudes in Australian society. On the surface there appeared to be two main strands of support for the expansion of tertiary education. First, the conservative parties stressed the role of education in promoting economic growth. Second, in addition to this, the A.L.P. saw in education the means of promoting social equality. These interpretations of the functions, and indeed the powers, of education were based on viewing education as an investment, either directly in the economic sense, or more indirectly, in the human capital sense. What they begged were questions concerning the real rationale for the development of tertiary education in the post-War period: was there a direct link between the development of the Australian economy and tertiary education? Chapters 2 and 3 illustrated the tenuous nature of such a link. The political context in which tertiary education developed in the post-War period reinforced this interpretation. Instead it illustrated the hegemonic nature of educational development.

FOOTNOTES

1. P.D. Tannock, "A Study of the Role of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australian Education Since Federation, 1901-1968", unpublished Ph.D thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1969.
2. H. Holt, CPD (Vol 165), 10 December 1940, pp 690-691, in ibid., pp 216-217.
3. ibid., p. 289.
4. ibid., p. 289.
5. E. Ashby, "The Tenpenny Universities", in E. Ashby, Challenge to Education, (Sydney, 1946).
6. J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p.104.
7. B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977), p.82 ff.
8. These changes were not universally accepted. More than one commentator suggested that Australian universities had become too utilitarian during the War, with a lack of support for cultural research, and too little attention paid to the problems of standards of students, employment conditions and staffing. See for instance, A. Lodewyckx, "Australian Universities Adrift", Australian Quarterly, June 1947, p.70.
9. "A Crisis in the Finances and Development of the Australian Universities", (Carlton, undated, [1952 ?]), p. ii.
10. ibid., p.3.
11. F.J. Schonell, "Australian University Expansion-Problems and Promise", Australian Journal of Science, Vo. 24, no. 1, July 1961, p.13.
12. P.H. Partridge, "The University System", in E.L. French (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1960-61, (Melbourne, 1962), p.56.
13. ibid., p.52.
14. ibid., p.58.
15. ibid., p.53.
16. ibid., p. 53.
17. A.G. Maclaine, Australian Education, (Sydney, undated [1974?]), p.205.
18. H.S. Williams, "Tertiary Technical Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 1, no.1., July 1963, p.90.
19. ibid., p.118. See also Partridge, "The University System", pp.58-59 and p.65.

20. P.H. Partridge, "Australian Universities - Some Trends and Problems", Australian University, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1963, p.11.
21. K.D. Buckley, "The Crisis", Outlook, Vol 6, no. 5, October 1962, p.12.
22. Partridge, "Australian Universities", p.25.
23. ibid., p.25.
24. W. Prest, "Federation and Education", in G.S. Harman and C. Selby Smith (eds), Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, (Sydney, 1976), p.122.
25. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol. H of R 45) 24 March 1965, p.270.
26. P.H. Partridge, "Tertiary Education in Society and the Future", in J. Wilkes (ed), Tertiary Education in Australia, (Sydney, 1965), p.5.
27. H.S. Williams, "Directions in Advanced Education - Indicators and Influences", Australian Journal of Advanced Education, Vol. 6, no. 1, 1976, p.5.
28. Evidence for this can be found in the submissions to the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (Sir Leslie Martin - Chairman).
29. P.H. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, (Sydney, 1973), p.138.
30. ibid., p.159.
31. L.N. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", Australian Universities, Vol. 5, no. 1, April 1967, p.17.
32. S. Murray-Smith, "Tertiary Education in the Melting Pot", Outlook, Vol. 3, no. 6, December 1969, p.17.
33. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p.97. S. Encel, "Politics and Resources for Tertiary Education" in Wilkes, Tertiary Education in Australia, pp.153-154, in comparing Menzies post-War record in general with his 1945 Parliamentary speech, extends this argument to education in general:
 it is all the more remarkable, therefore, that for the last few years he has rejected suggestions that the Commonwealth should concern itself with secondary education, and has also refused repeated requests by all the State ministers for education meeting collectively as the Australian Education Council, to conduct a joint enquiry along the lines which he so eloquently advocated 20 years ago.
34. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", p.25.
35. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 160.
36. H.S. Williams, "The Technical Colleges", in Wilkes, Tertiary Education in Australia.
37. Murray-Smith, "Tertiary Education in the Melting Pot", p.17.
38. See above Chapter 3, pp.83-84.

39. R. McCaig, "Recommendations and Conclusions", in R. McCaig (ed), Policy and Planning in Higher Education, (St. Lucia, 1973), pp.178-180.
40. R. McCaig, "A New Approach to the Administration of Higher Education in Australia", Vestes, Vol. XIII, no. 2, July 1970, p.116.
41. D. Hughes, "The Role of the Australian States", in McCaig, Policy and Planning in Higher Education.
42. M. Fraser, "Higher Education in Relation to Australia's Needs", in ibid., pp. 16-17.
43. I.W.Wark, "The Functions of Tertiary Institutions in Australia", in ibid., p.46.
44. M. Fraser, 11-9-72, cited in L.N. Short, "Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education: Defining the Difference", Australian University, Vol. 11, no. 1, May 1973, p.5.
45. K.J. Batt, "The Universities and Cooperation in Higher Education", Australian University, Vol. 7, no. 2, August 1969, *passim*.
46. Short, "Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education", p.6.
47. H. Philp "The Piper and the Tune - From Murray to the Fourth A.U.C. Report", Australian University, Vol. 8, no. 1, May 1970, p.21.
48. L.H. Pyke, "Levelling Australian Tertiary Education", Vestes, Vol XVIII, no. 1, June 1975, p.36.
49. ibid., p.41.
50. According to D.H. Ham, "Duality in Higher Education: Are There Two Systems?" Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 1, May 1975, both historically and to issues such as student preference.
51. ibid., *passim*.
52. See Chapt. 3 p. [30].
53. G.S. Harman, "The Government of Australian Education", in Harman and Selby Smith, Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, p.18.
54. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p.51.
55. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune", p.24.
56. M. Fraser, cited in ibid., p.22.
57. ibid., p.18.
58. P.E. Jones, Education in Australia, (Melbourne, 1974), p.54.
59. G.S. Harman, "The Political Environment of Australian Higher Education", paper delivered at a seminar, 21 April 1977, on the Environment of Higher Education: Politics, Consumers, Community, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland, p.5 and p.8.

60. Ibid., p.10.
61. Ibid., p.11.
62. N.F. Dufty, "Some Notes on Resource Allocation in Tertiary Institutions", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol XIV, no. 2, October 1976, p.221.
63. Williams, "Directions in Advanced Education", p.8.
64. For example, see Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 1, 1979.
65. D.P. Derham, "Universities, Governments, and the Assumption of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 3, November 1975, p.213.
66. J. Hyde, "The Structure of Higher Education in Australia", in P. Sheldrake and R. Linke (eds), Accountability in Higher Education, (Sydney, 1979), p.12.
67. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p.100.
68. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune", p.10.
69. For example, "Doubtless this can be explained by the creation and expansion of the colleges of advanced education...", Jones, Education in Australia, p.29.
70. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune", p.33.
71. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, pp.106-109.
72. See Teachers Journal, Vol LVI, no. 8, 1973.
73. P.H. Karmel, "Some Economic Implications of Educational Policy", Search, Vol. 6, no. 7, July 1975, passim.
74. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p.133.
75. ibid., p.134.
76. M. Fraser, C.P.D. (Vol H of R 100), 9 September 1976, p.876.
77. N.L.C. Batt, "The University as a Servant to the Needs of the Community", paper issued by the Office of Minister for Education, Tasmania, April 1977, p.11.
78. ibid., pp.16-17.
79. P.H. Karmel, "The Educational System and the Labour Market", in J.P. Nieuwenhuysen and P.J. Drake (eds), Australian Economic Policy (Melbourne, 1977), passim.
80. P.H. Karmel, "Tertiary Education in a Steady State".
81. G. O'Byrne and A. Lindsay, "An Analysis of the Tertiary Education Commission's Case for a No-Growth Policy in Higher Education", Australian Quarterly, Vol 50, no. 4, December 1978, pp.11-12.
82. K.E. Beazley, "The Commonwealth Ministry of Education: An Experience

in the Whitlam Government, 1972-1975", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1980, (Melbourne, 1980), p.58.

83. P.H. Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", proceedings of a Seminar on the Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities, University of Adelaide, 6-7 October 1978, p.13.

Chapter 5

Education, Economics and Hegemony 1939-1979

Introduction

The role of tertiary education during the period from 1939 to 1979 became the subject of more scrutiny than it had been prior to World War II. Its structures had been developed in response to the anticipatory and hegemonic needs of the bourgeoisie. The War had graphically illustrated the need for a more developed education system, not least at the tertiary level. In the post-War period, the tertiary education system continued to develop at the same time as the development of the economy and the society as a whole. The forces which had become dominant during post-War reconstruction planning deeply affected education. The tertiary education system became increasingly more sophisticated and complex.

The most comprehensive account of the establishment and maintenance of bourgeois hegemony in Australia is Connell and Irving's Class Structure in Australian History. They suggested that at the opening of the period under review, bourgeois hegemony in Australia was at its nadir since the beginning of the century. The Depression, and the restructuring of the economy with the drive toward industrialisation, had severely tested its strength. They argued,

In fact, throughout the period of industrialisation the ruling class was culturally on the defensive. Its power rested less on consent and more on force than it had done before, or was to do later.¹

While it was faced with an electorally successful Labor Party, the defence of hegemony was expedited by the lack of a serious strong alternative. The radicalism of the early ALP had been dissipated or absorbed, through the series of splits that plagued the party from the 1890s. They suggested that

All these splits, in fact, occurred over issues where bourgeois ideology had some grip within the movement, though not a complete one: parliamentary custom, nationalism, and the sanctity of property. The long series of splits is not mysterious; it is one of the signs of a working-class struggling to free itself from an only partly understood and only partly

opposed bourgeois hegemony.²

The post-War reconstruction movement was the last real expression of radicalism in the ALP and was intended to prevent another depression of the magnitude of that of the 1930s. Connell and Irving suggested that it was a defensive measure, and that "Its main ideas were captured...by a new conservative leadership".³

The rise of the conservative coalition, and the Liberals in particular, after 1945 followed the acceptance, by the bourgeoisie, of much of the non-socialist foundations of the Labor Party. According to Connell and Irving, "The new conservatism understood the state theoretically as a part of capitalism better than much of the labour movement did".⁴ The re-establishment of bourgeois hegemony in the immediate post-War period was aided by a number of factors. These included attacks on the working class, politically and culturally. The Menzies Government attempted to outlaw the Communist Party, polarising the community to a considerable extent. One of the results of the unsuccessful attempt was the 1954 ALP split. The increasing affluence evident among workers legitimised bourgeois lifestyle. The working class was further fragmented, and its strength eroded, by mass immigration which kept working class militancy at a low level, and by the growth of white collar jobs. In addition, they identified the growth of conservatism, or at least techniques which reinforced conservatism, among intellectuals and academics. They suggested that the depth of bourgeois legitimacy by the late 1960s and early 1970s was demonstrated by recognition of 'the poor', who were able to be characterised as being situated outside the social structure rather than being a result of capitalism. The growth of welfare programmes included the definition of a 'poverty line' through which they suggested "the existing equilibrium in class relations was reproduced by the state welfare apparatus."⁵ More correctly, perhaps, the equilibrium was reproduced in the welfare

apparatus, rather than by it, with the reproduction processes of the state and capitalism, (which included tertiary education), being reinforced by the state welfare apparatus.

By the end of the 1960s, however, opposition to bourgeois hegemony began to become apparent once again. At first, it was based on the anti-Vietnam War and anti-conscription movements, but as the 1970s progressed, came to include civil liberties, women's and aboriginal groups as well. The ALP had accepted the premises of bourgeois hegemony, especially during the immediate post-War period, and during the Long Boom. It had moved away from socialism and labourism toward social democracy.⁶ While Connell and Irving accepted that this was the case, they inferred that the election in 1972 of the Whitlam Labor Government was a threat to bourgeois hegemony. They suggested that this was a result of the membership of the various protest groups in the coalition which elected the ALP, although they acknowledged that the weakness of the opposition to bourgeois hegemony was not strong enough to sustain the government. Even though they recognised that the ALP in office set out, not to challenge capitalism, but to renovate it, and that it occurred during a period of bourgeois conflict they did not draw the conclusion that, once again, the role of the ALP was to ensure the absorption of mild alternatives to bourgeois hegemony and the discrediting of more serious alternatives. They also suggested that the Fraser LNCP Government which succeeded the Whitlam Government, because of its wide acceptance by the electorate, was less concerned with the maintenance of hegemony. They argued:

His government represented a ruling-class retreat from the strategy of integration and hegemonic control. It began to take higher risks in rejecting the economic demands of the labour movement, though this was aided by a rising level of unemployment.⁷

While this may be true to some extent, they put too much emphasis on Fraser's rhetoric in their analysis. In fact, under Fraser, bourgeois

hegemony was strengthened, as was evident from the retreat of the ALP from even mild alternatives, the continuing electoral success of the government, its success in promoting working class selfishness for the defects of the economic system, and in blaming the unemployed and other welfare recipients (like 'the poor' in the 1960s) for their predicament. Nevertheless, their analysis provided a valid background for an examination of some of those issues relating to the development of tertiary education in Australia in the post-War period.

The most striking characteristic of the tertiary education system in the post-War period was the development of a tripartite structure. Ely suggested that this reflected developments in the secondary school system with the advent of mass participation. She identified a tension between education for social mobility and education for training. The status which the various strata have in the educational pyramid which evolved reflected the dominant concerns of the bourgeoisie and their requirements from the education system, the separate parts of which "operate mainly as an educational support to an existing economic and social system".⁸

While Ely recognised that the role of tertiary education was not linked directly to the economy, other commentators were more economic in their analysis. For instance, Batt interpreted developments in education as a reflex of economic change and suggested that the growth of the university system was directly related to economic growth. He argued that demands for educational opportunity and social mobility were the political translation of economic demands.

The economy demanded a higher proportion of tertiary educated people and economic demands were supported by political demands which insisted on improving the educational opportunity for at least the exceptional among the children of the non-professionals. Education was seen as one of the surest avenues to higher status and income. Some made it to secondary schools and a smaller number to the universities and thence to the professions.⁹

In fact, Batt pointed to the hegemonic, not economic, role of tertiary education, as he emphasised its function of absorbing potential working class leaders - in his terms the children of the non-professionals. On the other hand, Karmel (writing in 1977), was more explicit about the hegemonic role of the education system. He suggested that the major function of the education system was

its role in locating people in the socio-economic distribution by sorting them into particular occupations. Other major functions include the development and socialization of the individual in the ways of society; the conservation, transmission and expansion of knowledge; and the custodial aspects of educational institutions whereby young people are segregated from the adult working world. It is important to emphasize that these roles of education do not themselves involve explicit goals, which may relate to educational philosophies emphasizing, for instance, personal values or social equality.¹⁰

This was a more complex analysis of the role of education in a capitalist society, the more remarkable for the position that Karmel occupied.

The direction of tertiary education during the post-War period had been set by the debate around a number of committees of inquiry. The reports of these committees, four of which will be analysed in Chapters 6 to 9, underpinned the increasing sophistication of the approach to tertiary education. Of fundamental importance to their arguments was the assumption that economic growth would continue. Their recommendations, however, rarely addressed themselves to direct links with the economy - for instance, manpower planning had never been a popular concept in Australia. Instead they adopted the proposition that economic growth was both a prerequisite and a result of educational development but in a complex and indirect way. On the one hand, economic growth relied on improving factors of production, including the improvement in the quality of the labour force and thus education played a role. On the other hand, educational development was only possible on the basis of economic growth.¹¹ The most important links between education and the economy as the two developed in Australia were anticipatory and hegemonic.

One of the most apparent factors pointing to the hegemonic function of the tertiary education system was the status accorded to technical education. Partridge's concern with the split between rhetoric and practice over the funding and status of technical education at the tertiary level has already been discussed.¹² This supposed paradox was an integral part of the hegemonic function. As the economy and society became more complex, the paradox became more apparent with the rapid growth in the numbers of technical courses in both the university and non-university sectors. As Partridge pointed out, many of the non-professional courses had been upgraded to qualify their diplomates and graduates for professional membership as the need for more middle-level management grew.¹³ The arguments which supported these developments were clearly intended to link tertiary technical education to economic growth. Expenditure in the tertiary sphere, however, continued to favour education for social mobility rather than training. Those areas of tertiary education outside higher education - technical and further education as it became known - remained the poor relation throughout the period under review.

The hegemonic function of tertiary education centred on the role of the universities, and relied to some extent on the legitimacy which they enjoyed in the community. There was a tension between the maintenance of their hegemonic/ideological role and their professional training role. While the latter received much more attention in justifying the activities of the universities, it provided the opportunity for attacks on those areas not directly related to the economy and society. The former provided a defence for a more indirect relation between the universities and society. Partridge suggested that as the universities became more diversified and specialised in their course offerings, the latter role became the major vehicle for their legitimation, adding pressures to demands for more vocational, utilitarian and 'relevant'

institutions. He argued that while the universities must be involved with professional training and 'relevance', they were more importantly concerned with wider aspects of knowledge:

that the values of university are specifically educational values, and not merely economic, social, or political values, because it is a primary objective of university education to produce certain intellectual capacities and habits, and certain attitudes and affections to which we attach high value - a concern with knowledge for its own sake, and especially with knowledge as a means to understanding, with enquiring or exploratory habit of mind, and the faculty of critical discrimination.¹⁴

It was here that the hegemonic role of the universities was situated. The division which was implied between, on the one hand, the discovery, maintenance and transmission of knowledge, and on the other, the application of that knowledge, justified a hierarchy of status between the universities and other tertiary education institutions which was important for their hegemonic function.¹⁵

The privileged place of the universities in the tertiary education system was ensured in the post-War period by the decision of the Commonwealth to support them. Initially, it was confined to the period of reconstruction, although the Walker Report and its accompanying papers suggested that it was seen as an ongoing commitment. Commonwealth commitment was institutionalised by the various committees of inquiry which followed. The ideology which underlined these developments was clearly expressed in the position taken by Menzies. He held strong views on the role of the universities in protecting and promoting conservative traditions, that is, bourgeois hegemony. Bessant suggested that Menzies' political views were based on a so-called 'middle-class', that he was not interested in the "unthinking and unskilled mass". He promoted in the universities values of independence, academic freedom, autonomy, while allowing no room for a world-view which differed from his own. It was this contradiction, the promotion of freedom and the refusal to allow freedom of rejection of his premises, which constricted the development

of colleges of advanced education, as recommended by the Martin Report, and indeed that of the universities. In Menzies' terms, the colleges were not meant to provide mass higher education, but to extend the 'sieve' which caught and directed able middle class students. As a result, university and higher education expansion was rigidly controlled.

While society changed the universities were allowed to expand, but only within a predetermined framework which would secure their remoteness from the turmoil of the outside world, and ensure that their end products continued to be steeped in the traditions of a venerable civilization which had long since passed.¹⁶

The acceptance of these premises in the universities was later to create problems when the Commonwealth attempted to extend its control more obviously. Moves to ensure that the universities remained firmly in the control of the bourgeoisie through measures to circumscribe their autonomy and prevent its extension to the colleges met with considerable opposition from within the universities themselves.¹⁷

These moves could be seen, in fact, in the context of a struggle within the bourgeoisie for dominance. There were apparent in the tertiary education system as the elitism implicit in the ideology which supported its expansion in the post-War period became more explicit in the mid-1970s. It coincided with the moves away from consensus in politics generally which was characteristic of the policies of the Fraser LNCP Government. In the education sphere, the notion of blaming the 'victim' surfaced along with the notion of blaming the unemployed and those who relied on the welfare system. Karmel suggested in 1977 that class and intelligence could be related which, of course, justified the imbalance in the representation of both the children of the working class and the bourgeoisie in the tertiary education system, particularly the universities.

Within each category in the distribution individuals will have differing natural endowments, although here again it is usually accepted that there is some positive correlation between these endowments and the social orderings.¹⁸

The arguments for the expansion of tertiary education were, in fact, the same as those for earlier educational expansion: international survival; a trained workforce for national efficiency; education for citizenship and democracy. As Ely pointed out, "even the benefits of 'pure research' are closely linked to economic and political payoff".¹⁹ The arguments and justifications, like those which had obtained in the development of tertiary education up to 1939, were essentially anticipatory and hegemonic. In the post-War period, the legitimization of the bourgeoisie was never really questioned after the absorption of the reconstruction movement, and the role of the tertiary education system was to ensure the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony.

Education as Investment

The arguments used to justify an ongoing Commonwealth commitment to tertiary education were heavily based on the education as investment thesis. These justifications were offered as part of the post-War reconstruction debate. They centred on the necessity of a highly skilled workforce for economic progress, and were reminiscent of the debate for the expansion of secondary education. The problems which faced Australia at the outbreak of World War II had emphasised the importance of a skilled workforce. The Walker Report, which was presented as part of the reconstruction proposals, relied heavily on this premise.²⁰ Not surprisingly, the notion of education as a form of investment was the subject of some debate. In the early 1960s. Wheelwright identified a number of methods of measuring the economic contribution of education. The first of these was the 'aggregative' approach, which attempted to measure the input of education into that part of growth in national output for which capital and labour increments cannot account. Second, the 'returns to individuals' approach, which was not entirely adequate because of the lack of a completely competitive market. Nevertheless, he

suggested that there was some merit in such measurements, while pointing out that "expenditure on education is an excellent example of the net social product exceeding the net private product."²¹ This led to the third method, the 'social returns' approach, which attempted to measure those factors to benefit of society. Finally, he identified the 'education as capital stock' approach. He suggested that

It is possible to regard the effort that has gone into education as having created a capital stock which resides, as it were, in the working population and makes it more efficient.²²

This approach was, in fact, the hardest to quantify, and yet, the most powerful in the debate.

While there was general agreement that expenditure on education was a form of investment, there was debate on the direct and immediate results of that investment in the economy. Boehm suggested that

as far as a number of tertiary industries are concerned, investment in intangible capital in the form of better education and training play the main and vital roles in maintaining and increasing productivity. In these fields of activity the degree of efficiency is more closely related to the performance of the individual persons themselves.²³

On the other hand, Encel argued strongly, while analysing tertiary education in the light of the Murray and Martin Reports, that

education and research have contributed relatively little to our prosperity, and the extent of public pressure or government concern can be easily exaggerated.²⁴

Encel suggested that the growth of higher education was the result of complexed forces. First, the influence of science and technology. Second, the increasing demand for professional training. Third, the influence and effects of nationalism, imperialism and militarism. Finally, he identified the most overtly hegemonic of the forces, "the use of higher education as an instrument in training some kind of governing elite".²⁵ He pointed out that the hegemonic aspects of the growth of higher education were far more important than the influence of science

and technology:

the same policies of tariff protection and other forms of governmental encouragement which made industrialization possible have greatly reduced the need to compete on the basis of quality and value.²⁶

Industrial development, because of the effects of tariff protection, imported its technology rather than relied on indigenously developed techniques, which further reduced the direct importance of science and technology in the growth of tertiary education.

The debate was encapsulated in 1965 by an article in the Current Affairs Bulletin, the main points of which were not really addressed until the late 1970s when the Fraser Government began to redistribute and reduce real resources to tertiary education. The article questioned the assumptions involved in quantifying social and private returns, especially if and when the former included the latter. It suggested that variations in methods of measurement and interpretation reflected

differences in the assumptions made and estimating procedures followed and are indicative of the many arbitrary elements in such calculations.²⁷

Stretton voiced the concerns which underlay the article and, in fact, the fears of many academics:

In almost any conflict between cost and quality in the development of universities, economy of cost, which is already popular, can add to its advantages the fact that all the arguments in its favour are safe, statistical, scientific, 'objective', and very nearly inarguable.²⁸

As he pointed out, such facets of the education as investment notion had obvious attractions for politicians and financiers who, he suggested, saw education in increasingly utilitarian terms,

The development of tertiary education over the next decade, which included the creation and expansion of the advanced education sector, and increasing Commonwealth commitment and control through the A.U.C., gave rise to some misgivings over the motives of the Government in relation to education. For instance, Jones suggested that expansion and

diversification were less about increasing opportunities for potential students than increasing control over tertiary education.

Diversification is seen in terms of a greater supply of technicians and technologists, And there has been rather more than a suspicion that Federal Government thinking has seen the allocation of funds of tertiary education in terms of national and economic development, that is, education as investment. By widening the higher education system, the selectivity of universities seems assured; with massive Federal aid and bodies like the Australian Universities Commission to control financial allocations, effective autonomy seems a thing of the past.²⁹

While Jones was suggesting in this passage that the relationship between tertiary education and the economy was becoming more dominant as the Commonwealth moved into the area, the real point was contained in the second half of the statement. Official thinking suggested that, while the Government saw more merit in the 'investment' factor (as Stretton had said they would), social demands had played the most important role in planning expansion. Karmel argued that part of the 'consumption' factor was in fact a personalised 'investment' factor.³⁰ While it was not important to define the difference between the two for much of the post-War period, when they coincided in any case, it became more so with the changing political and economic climate of the mid 1970s.

By then, changes in policies were needed to ensure that the hegemonic functions of tertiary education were maintained. These included strengthening the selective status of the universities, forcing the colleges back into the provision of utilitarian and middle-level management type courses, and expanding the T.A.F.E. sector. Karmel pointed out that social demand had always been over-ruled in relation to the high status professions:

The provision of tertiary places in Australia has been geared to social demand rather than to manpower considerations, although manpower requirements have been taken into account in the provision of expensive facilities where there is a clear one-to-one relationship between academic qualifications and the practice of a profession; for example, medical, dental and veterinary schools.³¹

The hegemonic functions of the tertiary education system were not threatened when a shortage of highly skilled professionals effectively meant that social demand was direct toward the required areas, so that in these cases there was little political disadvantage which would have been attracted by a more general application of such policies. By the mid-1970s, however, this was not the case, with social demand being at some variance with the rationale of the high status professions and institutions - that is, too high in those areas - and the rhetoric around education as an investment changed from the private investment notion to the social investment notion. Karmel's article, while pointing out the risks involved in manpower planning, proposed that a combination of it and reliance on the labour market would be the most likely way in which educational planning would proceed. He also pointed out that the Commonwealth had shifted ground from the Martin notion of tertiary education for all who were qualified, to increasing selectivity. In the end, the decisions on educational planning were political.³² The notion of education as investment, with its broad range of interpretations, allowed for such diversity.

Education and the Economy

Hunter drew attention to the derivative nature of Australian industry, showing that its technological base was imported rather than developed by local conditions.³³ Connell and Irving noted that total foreign investment rose from £500 million in the late 1940s to \$10,000 million in the early 1970s, with the United States and the United Kingdom controlling between one quarter and one third "of the entire corporate business of the country".³⁴ Throughout the post-War period, manufacturing investment attracted much overseas capital, although by the late 1960s and 1970s, mining investment had outstripped manufacturing investment in amount, and high technology inputs. Needless to say, the

conservative parties welcomed these developments. So did the A.L.P.:

Manufacturing investment found a great deal of sympathy from governments regardless of party: federal Labor governments saw it as a strategic resource and a necessary part of 'development', state Labor governments saw it as a way of creating or generating jobs, however much they might resent the same companies industrial relations policies.³⁵

The vigour with which Labor governments pursued foreign investment in the manufacturing industry sector both reflected the growing hegemony of capitalism and aided its consolidation following substantial attacks on it in the wake of the Depression and World War II.

In the educational sphere there were similar imports. Partridge noted that Australia not only imported technology but also social and educational ideas. It was here that there was a link between education and the economy, for the schools, technical colleges and universities played an important part in the dissemination of imported skills and knowledge, and their maintenance.³⁶ In addition to this role, the schools and universities also played an economic role through the absorption of part of the workforce, as participation increased. Boehm noted:

The increasing proportion of young people continuing their education through secondary schools and at universities considerably retarded the number of new entrants to the labour force during the 1950s, and in the 1960s delayed the entry of many of the first post-war generation.³⁷

This was a particularly important factor which aided the attainment of full employment during the 1950s and 1960s. (It also gave rise, and superficial substance, to critics of the education system who blamed education for rising unemployment in the 1970s.)

Given the importance of education to the economy in these areas, at least in official rhetoric, Australian participation rates and government expenditure in education compared unfavourably with those in similar countries. In 1958, prior to the implementation of the Murray recommendations, the participation rate for those in the tertiary age

group was only one-sixth of that in the United States, and below those of the U.S.S.R., Western European countries and Canada. Total expenditure as a percentage of the G.N.P. was 3.0 per cent compared with 4.5 per cent in the United States, and 3.7 per cent in Canada, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom. While there were some differences in the bases used in the compilation of the statistics, Australia's unfavourable position was accentuated in two ways; the higher proportion of the Australian population in the age group and, increases in expenditure resulting from increases in age group proportions rather than increasing standards.³⁸ The improvement of Australia's position in these comparisons was one of the major justifications for the expansion of tertiary education over the fifteen years from the Murray Report.

Even so, there was little hard data to link in a direct way education and the economy, or, even if there were, that they would be the appropriate measurements for justifying expenditure on education. Karmel argued, in a major address in 1962:

I should tonight advocate a greater educational effort in Australia, even if its sole economic consequences were to reduce national production by withholding more young people from the work force for more years. I should do this since I believe that democracy implies making educational opportunities as equal as possible and that the working of democracy depends on increasing the number of citizens with the capacity for clear and informed thought on political and social issues. Moreover I hold that the areas of expanded activity which education opens should be made as widely as possible.³⁹

He went on to suggest that whatever the justification, cultural or economic, the amount spent on education was far too little. Encel went somewhat further and suggested that the whole debate on the economic bases of education was, in fact, political. He identified three major areas within the debate. First, questions on the proportion of the national income to be spent, on which areas, and with which priorities (i.e. training, retraining, research). Second, he suggested that there was an ideological debate inherent within the wider debate, between using

education as a factor in achieving social equality against "that of its use as a selective agent in a complex industrial society".⁴⁰ Third, he suggested that the debate was part of the strategy to centralise educational administration.

By 1969 the general assumption that education was a necessary prerequisite for economic growth was being questioned. Williams, at the Armidale Conference, noted that while Australia and the United Kingdom spent about the same percentage of their G.N.Ps. on education as did West Germany, and all three spent substantially less than Canada and the United States, West Germany had an economic growth rate higher than that of the United States. He argued that "There is not, in fact, any good reason to believe that education, or that increasing the expenditure on education, would necessarily increase economic growth".⁴¹

Nevertheless, during the early 1970s, and especially during the Whitlam Government, educational policies continued to be based on the assumptions which had supported them throughout the period. The social equality aspects of the early Whitlam years clearly assumed that economic returns would be forthcoming for both individuals and society, and were, more than anything else, part of the government's wider strategy for renovating Australian capitalism.

The economic downturn and recession of 1974-75 severely jolted these assumptions, and the doubts which had been expressed by Karmel, Encel, Williams and others in the 1960s became far more widespread. There was, by then, little scope for education to absorb the youth labour force as Karmel had seen it doing in 1962, at least in the new political climate of expenditure reductions. The growing numbers of youth unemployed was blamed in large part on the inability of the educational system to perform successfully. This was very evident by 1976 when the Fraser government announced the establishment of the Williams inquiry. Fraser gave credence to this view:

The inquiry will need to consider the view that the education system, and particularly the pattern of post-secondary education is not matching satisfactorily the employment needs of many young people with the demands of the labour market.⁴²

He went on to argue that the education system, and particularly tertiary education, had led to economic bottlenecks through the lack of provision of proper courses which led to

shortages of critical skills which inhibit the creation of job opportunities in other areas...There is a danger that as economic growth gathers pace it may be hampered by inadequate availability of people with appropriate skills.⁴³

Political rhetoric such as this had a basis in, and was supported by, the work of bourgeois intellectuals. Karmel, as Chairman of the T.E.C., was in a particularly influential position. From 1975, he stressed the links between the education system and the labour market, even though the link was more ideological than direct. For instance, he said:

To a large extent...educational qualifications have become not a necessary proof of skill and knowledge for doing a particular job (although this is the case in certain fields), but a necessary requirement for job selection.⁴⁴

He began to stress the social rate of return and manpower requirement factors in educational planning. Even though he pointed out the dangers inherent in the two, the fact that he brought them more strongly into the discussion than individual rate of return, social equalisation and general cultural and educational factors, turned attention to them as justifications for more seemingly direct economic considerations in determining educational policies. Indeed, the qualifications which he placed on the notions were in economic terms rather than educational and social terms, and added weight to the idea of education as an integral part of economic planning.⁴⁵

Karmel also contributed to the notion that the education system was largely to blame for increasing unemployment rates, especially amongst youth. He linked youth unemployment to three main factors: economic

activity levels; structural maladjustment in employment, which he suggested resulted from tertiary education expansion and its emphasis on the production of white collar workers rather than skilled tradesmen; and "the low productivity of the unskilled and poorly educated".⁴⁶ He did admit that, in the second case, maladjustments might also relate to poor educational provision for trade-training, and pressures for social mobility, and that, in all cases, programmes to improve skills would have no effect without increased economic activity: "improved employability among the young will not reduce total unemployment unless aggregate demand increases".⁴⁷ He undervalued the hegemonic functions which the expansion of tertiary education performed, and ignored the fact that the lack of facilities for training skilled tradesmen was part of a longterm reluctance on the part of the Australian bourgeoisie to invest in local skills, preferring as they had to import skilled labour from Europe. In particular, Karmel did not identify his first factor, the low level of economic activity, as the most important one, to which those supposedly connected with education played a subsidiary role.

In 1978, Karmel linked education and the labour market even more closely. He suggested that the increasing number of graduates, even in steady state tertiary education, had serious social effects. These stemmed from the displacement, in terms of job opportunities, of less educated youth, particularly early school leavers.⁴⁸ In this analysis Karmel directly blamed the education system for the overproduction of graduates which he held responsible for the loss of jobs for other potential workers. This was, of course, a specious analysis. It was not the education system causing unemployment among non-graduates but the inequities inherent in capitalism as an economic system, and the low level of economic activity at the time. The creation of youth unemployment was a direct result of the lack of job creation not the increased numbers of graduates. Indeed, Karmel went on to point out that the problem was

essentially political, particularly due to public sector cutbacks. He noted:

There are not high employment opportunities in Australia for graduates in manufacturing, nor in primary industry; the big demand is from the service industries, particularly the public service.⁴⁹

Thus the drop in public sector employment was a major factor in the creation of the unemployment problem.

Karmel suggested that there were three ways of dealing with the problems caused by the dislocation of the education system in relation to the economy. The first was to cut back enrolments to meet labour market needs, a solution which he acknowledged was counter to educational opportunity, historical trends and public demand. Second, he suggested changing academic courses to for the job market. Third, job structures could be changed to match educational qualifications. While he favoured a combination of these approaches, he noted that the third "would require massive changes in our society."⁵⁰ The approach which was adopted by the Government was mainly in line with Karmel's least favoured option, the first, with pressures on institutions to undertake the second as well. The massive changes in the social order required by a serious application of the third option would entail dangers for bourgeois hegemony during the period when restructuring and reallocation of resources would need to be undertaken. The Government's apparent choice of the first option was also a logical outcome and extension of its political position in blaming the education system for unemployment, especially among youth.

The link between the education system and youth unemployment was the result of a superficial analysis of the links between education and the economy. Windschuttle, in his major study on unemployment, exposed the weaknesses of the analysis, and showed its political basis. He suggested that

Contrary to the belief of those who advance it, this is not an argument about the causes of unemployment. It is only a description of some of its results.⁵¹

He pointed out that the claims from some circles that the standards of young people leaving the education system had fallen had no empirical basis while there was a good deal of evidence to the contrary. There were, of course, obvious political bases for making such claims in relation to school leavers and the graduates from non-professional or non-technical areas. These were highlighted with the changes in argument to those based on manpower and political considerations with the advent of professional graduate unemployment. There was no serious suggestion that standards had declined in medicine, dentistry, law, or architecture, when unemployment began to rise among graduates of these areas. As Windschuttle pointed out, "It is the labour market, not the educational system, which has changed".⁵² Both he and Karmel had shown that, to a large extent, the basis of this change in the labour market was political.

Education as a Force for Hegemony

In Chapter 2, it was shown that the development of tertiary education in Australia up to 1939 - the point of departure for this study - was based essentially on the functions that it could perform within the developing liberal-democratic and capitalist state for the development and maintenance of bourgeois hegemony. This is not to say that other factors had no place in its development. Nevertheless, even the economic arguments were substantially mediated, and were able to be shown to be anticipatory rather than immediate. The society which developed from 1939, and particularly in the post-War period, was more sophisticated and independent than that which preceded it, and developed these characteristics increasingly rapidly. The debate concerning tertiary education and its growth reflected this.

The advent of World War II had shown that Australian tertiary

education, like other parts of Australian society, was unprepared in practical terms for the demands which it imposed. The task of reconstruction brought the role of the universities and tertiary technical institutions into the public eye through the scholarships and funding of the Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme. It did so, however, in terms of reconstructing the economy and not in educational terms and it further clouded the traditional hegemonic role of the universities, especially in the public perception. It did not encourage a widespread debate, even within tertiary education, of the role that it played in society, its contribution to values, politics and culture. Nevertheless, that debate developed. Its prime proponent was Robert Menzies, first as Leader of the Opposition, and then as Prime Minister. Despite his only sporadic practical commitment to education, Menzies rhetorical commitment was continuing. His was an elitist notion of higher education in particular, and this ensured that an increasingly vigorous debate developed around the arguments he put forward. Because of Menzies' notion of the proper functions of education, the debate concentrated to a large extent on its hegemonic role.

Menzies made a comprehensive statement on education as Leader of the Opposition in 1945, to which reference has already been made. He cast his argument in terms of education for citizenship and democracy, rather than in direct economic terms. He saw the role of education as producing responsible citizens within the prevailing system, which would thus be strengthened. The production of a trained workforce was of secondary importance. He said:

The first function of education is to produce a good man and a good citizen. Its second function is to produce a good carpenter and good lawyer, and the good carpenter and good lawyer will be all the better at their respective crafts if they have become aware of the problems of the world, have acquired some quality of intellectual criticism, and have developed that comparative sense which produces detachment of judgement and tends always to moderate passion and prejudice.⁵³

This did not mean that education was to be remote from the real world, for Menzies saw that the production of the good citizen meant, for the universities, the production of leaders. While he adhered to an elitist notion of the universities, it was not in terms of an hereditary elite, but a meritocratic one. Nor was it necessarily based on the notion of individual rights. For Menzies, the hegemonic role of the universities, in particular, and education in general, was too important to be left to individualism. In presenting the Murray Report to Parliament in 1957, he said;

It is not yet adequately understood that a university education is not, and certainly should not be, the perquisite of a privileged few. It is not to be thought of merely in terms of the individual student. It has become demonstrably clear that a complex and highly industrialised modern society has claims upon the universities which must be met, and has great responsibilities for seeing that those claims can be met.⁵⁴

The development of the mass university, however, was not part of the Menzies plan. As Bessant noted, Menzies saw that development as a major threat to bourgeois hegemony, institutions "at once so stimulating and so menacing".⁵⁵ Instead, he accepted the notion of upgrading tertiary technical institutions to provide tertiary education for those denied access to the universities, which were to continue to provide for the hegemonic needs of the bourgeoisie through the preservation of conservative standards, values and traditions. The University of Melbourne Gazette captured (somewhat respectfully) Menzies notions:

he did not wish to see the standards of our universities lowered, or bodies called universities which were not in fact universities. This had nothing to do with intellectual snobbery, but flowed from the universities' need to preserve the highest intellectual standards. These standards should not be swept away by a flood of numbers, but should rise, and continue to rise at all times.⁵⁶

The role of education, and particularly the universities was, for Menzies, consistent with the liberal-democratic notions which underpinned their development in Australia.

What little debate on the role of education in Australia existed during the forties and early fifties certainly did not deny the premises of Menzies' argument. Rather it tended to approach the discussion from an equally elitist position. Ashby anticipated the Menzies' statement of 1957 in 1942 when he pointed out that the restriction of Australian universities to the rich through the lack of adequate scholarships for the children of workers undermined the effectiveness of education in fulfilling its proper functions in society, and made the universities remote from their society.

He suggested that a large part of the blame lay with governments which had underfunded the universities, and which had also adopted policies which discouraged university attendance.⁵⁷ In 1944, Ashby suggested that Australian universities were developing away from the ideal.

Universities are being pressed all the time to divert more and more of their resources to professional training, to satisfy the desires of the modern society. But universities are concerned first of all with the needs of society, which are not the same as its desires.⁵⁸

He saw in Australian universities an accommodation of these pressures, with vocationalisation ousting elements of generalism in university courses. He made an early call for the development of a system of colleges at a post-matriculation but sub-university level, to cater for the growing demands for professional education. His influence on Menzies' thought was obvious, as was his influence on the notions entertained in the Murray and Martin recommendations over the following twenty years. He became one of the more cited authorities in the developing Australian debate, through his general discussion of the role, function and nature of universities in relation to education and society which was well-known in England and Australia.

One of the main results of the Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme was to create an expectation, both among potential

students and the universities, of increasing student demand and increased funding. There were, of course, some difficulties with both these expectations, not least being State rather than Commonwealth control over education. The Mills Report recognised the existence of these difficulties. Although it resulted in the introduction of annual funding support for the universities from the Commonwealth, neither it, nor the Government (nor, indeed, the universities themselves) recognised the continuing nature and strength of the demands. It became apparent, even given Menzies' rhetorical commitment to education, that the grants his Government made in 1951 went no further than to hold the universities' position, and certainly did not improve it.

This situation gave rise to the publication in 1952 of the A.V.C.C. paper, "A Crisis in the Finance and Development of the Australian Universities". It was a conservative document based very heavily on the hegemonic role of universities in society. It reiterated many of the old arguments for a public support of education, and sought to convince a conservative government, rhetorically committed to universities, to increase such support. While it opened with the statement that "the Universities are destined to play an increasingly important role in Australian development",⁵⁹ it concentrated almost entirely on the hegemonic functions that they could contribute. It listed the functions of the universities as learning and scholarship, specialist professional training, research, and safeguarding cultural and democratic tradition. It emphasised the contribution that could be made to defence and national development. In fact, it turned away from the direct economic benefits, which might have been emphasised to a government concerned with rapid industrial and economic development, toward the more indirect benefits of political and cultural stability which would allow rapid change in society without upsetting its social mores in a way which could threaten bourgeois control of such change.

Indeed the contribution of the Universities to society should not be reckoned only in terms of the professional proficiency of the graduates they produce or the value of their contributions to research but rather in terms of their part in determining and moulding our way of life.⁶⁰

This statement was one of the most overt in proclaiming the hegemonic role that universities played in society, going beyond what was usually argued as their most basic role, research. It was an acknowledgement of their role in preserving and fostering bourgeois traditions and values.

The debate concerning the role and function of tertiary education languished over the next few years despite the problems which confronted higher education. What debate there was continued in the vein of the A.V.C.C. paper, calling for increased funding and the establishment of a national inquiry into education. In 1956, Menzies announced the creation of the Murray Committee to investigate the needs of the universities. While a more detailed analysis of the Murray Report is made in Chapter 7, Bessant pointed out that,

Not unexpectedly, Murray proved to have views on the universities similar to the prime minister's. He saw the universities as guardians of the intellectual standards and intellectual integrity of the community, intent on the discovery of new knowledge and training the future professionals who were to have "a wide general education as a background to their professional knowledge".⁶¹

In the short term the Report achieved almost universal acclamation from the universities, whose position at the pinnacle of the educational hierarchy it confirmed. It was completely accepted by a government seeking justification for its rhetoric. In the long term, however, the restriction of the Murray Report to the problems of the universities, and its almost antagonistic attitude toward non-university higher education, ensured that the debate on the role and function of tertiary education was enlarged. It also led to a recognition that the difficulties facing the universities were not the only ones for tertiary education, but that considerable problems existed for tertiary technical institutions as

well. Encel suggested that the lack of concern on the part of the universities toward other tertiary institutions was reflected in their assertion that only they could provide a 'higher' education which would fit graduates for positions of leadership in society. He went on to suggest that the Australian universities inherited their position from those in the U.K. where

this argument was sustained by snobbery based partly on class distinction and partly on the dominance of the classical tradition in British education; a similar snobbery is reflected in our own universities, with their long-standing reluctance to give reasonable recognition for work done at technical colleges of high standards.⁶²

The pressures which the Murray Report put on the universities to drop 'sub-tertiary' courses, reflected many of the attitudes of academia. Partridge suggested in 1960 that this was part of a strong distrust in the universities of any difference in perception or approach to that which had developed as the norm among them. He pointed out the poor reception that both the A.N.U. and the N.S.W. University of Technology received from the established universities.

...their creation evoked in many academics the sense of shock that a flouting of the orthodox or conventional so often evokes; and also some of the fear for vested interests the monopolist is apt to feel when a competitor appears.⁶³

The case of the N.S.W. University of Technology was one which aroused the sensibilities of quite a few commentators. The University had been created in 1949 from the Sydney Technical College. In 1958, as a result of pressure from the Murray Committee, its name had been changed to the University of New South Wales; the Committee thought that the use of the word technology in its title was inappropriate. In 1965 the N.S.W. Institute of Technology was founded to take over those courses which were dropped by the University at its creation and following the Murray Report. Partridge used this as an illustration of the powerful pressures of conformity which he saw in Australian society, as the University

divested itself of many of its practical technological courses and expanded into traditional university areas.⁶⁴ Williams argued that

what has happened in New South Wales is convincing evidence that any institution in Australia calling itself a university will inevitably follow the well defined Australian university pattern and there is no doubt it will cease to provide the particular contribution typical of technical education.⁶⁵

Both Partridge and Murray-Smith pointed to the need to maintain bourgeois hegemony as the underlying reasons for the development of the University of New South Wales. It was the most significant attempt in Australia to establish a university with an alternative perspective and one which, theoretically, should have been welcomed by both government and industry as an important contribution to the development of Australia.

Murray-Smith noted

that the appetite of the planners and nation-builders for technological studies has not in fact been matched by the response either of industry or of a prospective student body,⁶⁶

while Partridge suggested that

perhaps also this record suggests that politicians and the informed public did not really believe in the importance of technological teaching and research of the most advanced kind and of the highest quality; or they may not have thought that Australia needed or could support an absolutely first-rate technological university.⁶⁷

Neither commentator saw the link between the pressures for conformity and the maintenance of a conservative ideology which, while paying lip service to development of local industry through a well trained work-force, remained committed to the profit motive. The cheapest way for Australia to gain a skilled work-force remained through a large scale immigration programme and the importation of manpower and skills.

Nevertheless, the bourgeoisie was not united in its stand toward technological education. Nor was the Australian population as a whole. Ashby had noted the hostility of the working class toward the universities in the early 1940s,⁶⁸ and other commentators had noted the

same hostility during the 1930s and in the post-War period. The differences between the various fractions of the bourgeoisie were serious enough to see the establishment of the Martin Committee in 1961, some four years following the Report of the Murray Committee. The new inquiry, a full analysis of which appears in Chapter 8, stemmed substantially from the conflict between the long-term hegemonic needs of the bourgeoisie, and the more immediate fractional pressures on the tertiary education system together with the demands of the population for access.

Karmel outlined the bourgeois debate in a submission to the Martin Committee, where he suggested that in the conflict between freedom of choice and economic requirements there were two choices. The first required a redefinition of terms so that the old notion of freedom of choice to tertiary education which had in practice meant to a specific course within a specific university was restricted to a generality and not equated with a specific choice for a nominated course of study. The second was what he called a more pragmatic approach. This necessitated an acknowledgement from potential students that there was a shortage of resources which limited the possibility for the attainment of the stated objective. "In other words we must accept some conflict as unavoidable."⁶⁹ Karmel recommended the adoption of the second.

It is not restrictive; it keeps the light still burning on the hill; and it gives promise of greater freedom of choice as more resources are devoted to the educational system.⁷⁰

In fact, the 'choice' that Karmel offered was not a choice at all, for in both cases the conceptions of freedom and of choice had been substantially limited, and for the same reason - lack of resources. The prescription of the first alternative was softened by the promise of 'the light burning on the hill' in the second. The softer alternative was that of the liberal capitalists who were more concerned with consensus than conflict. The growth of their influence resulted from the

increasing affluence of the Australian population, and was similar to that during the period of rapid growth in technical education in the late nineteenth century.

The outcome of the Martin inquiry, however, reflected the depth of the differences between the different fractions of the bourgeoisie. In the first place, the Committee took three years to report. Secondly, while it paid lip service to the notion of freedom of choice, it recommended the establishment of a new group of tertiary institutions which were quite blatantly inferior to the universities. Thirdly, it reaffirmed the hegemonic role of the universities and their status at the pinnacle of the educational hierarchy. The Committee had been faced with a number of potentially conflicting demands. It had to take account of the rhetoric of government, that all suitably qualified persons should be able to attend a university. Second, it was faced with demands from the universities to curb their rate of growth by introducing new institutions. The universities since the introduction of the Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme, had been faced with a growth in numbers which outstripped the provision of facilities, and with high failure rates, which most of them ascribed to an influx of substandard students. (Interestingly there was little discussion of the relevance of university courses, their cultural bias, or the standard of teaching in the universities.) Third, there were demands from various sectors of industry for tying tertiary education more closely to their own perceived manpower needs. These ranged from demands to increase the numbers of students in the sciences and technologies at the universities, to the establishment of colleges to train middle-level management which was perceived not to need the type of formal education offered in the universities.⁷¹ The establishment of the advanced education sector of tertiary education was the result of the Martin Committee recommendations which attempted to take these demands into account. While there was

little opposition to the new sector - it was recognised as a necessity for a variety of reasons - there was debate over the relationship between the colleges and the universities, which developed into a debate over hegemony and the function of the education system in promoting it.

Officially, the new sector was to alleviate the pressures on the universities which had caused unacceptable failure rates, and to provide higher level training for professional and para-professional areas. The new colleges (some of which were older than some of the universities) were charged with the education of those who were not of sufficient standard to enter the universities, but were to do so on an equal but different basis. The apparent contradiction in their role, promoted under the different pressures which had faced the Martin Committee, was soon at the centre of the debate. Very few commentators were to accept the official line on the creation of the college sector. Some did. Jones for instance argued that

The establishment of colleges of advanced education reflects a concern, among government ranks, that the percentage aspiring to university education has been too high, and that failure rates have been too acute. In other words, it has been felt that many entering universities would be better placed in other more practical institutions.⁷²

The statement, in fact, pointed to the real reason for the division which was imposed in tertiary education. The justification based on failure rates, which had improved slightly in the years from the early 1950s, was never expanded to provide a compelling reason for establishing a college sector. It hid the real motive, the inappropriateness of mass universities, and the suggested danger that such a development would challenge bourgeois hegemony. The development of the debate illustrated that the development of mass universities was a danger only to the hegemony of one fraction of the bourgeoisie for control of hegemony, not a danger to the totality.

The recommendations of the Martin Report were a subtle shift in the

division of labour between the universities and the other components of tertiary education.⁷³ The decision of the Menzies Government to impose a condition on the acceptance of the advanced education sector that prohibited its institutions to award degrees was an unsuccessful attempt to prevent the change. Up until the Martin Report, much of the universities status derived from their unique function as degree granting institutions. The creation of a new sector of degree granting institutions, which the colleges of advanced education became, meant that much more emphasis had to be placed on the special role of the universities as guardians of knowledge and culture. The development of the 'equal but different' debate was a reflection of this, and the confusion illustrated the different perceptions that abounded. On the one hand, there were those who supported the notion because it would preserve the essential differences between the two, and thus maintain the position of the universities. On the other, some supporters saw it as a way for the new colleges to become true alternatives to the universities. Among opponents of the thesis, there were those who saw it as a ruse to overturn the position which the universities held, and thus presented a danger to the fabric of society. Others considered it an ill-disguised attempt to maintain the status of the universities at the expense of the rest of the tertiary education system. Reviewing the situation some years after the Martin Report, Partridge noted that the advanced education sector had been unable to overcome the dominant position of the universities in tertiary education, especially in their stated role as professional educators. He suggested that

it may well be that the universities have been so well entrenched as institutions of professional training that it will be hard for the colleges of advanced education to win for themselves a distinct and well recognized role within the system of tertiary education.⁷⁴

There was little debate on Menzies' reason for establishing the colleges

- "They were to enable a brake to be placed on the establishment of more

universities".⁷⁵

The debate was not new but merely recast with the addition of the advanced education sector giving, as it were, ballast to the arguments. Essentially, it was a continuation of the debate on the role of the universities in society, which had been revitalised by the same pressures that had led to the establishment of the Martin Committee. Encel argued that, other than law and medicine, "both of which are notorious strongholds of intellectual conservatism", ⁷⁶ the major users of university graduates were the State governments. They employed graduates as teachers, engineers, agricultural scientists, chemists and architects. He suggested that the attitudes of the State governments to the universities had "accentuated their character as mere 'service stations'", and continued,

for the State Governments, universities have often been regarded as the tertiary component of a rigidly articulated public education system, whose functions are conceived in a narrowly utilitarian sense. State Governments have rarely been anxious to provide funds for the development of the wider functions of universities as centres of higher learning and intellectual enquiry.⁷⁷

Partridge, in discussing the 'service station' concept (or the universities as technical colleges notion) suggested that while there was truth in the criticism, much of it was based on an outdated idea of the universities as they existed (or were reputed to exist) as liberal democratic institutions in the United Kingdom. It was a reputation gained prior to acceptance of the mass university or at least universities open to all who could qualify for them. He argued that the old liberal ideal was outmoded because the technological revolution had increased the levels of knowledge and skill required in almost every occupation and profession, and was continuing to do so.⁷⁸ The new demands meant that research and development were continually under pressure as well, which held the potential for further compromising the old notions.

Partridge suggested that the debate had assumed the importance it held because of demographic pressures and as a result of

the still continuing process of democratization - the acceptance of the notion that equality of educational opportunity includes equality of opportunity to a university (or higher) education for any child that can make the grade.⁷⁹

For him the integration of the universities into public education systems (which was the result of factors such as total government funding and the role of governments as the major employers of university graduates) was to some extent at odds with pressures in them for 'democratization', which, if unchecked, contained a potential challenge to bourgeois hegemony. Partridge had recognised the integration of the universities as part of a wider movement in society.

This, of course, is not a small matter or one that affects only the universities: a progressive integration of the different sectors and institutions of social life is one of the long-term general trends of twentieth century, industrialized society; and the universities are not escaping the general trend towards social integration.⁸⁰

He had also linked it with a developing democratisation of society, although he saw this as the cause of the trend. He recognised the problems that these trends created for the universities as autonomous communities of scholars. What he did not recognise was the potential conflict between the two concepts, nor that the general integration of social institutions was part of the centralising process of capitalism. The democratisation process was one which had been controlled through the development of liberal bourgeois democratic institutions, while the social integration was, in effect, part and parcel of that control.

The Martin Report did not close the debate but re-invigorated it. Discussion on the respective roles of the universities and the colleges of advanced education developed throughout the period under review, and the conflicts on which it centred were in reality linked with the different interests that were involved in the struggle for a dominant

hegemonic position. They were only marginally concerned with the extension of educational opportunity to those sections of the population which had been previously denied access to higher education. In the general perception of the working class, both higher education sectors were remote, and for the 'middle class', the notion of the universities remained very much what it always had been, a notion extended to the colleges, which were also seen as vehicles of upward mobility. (This was related to the role of the teachers colleges, which had been for a great many, the first step on the status ladder.)⁸¹ The 1969 Armidale Conference highlighted the differences that existed within the bourgeoisie regarding the role of tertiary education and the proper functions and status of the various institutions in it. The government and the universities attempted to direct the debate toward discussion of the difference in emphases between the universities and colleges, rather than examining the traditional role of the universities in Australian society. On the other hand, the colleges and their supporters were not about to initiate discussion on the hegemonic role of the universities, since they were attempting to take over at least part of that role. Instead, they concentrated on the relevance of the universities to the developing society; that is, their success at performing their hegemonic role.

To a large extent, the debate centred on the areas defined by the Government and the universities. This was not to say that the two were in agreement on the issues of the debate, but that they were successful in restricting it to defining the difference between the higher education sectors. There were disagreements between the Government and the universities on the amount of Government control there should be over education, or at least the universities, and levels of funding. Some of these differences were quite deep. To treat the debate as a two-sided argument would be simplistic. Even when government and the universities

adopted the same position on a specific issue, their reasons were not always the same. The maintenance of hegemony was a more immediate concern for the government, which represented fractional interests in the bourgeoisie, than for the universities, whose position in society, which was linked with the long-term survival of bourgeois hegemony, gave them a class rather than a fractional perspective. Similarly, the status of the colleges related to the long-term position, although their immediate interests were related to the fractional struggle for dominance within bourgeois hegemony. As a result, the Government and the universities were able to adopt a similar position on the status of the colleges; the Government from a short-term, fractional position, and the universities from a long-term, class position. On the other hand, the universities and the colleges were able to take a similar stance on the role of education, and the independence and autonomy of institutions in opposition to the Government. In this case, the institutions acted from a long-term position regarding the maintenance of hegemony, while the Government was more concerned with the short-term issue of fractional dominance within the hegemonic process. The institutions, of course, had different short-term positions here as well, both involving the protection or enhancement of their status.

The integration of the universities into the public sphere was a theme which continued to be addressed throughout the seventies in a variety of forms: the problems of vocationalism; the role of the different institutions; the dangers of elitism; the nature of research. All these were included in the continuing debate on the differences between the universities and the advanced education sector, which was the major forum for the integration debate. The major line of discussion centred on the analytical versus the practical approach; theory versus practice. As White pointed out, this entailed two main assumptions. The first was based on the manpower requirements of Australian industry and

business. The second concerned the supposed intelligence and interests of potential students.⁸² These assumptions pointed to the hegemonic nature of the argument. The first rested on a dubious and inadequately researched assertion of manpower needs, which came to be recognised later in the 1970s during the recession, growing unemployment and labour 'oversupply'. The second assumption was also dubiously based, entailing as it did, value judgements in terms of class, sex and race.⁸³

Along with this went a process which Partridge called the 'de-emphasising' of the universities in the tertiary system. This process was complex, for it encompassed a number of widely different aims which ranged from returning the universities to the 'splendid isolation' of an imaginary past, to their complete integration into a comprehensive system of public education, the higher sector of which would encompass both the universities and the colleges of advanced education. Broadly, the argument proceeded as follows. First, there were too many university students not interested or capable of a university education, but who had a high vocational motivation. Second, this had led to higher failure rates. Third, it had also forced the universities into an excessively vocational mould. Fourth, the universities were not the best technical educators since they were out of touch with industry and its needs. Fifth, they should have, therefore, concentrated on high level research and teaching. Sixth, those areas of vocational and practical interest should have become the province of the colleges of advanced education. The argument had serious problems, not least the value judgements that it adopted. There was little evidence for these assertions, or for linking them to such factors as failure rates. The most serious problem was that of definition. There was little attempt to illustrate the differences in the types of technical education offered in the universities and the other institutions, differences that, as Partridge pointed out, had become more difficult to determine with the rising standards in

non-university technical education, and blurred by the vocational bias of many of the technical courses offered in the universities.⁸⁴ Philp suggested that the main danger of the de-emphasis of the universities would be a return to the elitism of pre-Murray times, as those students in the advanced education sector would be 'relatively poorer', and that such a trend would be adverse to the proper functioning of the universities.⁸⁵

In fact, the complexity of the process lay in its hegemonic nature and the aims of the various participants in the debate illustrated this. On the one hand, those who proposed that the universities return to a more elitist mould were not necessarily endangering their essential function as hegemonic agents of the dominant fraction of the bourgeoisie, especially if mass lower level institutions were established to provide for the aspirations of upwardly mobile sectors of the population and middle level skilled workers and management required by industry. On the other, the 'levelling' of the universities and the colleges of advanced education did not, per se, involve an attack on bourgeois hegemony, nor the position of the universities. Indeed, it was rarely, if ever, presented in such a way. Instead, it was seen as a way of preserving the essential differences of the universities, thus preserving bourgeois hegemony (even if it became more widely class based through slight shifts in the dominant position of one fraction vis-a-vis another) while providing a more effective sorting mechanism for upward mobility. Again, there were those who argued for a distinct separation between the two sectors because of what they saw to be the complete irrelevance and ineffectiveness of the universities. These commentators saw any moves by the colleges toward the universities as detrimental to their development. There were also those who wanted to see distinctions between the institutions broken down as one means of broadening or shifting the dominant position of one fraction of the bourgeoisie. Of

course, the terms of the debate were more covert.

The debate was taken up quite vigorously in academic and political circles. Batt, then Tasmanian Minister for Education, released a series of papers in 1977 on education, one of which directly related to this debate. In it he asserted that there were mythologies regarding the uniqueness of the universities, which he suggested were not based on intellectual, educational or economic grounds, but on elitism:

they have been devices for maintaining the children of middle-class parents firmly in the middle-class or perhaps a notch or two higher up in that class.⁸⁶

He argued that the notion that only the universities could maintain standards in research was unbased, and that, in fact, the conditions which allowed for their maintenance should be extended into other institutions. He went on to argue that the fragmentation of the tertiary system had led to a loss, or inability to gain, qualities of excellence in the advanced education and TAFE sectors, and a loss of community support for the universities, suggesting that the tripartite structure of tertiary education reflected a "failure of initiative, a failure of analysis, a failure of intellectual enthusiasm",⁸⁷ on the part of those people concerned with tertiary education.⁸⁸ At the other end of the scale, Derham put the case strongly for elite universities. His argument introduced a subtle change into the debate. Derham acknowledged that institutions other than the universities could have a legitimate claim to research activities. He claimed that elite universities owed much more to the world than to their local, State or national communities, and that

The real test of a university involves a further statement about the nature of the knowledge to be pursued, and the purposes of the dissemination of that knowledge.⁸⁹

This, of course, implied something more than might at first be obvious. It suggested a qualification of the unfettered pursuit of knowledge (even in the 'objective' sense employed by conservatives), one which has to do

with standards and values of (capitalist) society and the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony.

Most of the debate, however, occupied the middle ground. There was a general agreement that some reforms were needed, if not to the structure itself, at least in the relation between its components, especially as the legitimacy of the advanced education sector became accepted. White suggested that both the universities and the colleges needed to be relevant to society in a multiplicity of ways - culturally, educationally, through theory and research, and through its application.⁹⁰ Partridge gave qualified support to this notion, although his support was directed toward diversity among institutions rather than within them. This was not to say that he suggested that each institution should be mono-purpose. He did not. He was concerned, however, that calls, such as White's, would lead to competitiveness, rivalry, resentment and a drive toward uniformity, which would stifle the diversity he believed necessary to maintain standards, quality and choice in higher education.⁹¹ Bannon warned the universities that the defence of excellence should not be made in terms which restricted it to themselves. He acknowledged the unique position of the universities, but suggested that this lay in their maturity which should allow them to support an extension of the excellence concept throughout the community. He continued, "Too often the university case sounds like special pleading for the preservation of elitism."⁹² In his opinion, the community would support the universities case if it were seen to be relevant and effective.

The election of the A.L.P. in 1972 saw, if not a shift in dominance within the bourgeoisie, at least a change in the strategy that was being pursued to ensure the continuation of its hegemony. The Whitlam Government, in its first term, was at the apex of welfare statism, concerned with consensus as the most effective way of maintaining

hegemony. While the government was intergrationist, its emphasis on the welfare state and public participation in decision making illustrated the complexity of the hegemonic strategy.⁹³ Anderson suggested that the A.L.P.'s attitude toward education had no ideological basis, but rather was situated within its larger historical commitment to egalitarianism. He argued that while the government was committed to improving education, it had no direction apart from its general one, and instead, relied on the advice it received from the commissions it established.⁹⁴ In fact the basis of the A.L.P.'s ideology was quite clear. The government was firmly committed to capitalism and the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony, albeit from the position of reform of the system. There was never any doubt that the Whitlam government aspired to any more than a mild form of social democracy.⁹⁵ The initial direction of the policies of the A.L.P with regard to education were also quite clear. Their major emphasis was on the extension of educational opportunity, especially through the concept of recurrent education, which had been increasingly popular with the O.E.C.D. throughout the post-War period. The notion was one which was totally compatible with an integrationist and consensus-seeking strategy for hegemonic dominance. As Matthews and Fitzgerald pointed out:

By the use of the media, education packages, correspondence lessons, open entry and other means, everybody can be drawn into the educational fold. No previous lack of interest is an excuse. If a person is not interested, educational institutions must find subjects and methods to make him interested - nobody is to have any good reason not to participate.⁹⁶

They suggested that one of the problems associated with a widescale acceptance of recurrent education was the danger that it be seen as a socially acceptable, if expensive, means of disguising unemployment.¹⁰⁶ This was, in fact, only part of a wider rationale for the introduction of recurrent education. Illich had been critical of the concept, which he contended allowed the educators to proclaim the right

to extend their areas of interest into all facets of life, thus making everyone more dependent on planned learning processes.⁹⁸ There is a clear relationship here between education and the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony, a relationship that illustrates the complex and total way in which hegemony 'operates' in society.

Before the end of its period in office, the A.L.P. was faced with conditions which were unfavourable to its policies. Government intervention in favour of consensus welfare state policies came to be vigorously opposed by capital, and the government changed its direction during its last year to one of more overt intervention in favour of capital. This direction was strengthened by the Fraser L.N.C.P. Government following its election in 1975. Policies relating to education were the subject of a less favourable rhetoric from government as were those relating to health and welfare areas. Wheelwright suggested that while the expansion in tertiary education was justified with economic arguments, increased investment in education had not prevented the onset of economic recession nor graduate unemployment. Further, there was little evidence that it had contributed to a breakdown of class divisions or inequality. Instead, it had become obvious that tertiary education was a sophisticated sorting mechanism for the top positions in society.

These positions, however, do not expand with economic growth. So to the extent that education is a screening device, the possibility of general advance is an illusion. The distributional struggle is made worse, not better, by growth.⁹⁹

A general disillusionment with tertiary education, following its mass acceptance in the post-War period as a means of social mobility and advancement, contained the seeds of a threat to bourgeois hegemony, if the working class were to recognise its role in the hegemonic process and reject it. If this were to be checked, a modification of strategy was required with regard to tertiary education. This entailed restrictions

on the numbers of students in universities, large scale reductions in the advanced education sphere, and a transfer of resources to TAFE.

These shifts in policy toward education, following the expansionary policies which had been widely accepted after the Murray Report, required a process of legitimation on both the political and academic fronts. For the former, this was achieved by emphasising the links which were supposed to exist between education and the economy. It was alleged that these had either broken down, or that (more insidiously) education was at fault for the economic problems of society. For the latter, however, the legitimation of the new policies needed more specific evidence than the rhetoric of politicians. Although there were individual academics (especially in economic and political science) who favoured the restrictive policies undertaken by the government, those academics with a direct interest in educational administration were less positive in their support. Nevertheless, leading administrators did go part of the way toward legitimising the change in direction. For instance, the Chairman of the T.E.C., Karmel, attempted to give educational and academic grounds for Government policies. The T.E.C. gave no indication of the problems which led to the change in government policies prior to their announcement. Instead, it was not until the 1978 report that it presented arguments to support the cutbacks.¹⁰⁰ Karmel moved from perceiving the problems which faced tertiary education as a result of continuing growth, to a position in which he saw them as a consequence of past growth. In 1975, he suggested that there were four types of problems confronting tertiary education. First, as participation rates increased, the diversity of background of students would lead to a diversity of interests and goals with which the system must cope. Second, an increase in numbers would lead to more and older graduates with higher qualification, which, in turn, would lead to occupational disappointment. Further, increases would have a profound effect on the

promotion of equality of opportunity, since those who did not gain entrance would become even more disadvantaged. Finally, increased participation rates would mean that the tertiary education system was expanding its role as a labour selector into the area previously occupied by the secondary school system. Therefore, those who did not participate could become more disadvantaged with regard to job opportunities. In addition, the tertiary sector was faced with developing a system which would match output with the needs of the labour market.¹⁰¹ The problems which Karmel outlined were both educational and economic, reflecting the consensus seeking rationale of the welfare state in maintaining bourgeois hegemony.

By 1978, however, Karmel's main preoccupation was economic. His concerns reflected those of the government, which was restricting resources for economic reasons. Even so, he put the cause of the resource restrictions squarely on the political unpopularity of tertiary education rather than on any deep-seated economic demands. What this begged, of course, was the reason why the T.E.C. had supported the Government's restrictions, especially as Karmel had expected with regard to participation rates, "the upward trend to reassert itself",¹⁰² even with 'adverse' demographic considerations. Both Karmel and the Commission were concerned, however, to avoid simplistic manpower prescriptions for tertiary education, and with the danger that too heavy-handed economic policies would cause a fall in the quality of the tertiary institutions which would be difficult to reverse. It was clear that there was not total support for the change in strategy for the maintenance of hegemony among bourgeois intellectuals. At least in education, there were strong elements in favour of maintaining and even extending the consensus measures of the welfare state. While this was at its strongest in the Schools Commission, the T.E.C. also reflected a continuing intra-class struggle in the bourgeoisie.

As this suggests, the bourgeoisie was not united in the changing strategy. This was certainly the case among bourgeois intellectuals. Even so, a return to the welfare state consensus policies became less of an option politically during the late 1970s, especially as it became clear that much of their Keynesian base had not provided solutions to mass problems such as unemployment, inflation and inequality. Those rejecting the policies of the Fraser government in its realignment of the political direction of Australia, were faced with the adoption of radical alternatives or were forced to move closer to its position. This did not mean that the positions of intellectuals, or the A.L.P. in Opposition, were identical to that of the Government, for there remained substantial differences in relation to style and method. This was apparent in the Report of the Williams Committee, which was issued at the end of the period under review, 1979, and in the response of the A.L.P. to that Report. The Report, which is analysed in Chapter 9, gave some support to the government, but was by no means uncritical in its review and proposals. The response of the Opposition also illustrated how the A.L.P. had moved with regard to education while it had not been in office. In his Parliamentary speech, Hayden concurred with the Government's over-education thesis, claiming that there had been an "over-production of tertiary qualified people for the community",¹⁰³ although he distanced himself from the drastic measures which had been taken by Fraser. He also decried the Report's lack of insistence on manpower planning solutions in education to assist in overcoming national economic problems, calling for a restructuring of the educational system toward the training of skilled tradesmen, a position which contrasted with the expansionary solutions which the Whitlam Labor Government had proposed.¹⁰⁴

The change in the strategy for the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony as it was effected through the education system was not an isolated

occurrence in Australia, but had a number of common features throughout the Western world. These included redirecting resources away from the higher education components of tertiary education, and toward short-term, vocationally oriented and professional or para-professional courses in lower level post-school institutions. At the height of the 1974 recession, the Secretary-General of the O.E.C.D. suggested that;

At the heart of this reaction lie the difficulties experienced in all Member countries in establishing satisfactory relationships between the offerings of the higher education system, the aspirations of its new clients, and the needs and absorptive capacity of society for qualified people.¹⁰⁵

This typically liberal-bourgeois analysis presented itself as a neutral account of the problems confronting tertiary education. It posited the independence of individual 'clients' and the neutrality of the state ('society') in determining either the offerings of tertiary institutions or influencing the choices which individuals made. It was situated well within the confines set by bourgeois hegemony. In so being, it obfuscated the realities of class conflict, and denied the evidence for its existence in the education system.

Conclusion

An examination of the period from 1939 to 1979 in relation to the development of tertiary education illustrates the contribution of one sector of Australian society to the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony. This function of the tertiary education system had evolved in the century prior to 1939, as was shown in Chapter 2. The development of Australian society during and after World War II produced a complex and sophisticated industrial society, in which education played an important role. The Depression of the early 1930s and the War had challenged the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in Australia, but the history of the post-War period is the history of its re-establishment. By the 1960s it had been widely accepted and its maintenance was based on integrationist and

social consensus welfare state policies. The early part of the period, and the late 1970s, did not, however, present the same picture. In the former, the re-establishment of bourgeois hegemony was underway, and in the latter, changes in the strategy for the maintenance of hegemony were required in the face of deepening economic crisis.

The re-establishment of hegemony had two features. The first was the acceptance across class boundaries of the rhetoric of full employment. The second was the growth of a managerial bureaucracy which, while it gave the appearance of a professional continuum, was an illusion in which the senior ranks were quite differentiated from its bulk. This bureaucracy extended across the public and private sectors. Connell and Irving suggested that, while its senior personnel were clearly members of the bourgeoisie (or its agents), it recreated in its ranks the labour aristocracy, though on the basis of educational qualifications which were meant to certify skill, rather than on manual skills. The expansion of tertiary education in the post-war period was an integral and fundamental part of the process of recreation through which the labour aristocracy was

inducted into a new form of hegemonised class consciousness, the ideology of professionalism, which was assiduously spread among new occupations such as engineering and teaching.¹⁰⁶

The acceptance of bourgeois hegemony extended beyond the labour aristocracy and throughout the working class. It was underpinned by the affluence which resulted from full employment and welfare state policies, and was legitimised through the education system which held both the promise of social mobility, and the affirmation of the inferiority of those who did not complete it. It inculcated the myth of the individual in society, and refuted the notion of class and class struggle.

The development of an education system which was able to operate effectively within such parameters was of such importance that it could not be left to chance, or localised interests. In the tertiary sectors, especially, the Commonwealth assumed more and more control, and ensured

that the system developed in a coordinated fashion through a series of committees of inquiry. Even though acknowledged constitutional control (including for tertiary education) remained with the States, the Commonwealth's fiscal dominance meant that the States had decreasing control. This was most apparent in tertiary education, but by the late 1960s and early 1970s the Commonwealth had a substantial interest in primary and secondary education as well. At the tertiary level, the Walker, Murray, Martin and Williams Reports laid the groundwork for the development of the system, complimented by the reports of the Universities Commission, the Commission on Advanced Education, the Technical and Further Education Commission, and subsequently, the Tertiary Education Commission. Throughout these reports, the need to extend and maintain bourgeois hegemony led to a tension between arguments for economic efficiency and survival, and for citizenship and democracy. The rhetoric of the reports, which stressed economic prosperity, though often in terms of the individual, and which stressed freedom of choice, at least until the mid-1970s, also encouraged the long-standing tension between the education system and capital. While this tension tended to remain submerged much of the time, it became apparent during economic crises, when utilitarianism became more public, and the debate on education and training intensified. One of the most important characteristics of the tension was the subordinate position of technical education at all levels. It is not too great an exaggeration to assert that Australia's major technical training institutions, at least at the level of the skilled tradesman, have been in the United Kingdom and Europe. The hegemonic function of the education system was served at two levels by the position of technical education. First, the dominance of professional and non-technical education ensured that the status of technical education remained inferior in the perceptions of the working class. Second, the ability to be able to import skilled labour assisted

in class control.¹⁰⁷

The argument linking education and the economy was not restricted to technical education, but extended into the non-technical areas as well. With it came charges of the irrelevance of the education system, particularly the universities, to the community in general. By the late 1970s, the universities were closely connected to the community and to the professional groups they served, in comparison to their position prior to World War II, at least in the public eye. They remained, however, as utilitarian and vocational in their professional education (which ranged from medicine, dentistry and law, to engineering and the professional training of teachers in general arts and sciences), while at the same time remaining conservative and elitist. Partridge suggested that, while students tended to be vocationally oriented in universities, the institutions as a whole had little contact with industry and the community because of their conservative and elitist nature. In fact, at the policy making level, industry was well represented in the universities, through the membership of university councils, membership of committees of inquiry, and membership of the T.E.C. and its councils.¹⁰⁸ Partridge did not recognise the hegemonic role that the 'detached' universities played, even though he recognised that it was necessary for them to be if they were to properly pursue knowledge. The universities housed intellectuals of the bourgeoisie, and were not closely connected with the community in general because, for hegemonic purposes, they were not meant to be.¹⁰⁹

The conflict within the bourgeoisie for dominance led, during the period under review, to different concepts regarding the relevance of tertiary education and its hegemonic functions. The impediments placed in the way of the development of mass higher education, particularly in the advanced education sector, illustrated this. For a short time in the late 1960s and early 1970s, an alliance of the liberal bourgeoisie and

the working class meant that some of the restrictions were eased. However, any potential threat to bourgeois hegemony was neutralised by policies promoting the vocational functions of the developing system. The increasing control of the Commonwealth over tertiary education was also indicative of the conflict.¹¹⁰ It led to both State and Commonwealth governments increasing pressures on tertiary institutions to conform to one or another of their various policies. It also led to simplistic application of data in an attempt to justify governmental policy. The most obvious example was the assertion that increased expenditure on higher education involved a transfer of resources from the poor to the rich, thus justifying a cutback in education funding. (The fact that increased higher education expenditure went hand-in-hand with increased education expenditure generally, and that such a policy had long-term aims to minimise inequities across class, was ignored for the short term result of minimising inequities within the 'middle class').¹¹¹ The reaction from within tertiary education to these pressures was varied. There were general demands that the governments adopt a 'hands-off' approach towards the institutions, which was especially strong among the universities in relation to themselves. As the system became more complex, the needs for coordination were recognised, although there continued to be resistance to its application.¹¹²

With the development of the tertiary education system came the development of statutory co-ordinating authorities in all States and the Commonwealth. This in itself illustrated the tensions which existed around tertiary education, its role, and its relations with other areas of society. In the tertiary sphere, these authorities came increasingly to represent government policy, and less to offer advice to governments on what their policies should be. In fact, their role had not altered substantially, for their positions in the expansionary climate of the

1960s and early 1970s were far more conducive to offering advice than in the political climate of the mid to late 1970s. Karmel's position was quite consistent throughout the period with conforming to political decisions, and it is not surprising that the A.U.C. and the T.E.C. should have acquiesced during his period as chairman.¹¹³

The role of the tertiary education system in the period from 1939 to 1979 followed logically from the role that had been developed for it up to 1939. As in the earlier period the competing fractions of the bourgeoisie gave the substance and style to the debates which occurred, tempered by working class interests which could be readily absorbed into the system. The maintenance of bourgeois hegemony became more complex during the period as the society itself evolved, and the complexity of the education system reflected this. The role of tertiary education at the upper levels of the sorting mechanism became apparent from an examination of its development. Its links with the economy were more complex than in the earlier period, although it has been shown in this chapter that they were by no means as direct as has been asserted. The breakdown in the relationship which had been posited during times of expansion led to a reversal of the argument, with education being accorded much of the blame for economic problems, especially in the area of youth unemployment. The hegemonic purpose of both arguments has been illustrated above. The maintenance of bourgeois hegemony remained the major role of the tertiary education system during the post-War period. The system played an integral part in that maintenance.

FOOTNOTES

1. R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving, Class Structures in Australian History, (Melbourne, 1980), p.286.
2. ibid., p.287.
3. ibid., p. 285.
4. ibid., p. 290.
5. ibid., p. 303. This process was identified in the Reports of the Royal Commission into Poverty although not explained there.
6. This extended to the official platform of the ALP. The Party's commitment to socialism had never been defined in terms of class analysis, and during this period, most references to socialism were deleted or severely qualified.
7. Connell and Irving, Class Structures in Australian History, p.310.
8. J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p.127.
9. N.L.C. Batt, "The University as a Servant to the Needs of the Community", paper issued by the Office of the Minister for Education, Tasmania, April 1977, p.2.
10. P.H. Karmel, "The Educational System and the Labour Market", in J.P. Nieuwenhuysen and J.P. Drake (eds), Australian Economic Policy, (Melbourne, 1977), p. 203.
11. This position was one of economic orthodox. For instance:
 Modern methods of production require for their operation a labour force equipped with a high degree of technical skill; their implementation demands of society an increasing supply of qualified labour, and provide the basic motive force for expenditure upon education.
 K.S. Frearson, "The Nature of Economic Growth", in N.T. Drohan and J.H. Day (eds), Readings in Australian Economics, (Melbourne, 1965), p.34.
12. See above Chapter 2, pp.27-28.
13. P.H. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, (Sydney, 1973), p. 150.
14. P.H. Partridge, "Higher Education in Modern Society", in R. McCaig (ed), Policy and Planning in Higher Education, (St. Lucia, 1973), p.8.
15. There was, of course, a tension within this division between bourgeois hegemony and the struggle to develop an alternative. For instance, the Left had some interest in maintaining an indirect relation:
 There is, however, deep conflict between the values of the free mind and the values of the market place. Corporations exist to make money, while universities are supposed to encourage critical objective analysis. The university is not in business to be loved by the State and the corporations, or to produce

graduates who are admirable representatives of the conforming society and supporters of the dominant ideas in our culture.

J. Playford, "Big Business and the Australian University", Arena, 17, Summer 1968-69, p.31.

16. B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977), p.99.

17. For instance, the Vice-Chancellor of Melbourne University argued in 1975:

It is not possible for a government department or a Parliament to manage and direct Universities as such. If they tried to do so then the institutions concerned would cease to be Universities and the notion in the long term would suffer. In this kind of matter there has to be a high degree of faith.

D.P. Derham, "Universities, Governments and the Assumption of Federal responsibility for Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 3, November 1975, p.210. This was not the only defence, however. Short, for instance, suggested that the universities should become more obviously relevant and so head off the sort of attacks on their autonomy that were implicit in increasing government intervention. L.N. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 5, April 1967, p.14.

18. Karmel, "The Educational System", p.204. Connell had shown the fallacies which underlie these supposed correlations. Apart from bias which measurements relating class and intelligence contain, he pointed out that the growing demand for professionals, technologists and technicians in the post-War period had extended the 'sieve' effects of tertiary education. Even so, the universities in particular remained very class biased in their student catchment.

And perhaps there are some institutions in Australia which are harder for working class people to get into: the Melbourne Club and the Royal Sydney Yacht Squadron spring to mind. It remains true that the universities are powerfully class-biased in their intake and output.

R.W. Connell, Ruling Class, Ruling Culture, (Cambridge, 1977), p.160. Karmel was supported by others.

If students at a University are not an intellectual elite, if they are not being mentally stretched to capacity, if they do not have a prime concern and interest to extend the boundaries of human knowledge, then the University concerned has no right to exist.

J.J. Auchmuty, "The Pursuit of Excellence", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 1, May 1975, pp.4-5.

Other commentators were less flattering about the integrity of universities. Partridge, for instance, over two decades was critical of them. In 1960, he suggested,

There seems to have been little curiosity about the changing character of the society of which they are part, and about the wider intellectual life of the community.

P.H. Partridge, "The University System", in E.L. French (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1960-61, (Melbourne, 1962), p.52.

I think it is regrettable that so little thought is coming out of the universities about the redefinition of problems of the universities in the present day. The universities seem to me to be extraordinarily silent about many of these problems.

P.H. Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", proceedings of a seminar on the Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities, University of Adelaide, 6-7 October 1978, p.17.

19. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, p.109.
20. This was particularly apparent from the initial memoranda of Walker and Dedman to the Committee and to the Production Executive of Cabinet. Statement by Dr. E.R. Walker, and "For Production Executive: Coordination of Commonwealth Activities in the Field of Education", in P.D. Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, (Nedlands, 1975), pp. 27-36.
21. ibid., p. 167.
22. ibid., p. 168.
23. E.A. Boehm, Twentieth Century Economic Development in Australia, (Camberwell, 1971), p.97.
24. S. Encel, "Politics and Resources for Tertiary Education", in J. Wilkes (ed), Tertiary Education in Australia, (Sydney, 1965), p.150. There was a vigorous debate on the issue at this time, which set the parameters of debate for the next decade.
25. ibid., p. 155.
26. ibid., p. 152.
27. "Education as Investment", Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 36, no. 8, 30 August 1965, p.121.
28. H. Stretton, "Problems of University Expansion", in E.L. Wheelwright (ed), Higher Education in Australia, (Melbourne, 1965), p.77.
29. P.E. Jones, Education in Australia, (Melbourne, 1974), p.54.
30. Karmel, "The Educational System", p. 212.
31. ibid., p. 212.
32. ibid., pp. 212-217.
33. A Hunter, "Introduction", in A. Hunter (ed), The Economics of Australian Industry, (Melbourne, 1963), pp. 2-6.
34. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, p. 294.
35. ibid., p. 277.
36. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 224 and p. 239.
37. Boehm, Twentieth Century Economic Development, p. 56.
38. ibid., pp. 62-63.
39. P.H. Karmel, "Some Economic Aspects of Education", Buntine Oration delivered at Australian College of Education Third Annual Conference, 18 May 1962, p. 5. This paper was treated as a

submission to the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia (Sir Leslie Martin - Chairman), here-in-after cited as the Martin Report, CF. 343.

40. Encel, "Politics and Resources of Tertiary Education", p. 148.
41. B.R. Williams, "Australia's Resources and Their Utilization", in McCaig, Policy and Planning in Higher Education, p. 87. He ignored the wider issues underlying the 'success' of the West German economy in relation to the Nazi economy and U.S. controls on the economy of occupied Germany.
42. M. Fraser, CPD (Vol. H of R 100), 9 September 1976, p. 877.
43. ibid., p. 877. In his reply, Whitlam continued to stress his previous government's line.
 Important as jobs are, important as the needs of industry are, education must be seen as paramount in its own right; as a human process directed to the social and cultural needs of young people and their place in a civilised society. Education is not the means to an end but an end in itself. The Government will be failing in its duty, and its inquiry will be worthless, dangerous, circumscribed and counterproductive if education at any level is seen primarily as a function of economics and industrial efficiency.
 E.G. Whitlam, CPD (Vol H of R 100), 9 September 1976, p. 881.
44. P.H. Karmel, "Some Economic Implications of Educational Policy", Search, Vol. 6, no. 7, July 1975, p. 267.
45. Karmel, "The Educational System", pp. 213-216.
46. ibid., p. 210.
47. ibid., p. 210.
48. P.H. Karmel, "Tertiary Education in a Steady State", in G.S. Harman et al (eds), Academia Becalmed, (Canberra, 1980), p. 31.
49. ibid., p. 31.
50. ibid., p. 32.
51. K. Windschuttle, Unemployment, (Ringwood, 1979), p. 236.
52. ibid., p. 237.
53. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol 184), 26 July 1945, p. 4617.
54. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol. H of R 17), 28 November, 1957, p. 2701.
55. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p. 95.
56. University of Melbourne Gazette, Vol. 21, no. 2, 4/5/65. p. 1.
57. E. Ashby, "The Tenpenny Universities", in E. Ashby, Challenge to Education, (Sydney, 1946).

58. E. Ashby, "Universities in Australia", in Ashby, Challenge to Education, p. 80.
59. "A Crisis in the Finances and Development of the Australian Universities", (Carlton, undated [1952 ?]), p.i.
60. ibid., p. ii.
61. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p. 93, (citing Lord Murray, ABC guest of Honour, 22 September 1957).
62. S. Encel, "The Place of Technology", Outlook, Vol. 6, no. 5, October 1962, p. 10.
63. Partridge, "The University System", p. 59.
64. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, pp. 135-136. See also L.N. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", p. 8.
65. H.S. Williams, "Tertiary Technical Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1963, p. 118.
66. S. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education in Australia; with Special Reference to the Period Before 1914", unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Melbourne, 1966, p. 1021.
67. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, pp. 164-165.
68. Ashby, "The Tenpenny Universities", p.67.
69. Karmel, "Some Economic Aspects of Education", p. 10.
70. ibid., p. 10.
71. A full analysis is contained in Chapter 8.
72. Jones, Education in Australia, p. 88.
73. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", p. 17. See above Chapter 4, p.122.
74. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 137.
75. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies", p. 96.
76. Encel, "Politics and Resources for Tertiary Education", p. 156.
77. ibid., p. 156.
78. P.H. Partridge, "Australian Universities - Some Trends and Problems", Australian University, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1963, p. 11.
79. ibid., p. 8. It was a theme to which he returned. See Partridge, "Higher Education in Modern Society", (1969) especially p. 12, and Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education" (1978).
80. ibid., p. 8.

81. Short noted that public perception of the universities remained as professional training schools, with little concern for the other functions which they might have performed. "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", p. 14. Connell pointed out that those benefitting from the expansion of higher education strengthen this notion, since students continued to be drawn predominantly from 'middle class' occupational backgrounds, with substantial underrepresentation from the working class. This was despite an increase in school retention rates, even among the latter. Ruling Class, Ruling Culture, pp. 159-60. The working class continued to be remote from higher education - what little contact they had with tertiary education was with the poorer facilities of the TAFE sector.
82. M.A. White, "Portents of Integration in Tertiary Education", Forum of Education, Vol. XXX, no. 1, March 1971, p. 57.
83. The inadequacy of manpower planning was shown quite dramatically in the case of teacher supply and demand in the mid-1970s. The spurious nature of the second assumption has been the subject of widespread debate on the difficulties in determining intelligence and interest ratings free of value bias of the investigator. Connell has illustrated this in his writings, for instance.
84. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, p. 156. Jones unwittingly acknowledged the nature of many university courses when adopting the official justification for the colleges development:
Colleges of advanced education offer tertiary courses designed to provide an even greater vocational emphasis than is the case at the universities.
Jones, Education in Australia, p. 90, emphasis added.
85. H. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune - From Murray to the Fourth A.U.C. Report", Australian University, Vol.8, no. 1, May 1970, p. 7.
86. Batt, "The University as a Servant", p. 12.
87. ibid., p. 16.
88. L.N. Short, "Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education: Defining the Difference", Australian University, Vol. 11, no. 1, May 1973, approached the Batt position. While he recognised two traditions associated with the two systems - one of intellectual cultivation, and one experimental - he saw no convincing argument for continuing the separation of the institutions.
89. D.P. Derham, "Universities and Australia", Australian Director, Vol. 8, May 1978, p. 61.
90. White, "Portents of Integration in Tertiary Education", p. 58.
91. Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", p. 15.
92. J.C. Bannon, "Excellence, Elites and the Community", proceedings of a Seminar on the Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities, p. 31. Partridge had suggested in 1969:

The ideal of devotion to "knowledge for its own sake" is a treacherous one:...The issue of "relevance"...is, in my opinion, a quite real issue that is not often or seriously enough faced within modern universities.

Partridge, "Higher Education in Modern Society", p. 11.

93. Whitlam's rationale for the use of commissions and statutory bodies with wide sectional membership was outlined in his policy speech in 1972. He did not, of course, comment on the selection of members. See J.K. Matthews and R.L. Fitzgerald, "Educational Policy and Political Platform: The Australian Labor Government", Australian Education Review, Vo. 7, no. 4, 1974, p. 13.
94. D.S. Anderson, "Labour's Achievements in Australian Education, 1972-1976", in New Directions in Australian Education, (Carlton, 1976), p. 35.
95. There is extensive literature on the nature of social democracy and its relation to capitalism. For instance, see R. Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society, (London, 1978).
96. Matthews and Fitzgerald, "Education Policy and Political Platform", p. 56.
97. ibid., p. 56.
98. I. Illich, Deschooling Society, (Harmondsworth, 1971), pp. 72-73.
99. E.L. Wheelwright, "The Higher Learning in Australia", in E.L. Wheelwright (ed), Capitalism, Socialism or Barbarism? The Australian Predicament, (Sydney, 1978), p. 93.
100. see above Chapter 4, p.138.
101. Karmel, "Some Economic Implications of Educational Policy", p. 267.
102. Karmel, "Tertiary Education in a Steady State", p. 29.
103. W. Hayden, CPD (Vol H of R 113), 22 March 1979, p. 1052.
104. ibid., p. 1059. This was a solution which both Karmel and Windschuttle rejected. Karmel, "Tertiary Education in a Steady State", p. 31 suggested that vocational courses should become less specific within their disciplines with increases in graduate unemployment to allow graduates and their employers more flexibility in employment. Windschuttle, Unemployment, p. 241 noted that graduate unemployment statistics disproved the thesis that vocationally oriented courses were the most saleable. He pointed out that vocationally trained graduates were most likely to be employed in those areas of industry most affected by recession - manufacturing building/construction, agriculture - while more generally trained graduates, apart from being more flexible in the employment sense, were most likely to be employed in the services and tertiary sectors. Nevertheless, as had been argued elsewhere, the challenge which mass higher education might have presented to bourgeois hegemony as the occupational hierarchy was faced with its inability to absorb graduates into career positions, was overcome by attempts to vocationlise higher education, especially the advanced education sector, and expand lower level technical education. See J. Hyde, "The Structure of Higher Education in Australia" in P.

- Sheldrake and R. Linke (eds), Accountability in Higher Education, (Sydney, 1979), pp. 14-15.
105. E. Van Lennep, "Opening Address", in Policies for Higher Education, (Paris, 1974), p. 13.
106. Connell and Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, p. 301.
107. Boehm noted that immigration added more, proportionately, in skilled and semi-skilled labour to the labour force than natural increase, in the post-War period. He pointed out that where-ever crises in skills had occurred, industry was
 able to bridge technological gaps in...education, training, and knowhow by importing capital and labour to assist the achievement of more rapid rates of economic growth.
 Boehm, Twentieth Century Economic Development, pp. 64-65.
108. Harman and Selby Smith pointed out that the situation was essentially the same for the colleges of advanced education after their establishment. College councils replicated university councils with membership mostly drawn from professional, business and academic groups.
 G.S. Harman and C. Selby Smith, "Some Current Trends and Issues in the Governance of Australian Colleges of Advanced Education", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 20, no. 2, June 1976, p. 135 and p. 138.
109. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress, pp. 127-133. The need for 'detachment' was advocated by many commentators from Menzies to most Vice-Chancellors to the Left.
110. The paper to the 1969 Armidale Conference by D. Hughes, "The Role of the Australian States", in McCaig (ed), Policy and Planning in Higher Education, pp. 62-75, canvassed the Federal/State debate with regard to higher education.
111. J.E. Vaizey, "The Economics of Higher Education", in ibid., pp. 76-88, referred extensively to this transfer of resources at the 1969 Armidale Conference. It was used as one of the underlying principles by D.S. Anderson et al, "Students in Australian Higher Education: A Study of their Social Composition Since the Abolition of Fees", A Report to the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee, Education Research and Development Committee, and Conference of Principals of Colleges of Advanced Education, (Sydney, 1978), which was undertaken only a couple of years after fees were abolished.
112. Partridge as chairman of the W.A. inquiry recommended the establishment of a coordinating commission. He believed that such bodies would mediate the pressures for conformity imposed by governments, and moderate politically motivated decisions. See, Partridge, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", p. 16 for his views.
113. For instance, see Karmel, "Some Economic Aspects of Education", [1962]; P.H. Karmel, "Some Arithmetic of Education", [1966] in G.S. Harman and C. Selby Smith (eds), Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, (Sydney, 1976) pp. 148-161; and Karmel, "The Educational System", (1977).

Chapter 6

Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on
the Commonwealth's Responsibilities in Relation to Education.
(The Walker Report). 1944

The establishment of the Walker Committee in 1943 by the Curtin Labor Government provided the support necessary for the large-scale entry by the Commonwealth into the sphere of education, particularly at the post-school level. As was shown in Chapter 2, the Commonwealth had been involved in education since World War I. In the Tertiary sector, its interests were varied, although mostly directed to the territories, and to technical and/or vocational education. Its interest increased sharply with the advent of World War II, and proposals for educational involvement through post-War reconstruction plans. Initially, the Commonwealth used its wartime powers to ensure an adequate supply of skilled labour as an entrance point into wider educational involvement. An Inter-Departmental Committee on Universities was established in September, 1942, with representation from the Departments of War Organisation of Industry, Labour and National Service, the Treasury, and the Director-General of Man Power to review policy with relation to the universities, particularly for 1943. In its brief was a requirement to recommend on a financial assistance scheme to students and on a sum required to fund it.¹ The establishment of the I.D.C. had resulted from a minute from J.J. Dedman proposing the establishment of a Universities Commission.² The Committee recommended that there should be a Commonwealth policy toward the universities, noting that it was already involved with them, and on the establishment of the Financial Assistance Scheme for university students. The report was accepted by the Production Executive of the Cabinet in late October 1942, and the formation of the Universities Commission announced in early November.³ The decision attracted immediate criticism, which foreshadowed the debate which was to continue from then on around formal Commonwealth involvement in education. Dedman was forced to issue a statement denying interference in university affairs; "I should like to make it very clear that there is in our proposals no suggestions of Government control over

universities, nor of interference in their internal affairs."⁴ Officially, the Commission was to administer the Financial Assistance Scheme, and to advise both the Government and the universities on the war effort. At the beginning of 1943, it advised that quota should apply to a number of university courses. The government issued an order under the National Security Regulations to the universities. While these were applied by the universities, they were the subject of an immediate challenge in the High Court, which ruled in May, 1943, that the Commonwealth had no power to legislate in the field of education.⁵

The legal and constitutional threat to the Curtin Government's plans to involve the Commonwealth in education on a continuing basis provided the necessary fillip to institutionalise this involvement. The Government's proposals to increase the presence of the Commonwealth in education in the post-War period was a response to two sets of pressures which had been brought to bear on it. These were concerns for the reconstruction of the economy, especially in rapid industrial modernisation, and the interests of its own supporters in promoting a more equitable distribution of the nation's wealth. Implicit in the second factor was the assumption that better educational qualifications would provide the means to social justice. Dedman, in particular, was concerned that the High Court ruling would prevent the development of an education system which would be able to respond to the national interest and to individual demands for more accessibility.

In October, 1943, following discussion with Curtin and some other Ministers, Dedman established the Inter-Departmental Committee on Education. It was to be chaired by E.R. Walker, Deputy-Director of the Department of War Organisation of Industry, and its membership was comprised of Sir David Rivett (C.S.I.R.), Professor R.C. Mills (Chairman, Universities Commission), E.P. Eltham (Director of Industrial Training, Department of Labour and National Service), J.H. Cumpston

(Director-General of Health), R.B. Madgwick (Director of Army Education), H.C. Coombs (Director of Post-War Reconstruction), and later included G.P.N. Watt (Treasury). The intention of the Government to establish and maintain a permanent Commonwealth presence in education activities was confirmed by the Committee's terms of reference, which were: to review the Commonwealth's responsibilities in the field of education, past, present and future, for the information of the government; to propose machinery to assist the Commonwealth government in the discharge of these responsibilities during and after the war. The I.D.C., which Tannock described as "anonymous",⁶ was not officially approved by the Production Executive until November, 1943, after it had met twice. It was endorsed, and Ministers were specifically directed that no publicity be given to the Committee, and that it be treated as a confidential matter.⁷ The membership of the Committee had been constituted to enable it to draw on relevant material without the need for public discussion, a decision no doubt arrived at in view of the criticism which had greeted the establishment of the Universities Commission a year earlier.

Meetings of the Committee

The Committee began its deliberations immediately.⁸ At its first meeting on 29 October 1943 it decided to undertake a review of the Commonwealth's role in education. It also had before it a proposal from Walker for the establishment of a Commonwealth Council of Education, with representation from those Commonwealth bodies with responsibilities in the area. It was agreed that Walker's proposal should be presented as a working draft. There was no disagreement with the principle of permanent machinery. At its second meeting on 31 October, the Committee considered the second of its two most important topics, that of the constitutional responsibility for education. This question had been the subject of a

challenge earlier in 1943, when the High Court ruled against Commonwealth legislative competence. Dedman indicated to the Committee that a report on the issue would be welcome,⁹ and the Committee decided to prepare one immediately. Three proposals were canvassed; complete Commonwealth control, partial Commonwealth control, or the status quo. In both the first two cases Constitutional amendment would have been necessary, and even in the third the Committee saw the need for permanent Commonwealth machinery. With remarkable speed, the Interim Report on the Question of Constitutional Amendment was prepared and presented to Dedman, who presented it to the Production Executive, along with the Minute of endorsement of establishment of the Committee, on 11 November.

In the Interim Report, the Committee considered the Commonwealth's role in education and the desirability of extending it. It noted the pressures on the Government to extend its educational activities in the post-War period, including the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and the Australian Teachers Federation, the National Union of Australian University Students and sections of the A.L.P.¹⁰ The Report recommended that the Commonwealth seek complete legislative power in relation to education:

we desire to record our view that the Commonwealth's inescapable responsibilities within the field of education could be most readily met, if the Commonwealth secured complete legislative powers.¹¹

It suggested that without legislative power

The development of educational activities considered necessary by the Commonwealth for the discharge of its Constitutional functions might at any time be limited by judicial interpretation of the Constitution.¹²

The Committee suggested that without a Constitutional amendment, the Commonwealth would be forced to rely on "grants in aid and action incidental to its various powers and functions",¹³ subject to these judicial constraints, and that while this did not mean that the

Commonwealth had no educational responsibilities, these difficulties "should be foreseen and removed, if an appropriate amendment of the constitution can be secured".¹⁴

The Interim Report was circulated as a confidential document to Ministers following its endorsement by the Production Executive.¹⁵ The recommendations of the Interim Report were clearly in line with the thinking of senior members of the Government. Not only had the Committee's terms of reference made clear the Government's intention to lock the Commonwealth into a permanent education presence, but the statements of Ministers also provided parameters within which the Committee was able to work that were broader than may have otherwise been acceptable.¹⁶ The Interim Report itself cited Curtin's statement that the Government was "giving very serious consideration to the whole problem including the question whether the Commonwealth should not exercise some more direct responsibility in respect of education."¹⁷ Dedman's accompanying memorandum to the Production Executive stressed that the view that education was purely a States' matter was a misconception, and that the Commonwealth had explicit functions which could not be discharged without some educational provision.¹⁸ He strongly supported the Committee's recommendation on the desirability of a Constitutional amendment (a position he already supported).

The Committee met for the third time on 22 November. Discussion regarding the establishment of permanent machinery centred on the proposed review which the Department of War Organisation of Industry was compiling from information collected from other Commonwealth departments. It was clear from discussions on other matters on the agenda that the Government was taking for granted that permanent machinery would be recommended. Walker informed the Committee that Curtin had referred to it a request from the Australian Council for Educational Research for continuing Commonwealth support for its

activities, and that his department was to obtain advice on educational matters from the Committee. Walker believed that this indicated the Government's acceptance of the need for centralised advice on education.

I think the promptness with which the Government has begun to use the Committee indicates a definite need for some central Commonwealth educational authority...¹⁹

It was clear by this stage in the Committee's existence that its course had been charted, and that its recommendations would be used by the Government to justify its policies for educational expansion in the post-War period.

The Committee did not meet for the fourth time until 10 March 1944. At this meeting the Committee had further items for discussion which had been referred to it by the Government. Both items pointed to possible avenues by which the Commonwealth would expand its responsibility in the education field: the establishment of a national university in Canberra, and the question of the Commonwealth's responsibilities for education through commitments to international treaties and agreements. More substantially, however, was an element of disagreement with some of the proposals Walker had made for a Council of Education. Three alternative structures were suggested, but the meeting remained inconclusive. By the time of the fifth meeting on 13 April, the disagreement had developed into opposition to formal Commonwealth machinery. Eltham reported that the Secretary of the Department of Labour and National Service, Roland Wilson, was opposed to centralised control of education, proposing instead that the I.D.C. be retained for the purpose of advising the Commonwealth. Wilson also suggested that the whole issue be left until after the proposed Constitutional referendum which aimed at securing temporary but wide-ranging reconstruction powers, as it was likely to be a sensitive issue among the States. Other members of the Committee agreed that the issue was sensitive, and Coombs suggested that rather than put off any decision, the Committee propose a conference between the

Commonwealth and the States to explain the purpose of the plans.²⁰ Rivett suggested a compromise which would have made it clear that the Committee did not believe a radical reorganisation for education could be effected given existing constraints, but that if education were to be seen as a national issue substantial revision of current structures would be necessary. The meeting remained inconclusive.²¹

The issue dominated the discussion at all subsequent meetings of the Committee. At the sixth meeting on 5 May, following some discussion on which fields were most appropriate for strong Commonwealth involvement in the post-War period, Coombs suggested what was to become the solution to the problem. In his plan, the Commonwealth would request membership of the Australian Education Council, and offer to provide a secretariat for it on the national level, which could then develop into a central authority. No opposition was forthcoming, and although no decision was made, the Committee spent some time discussing possible tactics vis-a-vis the States and possible areas of participation for the new authority. Over the next two meetings of 6 June and 4 August, submissions from a number of the Committee were discussed at some length.²² The suggestions made in them ranged from the formalisation of the I.D.C. to a three member Education Commission. Finally, however, the Committee returned to Coombs' proposal which had been enlarged to provide an Office of Education servicing both the Australian Education Council and a Commonwealth Standing Committee on Education, as well as providing a research facility in education. At its meeting on 4 August, the Committee accepted Coombs' proposal in principle, with a decision to recommend that an approach be made to the States requesting Commonwealth membership of the Australian Education Council.

During these meetings, the Committee was also concerned with a number of issues which had been referred to it by the Government. In particular, the establishment of a national university was discussed, and

C.S. Daly, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, joined the Committee for this. The future of the Commonwealth's role in adult education was also extensively discussed. Madgwick prepared a paper with Dr. W.G.K. Duncan who was investigating the issue for the Universities Commission,²³ and Coombs was particularly in favour of a strong Commonwealth presence in the area. There had been some pressure on the Government, including from the Australian Education Council, and the Australian Services Education Council (representing the armed forces which ran extensive educational programmes during the War), to continue and develop the wartime system, and hand it over to the States in the post-War period.

The last meeting of the Walker Committee was held on 8 September. Walker had prepared and circulated a discussion paper prior to the meeting, which outlined the proposals to be contained in the Report.²⁴ The Committee agreed on the final recommendations for the Report, covering the establishment and role of a Commonwealth Office of Education, consultative machinery with the States, the future of the Universities Commission, and the establishment of a national university. Walker was directed to prepare the final Report, circulate it to members of the Committee, and then forward it to Dedman for presentation to the Production Executive.

The Report

The Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Education paved the way for the Government to justify its expansion into educational provision in the face of opposition from the States and other parties. Given the Committee's terms of reference and the expressed views of members of the Government, the Report held no major surprises, and the disagreement and opposition which had been expressed during some Committee meetings were nowhere apparent in it. The Report noted the

Commonwealth's extensive involvement in education, and its implications early on.

The Committee has been impressed by the extent and wide range of the Commonwealth's action in this field, which stand in marked contrast to the common view that, because of the absence of any express Commonwealth power to legislate on education, the provision of education is purely a matter for the States.²⁵

Thus it was able to draw together two main threads in the Report, which had the support of those interests within the bourgeoisie that recognised the importance of education in the processes of post-War society. While the Commonwealth may not have had a directly constitutional basis for education provision, the Report recognised that the move into the area stemmed from other legitimate Commonwealth activities. Commonwealth operations took three forms; first, through grants to the States for specific educational services; second, through direct grants to educational authorities and/or institutions; and third, through direct Commonwealth activity such as scholarships, other financial assistance, and education services for the territories and the armed forces.

The Committee had already committed itself to supporting Constitutional change in its (confidential) Interim Report. Direct Commonwealth involvement, as distinct from the Commonwealth support already noted, was identified as the training of officials, defence, health, research, rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the educational work of the A.B.C. and the Commonwealth Literary Fund. The Report suggested that the Commonwealth had been forced to take action in these areas where the educational facilities of the States were inadequate for the purposes required, or where the activities were properly Commonwealth functions, or where until the Commonwealth entered the field no such facility existed. Three main causes of these difficulties were identified. First, the unequal financial strength of the States. Second, the unequal priorities of the States in relation to educational

development. Third, the fact that the States should not be expected to contribute toward those areas properly the concern of the Commonwealth.²⁶ According to the Report, the Commonwealth had acted under consistent principles rather than any single plan in the development of its educational activities. These principles were important as they helped explain the extent of existing policies, and provided reasonable guidelines for the future. They were the use in the first place of the educational facilities of the States, the establishment of Commonwealth facilities only when the States were unable or unwilling to provide them, full inter-governmental consultations on the establishment of Commonwealth facilities or the funding of new facilities in the States. The Committee made an important statement on the principle of Commonwealth involvement in education which provided a rationale for its activities in the post-War period. The sentiments expressed in it were to be echoed strongly in the Murray and Martin Reports, and it was one of the major contributions of the Walker Report to the development of tertiary education in Australia for the following thirty five years.

Certain educational developments may be considered necessary from a national point of view, while not falling within the sphere of direct Commonwealth interest. Here the responsibility rests with the States. But if, owing to inequality of financial resources as between States, or owing to the unwillingness of any State to take a broad view of the nation's educational needs, some States lag behind the others to the point of slowing the progress of the whole Federation, and perhaps imperilling the future of the nation, it is proper for the Commonwealth to initiate discussion with the States, with a view to securing agreement to raise the general level of educational services, and to considering whether this will involve Commonwealth assistance. Similar initiative by the Commonwealth may also be necessary in the case of certain educational services that are basic for particular industrial developments, since the Commonwealth is in a better position than the States to determine the major lines of industrial development in the light of international political and economic conditions and the Commonwealth's own responsibilities for tariffs and bounties.²⁷

The statement illustrated the strength of those fractions and alliances

of the bourgeoisie linked with centralisation in promoting their interests through the medium of a 'neutral' committee of experts. While its language paid some attention to States' rights, it was scant indeed when compared with references to 'the progress of the Federation' and the national interest.

The Report suggested that there were a number of areas of concern to the Commonwealth in the future. These were the de-mobilisation of armed forces personnel, industrial development, rural industries, scientific education and the training of research workers, health, adult education, and policies for the promotion of equality of educational opportunity. The Committee was throwing down the gauntlet to the States to accept Commonwealth involvement in education in the 'national interest'. The Committee was particularly concerned that the War had found Australia lacking in skilled workers which had seriously affected the War effort, and which could, if continued, limit the extent of post-War reconstruction.

The development of war industries was hampered by the lack of sufficient trained workers, and the availability of workers with appropriate skills may be a limiting factor in all post war industrial development.²⁸

While the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme would be of some assistance, "it does not remove the need for a still broader approach to the problem of laying the educational foundations for future industrial developments,"²⁹ an approach which played an important role in future inquiries into the development of tertiary education. It extended the notion of the national interest to embrace the Commonwealth's obligations under international agreements and treaties, drawing particular attention to Australia's acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture. These agreements bound contracting nations to the strengthening, expansion and development of rural and agricultural education. The Report maintained that

It would appear essential for the Commonwealth to maintain a continuous review of developments in other countries in the field of agricultural education (as well as research and farming practice) and to assist the State Governments and other organisations such as Universities to keep abreast with the methods of Australia's competitors.³⁰

The provision of education at all levels for all sectors of the population was an A.L.P. and Government policy, and the Report addressed itself to questions of adult education, and equality of educational opportunity. The Government had come under some pressure during 1943 and 1944 in relation to these two topics and had referred them to the Committee. The Report noted the request of the States that the wartime system of adult education be handed over to them in the post-War period, with Commonwealth assistance, and the importance which the Government had attached to the issue. The discussion in the Report showed a tension between education for industrial requirements, and education for democracy and citizenship, a tension which is evident in much of the debate in Australian educational development reflecting the necessity within the hegemonic process to accommodate differing bourgeois and (to a lesser extent) working class interests.

The Report identified equality of educational opportunity as one of those issues in which the Commonwealth would be vitally interested in the future. It noted that there were two main causes of inequality in education; inequality of income, and inequality in the range of available facilities. Both the Commonwealth and the States had established schemes to alleviate the problem. The States provided limited numbers of bursaries and scholarships, while the Commonwealth had offset inequality to some extent with the provision of child endowment, and to a lesser extent, through financial assistance under the Industrial Training Scheme and to university students. The Committee supported these schemes as well as suggesting that increases in educational facilities were required. It pointed to the Government's interest in the matter.

the provision of allowances to children will not overcome the unequal provision of an appropriate range of educational facilities in different parts of Australia. The provision of additional schools of various types where required, and of transport and suitable accommodation for pupils is a State responsibility, but in view of the unequal resources and interests of the States, a greater approach to equality of opportunity may require Commonwealth initiative and assistance.³¹

Once again the Commonwealth was serving notice on the States. The dominant sections of the bourgeoisie were not prepared to see Australian economic development retarded through either lack of a skilled work-force or political instability which might conceivably accompany thwarting the educational and social aspirations of an affluent working class. The tone of the Report established the pattern for at least the rhetoric of future education reports and the political importance of the issue.

The Committee considered that in view of the factors presented, the Commonwealth could no assume that the States could or would act properly with respect to their Constitutional responsibility for education.

The foregoing review of the Commonwealth's past and present educational activities and future responsibilities leads to the inescapable conclusion that, although legislation on education is a matter for the States, the Commonwealth has a definite interest in and responsibility for certain educational developments, and should not assume that this responsibility can reasonably be left to the States alone.³²

It recommended that the Commonwealth establish "permanent machinery for the development and execution of Commonwealth education policy,"³³ with executive functions, and advisory and co-ordinating powers. The executive machinery should be of two types, the first based in the department concerned with the particular operation, and the second involved the establishment of a permanent body to oversee Commonwealth involvement in education. The first already existed. The Report recommended the establishment of an authority concerned with adult education, and because of the increasing interest of the Commonwealth in the universities, the conversion of the Universities Commission from a

temporary wartime body to a permanent statutory authority. In this context it also recommended that a national university be established in Canberra.

In relation to the advisory and co-ordinating machinery, the Report recommended the establishment of a Commonwealth Office of Education, and a Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Education. The latter was to comprise both independent experts and senior public servants. The former was to service this Committee, provide a secretariat for inter-governmental discussions, maintain statistical and other information, and generally serve as a focal point for the review and coordination of all Commonwealth activities in education. In addition, it recommended that the Premiers be invited to establish a Joint Committee for Educational Development with the Commonwealth, and to allow the Commonwealth to become a full member of the Australian Education Council.

Reactions to Report

While the recommendations of the Walker Committee had been to invite the Premiers to discuss Commonwealth membership of the Australian Education Council, and the establishment of a Joint Advisory Committee, Dedman's minute of transmission and the subsequent Cabinet decision made no mention of prior discussions with the States. Consideration of the Report had taken some time to reach Cabinet. It had been sent to Dedman on 31 October 1944. Dedman had presented the Report to Cabinet on 10 January 1945, where it was deferred. The recommendations were not approved until 2 July 1945, on a memo from Dedman dated 28 June. Cabinet approved

that the Commonwealth should immediately set up a Commonwealth Office of Education to Assist in effectively meeting the Commonwealth's own educational responsibilities, and, further, should offer to join the Australian Education Council and to collaborate with the States in developing educational facilities in relation to the needs of the nation.³⁴

Nevertheless, over the next four years, the Government implemented the major recommendations of the Report. The Commonwealth Office of Education was established and the Universities Commission set up on a permanent basis. Steps were taken to establish the Australian National University. As a result of the Committee's confidential Interim Report, the 'benefits to students' clause was added to the Constitution in the 1946 referendum, giving the Commonwealth a direct educational power. While the Commonwealth did not join the Australian Educational Council, nor establish the Joint Advisory Committee on Education with the States, it became heavily involved with secondary, technical and university education through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme, which had lasting effects on the expectations of the States and the universities in relation to Commonwealth financial assistance. The Financial Assistance Scheme for university students was converted to the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme which remained in force until the creation of the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme by the Whitlam Labor Government in 1973, and which influenced the expectations of individuals that Commonwealth funding of tertiary education was permanent. In addition, at the time of its defeat, the Government had moved to establish a Commonwealth Ministry of Education.³⁵

The Walker Committee played an important role in the development of tertiary education in the post-War period. Its Report justified the centralising policies of a Government committed to rapid industrial development, and decreasing inequalities in Australian society through an expansion of educational facilities which was seen as contributing to ensuring working class consent. The aspirations of the working class had been raised during the War, and if those elements of the bourgeoisie which were promoting industrial growth and centralisation were to be successful, post-War political stability was essential. The Walker

Committee was an important factor in warning the States (and those less progressive members of the bourgeoisie) that a brake on development would not be allowed. Walker recalled in 1969.

Perhaps our main contribution was to arouse a wider recognition in the Federal Government circles that education was of basic importance in relation to various responsibilities of the Commonwealth. The Committee's activities were not altogether welcome in some quarters, but by bringing together officials who, in their respective spheres, were concerned with such Commonwealth activities (and the Treasury) we at least helped combat the traditional view that 'education is purely a matter for the States'.³⁶

The sentiments expressed by Dedman in his memorandum to the Production Executive which approved the establishment of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Education where he suggested that conditional Commonwealth grants to the States for additional educational services "places the Commonwealth in a strong position to influence and co-ordinate to the extent desired, the future educational policy of the State Governments",³⁷ were given authority from outside the political sphere by the Committee's Report.

The Education debate in the Commonwealth Parliament in 1945 gave the Government the opportunity to release the findings of the I.D.C. to support their position on future educational involvement, and many of their ideas were supported by Menzies as Leader of the Opposition.³⁸ The bipartisan nature of support for education reflected the dominance of the centralising alliance of the bourgeoisie. By 1946, Dedman was openly confronting the States, in the terms of the Report.

The Commonwealth recognises that education is a State responsibility and does not wish in any way to interfere with the States in this field. The Commonwealth, however, has been forced to a realisation that education is also of the greatest national importance, and, on this account, it feels that it must accept some responsibility...for assisting the States as far as is possible in their developmental activities...even in peacetime the Commonwealth found it necessary for the discharge of its other responsibilities to perform important educational activities.³⁹

The Constitutional referendum of 1946 was successful, and the political

climate looked favourable for the continuation and development of the Commonwealth's involvement in education, particularly at the tertiary level. Undoubtedly, the influence of the Committee was far greater than has been acknowledged by most educational commentators, and the arguments employed in its Report were to become an important justification for the development of tertiary education in the post-War period.⁴⁰

FOOTNOTES

1. Decision No. 137, Production Executive, 24/9/42 in Papers of the Interdepartmental Committee on Education, Australian Archives, A1361, 1/17/17.
2. Minutes to Production Executive from J.J. Dedman, 21/9/42, in A1361, 1/17/17.
3. Decision No. 157, Production Executive, 29/10/42, in A1361, 1/17/17.
4. J.J. Dedman, Press Statement, 5/11/42, in A1361, 1/17/17.
5. See, P.D. Tannock and I.K.F. Birch, "Defining the Limits of Commonwealth Education Power: the Drummond Case, the Federal Government and the Universities", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1973, (Melbourne, 1973).
6. P.D. Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, (Nedlands, 1975), p. 4.
7. Decision No. 396, Production Executive, 11/11/43, in papers of Professor R.C. Mills on the Interdepartmental Committee on Commonwealth Education Activities, Australian Archives, A2473(1).
8. The Minutes of the meetings of the Committee are contained in papers of the Interdepartmental Committee on Education, Australian Archives, SP433/3. Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, pp. 8-22, summarises their contents.
9. Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, p. 10.
10. Interdepartmental Committee on Education (E.R. Walker, Chairman) Interim Report on the Question of Commonwealth Constitutional Amendment, in ibid. p. 54. Although the Interim Report and the Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Commonwealth's Responsibilities in Relation to Education are contained in various archival files held in the Australian Archives and the National Library of Australia, they have been reprinted in Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, pp. 53-56 and pp. 91-116 respectively. I have referred to these as they are far more accessible to the reader. Here-in-after they are cited as Interim Report and Walker Report with page numbers referring to the Tannock reprint.
11. Interim Report, p. 55.
12. ibid., p. 55.
13. ibid., p. 55.
14. ibid., p. 56.
15. Production Executive Minute, 11/11/43, in A2473(1).
16. Even so, the political volatility of the issue ensured that the Committee's deliberations continued on a confidential and no-publicity basis.
17. Interim Report, p. 54.

18. J.J. Dedman, "For Production Executive: Coordination of Commonwealth Activities in the Field of Education", in Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, p. 32. The memorandum is in A2473(1), and was presented to the Production Executive 11/11/43.
19. E.R. Walker, Minutes of the Interdepartmental Committee on Education, 22/11/43 in SP433/3. Also cited in Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, p. 11.
20. Such a procedure may well have been successful, for less than ten years earlier (1936) the States had argued that technical education was a national issue and should receive recurrent financial assistance from the Commonwealth at a conference between the States and the Commonwealth. See above Chapter 2, p. [34].
21. Nevertheless, the Committee agreed to continue on this course, and various members undertook to redraft certain sections of a draft report presented to the meeting. Some sections of the draft met with definite approval. See Minutes, 13/4/44, in SP433/3, and Draft Report in A2473.
22. These submissions are included as Section 2 in Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, pp. 39-47.
23. See ibid., Section 6, pp. 75-87.
24. See ibid., Section 2, pp. 48-50.
25. Walker Report, p. 98.
26. ibid., pp. 101-102.
27. ibid., p. 103.
28. ibid., p. 104.
29. ibid., p. 104.
30. ibid., p. 105.
31. ibid., p. 111.
32. ibid., p. 112.
33. ibid., p. 112.
34. Cabinet Minutes, 2 July 1945, p. 4 in Vol. IIIA, Folders of Cabinet Minutes, p. 68, Australian Archives, A2703/XM.
35. Tannock, The Government of Education in Australia, p. 21.
36. E.R. Walker, correspondence with P.D. Tannock, 24 February, 1969, in ibid., p. 22.
37. J.J. Dedman, "For Production Executive", in ibid., p. 35. Also in A2473(1).
38. See above Chapter 3 for an outline of the debate.

39. J.J. Dedman, speech, Goulbourn, 3/4/46, p. 3, in Dedman Papers, Box 9, National Library of Australia, MS987/8/1-79, p. 23.
40. One final issue was referred to members of the Committee in 1945. In July, the Holy Cross Fathers of Notre Dame, Indiana U.S.A. requested land at a peppercorn lease in Canberra for the establishment of a National Catholic University. Dedman referred it to the Committee for advice, and the Minister for the Interior, Senator Collings, replied non-committally, with the promise of a more substantial reply later. In November, it was noted that no reply had been sent. In December, Madgwick wrote on the file: "At this stage it mt(sic) perhaps be as well to put the file away!" The relevant papers are in A1361 1/17/6.

Chapter 7

Committee on Australian Universities.

(The Murray Committee). 1957

The establishment of the Murray Committee in 1956 has been generally considered a watershed in the development of tertiary education in Australia, at least as far as the universities were concerned. For them, it appeared to be the culmination of a serious crisis which had been affecting Australian tertiary education from at least the beginning of World War II. The War had illustrated the glaring deficiencies which existed in the universities, and the Commonwealth had been forced to consolidate its presence in tertiary education. The Walker Committee had been the vehicle for setting the conditions for a permanent and formal Commonwealth presence. Both the Labor Government and the emerging Liberal Opposition had strongly supported the recommendations of that Committee, and it appeared that the alliance of the industrially based, centralist bourgeoisie and the working class would ensure that growth in tertiary education would continue in the foreseeable future. However, political conditions had changed in the late 1940s, especially at the time of the bank nationalisation campaign, and the alliance had been seriously weakened. The election of a conservative government in 1949 saw the end of Labor plans to create a Federal Ministry of Education, and extend schemes such as the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme in ways appropriate to peacetime to ensure that tertiary education, and the universities in particular, played a role more relevant to a modern industrial capitalist society.

The Menzies Liberal-Country Party Government backed off Commonwealth involvement after its election, although the problems facing the universities and the pressures exerted by them, the States and public opinion meant that the Government was unable to ignore the issue completely. The Chifley Labor Government had established a committee chaired by Professor R.C. Mills, Chairman of the Universities Commission, before its defeat, to enquire into the needs of the universities. The Mills Committee reported in 1950. It recommended that the Commonwealth

offer the States special grants for university general expenditure totalling £753,000 for 1950-51, and of £803,00 for 1951-52. Funding was to be supplementary to States' funding, and was to be conditional on a £1 for £2, Commonwealth to State allocation. In addition, the Report recommended that the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme cease from 30 June 1950, along with special Commonwealth grants for research and research training.¹ The Government extended the Committee's terms of reference, and in its final report it recommended a continuing scheme of Commonwealth funding assistance (though not formalised) based on a £1 for £3 subsidy by the Commonwealth of State funds up to a stipulated ceiling.² While this scheme continued as the basis for Commonwealth funding until the adoption of the Murray recommendations, it was not without its critics. In 1951, the A.V.C.C. released a document outlining the major problems facing the universities in the future, and the inadequacy of the Government's current policies to tackle them.³ Continued criticism met with little response from the Government, faced as it was with a crisis of legitimacy, until over five years later when it announced the establishment of the Committee on Australian Universities with Sir Keith Murray as its chairman.

The inadequacies in funding for universities were exacerbated and amplified by an extraordinary demand for university places as ex-servicemen and women began to seek tertiary qualifications forgone during the War. Most university administrators and educational authorities saw this as a temporary phenomenon even when numbers did not decline at a rate comparable with the fall-off in this category of students. (This was, in fact, an artificial fall-off, since the recommendations of the Mills Report had wound up the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme in 1950). Student numbers grew from a 1931 rate of 146 per 1000 (17 to 22 year olds) to 433 per 1000 in 1955.⁴ In addition, population predictions suggested that there would

be a rapid increase in the numbers of 17 to 22 year olds in the population over the decade following 1955 that would result in a continuing demand for university places even without the trend for increased participation.⁵

The Commonwealth's retreat from a more permanent involvement in tertiary education, which was based in the changed political climate in 1949 to 1951, was only partial. The bourgeois alliance aimed at industrialisation and centralisation remained dominant, and the Government's plans for continued economic development were similar to those of the Labor Government which had preceded it. The demands of such a strategy ensured that the Commonwealth would have to overcome the shortfalls in State policies, or even over-ride them if they hindered development, thus forcing increased Commonwealth involvement. The success of the campaign to remove the Labor Party from government and maintain the dominance of a revitalised conservative political alliance, had an effect on the political climate which had to be overcome. The Government's strategy was to appoint the Murray Committee. The major role of the Committee was to provide legitimacy for a change in the Government's rhetoric. The Mills Report and the paper of the A.V.C.C. had already established the needs of the universities. As Lindsay pointed out,

the major role of the Murray Committee was to ensure that the greatly increased Commonwealth participation necessary for the upgrading and expansion of university education would be seen to be desirable, appropriate, and in accord with the due process.⁶

The Report of the Committee certainly provided that legitimation. It introduced a number of new principles in tertiary education, the most important of which were the concept of triennial funding, and the notion of a permanent Commonwealth presence. While the Report came to be considered in an almost doctrinal manner, its reception was somewhat cooler. There was general recognition that the recommendation of

emergency grants and permanent funding mechanisms was an admonition of the neglect of the universities, rather than a plan for their balanced development, which could only come after the faults and deficiencies in them had been overcome.⁷ Spann considered that the Report was bland and naive in its supposition that maximum autonomy and the output of 'brain power' in the national interest were totally compatible. He went on.

One of the many English characteristics of this report is the belief that by piously listing all the desiderata of a good society, and a good university, and asking everyone to pull his, or her weight in some direction, one can have the best of all possible worlds.⁸

This description of some of the major qualities of the Report illustrated the hegemonic functions that it played. The tension between compatible educational goals were disguised in an ambivalent rhetoric which was not supported by the types of recommendations made. For all its rhetoric with regard to liberal educational ideals, the final recommendations of the Report were more concerned with economic development and the role of vocational education in it.⁹ As one commentator succinctly noted, "Capitalism's urgent requirements from the universities emerge clearly from the Report."¹⁰ An examination of the processes of the Committee and its Report reveals the urgency of its contribution to the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony.

The Murray Committee was appointed by Menzies in December 1956. It comprised the Chairman, Sir Keith Murray, who was Chairman of the British University Grants Committee, Sir Charles Morris, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds, Sir Ian Clunies Ross, Chairman of the C.S.I.R.O., Mr. A.J. Reid, Chancellor, University of Western Australia and a member of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and Mr. J.C. Richards, Assistant Manager of B.H.P. As Spann noted at the time, "It was the kind of committee a government appoints when it wants to do something, not put off doing something."¹¹ Although the Committee was appointed in

December 1956, it did not meet until 2 July 1957. It was obvious that the Committee by that time had a grasp of the problems confronting it and in the week of its first meeting it plunged into a series of meetings with universities and educational authorities. The Committee held its final meeting in late August 1957.¹² During this period, the Committee pursued an extensive programme of discussions with the universities, staff associations, students and other interested bodies. The Committee's terms of reference implied the importance of the universities to development, particularly to technological progress, and the demands for an extension of the university system to cope with increased numbers. They read:

The Committee is invited to indicate ways in which the Universities might be organised so as to ensure that their long-term pattern of development is in the best interests of the nation, and in particular to inquire into such matters as:-

- (1) the role of the University in Australian community;
- (2) the extension and coordination of University facilities;
- (3) technological education at University level; and
- (4) the financial needs of Universities and appropriate means of providing for these needs.¹³

The terms of reference were situated within a specific context by the Prime Minister in his letter accompanying them.

We would hope that the Committee would take a wide charter to investigate how best the Universities may serve Australia at a time of great social and economic development within the nation.¹⁴

The hegemonic nature of the instructions suggested the type of report that the Government wanted to see, one which would justify actions it proposed to take in the face of public and political pressures, and which may have been seen to be contrary to those policies it had promoted during the early 1950s as it attempted to maintain its position.

The Workings of the Committee

At its first meeting on 2 July, the Committee discussed the broad thrusts which might make up the main emphases of its Report.¹⁵ While

discussion was general, Richards stated his express interest in technological development and the role that the universities could play in its promotion. The meeting was attended by Sir Allen Brown of the Prime Minister's Department, who explained that the Government wanted a broad sketch rather than a detailed plan, which paid some attention to but which was not dominated by financial factors. He did, however, acknowledge that a permanent Commonwealth body was necessary to safeguard the universities in the conflicts which would arise between Commonwealth funding and State control and responsibility for them. Brown also expressed a personal opinion on behalf of the A.N.U. supporting its opposition to a merger with the Canberra University College, which would, because of its lack of diversity, smallness and teaching demands, distract the University from its research effort. This issue was raised the following day at a meeting between the Committee and the A.N.U., with the university showing some reluctance to be tied down on it.

At that meeting, Coombs (who had been a member of the Walker Committee) strongly resisted suggestions that the Commonwealth should accept total responsibility for the universities, alleging it would lead to undesirable uniformity within the system. Nevertheless, one senior academic, Professor J.W. Davidson, suggested that increased student numbers, especially at undergraduate level, would lead to falling standards. This theme was addressed at the meeting between the Committee and the A.V.C.C. on 4 July, at which strong support was voiced for the creation of a permanent Commonwealth grants body, similar to that operating in the United Kingdom. In addition, the A.V.C.C. supported Murray's suggestion that the university system should be expanded, both in numbers of institutions and in student numbers. There was very little support for the notion of American style community colleges, or of alternative tertiary level institutions other than universities. Murray also stated that he believed that the staff-student ratio needed to be

halved. Richards suggested that high failure rates were a result of unrealistic standards being set. Some members of the A.V.C.C. cautioned about equating high failure rates with wastage, supporting the notion that the former did not necessarily mean that students were lost, or that their time at university was wasted. The tone of the meeting was one of general optimism and support for a rapid and substantial expansion of the university system.

The Committee met on 5 July to review the week's meetings. Murray tentatively suggested the establishment of an Australian Universities Commission, comprising a chairman, five academic members who were not to be representatives of the universities, and two or three lay members. The Committee agreed that there was a need for such a body, and agreed to pursue the matter further. It was also decided that the Committee would have to recommend emergency grants to the universities. There was also agreement at the meeting that the A.N.U. should not be expanded, until it had reduced its isolation from the Canberra University College and the State universities. There was a general rejection of the A.N.U. argument that closer links would reduce its ability to conduct first-rate research. Clunies Ross linked this type of argument with the issue of failure rates, which was of major concern to the Committee, arguing that they were less related to matriculation standards as had been suggested strongly to the Committee, than to quality of teaching which suffered because of research biases of university staff. At this meeting, the Committee also received an opinion on constitutional and legal problems which might possibly face the Commonwealth Government if it supported universities financially. The Commonwealth Solicitor-General, Professor K. Bailey, identified four issues: Section 96 and the 1955 Roads Tax ruling assured the Commonwealth's right to grant; an investigative brief to determine university needs was more doubtful but possible; the States would need to agree to formal co-ordinating machinery; and, while

legislation was not necessary to establish a co-ordinating body, it would be desirable especially since grants would have to be legislated.

During the next week, the Committee held a series of meetings in Sydney. In most of these, the views expressed to it were conservative, and in some cases short-sighted, although the universities in particular supported an expansion of the existing system with Commonwealth backing. There was a general lack of support for experimentation or change, and a prevailing attitude of more of the same. The views expressed by the Sydney Association of University Teachers on 11 July were a marked contrast, however. Wheelwright strongly promoted the case for regarding the universities as a national responsibility which should be financed totally by a responsible Commonwealth government. He suggested that such a course could be achieved through the use of Section 96 grants, a view supported by Butlin who saw no reason why a Commonwealth government could not make direct grants to the universities. The Committee also met with the Director of the Commonwealth Office of Educational M.J. Weeden, and his deputy, J.J. Pratt. Weeden told them that the Commonwealth was making long-term decisions on the basis of 1950 emergency programmes but that a more permanent arrangement would have difficulties, not least the suspicion in the States of Commonwealth moves to increase its participation. He also suggested the failure rates issue needed investigation because figures he had showed that 1939 open entrants had the same failure rates as 1946 rigorously selected students. (These figures were supported by an A.C.E.R. Survey, CAU/FAIL RATE/1). He also suggested the establishment of new institutions for those not selected for university entrance.

At its review meeting on 12 July, the Committee was critical of the universities, particularly the University of Sydney, for their conservatism. Murray suggested that there was a need for a permanent body which would not only make grants, but also stimulate policy in the

universities, while at the same time protecting them from political pressures. It became clear during the meeting that the Committee saw that the bargaining power which a commission would derive from its granting functions would be an important factor in its successful influence of the universities in their development. Reid suggested that, unless the Commonwealth was prepared to take over total responsibility for university funding, grants would have to be tied to States' funding levels. Without this tie there was a strong suspicion that at least some of the States would channel money away from the universities.

Further meetings between the Committee and interested parties canvassed many of the same issues that were raised in the meetings of the first two weeks, and the views of the Committee were consolidated during their review meetings which followed each series. On the 16 July, the Committee discussed at some length the issue of coordinating machinery. Reid proposed a commission of three - one university and two lay members - with a supporting sub-commission in each State. Murray rejected this as burdensome, and pressed his earlier proposal. He gave more details of his ideas for membership, and it became clear that he favoured a semi-representative body, consisting of a full-time chairman, three lay members, one of whom would be an educationist, and five academics, one each representing Arts, Social Science, Science, Technology, and Medicine. He also proposed that the Commission should make triennial recommendations to allow the universities to plan with more certainty than had been the case throughout their history in Australia. Murray's proposal was to be that adopted by the Committee, and further discussion of it was on matters of detail and powers, rather than on the issue itself. The major area to do with the coordination issue which needed resolution following acceptance of Murray's proposal was the financial functions of the commission, and how this was to link with the proposals which the Committee itself might make in relation to the immediate

problems of funding facing the universities. (The Committee also discussed a draft report outline and workload proposals at this meeting.)

On 17 July, the Committee met with representatives of the Universities Commission. The major topic of discussion concerned high failure rates. The Universities Commission consensus appeared to be that the high rates were not the result of incapable students but of courses that were too severe, overcrowding and underprovision, and poor teaching. Within the universities there had been little attempt to break the pattern by innovation such as the introduction of tutorials, and the problem within the sector as a whole required increased facilities and the establishment of new universities. (The optimum size of a university was seen to be 8000 - the size of Melbourne.) The Committee questioned the Commission on its administration of the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, and while members of the latter supported increased living allowances, they believed that the Government would not pay them. Weeden continued this criticism of the Government by illustrating its lack of support for postgraduate awards. In 1955 the Universities Commission had prepared a postgraduate scheme only to have it rejected by the Government on economic grounds. The Government wanted the numbers of undergraduate scholarships cut to balance the cost of the new scheme. One postgraduate award was costed at six undergraduate scholarships which meant the introduction of 100 of the former would reduce the latter from 3000 to 2400 annually at a time of increasing demand. The Vice-Chancellors, not surprisingly, had refused to accept this and the postgraduate scheme had lapsed.

The Committee held a review meeting on 23 July. It agreed that "prompt action" was required to combat the urgent needs of the universities for staff and buildings. The members agreed that they would recommend a Commonwealth operation to "prime the pump" by injecting £4 million per annum for capital expenditure and a £1 for £1 subsidy for

recurrent expenditure over a period of three to five years. They recognised that a greater State expenditure would be required if the universities were to receive the full benefit of these measures. They agreed that it was necessary for the Commonwealth to institute emergency aid and to complement it by the establishment of a permanent long-term body.

At the meeting of 8 August, it was decided that the emergency financial assistance should be provided on two levels, per capita and needs, so that all universities could plan on expansion from a more equitable position.¹⁶ The Committee recognised that it would be politically unacceptable to restrict the expansion especially given widespread support for allowing all who matriculated entry, even at the expense of high failure rates. It was also decided to recommend a further improvement of the conditions of funding subsidy to overcome the problem of financially embarrassing the States. The new level was to be a £2 for £1 instead of a £1 for £1 subsidy as had been decided two weeks earlier. The new amount was a considerable improvement on the £1 for £3 subsidy in operation from the 1950 measures. Reid also suggested that the Committee's Report should note the differences in ethos between university entrance in Australia and the U.K. pointing out the less restrictive nature of the former. However, he was critical of government policies in Australia.

If, he said, the policies of the State Governments to provide tuition for all who wish to go to a University is accepted, then it is up to the Australian Governments to provide sufficient and adequate facilities.¹⁷

On the financial side, the Committee also decided to recommend at the meeting of 29 July that the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme be expanded, and that it also embrace postgraduate students, even in the light of the Government's attitude to the Universities Commission plan.

The Committee addressed the question of the nature of universities a

number of times in the course of its meetings. The traditional nature of the ideas of the Committee were evident, although there was some impatience expressed with the even more conservative views of a great many of the people with whom it met. Nevertheless, the Committee demonstrated its reluctance to take a progressive position on the nature of the universities with its decisions for the development of new institutions. At its meeting on 29 July the Committee agreed that a new university was needed in Victoria with a technical bias, but that it should be traditionally organised to prevent the emergence of another institution like the New South Wales University of Technology. This issue was discussed again at the meeting of 5 August. In particular, the Committee rejected proposals from the Royal Melbourne Technical College (R.M.T.C.) to become a University of Technology. The University of Melbourne had already made its opposition to this course of action known to the Committee. It was agreed that an arrangement between the University and R.M.T.C. similar to that between the University of Adelaide and the S.A. School of Mines would be unsatisfactory because of the distance between the two. The R.M.T.C. had also been questioned at length at the meeting earlier that day, where it was obvious that the scheme was beyond the scope of the College, which had eventually admitted it saw itself limited to awarding only degrees in technology. Nevertheless, the R.M.T.C. had already approached the University of London with a proposal to teach external degrees awarded there in an effort to circumvent any adverse developments in Australia. The Committee's views on this issue were to be translated into a specific recommendation regarding the latter institution which was to be cited as an example of short-sightedness in Australian educational planning by many commentators during succeeding years.

Submissions to the Committee

The Committee received 145 written submissions. It also met with a number of individuals and organisations which had not submitted in writing. Most of the submissions were from the universities or those connected with them. There were, however, a number of submissions from industry and commerce which illustrated the perceived importance of the universities to industrial development and economic growth. Submissions were also received from government departments. This section will look at what might be termed the academic submissions, and then turn to the others.

Submissions from the universities were all very similar in content and contained virtually no direct philosophical discussion. Instead, they assumed an acceptance of traditional ideas about the universities - not unrealistically given the composition of the Committee. For all intents and purposes, they were pleading documents. Without exception they outlined the physical and financial strictures which faced them, and went on to paint a grim future in the event of expected increases in student and societal demand for higher education. Each of the universities predicted student number increases of 100 - 120 per cent over the next five years and estimated that massive boosts in both recurrent and capital expenditure would be required to cope with them. They pointed to the problem of research inadequacies and the high student failure rate as evidence of existing neglect by governments of the universities, and suggested that these problems could only be exacerbated without emergency assistance. The pleading nature of the submissions resulted in an implicit utilitarianism in them which produced a tension with the traditional assumptions which they made. This tension was that which had been identified by many commentators between the two goals which liberal education attempted to reconcile. All in all, however, the universities' submissions were not aimed at long-term solutions but at

redressing the imbalances which had developed. Their aim, in the words of the University of Queensland, was directed at obtaining "a fair and reasonable grant from the Committee".¹⁸

The one area in which short-term necessity and long-term planning coincided in the submissions was that of Commonwealth funding. The universities were united in their support of increased and permanent Commonwealth financing. Most of the universities assumed that such an outcome was a formality and only a few included details of any proposed commission. The University of Western Australia wanted a body independent of the Commonwealth Office of Education. The University of Melbourne envisaged a national advisory committee with both financial and co-ordinating powers. The N.S.W. University of Technology suggested a large body with wide-ranging membership drawn from the universities, the States, industry, the Commonwealth Office of Education, and the Treasury. The University of Sydney opposed any form of coordination which did not recognise the primacy of the universities as co-ordinators of academic life, and argued that a grants commission should give untied and direct grants to the universities. While it recognised the constitutional problems which might arise, it suggested that a recalcitrant State could nullify the effects of increases in Commonwealth funding if grants were made via the States.¹⁹

The most detailed submission on co-ordinating machinery was made by the A.N.U. in a paper entitled "A Permanent Universities Commission in Australia". It argued for the establishment of a Universities Commission which would deal with the universities as a national system with due regard for States' rights and the increasing responsibilities of the Commonwealth. The Commission would have investigatory and advisory powers, as well as operating as a grants commission. To overcome the problems of bias, its membership would be restricted, with a Chairman appointed after consultation with the States and the A.V.C.C., one member

appointed from a short list submitted by the A.V.C.C., and one member from a list nominated by the Academy of Science, the Social Science Research Council, and the Humanities Research Council. The A.N.U., of course, wanted its special position in the Australian university system recognised by the Commission, and was prepared to work with such a body on that condition.²⁰

The submissions from the universities were all supportive of that of the A.V.C.C. The Vice-Chancellors presented a detailed case for an expansion of the university system. The submission was an extension of the case which the A.V.C.C. had first publicly announced in its 1952 document on the crisis facing the universities. It argued that the universities were unable to plan for a long-term future given the difficulties with which they were faced, and stated "that only a national plan in which the Commonwealth plays an important part can enable the universities to prepare for the future".²¹ It linked the physical situation of the universities - the inadequacies of the staff/student ratio, income, buildings and equipment - with the problems of high failure rates, low teaching standards, and lack of research. It suggested that the States were overburdened and that any increases in funding would need to be Commonwealth based, but that such increase would have to be tied to ensure that the States did not reduce their funding accordingly. It sought an increase in the rate of Commonwealth subsidy beyond the £1 or £3 rate, and for direct capital grants. It strongly argued, however, that increased Commonwealth participation should not mean increased control over the universities and sought an assurance from the Commonwealth that university autonomy would be maintained. The A.V.C.C. opposed a role for the Treasury in the review process, and proposed the establishment of a permanent grants commission, not solely as a Commonwealth instrumentality but with the nominal support of the States.²²

This series of submissions also addressed themselves to some other issues which were related to the problems faced by the universities in the future. In particular, two stood out as areas for concern, and both were presented in the submissions in a utilitarian manner. The first concerned the role of the universities in technical and technological education. There was agreement that the universities had played the major role in this area, and that they had provided a well-balanced and adequate education. In most cases there was reluctance to suggest increasing the technical components of university courses, except in the submission from the N.S.W. University of Technology. There was general agreement that the universities would be well-equipped to carry out this function with increased funding. There was also a feeling that the role of the universities in technical education had not been appreciated, especially in industry where there were contradictions between expectations and support. The University of Melbourne suggested that

industry must accept the responsibility for training the graduate in practical on-the-job knowledge, a task which it is sometimes reluctant to accept.²³

The other area was that of student financing. Almost all the university submissions and that of the A.V.C.C., listed this as a critical issue, as the development of Australia depended on a ready supply of skilled workers, many of whom would be university graduates. In many cases the issue was linked with that of increased funding for technological education. The submissions proposed that increases in the number and level of Commonwealth Scholarships, and the introduction of a national postgraduate scholarship scheme were urgently needed. The Universities Commission, which administered the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, supported the introduction of a postgraduate award scheme, and proposed that one hundred be offered each year for distribution by the A.V.C.C., with a living allowance of £500 for Masters and £650 for Ph.D.²⁴

Finally, this group of submissions recognised the need for the

establishment of new universities to complement the expansion of those already in existence. There was, understandably, support for the existing organisational model, and for the type of curricula and emphases provided in the established universities. The A.N.U. and the Canberra University College both sought the establishment of a full university in Canberra, although the former was adamant that it did not want to be distracted by an amalgamation with the latter and consequently undergraduate teaching. The A.V.C.C. suggested that the need for new universities was indisputable, and insisted that there would have to be carefully planned and coordinated development to ensure that the existing universities were not disadvantaged by a thin spread of funds and fields.²⁵ There were a number of other submissions that supported an expansion of the university system, some with specific proposals. Five submissions dealt with the establishment of a university in the Riverina. A number supported upgrading the Newcastle University College into a full university, and others supported the establishment of another Melbourne or Victorian University. In particular, the Victorian Teachers Union proposed the establishment of a University of Technology in Victoria in preference to a traditional structure, and with entrance based on technical school rather than H.S.C.²⁶

The Committee also received submissions from university staff associations, individual staff members and student organisations. To a large extent, the submissions of the staff associations were concerned with industrial issues, such as salaries and superannuation, and study leave, or were letters of support for the submission of the Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia (F.C.U.S.A.A.). This submission, like that of the A.V.C.C., was a wide-ranging review of university conditions. Its philosophy was a balance between conservatism and pragmatism, but was less elitist than that in university submissions. It supported the expansion of universities and the system,

not only from a utilitarian position, but also from a point of view of social justice. It countered the elitist argument which was raised in some submissions to the Committee which attempted to lay the blame for high student failure rates with the inadequacies of the students. Rather than stating that many students should not be attending universities, F.C.U.S.A.A. argued that

the converse truth is more important: there are many persons who should receive the benefit of a university education but who are disbarred from it by economic circumstances.²⁷

The submission promoted the expansion of the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme and the introduction of a postgraduate awards scheme, as well as maintaining the provision of part-time and external courses. It supported the establishment of technological universities where they were complemented by a traditional university. The submission suggested that most of the problems facing the universities were financial and reflected the lack of support they had received from governments in the past. The Commonwealth was accused of 'ad hocery' in its support. The F.C.U.S.A.A. pressed for joint Commonwealth-State arrangements (only because of the Constitutional problems which might arise from total Commonwealth control of the universities) for recurrent funding and total Commonwealth responsibility for capital works. It recommended the establishment of a University Grants Committee, comprising a full-time academic chairman, and four part-time members with university experience or connections, to determine the financial needs of the universities and recommend grants.²⁸

Two submissions from university staff associations stood out from the others, in that they presented arguments to the Committee on issues wider than industrial and/or parochial matters. The N.S.W. University of Technology Staff Association made two proposals with far-reaching potential. The first argued for the removal of student numbers from the funding formula or at the very least to include other factors in it. The

second was for decentralisation. The Association envisaged a system of branch universities based in local schools or technical colleges which could be used as study and teaching centres.²⁹ The submission of the Sydney Association of University Teachers was a more radical document, one of the authors of which was Wheelwright. It presented an explicit philosophy at odds with the conservative implicit philosophies of other submissions. It recognised the dynamic nature of society and proposed that independent universities were essential for the health of its development. As such it did not promote the notion of the traditional university, but instead promoted the idea of an integrated teaching and research programme across the academic, professional and technological areas to ensure that the advantages of university education would be diffused widely. It suggested that support should be given to junior colleges linked to the universities, and strongly supported increases in research funding without linking it to specific proposals. Similarly, it supported the coordination of the university system, but argued that it should be non-restrictive and aimed at promoting diversity. It argued that the Commonwealth must take full responsibility for funding the university, since the States had shown neither the capacity nor the inclination to even fund primary education to an adequate level, and recommended the establishment of a university grants commission without tied grants.³⁰

The submissions of student groups to the Committee covered much the same ground as those of other academic submissions. All of those from the Students Representative Councils of each university dealt with inadequate teaching standards, overcrowding, and the need for extending the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme.³¹ The National Union of Australian University Students presented a more wide-ranging submission. It expressed concern over possibilities for increased political control of the universities and a concomitant reduction and in their autonomy,

suggesting that this issue should be addressed by the Committee, and some form of protection for the universities recommended. There was support in the submission for a continuation and extension of liberal education rather than increasing specialist education in the universities. Strong support was voiced for increased Commonwealth funding of all areas in the universities, especially student financing. The N.U.A.U.S. also recommended the establishment of a grants committee, representative of the universities, the Treasury, the Commonwealth Office of Education, but divorced from the A.V.C.C.³²

The Committee also received submissions from academics and educational authorities on the issue of technical and technological education, in addition to those from the universities, staff associations and students. The Australian Academy of Science, in its submission, suggested that the universities were not coping with the task of science and technological education because of a lack of resources, and that expenditure in this area, at least, must be increased. It pointed out that a severe manpower shortage existed in these areas, which would not be solved in the foreseeable future. The submission was critical of the universities for not encouraging more students to enter these areas, and suggested the establishment of junior colleges and the provision of additional postgraduate training facilities. It also recommended the establishment of a national universities grants commission.³³ The Education Department of Victoria argued that the shortage of skilled manpower in the sciences and technologies could only be overcome by the establishment in Victoria of a University of Technology, since the "sufficient development to meet the full requirements of industry and expansion of community services is not likely in a traditional university".³⁴ R.M.T.C. made a similar submission arguing that a University of Technology should be based on it. As noted earlier, the college was making alternative plans to have its courses given university

status, in applying to the University of London to have its courses registered for external degrees there on the completion of one year's extra work, as opposed to two extra years as at the University of Melbourne.³⁵ The S.A. School of Mines (now the S.A. Institute of Technology) outlined its joint degree programme in applied science with the University of Adelaide, and proposed that this might become the model for future developments in technical and technological education. It did not propose to become an independent university, preferring to retain its associate status with the University, but recommended that it be funded on the same basis as the universities. In doing so, it was suggesting a radical departure from the existing funding responsibilities for higher education.³⁶ A submission from Professor E.C.R. Spooner, Dean of the Faculty of Technology at the University of Adelaide, went a step further with this plan, suggesting that the School of Mines become a College of Technology, affiliated with the University, and including the Faculty of Engineering at the University. The other functions of the School would then be hived off into technical schools and colleges.³⁷ The N.S.W. Department of Technical Education presented a submission which proposed a similar division, but based on independent and upgraded technical colleges. It suggested in a discussion of manpower planning and shortages of skilled labour, that shortages should not only be seen in the sciences and technologies, but across the board, and in quality as well as quantity. Existing methods of measurement had proved unreliable, especially as they were broken down over six States, and the Department believed that coordinated planning on a national basis was required. Because the universities were already overloaded, and because their essential functions were the production and maintenance of knowledge through research and scholarship, the submission suggested that vocationally oriented courses should be located in upgraded technical colleges. In a series of recommendations which proved to be too radical

for acceptance by the Committee, and indeed for the Martin Committee which recommended the establishment of the advanced education system to overcome some of the problems identified in this submission, the Department suggested that: increased skilled trades and technical education in technical colleges should complement the education of university graduates; more service teaching of first year university courses should be carried out in technical colleges; high level technologists should be trained in technical colleges and Commonwealth Scholarships should be made available to them; university numbers should be restricted, and numbers in the technical colleges should be increased markedly to provide higher education to all those with ability; university standards should rise and research should become the primary function of the universities; the traditional functions of the universities should be recognised by removing student numbers from the funding formula, academic freedom should be preserved, and grants should be untied.³⁸

The submission of the N.S.W. Department of Technical Education was isolated in its proposal that the university system be restricted and expansion take place on another level. In the area of teacher training the Committee received submissions that suggested that all teacher training should be moved into the universities, with the teachers colleges becoming either affiliated colleges or the faculties of education in the universities.³⁹ Other academic submissions were received from State Departments of Education. The Department of Public Instruction, Queensland, refuted suggestions that the standard of students was falling, pointing out that the wastage rate in terms of participation was high, indicating that large numbers of students were not proceeding to university. It argued for increased facilities and more Commonwealth scholarships to overcome these problems.⁴⁰ This submission was supported by the Director-General of Education, New South

Wales, Dr. H.S. Wyndham, later to be a member of the Martin Committee. He also refuted the suggestion that standards were falling, pointing out that the universities themselves controlled entrance requirements. He estimated that, although about 16 per cent of the age group were capable of university study, only 7.5 per cent matriculated, and only 4.4 per cent entered university. He continued that the universities were, by this criterion, enrolling far too few students, and should be expanded to cater for those scholastically able to attend.⁴¹

The Committee also received a large number of submissions from 'non-academic' sources. These fall into two sub-sets: those from government departments; and, those from industry, commerce, and professional associations. Submissions from the States were unanimous in encouraging the Commonwealth to enter the funding field for the universities, even though they were perceived to be within a State area of constitutional responsibility. The submissions varied in their insistence that the Commonwealth accept funding responsibility without control. The Tasmanian Government submission supported the traditional role of the universities, using this as an argument that they formed a national system, and should therefore be funded by the Commonwealth. The Tasmanian Government was already funding the University of Tasmania at a high level because of its compulsory school leaving age of 16, which meant that more teachers were required.⁴² These arguments were supported in a submission from the Tasmanian Treasury, which was concerned with the limited ability of the State to fund increased demands in higher education, especially given its position as a claimant State. It noted the record of the Tasmanian Government to fund the university at a rate consistently higher than that required to attract Commonwealth subsidies. It recommended the establishment of a university grants committee, with the major funding coming from the Commonwealth leaving the States free to divert some of the resources currently used in the

universities in other areas.⁴³ The submission from the Western Australian Treasury was in a similar vein. Western Australia was a claimant State as well, and had consistently funded its university at high levels, especially since it charged no fees. It argued for increased Commonwealth funding to release State funds for other projects.⁴⁴ The Queensland Treasury submission also called for increased Commonwealth funding, although it reversed the argument put by the claimant States that they could not afford to continue paying for higher education, suggested that the non-claimant States were in fact disadvantaged because of increased Commonwealth assistance to the claimants.⁴⁵ The submissions of the South Australian Treasury, and the Victorian Treasury, both pressed for increased Commonwealth funding, but strictly through the States, and not directly to the universities. The South Australian submission supported the existing formula for Commonwealth subsidy, and the Victorian submission wanted an assurance that Commonwealth funding would not be offset by decreased funding in other areas.⁴⁶ All the submissions asserted that each State had the highest rate of funding in Australia! None of them suggested that the Commonwealth should not become involved in the funding of the university system for constitutional reasons, an issue which had consistently been to the fore in the discussions of the Walker Committee, and had been an important topic of discussion during the meetings of the Murray Committee.

The submissions from industry, commerce and professional associations were varied, and related to some extent to the rate of economic development in their areas of interest. All were concerned with technical and technological education, but the solutions proposed to the problems of shortages differed between those groups representing manufacturing industry, mining, and primary industry, and also between the States. The uneven economic development which characterised these sectors was apparent. There was general support for increased

Commonwealth funding, although the notion of increased Commonwealth control was resisted. In addition, there was evident support for the view that education was a public matter and, as such, should be government funded with a decreasing burden applying to industry. In line with this was concern that universities were not producing graduates to the specifications of employers. On the whole these submissions did not see education as an end in itself, but as a means to an end, which therefore necessitated the direction of limited resources to areas of national priority such as science and technology. There was some support for the establishment of a system of technological universities, foreshadowing the stronger support which would emerge during the Martin Inquiry. However, most support continued to be for a general expansion of university facilities with quite explicit demands for the traditional universities to be heavily involved in technological education. This was less a measure of support for them as institutions than it was a recognition of the functions they had in society. The submission from the S.A. Chamber of Manufacturers suggested that management consultants should be used to assess the efficiency of the universities, and vocational guidance tests should determine the suitability of university students as a means of lessening the high failure rates.⁴⁷ The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, while supporting the role of the traditional universities in technological education, suggested that education at universities should be for those who would reach senior positions in industry and/or research positions in industry and the universities, and that other technological staff should be trained in other higher technical institutions.⁴⁸ The Australian Primary Producers' Union wanted the establishment of a system of junior colleges, similar to the U.S. land grant colleges, to act as feeder institutions into the sciences and technologies in the universities.⁴⁹ While most of the submissions were concerned with expanding the ability of the

universities to undertake high level technological education, which included proposals to redirect resources away from other areas in them, most of the submissions opposed the political control of the universities and supported the notion of autonomy, and of academic freedom. Once again, there was recognition of the role which the universities played in society which demanded a measure of autonomy if it were to be successful, but which had to be pursued within parameters set by the needs of economic growth and development.⁵⁰

The submissions from industry and commerce also covered many of the issues raised in the academic submissions. There was support for increases in the numbers of Commonwealth Scholarships and for the introduction of a postgraduate awards scheme. The demands of academic staff for improved conditions were supported, as were demands for better facilities. In all submissions there was strong support for a substantial increase in Commonwealth funding to the universities and for the idea of coordination of a national system of universities. Some submissions explicitly proposed the establishment of a university grants committee. The similarity in the proposals and demands of the academic and industrial submissions gave the Committee an indication of the level of support which increased Commonwealth participation had, and of the importance with which universities were perceived. The economic and political conditions of the preceding decade demanded an increased provision of education at all levels for both economic development and political stability. The training provided by the universities for economic and hegemonic purposes had become all too clear to the bourgeoisie, as was evidenced by the wide-ranging support which proposals for their expansion received along with support for their traditional role and functions.

The Report

The central problem facing the universities in the decade after the end of World War II was demand outstripping supply. This problem had a number of different levels. First, there was the immediate logistical problem of housing and teaching large numbers of students. This facet was the most obvious and it was exacerbated by the attitude of the Commonwealth after the change of government in 1949. As was apparent in the submissions to the Committee, and in earlier documents such as the Mills Report and the A.V.C.C. document of 1952, it was this which had been presented as the crisis facing the universities. The problem went somewhat deeper. The universities were faced with a crisis of legitimacy, similar to that confronting the government, and indeed the political system in the immediate post-War period. The second level of the problem was presented in terms of the public functions of universities, and centred on the debate between specific, vocational, technical and technological education, and a more general, liberal education. This debate, in reality, related to the role the universities played in the hegemonic process. The rapid social and economic changes which were confronting society in this period ensured that a vigorous debate would occur on how best the universities could develop from their traditional, seemingly remote positions to more acceptable positions while retaining their role in the hegemonic process.

The report of the Committee, of course, was concerned with the public presentation of the crisis facing the universities, and concentrated on the immediate issues, and the debate on educational emphases. The Report was to promote the case for expansion and the notion of a liberal education. Its language was consensus based and optimistic. It concentrated much of its analysis on student demand, which it read in terms of individual aspiration and in terms of the national interest. Student demand was translated into financial demand

by the universities and the continuing rapid increase in student numbers following World War II, which did not abate even when the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme was wound up, illustrated the most obvious areas of financial inadequacies. It pointed out the lack of facilities for teaching and research both at the undergraduate and postgraduate level. It showed the serious understaffing problem which had led to a considerable lack of staff morale. In fact, the average staff/student ration in Australia of 1:10 compared unfavourably with the British average of 1:7.⁵¹ Inadequate provision was made for part-time students who made up a large proportion of Australian university enrolments - in 1956, 64 per cent of students at New England and 36 per cent at Queensland were externally enrolled, and there was a high proportion of part-time enrolments at all universities.⁵² This factor impressed the Committee, and continued until by 1963, 45 per cent of all enrolments were part-time or external.⁵³

One of the most crucial indicators of the inadequacies was the high student 'wastage' rate, termed by the Committee as "a national extravagance".⁵⁴ In 1951, an average of 61 per cent of entrants passed their first year exams, while only 35 per cent graduated in the minimum time. The number of students who graduated or were expected to graduate ranged from 50 per cent in science to 67 per cent in medicine and dentistry.⁵⁵ The Committee was extremely concerned by these figures; not only was the high failure rate impairing the efficiency of the universities and inconveniencing successful students,

it also seriously diminishes the national resources of trained university graduates by causing at least one year's service in the working lives of a very large number, and by excluding a further number from completing their training at all.⁵⁶

Although the Committee believed that the principle cause of the problem was financial it outlined a number of more immediate reasons for the situation. These were the gap between school and university, the

preparation of students at high schools, the pressure of curricula, teaching methods, and the lack of student health and guidance services.⁵⁷ Compounding the problem of high failure rates, according to the Report, was the weakness of honours and postgraduate schools in most Australian universities (the one exception being the A.N.U.).

The recommendations of the Committee were made in the light of two sets of more general factors. These concerned the role of universities in society and the general characteristics of the Australian situation, and formed the subject of the first two chapters of the Report. It was this section of the Report that underpinned the ideological considerations of the Committee, and identified the functions of the universities as institutions within the hegemonic processes. While the universities had undergone many superficial changes in the course of their historical development, the Committee sought to base its judgements "in the light of what is of unchangeable value in their work and nature",⁵⁸ and noted that the mid-twentieth century universities had become prized and supported institutions by governments and public alike, both of which "have become aware that the national community of our age cannot flourish without good universities".⁵⁹ The Committee suggested that the universities had two major functions - teaching and research. The first, while recognising the need of the society for skilled manpower and highly educated graduates, also recognised the function of education in transmitting value systems: "It is the function of the university to offer not merely a technical or specialist training but a full and true education, befitting a free man and the citizen of a free country".⁶⁰ The second also extended the simple concept of direct application of research to a more mystified concept. While the Report recognised that research could be carried out in a variety of ways and in a variety of institutions, it asserted that "there is one kind of research which is in general best done in universities".⁶¹ It noted that historically

Advances in knowledge have come because free inquirers have been pursuing their own ideas and insights, devotedly and with great persistence, in pursuit of enlightenment for its own sake. These men have no immediate practical aim or profit in view; they are simple "knowledge-intoxicated" men who love the life of intellectual effort and inquiry for its own sake, and will devote their lives to it if they possibly can.⁶²

The Committee saw two important consequences arising from this for the university and society - the continuing discovery of knowledge and the exposure of students to advanced and dedicated scholars.

The Committee then drew a distinction between these functions of universities and the most important role that they play in modern society. The universities are, or should be

the guardians of intellectual standards, and intellectual integrity in the community. Scholars and scientists who spend their lives in the search for knowledge should, at least in their own spheres of inquiry, be proof against the waves of emotion and prejudice which make the ordinary man, and public opinion, subject from time to time to illusion and deceit.⁶³

The Report allowed the protection which this offered a very wide brief to include national "self-delusion" and "deceit by other nations", interesting terms considering the hysteria which had been officially fomented regarding the communist threat in the United States and Australia in the period immediately preceding the Committee's investigation. The right and expectation of the society to have the truth made known had been conveniently forgotten during this time along with the rights of those people within the universities who had been subject to attack. The Committee's statements were the first major attempt in Australia to justify the remote nature of the universities from the general population by ascribing to them tasks which were beyond those normally experienced by the general public and giving to them a mystique which elevated them above the capacities of 'ordinary' men in determining truth as opposed to searching for knowledge.

The second set of factors which influenced the Committee were the general characteristics of the Australian situation. This essentially

took note of three areas - the economic background, the educational background, and the state of public opinion. The Committee commented extensively on the demographic distribution of the country, the growth of the industry - of which it said, "Expansion is taken as the natural order of things and it is expected to continue"⁶⁴ - Australia's new international responsibilities, and the need for graduates, particularly in the areas of teaching, science and technology, where it foresaw the need for at least 90 per cent more graduates within five years of the Report.⁶⁵ It described at some length the differences between the States in primary and secondary education and suggested that the problem "of wastage of talent at the secondary school level, due to early leaving... merits close attention".⁶⁶ It surveyed but did not comment on the conditions of non-university tertiary education, as well as university development where it foreshadowed the problems with which it would deal later in the Report. Finally, in this section, the Committee addressed the state of public opinion. Here it voiced concern that public acceptance of the universities and the recognition of their problems fell far behind that in the United Kingdom or the United States. "Indeed, they are not as sensitive in this matter as might have been expected".⁶⁷ This was a matter of considerable concern for the universities could only perform their role in the hegemonic process if they were accepted in the society as a valuable, and indeed, necessary institution. It was, however, hardly surprising that, after years of neglect in Australia, and given the political instability which characterised the crisis of legitimacy which had been evident in Australia in the post-War period, there was some ambivalence toward them, a state of affairs that had been the driving force behind the establishment of the Murray Committee. The legitimization of the universities was an important part of the process to ensure the legitimization of bourgeois dominance in Australian society during this

period. The Committee noted that, while the Australian public still had the impression that a modern society needed only a few highly educated and skilled people, instead of recognising that it required increasing numbers of them, there had been recent indications of change, especially in relation to the sciences and technologies and the role that the universities had in high-level training in these areas. Nevertheless, the Committee continued to have reservations on the extent of public support noting that "this has been expressed by the development of Government agencies such as C.S.I.R.O., rather than by the participation of private industry in research and development".⁶⁸ Given these general factors, and the more immediate and apparent problems caused by inadequate financing, the Report proposed some firm courses of action.

The Committee's main recommendation was the establishment of an Australian University Grants Committee, similar to the British body of which Sir Keith Murray was also chairman. The Committee saw the problems of the universities not only in terms of lack of financial resources but also in terms of lack of coordinated development of those resources available.

it appears to us that the day is past when planning of university development can be left entirely to individual institutions or confined within the boundaries of one State. We consider, therefore, that the time is now ripe for a permanent Australian University Grants Committee. We believe that it would foster that continuing discussion within universities and between universities which is essential for their good health.⁶⁹

The Committee was to comprise a full-time chairman "with personal experience in university affairs", seven part-time members, five of whom would be academics "competent to consider university problems on a broad basis but also to provide particular knowledge throughout the many fields of university interest", and two lay members "from the professions or industry".⁷⁰ Included in the recommendation were also substantial guidelines for the operations of the new Committee and its constitutional

position. At least initially, it was proposed that it be an informal yet high powered body operating as a constituent part of the Department of the Prime Minister - and so be independent from the Commonwealth Office of Education - to advise "the Commonwealth Government on the needs of the universities for Commonwealth funds, both recurrent and capital".⁷¹ This was recognised as being a major departure from established practice, and indeed treading on delicate grounds, as education was seen as being a State responsibility under the Constitution,⁷² with the general exception of the Territories. In the case of the Australian Capital Territory the Committee recommended that the Grants Committee have responsibility for advising the Government on the needs of a new Australian National University to be formed by the merger of the A.N.U. and the Canberra University College.⁷³

The recommendations for the financial, planning and development role of the new Committee also introduced the concept of triennial planning. The concept was restricted to recommendations regarding recurrent grants, which were also to be non-specific. The Committee saw that

indication of longer term provisional levels of grants would be an immense benefit to the universities, and would undoubtedly lead to more effective planning than is possible on a one-year basis. To carry out this task more frequently than every three years would reduce the universities' sense of responsibility, would interfere too often with their day to day work, would impose excessive demands on the time of the members of the Committee, and would deprive the universities of the undoubted advantages of planning on a longer term basis.⁷⁴

On the other hand, capital grants were to be specific and annual. Two reasons were given for the distinction.

The sums involved in such capital grants are usually of considerable magnitude and the consequent results, in terms of increased recurrent financial needs, are so great that it is not unreasonable that the Commonwealth should give more specific attention to the use of capital funds than it would desire to do in the division of the university's recurrent block grant. Again, a university's priorities in its building programme tend to undergo change from time to time, and the relative needs among the universities may also vary frequently.⁷⁵

Apart from these two major areas of financial responsibility, the new Committee was to have a role in advising on salaries, staffing patterns, superannuation, fees, new institutions, specialisation, and the like. The Report again stressed the delicate nature of its recommendation in regard to Constitutional responsibility for education.

It would have to be recognised that all such problems would have to be worked out by the Committee in consultation with the universities and State authorities, since the success or failure of the system will depend on the degree of confidence which the Committee builds up and on a continuous effort to minimize areas of disagreement by the closest collaboration on as informal a basis as possible. We feel confident that a competent Committee, given an adequate measure of responsibility, can establish itself in a way that will prove its advice to be acceptable to the Commonwealth, the States and the universities; all have much to gain from its existence.⁷⁶

The recommendations of the Committee to establish a Grants Committee and outline a new set of guidelines for Commonwealth financial support for areas of State Constitutional responsibility, were aimed at providing the universities with the support required for major development while at the same time giving them a degree of autonomy within which to acquire a more accepted status and thus legitimacy in the eyes of the general public, from whom they had been remote in the past.

The Committee recognised that the acceptance of the recommendations and the subsequent setting-up period that would be required was likely to delay the urgent reforms in university funding it deemed necessary immediately. As a result, it spent a considerable part of the Report recommending an interim, emergency programme for the years 1958, 1959 and 1960, by which time it was assumed the Australian University Grants Committee would be operating. The immediate programme suggested the major deficiencies of the universities were a shortage of staff, a lack of accommodation, and a lack of equipment. In addition, the financial crisis in which they had found themselves in the preceding years had resulted in inadequate salary levels for staff, lack of development of honours and postgraduate schools, and that policies to overcome the

relative isolation of Australian universities - study leave, conference leave, and exchange visits between institutions - had not been implemented.⁷⁷ The programme was divided into two parts - capital needs and recurrent requirements. During the course of the inquiry, the Committee had asked the State universities to estimate the amount of additional recurrent funds they would require to continue their existing teaching and research programmes at an efficient level, the amount required for the development of new programmes over the following decade, and the amount required to cope adequately with the expected increase in enrolments in that period. The total estimates were about £3 million and £4 million respectively in the first two categories. The replies to the third category were unable to be reconciled, but the Committee estimated that by 1967 about £8 million or £9 million per annum would be required. Estimates for capital funds totalled over £25 million with a further £4 million for subsequent equipment costs. The needs of the new A.N.U. totalled about a further £5 million.⁷⁸

In the programme recommended by the Committee, changes were suggested to both the Commonwealth and the States in the procedures for granting of capital funds, providing for an annual unrevisable allocation, with authorised dates of commencement for projects to allow the processing of funds as required. The universities were also advised to plan capital projects in stages to prevent funds from being totally tied up in one project at the expense of other urgent demands.⁷⁹ The Committee then recommended building programmes totalling £12,445,000 for the State universities over three years, to which it was recommended the Commonwealth offer assistance to the States at a rate of £1 for £1 except for Western Australia and Tasmania where the subsidy was to be 25s. for £1. In addition, the Committee recommended that the Commonwealth contribute about £1 million for equipment. Almost £2 million was recommended for capital works at the Australian National University. The

maximum Commonwealth liability for capital funds over the three years would have been £9,387,000 or £3,129,000 per annum.⁸⁰

The recommended programme for recurrent funds paid considerable attention to correcting the deficiencies to which the Committee had drawn attention earlier in the Report. The Committee recognised three categories of need for the expenditure of extra recurrent funds.

- (a) to meet the increase in the cost of existing commitments, such as increments in current salary scales, the costs of running new buildings which are already under construction and which come into use in the near future, and other such inevitable increases;
- (b) to meet the increase in cost occasioned by the rising numbers of students who wish to have a university education; and
- (c) to start to remedy some of the most serious deficiencies resulting from the under-financing which has occurred in recent years.⁸¹

The Committee recommended that the Commonwealth's share of university expenditure be increased by 10 per cent per annum above the ceiling which had operated for the preceding four years to provide for categories (a) and (b). This would have meant a total payment over the three years of about £8.5 million to the State universities, and about £5 million to the A.N.U. - a total of £13.5 million.⁸² The estimates contained in the recommendation had two reservations attached. The first assumed no substantial rise in inflation over the period, and the second did not take into account the salary rises to which the Committee had already lent support. The latter in itself - of £500 per annum for professors with appropriate increases for other staff - would have added a further £750,000 to the universities expenses each year, £187,000 of which would be Commonwealth funded.⁸³ Category (c) - dealing with the serious deficiencies resulting from under-financing - was the subject of a special recommendation in the Report. The Committee did not see the States as being able to remedy the situation by themselves, given the already increased demands the other recommendations in the Report, if accepted, would place on their resources, and so recommended additional unspecified Commonwealth grants to the universities to help them overcome

the situation. These grants totalled an additional £4.5 million over the triennium - £1 million in 1958, £1.5 million in 1959 and £2 million in 1960.⁸⁴ The Committee noted,

We recognize that these financial proposals will make new and, at first sight, heavy calls on Commonwealth finances, but we would emphasize that much of the recurrent increase would have occurred in the normal course of events, that some £1 million, rising to £2 million of the increase is an emergency measure, and that the introduction of capital grants is a development which we consider to be absolutely essential if the Commonwealth hopes to find a national policy for the universities and to obtain university graduates in the numbers and of the calibre required for national needs.⁸⁵

The thrust of the Committee's major recommendations was designed to enhance the development of a national system of highly regarded universities, with the ability to provide for the educational, in addition to training, needs of an advanced industrial society. The differential recommendations, both in regard to the States, and in regard to the emergency and long-term programmes, were designed to serve notice to the States and the universities that a modernising process was being set in train which the Commonwealth would ensure would continue and succeed. The process of legitimation of the universities in the eyes of the Commonwealth, the States and the general public was one of the major roles that the Committee promoted. It was, of course, part of the wider processes to ensure bourgeois hegemony in Australia by providing institutions which would underpin its fundamental tenets from a seemingly objective and, because relatively autonomous, unrelated position.

Reactions to the Report

The Report was forwarded to the Commonwealth Government on 19 September 1957. The Prime Minister, R.G. Menzies, tabled it in the House of Representatives on 28 November with an accompanying statement which outlined the major points of the Report, particularly those relating to the parlous state of the universities. The statement also contained

details of the Government's response to the recommendations. All the major recommendations of the Committee were accepted by the Government. This, of course, entailed a major departure from the procedures for financing the universities, and in responsibility for them, with the acceptance of a formal Commonwealth presence in an education field. The full benefit of the Commonwealth's acceptance of the recommendations, and to some extent acceptance itself, was contingent on the concurrence of the States. This contingency was a major one, for although the States had argued in their submissions for increased Commonwealth involvement, the formula suggested by the Committee had the effect of substantially increasing the States' own contributions to the universities. This could have proved to be a major stumbling block for, as the Report itself noted,

Between 1950-51 and 1955-56, the States' revenue from income tax reimbursement grants, State taxation and special grants rose by 77 per cent, but their grants to the universities rose by 123 per cent. The universities have, therefore, fared far better than many other claimants in the allocation of the States' resources.⁸⁶

Some three and a half months after the Menzies announcement, there had been little response from the States and the concern mounting in the universities over the outcome of the Report was reflected by the Current Affairs Bulletin.

Apart from the unmatched grants to remedy accumulated deficiencies, the additional grants from the Commonwealth are dependent upon receipts from elsewhere of equal size in the case of capital grants and of three times the size in the case of recurrent expenses and salary increases. If the universities in the States raise fees by as much as 50 per cent the State treasuries will have to find another 2 1/2 million pounds to enable the universities to obtain the additional Commonwealth recurrent grants. If fees are not raised the State treasuries will have to find 3 1/3 million pounds. Where the funds for these amounts are to be found at present is far from clear.⁸⁷

In the outcome, however, the States accepted the extra burden of the Murray Report recommendations, but in doing so also accepted far greater Commonwealth involvement and, therefore, influence in the universities than previously.

The concerns expressed in the Current Affairs Bulletin article were also directed toward the lack of action on the part of the Commonwealth. It was not until May 1958 that the Government brought on the Second Reading of the States Grants (Universities) Bill, which as Act No. 27 of 1958, provided the emergency funding that the Murray Report had recommended for the succeeding three years. The Chairman of the new grants committee was not named until early 1959, well over twelve months after the presentation of the Report, and legislation to establish it was not introduced until April 1959. It then became apparent that the Government had not entirely accepted the Report's major recommendation, for the new grants committee was given statutory authority status as a Commission, independent of the Commonwealth Office of Education or any Government department. The Government was concerned that the new body be seen to have a wide-ranging brief and authority from the outset, because, as Menzies put it; "We are not satisfied that it should be called a 'Grants' Committee, since that word may be thought, on Australian precedent, to indicate its functions too narrowly".⁸⁸ The legislation established the Australian Universities Commission, with a full-time chairman, and no less than two and no more than four part-time members. It amended the Education Act to abolish the previous Universities Commission which had been set up during the War to administer the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme and later scholarships awarded under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. These functions were handed over to the Commonwealth Scholarships Board of the Commonwealth Office of Education.

The outcome of the Government's action was to underline the importance in which the universities were held. The notice which had been served in the recommendations to the States and the universities was underlined. The Committee had provided the Government with the types of recommendations which it required if it were to respond to the pressures

upon it from those sections of the bourgeoisie promoting further centralisation and industrialisation and, at the same time, provide valid grounds to alter the strong stance it had developed toward Commonwealth involvement in areas seen to be the Constitutional province of the States. It continued the course of development of tertiary education that had been set by the policies of the Labor Government as a result of the recommendations of the Walker Report. The demands of bourgeois dominance ensured that the universities would be drawn in a more relevant manner into the hegemonic process. The importance of the universities in that process was recognised by Menzies in justifying the move by the Commonwealth into greater financial responsibility and coordination of them at the expense of the States. In addition to the reason of economic demands on the States, Menzies also stressed the Commonwealth's interest in the universities as national rather than local institutions. He also stressed their wider role than just that of high level professional training schools, as civilising agents. The national, rather than local focus, reflected in a concern for more than simply serving the interests of immediate economic interests, led Menzies to imply that the States could not be trusted with ensuring the balance development of the universities.

I have indulged...in these general reflections, not because the Government has any reservations about the urgent and growing need for more scientific training, a need which has been more and more clear in recent times, but because it would be unfortunate for the universities themselves if the balanced conception of higher education came to be regarded as out of date.⁸⁹

The Australian Universities Commission was the mechanism by which the universities could be coordinated. By 1965, Partridge noted that the A.U.C. "has become probably the main agent in influencing and controlling university development",⁹⁰ replacing the institutions themselves in conjunction with the States.

While the Report of the Committee on Australian Universities generally came to be seen as the watershed in the development of universities, its reception was by no means unequivocal. On the one hand some contemporary commentators fawned upon Menzies: "Australia is fortunate to have political leadership of this quality and the capacity to take prompt action in a crisis of the seriousness underlined in the Committee's report",⁹¹ with no question of the role of the Government in the development of the crisis. Within this climate, there was a decided lack of concern for the loss, or possible loss, of university autonomy as a result of greater coordination by a central authority, which would come to dominate the debate on university development a decade later.

the risk of chaos through lack of finance, and the risk of withering or at least wilting on the branch, is far greater for the universities than any danger that might lie in possible federal interference with universities, as increasing funds come from federal sources to sustain them.⁹²

There was no debate on alternative solutions to the crisis. On the other hand, there was quite strong criticism of the Report. Oliphant argued that the existence of State rivalries, which led to a strong resistance to change and innovation had prevented the Committee from addressing the need for a national system of education, and so proposing solutions for a great number of the problems which had been identified: "It is clear that the conflict of interests and the extraordinary influence of rivalries between the States rendered it impossible to offer any solution".⁹³ He was supported by Baxter (Vice-Chancellor of the N.S.W. University of Technology), who suggested that the emergency programme was not a development programme:

this crisis is averted, but it is only postponed, and further assistance on a substantially greater scale will be required by 1961, due to rapidly increasing student enrolments.⁹⁴

He suggested that the Committee's investigation was hasty, lacked detail and was, therefore, unreliable in some areas. He was critical of the role of the Government in the period following presentation of the Report in its refusal to discuss the findings of the Committee with the universities, especially in relation to capital requirements, a situation "not reassuring" for suggesting that relations between the universities and the Australian Universities Commission would be good.⁹⁵ Partridge, too, was critical of the Report, especially its role in discouraging innovation in university development, his major example being the post-Murray development of the University of Technology which became the University of New South Wales: "It is deplorable that it has been converted, with the encouragement of the Murray Committee, into the academic emporium it has now become".⁹⁶

The reaction of the Labor Opposition reflected the tension which the duality in educational aims gave the debate. The A.L.P. had set the course for the development of tertiary education in the post-War period with the implementation of the recommendations of the Walker Report. In government, it had promoted continuing Commonwealth involvement in all areas of education and had moved to include the residual education power into the Constitution in the 1946 referendum. At the time of its defeat in 1949 plans to establish a Commonwealth Ministry of Education were well advanced. As was to be expected, the Opposition strongly supported the findings of the Murray Report but was critical of the Government's handling of their reception and implementation. In his reply to Menzies' speech when tabling the Report in the House of Representatives, Evatt suggested that the Report confirmed what everyone had known about the universities since the end of World War II, and that what was needed was not just an investigation into one section of the education system, as had occurred, but a major review across primary, secondary and tertiary education. In his speech he followed up many of the themes expounded by

Menzies as Leader of the Opposition in 1945, and conveniently put aside as Prime Minister. He rightly drew attention to the relation between secondary and tertiary education as one of the seats of the problems facing the universities. He suggested that the universities faced a more secure future if the Government implemented all the recommendations of the Report, but cautioned on complacency.

Their troubles appear to be over, but, in fact, their troubles are only beginning, because further demands, which they will find it difficult to satisfy, will be made on them.⁹⁷

He spent some time discussing the demands which the universities faced for graduates in the sciences and technologies for the same reasons which preoccupied the Government; "it is recognised to be of supreme importance to both defence and development, in the light of technological developments in the modern world".⁹⁸ At the same time, Evatt attempted to turn away from utilitarian and economic justifications for a concentration on education. He suggested that

Since the depression there has no doubt been a tendency to subordinate to other needs - great economic needs including those of transport and the like - the claims of the children for adequate education.⁹⁹

The A.L.P. recognised the importance of education in the hegemonic process, and it continued to promote the interests it had expounded for modernisation, which included the increasing integration of the universities into an identifiable position in a system approaching mass participation. Its position, like that of the Government, encompassed the tension between utilitarian and liberal educational goals, as well as the tensions arising from the conflict within the bourgeoisie in the struggle to maintain dominance within the hegemonic process. Unlike the Government, it was prepared to align itself with those forces promoting centralisation and, while it generally endorsed Government moves to support education, it continually advocated increased Commonwealth involvement to ensure that the education system as a whole was capable of

its functions and role in the developing advanced capitalist society in Australia.

The role of the Murray Committee in ensuring that the universities were integrated into a position of relevance to mass public participation, and thus able to play a role in the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony in the post-War period, was illustrated in a review by Hughes of the Report some fifteen years later. Hughes identified the three functions of the university suggested in the Report - teaching, research and the overarching function of the protection of intellectual standards. He suggested that the first was equated with trained manpower, specifically professional education, rather than the concerns of liberal education to ensure that all capable of benefitting from a university educational would receive one. Rather than providing avenues for upward social mobility, he suggested the universities in the post-Murray period served as "devices for maintaining the children of middle-class parents firmly in the middle-class or perhaps a notch or two higher up in that class".¹⁰⁰ The promotion of bourgeois values in a society where ever increasing numbers of highly skilled workers were required had led to the Murray Committee promoting those liberal educational values of educating the "whole man", while at the same time ensuring that the vocational role that the universities had traditionally played in Australia in this area was not undermined. Hughes' review confirmed the success of the Committee.

Whatever the pious statements to that effect are made by university authorities or curriculum committees, the traditional style of Australian University education has been firmly committed to a heavy vocational content. The commitment of static resources such as academic staff and buildings, and even equipment and non-academic staff, reinforces conservatism.¹⁰¹

He suggested that measurement of the success of the Murray Committee in terms of the second - research - was more difficult, as pure research defied definition, let alone measurement and, in terms of applied

research, the Murray Report dealt almost entirely with science and technology. Nevertheless, he suggested that the notion in Murray that research would influence students to move into areas defined by it as of national importance had proved to be a difficult one to put into effect.¹⁰² Once again, the problem of definition presents difficulties for measuring the success of the universities in protecting intellectual standards. Hughes suggested that the difficulty in defining area of expertise of an academic was compounded by the dichotomy academics faced in liberalism between dissidence in word and deed. In addition, the issue was compounded by the anti-intellectualism of the mass media, and the intolerance of politicians and businessmen to criticism and controversy.¹⁰³ What was clear, however, was that the values of the bourgeoisie were promoted in a climate produced by these factors, thus confirming the position of the universities in the hegemonic process.

The problems which faced the Murray Committee when it began its investigation were the result of the need to reposition the universities to enable them to continue their functions within a rapidly developing society. These problems were related to the demands of economic growth, demographic growth and increasing individual aspirations which compounded the other two. They were manifested as problems resulting from financial stringencies or those related to students. The recommendations of the Committee directed toward the physical aspects of the problems - accommodation and equipment - were generally successful, although those directed toward alleviating the inadequate staffing levels had less success. The pressure of student related problems resulted, of course, in the establishment of the Martin Committee and, subsequently, the advanced education sector. The issues around relatively high failure rates continued in the post-Murray period. Nevertheless, the solutions of the Murray Committee to the physical problems faced by the universities were generally successful (one reason why the Report has

received the acclamation of hindsight as it has) even given the massive growth which occurred in tertiary education as a whole over the following fifteen years. For instance, while Murray predicted that student numbers would grow from 36,465 in 1957 to 70,785 by 1965,¹⁰⁴ in reality student numbers outstripped these predictions. By 1965, there were 83,551 students in the universities, by 1967, just ten years later, 94,093, and by 1969, 107,216.¹⁰⁵ In addition, by the late 1960s the advanced education sector was also growing rapidly. Hughes suggested that

Through the 1960s and into the 1970s many of the problems diagnosed by the Murray Committee have approached solution more through absolute growth than relative improvement.¹⁰⁶

The acceptance of the recommendations of the Murray Report was to have been expected in the light of the pressures which had been placed on the Government in the years preceding the appointment of the Committee, and in the light of the moves which had been made during the frenetic period of planning for post-War reconstruction under the Labor Government in the 1940s. The concern of the bourgeoisie in the late 1940s had been directed to managing the crisis in its legitimacy which had arisen in the aftermath of the War and which continued in the early 1950s. As the political situation had stabilised, attention was turned to ensuring that there were institutions in society which were able to play a role in the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony, and the establishment of the Murray Committee was part of that consideration. Jardine suggested, of the acceptance of the Report;

The Government's generosity does not necessarily indicate an overpowering love for higher learning. There were strong demands of industry for more graduates and of a large section of the community for access to University education. Moreover from the economic point of view graduates were a good investment.¹⁰⁷

Both Murray and Menzies, as Bessant pointed out, shared similar views: "Not unexpectedly, Murray proved to have views on universities similar to the prime minister's".¹⁰⁸ The Report of the Murray Committee did not

question the traditional pattern of the universities, or its appropriateness for developing Australian conditions but was, instead, concerned to ensure their legitimation in a period of rapid development. In this it was successful. It secured for the universities massive federal assistance, ensured that the Commonwealth was locked into supporting their well-being, thus giving them status and legitimacy and safeguarded their leading and dominant position in tertiary education during the development of a modern advanced capitalist society in Australia.

FOOTNOTES

1. Interim Report of the Committee on the Needs of Universities, (R.C. Mills - chairman), 1950, pp. 21-22 in Murray Committee Documents: general part 1, part xii, CAU/CEN/20, The Murray Committee Documents are held in 18 bound volumes at the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Canberra.
2. Report of the Committee on Australian Universities, (Sir Keith Murray - chairman), September 1957 (Canberra 1958) pp. 24-25. Here-in-after cited as Murray Report.
3. A Crisis in the Finances and Development of the Universities (Carlton, undated [1952?]). See above, Chapter 3, p. 78.
4. "The Murray Report on Australian Universities", Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 21, no. 11, 24/3/58, p. 165.
5. See W.D. Barrie and Dedman, A.N.U. Social Science Mongraph 10.
6. A. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 36. See also L.M. Bit, "Universities and the Next Twenty-Five Years" in G.S. Harman et al. (eds.), Academia Becalmed, (Canberra, 1980), pp. 183-184; C.A. Hughes. "The Murray Report Fifteen Years After." A working paper for the August, 1972 meeting of the Federation of Australian University Staff Associations, p. 26; and R.N. Spann, "The Murray Report and the Universities", Quadrant, Vol. II, no. 2, Autumn 1958, p. 9.
7. See for instance, N.S. Bayliss, "The Murray Report", Educand, Vol. 3, no. 2, November 1958, p. 120.
8. Spann, "The Murray Report and the Universities", p. 16.
9. See for instance, J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p. 112.
10. K. Buccleugh, "The Murray Report", Outlook, Vol. 2, no. 1, February 1958, p. 14.
11. Spann, "The Murray Report and the Universities", p. 9.
12. There were, however, no meeting records for only Committee meetings after 8 August. From then until 20 August, meetings were held with education authorities. It is safe to assume, however, that the Committee held extensive informal discussions during this period, and later as they Report was drafted.
13. Murray Report, Appendix A, p. 127.
14. ibid., p. 127.
15. The information in the following discussion on the meetings of the Committee is from Murray Committee Documents: Draft Summary Records, part XI.
16. The plan had been suggested by the South Australian Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, who argued that the neglect of some state governments of their universities should not prevent university development or distort future development needs.

governments of their universities should not prevent university development or distort future development needs.

17. Murray Committee Documents: Draft Summary Records, part xi, 8/8/57.
18. University of Queensland, CAU/QLD/3, p. 7. The submissions to the Murray Committee are included in the Murray Committee Documents. They are referred to here by the reference number allotted by the Committee.
19. The submissions from the universities were: Australian National University, CAU/ANU/3a, 3b, 3c and 36; Canberra University College, CAU/CUC/ 3 and 4; University of Adelaide, CAU/ADEL/3 and 21; University of Melbourne, CAU/MELB/3; University of New England, CAU/NE/3; University of Queensland, CAU/QLD/3; University of Sydney, CAU/SYD/2a, 2b, 4 and 5; University of Tasmania, CAU/TAS/3; N.S.W. University of Technology, CAU/UT/3; University of Western Australia, CAU/WA/3. Those referring to a coordination or grants committee were; CAU/MELB/3, p. 41; CAU/UT/3, p. 17; CAU/SYD/5, pp. 4-6 and pp. 13-14; and CAU/WA/5, p. 79.
20. CAU/ANU/36.
21. Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee, CAU/ALL UNIV/8, p. 14.
22. ibid., pp. 13-20.
23. CAU/MELB/3, p. 40.
24. CAU/CSS/2 is a summary of university recommendations on Commonwealth Scholarships. The Universities Commission submission was CAU/CSS/4.
25. CAU/ALL UNIV/8, p. 24.
26. These submissions were; for the Riverina, CAU/NEW UNIV/1-5; for Newcastle, CAU/NEW UNIV/6 and 10, and CAU/STAFF/6; for Victoria, CAU/NEW UNIV/7-9 and CAU/SCI/13.
27. F.C.U.S.A.A., CAU/STAFF/2, p. 2.
28. ibid., p. 2.
29. N.S.W. University of Technology Staff Association, CAU/UT/4.
30. Sydney Association of University Teachers, CAU/SYD/9.
31. CAU/STUD REP/2-7.
32. N.U.A.U.S., CAU/STUD REP/1.
33. Australian Academy of Science, CAU/SCI/10.
34. Education Department of Victoria, CAU/MELB/4, p. 18.
35. Royal Melbourne Technical College, CAU/MELB/5. The information about the approach to the University of London is in a letter to Murray from F.W. Logan, Principal, University of London, CAU/MELB/6. See above p. [9].
36. S.A. School of Mines, CAU/ADEL/2.

37. E.C.R. Spooner, CAU/ADEL/2.
38. N.S.W. Department of Technical Education, CAU/SYD/8, especially pp. 40-42.
39. CAU/TR TRG/1-2.
40. Queensland Department of Public Instruction, CAU/QLD/10.
41. H.S. Wyndham, CAU/SYD/11.
42. Government of Tasmania, CAU/TAS/9.
43. Tasmanian Treasury, CAU/TAS/5.
44. W.A. Treasury, CAU/WA/4.
45. Queensland Treasury, CAU/QLD/6.
46. S.A. Treasury, CAU/ADEL/5 and Victorian Treasury, CAU/MELB/9.
47. S.A. Chamber of Manufacturers, CAU/GEN/42.
48. Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, CAU/SCI/8.
49. Australian Primary Producers' Union, CAU/GEN/44.
50. Submissions surveyed were: N.S.W. Chamber of Commerce, CAU/GEN/25(1); Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, CAU/GEN/25(2); Adelaide Chamber of Commerce, CAU/GEN/25(3); Victorian Employers Federation, CAU/GEN/21; I.C.I.A.N.Z. Ltd., CAU/FAIL RATE/3; Royal Australian Chemical Institute, CAU/SCI/4; Institution of Engineers, Australia, CAU/SCI/5.
51. "The Murray Report on Australian Universities", p. 168.
52. Murray Report, p. 33.
53. P.H. Partridge, "Universities in Australia", Comparative Education, Vol. 2, no. 1, November 1965, p. 24.
54. Murray Report, p. 35.
55. ibid., Table 5, p. 35.
56. ibid., p. 35.
57. ibid., pp. 36-41.
58. ibid., p. 7.
59. ibid., p. 7.
60. ibid., p. 8.
61. ibid., p. 9.
62. ibid., p. 10.
63. ibid., p. 11.

64. ibid., p. 14.
65. ibid., p. 19.
66. ibid., p. 22.
67. ibid., pp 26-27.
68. ibid., p. 27.
69. ibid., p. 98.
70. ibid., p. 105.
71. ibid., p. 101.
72. ibid., p. 100.
73. ibid., pp. 88-90.
74. ibid., pp. 101-102.
75. ibid., p. 103.
76. ibid., p. 104.
77. ibid., pp. 108-109.
78. ibid., p. 109.
79. ibid., pp. 110-111.
80. ibid., p. 115.
81. ibid., p. 116.
82. ibid., p. 117.
83. ibid., p. 117.
84. ibid., p. 118.
85. ibid., p. 119.
86. ibid., p. 25.
87. "The Murray Report on Australian Universities", pp. 172-173.
88. R.G. Menzies, "Australian Universities", p. 7, in Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers, General, Session 1957-58, Vol. V, p. 721.
89. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol. H of R 17), 28 November 1957, p. 2696.
90. Partridge, "Universities in Australia", p. 27.
91. J.F. Foster, "University Commentary", Universities Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 1, November 1957, p. 193. See also, G.A. Currie, "The Report of the Committee on Australian Universities: An Evaluation", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 2, no. 1, April 1958, pp. 29-30.

92. Currie, "The Report of the Committee on Australian Universities", p. 32.
93. M.L. Oliphant, "Science and the Report of the Committee on Australian Universities", Nucleus, Vol. 4, no. 1, April 1958, p. 3.
94. J.P. Baxter, "The Impact of the Murray Report upon Universities", Proceedings of the Royal Australian Chemical Institute, Vol. 25, no. 6, June 1958, p. 261.
95. ibid., p. 261.
96. P.H. Partridge, "The University System", in E.L. French (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1960-61, (Melbourne, 1962), p. 65.
97. H.V. Evatt, CPD (Vol H of R 17), 28 November 1957, p. 2703.
98. ibid., p. 2704.
99. ibid., p. 2704.
100. Hughes, "The Murray Report Fifteen Years After", p. 7.
101. ibid., p. 9.
102. ibid., pp. 10-11.
103. ibid., pp. 12-14.
104. Murray Report, Table 9, p. 82.
105. H. Philp, "The Piper and the Tune - From Murray to the Fourth A.U.C. Report", Australian University, Vol. 8, no. 1, May 1970, Table 1, p. 5.
106. Hughes, "The Murray Report Fifteen Years After", p. 44.
107. B. Jardine, "The University Sell-Out", Prospect, Vol. 4, no. 3, 1961, p. 14.
108. B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977), p. 93. See Murray's statement in ibid., p. 93; and R.G. Menzies, C.P.D. (Vol. H of R 17), 28 November 1957, p. 2701.

CHAPTER 8

Tertiary Education in Australia: Report of the Committee
on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia.

(The Martin Report) 1964/1965

The Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia was appointed as a committee of the Australian Universities Commission in August 1961, less than five years after the Report of the Murray Committee. Its appointment, under the chairmanship of Sir Leslie Martin, Chairman of the A.U.C., came with an increasing awareness in Government circles that the Murray recommendations had not solved the problems faced by tertiary education institutions in Australia, and with indications that the system as a whole was growing at a faster rate than had been anticipated even in 1957. The criticism which had been levelled at the Government at the time of the appointment of the Murray Committee because the scope of its inquiries was limited to the universities, and which had been echoed by the A.L.P. at the time of the presentation of the Committee's Report, had proved to be justified. As the recommendations of the Murray Report were implemented the policies adopted by the Australian Universities Commission and recommended to the Government came under growing criticism.¹ The appointment of the Martin Committee in this climate was greeted with more reticence than had been that of the Murray Committee, not because of opposition to a thorough going inquiry but because there was less confidence that the new Committee would address the real problems facing tertiary education. Wheelwright suggested that if pressure were applied to the Committee the result could be a tertiary education system with "quality, variety, and flexibility",² although he was not confident of this result. Buckley asserted that the real problems facing tertiary education were political and a danger existed that a cheap alternative to the universities would be sought in the establishment of U.S.-style junior colleges in an effort to relieve the pressures of demand.³ An editorial in Prospect was critical of the composition of the Committee and its bias toward science and technology, suggesting that its recommendations were in danger of being a foregone conclusion.

We find, for instance, that included on the committee...are the managing director of B.H.P. and the technical director of I.C.I.; these on a committee where technology (as well as commerce) is already grossly over-represented, and at a time when there is little danger of anyone overlooking the demand for technological graduates while the Press so indulgently reports all those who issue imperatives to step up the extent, variety, expenditure, and everything else connected with that branch of education.⁴

It was obvious that, unlike at the time of the appointment of the Murray Committee when the crisis facing the universities was of such proportions that there was widespread support for the Committee, the outcome of the Murray Report, and the policies of the Government in the intervening period had engendered a more critical attitude in tertiary education. In addition, the pressures of demand which continued on the universities more strongly than had been anticipated had coupled with the less passive environment to challenge the hegemonic functions of them. There was a recognition for a need to remove much of this pressure from the universities if they were to meet their obligations adequately, and proposals had been made since the time of the Murray Report for more resources to be made available to non-university tertiary education to allow this. Menzies pointed to the factors which influenced the decision to hold another inquiry;

the rapidly increasing number of students who may wish to take advantage of tertiary education, and other factors such as student wastage, staff shortage and the pressure on universities generally, make it imperative that we investigate the best way of making the most efficient use of available and potential resources.⁵

The involvement of the Commonwealth in tertiary education in a formal manner with the establishment of the A.U.C. had led to increasing expectations from the community, business, and not least, education authorities that it would extend its support to other tertiary education institutions. The States also supported further Commonwealth funding to ease the burdens on their own budgets which the demands of A.U.C. recommendations had imposed for they were unable to oppose them or refuse to accept them. The equation between tertiary education and economic

growth which had been the major message of the Murray Report and the Government in its aftermath, had led to strong public support for tertiary education and demands for the upward mobility which it was believed to promote. The membership of the new Committee reinforced this attitude. Sir Leslie Martin was Chairman of the A.U.C., and formerly Professor of Physics, University of Melbourne. The Deputy Chairman was Emeritus Professor C.R. McRae, formerly Professor of Education and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Sydney. Other members of the Committee were: Sir Keith Angas, grazier; Professor D.P. Derham, Dean of Law, Monash University; Professor A.H. Ennor, Professor of Biochemistry, Institute of Advanced Studies, A.N.U.; Sir Alexander Fitzgerald, formerly Professor of Accounting, University of Melbourne and formerly, Chairman, Commonwealth Grants Commission; Professor Sir Edward Ford, Professor of Preventive Medicine, University of Sydney; Dr. C.M. Gilray, formerly Principal, Scotch College, Melbourne, and formerly Deputy Chancellor, University of Melbourne; Mr. N.E. Jones, Managing Director, B.H.P.; Professor P.H. Karmel, Professor of Economics, University of Adelaide; Mr. R.R. Mackay, Principal R.M.I.T.; Mr. A. McDonell, Director of Education, Victoria; Professor J.W. Roderick, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Sydney; Professor Sir Fred Schonell, Vice-Chancellor, University of Queensland; Emeritus Professor Sir Samuel Wadham, formerly Professor of Agriculture, University of Melbourne; Mr. L.W. Weickhardt, Technical Director, I.C.I.; and Dr. H.S. Wyndham, Director-General of Education, New South Wales. The Committee was heavily biased to science and technologies, and to management interests in industry.⁶

This was also reflected in the Report that the Committee finally presented. The Report was concerned to link, unquestionably, economic well-being with tertiary education, particularly in science and technology. It was unashamedly utilitarian in outlook with barely a

mention of the liberal ideals which had underpinned the rhetoric of the Murray Report. It was based on optimism in the concept of continuing and dynamic economic growth.⁷ Little suggested that the Committee's real purpose, redefining the functions of tertiary education toward the demands of industry and commerce, was evident throughout the Report.

It is difficult to escape the impression that the Committee's proposals for broadening technical education owe more to the growth of the services sector, the increased demand for white-collar labour than to faith in a liberal curriculum...Throughout the Report, proposals for 'liberalising' the curriculum are linked with the 'middle-management' jobs it will lead to. Thus the Martin's [sic] main 'qualitative' message reflects the commercial and industrial status quo.⁸

The Committee was concerned that its proposals were seen in the light of the prevailing attitudes to tertiary education and its rhetoric, while directed in the way that Little noted, retained the attachment to liberalism. Its message was directed at an increasingly sophisticated and diverse society but aimed at assisting the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony. As Smart noted, "Whilst advocating a greater diversity in tertiary education, it simultaneously sought a greater unity of purpose".⁹ The Murray Committee had ensured that the participation of the Commonwealth in tertiary education was acceptable to the community, and the role of the Martin Committee was to promote the changes in emphases which the development of an advanced capitalist economy required. As Lindsay suggested, it

"was less concerned with the Commonwealth's involvement in higher education than with advocating and legitimating major changes in the direction and structure of Australian higher education."¹⁰

Diversity was required to ensure that the status of the universities was preserved so that they might continue to be effective in the hegemonic process. The establishment of new and variegated sectors in teacher education and institutes of colleges would enable the demands of the community for access to the educational ladder and upward social mobility to be met without threatening the status of the universities. Unity of

purpose was required to ensure that the educational aims and goals of the different sectors of tertiary education were compatible and did not lead to conflict which could undermine the legitimacy of any part of it. The development of the universities and the demands made on all sectors of tertiary education in the post-Murray period proceeded at such an unforeseen pace, even to the Murray Committee, that the Government was caught somewhat unawares, and it was less enthusiastic for the appointment or the recommendations of the Martin Committee. Even so, the importance of the Committee's Report to Australian tertiary education was immense. As Bessant noted,

the Martin Report was as vital to the universities as it was to the colleges of advanced education it sought to establish, for in the latter lay the salvation of the universities. The creation of the colleges helped to enable the universities to preserve their traditional aims and structures.¹¹

The complexity of the task which faced the Committee led it to undertake its investigations in a manner considerably different from the deliberations of the Murray Committee. Most obviously, the whole investigation took over four years and much of the first year was taken up with ironing out differences of opinion between Committee members.¹² Much greater importance was given to papers by the expert members of the Committee during its deliberations than had been the case with the Murray Committee. The Committee's Report was presented in three volumes, the first two of which were released in August 1964, and the third in August 1965. The Committee continued to meet during this period and was able to assess reactions to the Report from the Government and educational authorities. The issues canvassed by the Committee were wider and dealt with in more detail. The result, of course, was that the Report was more open to criticism and much more discussion ensued following its publication. The nature of the Committee's task, and the scope of its inquiry, encouraged this process.

The Workings of the Committees

Records of the meetings of the Martin Committee, and the Report itself, show that much of its discussion centred on problems which had been evident to the Murray Committee but which had not been solved by the recommendations of Murray. These were particularly concerned with student wastage, and inadequate staffing and facilities. All were related to the continuing demand for tertiary education. Many of the proposals put forward during the course of meetings of the Committee and, indeed, recommendations contained in the Report, reflected the approach which had been evident in the earlier Committee. There was, however, one major point of discussion which, when translated into recommendations, was to have the most important effect on the development of tertiary education in Australia since the decisions to establish the State universities. That was, of course, discussion of the proposal from many different quarters for the upgrading of the technical colleges and/or the establishment of new non-university institutions to relieve the pressures on the universities and provide alternative avenues into tertiary education. Included in these discussions was the issue of coordination. The recommendations were those to establish the advanced education sector and to co-ordinate three types of institutions which would then exist in the tertiary sectors - the universities, institutes of colleges, and teachers colleges - through an Australian Tertiary Education Commission. It was clear at the outset, that the Committee was under considerable pressure to move in this way and, as has been seen, expected to do so by both its critics and supporters. Writing just prior to the appointment of the Committee, one of its members, Sir Fred Schonell suggested,

It is now obvious that the needs of the universities for the next ten years will exceed anything that the Murray Committee anticipated or in fact the universities themselves anticipated.¹³

The solution would need to be a fundamental one. Early in its life, Mr. Ken Myer, a member of the A.U.C., wrote to the Committee arguing that it

recommend substantially increased spending for tertiary education because

The cheapest and most productive form of national investment in the long term is surely in the training of its talented citizens of which Australia is so well endowed.¹⁴

He opposed suggestions that the way to overcome increased demand was to increase general standards, although he was not opposed to increased standards in the universities. His solution;

There appears to be a need for a completely new type of junior college in the academic and technical field which fills the gap between our present secondary schools and our universities.¹⁵

The climate existed for such a solution to the pressures which were being exerted on the universities, not least because it appeared to satisfy most of those concerned: individuals who wanted access to higher education, the non-university institutions which wanted increased support and status; bourgeois interests which wanted to ensure the development of a highly skilled workforce without undermining the role of the universities in the hegemonic process.

One of the more influential members of the Martin Committee proved to be Professor P.H. Karmel, then Professor of Economics at the University of Adelaide. Karmel played a considerable public role in presenting issues for debate throughout the course of the Committee's deliberations, and the papers he presented to academic conferences and articles which appeared in the general press were included among the Committee's working documents. He suggested that growth in demand by students would be a temporary phenomenon and that measures to meet it should be short-term ones. Longer term developments should be planned with this factor in mind. He predicted that by 1975 university participation rates would be about 8.7 per cent with total tertiary participation at 14.5 per cent, and that the Commonwealth should increase its expenditure to meet these demands.¹⁶ He warned, however, that other increases in demand in terms of standards, staffing levels, salaries or capital works would increase the call on Commonwealth

funding, and that, therefore, increased Commonwealth funds should be made available without tying them to State expenditure.¹⁷ He pointed out that this analysis was reasonable if an examination were made of participation rates and expenditure on education in comparison with other industrialised nations. These showed that Australia had only a middle-ranking for secondary school participation rates and ranked very badly at the tertiary level.¹⁸ He pointed out that "Australia spends a relatively low proportion of gross national product"¹⁹ being bottom on the list of nations surveyed and the only one with no target for growth of educational expenditure. The situation was exacerbated since Australia also had among the highest proportions of population in the age groups most likely to be in education, which meant that less was being spent per student than might otherwise have been supposed.²⁰ Karmel suggested that in the conflict which presented itself to the community between freedom of choice and economics in relation to educational provision there were two choices. The first involved a redefinition of terms, so that each individual's right to tertiary education did not mean a right to a particular provision which a student might have preferred but a more general right to some form of tertiary education. The second was a more pragmatic approach to

point out that in a world of limited resources, whilst we may strive for complete freedom of educational choice, it may not always be possible to fulfil this objective. In other words we accept some conflict as unavoidable.²¹

Karmel chose the second because "It is not restrictive, it keeps the light still burning on the hill; and it gives promise of greater freedom of choice as more resources are devoted to the educational system".²² The nature of Karmel's "pragmatic" choice is quite clear, as it enables the education system to fulfil its role in the hegemonic process through the tension between conflict and promise.

Given these factors, Karmel proceeded to offer solutions within the second framework. At the A.N.Z.A.A.S. Conference in August 1962 he "flew

the kite" for the establishment of a new system of non-university tertiary institutions, with the goal for all qualified students to attend tertiary institutions even if these were not universities. He suggested that "we should attempt to increase quite sharply the population of each generation attending non-university tertiary institutions".²³ This was an effort to relieve the pressures on the universities, while at the same time increasing provision for tertiary education to cater for individual aspirations and the demands for a skilled workforce. He argued strongly for Commonwealth intervention and growth in public expenditure to ensure a general growth in the economy.

My conclusion is that the economic health of Australia during the next decade may, among other things, require the relative expansion of the public sector. Far from regarding this as an evil to be avoided, we should accept it as an opportunity to improve the quality of our economic life.²⁴

The message implicit in this was that, having given a promise of increased educational provision with a growth in the economy, increased Government expenditure would benefit, and indeed be necessary for, tertiary education. It must be recalled that Karmel's call for the expansion of the public sector came at the time of the Menzies Government credit squeeze which had been the basis for the 1961 election.

The development of new non-university tertiary institutions was, then, central to the deliberations of the Committee. By October 1961, the Secretariat had prepared the first of the Committee's draft outlines for the Report. In it a substantial amount of space was devoted to the "higher technical institutes", to "other institutions for higher education" and the relations between these and the universities. It was suggested that the participation rate targets should be 10 per cent for universities and for the other institutions. This target increased the proposed access to tertiary education which Murray had anticipated. The paper recognised the hegemonic nature of the Committee's task, especially given the political climate engendered in the period since the 1961 election.

The success of the proposals of the new Committee will depend ultimately upon the extent to which belief in education can be developed within the Australian community. Here lies a public relations exercise to be conducted on an extensive scale.²⁵

Karmel's public interventions, and those of other members of the Committee, were a major part of this. The paper also suggested that (as justification for the expansion of tertiary education, especially into those areas which had been seen traditionally as of low status) the universities were facing a rapid decline in standards as increasing pressures of numbers, coupled with the rapid expansion of knowledge, were made upon them. According to the paper,

Our task is to outline a comprehensive plan for higher education in Australia; not one which implies that all States should proceed in the same way, but rather one which allows for local variations; nevertheless, a fundamental plan designed to remove the present quantitative and qualitative deficiencies.²⁶

The tensions inherent in the Committee's task between liberal and utilitarian goals in education, between fractional conflict in the bourgeois apparent in Federal/State relations and constitutional responsibilities, and in an uneven development of the hegemonic process, were evident from this statement. These tensions were, of course, also apparent among the members of the Committee. The paper received general approval at the Committee meeting of 13 October, 1961, and became the basis for working papers for the Report.²⁷

The Committee met with a wide range of educationists and educational authorities while it fleshed out its proposals for the establishment of non-university tertiary institutions and found almost unanimous support for the notion, if not the details, it was proposing.²⁸ What little opposition there was quickly received a negative response from the Committee. For instance, the Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research, Dr. W.C. Radford, who opposed the concept and proposed instead the expansion of the university system to cater for a participation rate of 25 per cent of the relevant age group, received a

response which contained the seeds of the debate which was to arise in the post-Martin period regarding the relative status of the different types of institutions. The Minutes of the meeting said,

The Chairman interposed to say that it might be far too expensive to extend the existing pattern and that other types of higher education were not necessarily inferior. He suggested that the elite should be trained to their maximum capacity, and that universities should not be preoccupied with large numbers of pass students.²⁹

More in keeping with the attitude, at least of the Chairman, were the views of Sir John Medley, formerly Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne. Medley, in notes of a meeting he held with the Committee, offered an elitist approach to solving the problems faced by the universities which would enable them to continue their functions unimpaired, and indeed, in an improved manner. He suggested that the selection process for the universities was inadequate and that the burden should be removed from them and given to a system of one year colleges which would teach the first year of general university courses. The best students would then go on to university while by far the most considerable number would leave the university system, or more correctly, not enter it. Of this group, the residue as he called it, Medley said,

I doubt if we can or should try to devise anything very elaborate for them. If they are any good at all, they will have got a great deal out of the one year even though they have not survived it. Is this where the Techs could come in on a part-time basis?³⁰

Medley's view was to one extreme. It was, however, with its proposal to protect the universities from corruption and pollution of their proper functions, and establish or expand other, lesser status institutions to take the 'residue' of students, much closer to the Radford proposal to expand the university system in line with research findings on capabilities of certain proportions of each age group which had been first presented to the Murray Committee five years previously.³¹ Medley was quite explicit in his concern that the universities be able to continue their hegemonic functions.

I was very much encouraged to hear you say - though these were not your actual words - that elite is not a dirty word and that the real job of a University is to concentrate on it.³²

In this he was not on the extreme, for his view coincided with at least that of Martin in his reply to Radford, and indeed with the final recommendation of the Committee. The issue of training the elite surfaced once again in a paper by one of the members of the Committee, Weickhardt, in which he surveyed the types of submissions received, noting that one of the central questions facing the Committee was indeed, how and when to choose the elite.³³ It was clear that the issue of elite training and the establishment of an alternative set of institutions to ensure that function in relation to this remained unimpaired was the central issue which coloured the recommendations of the Committee and the discussions which preceded their formulation.

In the first volume of the Report (released in August 1964), the Committee presented to the Government its proposals to create two new sets of non-university tertiary education institutions based on existing technical colleges and institutes of technology on the one hand, and teachers colleges on the other. At the same time the new advanced education sector, as it was to be known, would be coordinated with the universities through an Australian Tertiary Education Commission, which would subsume the A.U.C. The Government's negative reaction to the Report, especially those parts designed to protect the development of the universities in the face of increasing demand, was a matter of some concern to the Committee which was still deliberating on the final volume of the Report. The Chairman

was sorry not more of it had been accepted by the Government but he was confident that eventually many more of the recommendations would become effective. Mr Weickhardt said the reception by the press, on the whole, had been very favourable. This was symptomatic of the growing interest in education in Australia. The Chairman said that it was unfortunate and inevitable that some persons who had not access to a copy of the Report would be misled by some of the press reports and as well by the Prime Minister's speech in Parliament. Some things were said in the speech to be

recommendations which in fact were not recommendations of the Committee. Sir Keith Angas said that there was a certain amount of internal inconsistency in the Prime Minister's speech.³⁴

It was clear to the Committee that the directions in which it had recommended were those which had a great deal of public support and that the negative reaction of the Government was out of step with public opinion. The public relations exercise which the Committee had set out to undertake to ensure that its proposals be acceptable in the community had been, to a large extent, successful.

Submissions to the Committee

Like the submissions to the Murray Committee, the submissions to the Martin Committee can be divided into those from academic sources and those from non-academic areas. Within each there was a similar breakdown into sub-sectors. There were substantially more submissions to the Martin Committee than there had been to Murray, primarily because the scope of the inquiry was much wider than had been that of the earlier Committee. This section will examine the submissions in much the same way as they were treated in the previous chapter; first the academic submissions, beginning with those from institutions, and then the non-academic submissions.

The submissions from the universities generally supported the notion of the establishment of new non-university tertiary education institutions. Those from the technical colleges were directed at increasing their support and, indeed, upgrading their status to enable them to undertake much of the role of any new tertiary education sector which might be created. The universities were all adamant that they remain the premier institutions, and in many cases suggested the establishment of links between them and proposed colleges to ensure that standards were maintained and a proper sense of purpose be developed for the colleges. The University of Sydney argued for more restrictive

entrance procedures for the universities, complemented by the establishment of new institutions for those who did not want a university education. It suggested that the standards of the new institutions should be gradually raised until they were able to compete with the universities.³⁵ The University of New South Wales, itself the result of the upgrading of technical colleges into a university, stressed that the major function of the universities was "to produce the scholars, intellectual leaders and research workers on whom the development of Australia as a nation will ultimately depend".³⁶ It argued that new tertiary institutes and colleges should be established to enable the universities to cope with this role without pressures of numbers, which would allow them to be rigorously selective in their entrance procedures while enabling all who wanted tertiary education to have it. Adequate transfer of credit provisions would be necessary.³⁷ Other university submissions went even further. The University of Melbourne proposed that a system of two year colleges like the U.S. Junior Colleges be established with a flow of students both ways.³⁸ This proposition was supported by the A.N.U.,³⁹ and both stressed the need for more restrictive entrance requirements for the universities if they were to preserve their standards in the face of increased student demand. The University of Melbourne also proposed that the existing technical colleges be upgraded and attached to universities so that in the long term they could achieve, by association, university standards and status in their fields.⁴⁰ The submission of the University of Adelaide supported this idea. It argued for diversity in tertiary education with the system being expanded to include technical colleges, institutes of technology, and the teachers colleges. However, the submission stressed the primary importance of the universities: "If the universities degenerate, so will every phase and form of education in Australia".⁴¹ The university was held to be the training ground for teachers in all

education institutions, hence their primary importance. It was clear that a large degree of support existed in the universities for the establishment of the advanced education sector. It was not, however, an altruistic support for the needs of either the non-university institutions or the interests of potential students in providing more access to tertiary education, but an attempt to preserve the status of the universities in the event of a large increase in student numbers, and to maintain their position of status which enabled them to undertake successfully their functions in the hegemonic process.

The submissions from technical institutions supported increased aid for non-university institutions. The crisis which faced them was very similar to that which had faced the universities prior to the Murray Committee, the recommendations of which had been almost exclusively concerned with the universities. On the whole, the submissions were catalogues of deficiencies and were directed toward individual institutions rather than to the system.⁴² The individual technical institutions were supported by the submissions from State departments of education. Typical was that of the Minister for Education in New South Wales, which argued strongly for increased Commonwealth aid for technical education. It argued that technical education was of national importance and that the States should not be left to carry the entire burden. Included as an appendix to the submission was an extract from the 1936 submission calling on the Commonwealth to become involved in technical education, particularly its funding, an issue which had been raised again by Coombs during the Walker Committee's deliberations in 1944.⁴³ It suggested that the Commonwealth institute subsidy arrangements similar to those proposed by the Murray Committee for the universities for technical education institutions.

Submissions from academic bodies/associations supported the calls for more support for technical education at the tertiary level. The

Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia (F.C.U.S.A.A.) recommended the expansion of universities and other tertiary education institutions, especially in the technological area.

Technological education should be recognised as an integral part of higher education and technological institutions should be expanded and strengthened to enable them to make an effective contribution.⁴⁴

It called for a major inquiry into the status of teachers and the problems of teacher education. It rejected the notion of U.S.-style junior colleges for a number of reasons. First, it judged the crisis in demand to be one of short-term demographic nature and argued that the new colleges would not be established in time to meet the need. Second, it argued that the universities and existing technical and teachers colleges were in a position to expand and adapt to meet increased demand. Third, it saw the establishment of junior colleges as detrimental to the upgrading of secondary schools with which they would compete for teachers and resources, and because they could be used as an excuse to delay upgrading the schools. Fourth, there could be no effective guarantee on the selection of students to junior colleges. Fifth, the establishment of such colleges would be no cheaper than the expansion of existing tertiary education institutions. Other staff association submissions supported the F.C.U.S.A.A. submission. All these submissions stressed the importance of research to the universities, especially that of the Sydney Association which followed up its submission to the Murray Committee with a strongly worded call for recognition of the "over-riding importance" of research to the whole of tertiary education, and especially to the universities, and called for more resources to be allotted to it. The submission also called for greater coordination between the Commonwealth and the States in the field of tertiary education.⁴⁵

In addition to submissions from associations of academic staff, the Committee also received submissions from individuals or groups of

academics. As in the case of the Murray Committee, the Professors of Education at Australian universities made a detailed submission to the inquiry. The professors noted four factors which were affecting the development of tertiary education - growth, public funding, demand and specialisation. Their attitude to the universities was quite different from the elitist and isolationist attitudes which had been displayed in many other submissions, for they refused to allot to the universities a monopoly on research and scholarship, and endeavoured to break down the mysticism which surrounded much of the opposing argument. The professors stated that

tertiary education should not be recognised as being distinctly different in nature from primary or secondary education. It has no pre-emption on scholarship, or the pursuit of truth, or the cultivation of the intellect, or any other phrase commonly encountered in the literature dealing, for example, with universities. It is simply the third level of education.⁴⁶

They suggested that tertiary education should be free, in variety, and available to those who wished it. They suggested that, already, all the tertiary institutions, including the universities, had "become very largely a group of higher vocational schools".⁴⁷ Research in the universities had become more and more utilitarian with this development, according to the submission. The submission argued that tertiary education should be a response to a common tradition and should, therefore, be pertinent, related to the community, carefully guard intellectual integrity and encourage it in the community, attempt to raise intellectual awareness in the general public, and should be involved in advisory, evaluative research into matters of practical concern to the community.⁴⁸ In a bold move, which foreshadowed demands which would arise in the aftermath of the Martin Committee when the rivalries between the universities and the advanced education sector began to impinge on the support that each received from State governments, the submission suggested "that the best way in which the Commonwealth Government can assist Australian education is to undertake

full financial responsibility for all forms of tertiary education".⁴⁹ The submission recognised the real nature of educational functions of tertiary education institutions but did not, however, recognise the hegemonic functions of the universities and hence their status and the mystification which surrounded them in the general community.

The call by the Professors of Education for total Commonwealth funding of tertiary education was echoed in a submission from Professor J.J. Auchmuty. His call was restricted to the universities, and was made for quite different reasons which were, in fact, inimical to the philosophy inherent in the previous submission. Auchmuty's call was to enable the Commonwealth

to be able to allocate specialisations from University to University but also could ensure that Universities devote themselves to fundamental research and traditional academic training without introducing all the new courses and subjects demanded by socially conscious pressure groups.⁵⁰

Nevertheless, he advocated the expansion of the universities with the inclusion of the teachers colleges into them as faculties of education. This concern with the status of the teachers colleges formed the basis of a submission from Professor C. Saunders, who recommended that the teachers colleges be developed into a system of higher technological institutions along with existing technical colleges, along the lines of British tertiary educational development.⁵¹ Sir MacFarlane Burnett warned the Committee that because of Australia's peripheral position among the advanced industrial nations, the development of technological and technical education should be a high priority, and should be promoted to ensure widespread public acceptance of its importance. He suggested that the country would not be able to develop its full potential without this acceptance.⁵² This position was defended in a submission from Sir Mark Oliphant who was concerned about the dilution of standards, particularly in the training of scientists and technologists. He suggested that too many students of

poor ability meant that university teachers were frustrated and indifferent to their teaching tasks. He proposed that the universities institute ruthless selection procedures to reduce the numbers to be admitted, and that the Committee recommend the establishment of non-university colleges "to provide less exacting training for the remainder of those who matriculate".⁵³ He also proposed that the colleges have degree granting powers at the undergraduate level but not be permitted to teach at the postgraduate level.

In addition to these academic submissions, the Australian Academy of Science submitted a document which had been prepared in September 1957 but which the Academy still considered relevant to the Committee's investigations. It concerned the supply of skilled scientific and technological manpower in Australia, and suggested that there the situation was extremely grave. The Academy believed that trends in Australia did not favour science and technology.

The Australian philosophy - one with which the Academy does not quarrel -...has favoured a trend towards equalisation in social conditions among all members of the community...If this policy accentuates the shortage of scientists - and we believe it does - it must have deleterious effects on productivity and living standards, and the people should be so informed.⁵⁴

The Academy's position was overtly hegemonic, equating social progress with falling standards of living in an argument to maintain the mysticism which surrounded the status of the universities. Its attitudes reflected prevailing bourgeois attitudes. The submission suggested that there be a massive transfer of resources toward the sciences, both at the university and school levels, to overcome the problems it foresaw.

The Committee also received a number of 'non-academic' submissions from bodies such as government departments, industrial and commercial groups, professional associations and unions, and other interested parties. While the philosophical differences between many of the submissions were obvious, many of them gave the Committee the support it required to promote an expansion of tertiary education, particularly the

non-university sectors. The Committee treated as a submission the report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Growth of Population and Work Force, entitled "Education and Training in the 'Sixties", which had been prepared in 1960. The Report suggested that in the post-War period skilled manpower demands had outstripped supply even while the latter had increased markedly. (It distinguished between the nation's needs for skilled labour and the demands of employers.) It suggested that the growth which had occurred at the university level had been at the expense of the technical colleges, one of the early examples of an argument which was to become increasingly popular over the succeeding decade, and charged that within the university sector increasing enrolments with static numbers of Commonwealth scholarships had seriously disadvantaged students from lower socio-economic backgrounds. It argued that the need for technicians and tradesmen was far greater than the demand for professionals, and suggested that the deflection of students away from university courses toward those in technical colleges would be a more economic use of the Commonwealth's investment in tertiary education.⁵⁵

This proposition gained some support from the Department of Immigration which pointed out that

the proportion of male migrant workers who were skilled tradesmen was some 50 per cent greater than the proportion among the Australian male workforce at the time of the 1947 Census.⁵⁶

The submission from the Department of Supply was more cautious than that of the Interdepartmental Committee, stressing the need for three major factors: tertiary education for all who want it; greater coordination between education institutions, government agencies and industry; and, standardisation of courses throughout tertiary education within each sector.⁵⁷

Because of the inquiry's bias toward technical and technological education, the Committee received many more submissions from industry and commerce, and the trades unions than had the Murray Committee. In almost

every case the support for the expansion of the technical non-university sector of tertiary education was emphatic, and in many cases the universities were criticised for being irrelevant and/or inflexible. The N.S.W. Chamber of Manufactures was strong in its criticism of the universities which, it said, produced graduates who were not trained for industry, who were overeducated, and who, because of high failure rates, contributed to a wastage of resources. The Chamber suggested that technical education needed a boost in finance and proper coordination to ensure that it produced graduates of use to industry, and argued for the establishment of new institutions to cater for the need.⁵⁸ The Queensland Chamber of Manufactures suggested that there was an oversupply of university trained skilled labour and a shortage of technical trained labour at both the trades and technologist levels. It suggested that "the universities are being asked, at least in Queensland, to provide education which is really outside the scope of a university",⁵⁹ arguing that industry required technologists of the same standards as graduates but with a more applied training. The submission stressed the need for the establishment of new institutions at the same level as the universities to provide these technologists: "an entirely new concept is required of what is needed for technological and technical training on a tertiary level",⁶⁰ especially since the existing technical colleges were designed to produce tradesmen, not technologists. The submission also stressed the need for increased Commonwealth support for technical education funding. The submission from the parent body of the Chambers, the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, presented much the same views, although aimed somewhat more at consensus.

It is agreed that Universities must play an important role in supplying manufacturing industry with a number of adequately trained personnel in the technical and commercial fields, but by no means can or should they be asked to supply all that are required. The substantial majority of personnel with higher technical and commercial training should come from other sources.⁶¹

The submission supported the expansion of technical faculties in the universities, but placed more importance on the establishment of new technical institutions at the same level as the universities to supply the personnel to which they had referred. It argued for transferability between courses and institutions, and the standardisation of courses to enable this to occur. It strongly supported additional Commonwealth funding in the technical education arena.

Other employer groups supported the views that had been presented by the Chambers of Manufactures. The Metal Industries Association argued that the universities should not supply the entire requirements of skilled staff for industry and commerce, suggesting that their capacity to do so was limited by the need to maintain high academic standards, their special emphasis on research, the wide range of student capability, differences in the needs of various employers, university staff shortages, and high costs. The Association had specific requirements it wanted met: "It is considered natural and desirable that industry should be 'fed' with employees completing their vocational training at a variety of levels."⁶² It therefore wanted the standardisation of courses, the expansion of non-university institutions and their upgrading to university status, and a boost to Commonwealth funding for technical education. The submission stated,

Put simply, a stated investment in technical colleges or institutes will secure many more personnel trained to the required standard than the same investment in universities.⁶³

The Victorian Employers Federation stressed the need for closer liaison between industry and tertiary education, closer coordination of the education system, and the need for it to undertake much more relevant and applied research which was beyond the capacity of industry.⁶⁴ The Metal Trades Employers' Association put forward a more sophisticated submission which recognised the hegemonic role of the universities and the threat which would emerge to that if they were to become mass

educational institutions, while at the same time stressing the more immediate needs of industry. It argued that all members of the public were entitled to a balanced education which, while being complete in itself, would offer the potential for continuing education. To achieve this, it suggested that the technical colleges be upgraded, independent of the universities, since the latter were in danger of having their nature changed if they attempted to undertake this task, the submission suggested two options. The first was to attempt to reduce such a role as mass participation in tertiary education became more likely. If, however, the universities were to be required to undertake costs in some areas within the universities since "the question which arises is whether it is economically possible to pursue this course".⁶⁵ The second was to create some higher research universities which would concentrate on postgraduate and research activities, "thus making it more possible for the present Universities to concentrate on their presently assumed role in a more economical way".⁶⁶ It stressed that the second option should be seen as a last resort and should alert the Commonwealth to the fact that new institutions were required for "the training of those for whom the more expensive University training is not essential and, in some cases, not suitable."⁶⁷

In its submission, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, the Managing Director of which, Mr. N.E. Jones, was a member of the Committee, supported the differentialisation of tertiary education. It foresaw greater future demand for technicians and specialists rather than generalist university graduates. In a proposal which anticipated future developments in tertiary education the submission suggested the establishment of a three tiered structure for tertiary education - at certificate level for trades training, a mid-level of diplomas, associate diplomas and technology degrees for technician and specialist training, and degree level in the universities. It included two important

provisos. The first was that there should be the possibility of transferability between the sectors. Second, it stressed the need for standardisation between courses. In addition, it suggested the need for increasing the numbers of scholarships available in tertiary education and extending the possibilities for postgraduate study. The submission proposed that the issue of the re-organisation of tertiary education should be the province of a coordinating commission. It also stressed the need for closer co-operation between the tertiary education system and industry.⁶⁸

Submissions from employers outside manufacturing industry were less unanimous in their demands for an intermediate sector in tertiary education which would produce graduates with a more specialised training. The A.N.Z. Bank submission supported the proposals of industry. It suggested that increasing mechanisation in the banks had provided more opportunity for less educated girls to gain employment, with fewer trained supervisory staff required. As this trend continued, the Bank suggested that

it seems reasonable to expect that in future banks will require more unskilled labour and [sic] lower levels and more highly trained staff for senior positions, and will, therefore, demand less general education than in the past.⁶⁹

While the banks would still have a demand for people with higher education qualifications, presumably gained from a university, the proportion of these people in comparison to those at the lower levels of the occupational hierarchy would fall. Nevertheless, such staff would require a much more general and broader education than they would be able to receive at the universities as they were organised at that time. The submission did not equate such a more general and broader education with traditional liberal-arts curricula, but within the ambit of modern business practice. What it proposed - "It would suit the Bank's purpose"⁷⁰ - was the establishment of business schools within the universities which provided short-term and part-time courses with

provision for full-time advanced courses for those staff who might need it for their employment. The submission was one of the most utilitarian received by the Committee and, as became apparent, out of step even with the recommendations which it was finally to make.

On the other hand, another employer group within the financial sector of capital made a much more liberal submission which recognised the benefits of mass tertiary education in the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony. The Life Offices Association proposed that tertiary education be extended - "it should be withheld only from those people (whatever the proportion may be) who lack the capacity to benefit from it".⁷¹ Its submission was clearly in line with the mood of educationalists and, indeed, with the aspirations of upwardly mobile sections of the population for whom white collar occupations such as those offered by its members appeared to be the ladder to success. The submission continued;

In short, any general increase in the level of education would conduce to greater efficiency within our industry, and we do not believe that there is any need to fear a situation where our people are "over-educated", having regard to the kind of work available to them.⁷²

The submission, in comparison with others from employer groups, was progressive and subscribed to the generally accepted philosophy which had governed the development of tertiary education in Australia up until the Murray Report. In its rejection of a more overtly utilitarian and vocational stance, the Association recognised the value of tertiary education as a whole in the hegemonic process.

Submissions from professional associations and unions supported the call for increased resources for technical education and a general upgrading of its status. The Institution of Engineers supported the expansion of tertiary education within defined guidelines. These were: tertiary education should be available to all capable regardless of financial considerations; it should not be readily available to those without the capability to undertake it; therefore, the entrance standards

of tertiary education institutions should be set at high levels; the universities should not become technical institutions dealing with the techniques but should retain their essential character; and those who do not have the ability or desire to attend universities should be provided with other types of institutions and courses.⁷³ The Institutions of Surveyors supported the call for increased resources and facilities for technical education, and also other calls for standardisation of courses.⁷⁴ The Royal Australian Chemical Institute submission stressed the need for the expansion of existing university and technical college facilities for technical education as well as establishing new institutions for training technicians and technologists.⁷⁵ The Australian Society of Accountants suggested that technical colleges and institutes should be up-graded vis-a-vis the universities.⁷⁶ In its submission, the Professional Officers Association of the Commonwealth Public Service suggested that social conditions demanded changes in tertiary education.

We are living in a time of rapid change and both the rate of advancement of living standards and the ability for national survival are controlled by those members of the community who have advanced education and training.⁷⁷

According to the Association, the universities had outdated and conservative attitudes which demanded change on their part. In addition, a system of U.S.-style junior colleges was proposed. The submission stressed the need for broad based undergraduate courses and standardisation. The Australian Clerical Officers Association of the Commonwealth Public Service took a somewhat different point of view, suggesting that high student failure rates were due to a lack of transfer of credit between institutions and of sub-degree courses within the universities. In addition, the Association proposed increases in provision for part-time and mature age students in the universities.⁷⁸ The Victorian Teachers Union presented proposals for the extension of degree conferring powers onto non-university tertiary institutions, which

should act either in association with a nearby university, or be upgraded to the same level, in a manner similar to the establishment of the British Institutes of Education. The Union was concerned that flexibility among tertiary education institutions should be maintained through variable entrance requirements and transferability between them.⁷⁹

The Report

Unlike the Murray Committee which had taken great pains to spell out the philosophy underlying its conceptions of universities in its Report, the Martin Committee made no positive nor concise statement of its concept of the respective roles of the various tertiary education institutions, even though it recommended major changes in the organisation of the sectors to which they belonged. Instead, from its first chapter, the Report set the pace with its utilitarian and commercial analysis of the continuing crisis which was besetting tertiary education. The Report went straight to the manifestation of the crisis; "A striking feature of the post-war years in Australia is the rapid increase in the number of people seeking higher education",⁸⁰ that, in fact, while the increase in the 17-22 year old age group was 32 per cent between 1946 and 1963, enrolments increased by 220 per cent in that time.⁸¹ This was attributed to "a desire for social and economic advancement" and "a genuine demand for increased opportunities for higher education".⁸² The Report suggested that while modern society faced problems on a scale never before recognised, which called "for mature judgements by free and well-trained minds", it continued, "at the same time, economic growth requires continued expansion of educational opportunities for the young people who will provide the trained work force of the future".⁸³ It introduced what was to become its dominant theme, that science and technology had contributed immensely to the

twentieth century world and should be recognised as the most important factors for the education system and the nation. The only justification given for the study of the humanities and social sciences in the introductory chapter of the Report was the irrationality of mankind.

Although man may be distinguished by his reasoning capacity, nonetheless, when considering his need for education for life in the societies of the future, it is well to remember the extent to which his behaviour is irrational and how many of his attitudes are unscientific.⁸⁴

Even the basic justification for this was made over to science and technology which were supposed to have caused the changes in society which led to the complexities of the modern world.

More complicated than ever before, capable of comprehending very many more human beings within one administrative order, these changed forms and new systems have been largely made possible, and to some extent have been caused, by the scientific and technological revolution.⁸⁵

The concerns of the Committee were obvious from its scant attention to the traditional rhetoric which had been used in justifying support for tertiary education, preferring instead to adopt a modern and economic approach. The lack of government support for tertiary education in the Menzies' years, apart from the period around the Murray Report, had led to a political climate which required a different language than had been previously adopted, especially as the Martin concern for tertiary education was much broader than the Murray concern, limited as it was to the universities. Tertiary education as a whole was much closer to the general public than had been the universities, at least up until the Commonwealth Post-War Reconstruction Training Scheme. The hegemonic functions of tertiary education, and particularly the universities, could only be ensured if the community was assured of their importance in language which was at once relevant and mystifying. Rhetoric based on technological advancement and economics did just that.

The Report then turned to the concept of education as an investment, an approach in keeping with the utilitarian view already outlined. For the individual increased material benefits were the dividends of

educational investment. For society, continuing economic growth depended significantly on "national investment in human capital", in at least four ways.

Firstly, the work force should itself become more skilled and efficient at doing a given task. Secondly, existing knowledge may be applied more rapidly in the modernization of capital equipment, and in the introduction of new products and of new methods for producing old products. Thirdly, new knowledge may be acquired. Fourthly, improved methods of management, whether at the level of decision making or that of detailed control, may become available.⁸⁶

The special need for tertiary education in modern industrialised societies was couched entirely in terms of economic expansion and was supported by a lengthy quotation from the National Economic Development Council of the U.K. dealing with investment, productivity management and industrial relations. Similarly, individual aspirations and community needs were seen on the economic level, although, interestingly, the Report rejected a strict manpower planning approach, which it saw as liable to both grave error and restricting educational opportunity.⁸⁷ Finally, the Report reviewed the trends of expansion in Australian tertiary education which were the immediate rationale for the establishment of the inquiry. It concluded that

It is clear that the growing demand for higher education has stimulated a great deal of interest at the government level which has resulted in greatly increased support. Nevertheless, the pressure for greater and greater expenditure has been maintained. Considerable public interest both in political spheres and in the community generally has been generated. The climate of opinion favours further expansion.⁸⁸

Thus the tone of the Report and the type of recommendations it would make were set.

The second of the Report's general chapters reviewed the Australian educational scene from a statistical stance. It compared domestic education expenditure with that in other areas and participation with that in comparable societies. It illustrated that education expenditure was the fastest growing area of government expenditure. Participation rates in primary and the first two years of secondary school were shown

to be significantly higher in Australia but worse than average after that. Australia's position with regard to graduates as a proportion of the population had actually fallen between 1952 and 1959, as had the numbers in proportion to the 17 to 22 year old age group.⁸⁹ Using Borrie and Rodgers,⁹⁰ the Committee pointed out the unusual fluctuations which had caused and would cause problems for tertiary education in the future, at least until 1968, noting that "marked fluctuations in the normal age structure are responsible for many of the difficulties being encountered at present by tertiary institutions".⁹¹ In addition, it pointed out that changing patterns of participation at senior secondary levels, particularly amongst girls, would have an important effect on tertiary enrolments.⁹² Given these factors, the Report predicted that there would be a substantial increase in senior secondary school participation rates until 1975.⁹³ This, in turn, would have an effect on tertiary education enrolments, which it predicted would rise from 117,900 in 1963 to a 1975 level of 248,000.⁹⁴ Such an increase would result directly from increased numbers in the 17 to 22 year old age group, although this factor would diminish in importance as the increase levelled out, and the expected trend towards longer periods of education, particularly for girls and women. By 1975, it expected the participation rate for tertiary education to be around 18 per cent.⁹⁵ The Report pointed out that there was a large untapped reserve of capable potential students in society;

It has been shown that the proportion of 'school leavers' who proceed to higher education is positively related to the socio-economic class of their fathers...it is not lack of scholastic aptitude which keeps many children of lower status families out of the university.⁹⁶

Further evidence to this effect was provided in Appendix II of the chapter which showed that class bias was a particularly effective form of selection for tertiary education.⁹⁷

In the following chapters of the Report, the Committee outlined the

future it envisaged for tertiary education. It was particularly concerned to increase the status of the non-university institutions and it did so by suggesting that the universities were unable to provide many types of education and training required in a modern society without damaging their own essential characters. It suggested that the system as it had developed was inappropriate in denying many able students the possibility of advanced education. It argued that much of the pressure on young people to gain a university education resulted from "the lack of other tertiary institutions of comparable status in the eyes of the community".⁹⁸ It foreshadowed its intention to recommend the "expansion, improvement, and establishing of appropriate institutions to provide a wider diversity of tertiary education",⁹⁹ so that there would be enough places in the system to satisfy demand. The Report stressed also the need for entrance requirements for tertiary education to be reviewed to promote transferability between institutions to maximise the potential of investment in education. The Committee recommended that the number of places provided in the universities be increased by 80% from the 1963 figure of 69,000 to 125,000 in 1975, giving a participation rate of 9 per cent.¹⁰⁰ Correspondingly, it proposed that there be a substantial increase in enrolments in non-university institutions in the same period. The proportion of those enrolled at the universities would, in fact, fall from 58 per cent of the total to only 50 per cent,¹⁰¹ a move justified because, from

Interviews with and submissions from leaders in industry and commerce...the Committee has concluded that the rate of growth necessary in this sphere should be greater than in any other sphere of tertiary education.¹⁰²

The concerns of the Committee and of members of the bourgeoisie with whom it discussed the issue were clearly hegemonic. The provision of tertiary education to match the aspirations of the working class was necessary if political stability were to be maintained. The role of the universities

in the hegemonic process, however, had to be protected. This meant that their status had to be ensured and their elite character preserved without alienating the working class from non-university alternatives. In some ways, the legitimation of the universities which had been one of the major functions of the Murray Report had to be qualified, so that they did not hold a monopoly of tertiary education status, while maintaining a leading position among tertiary education institutions.

The way in which the Report attempted to do this was to make the universities slightly more remote from the concerns of many potential students than they had become in the post-Murray period. It did this in two ways. The first was to concentrate on the levels of student wastage, suggesting that many of the students who attended universities would be better off in a non-university institution of comparable status but with a more practical emphasis. It reviewed the Murray findings on this issue and suggested that little improvement was noticeable. It investigated the success rates of Commonwealth Scholarship holders, part-time and external students, and concluded that the standard of matriculation needed to be raised, and that part-time provision should be transferred from the universities, as should external studies. It recognised that such a move would have to entail a change of attitude among students, employers and the general public, and sought to make the recommendations more palatable by proposing increased support for these areas in other institutions, including the establishment of institutions devoted substantially to external studies. In the same vein, the Report endorsed and sought to hasten the implementation of the Murray recommendation to transfer sub-university courses to other institutions.¹⁰³

The second way the Committee attempted to make the universities slightly more remote was to criticise their inflexibility in relation to technical and technological education, thus removing some of their relevance, if not mystique, to the students whose prime aim might be to

receive an applied qualification for vocational purposes. The Report suggested that

universities have usually been conservative bodies. They have shown themselves somewhat insensitive to long-term trends and have delayed much needed innovations.¹⁰⁴

Nevertheless, it criticised the general view that the universities were the only genuine form of tertiary education.

The Committee deplores the view that a university is the only place in which young men and women can get a worthwhile form of higher education; for many students, other types of tertiary education may be more desirable and more rewarding.¹⁰⁵

It suggested that, while universities were under considerable pressure to introduce new courses, particularly from the professions, and while there may be good reasons for them to do so in the light of their alleged inflexibility, the universities should not promote such attitudes, but allow other institutions to undertake courses in those areas, especially when there was an "undue emphasis on techniques" or where the course was sub-matriculation in standard.¹⁰⁶ The Report noted the essential link between teaching and research within the character of universities, supporting the notion that "a body concerned with only one of them is clearly no longer a university",¹⁰⁷ although it criticised the universities in relation to their attitude to this linkage. It proposed that they devote more resources to educational research in the university, to evaluate teaching, and especially develop policies on issues vital to their own existence, such as

who should be taught at a university, what courses should be included in a university, how academic success of able students may be assured, what facilities are needed, and many others affecting staffing.¹⁰⁸

The criticisms the Report made of the universities were clearly qualified by reference to the general attitudes of the community and to the pressures which these had placed on the universities. They did not attach to the functions of the universities, nor to their essential character or status, but to the monopoly they held in the tertiary

education sphere. They were clearly intended to remove the impediments to the hegemonic functions of the universities which mass participation would thrust upon them, thus preserving their usefulness in the hegemonic process. They, in fact, strengthened the implications of the arguments on student wastage thus adding to the mystique which surrounded them.

The Report suggested that the transfer of part-time, external and sub-degree students from the universities to other institutions would not solve the problem of high student wastage entirely. It remained concerned at the poor correlation between matriculation and university results, and suggested that a number of reforms should be implemented. First, it proposed that matriculation standards should be increased, and that the relationship between matriculation and the development of scholarship in the universities be kept under continuous review. Second, it stressed the importance of adequate transfer of credit provisions in the universities. Third, it suggested that university courses be kept under constant review to ensure that outdated subject options and unnecessary details were not retained. Fourth, the Committee suggested that where student numbers in service courses became excessive,

there would be distinct advantages in requiring many of them to undertake the first year at another institution, which need not necessarily be on the main campus.¹⁰⁹

Fifth, it suggested that university enrolments be kept between 4,000 and 10,000, and that new universities should specialise rather than attempt to provide courses in those more traditional areas already serviced by established institutions. Sixth, it suggested that previous staffing practice had been to over-emphasise research at the expense of teaching, and proposed that in future a proper balance should be struck between the two. Finally, it recommended that adequate staffing arrangements would have to be planned for, and predicted that an extra 5,000 staff would be required by 1975 if existing standards alone were to be maintained.¹¹⁰

At the same time, the Report gave the universities support in maintaining

their status and functions at the top of the educational hierarchy in recommending a substantial increase in research funding, and new machinery - an Australian National Research Foundation - to co-ordinate research on a national scale. This support was to be in addition to increased support for postgraduate training and for equipment.¹¹¹ The streamlining of the universities which would result from the implementation of the Committee's recommendations would protect them from declining standards as increased demand occurred, which in turn would have threatened their legitimacy, and so their ability to perform their hegemonic functions. By maintaining the status of the universities, while creating institutions of equivalent standards but with lesser status, their position in the hegemonic process could be assured.

The Committee then turned its attention to the non-university institutions. It first tackled the question of teacher education which was presenting serious problems for educational authorities. ~~The Report noted that the demand for teachers would increase educational authorities.~~ The Report noted that the demand for teachers would increase substantially by 1975 for a number of reasons, not least the expected increases in participation rates and the numbers of school enrolments due to increased population. In addition, it noted the desires of the States to improve markedly the quality as well as quantity of teachers. The Report recognised the efforts of the States to build up the teacher training college network to cope with demand. These factors had considerable implications for the future of tertiary education in Australia. It was clear that the numbers of places in teacher education would need to be expanded, either in existing or new institutions. The Report estimated that government schools alone would require an increase of 72 per cent in the numbers of teachers by 1975, and the private system would add an extra 33 per cent to these numbers.¹¹² The first implication was that

in any event, the preparation of a number of teachers adequate to meet the needs of the Australian community must be given a high priority in the total national undertaking at the tertiary level to ensure the further supply of well-educated students.¹¹³

The second implication was that the quality of the preparation of teachers would also have to improve if the demands of the community were to be met. This would have effects on the physical resources available to the tertiary education system as a whole. The Committee proposed that quality should be raised in two steps - first, increasing entrance requirements for the teachers colleges to matriculation, and second, increase basic training from two to three years.¹¹⁴ In addition, the Report suggested that these should be viewed as initial steps only and that in-service programmes should be developed to ensure the continuing exposure of teachers to quality education, a proposal that would have significant resource implications in itself.

The third sector of tertiary education that concerned the Committee, and in fact became the subject of the major thrust of its Report, was technical and technological education. It was concerned that the public was not sufficiently aware of the importance of technology to the future of an advanced industrialised society, a situation which it believed was shown by the lack of status afforded to the technical colleges. It noted that government support for technical colleges was much less than that for the other tertiary institutions, especially the universities which trained technologists in similar areas. The Report emphasised the relation between technological education and national development.

The importance of the technical colleges in the system of tertiary education in Australia cannot be over-emphasized...At this stage in Australia's development from a primary-producing country to one which is becoming industrialized rapidly, it is important to develop to the maximum all institutions which provide education in the technologies.¹¹⁵

The importance and wide representation of engineering in the field of technological education provided the Committee with an example with which

to illustrate the importance of the area and its uneven development in Australia. While it concentrated on this example, the Report recognised that a wide range of courses, such as chemistry, business administration, commerce, accountancy and architecture, at the diploma level were catered for in technical colleges.¹¹⁶ While it recognised that these courses overlapped with similar courses in the universities, it stressed that the differences in emphasis of the two types of institutions validated the similarities which occurred. It asserted that many students in these areas found university courses too abstract for their purposes and proposed "that an attempt should be made to divert a percentage of potential students in these subjects from the universities to the technical colleges".¹¹⁷ This could, of course, only be achieved if the technical colleges were upgraded, both in physical facilities and in status. The Report recognised this and argued strongly that the fundamental differences between the universities and technical colleges should not imply quality differences, as had been the case. It asserted that

The objective of the education provided by a technical college is to equip men and women for the practical world of industry and commerce, teaching them the way in which manufacturing and business are carried on, and the fundamental rules which govern their successful operation. The university course, on the other hand, tends to emphasise the development of knowledge and the importance of research; in doing so it imparts much information which is valuable to the practical man but which is often incidental to the main objective. Both types of education are required by the community, and in increasing amounts, but it is important that students receive the kind of education best suited to their innate abilities and purposes in life. At present, certain pressures tend to overtax the academic ability of a considerable segment of the student population which could be better provided for in institutions offering courses of different orientation and less exacting academically.¹¹⁸

The Report suggested that the technical colleges could be strengthened in a number of ways to enable them to achieve the quality of the universities, and thus make them an attractive alternative for students and employers. While the colleges were to retain their practical

orientation, the Report proposed that some of the characteristics of the universities be added to them to ensure that they offered full educational development. First, it suggested that the study of the humanities and social sciences be an integral part of courses in them. Second, it proposed that student union facilities should be established or upgraded to allow technical college students the opportunity to interact with each other outside the academic arena. Third, the Report recommended that recreational and trade courses be separated from those more advanced diploma courses which would become the focus of the colleges (and thus paving the way for the establishment of the technical and further education sector of tertiary education over the succeeding decade). Finally, it suggested that conditions of service should be upgraded to attract more qualified staff.¹¹⁹

The Report then proceeded to detail its plans for the development of tertiary education in the future. It argued that

The present system of tertiary education in Australia places undue emphasis on university education. As a result, the weakness of non-university tertiary institutions prevents the latent abilities of many young Australians from being fully developed.¹²⁰

The Committee's recommendations attempted to rectify this imbalance by increasing the quality and thus the status of non-university institutions, rather than by restructuring the university system. Although the Committee suggested that the existing system was simple and inflexible, its proposals did not challenge the status quo but aimed, instead, to strengthen the existing system to enable it to cope with the demands it faced while retaining its functions in the hegemonic process. It accepted the concept of three different types of tertiary institutions (and by implication even more types of post-school institutions following from its recommendations to jettison non-advanced courses), and its proposals to expand non-university provision aimed at rendering the inflexibilities of the system less apparent rather than less real. Once it had rejected even simple reforms such as the association of

universities and technical and teachers colleges, a move which may of course have threatened the legitimacy of the universities as premier institutions, it was faced with the problem of increasing the quality of the non-university institutions. It did this by proposing a new organisational framework for their development. In relation to the teachers colleges, it agreed that "the development of autonomous colleges is a desirable goal"¹²¹ but was not prepared to recommend that they should have the status immediately. The Report had already pointed out that the standard of the staff of many teachers colleges was inadequate; "if all teachers colleges are to be accepted without question as tertiary institutions, the academic quality of the staffs of some of them must be improved".¹²² Instead, it recommended that the colleges be coordinated by a Board of Teacher Education in each State, which would advise educational authorities, review developments, oversee the relations between the colleges and other tertiary institutions, particularly those also providing teacher education, and in the future, grant degrees and institutional autonomy.¹²³ For technical colleges, the Report recommended similar arrangements under State Institutes of Colleges. It envisaged that, as demand grew and the quality of the colleges improved, they would become degree granting, autonomous institutions, offering an alternative to the universities, thus reducing the need for government intervention in directing students away from the universities. The Committee had been impressed with the example of the U.S. junior colleges, and suggested that some of the characteristics of the system be adopted in Australia. In particular, it suggested that the universities experiment with the type of relations U.S. universities had with tertiary colleges and reiterated its view that some first year courses be taught elsewhere.

The Committee hopes that, in the near future a number of first year classes, particularly those providing terminal pre-professional courses, can be provided in appropriate senior technological institutions or elsewhere.¹²⁴

In fact, the Committee moved to contain existing flexibilities in the system by more rigidly defining the boundary between university standard work and that of the other tertiary institutions, by strongly supporting the Murray recommendations (which had been supported by the A.U.C. as well) to move non-degree level work from the universities.¹²⁵ Finally, "provided that the Committee's recommendations on Institutes of Colleges and Boards of Teacher Education are accepted and implemented",¹²⁶ the Report did not foresee any need for the establishment of new universities in the decade to 1975.

The main purpose of the Institutes of Colleges and the Boards of Teacher Education was to be the coordination of the non-university tertiary sector. The Committee view was that granting autonomy to tertiary colleges immediately would ensure imitation of the universities, especially since other recommendations of the Committee were designed to promote their status in the community. It was important that, if these institutions were to play their assigned role in tertiary education, the differences between the two sectors had to be preserved. What had to be ensured was the upgrading of the colleges in the interests of technological and scientific efficiency, while retaining the position of the universities as the educators of the intellectual elite, and so their position and role within the hegemonic process. To ensure that the system as a whole would develop in line with the aims of the Committee, it recommended an overarching co-ordinating commission. Within the constraints of the Constitution, and recognising that increasing demands for resources in tertiary education had outstripped the ability of the States to meet them, the Report proposed a further voluntary encroachment into education by the Commonwealth. It recommended the establishment of the Australian Tertiary Education Commission (A.T.E.C.), to operate as the A.U.C. had done, and subsuming that body.¹²⁷ The aim of the twin coordination proposals would also have removed the tertiary colleges from

direct official contact with universities, which would deal with the State based co-ordinating bodies in their relations with the colleges. Commonwealth coordination would then operate at the level of the universities and the State authorities, thus ensuring the upgrading of the colleges and the preservation of the status of the universities.

An important factor in the success of the Committee's proposals would be the acceptance by students of the upgraded tertiary colleges. To ensure this the Report dealt extensively with the issue of financial assistance to students. It identified students receiving financial assistance in two categories - manpower planning, as in cadetship or teacher scholarship schemes, and educational opportunity programmes, as in the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme. The Committee rejected the use of a loan scheme as the primary method of offering student assistance because of its inefficiency and because it would impose a burden on students which would be discouraging at a time when students needed to be encouraged.¹²⁸ The Report noted that about two-third of university students and almost all teacher education college students received assistance through one or other of the schemes already operating, although it was unable to estimate the numbers receiving awards in technical colleges, even though some students there received either State or Commonwealth assistance. The Committee proposed that the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme be extended to cover the technical colleges, and also be extended in scope.¹²⁹ This would ensure that all students who completed their first year in minimum time would receive an award equivalent to the existing Commonwealth Scholarship. The Committee recommended that the scholarship levels be kept under constant review so that living allowances bore "proper relation to price and wage levels",¹³⁰ that means tests were raised according to salary and wage movements, and that numbers were kept at existing levels in proportion to the numbers of students enrolled, which would have led to increased

numbers of scholarships available over the decade. In addition, ten per cent of teachers college students were to be offered Commonwealth Scholarships under the proposal. The attitude of potential students to the proposals of the Committee would play an important role in their success, for if there was not a shift in emphasis in the community from the universities to the colleges, the strategy proposed would be endangered.

The final chapter of Volume I of the Report dealt with the Committee's specific financial proposals in relation to its recommendations. The Committee pointed out that "comprehensive statistics of Australia's financial expenditures in the field of tertiary education, except for universities, are not available."¹³¹ In addition, it suggested that certain types of expenditure should not be included in the figures; for instance, maintenance of students should be excluded from education expenditure, "since the cost of sheltering, feeding and clothing young people is independent of the fact that they are students",¹³² and teacher education studentships should more properly be charged against primary and secondary education expenditure. With these qualifications, the Committee included tables on educational expenditure over a number of years. These showed that in 1954, prior to the Murray Report, the Commonwealth share of the tertiary education bill was 21.8 per cent, the share of the State was 55.6 per cent and student fees, 12.7 per cent. Recurrent expenses accounted for 84.6 per cent of the total, while capital costs were 15.4 per cent, and total expenditure was less than the total income.¹³³ By 1962, when the effects of the Murray recommendations were fully noticeable, the Commonwealth share of income had risen to 32.3 per cent, while the States' share had fallen to 49.2 per cent, and the share of student fees to 9.6 per cent. Recurrent expenses had fallen to 74.7 per cent of total expenditure, while capital costs had increased to 25.3 per cent, and expenditure had outstripped

income.¹³⁴ Total expenditure on tertiary education had increased from just over £5 million in 1947, to almost £48 million in 1959, and about £74.5 million in 1962.¹³⁵ It was estimated that recurrent expenditure in universities would rise to £107 million in 1975, and in non-university institutions to £52 million, a total of £159 million,¹³⁶ and that capital expenditure of about £200 million - £22 million per annum - would be required by 1975 to cope with the expected growth in the field.¹³⁷ Total expenditure would thus amount to about £181 million per annum by 1975,¹³⁸ compared to a 1962 total of about £74.5 million.¹³⁹ The Committee pointed out that in terms of the GNP, total expenditure on tertiary education would rise from 0.8 per cent in 1963 to 1.4 per cent in 1975, an increase of about 75 per cent.¹⁴⁰ It suggested that

This is in general conformity with experience that, as incomes rise, education is one of the avenues of expenditure on which the community spends proportionately more of its income. The Committee regards the increase in the proportion of G.N.P. devoted to higher education as natural in the light of the characteristic behaviour of developed societies with rising incomes...the Committee is convinced that expansion in higher educational facilities in Australia is in itself an essential condition for the growth of national production and the maintenance of Australia's place in the ranks of the technologically advanced nations.¹⁴¹

The Committee noted that although the Commonwealth's share of the higher education bill had risen considerably over the last decade, this had been almost entirely confined to the universities, where it provided about 44 per cent in 1962 compared to only 4 per cent in the non-university sector.¹⁴² The recommendations that it had made, made "necessary a reconsideration of the financing of those institutions which have hitherto depended predominantly on state government support".¹⁴³ This led the Committee to recommend that teachers colleges and technical colleges be funded on the same basis as universities - £1 by the Commonwealth for every £1.85 from the States and fees for recurrent expenditure, and £1 for £1 for capital expenditure, to approved

limits.¹⁴⁴ The Report continued;

Moreover, there is a special reason why the Commonwealth should take a particular interest in the non-university institutions. From these will come the skilled manpower which is of such critical significance for Australia's economic growth.¹⁴⁵

The Committee recommended that the grants continue to be on a triennial basis, and that whereas non-academic salaries and wages had been previously excluded from calculations for supplementary grants for inflation and increased costs, they now be included.¹⁴⁶

Finally, the Report dealt with the Committee's specific recommendations for 1965 and 1966, which were to be in addition to the recommendations of the Australian Universities Commission for the 1964-66 triennium. The Committee thought that "it would be an impossible task" to estimate the recurrent needs of institutions for the period, but recommended only capital grants for "those particular institutions which are likely to become "foundation members" of the Institutes of Colleges and the Boards of Teacher Education",¹⁴⁷ as well as for the new universities. It recommended that the Commonwealth make grants to be met on a £1 for £1 basis by the States of £2.45 million for new university development, £5 million for the technical college sector, £2.5 million for the teachers colleges, and £1.25 million for other institutions such as agricultural and para-medical colleges, a total of £11.2 million.¹⁴⁸ The Report recognised that in some area, States might not have sufficient time to undertake the necessary planning to cope with the funds in the time suggested, and stated,

therefore, that there would be advantages in making any legislation sufficiently flexible to permit transfer of grants within the overall approved total, from any of the institutions named above, where projects may be lagging, to other institutions which are ready to proceed immediately with approved building programmes.¹⁴⁹

It was clear from the financial proposals of the Report that the Committee's main aim was the restructuring of tertiary education for

economic considerations. The justifications given throughout were financial, economic and labour market related with little reference to the educational issues involved. In this, the final chapter of the Report did not differ from its bulk.¹⁵⁰

Reaction to the Report

The Committee presented Volumes I and II of its Report to the A.U.C. in August 1964. It was presented to the Parliament in March 1965, when the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, outlined the Government's reaction to the recommendations of the Committee.¹⁵¹ The Government divided these into contentious and non-contentious issues. The latter included those concerning increasing the numbers and scope of the Commonwealth Scholarships, and the provisions of additional capital grants to the new universities during the 1964-66 trienium. The Government accepted some of the recommendations relating to scholarships, but rejected those relating to the teachers colleges, and that to grant scholarships to all students completing the first year of their course in the minimum time. The major non-contentious issue relating to increased capital grants was accepted and Menzies announced that legislation to provide the Commonwealth's share (£1.225 million) would be introduced in the current session of Parliament.¹⁵²

The bulk of Menzies' statement was concerned with the more contentious issues - the development of an advanced education sector of autonomous teachers colleges and technical colleges, and the expansion of the A.U.C. into the Australian Tertiary Education Commission to co-ordinate the advanced education and university sectors. The Government was prepared to accept the broad concept of an advanced education sector and to offer assistance to the States for its development, although on a much limited scale to that recommended, for it rejected a major part of the recommendation to include teacher education

colleges. Contrary to the arguments put forward by the Committee, regarding the educational problems in the relationship between State education departments and teachers colleges under the existing arrangements, and the demands which would be made by non-government schools on the teachers colleges over the next decade, Menzies stated;

Important as this field is, the Commonwealth is not prepared to enter it. It is one which has been the exclusive responsibility of the States and is, in each State, closely bound up with the State Education Department's judgement as to the training it wishes teachers in its schools to have, and as to the manner in which it decides to run its primary and secondary schools.¹⁵³

Instead, the Commonwealth proposed to let the States decide whether the teachers colleges should be autonomous colleges and the extent to which they wished to relinquish control over them, although Menzies made it clear that the Commonwealth would not extend funds for them. The recommendations to upgrade technical colleges were accepted in principle, but only in those areas where the entrance requirement was matriculation.¹⁵⁴ The Government's contribution toward technical college funding was to be on the same basis as its support for the universities, as recommended by the Committee, and was to total about £24 million for capital grants and £34 million for recurrent grants in the 1967-69 triennium.¹⁵⁵ Menzies stressed the limits to Commonwealth support, which was only for basic tertiary development at tertiary level, and did not include provision for existing sub-diploma courses in the technical colleges, nor signify future support for degree-level courses as suggested by the Committee. The Government strongly agreed with the Committee's statements that the colleges should not base their development on the universities and that they should view their responsibilities to the community as different from those of the universities.

the support now pledged by the Commonwealth will not go beyond supporting the basic concept of the Committee as to new type colleges with a variety of advanced courses leading on

completion to a diploma...Our support is founded on acceptance of this principle, and we do not make our support available for the development out of these colleges of new universities. We do not look so far ahead as that.¹⁵⁶

The Government also agreed to make interim capital grants of about £2.5 million in each of 1965 and 1966 which had been recommended in the Report.¹⁵⁷

The Government also rejected the Committee's proposals for the coordination of tertiary education. While it endorsed the recommendations for the establishment of the Institutes of Colleges, it regarded the matter as one for the States to determine and declined to establish a Commonwealth Institute or make provisions of grants to the technical colleges dependent on the establishment of Institutes in each State. It rejected the recommendation to establish an Australian college of external studies, and the proposal for the universities to gradually wind down their involvement in external studies in favour of the advanced education sector. It was cool toward the establishment of an Australian National Research Foundation as recommended by the Committee, and announced instead its intention to create a further advisory committee to administer Commonwealth support for research in the tertiary education system. (The A.U.C. had recommended grants of £2.5 million in the current triennium.)¹⁵⁸ Most importantly in relation to coordination, the Government rejected the major recommendation in this area. The Committee had proposed that an Australian Tertiary Education Commission be established, subsuming the A.U.C., to co-ordinate the universities and the advanced education sector. Instead, it established an advisory committee for the latter, leaving the former to continue unchanged. In addition, the Government rejected the Committee's recommendation that the development of the universities be scaled down. While it supported the development of the technical colleges, it did not accept that no new universities be planned, that the universities should withdraw from

external studies and part-time provision, or than an arbitrary upper limit be placed on their size.¹⁵⁹

The ALP Opposition response to the Report was spearheaded by Dr. J.F. Cairns. The Opposition was critical of both the Government and the Committee in their neglect of the results of rapid social change which demanded that tertiary education be integrated into the offensive against social inequality. Cairns accused the Committee of being unaware of the most serious barriers to educational participation and argued for a more comprehensive educational enquiry similar to that called for by Menzies as Leader of the Opposition in 1945. Cairns stated;

Neither the Committee in its report nor the Government even begins to think of the practical needs of these changes. There is enormous complacency today, particularly among those who have had tertiary education and particularly those who have attained some position of status or influence in the community in and around the Government, the universities, the Public Service and elsewhere. There is an enormous complacency today in those people because they have got where they are.¹⁶⁰

He suggested that the Report was uninspired and that it could be nothing else given the Government to which it was to be presented. He accused the Government of being remote from the real problems that existed within tertiary education, and unrealistic in its meagre support for tertiary education. He pointed out that "the main characteristics of the Commonwealth's contribution have been, first, irregularity, and secondly, instability of the proportion".¹⁶¹ He suggested that the Government's rejection of the teacher education and coordination recommendations would lead to a worsening situation in tertiary education, not least because of the inequalities the rejection actually created.

There are differences between the treatment of one group in education and another. Conflicts are being generated inside the system, and one group put against another because not enough money is available to satisfy both.¹⁶²

This he argued was because the Commonwealth had failed in its responsibility to provide extra support, even in a time when the

political climate would have enabled it to do so.¹⁶³ The A.L.P., which in Government had laid the foundations for increased participation by the Commonwealth in tertiary education as part of its post-War reconstruction plans, was maintaining its support for the renovation of the education system to ensure that it was relevant to an advanced industrialised society as was developing in Australia. Its policies in Government had recognised the important role which the education system played in the hegemonic process and Cairns' response to the Martin Report made it clear that the A.L.P. would continue to support those modernising sections of the bourgeoisie which sought an integrated education system which would respond to the needs of capital, both economically and culturally. This entailed, of course, concessions to the working class to promote political stability.

Reactions to the Report by contemporary commentators were by no means as supportive as had been those to the Murray Report. Partridge was strongly critical of the Report, particularly of its failure to enunciate educational principles in support of its recommendations.

The main deficiency seems to me to be that the Committee reveals itself to be deplorably vague, inarticulate or indecisive about the basic concepts and principles it employs for constructing its picture of the structure of tertiary education.¹⁶⁴

He suggested that over the period since the Murray Report, social forces had been acting upon the tertiary education system producing rapid changes in an almost uncontrolled manner, and which had produced a structure which was not adapted to the society in which it was situated. He believed that the failure of the Report to enunciate educational principles in defining the differences between the sectors was certain to lead to confusion especially in relation to technical education. He agreed that technical education needed expansion and upgrading but questioned the reasons for this requirement. He identified three main reasons. First, the Report had suggested that there was a need to

protect the universities from over-crowding which would lower their standard of teaching. Partridge was critical of this reason, arguing that it would be easier to justify the expansion of the universities through the creation of new institutions to cope with demand, especially given the claims that a university education imparts "something of inestimable value"¹⁶⁵ which might be expected should be extended to as many qualified people as possible. Second, there were suggestions that the universities were accepting too many students incapable of meeting the intellectual demands of them and so diluting their quality. He suggested that this was an entirely unproven assumption on the part of the Report and suggested that, if it were the case, the universities would have already established an informal "pecking order" (as they had done in the U.S. where the participation rate was much higher than that in Australia). However, he suggested that the Report was deficient in this area in any supporting argument for its assertion. Third, he identified demand related not to level but to type of education which he agreed was

an important reason for diverting students from the universities and creating non-university institutions which would be related not to different levels of intellectual ability and the different levels of teaching that should be provided, but rather to the consideration that there are important types or areas of higher education which, although they make the same exacting intellectual demands as the teaching of universities does, are not properly the responsibilities of universities.¹⁶⁶

Partridge suggested that the Committee clearly accepted this in foreshadowing the development of the advanced education system to a comparable quality level with the universities as degree granting, but that it never outlined the differences which might be expected to justify the separation of the types of education, nor provide an indication of how to prevent their convergence. He suggested that at this point the Report presented an inconsistent argument. On the one hand, it argued that technological and technical education and research were central to

the development of an advanced industrial society, yet on the other argued for the separation of the two and the establishment of institutions to ensure that the universities were not overburdened with vocational education of this type.¹⁶⁷

Partridge was not alone in his criticisms of the Report. Encel opposed the establishment of the advanced education sector;

Despite a few nice words about the humane functions of education, the Report is largely based on a vocational and utilitarian conception of education and its role in society.¹⁶⁸

He suggested that the recommendation for the development of colleges of advanced education indicated a confusion in the minds of the Committee between education and training, and that it would distract from real needs for vocational training at tertiary level through what he saw to be a confusion between further education and vocational education. He suggested that the new colleges would inhibit the development of secondary education by competing with it for resources and staff and that there would be little if any saving in tertiary education, as the new institutions would have to compete for staff with the universities and professions if they were to achieve comparable status. Finally, he suggested that their development would lead to an unnecessary concept of hierarchy in tertiary education instead of flexibility and diversity.¹⁶⁹ Playford suggested that the utilitarian nature of the Report, and its reliance on the human capital theory of educational development, developed from the corporate interests which were represented on the Committee, almost to the exclusion of any others. He pointed out that apart from businessmen members, the Chairman was not only Chairman of the A.U.C. but also a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Chairman of the Defence Research and Development Policy Committee of the Department of Defence, and a director of I.B.M. According to Playford, the Report "in advocating the subordination of

higher education to the needs of industry and commerce, it could have just as easily been written by businessmen alone".¹⁷⁰ Little suggested that the development of the colleges, far from being a recognition of the need for diversity and flexibility as had been suggested, resulted from a combination of the elitist nature of the universities and the demands for middle-level management training. He continued;

The consistency with which the Committee emphasizes the latter makes it impossible to detect as a result of their proposals the emergence of any really new institutions. It is more realistic to view the strengthening of technical education as a strengthening of the elitist and illiberal characteristics of our system of higher education modified only by the Report's stress on the necessity of easy transfer between institutions...The upper class domination of the universities will thus continue.¹⁷¹

The Report and its acceptance in part by the Government had clearly found less acceptance than it might have if it had been couched in different rhetoric and had included the types of educational justifications employed by Murray. As it was, its recommendations for an explicit division between theory and practice - in mass education a necessary division if the system were to fulfil its hegemonic functions - and the division between vocational and liberal education which it entailed, were in opposition to the development of education in Australia, especially in the post-War period.

The Report also attracted a good deal of specific criticism regarding its proposals for teacher education and technical education, and the response of the Government did likewise. Howie regarded the Martin proposals for teacher education as only going part way, suggesting that without the involvement of the universities as the major participant, even in association with the colleges, the recommendations would result in major professional and educational divisions in the area.¹⁷² He was supported by Hogg, who was critical of the Report for "its failure on its own evidence to recommend university status for teacher education".¹⁷³ Both were strongly critical of the Government's

response to the recommendations which widened the division proposed by the Report. Howie suggested that the Government's refusal to include teacher education within the ambit of its responsibility was consistent with its "stubborn resistance" to inquire into other areas of education and inconsistent with even the Report's stated views on the unity of education. He continued; "It is foolishly illogical to make an arbitrary and doctrinaire separation between the whole and one of its most necessary parts".¹⁷⁴ Hogg suggested that the Government's response had produced a "debilitating disappointment" and "a sense of anti-climax"¹⁷⁵ in teacher education circles, which had been assigned a 'cinderella' role in tertiary education. She suggested that it was unacceptable for the Commonwealth to use the excuse of Constitutional responsibility to reject the recommendations on teacher education while accepting those for technical education, and in the light of the support it already offered for the universities, implying that the Menzies Government interpreted Commonwealth involvement as co-operation when it suited its political purposes and as interference when it wanted to avoid action.¹⁷⁶ Andersen suggested that the Government had bowed to pressure from the States in regard to teacher education and responded instead to the "more immediate material rewards" which seemed apparent in supporting technical education.¹⁷⁷

The Government's response to the acceptance of the recommendations on technical education were not, however, without criticism. Nor was the Report itself. Wood, who was generally in support of the thrust of the Report, was critical of the arbitrary decision to divide student numbers on a 50/50 basis rather than on a potential success-rate basis. More importantly, however, he suggested that the separation of advanced level students in the technical colleges from those undertaking sub-diploma courses would drain resources from trade and further education courses resulting in "quite serious implications for students at these lower

levels and for their teachers".¹⁷⁸ Wood's concerns foreshadowed the problems which were to arise over the succeeding decade in relation to the boundary between the advanced education and T.A.F.E sectors, which were to lead to serious problems across the whole tertiary system, but particularly for the long-term development of the colleges. Murray-Smith was much more critical of the Report in regard to technical education. He suggested that the Report merely perpetuated traditional methods of inquiry, calling it "blinkerred in its field of vision" and containing a "failure of nerve and of vision."¹⁷⁹ He argued that the proposals of the Committee continued the inadequate conception of technical education as an addendum to liberal-general education and suggested that the Committee should have taken a much more radical stance in its proposals to restructure tertiary education. He continued;

Just when it was within its grasp, the Martin Committee has let slip from its grasp the one great recommendation it almost seemed on the point of making - the recommendation that forms of higher education distinct from but parallel to the universities need to be created.¹⁸⁰

He was particularly critical of the Government's response which he suggested showed Menzies' inability to grasp the complexities which faced tertiary education, "a tragic and perhaps, the culminating example of Mr Menzies' insulation from the realities of our national existence today".¹⁸² On the other hand, Williams suggested that the Government's acceptance of much of the Report in relation to technical education would unify non-university tertiary institutions, leading to growth, research, rationalisation, and would avoid unnecessary duplication. He supported the essence of Murray-Smith's thesis on the importance of technical education but, unlike him, believed that greater diversity, flexibility and choice would result from the development of an advanced education sector along the lines proposed in the Report.¹⁸²

Reactions to the Report and to the Government's response to it clearly showed that the debate in tertiary education had become more

sustained in the period since the publication of the Murray Report and indicated the growing importance of the tertiary education system in the development of the post-War society in Australia. This debate was to continue during the period of rapid development in tertiary education which followed the Martin Report, during which time the Commonwealth was forced to revise its position by the flow of events. By 1968, it had accepted that teacher education was a legitimate part of the advanced education sector and teacher education institutions were becoming Commonwealth supported colleges of advanced education. In 1974, the Commonwealth accepted full responsibility for financing advanced education and the universities, and in 1975 announced its intention to merge the A.U.C. and the Commission on Advanced Education (which had succeeded the advisory committee established by Menzies) into a Tertiary Education Commission. In 1976, Smart wrote;

The decade 1965-1975 has seen the realisation of many of the Martin Committee's aspirations for a robust CAE sector and it has grown to the point where it now rivals in size and importance the once supreme university sector of tertiary education.¹⁸³

While Smart's perception of the advanced education sector may have been optimistic in view of developments in the latter half of the 1970s, it was true that it had developed far beyond the point envisaged by Menzies. The requirements of bourgeois hegemony to meet the growing demands for tertiary education in the community had resulted in this development. Nevertheless, the criticisms of those commentators who called for a unified system of tertiary education, at least between the advanced education and university sectors, had less impact on the developing system, which remained compartmentalised, with the universities heading an hierarchical structure. While the universities retained their leading positions with regard to the relationship between the tertiary education system and the hegemonic process, the rapid development of the advanced education sector acted as an incentive to

them to remain faithful to their traditional roles while reforming their structures to make them more relevant. The Report of the Martin Committee provided the basis for this development to occur. It enabled the labour market requirements of advanced capitalism to be met without undermining the position of the universities in the hegemonic process. It was able to satisfy much of the demand for tertiary education which arose from demand for upward social mobility. It reinforced the recommendations of the Murray Report in relation to the universities. It secured a continuing and growing interest by the Commonwealth in supporting tertiary education. In particular, developments which flowed from its recommendations assisted in maintaining the legitimacy of the education system during a period of intense social pressure, and so assisted in the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony in Australian society.

FOOTNOTES

1. E.L. Wheelwright, "Problems of Higher Education" (1965), in E.L. Wheelwright (ed), Radical Political Economy, (Sydney, 1974), p.177.
2. ibid., p. 179.
3. K.D. Buckley, "The Crisis", Outlook, Vol. 6, no. 5, October 1962, p. 12.
4. "Editorial", Prospect, Vol. 5, no. 1, 1962, p. 3, original emphasis.
5. R.G. Menzies, press statement, 27/8/61, in Tertiary Education in Australia, Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia, (Sir Leslie Martin - chairman), August 1964, (Canberra, 1965), Appendix A, Vol. 1, p. 225. Here-in-after referred to as Martin Report.
6. For a discussion of the appointment of the Committee, see S. Davies, "Establishing the Martin Committee: A study of the setting up of the Committee and its preliminary discussion", unpublished MEd thesis, Monash University, 1981, especially for the conflict which led to the resignation of the Deputy Chairman.
7. J. Ely, Reality and Rhetoric, (Sydney, 1978), p. 107; and B.V. Hill, "The University in Australian Tertiary Education", Australian University, Vol.6, no. 2, August 1968, p. 145.
8. G. Little, "The Martin Report and the Universities", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. III, no. 2, September 1965, p. 65.
9. D. Smart, "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education 1964-1975", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol XIV, no. 2, October 1976, p. 242.
10. A. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making in Higher Education", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p.36.
11. B. Bessant, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne, 1977), p.95.
12. See Davies, "Establishing the Martin Committee", *passim*.
13. F.J. Schonell, "Australian University Expansion - Problems and Promise", Australian Journal of Science, Vol 24, no. 1, July 1961, p. 13, original emphasis.
14. K. Myer, letter to the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia, 7/11/61, CF11. The Committee documents are held in the Australian Archives, A 1326, and some also at the Australian College of Education, Melbourne. They are referred to here by the reference number allotted by the Committee.
15. ibid.,
16. P.H. Karmel, "Notes on the Economic and Financial Aspects of Tertiary Education", 13/6/62, p. 15, CF 344.

17. ibid., pp. 28-30.
18. P.H. Karmel, "Some Economic Aspects of Education", Buntine Oration, delivered at Australian College of Education. Third Annual Conference, 18 May 1962, p. 15. This paper was also included in the Committee documents, CF 343.
19. ibid., p. 20.
20. ibid., p. 20.
21. ibid., p. 10.
22. ibid., p. 10.
23. P.H. Karmel, "The Pattern of Tertiary Education in the 1960s", Australian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 1, November 1962, p. 33. This paper was also included in the Committee documents, CF 440.
24. P.H. Karmel, Sydney Morning Herald, 22/10/62, p. 6, CF 425.
25. Paper prepared by the Committee Secretariat, 12/10/61, for Committee meeting 13/10/61, p. 2, CF 6.
26. ibid., p. 3.
27. Minutes of the Committee, 13/10/61, p.2, CF 8.
28. See for instance, minutes of discussions with J.A.L. Matheson, Vice-Chancellor, Monash University, and J.P. Baxter, Vice-Chancellor, University of N.S.W., 1/12/61, CF 56; minutes of discussions with L. Huxley, Vice-Chancellor, A.N.U., and Sir Mark Oliphant, 20/6/62, CF 419; and minutes of discussion with S.H. Roberts, University of Sydney, 26/9/62, CF 421.
29. Minutes of the Committee, 16-2-62, Appendix II, p. 2, CF 228.
30. Notes by Sir John Medley of discussion with the Committee, 16-3-62, p. 3, CF 396.
31. See above Chapt. 7, p.249.
32. Sir John Medley, p. 1, CF 396.
33. L.W. Weickhardt, "Manufacturing Industry and Tertiary Education", Bulletin for Australian Industry, Vol. 1, no. 3, August 1962, pp. 3-4. This paper was also included in the Committee documents, CF 427. Martin, at the meeting of 20/5/64, saw little prospect for change in the existing pattern.
The Chairman thought that entrance to the universities was determined also by the socio-economic status of students' families. He did not anticipate any rapid change in this structure.
Minutes of the Committee, 20/5/64, p. 4, CF 593.
34. Minutes of the Committee, 14/4/65, p. 2, CF 692.
35. University of Sydney, CF 79.

36. University of N.S.W., p. 1, CF 415.
37. ibid.
38. University of Melbourne, CF 179.
39. Australian National University, CF 162.
40. University of Melbourne, CF 179.
41. University of Adelaide, p. 2, CF 97.
42. S.A. Institute of Technology called for upgrading technical institutions, citing as an example its own cooperation with the University of Adelaide, CF 221. The Association of Principals of Victorian Technical Institutions made a similar call, CF 271.
43. N.S.W. Minister for Education, "The Case for Commonwealth Aid to Technical Education in Australia", CF 44. See above Chapt. 2, p.56 and Chapt. 6, p.212.
44. F.C.U.S.A.A., p. 1, CF 377.
45. Sydney Association of University Teachers, CF 338.
46. Professors of Education at Australian Universities, p. 4, CF 461.
47. ibid., p. 2.
48. ibid., pp. 4-5.
49. ibid., p. 7.
50. J.J. Auchmuty "Establishment and Development of new Universities and University Colleges", p. 2., CF 62.
51. C. Saunders, CF 167.
52. Sir MacFarlane Burnett, CF 130.
53. Sir Mark Oliphant, p. 2, CF 38.
54. Australian Academy of Science, "Scientific and Technological Manpower, Supply and Demand in Australia", p. 20, CF 145. This paper had been prepared in 1957.
55. Interdepartmental Committee on Growth of Population and Workforce, "Education and Training in the 'Sixties", October 1960, pp. 10-14, CF 38. The Department of Labour and National Service also supported the call for increased resources to a new system of technical institutions, CF 238.
56. Department of Immigration, "Immigration and the Demand for Tertiary Education", p. 1, CF 272. See above Chapt. 5, p.164.
57. Department of Supply, CF 332.
58. N.S.W. Chamber of Manufactures, CF 429.
59. Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, p. 1, CF 233.

60. ibid., p. 2.
61. Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia, p. 1, CF 436.
62. Australian Metal Industries Association, p. 2, CF 308.
63. ibid., p. 4.
64. Victorian Employers' Federation, CF 328.
65. Metal Trades Employers' Association, p. 7, CF 197, original emphasis.
66. ibid., p. 7.
67. ibid., p. 8, original emphasis.
68. B.H.P. Ltd., CF 59.
69. A.N.Z. Bank Ltd., p. 2, CF 183.
70. ibid., p. 3.
71. Life Offices Association, p. 1. CF 104.
72. ibid., p. 2.
73. Institution of Engineers, Australia, CF 98.
74. Institution of Surveyors, Australia, CF 334.
75. Royal Australian Chemical Institute, CF 235.
76. Australian Society of Accountants, CF 226.
77. Professional Officers' Association, P. 1, CF 336.
78. Australian Clerical Officers' Association, A.C.T. Branch, CF 78.
79. Victorian Teachers Union, CF 156.
80. Martin Report, p. 2.
81. ibid., p. 2.
82. ibid., p. 2.
83. ibid., p. 2.
84. ibid., p. 2.
85. ibid., p. 3.
86. ibid., p. 6.
87. ibid., p. 12. The Committee appeared to accept advice given to it in a submission from a senior officer of the Swedish Ministry of Education, where educational planning was well advanced of that in Australia, S. Moberg, CF 128.

88. Martin Report, p. 13.
89. ibid., Tables 13-17, pp. 22-24.
90. W.D. Borrie and R. Rodgers, Australian Population Projections 1960-75; a study of changing population structure, (Canberra, 1961).
91. Martin Report, p. 28.
92. ibid., Table 20, p. 28 and pp. 28-30.
93. ibid., pp. 30-32.
94. ibid., Table 27, p. 34.
95. ibid., p. 34.
96. ibid., p. 35. This was an interesting comment considering the views stated during meetings of the Committee. See above p. 291, particularly footnote 33.
97. ibid., pp. 43-44.
98. ibid., pp. 36-37.
99. ibid., p. 37.
100. ibid., p. 37.
101. ibid., p. 37.
102. ibid., p. 38.
103. ibid., pp. 66-80. The implication in this was to convince potential students of their own incapacities, thus lessening the damage to the status of the universities.
104. ibid., p. 48.
105. ibid., p. 47.
106. ibid., p. 47.
107. ibid., p. 48.
108. ibid., p. 48. It was suggested that "there has been far too little discussion, investigation and experimentation" (p.48), a charge which had already been levelled often by Partridge among others, and one which was to become common.
109. ibid., p. 53.
110. ibid., p. 48, p. 53 and p. 93.
111. ibid., p. 58.
112. ibid., Tables 80 and 81, pp. 105-106, and p. 114 and p. 117.
113. ibid., p. 115.

114. ibid., pp. 117-118.
115. ibid., p. 129.
116. ibid., p. 165. It noted the social functions of the technical colleges in providing non-diploma recreational, further education, trade and certificate courses, but later proposed their separation from advanced education courses.
117. ibid., p. 165.
118. ibid., p. 165.
119. ibid., p. 166.
120. ibid., p. 171.
121. ibid., p. 121.
122. ibid., p. 111.
123. ibid., p. 121.
124. ibid., p. 177.
125. ibid., p. 179.
126. ibid., p. 182.
127. ibid., pp. 195-197.
128. ibid., p. 202.
129. ibid., p. 201.
130. ibid., p. 203.
131. ibid., p. 216.
132. ibid., p. 216.
133. ibid., Table 120, p. 217.
134. ibid., Table 121, p. 218.
135. ibid., Table 122, p. 219.
136. ibid., Tables 123 and 124, p. 219.
137. ibid., p. 220.
138. ibid., Table 125, p. 220.
139. ibid., Table 121, p. 218.
140. ibid., pp. 220-221.
141. ibid., p. 221.
142. ibid., pp. 220-221.

143. ibid., p. 222.
144. ibid., p. 222.
145. ibid., p. 222.
146. ibid., p. 222.
147. ibid., p. 223.
148. ibid., pp. 223-224.
149. ibid., p. 224.
150. The Committee released Volume II of its Report at the same time as the release of Volume I. In this Volume it dealt with specific fields of study; the land industries (agriculture, veterinary science), management (economics, commerce), legal education, medical education, para-medical education, the needs of the defence forces, and theological training. The recommendations contained in the Volume put into a practical perspective the proposed pattern of development for tertiary education in the future. One chapter in particular illustrated the hierarchy of institutions, with the tertiary colleges, senior technological institutions, and universities having progressively more advanced courses in the same field of study, management. The summary of Chapter 10 showed the progression of courses in management - business studies, economics, commerce, business administration - from sub-graduate diploma level at tertiary colleges, through undergraduate and graduate diploma level at technical colleges and universities, to Masters and Doctor of Philosophy level at the universities.
Volume III of the Report was released by the Committee a year later than the first two volumes, and contained more general comment on fields of study, without specific recommendations. It also included a chapter on postgraduate students which had been promised in the chapter of Volume I dealing with financial assistance to students. The general chapters in Volume III dealt with Teaching and Research in the Humanities, Education for the Sciences, The Training of Teachers, Training in Social Work, Libraries and the Training of Librarians, the Need for Mathematicians, Education in Music, Fine Art and the Theatre, in addition to the survey of postgraduate students. While the Committee agreed on the general importance of the subjects covered in the Volume, it could not agree on specific courses of action, and the Volume was in fact presented as a discussion.
151. R.G. Menzies, CPD (Vol H of R 45), 24 March 1965, pp 267-274.
152. ibid., p. 269.
153. ibid., p. 272.
154. ibid., p. 270.
155. ibid., p. 270.
156. ibid., p. 270.
157. ibid., p. 271.

158. ibid., p. 274.
159. ibid., p. 271.
160. J.F. Cairns, CPD (Vol H of R 45), 28 April 1965, p. 935.
161. ibid., p. 936.
162. ibid., p. 935.
163. See above Chapt. 3, p.82.
164. P.H. Partridge, "The Martin Report", Vestes, Vol VIII, no. 2, June 1965, p. 72.
165. ibid., p. 75.
166. ibid., p. 76.
167. ibid., p. 77.
168. S. Encel, "The Martin Report: Tertiary Colleges", Vestes, Vol VIII, no. 2, June 1965, p. 81.
169. ibid., pp. 83-84.
170. J. Playford, "Big Business and the Australian University", Arena, 17, Summer 1968-69, p. 32.
171. Little, "The Martin Report and the Universities", p. 67.
172. G. Howie, "The Martin Report: Teacher Education", Vestes, Vol VIII, no. 2, June 1965, p. 106.
173. A.C. Hogg, "The Future of Teacher Education in Australia", Journal of Christian Education, Vol III, no. 2, September 1965, p. 85.
174. Howie, "The Martin Report: Teacher Education", p. 107.
175. Hogg, "The Future of Teacher Education in Australia", p. 85.
176. ibid., pp. 86-93.
177. W.E. Andersen, "The Role of the Universities in Teacher Education: The Perspective of The Martin Report", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. III, no. 2, September 1965, p. 100.
178. J.F.D. Wood, "The Martin Report - Its Implications for Technical Education", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. III, no. 2, September 1965, p. 78.
179. S. Murray-Smith, "The Martin Report: Technical Education", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 85-86.
180. ibid., p. 88.
181. ibid., p. 89. See also, S. Murray-Smith, "A History of Technical Education in Australia; with special reference to the period before 1914", unpublished Ph. D thesis, University of Melbourne, 1966, p. 1023.

182. H.S. Williams, "The Martin Report and After", Australian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 2, no. 3, December 1966, pp. 258-259, and p. 252.
183. Smart, "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education", p. 243.

CHAPTER 9

Education, Training and Employment: Report of the
Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training.

(The Williams Report) 1979

The Williams Committee was appointed by the Fraser Liberal-National Party Government in September 1976, and reported in February 1979. Its report was a much larger and more comprehensive survey of Australian education than had been previously attempted or commissioned. Although asked to address itself to education as a whole, its brief to investigate the relationship between education and training resulted in a concentration of issues concerning tertiary education and the transition from secondary schooling to it and/or the workforce. The political context in which the inquiry was situated differed quite considerably from those of the previous reports which have been examined. The sense of continuing and sustainable economic growth which had characterised plans for post-War reconstruction and the climate of the 1950s and 1960s had all but vanished, and the economy faced what appeared to be a period of sustained recession if not depression. The political climate was also depressed following the dismissal of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1975, and the election of the Fraser Government on a platform of monetarism and small government.¹ In addition, the National Population Inquiry of 1975 had predicted a slowing down in the rate of population growth in comparison with that up to the 1970s, which had important implications for tertiary education. It predicted that the numbers of people in the 17 to 22 year old age group would fall between 1981 and 1986, recover slightly up to the early 1990s, then fall again until 2000. This included the effects of immigration of 50,000 per annum. Increases in participation rates had led to an expectation of continued growth in tertiary education up to the 1980s, but the economic and political factors operating had lowered this from 25 per cent growth to 10 per cent, with numbers levelling off.² In fact, numbers in the universities were held steady from 1976 and in the colleges from 1977, although there was allowance for growth in the T.A.F.E. area. The policies of the Fraser Government toward tertiary education reflected its

more general political nature, and represented a major shift in political attitudes toward education from demand planning to matching output with labour requirements. This change was obvious in the guidelines which the Government gave to the new Tertiary Education Commission, and in the terms of reference to the Williams Committee. O'Byrne and Brown suggested that

underlying the Commonwealth Government's public policy to higher education is the philosophical base that higher education ought to be predominantly directed toward providing the labour market with its qualitative and quantitative manpower requirements.³

Implicit in these policies were charges that the education system was responsible for unemployment, and that changes in educational strategy would somehow lessen the unemployment rate. The terms of reference quite explicitly linked the labour market and education in a way which had not been as apparent in the briefs of other educational inquiries, while at the same time including the more traditional areas which had characterised the liberal educational tenets of the earlier inquiries.⁴

There were a number of reasons that Fraser gave for the establishment of the Williams Committee. First, it was more than a decade since the Martin Report which had only been concerned with the period to 1975. Second, the link between the aspirations of individuals, education and the labour market required examination. Third, there was a danger that economic growth could be hampered by an imminent skilled labour shortage. Fourth, there was community debate on the role and purpose of education, especially in relation to recurrent and open education. Finally, the demands of an advanced industrial society and the aspirations of its members meant that a large share of the nation's resources were put to education, and it was vital that this was efficiently used and planned for.⁵ The terms of reference reflected these concerns. Butler suggested that what they really meant was

(i) There needs to be established a clear hierarchy of institutions of tertiary education, implicitly - I suggest - because credentials are becoming ambiguous. (ii) The systems of tertiary education must take some of the blame for the high and increasing rates of unemployment among young people off the shoulders of the government itself. (iii) Technical education in part must be made more adaptive to modern processes of production and to changes in such processes. (iv) The systems of tertiary education must increase their efficiency, whatever their objectives.⁶

The concerns of the Government were to ensure that the education system was able to continue to play its part in the hegemonic process as the restructuring which was to result from the global recession took effect. On the larger scale, its commitment to monetarism, the redistribution of resources toward capital via increased profitability, and smaller government were translated in educational policies to increased economic efficiency and accountability, and increased political control. Craney and O'Donnel suggested that "Clearly the task of the Williams Report is to identify ways of cutting spending to re-establish the educational hierarchy...".⁷ The Government required the services of an expert committee to legitimate its policies in tertiary education, an area which had been so strongly identified with economic growth and social mobility right up until the mid-1970s, as part of its campaign to reduce commitments to social wage policies and redistribute those resources to capital. The Committee was supported and encouraged by the other major initiative of the Government in the tertiary education area, the establishment of the T.E.C., which was able to set the scene for 'steady state' educational policies while the Committee was involved in its deliberations.

After an investigation of two and a half years, the Committee presented its Report to the Government in early 1979. The Williams response to the pressures acting upon the education system was to endorse the existing hierarchical pattern of tertiary education, thereby accepting the class base of education and its role in the hegemonic

process. It confirmed that expansion which had characterised tertiary education over the post-War period was over, and that the new rationale for the system would be rationalisation and consolidation. Partridge suggested that

In the creation of the world, we are reliably informed, God paused on the seventh day and contemplated his handiwork; the Williams Report may be regarded as being at least in part, a seventh-day exercise.⁸

While the Report accepted that the period of rapid growth was over, it did not propose a no-growth future as had been adopted by the Government for the universities and colleges, but proposed alternative approaches to how small but sustained rates of growth could be achieved. It proposed that the advanced education sector would grow more strongly than the universities, but that there should be a major channelling of resources to the T.A.F.E. sector. It resisted Government and industry pressures to endorse outright manpower planning. Nevertheless, the Report accepted prevailing conservative attitudes with regard to economics and small government, and while some details of it appeared to be against the tide of industry and Government, its general thrust supported the aims of capital. Many of its detailed recommendations were not welcomed by the Government, the response of which, according to Lindsay, "does not encourage the belief that specific recommendations made by the Committee will be pursued vigorously".⁹ The Report was, of course, caught in the conflict within the bourgeoisie which the restructuring capitalism was undergoing had promoted. Even so, its aims were quite clear. It sought to legitimate the existing system in the face of change, for, as Freeland and Sharp noted,

against a background of the restructuring of Australian capitalism, Williams serves to legitimate the destruction of the brief social democratic settlement and define a new set of guidelines for the legitimate discussion of schooling in Australia.¹⁰

Instead of playing a central role in the formulation and implementation of new policies as had earlier Reports, the Williams Report did not. Partridge pointed out that "it is not, like the Murray and the Martin Reports, an introduction to new age Australian post-secondary education".¹¹ The Report attempted to apply conservative arguments, based on dominant conservative economic attitudes, "which sought to place efficiency and quality as the central concerns in the debate about education",¹² in place of those liberal and social democratic arguments related to the development of the welfare state which had characterised the growth of tertiary education in the post-War period, to legitimate the functions of the education system.

The Committee was chaired by Professor Bruce Williams, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney. Its membership comprised Mr. M.H. Bone, formerly Director-General, S.A. Department of Further Education, Mr. C.O. Dolan, senior Vice-President of the A.C.T.U., and a member of the T.E.C., Dr. A.M. Fraser, Director, Queensland Institute of Technology, and a member of the Advanced Education Council and the Queensland Board of Advanced Education, Commissioner P. Griffin of the Australian Arbitration and Conciliation Commission, Miss E.M. Guthrie, a regional director of the N.S.W. Education Department, Mr. J.A.L. Hooke, Chairman, Amalgamated Wireless (Australasia) Ltd. and a member of the Defence (Industrial) Committee, Sir Peter Lloyd, formerly Chairman, Cadbury Fry Pascall Australia Ltd. and a member of the Council of the University of Tasmania, Dr. W.D. Neal, Chairman, W.A. Post-secondary Education Commission, and Mr. D.R. Zeidler, Chairman and Managing Director, ICI Australia Ltd. and a member of the Defence (Industrial) Committee. The terms of reference to the Committee were in two parts. The first concerned the provision of services and facilities, and included reference to those areas of liberal education which had become part of the educational tradition in Australia. However, most of the

section was related to the economy. Facilities and services were to be considered in relation to: the pattern of institutions and courses including their objectives; State and Commonwealth responsibility for type and location of institutions; the amount and balance of educational provision; the relation between individual demand and community need; access, including re-entry and transferability, especially for women, aboriginal people, ethnic and handicapped groups; preparation for skilled and semi-skilled employment especially in relation to skilled labour shortages; recurrent education; and, the means of evaluating quality and efficiency. The second part of the terms of reference directly concerned the relationship between education and the labour market. This was to be particularly concerned with: the role of education in training and influencing student's choice of occupation; the extent and trends in unemployment and underemployment, particularly among youth; credentialism and its effects on the labour market; special group needs, with regard to Government policies and services in this area; recurrent education and retraining; and, manpower planning, its reliability and application to educational planning.¹³ While enjoined to examine these areas fully, the Committee was told

to take as given and not consider in detail the arrangements for funding and co-ordinating post-secondary education agreed between the State and Commonwealth Governments, except insofar as such consideration proved essential to the main theme.¹⁴

Clearly, the Government was directing the inquiry toward far more specific ends than had earlier terms of reference for the Murray and Martin Committees, and the restrictions placed on the Committee in relation to funding and coordination virtually ruled out a full consideration of much of the first part of the terms of reference. The restructuring taking place within capitalism required that the education system re-orient its aims and outcomes to take this into consideration, and the concentration on the relationship between the labour market and

the education system, without a major commitment of resources, was an important part of the consideration.

Submissions to the Committee

Submissions to the Williams Committee can be categorised in the same way as those to the Murray and Martin Committees, between academic and non-academic submissions. Within these categories similar sub-divisions also apply. The Committee received 621 submissions, a growth in numbers on that received by the Martin Committee, and substantially more than received by the Murray Committee. The range of the submissions reflected the increased debate which had evolved around tertiary education in the decade since the Martin Report, and the importance of the tertiary education system to the restructuring of capitalism. This chapter will examine the submissions according to these categories.

The submissions received by the Committee from the universities were more sophisticated than had been the general standard of those to either of the previous inquiries. This did not mean, however, that they were less elitist, although the elitism evident was more tempered in many cases. This was, of course, not always the case. The University of Melbourne produced an unsupported and elitist document arguing for the superiority of the universities in relation to the rest of the education system.

It is submitted that the Committee should address itself to the national need for maintaining a limited number of universities with postgraduate schools capable of serving the nation at a world level of scholarship and research. If a long enough view is taken, it will be seen that if such universities are not supported then all other educational institutions in the country will suffer and the capability of the nation to maintain itself in an international world will be diminished.¹⁵

It argued that it was impossible to afford excellence in all institutions, including by implication all universities, and its proposals were an effort to ensure the dominance of a reduced number of

universities within the tertiary education system. In addition, it argued that it was equally impossible to allow all those who wanted a university education into these elite institutions if standards were to be maintained. This assertion was supported by the University of Sydney, which opposed the moves by some colleges of advanced education toward university standards if not status: "that as the purpose of Colleges of Advanced Education is for vocational training, the tendency to make these into quasi-universities is undesirable".¹⁶ It wanted a clear distinction between a small elite group of universities, and other tertiary education institutions. The University of Newcastle put forward a similar view, although with more concern for liberal rhetoric:

The Senate recognises that university graduates may not be completely competent to do a specific job immediately on entering employment: but their education does equip them to acquire rapidly the abilities specific to their jobs. Other tertiary institutions have a more narrow vocational function and their students are fitted to do work at levels in the occupational structure which is less demanding in terms of sophistication of appraisals and of imaginative thinking.¹⁷

However, the University was also concerned that too much importance was placed on occupational structures and their relationship to the education system, showing the wary attitude which characterised much of the thinking of educationalists in the universities and the advanced education sector to manpower planning as the prime factor in educational planning. Its submission stated that

There is a danger that the occupational structure will be accorded a prior importance and educational institutions viewed as appropriately producing manpower as imposed by the occupational structure. It is important to recognise...that there is an interplay between educational philosophies, policies and provisions and the occupational structure. Education helps to shape the occupational structure as well as being shaped by it. Important social as well as economic implications follow from this.¹⁸

The University of Queensland linked the concern about manpower planning with the issue of credentialism, which it argued was being used to prevent or inhibit educational development and extension, and to obscure

the benefits of an increasingly educated population. The submission suggested that employers would be better off looking to ways of increasing productivity given a better educated work force, than focussing on it negatively.¹⁹ Similarly, Macquarie University was also concerned with attempts to isolate education in this way, pointing out that its philosophies had led it to pursue a three strand approach in its provision - liberal undergraduate studies, vocational postgraduate diploma and Masters courses, and research oriented postgraduate degrees. It argued that far from being inconsistent, this approach had produced major benefits for all three due to the close proximity that applied and liberal studies enjoyed.²⁰

The A.N.U. submission suggested that there was a "dynamic interplay" between the education system and the labour market, and that there were indications that the relationship was being treated too seriously. It argued that the benefits of education at all levels were not only quantifiable economically, but that there were unquantifiable cultural benefits which flowed from it. These were on both an individual and societal basis, and it was these qualities which should be protected

because close consideration of future community needs indicate that it is precisely those personal capacities which the educational system seeks to foster that are likely to become increasingly at a premium in the work force.²¹

The submission suggested that the Australian national culture and national discourse, which it judged by comparing Australian media with major overseas media, was not as good as it should or needed to be to cope with the rapid economic and social changes it faced. It argued that the role of the education system, particularly the universities, was not just to respond to the demands of society but to promote rational decision making. The universities at the apex of the education system had, as an over-riding function, "to sustain the practice of rational inquiry at the highest level of theoretical principles which underlie any

particular application".²² The submission opposed manpower planning as the basis for educational planning, although it recognised that work force needs were a valid component of such planning. It pointed out that private industry employment of tertiary education graduates in Australia was extremely low when compared to the U.S. or Europe. The ratio of graduates employed in private industry was 1 in every 15, while overseas it was 1 in every 4.²³ It suggested that there was more in this situation than "inadequacies" in degree structures, and that the Commonwealth should institute an immediate inquiry into private job training and management training, since it was clear that the attitudes of employers as well as those of educational institutions required change. "The private sector here has been remarkably reluctant to recruit graduates",²⁴ a situation which was even worse among higher degree graduates. The University suggested that attitudes toward educational funding were often misconceived. It suggested that the universities had not been excessively funded especially since there had been no real increase in funding per student between 1964 and 1975. It pointed out that the universities' share of both the total education expenditure and of the G.D.P. had declined in the decade from 1965 to 1975. It supported the notion of a core group of well funded research oriented universities, if other forms of higher education within the tertiary system were available for those who had qualified. To this end it proposed that the advanced education sector should be strengthened by strengthening larger colleges and merging smaller ones with T.A.F.E. colleges to form community colleges. It suggested that the stronger T.A.F.E. sector which would thus be created would be strengthened by close relations with strong university based technical and technological research.²⁵ There was a level of sophistication in the A.N.U. submission which was not present in those of the other universities, but it, nevertheless, continued to promote the elite nature of the

universities in the educational hierarchy within a more unified view of tertiary education than had previously been advanced in a university submission.

Submissions to the Committee from the colleges of advanced education and the State co-ordinating authorities for the advanced education sector continued the air of caution on the link between education and the ^bla^aour market which had been apparent throughout the submissions from the universities. Although the sector was charged with the provision of advanced vocational and professional education, there was unanimous agreement that education and training should not be equated simplistically. In its submission, Mt. Lawley C.A.E. echoed that of the University of Newcastle, and it also anticipated those of many other institutions

where training is viewed merely as a process by which individuals learn the skills, attributes and orientations of a particular role in society then unfortunate conservative connotations may evolve. Training viewed in this way takes no cognisance of the evolutionary nature of society. Such a mechanistic approach infers that individuals are shaped to fit existing organisations rather than organisations being shaped to accommodate people.²⁶

The S.A. Board of Advanced Education was concerned that political focussing on the relation between education and employment would lead to hasty and ill conceived changes being thrust upon the education system. It argued that the notion that education had contributed to the unemployment problem was fallacious, adding that while the education system could ameliorate the effects of unemployment, it was unable to solve the problems it caused.²⁷ In this it was supported by the W.A. Post-Secondary Education Commission. Its submission argued that a compromise was required between specific employer demand and general demand, and between the needs of employers for trained workers and the needs of individual workers for useful and satisfying education. This compromise would have to include continued and well conceived

employer-run induction programmes and job training. It suggested that there was a need for extensive counselling at the education/work interface. The submission expressed caution with regard to manpower planning, where it saw a major danger in hasty withdrawal and transfer of resources to support apparent areas of need rather than the application of long-term planning, especially in relation to individual freedom of choice. It saw the provision of continuing education and its extension as vital in this area.²⁸ The Commission also suggested that the sectoral boundaries in tertiary education were too rigid and argued for policies which would increase flexibility within the system. It supported central coordination, but suggested that it needed to be tempered with institutional autonomy, and in the development of autonomous role for State co-ordinating authorities, which it suggested would require a major adjustment in Commonwealth/State relations in the area of tertiary education.²⁹ The S.A. Board advanced a different view. It suggested that the universities should be prevented from undertaking development in those areas more properly of interest to the advanced education sector - vocational and professional education - and that the colleges themselves should undertake development in these areas slowly to ensure that community relations and course relevance were developed concomitantly. Nevertheless, it rejected the notion of rigid boundaries between the sectors and proposed that coordination at the State level should be strengthened considerably to ensure more flexibility.³⁰

Submissions from the T.A.F.E. sector were by no means as developed as those from the other two sectors. In fact, they were reminiscent of university submissions to the Murray Committee, and the submissions of technical education authorities to the Martin Committee, usually being concerned with areas of need and attempting to stake a claim in the tertiary education arena. They were less homogenous than the submissions

from the other sectors, which reflected the development of debate in those areas, and instead presented diverse views on similar issues. Nevertheless, submissions in this area concentrated on similar problems - recurrent education, school to work transition, and post-school vocational education and job training. There was also a strong opinion that many of the problems facing the T.A.F.E. sector resulted from the imbalance of funds between it and the other tertiary education sectors. This led to simplistic arguments for per capita parity funding. For instance, the S.A. Department of Further Education noted that while the sector trained 44 per cent of the work force with post-school qualifications, it received only 30 per cent of the funds available, and that a re-allocation should redress this imbalance.³¹ The N.S.W. Department of Technical and Further Education suggested that much of the cause of the imbalance was the excessive development of the advanced education sector at the expense of both the T.A.F.E. and university sectors.³² The two submissions took opposite approaches to other issues reflecting the diverse views which existed among T.A.F.E. authorities. The S.A. submission argued that all off-the-job vocational education should be the responsibility of the sector, and should not be duplicated in other agencies, including recurrent education which it proposed should be embodied in legislation as a right of every individual.³³ The N.S.W. submission, on the other hand, suggested that "recurrent education is not the sole prerogative of education systems",³⁴ but that employers had a major responsibility in the area. It argued that T.A.F.E. should not be expected to pick up areas in which employers had legitimate responsibility.³⁵ The submission also argued that the school to work transition was not the sole responsibility of the education system, but that employers had a major responsibility in the area as well.³⁶ In addition, it suggested that T.A.F.E. should not be seen as "a panacea for the unemployment problem",³⁷ noting that the

provision of T.A.F.E. did not create employment, supporting other sector submissions.

In its submission, the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee suggested that the ambiguities in the tertiary education system followed "from a failure to follow more closely the recommendations of the Martin Report",³⁸ particularly in the development of the colleges of advanced education and the establishment of a central co-ordinating authority. One major result of this was the "serious weakening of the provision of education in the senior technical and junior technological areas"³⁹ as the colleges moved away from sub-diploma courses, and the T.A.F.E. sector continued to be neglected and under-funded. The submission argued that the universities had an important role to play in society by providing a unique blend of research and teaching in a scholarly environment, which would provide well informed critical analysis, additions to the sum total of knowledge, and the ability to teach creatively. It suggested that in such an environment, there was no conflict between the different aims of the more fundamental disciplines and the professions, and that the universities had, therefore, a substantial role to play in the development of Australia, culturally, socially, and economically, through education and training.⁴⁰ It acknowledged that the relations between the universities and other tertiary education institutions, and with employers, were not always as cordial as they should be, especially with the expansion which had occurred in tertiary education in the post-War period. It suggested that such relations should be tempered by a recognition that education had not failed in ensuring that standards were maintained, but that marginal candidates for entry to tertiary education and the work force occurred because of higher participation rates in education and increases in educational standards.⁴¹ It proposed that relations with the other tertiary education sectors would be improved if the T.E.C. were to oversee the large colleges in the same way as it did

the universities, allowing them much more institutional autonomy than they possessed, and merged the smaller colleges with the T.A.F.E. sector to form a system of community colleges which would complement the universities and colleges.⁴² Relations between the universities and industry and commerce would improve if "mismatches in perception" which many employers had, were overcome through the establishment of standing bodies, the membership of which would be drawn from both the universities and industry groups. It suggested that these mismatches arose because many employers were still coming to terms with increased participation rates in tertiary education which had led to changing attitudes to work in the community, and because many employers believed that the universities and other education institutions should provide courses to match their specific requirements.⁴³ Both sets of relations could be improved if the relationship between the universities and governments were improved. The A.V.C.C. believed that governments should recognise that quality was as necessary as quantity in educational provision, and that because the universities' contribution was pre-eminently qualitative it became much more difficult to measure their contribution. Nevertheless, it should be recognised by governments that the universities provided a major training role for senior positions in society, where a major educational centre for high level technical specialist and recurrent education, preserved and extended the fund of knowledge through scholarship and research, and contributed to the analysis and solving of major problems confronting society. If they were to continue playing this role, it was essential that the universities retained substantial institutional autonomy.⁴⁴ The A.V.C.C. submission continued to stress those aspects of the universities which were vital to their role in the hegemonic process, and complemented the submissions from the universities themselves. It was clear that the universities were prepared to allow streamlining in the tertiary education system to

improve its efficiency as long as the pre-eminent position of the universities was recognised. It was also clear the the universities were prepared to allow the evolution of a small number of colleges to complement their position, and to make room for the evolution of an elite group of institutions within the university sector to safeguard their contribution to the hegemonic process.

The submission from the Conference of Directors of Central Institutes of Technology (D.O.C.I.T.) agreed with that of the A.V.C.C. in relation to a re-organisation of the tertiary education system. D.O.C.I.T. represented eight major State institutes of technology and the Canberra C.A.E. It suggested that these colleges should be given autonomy equal to that enjoyed by the universities, while remaining institutes of technology. It pointed out that only 22 of the existing colleges had reached the Martin Committee recommended target of 1,500 equivalent full-time student enrolments, and suggested the Committee should take this into account when recommending on the future pattern of tertiary education. It suggested that within the tertiary system, rigid sectoral boundaries should be made more flexible, but that the truly national character of the universities and the D.O.C.I.T. colleges should be recognised with the granting of considerable institutional autonomy.⁴⁵

Submissions from those groups representing academic staff and students in the tertiary education system also presented a diverse set of views and opinions. That of the Federation of University Staff Associations (F.A.U.S.A.) supported the submissions from university authorities on the role of the universities and their position within the education system. It argued that "there is an intrinsic difference between universities and other institutions in terms of their general educational goals, their standards and their ethos".⁴⁶ It suggested that the universities were not only national, but also international

institutions and should be recognised as such.

It suggested that the universities had a role, nevertheless, in vocational education, as part of their role as high level multi-purpose institutions. However, it suggested that the education system should not aim merely to satisfy the short-term requirements of the labour market, but to provide a wide range of educational offerings. In particular, it suggested that the role of the universities in advancing the growth of knowledge would "have a significant influence on the future of society and the structure of the future work force",⁴⁷ and that to concentrate on immediate requirements would be short-sighted. It pointed out that the application of manpower planning in Australia was problematic, not least because of the inadequacies in statistical bases for it, which it proposed should be upgraded. Even so it suggested that manpower planning should be in the form of guidelines only, especially in relation to the universities.

We believe that comprehensive manpower planning must be approached with caution by universities, partly because of the technical problems but also because of its potential to compromise the integrity of universities as autonomous bodies in a free society and to destroy any concept of open access to universities by suitably qualified students.⁴⁸

In conjunction with a recognition of the intrinsic qualities which characterised the universities, the submission suggested that the tertiary education sectors should be re-organised to provide for a 'combined development model' which would allow for horizontal development of different institutions within clearly defined areas of content and level, but with some overlap between them to allow for flexibility. It opposed the upgrading of other institutions into universities, although it proposed that single purpose institutions should be absorbed by multi-purpose colleges.⁴⁹ F.A.U.S.A. was also critical of developments in the area of coordination, where it opposed the extension of State co-ordinating authority powers over the universities, and held grave

misgivings about increased control by the Government over the T.E.C. and subsequently the universities. It suggested the outcome of the erosion of the independence of the T.E.C. through the introduction of Government guidelines had threatened the autonomy of the universities, and accused the Commission and its Councils as having "become the instruments of Federal Government planning in higher education - ad hoc and short-term planning based on 'rolling triennia' which have been proven not to be triennia at all",⁵⁰ something the A.U.C. had been designed to act as a buffer against. The submission from the Melbourne University Staff Association supported the F.A.U.S.A. submission, in particular that section regarding the position of the universities in the tertiary education system. It hoped that

in the national interest that the findings of the Committee will guarantee the survival of some first-class research universities of international standing. It does not believe that there is a necessary conflict between excellence and equality in the system of higher education, or that to recognize egalitarian sentiment about access and academic progress requires a fundamental change to all institutions in a sector or the higher education system as a whole.⁵¹

On the other hand, submissions from academic staff in the advanced education sector took a different line in relation to the boundaries which existed between their sector and the universities. The N.S.W. Institute of Technology Staff Association proposed that there be a unitary rather than binary system of higher education within tertiary education, and that internal institutional autonomy be extended to all institutions within it. It suggested that coordination authorities "restrain institutions from seeking uniform objectives, ensure diversity yet maintain academic standards".⁵² Nevertheless, submissions from academic staff in the colleges and the universities recognised the importance of maintaining standards and status, which were important factors in the successful pursuance of the role of the education system in the hegemonic process. The differences in emphasis were related to

differences in position and hence perspective of each group, but there was no difference in the stress applied to the central factor.

Teachers in the technical and further education sector also recognised the importance of maintaining educational standards. The Australian Teachers' Federation, the members of which covered primary and secondary education as well as the T.A.F.E. sector and some academics in colleges and universities, suggested that the Report of the Committee should contain a comprehensive statement of aims for the education system to enable it to develop without unnecessary duplication. It argued that the educational aspects of issues such as school to work transition and recurrent education should be pre-eminent, and that increased flexibility in the sectoral boundaries at the tertiary education level was essential for this to be achieved. It suggested that co-ordinating authorities and the establishment of multi-level tertiary institutions, together with increased resources for the T.A.F.E. sector, were all necessary if tertiary education was to remain relevant in Australian society.⁵³ The Queensland Technical and Further Educators' Professional Association supported the A.T.F. position with regard to the pre-eminence of education in relation to the labour market in the T.A.F.E. sector.

T.A.F.E. is an educational sector not a training sector. Students of T.A.F.E. must be given the same educational opportunities to proceed with their choice of a career as are those in other post-secondary areas. This Association is totally opposed to the use of any T.A.F.E. institution to merely train individuals to fill existing vacancies in the labour market while ignoring the desires and educational needs of those involved.⁵⁴

It suggested that the sector required an immediate injection of resources to enable it to overcome its 'poor relation' image in relation to the other education sectors, which had resulted from a long period of government neglect at State levels and inadequate recognition by the Commonwealth following its entry into the tertiary education area.

The submissions to the Committee from student groups were much less

supportive of the tertiary education system than those from the institutions and staff. The Australian Union of Students produced an argument critical of the education system which it saw as ideological rather than educational in relation to its stated aims and its real functions within an advanced capitalist society. It argued that the Committee's terms of reference which attempted to link the education system directly with the labour market were aimed at reinforcing the sorting function which the system played for the economy.

The unequal outcomes of schooling are a direct result of the functions of the education system to stratify the workforce and to reproduce the social relations of production. That is, the education system serves the economic mode; the inequalities are economically determined and reinforced by the education system.⁵⁵

It cited Beighton and Gallagher to show that a serious imbalance in the socio-economic background of students and graduates existed favouring administrative and professional strata in society at the expense of members of low socio-economic groups.⁵⁶ It suggested that this situation was supported by vertical and horizontal stratification within the education system. It suggested that the differences between the universities and the colleges of advanced education were historical rather than intrinsic, and that arguments presented by educational authorities for their separation were inconsistent and becoming less relevant as the two developed. It suggested that the T.A.F.E.C. had provided a rationale for restricted vocational training in its reports rather than pursuing equality with the other tertiary sectors by refusing to question the ternary nature of tertiary education.⁵⁷ A.U.S. argued that the tertiary education system presented a number of attributes which had resulted from its post-War development. First, it aimed to maintain elite control of society. It identified this elite with industry and commerce. It was a tool for the legitimization of social control by the elite. It trained people with skills necessary for technological

expansion and, at the same time, stratified this training to reproduce a stratified work force. This stratification enabled the fragmentation of knowledge to support the elite and inhibit the development of worker alternatives. It used the notion of objectivity to impose ideological definitions and knowledge divisions on workers. It certified conformism. It estranged educational institutions from their communities. It divided curricula from relevant experience. It perpetuated the "myth of a free society where equal opportunities exist for all and where social mobility is based on individual merit, and so induce acquiescence to social inequalities".⁵⁸ It did not provide students with relevant skills and understanding to cope with society. It had in it inherent contradictions between the reproduction of social relations of production and the necessity to produce "a meritocratic elite within a tradition of critical inquiry".⁵⁹ The submission proposed that the tertiary education system should be democratised, particularly at the co-ordinating body level, and that the institutions should be given substantial autonomy. At the same time, it proposed that there be a gradual yet positive development of a unitary rather than ternary system.⁶⁰ It accused the Commonwealth of discouraging potential students through its policies and especially through funding restrictions.⁶¹ It supported the notion of recurrent education, arguing that the structural changes which were occurring within the economy had to be met with real change in the education system if students were to be provided with skills which were adaptable and flexible enough to enable them to survive in such a situation.⁶² The A.U.S. submission was one of the very few, to any of the inquiries under examination, to attempt an analysis of tertiary education which went beyond description. While it contained facets of reproduction theory and relied on ideological coercion for the maintenance of bourgeois dominance through the education system, it had begun to recognise certain aspects

of the role of education in the hegemonic process through the transmission of selected skills and values which were passed off as part of the 'natural order' rather than related to class differences and values.

Other student organisation submissions presented similar and supporting arguments. The S.A. Institute of Technology Union was concerned that the Committee would produce an evaluation in line with Government policies which equated the education system with a training system. It was concerned that the establishment of the Williams Committee and the many State committees of inquiry suggested that education "per se, is being held responsible for many of the economic and welfare problems being experienced".⁶³ It argued for the maintenance of a system which would promote critical evaluation in the interest of societal renewal together with education which would enable individuals to "exercise greater control over his or her destiny as being paramount to a democratic, industrial society".⁶⁴ The University of New South Wales Students' Union suggested that the existing pattern of vertically structured institutions and sectors in tertiary education

has the effect of reproducing class based distinctions... This occurs because...social relations of the sectors reproduce and reinforce the social relations of the workplace. Crudely put, lower class students go to lower class facilities to prepare them for lower class jobs. Nowhere is there concern for awareness, articulation or criticism throughout the process.⁶⁵

The submission argued that the production of critical, aware and rational human beings able to cope with everyday life was of paramount importance, and in this the tertiary education system was failing. Interestingly, both these submissions came from technologically oriented institutions.

The final group of submissions in the 'academic' category were those from individuals involved with teaching and research in some capacity in tertiary education. These submissions had a common thread concerning the relationship between the education system and the labour market. In

particular, the message they offered was one of caution. Duke questioned the ability of the Committee to be able to promote co-operation between the two areas without making the education system subserviant to employer interests.

It's easier to manipulate the education system than the economy and employers, but the superficial manpower planning type responses likely to appeal to some employers would be maladaptive; the need is to produce more responsive and adaptive earners who can use further educational opportunities as the need arises, not persons more closely moulded to one ephemeral job-sheet.⁶⁶

Schuller, an O.E.C.D. consultant visiting Australia, argued that the only way to overcome inequalities of outcome which he saw as class related, was to turn to the individual and promote equality of opportunity through recurrent education programmes. He suggested that aside from the responsibilities education had to the society and the individual, "it is only realistic to accept the fact that the degree to which educational objectives are achieved depends in large measure on external forces and trends".⁶⁷ Dunn, then Chairman of the Education Research and Development Committee, saw the inquiry as having two major tasks. The first was to identify and publicise the data base deficiencies which existed in Australian education and which made educational planning extremely difficult. The second

would be to clarify the kind of research needed to better understand the complexity of the relationships involved at the interface between an education system and the employment situation in the context of the total needs of citizens in the rapidly changing Australian society.⁶⁸

Karmel, in a submission made under the auspices of the Academy of Social Sciences, called for the establishment of a Unit for Youth Studies to undertake research into some of these areas, particularly studies of the work force by educational status, youth unemployment, the role of education in preparing youth for work and social issues relating to youth. He suggested: "I do not feel confident that there will be

sufficient research on these problems if it is left to individual initiative".⁶⁹ Fitzgerald, who had been Education Commissioner on the Commission of Enquiry into Poverty, suggested that the education system in being geared toward the professions, was providing only indirect benefits to individuals. He pointed out that the sorting function performed by the education system affected only a few careers, but hemmed in the rest of the student population. Governments had a responsibility to promote social justice and educational equality of opportunity by taking initiatives to restructure the occupational structure. He continued;

the role of the education system in preparing people for work and influencing their choice of occupation must be seen in terms of the opportunities for worthwhile employment available. It should be recognised that the schools operate effectively at present to sort and rank young people with regard to that quarter of jobs in the workforce which can be described as careers. So long as this ratio remains small and no alternative form of access to career is developed the schools will probably be forced to continue with ambiguous policies based on the myth of equality of opportunity.⁷⁰

It was clear from these submissions that senior educationalists were caught in the dichotomy between the different goals of the education system which had resulted in the tension apparent in Australian education throughout its development, and which had led to the contradictory and ambiguous policies to which Fitzgerald had referred.

The non-academic submissions to the Committee also reflected this tension in their content and concern. The Commonwealth Department of Productivity suggested that the twin goals of education were correct in the Australian context. It suggested that there had been an imbalance between the two in the past, while conceding that educational institutions had become more flexible in the preceding decade. The rigidity which had characterised the education system had hampered, and still was hampering, labour mobility. It argued that education and training should enhance labour mobility and flexibility, and should,

therefore, enhance skills and productivity.⁷¹ The submission accepted that universities and colleges of advanced education should provide courses which did not aim at cost-benefit analysis type results but which aimed for quality and the benefits which educated individuals offered society. Nevertheless, it called for a clear distinction between the two types of institution, based on the universities' role in research. It also suggested that vocationally oriented courses in both should be monitored closely to ensure that imbalances of output and demand did not occur. It suggested that the decline in the employment of graduates in private industry reflected differing attitudes between graduates and employers, which had begun to be apparent before the deterioration in the employment situation generally, and suggested that this had clear implications for education and manpower planning.⁷² The submission compared the funding situations of T.A.F.E. and the other tertiary sectors and recommended a substantial upgrading for the former. It suggested that much of the problem faced by the T.A.F.E. sector resulted from the fact that it relied heavily on skills transmission on the job which reduced its capacity to introduce new skills in an educational context. This problem would be relieved, according to the submission, if the costs of T.A.F.E. were shared more evenly, and employers were relieved of the direct costs of T.A.F.E.⁷³ The Commonwealth Department of Education believed that the Committee's terms of reference were biased toward the labour market, and warned the Committee that it should avoid an over-concentration on vocational issues and objectives at the expense of the balance education should provide. It suggested that

The particular requirements of the labour market are not regarded as a primary aim of education, although as students move beyond the period of compulsory education, the interaction between educational preparation and the requirements of the labour market becomes more significant and direct.⁷⁴

The Department suggested that the nature of the universities in relation to vocational education should be examined with a view to recommending

that at least some universities move away from it toward greater research orientation. This would enable a redefinition of the colleges of advanced education. However, with such a move, it suggested that the Committee would also have to consider alterations to funding procedures to move them away from their relation to student numbers.⁷⁵ In any case, the submission proposed that there be a shift in resources to the T.A.F.E. sector from the higher education (and particularly non-skills) component of tertiary education.⁷⁶ The Commonwealth Public Service Board submitted the Report of an Interdepartmental Joint Working Party on Manpower Planning as a major part of its submission. The report concentrated on the concept of manpower planning which it defined as

the process of systematically forecasting an organisation's future manpower requirements and of producing plans to acquire, develop and deploy the human resources needed to achieve its goals and objectives. In this process full account must be taken of the organisation's quality of achievement and current manpower utilisation and of the well being of individual staff members, with due regard to economic and political considerations.⁷⁷

It suggested that manpower planning would be influenced by factors external to the organisation concerned, including economic, political, social and technological changes, supply and demand interaction, and the decisions of individuals. Notably, there was no mention of the interaction between the education system and the concept of manpower planning in the definition and accompanying discussion.

State government departments also presented their views to the Committee. The S.A. Department of Labour and Industry suggested that tertiary education was not meeting the need for qualified and skilled manpower, especially at management level. This was highlighted by the low numbers of graduates employed in private industry. It suggested that there needed to be more contact between industry and tertiary education, and that the attitudes of industry to graduate employment required improvement. It suggested that industry associations had moved toward

the promotion of training, but that individual employers had not responded adequately to the initiatives of governments to promote industrial training.⁷⁸ It suggested that there was little need for increased educational provision except in relation to youth unemployment, and argued in fact, that it might be detrimental in the long-term, as higher educational qualifications increased pressures for higher rates of pay for inexperienced workers, and reinforced unrealistic aspirations.⁷⁹ It extended its utilitarian tone: "For all practical purposes the only measure of community benefit is one which is made in economic terms".⁸⁰ On this basis, it argued that the T.A.F.E. sector was too concerned with leisure and personal enrichment courses, and proposed a transfer of effort within the sector to vocational education, and within the vocational area, from certificate type courses to individual units. It also proposed that there should be a redistribution of resources from universities and the advanced education sectors to T.A.F.E., using, in common with other submissions, the simplistic arguments relating to unit and per student costs.⁸¹ The Department suggested that there should be no further moves to institutionalise training in educational institutions external to the workplace. Instead, employers should recognise their responsibilities in the area. It argued that it would be a better use of taxpayers' funds to subsidise employers than expand tertiary education.⁸² Pressures from within government departments for increasing the compartmentalisation of training, and maintaining its isolation from educational theory were evident from this submission, as was the strength of bourgeois attitudes to the proper place of individual aspirations which had become politically popular in the post-Whitlam political climate. These attitudes received a boost from the apparent inflexibility of the universities and colleges of advanced education in relation to entrance requirements, and the over-riding concern at the senior levels of secondary schooling with

university and college entrance. For instance, the N.S.W. Department of Public Works asserted that "The major deficiency in the role of educational institutions is their neglect of people who do not follow the standard routes to higher education".⁸³ The N.S.W. Department of Labour and Industry emphasised the vocational aspects of tertiary education in its submission to the Committee. It suggested that there were two areas of change in industry - technological change and structural change - which resulted in problems with implications for education. It believed that the high youth unemployment rate was a symptom of these changes, along with the concomitant shortage of skilled labour. It suggested that the economic downturn had exacerbated these problems, so that employers had found it difficult to afford adequate staff training, and proposed that there be a transfer of resources to compensate for this.

Should industry not be able currently to provide for the training of adequate numbers of skilled persons, within its volume of production, then T.A.F.E. or similar institutions must be funded to carry along initial training, coupled with idle resources (both material and personnel) within industries producing below capacity.⁸⁴

Clearly there was not agreement among the various parts of government bureaucracies in relation to tertiary education, its direct role, or how its direct costs should be distributed. There was, however, agreement on the importance of education in the development of an advanced industrial society which went beyond the interests of individual members or groups within the bourgeoisie.

There were many more submissions to the Williams Committee from industry groups and companies than there had been to the other inquiries under examination. Once again, the views expressed in this group of submissions were varied, ranging from sophisticated to overtly ideological statements. A great deal of attention in the submissions was paid to the problems of the T.A.F.E. sector, and many proposed that there

be a transfer of resources from the higher education component of tertiary education to that sector. For instance, the Heavy Engineering Manufacturers' Association believed that the resources devoted to T.A.F.E. were "hopelessly inadequate" suggesting that the transfer of resources must be from generalist higher education courses to vocational T.A.F.E. courses. It continued; "no matter what value is attached to these occupations in a social welfare sense, they are a charge against the marketed output of industry and services".⁸⁵ The Association believed that this imbalance had led to the high level of youth unemployment.

One of the reasons thought to be responsible is that employers are reluctant to take on untrained school leavers for further training at the present market price for their labour. The matter of further training should concern the Government if it is not to be faced with the present situation as a growing problem.⁸⁶

The Australian Institute of Building took this notion further in suggesting that the dichotomy between education for training and for individual aspiration, together with increasing technological advancements, would produce a society divided between skilled labour and 'unemployables'. It suggested that a major function of the education system in the future would be to cope with the problem, especially since it had created much of it through producing school leavers and graduates who were unemployable in other than 'make work' systems.⁸⁷

The most blatantly ideological statement came from the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce which suggested that tertiary education should be subject to regular audits to ensure it maintained its relevance, particularly "the need to develop an appreciation of the contribution by private enterprise towards the country's growth and development".⁸⁸ The tone of the submission was decidedly utilitarian, with the community being equated with private enterprise. It had a particular antipathy to those who held views which differed from its own, and described

oppositional positions in extreme terms.

Most teachers are dedicated to their profession, and in the secondary schools they seek to prepare their students to acquire a useful ground knowledge.

Nevertheless, many secondary and technical teachers have allowed themselves to be swayed by radicals whose intentions are primarily political rather than the advancement of their professional standards.

Citizens do hold a variety of political persuasions, which is their democratic right to exercise once they become of age to vote. However, a tendency exists among such teachers to influence their charges into strongly socialistic lines of thinking, to the disadvantage of the free enterprise system upon which young people will primarily depend throughout their working life.

The financial and excessive freedoms, through Federal Government funding introduced by the Whitlam Government, gave teachers an autonomy they never before enjoyed. They admitted some excesses, particularly with equipment, and now that economic conditions are reversed, they are prepared to use their young charges as front line troops to try to preserve their own advantages.⁸⁹

It was particularly concerned with the promotion of bourgeois ideology at the school level where it called for compulsory private enterprise work experience for all teachers, and for a return to "responsibility" by teachers.

Then will commerce and industry more readily and more effectively absorb school leavers into the work force and assist them to become efficient members of the community.⁹⁰

Not all the submissions in this group were as blatant, however. The Master Builders Federation of Australia recognised the factors which had contributed to shortages of skilled labour at a time of recession, especially in the trades. The most important of these was, of course, immigration, which the Federation noted supplied the building industry with 50 per cent of its skilled tradesmen up until the early 1970s. It suggested that the significant down turn in immigration since that time had meant that the education system had to alter the direction of its training contribution to compensate for the shortfall if it were to be overcome.⁹¹ The National Retail Motor Industry Training Committee

suggested that even in the area of vocational education, the system must stress both the educational and training aspects in the transmission of skills. It suggested that the education system served the community, not only employers. It proposed that the education system become more attuned to the manpower needs of the community, through the provision of recurrent education, retraining, and through the increased involvement of industry and commerce in educational decision making.⁹² This was, of course, a common theme throughout this group of submissions, ranging from mere statement to specific example or proposal.⁹³

Similar consideration arose, as could be expected, in the submissions to the Committee from individual companies. Mt Isa Mines suggested that the local T.A.F.E. college should take over completely the training undertaken by the company, and that the Government should subsidise 100 per cent of first year apprentice and 50 per cent of second year apprentice wages.⁹⁴ C.S.R. Ltd suggested that educational expansion had proceeded without adequate consideration for the labour market, resulting in an oversupply of graduates and a shortage of skilled labour in the trades. It suggested that the structural nature of much of the unemployment problem meant that technical education should be upgraded. (It pointed out that the ratio of unemployed males to available jobs was 12:1 whereas in the trades it was only 4:1 in support of its case. What this really showed in fact was the seriousness of the unemployment problem rather than an imbalance in educational output.) The company recommended that manpower policies be developed which coordinated the activities of educational authorities, governments, unions and employers.⁹⁵ Simpson Pope Ltd. presented a critical view of the higher education sectors of tertiary education, stating that the universities had become "self sustaining to the point of ignoring and being able to ignore community needs",⁹⁶ and were thus able to resist review, and to ignore the quantity or quality of their graduate output,

and so develop into inflexible institutions. The company believed that the institutes of technology were little better. On the other hand, the company was supportive of some colleges of advanced education and the T.A.F.E. sector which provided courses specific to employer needs, and criticises the concept of a complete education - "The student receives no additional benefit from completing a 'full' and 'rounded' course only partially relevant to his particular needs",⁹⁷ - arguing that the only benefits are to that group of lecturers involved. It suggested that the low employment rate of graduates in industry was a result of their lack of skills, and proposed that all educational courses should contain components relating to industry and commerce.⁹⁸ This view was also put by I.C.I. Ltd., although in a less dogmatic manner. It suggested that one of the main needs in the education system was for career counselling, which it believed would help in overcoming the imbalance between graduates and tradespeople. This would entail close co-operation between employers and educational authorities, including input into the education system of the benefits of a "free market economy".⁹⁹ It admitted that its concerns were utilitarian, arguing that the needs of the labour market were so defined. It suggested that resources should be diverted from the universities and colleges of advanced education to the T.A.F.E. sector.¹⁰⁰ The most cautious statement came from the Commercial Bank, although its underlying message remained clear. It acknowledged the training responsibilities of employers and the inadvisability of educational institutions providing specific programmes for individual employers. It was, however, concerned at the trend away from fundamental principles in business related courses, and suggested that work experience components could overcome this problem. It supported advanced education courses above those offered by the universities as they were seen to be "more relevant to the work environment".¹⁰¹ The Bank supported closer coordination between the advanced education and T.A.F.E.

sectors to ensure flexibility in courses and movement between the two. It suggested that there was a problem in both industry and education in understanding the problems of the other, but believed that there was a reservoir of goodwill in each that should be encouraged. It suggested that this could be done by joint associations, and through job exchange programmes.¹⁰² Throughout the submissions from individual companies, as there had been in those from industry associations, there was a clear hegemonic message. Industry and commerce were concerned that tertiary education produced graduates who were not conversant with their needs, either long-term or immediate. Hence their concern with redirecting students to vocational education, and away from the universities, and a lesser extent, the advanced education sector, and into T.A.F.E. The attitude of employers to dampening individual aspirations was one which was apparent throughout the society and not only in relation to education. The rate of graduate employment in business was only one indication of how the bourgeoisie saw the role of tertiary education, and was directly related to the efforts to redirect students away from the universities. The dichotomy between the liberal ideals of education and the demands of an advanced industrial society had become more apparent with increased needs for a more skilled labour force and a compliant working class. The tertiary education system had become an important area of struggle for the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony in the same way as the junior parts of the system had been in the period to 1939. Of course, the effects of the recession had exacerbated bourgeois concern that tertiary education conform to its demands, and those alternative concerns which had been tolerated during the long boom became targets in the struggle for conformity which marked this phase of the hegemonic process.

The extent of the debate around tertiary education was also apparent from the submissions of professional groups and trades unions. The

Institution of Engineers suggested that manpower planning should be a major concern of tertiary education and of industry. However, it did not endorse a simplistic approach to the issue, proposing instead that median points should be struck in technological forecasts, and in determining numbers in relation to industry requirements and personal demands. It suggested that the paramount concern should be the production of graduates who were flexible, well-educated professionals, with the support of technicians and para-professionals of a similar nature.¹⁰³ The submission of the Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy was more utilitarian and self-interested, based on what it claimed to be quantifiable economic grounds for special consideration.

the departments of mining and metallurgy in the Universities and colleges of advanced education may legitimately claim a higher than average disbursement of funds on a student-population basis, or State or regional requirement basis, because of the dominant importance of the mineral industry to the national economy. The contribution of graduates/diplomates in the fields of mining and metallurgy to the economy justifies the higher cost per student for training graduates/diplomates in these fields.¹⁰⁴

The submission continued with a demand that the cyclical nature of the mining industry be recognised so that tertiary education facilities established in the area were protected from closure or consolidation during downturns in the industry. The Australian Institute of Training and Development presented a more liberal submission. It argued that there was a need for behavioural objectives in education which linked personal aspirations with societal needs in an evaluative way, which would enable both educating and training individuals for jobs, and designing jobs to fit the skills and interests of individuals. It suggested that close links between this approach and manpower planning were essential. It was critical of Australian industrial attitudes to manpower as "not only conceptually separate but also as administratively separate",¹⁰⁵ instead of recognising it as an integral part of training, personnel development, industrial relations and industrial democracy.

The Institute called for a recognition of the importance of job training as separate from education, and suggested that there should be a transfer of resources to short-term T.A.F.E. courses to this end. There was little conflict in the interests elaborated in the submissions from professional organisations and those of industry, with a similar range of rhetoric from utilitarian to liberal.

Trade union submissions offered similar views. The Australian Workers' Union (A.W.U.) addressed the effect of employing students as casual part-time workers on total employment patterns and attitudes to work. It suggested that the practice led to exploitation of casual and junior staff, which resulted in adverse attitudes to future employment and created employment problems for senior and skilled workers. It also suggested that such employment practices had been poorly planned in relation to work experience and school to work transition programmes. The Union was clearly not only addressing immediate interests of its membership but also longer term interests concerning stability in employment, which had been the major factor in the alliance between sections of the working class and the bourgeoisie in the post-War period.¹⁰⁶ The Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union (A.M.W.S.U.) offered one of the most sophisticated analyses of tertiary education and its relations to the community among submissions. It suggested that the economic recession facing Australia was not of a short-term cyclical nature but was "a period of accelerated structural change"¹⁰⁷ which would produce substantial changes in the society by the time it had been overcome. It saw this change coupled with "a society that is both retreating from the goal of full employment and increasingly making use of new technology ever increasing in complexity"¹⁰⁸ which would also produce considerable effects on the nature of society. Because of this, the Union suggested that the education system should continue to be improved to increase its capacity

to promote social mobility, the fulfilment of personal aspirations, and to enable people to be adaptable in the changing society. It suggested that a problem existed in the attitudes of senior management, which was more traditionally educated, in not being able to cope with the conflicts which were likely to arise. It suggested that the education system should become more oriented to recurrent and continuing education to enable adaptability and the promotion of skills in a more and more cultural context. In particular, it was concerned that the education system should retain a broad base and its emphasis on introduction to skills, rather than being channelled more to vocational interests.¹⁰⁹

The A.M.W.S.U. was concerned that the interests of the working class would be recognised by the education system in a way which did not conform to the interests of the bourgeoisie in the struggle for the maintenance of its hegemony. Although presented in the rhetoric of liberal ideals for education, the Union's submission clearly spelt out a reform of the education system which would allow the development within it of alternatives to bourgeois hegemony that would enable the working class to promote its own long-term interests in opposition to the restrictions which the drive to conformity promoted by the bourgeoisie included.

The community of interests between many sectors of industry which had been promoted in the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the working class during the post-War period was presented to the Committee in the submission of the National Training Council which represented government, capital and labour. It suggested that employers should be encouraged to undertake job training through subsidisation, as an unskilled or inflexibly skilled work force was against the nation's economic interests.¹¹⁰ According to the Council, coordination of government and industry efforts in training were essential. It suggested that there should be a transfer of resources to the T.A.F.E. sector from the other

tertiary education sectors, in particular to assist the sector to cope with increasing demands being made on it by employers and governments.¹¹¹ It also suggested that more communication between industry and education authorities was required.

There appears also to be too little knowledge in industry of what is happening within the education system; this suggests a need for more extensive consultation between industry and all sectors of education.¹¹²

This situation was exacerbated by an inadequate spread of educational provision in relation to industry needs, a misunderstanding among employers of the role of education in relation to specific job training, and inadequate manpower planning statistics and data made available by industry to tertiary education, all of which required improvement. The submission reflected the dominance which those sections of the bourgeoisie representing centralisation and industrialisation had in relation to education in such forums during the post-War period. Their interests in transferring the costs of education and training from industry to government, and large scale training of skilled labour through the expansion of tertiary education, became more intensive in the 1970s as economic conditions dried up immigration as a source and increased pressures on capital to reduce their own costs. Pressures for the development of the T.A.F.E. sector and the transfer of resources from the universities and advanced education sector were part of the trends in the development of tertiary education which had been apparent during the post-War period.

The Report of the Committee

In its Report, the Committee dealt first with the factors which precipitated its establishment. It noted participation rates in universities and colleges of advanced education, and expenditure as a proportion of the Gross Domestic Product, had risen considerably in the

twenty years after the Murray Report. It noted the more recent growth in the T.A.F.E. sector, particularly in the area of leisure and personal enrichment courses. However, it also noted that by the mid-1970s, "there were clear signs of further changes, though changes of a very different kind".¹¹³ These were the levelling out of school retention rates, a decline in the birthrate, and predicted declines in the numbers of students of school and tertiary education ages. In addition, the Commonwealth had decided in 1975 to hold university intakes at the 1976 level and college intakes at the 1977 level, as well as to halt the rise in tertiary education expenditure relative to the G.D.P. It noted that while there had been substantial increases in the participation rate and the absolute number of students enrolled in tertiary education, the situation in relation to staff/student ratios in the universities and colleges of advanced education had shown a slight deterioration, and that there were obvious deficiencies in the T.A.F.E. sector.¹¹⁴ The Committee noted that the Commonwealth's share of education funding had increased from 2.6 per cent in 1956-57 to 42.1 per cent in 1976-77, with the tertiary education share representing "1.8 per cent of gross national expenditure on all goods and services, and 2.12 per cent when grants to students are included".¹¹⁵ This increase had followed the acceptance of the recommendations of the Murray and Martin Reports and the decision of the Whitlam Government to accept full responsibility for funding the universities and advanced education sector. Nevertheless, the Committee believed that constitutional responsibility for education rested with the States, with the qualification of the 1946 amendment, adding that

the divergence between direct constitutional responsibilities of the States and the financing role of the Commonwealth Government is the cause of much confusion in public discussion.¹¹⁶

This was especially so since the Commonwealth used its powers under Section 96 to advance funding while the States maintained responsibility

through State co-ordinating authorities. The Committee also suggested that the changing nature of tertiary education students was a factor which had contributed to its establishment. It noted that the proportion of students who were not direct school leavers had grown considerably so that by 1977, 19 per cent of students in universities, 18 per cent in colleges, and 32 per cent in T.A.F.E. colleges were over thirty years of age.¹¹⁷ It suggested that there were "two distinct social processes affecting participation in higher education".¹¹⁸ For those students who were direct school leavers parental socio-economic status played an important role in their remaining at school, rather than their transition to higher education. For mature age students demand for social mobility was an important factor.

Having reviewed these factors, the Committee surveyed malfunctions and new problems within the education system. It suggested that

It is clear from the terms of reference of this Committee of Inquiry that there are some doubts about whether the education system is functioning well and concern whether it has the capacity to respond to new problems.¹¹⁹

The creation of the Tertiary Education Commission had shown that the Commonwealth was committed to closer coordination in tertiary education. The Committee believed that the rejection by the Menzies Government of the Martin proposal to establish such a body in 1967 had led to much of the confusion which had subsequently developed. It believed that the establishment of State co-ordinating authorities had created problems for the T.E.C. with its structure of three Councils and an over-riding Commission, which only be overcome by restructuring it along the lines proposed by the Martin Committee. In addition to cross-sectoral problems, the Committee suggested that there was concern about the internal efficiency of each sector, especially in relation to the universities and colleges of advanced education, and the ability of the economy to absorb their graduates. It suggested that issues relating to

cost-benefits in tertiary education were persistent. In addition, it suggested that new problems were becoming evident; demographic change, technological change, and structural change were presenting issues of planning relating to organisational and financial demands, and to increased leisure and the demands of non-vocational education.¹²⁰ Nevertheless, the Committee did not consider that these problems warranted fundamental change in the tertiary education system. It believed that

the Australian community...has been well served by its system of education. The T.A.F.E. sector has responded quickly and creatively to the new demands on it and to opportunities provided by more adequate funds. The universities displayed a capacity to grow and to cope with new types of students that belied their reputation as conservative and inward looking institutions. The history of the advanced education sector that was developed after the Martin Committee Report in 1964 and 1965 reflects great credit on the colleges, the State authorities and the Commission on Advanced Education.¹²¹

It proposed "a period of quiet reform"¹²² rather than major structural changes in the tertiary education system.

The Committee then dealt with the issue of education expenditure increases. It noted that public education expenditure had increased at a faster rate than the growth of the G.D.P. between 1956-57 and 1976-77. Two sets of factors operated on this increase. First, the increase in the numbers of the population in student age groups. Second, the increase relative to the G.D.P. was affected by more complex issues.

first, the numbers in the education age group rose faster than the numbers in the working population; second, there was a substantial increase in educational opportunity...; third, the number of teachers increased relative to the number of students in primary and secondary schools and the ratio of supporting staff to teaching staff increased in colleges of advanced education; fourth, the Government paid for an increasing proportion of the costs of education.¹²³

However, the Committee pointed out that these were not static and that more recent trends tended to reduce demand on funding. For instance, the numbers in the working population had increased relative to student

numbers from 1972, which had relieved the upward pressure on capital expenditure, a change which "was discernible before the Federal Government's decision in 1975 to cut back plans for capital expenditure".¹²⁴ Nevertheless, increases in participation rates and retention rates had continued to exert upward pressure on education expenditure. These increases resulted in student enrolments in the higher education sectors of almost 300,000 in 1977 compared with a static projection of 88,000.¹²⁵ Increased participation and retention rates also meant that the numbers of students in tertiary education rose relatively to those in schools thereby increasing costs.¹²⁶ While the Committee noted that there was little data in relation to the T.A.F.E. sector, it suggested that increases in enrolments had led to increased expenditure in the sector. It suggested that this increase had similar characteristics as for that other education sectors - a natural population increase and increased participation rates.¹²⁷ The Committee ranked the influence of these factors according to a method devised by the O.E.C.D. which measured expenditure movement relative to G.D.P. by demographic, participation and relative cost indices. It suggested that while the first two had exerted upward pressures throughout the period 1957 to 1977, the third had restrained it until 1967. From that point all three exerted strong pressure on expenditure, with the most important being related to social demands brought about by increased community affluence and measured in the participation index.¹²⁸ The Committee noted, however, that these factors had shown a marked change from the mid-1970s. First, the demographic index had fallen and was projected to continue to do so until the end of the century. Second, school retention rates had stabilised and would check tertiary education enrolment growth. Third, higher costs per student in the higher education sectors had increased the relative cost index, although Government funding restrictions had restricted this trend.

Fourth, capital expenditure growth rates had eased considerably. It pointed out that even without Government measures to restrain public expenditure growth rates the decrease in the demographic index alone meant that even a 20 per cent increase in the participation index would not halt the decline in the pressures on expenditure, and that independent of Government policies, "there will be a strong tendency for expenditure to fall relative to G.D.P."¹²⁹ In addition, it pointed out that

Prospective movements in the education age groups should not be confused with the prospective sharp reduction in the demographic index caused by the increase in the working population relative to the educational age groups. That movement will, other things being equal, reduce expenditure relative to G.D.P., and diminish the recent strong pressures coming from the budgetary processes to reduce real grants per student in universities and colleges of advanced education.¹³⁰

The Committee drew attention to the "quite dramatic" differences in the political and social climate in which it was situated in comparison with that of the Murray and Martin Committees. The Murray Committee had concluded that the attitude taken in the 1930s that too many graduates were being produced in a period of economic depression was wrong, and recommended a programme of rapid expansion in the university sector. The Williams Committee noted that the fears of technologically based unemployment had increased in the mid-1970s at a time when graduates were accepting employment which had been previously seen as below graduate standard and when graduate unemployment was increasing. There was a public perception that too many graduates were being produced and this increased pressures to reduce expenditure on tertiary education, which was not the case during the Murray period. There were also differences in relation to the climate of the Martin Committee, when prospects for the future were viewed in the light of expected growth in the tertiary education age group, in expected participation rates in higher education, and in school retention rates. The Martin Committee had recommended a

further expansion of tertiary education

on the grounds that such an expansion of education was needed in the interests of economic growth and that, in part because of the pull from the market, there would be a sufficient number of willing and able students.¹³¹

The Report noted that the situation in the late 1970s had changed markedly. The numbers in the tertiary education age group were expected to fall until the early 1990s, school retention rates had stabilised, and tertiary education expenditure had reached 1.8 per cent of the G.D.P. in 1978, all of which had led the Commonwealth Government "to check any further growth in expenditure relative to growth in G.D.P."¹³²

Throughout this section of the Report, there was no direct criticism of Government policies toward education, nor any indication of the role of the Government acting in the interests of the bourgeoisie to dampen individual aspirations in relation to education, even though it provided data to show that the Government's attitude to tertiary education was not justified in economic terms. It avoided the reason for the actions and policies of the Government which had pre-empted much of the Committee's grounds by restricting its terms of reference, and taking decisions about coordination, funding, and enrolment numbers prior to the Committee's establishment. There was, of course, no discussion of the role of the education system in the hegemonic process. In fact, the Committee by not recommending major structural changes was endorsing that role.

The Committee then addressed general issues of growth and expenditure until the year 2000. Rather than settle on firm predictions, as had the Murray and Martin Committees, the Report

concentrated on a number of statistical projections which present...the implications for expenditure expressed as percentage of gross domestic product (G.D.P.) of a range of specified assumptions about changes in population, retention rates in schools and participation rates in the three sectors of post-secondary education, and economic growth.¹³³

It used statistic from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the National Population Inquiry and its own studies to present four statistical projections. The Report did, however, select one projection as the most likely, modifying it to take into account political considerations regarding pegged student numbers which it assumed would be maintained until 1981. It suggested that if it were correct, an expenditure peak as a percentage of the G.D.P. would occur in 1981 with an ongoing fall until 2001.¹³⁴ Even if variations were made to counter criticisms of inadequate research funding and high student/staff ratios (both of which were relatively worse than prior to the Martin Report in the early 1960s), the trend referred to earlier in the Report would still cause a relative decline in tertiary education expenditure from the mid-1980s. Nevertheless, the Report stressed the need to keep such projections under continuing review. It suggested that there was no longer sufficient grounds to assume that a simple relationship existed between tertiary education and economic growth as had previous inquiries, but that it had "become more important to think of plans for educational expenditure in terms of economic growth".¹³⁵ In its first statement in regard to liberal educational ideals, the Report then continued that

It is equally important to think of plans for activities in education that serve different purposes such as a 'full and true education' befitting the rights and obligations of citizens of a democratic State, the encouragement of scholarship and research, and the promotion of stable economic growth.¹³⁶

The brevity of the statement, which was to draw criticism from many commentators following the release of the Report, reflected the way in which debate on tertiary education had developed in the twenty years from the Murray Report, as the hegemony of the bourgeoisie had become more secure.

Before considering the future of tertiary education, the Report examined the relationship between secondary education and the labour

market. Its recommendations in this area, while not referring directly to tertiary education, had relevance to it. In brief, the Report identified a need for increasing emphasis on vocational counselling and the encouragement of "disciplined work habits" at secondary schools, although it recommended that they continue to stress their general educational objectives with complementary attention being paid to vocational education. It suggested that schools could not solve the problems of youth unemployment although some improvements in the system could be part of a solution to halt its rise relative to adult unemployment.¹³⁷

The Report dealt separately with each of the tertiary education sectors. It suggested that the development of universities in Australia had rested on four precepts.

- (a) that every young person of appropriate ability who desires a university education should have a fair chance of getting it,
- (b) that universities should restrict their teaching to degree and higher degree work and expand higher and research activities,
- (c) that universities could not be efficient and economical with less than 4,000 students in universities providing courses in the humanities, sciences and social sciences, or less than 8,000 when courses were also provided in medicine, dentistry, veterinary science, agriculture and engineering, and
- (d) that where, for reasons of location or recency of foundation, universities are of less than the optimal size they should receive relatively higher grants per student.¹³⁸

It suggested that especially in relation to newer or smaller universities all had been qualified by political considerations, where for instance, if the A.U.C. had recommended against the establishment of Griffith, Murdoch or Deakin universities "it is far from certain the Governments would have regarded such advice from the Universities Commission as at all credible".¹³⁹ The need to protect university autonomy was also a political consideration of some magnitude following establishment, and the first had been qualified by manpower considerations as well. The Report suggested that the first precept, because of its generality, offered little policy guidance, but noted that the abolition of fees, the

introduction of the T.E.A.S. scheme, and the continuation of part-time and external educational provision were all justified in relation to it. It suggested that results had been unequal, and argued that the abolition of fees "has had at best a marginal influence on the accessibility ... to socially and economically disadvantaged groups",¹⁴⁰ that T.E.A.S. had been more important in this regard, and that the advantages of part-time and external provision had been partly offset by high attrition rates in those areas. Nevertheless, it noted that success rates had improved since the Murray Committee expressed grave concern about them. In 1957 under 60 per cent graduated with only 35 per cent doing so in the minimum time, while by the 1971 intake, over 70 per cent were expected to graduate with 57 per cent doing so in the minimum time.¹⁴¹ Even so, the Report suggested that results could be improved and recommended that the T.E.C. set realistic targets numbers so that commencing students would be likely to graduate.

The Report suggested that the second and third precepts had strongly influenced the development of Australian universities since the Murray Report. Numbers in sub-degree and miscellaneous courses had fallen from almost 25 per cent of total enrolments in 1957 to only 3 per cent in 1977, while higher degree students had increased from 3.8 per cent in 1957 to 11.6 per cent in 1977 (and 16.6 per cent if postgraduate diploma students were included).¹⁴² Until 1970 research expenditure grew considerably in real terms, although it had fallen since, and the Report noted that "real resources per student increases following the Murray and Martin reports until 1968, and then declined significantly from 1975".¹⁴³ Funding for degree and higher degree students had followed the third precept, particularly in relation to course characteristics. Eight of the nineteen universities had in 1977 enrolments of less than the 4,000 supposed to make them economical and effective, although the excess cost amounted to only 3 to 4 per cent of total costs. However,

"the size of the financial grants per student to some small universities is the cause of considerable discontent in some colleges of advanced education".¹⁴⁴ While stressing that its projections were quantitative and not qualitative, it suggested that some small universities would not reach an enrolment of 4,000, and the Report recommended that the T.E.C. continue to review the projections even given the difficulties of manpower planning. In addition, it stressed the need for more research and analysis on trends in attrition rates and their effects on the projections. It recalled the Martin recommendations noting that because they were not taken up,

the Universities Commission continued to set target numbers of students which in some universities could not be met without admitting many students with little prospect of graduating.¹⁴⁵

It made a number of recommendations on the directions of such research. The Committee implicitly criticised the Government by stating that "It will not be possible for universities to improve graduation rates if real resources per student continue to drift down".¹⁴⁶ The Report recognised that acceptance of these recommendations would result in some disadvantage to some students who might normally have entered university or who attended small non-metropolitan universities. It suggested two solutions; first, redirection to the advanced education sector, and second, collaboration between universities and colleges of advanced education, particularly neighbouring institutions, in the provision of courses. It also recommended that the T.E.C. reconsider the rationale for setting the minimum number of 4,000 enrolments.¹⁴⁷ In relation to the fourth precept, the Report suggested the problems arising from it "are the consequences of retarded growth",¹⁴⁸ and noted that high cost universities were either new or located in geographical areas where growth was slower. It suggested that collaboration with other institutions would solve some problems but recommended that Murdoch be absorbed by the University of Western Australia, and that the proposed

university at Albury-Wodonga not proceed.¹⁴⁹

The Committee also commented on other areas concerning the universities. It suggested that their most distinctive characteristics were their research functions, and pointed out that funds in real terms had been falling for several years. It asserted that if this were to continue, the universities would gradually slide back into the position they occupied prior to the Murray Report. Its own projections assumed that research funds would increase from .7 per cent to 2.13 per cent of total funds between 1978 and 1981. It recommended that postgraduate funds be increased as well and that research in general be upgraded. With regard to academic employment, it noted that the difficulties which arose from innovation, changing student preference, and curriculum developments in a period of funding restrictions were exacerbated by the effects of the tenure system. It suggested that flexible staffing arrangements were required, and recommended the introduction of periodic efficiency reviews by the universities.¹⁵⁰ It was critical of the T.E.C.'s study leave report, which it implied was more political than economic, noting the total savings amounted to between \$1 million and \$1.5 million in a total budget of \$1,100 million, and that "This does not suggest that large-scale reductions in the direct cost of study leave are possible if legitimate and desirable objectives are to be met".¹⁵¹

The aim of the Committee's recommendations in relation to the universities was clearly to improve their efficiency in both qualitative and quantitative terms. While it was critical of the Government's policies of funding restrictions, it was not on the grounds that these impaired access to the universities or impaired their ability to offer students the type of educational provision that they sought, but in terms of impeding the functions of the universities in elite training and research which were necessary components in the maintenance of bourgeois hegemony. The conflict that the economic recession had opened in the

bourgeoisie was apparent from these disagreements, although the Report had no difficulty with Government decisions to promote a streamlined and more efficient university sector.

In dealing with the advanced education sector, the Report noted that "The Martin Committee did not plan the advanced education sector as it is",¹⁵² and that the failure of the Menzies Government to adopt the recommendations of that Committee had led to a considerable "lack of coordination between the two sectors" in higher education.¹⁵³ It noted that, while the Menzies Government had restricted funds in the sector to those courses leading to a diploma, by 1970 almost 50 per cent of college students were enrolled in degree courses or postgraduate programmes, and that with the inclusion of teachers colleges in the sector, participation rates had risen from 3.5 per cent in 1968 to 10 per cent in 1978.¹⁵⁴ While noting that the basic principles for the sector stressed its vocational, applied and teaching orientation, its tertiary standard and flexible entry requirements, and its undergraduate rather than postgraduate emphasis, the Report suggested that the phenomenon of academic drift away from these had occurred through lack of adequate and firm planning in the sector. It suggested that piecemeal development had resulted from joint planning arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States without firm lines of responsibility. Although the advent of total Commonwealth funding and the establishment of the T.E.C. had changed the context of planning, the Report suggested that difficulties would remain, not least because of the numbers of colleges in the sector. Even given recent moves to rationalise the sector, it noted that there were still over seventy colleges, and that the average number of students per college was less than 2,000. In 1977, only nine had more than 3,000 students, and only seventeen had more than 2,000. It suggested that multi-purpose metropolitan colleges could be economical and effective with 3,500 students, regional colleges with 2,500, and

single purpose colleges with between 500 and 1,500. It noted the difficulties in measuring student progress, although it expressed concern that its own study suggested that one third of those commencing UG1, UG2 and UG3 courses in 1974 had discontinued by 1977.¹⁵⁵ The Report supported the intention of the T.E.C. to devolve some of its powers to State co-ordinating authorities, suggesting that

There is unnecessary duplication and waste of effort and resources which stems in some measure from different interpretations of the proper roles of Commonwealth and State authorities.¹⁵⁶

It recommended that a joint Commonwealth/State working party be established to facilitate an appropriate devolution of power. However, it recommended that in each State, one large college of advanced education be treated in a manner similar to the universities, submitting triennial proposals to the Advanced Education Council through its State authority. Other colleges would be subject to coordination by the State authority, which would receive Commonwealth funds and allocate them to the colleges. Nevertheless, the Commonwealth would retain some powers to ensure continued planning controls. In addition, the Report recommended that the larger and more established colleges should have a more independent and autonomous relationship with the State authorities.¹⁵⁷

According to the Committee, one of the most effective administrative features of the advanced education sector was the structural reviews which had ensured continuing rationalisation. However, it suggested that the factors on which the reviews had been based were not always clearly stated, foreshadowing criticism of its own Report, and stated that future reviews should be based on benefit and cost analyses. However, it suggested that other factors should also be taken into account, particularly as political considerations to do with location, decentralisation and access had played an important role in the development of the advanced education sector. While these may be seen as

leading to excessive direct costs, the indirect economic benefits to a region may be offsetting factors. It recommended that future rationalisation inquiries should have terms of reference which took account of educational, access, regional and sector economic and industrial factors, that minimum effective staff numbers be researched, and that evaluative case studies of amalgamations be commissioned to determine their benefits. It suggested that in relation to these, there needed to be "a considerable improvement in the accuracy and comprehensiveness of advanced education statistics".¹⁵⁸ It noted the maximum growth in the sector until 2,000 would be just over 30 per cent compared with a 15 per cent growth in 1975 alone, and suggested that the colleges would "have to accommodate their plans to low rates of growth in the number of students" and treat the future as a period "for consolidation and review".¹⁵⁹ In particular, it looked to the T.E.C. to facilitate the development of multi-level institutions with T.A.F.E. components, and recommended similar collaboration as it had for the small non-metropolitan universities. It suggested that such measures would improve flexibility within the sector and across the sectoral boundary with T.A.F.E. It noted the recommendations of the Committee on Open Tertiary Education which had recommended the establishment of a national institution for external studies, and suggested that the advanced education sector could take up the suggestion within existing structures. It recommended that State authorities integrate external studies in other programmes, granting awards when credit was obtained in more than one institution.¹⁶⁰ The Report recognised that the attrition rate in advanced education was in some part due to the access provisions which operated, although it recommended that selection procedures should be modified to ensure that student progress rates were improved without reducing access.¹⁶¹ The Committee recommended that the T.E.C. continue to apply the policy of the Commission on Advanced Education in the

development of the sector - that it be vocationally oriented with an emphasis on teaching, except where non-vocational and research programmes had an adequate basis in vocational courses. Nevertheless, it recognised that individual staff may undertake research and suggested that it be funded by research bodies rather than from teaching funds of the colleges.¹⁶² It recommended in a similar vein to its proposals for the universities in relation to staff flexibility.

The Committee's recommendations in relation to the colleges of advanced education were meant to complement those relating to the universities. Access to the higher education sectors of the tertiary education system for the majority of students was clearly envisaged to be in the advanced education sector as the universities were streamlined. The social considerations which had led to the rapid expansion of tertiary education in the post-War period, and which had led to aspirations which may have threatened the role of the universities in relation to bourgeois hegemony, were to be catered for, but contained in a more restricted advanced education sector. Its emphasis was to continue to be on vocational and applied teaching in contrast to that of the universities in research and scholarship. The Committee's recommendations to redirect students to the former rather than the latter was a continuation of the recommendations of the Martin Committee, which had not been as successful as had been envisaged, with resulting demands on the universities which might have affected their legitimacy in the hegemonic process. The rejection of the coordination arrangements of the Martin Report, and its proposal that future developments exclude the establishment of new universities while concentrating growth in the advanced education sector, had met with criticism in the Williams Report. Its recommendations reinforced the Martin proposals with added safeguards in the form of the de facto establishment of an elite group of institutions within the university sector, and proposals for stronger

growth in the advanced education sector rather than in the universities.

In its treatment of the T.A.F.E. sector, the Committee was unable to approach issues in the same way as it had for the other sectors, as the structure of the sector, and statistics pertaining to it were not as developed. As a result, apart from proposals for increased funding, submissions to the Committee regarding T.A.F.E. had been less consistent. The Committee stressed this situation. The Report accepted the assumptions of the Technical and Further Education Commission that the correct number of T.A.F.E. students was 80 per cent of subject enrolments. This meant that in 1977 there were 647,000 students enrolled, with an estimated equivalent full time notion of between 173,000 and 204,000. The Committee stressed that this estimate "must be subject to a considerable margin of error".¹⁶³ T.A.F.E. development had been uneven in course areas and between the States. In course areas, the greatest development had been in further and leisure courses which were non-vocational, while the areas of highest concentration were general studies, engineering and business studies. There had been a falling growth rate in vocational education numbers, although at the same time there had been an increase in the number of full-time students in the area, as pre-employment education became more important. Nevertheless, only 5 per cent of total enrolments were full-time, reflecting the nature of trade-training and the high numbers in non-vocational education.¹⁶⁴ There were significant variations in T.A.F.E. participation rates between the States, from 17.4 per cent for all areas in Queensland to 52.4 per cent in South Australia, and for vocational areas, from 7.4 per cent in Queensland to 25.8 per cent in South Australia.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the Committee suggested that T.A.F.E. was more accessible, both geographically and academically, to a wider range of the population, and more flexible in its educational approach than the other tertiary education sectors. This resulted from

its use of part-time staff, who undertook a considerable amount of teaching in all areas, and the "very wide range of courses of varying lengths and levels" it provided.¹⁶⁶

The Committee noted that the activities of the T.A.F.E. sector in the States were undertaken by a government department rather than through statutory bodies as were the other sectors, and that where post-secondary education inquiries had reported, they had recommended the immediate conversion or study of the desirability of converting T.A.F.E. departments to statutory authorities. It suggested that the reasons for rejection by the States of such recommendations was the strong links which T.A.F.E. had with schools, and its position at the transition from schooling to tertiary education. It noted that funding arrangements for T.A.F.E. were similar to those for schools, a situation which it recognised had drawn considerable criticism in three ways. First, they gave the T.E.C. little control to support or direct specific developments. Second, the arrangements encouraged the States to establish advanced education courses in preference to T.A.F.E. courses to obtain full Commonwealth funding. Third, divided control and responsibility emphasised the lack of coordination between Commonwealth and State plans for development. The Report suggested that the criticisms were based on the assumption that by removing funding differences between the sectors, the Commonwealth would solve academic and administrative problems as well. It suggested that the defective nature of T.A.F.E. statistics made such assumptions impossible to test. It also pointed out that the differences in funding arrangements were based in differences in teaching and research activities, and took account of specific differences in administrative and decision making responsibilities. In particular, the Committee was

not persuaded that a funding formula under which there is the same ratio of Commonwealth to State grants in each sector is required for a rational allocation of activities between the sectors, and in particular to achieve a sensible division of

labour between T.A.F.E. and colleges of advanced education in the provision of middle-level courses.¹⁶⁷

In fact, the Committee rejected suggestions that the Commonwealth should become involved in conflicts between the advanced education and T.A.F.E. sectors at the middle-level, suggesting that the problem was essentially administrative and better solved at State level. It suggested that much of the problem could be overcome by a system of course contracting similar to that recommended as part of its university/advanced education collaboration.

The Committee recommended that a National Centre for Research and Development in T.A.F.E. be established to overcome difficulties the sector faced in planning and development in areas such as the work/education interface, course classification, educational technology and self-paced learning programmes. Its recommendations stressed the need for rationalisation between T.A.F.E. and other community services, especially in country areas. It dealt extensively with trade training, where it believed that extensive changes would take place in the future. It noted that moves away from the apprenticeship system to an institutionally based one year full-time and two year part-time system would increase costs considerably, and also noted that range of attitudes of the Commonwealth and State Governments. It noted the different capacities of various industries to undertake efficient and effective training programmes, and recommended

a progressive movement to a substantial component of pre-employment education and training where changes in the structure of industry have removed the basis of effective training, where fluctuations in an industry cause employers to reduce the intake of apprentices to a level that will cause future shortages of tradesmen, or where changes in technology have created a greater need for trainees and training than can be accommodated by the customary ratios of apprentices to tradesmen.¹⁶⁸

It stressed the need for research based on need and not custom, and suggested that areas which were more appropriately served by

pre-employment type courses rather than employer specific type courses should be identified and developed. Underlining all the Committee's recommendations was the issue of T.A.F.E. statistical data. It suggested that in the area of student attrition, projection and recommendation were impossible because of the paucity of data, and in general noted that

The state of T.A.F.E. statistics is such that the projections for T.A.F.E. are much more speculative than the projections for the universities and colleges of advanced education.¹⁶⁹

It suggested that it was almost impossible to quantify the cost implications of the assumptions it made, a situation compounded by the difficulties in estimating the implications of trends to move costs from industry to government, which made the margin of error "considerable".

It suggested that

The uncertainty of the T.A.F.E. costing and the cost of other recommendations makes it difficult to assess whether adequate provision has been made in the costings for the other recommendations.¹⁷⁰

It recommended that costings be continually reviewed as the recommendations were implemented, and as an experience and improved data became available.

The recommendations of the Committee in relation to the T.A.F.E. sector continued the trend which had been apparent in educational development in Australia toward centralisation, and the transfer of resources from private to public sources. The onset of the recession in the mid-1970s which followed the sectoralisation of non-university tertiary education had made apparent deficiencies in vocational education which were both historical and exacerbated by post-War developments. Development in the T.A.F.E. sector was designed to reduce pressures on both the other tertiary education sectors which were concerned with more formal advanced courses. On the other hand, the T.A.F.E. sector was concerned to provide for non-certificate and non-formal, personal enrichment education, and trade and lower-level management vocational

education and training. One of the most important factors in satisfying labour market demand for vocational training at these levels in the post-War period had been the large scale immigration programmes which had been encouraged. This had meant that costs to employers and industry were substantially subsidised by the Commonwealth which provided assisted passages and other benefits to migrants and their families. The reduction of immigration had two effects. The first was a consequent reduction in the numbers of skilled tradesmen available in the labour market. The second, which flowed from this, was the necessity for industry to provide increased training provision, which incurred costs it had not previously borne. Demands from industry that there be increased provision of institutionally based trade and vocational education and training followed swiftly on this development. The recommendations of the Williams Committee recognised these factors and were aimed at facilitating the transfer. There were two important reasons why such a development was necessary. First, it assisted in centralising costs and so assisted in the restructuring of capital that was a major function of the economic recession. Second, it provided the T.A.F.E. sector with increased status, which was essential if it were to be able to attract students and relieve pressures on the other tertiary education sectors. The relationship between education and training was closer in the T.A.F.E. sector, and the hegemonic role of education was potentially more apparent to its participants at this level. Its status had to be ensured if it were to maintain legitimacy. The recommendations in the Report facilitated this process.¹⁷¹

In the period around the presentation of the Report to the Government, the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Bruce Williams, gave a number of interviews and released a number of papers which commented on the major issues raised in the Report. He suggested that, while it was

respectable to note the link which existed between education and economic growth,

The cause of education is currently suffering from an over simple emphasis in the Murray and Martin Reports on the causal link between expenditure on education and economic growth.¹⁷²

According to Williams, the two reports had overestimated the economic role of education as distinct from the type of education in relation to economic growth. This had caused problems with later interpretations of the relationship. "The expectations were excessive, and when they were disappointed the reaction was excessive".¹⁷³ He suggested that the relationship turned most productively around technological advancement, although it was by no means constant or smooth. He stated that "the Report was based on the powerful and pervasive influence of technological change".¹⁷⁴ Nevertheless, he was definite on what education could not do;

while education and training must keep pace with, and also create the conditions of technological and social change, the education system cannot by itself create employment and economic growth.¹⁷⁵

Even so, the Committee had confirmed the structural arrangements which had developed as a result of previous inquiries, noting that the Report

referred to the importance of maintaining defined roles for the sectors and of institutions within them, and concluded that the conclusions reached by the Murray, Martin and Kangan Committees on the respective roles of Federal and State authorities were still valid.¹⁷⁶

He suggested that the T.A.F.E. sector should not be seen as a panacea for youth unemployment. He noted that the rate of youth unemployment had remained static in relation to adult unemployment rates, asserting that it

could not be explained by defects in education and no change in education policy (other than an insistence that teenagers and young adults remain within the formal education system until they gained employment) could of itself bring a quick solution to the unemployment problem.¹⁷⁷

He was critical of the attitudes prevailing in industry and commerce that

advocated strong manpower planning and other utilitarian proposals in the education system.

Educational planning should be based on manpower planning only when the sole purpose of education is to produce employment skills...no country has shown a capacity to forecast manpower needs, even in highly specialised skills...The current problems of employment are greatest not with the arts, economics, and law graduates, where there is often alleged to be over-production, but with the highly specialised graduates...The Committee made recommendations about manpower planning in limited fields only. We restricted our comments on it to those things we think are feasible, and have not gone in for any grand designs. We judge that they would not be worth the paper they were written on.¹⁷⁸

While he agreed that the colleges of advanced education had moved too close to the universities in some respects, which necessitated the development of the T.A.F.E. sector as a "radical alternative",¹⁷⁹ he was also critical of allegations of unwarranted credentialism in them, and in the system generally. He pointed out that the advanced education sector had developed along the lines envisaged by the Martin Committee to become degree granting institutions, adding that it was Menzies' conception that they should be restricted to diploma level activities.¹⁸⁰ He also suggested that there was plenty of capacity in industry to absorb graduates, and asserted that allegations of credentialism were "difficult to distinguish from an attack on a widening of educational opportunity".¹⁸¹ While he agreed that research was a proper function in both the universities and colleges of advanced education, he argued that in the latter it should not draw on the recurrent funds of the institutions but be funded from specified sources of research funding. He argued that in the universities extra funds were urgently required if they were to meet their obligations to the community in providing research. The universities, he suggested, provided "a balance between process and product innovations, for improvements in the environment, health and social life generally", and were important in "meeting the challenge of unsolved intellectual problems".¹⁸²

Williams' statements made apparent the divisions which existed in the bourgeoisie between fractions of capital, and between the long and short-term interests of the class as a whole. Clearly, his views were in no way antipathetic to bourgeois interests. They reflected the demands which the class made through its intellectuals on its members, and especially by dominant groups within the class. The notion of intellectual objectivity, a powerful weapon in the legitimation of bourgeois interests in the maintenance of hegemony in society, was equally as powerful within the class. The simplistic proposals which had been to the forefront in political rhetoric since the election of the Fraser Government were confined to that arena by the Williams' proposals. The space which they had offered the bourgeoisie in the hegemonic process while capital underwent restructuring, had been invaluable, but the threat to the legitimacy of the tertiary education system had to be averted by the time of the Williams Report if it were to maintain its value in the hegemonic process. Hence, Williams' concentration the tenuous relationship between the economy and the education system, and the efforts in the Report to avert blame for unemployment from the education system.

Reactions to the Report

The response from the Government to the Report was much less enthusiastic than had been its announcement of the establishment of the Committee. The Report was submitted to the Prime Minister on 28 February 1979, two and a half years after the Committee began its deliberations, and was released in Parliament almost a month later. The Government's lack of enthusiasm for a Report which it had directed in its terms of reference to link deficiencies in the education system to high levels of unemployment, particularly among youth, was highlighted by Fraser's speech, which took less than ten minutes to deliver, and which

concentrated on those aspects of the Report which might have been construed to fit the Government's policies. There was no mention of the implicit criticisms in the Report of the Government's decisions to restrict funding, particularly for research, or for its attempts to blame the education system for unemployment. There were no acceptances of recommendations in Fraser's speech. The Government's actions in relation to the Report were confined to thanking the members, announcing that the Australian Education Council would hold a special meeting in June to consider the Report, and the announcement of a committee of Ministers to co-ordinate consideration of the Report and hand its findings to the Government during the Budget session of Parliament. According to Fraser, "it is clear that a number of the recommendations, if adopted, will require several years to implement fully and effectively".¹⁸³ There was no agreement in principle of any of the Report's findings, nor support for the principles on which it was based. The response of the Opposition was far more critical. In his reply to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, Hayden, called the Report "a blurred perspective" of education to the year 2000, and stated, "All I can say is that I am displaying a remarkable degree of restraint by describing this report as greatly disappointing".¹⁸⁴ He pointed to the lack of specific recommendations in areas such as migrant, aboriginal, and transition education, and the conservative nature of the discussion about the relationship between manpower planning and education. The A.L.P. was faced with its continuing support for widening access to the higher education institutions in the tertiary education system, and its recognition of the structural changes in the economy which would require different responses from the education system than during the period of rapid expansion in the twenty years since the Murray Report. The tension evident was a familiar one, which had been apparent in liberal responses to the Murray and Martin Reports. Hayden drew attention to the apparent

over-production of graduates, while at the same time pointing out that 80 per cent of the population held no tertiary education qualifications. His response was to call for a major restructuring of tertiary education to match that occurring in the economy.

it is my firm belief that the education system has to be restructured massively so that training of skilled tradesmen required in our community can proceed successfully. If that restructuring does not take place as a matter of urgency, then we are going to be quite inadequately equipped to handle economic problems in the near future.¹⁸⁵

There was one area covered in the Report which received commendation from the Opposition in its initial response. Hayden drew attention to the section of the Report which demolished "so much of the conventional wisdom of the Government and so much of its abuse of the so-called dole bludger syndrome which is held responsible for the unemployment problem".¹⁸⁶ He suggested that the critique offered by the Report exposed the Government's stand as superficial and spurious, and as such was one of the most important findings of the Committee.

Political response to the Report outside the Parliament was equally as unimpressive. The Minister for Education, Carrick, suggested that

Already it is clear that this is not just another report to lie in the dust of the bookshelves. The process of its implementation is significantly advanced.¹⁸⁷

His evidence was that the A.E.C. had been aided by the conclusions of the Report in its future planning. He ignored the recommendations of the Report, for instance, to restore funding to the universities, suggesting that they would face constant funding for the foreseeable future, and have to cope with problems such as staffing requirements and restructuring within that context.¹⁸⁸ The former Minister for Education in the Whitlam Government, Beazley, gave a more balanced assessment of the Report. He was critical of Fraser's motives in establishing the Committee, which he suggested; "translated honestly this means 'Please find reasons for blaming the education system and not

us"¹⁸⁹ for unemployment. He also suggested that the Report illustrated clearly that "non-education was a more significant cause of unemployment than education",¹⁹⁰ as well as presented cautiousness in relation to manpower planning as a means of overcoming the problem. However, he suggested that the response of the Committee to the obviously loaded terms of reference it was given by the Government had been to play it safe. In doing so, he asserted that it had presented misleading assessments of areas such as T.A.F.E. funding, which did not take adequate account of the shared funding arrangements unlike those in the other tertiary education sectors, nor of the disparities in funding which occurred between the States. Nevertheless, Beazley was generally supportive of the Report as "a sensible program of action" which overcame the prejudices and vested interests of the Government which had viewed the establishment and terms of reference of the Committee "as a useful propaganda point on unemployment".¹⁹¹ Williams' own response to the Government's response was critical. Specifically mentioning the rejection of the recommendation to upgrade a major college of advanced education in each State to enable it to operate with status similar to that of the universities, but in the context of the response to the whole Report, he suggested that "Despite its doctrine of co-operative federalism it did not wish to surrender the possibility of detailed intervention".¹⁹²

The mixed responses to the Report by the Government and the Opposition illustrated the extent of conflict within the bourgeoisie in which the future role of the education system played an important part. The advent of high levels of unemployment had, with other economic problems which were being experienced, forced a review of the process by which hegemony was maintained, especially as those institutions which had played important roles in legitimating the process were themselves facing a crisis of legitimation. Both the major political parties had been

caught up in these events, as their responses to the Williams Report showed.

Subsequent comment on the Report was both muted and critical, and the level of support which had been evident for the Murray Report, or the debate which followed the Martin Report were not apparent. Partridge suggested that "The Williams Committee wants the post-Martin system to work; its recommendations are intended to improve its workings".¹⁹³ He asserted that those criticisms of the Report which labelled it elitist were misled and a reflection of the attitudes which dominated the debate about the university/advanced education overlap which had hampered the development of tertiary education since the Martin Report. However, he acknowledged that the Report did little to remove the doubts of those who saw its recommendations to divert students from the universities to colleges of advanced education as an attack on equality of opportunity through its lack of discussion of educational aims of the institutions in any penetrating manner. In addition, Partridge was critical of the weakness of the Report in relation to educational philosophy, a criticism he had levelled more strongly at the Martin Report, and at educational planning in general in Australia in the post-War period. He was not alone in this. Haines suggested that the Committee had failed to look at recent advances in educational philosophy, including those which had become commonplace in reports of bodies such as U.N.E.S.C.O. and the O.E.C.D.'s Centre for Education Research and Innovation. He asserted that it "was not about to be blinded by lights from these great luminaries of our late-century world",¹⁹⁴ and suggested that its failure in this direction had left it unable to consider alternatives to cope with the problems of growth limits and their social implications. On the other hand, Freeland and Sharp suggested that far from ignoring educational philosophy, the Report was an implicit statement of liberal pluralist assumptions, seeking to legitimate anew the premise that

education served individual and community needs, rather than class interests. They saw the view of the state implicit in the Report,

as the rational centre of the body politic, independent and above society, guided by consensual considerations of the 'national interest' and the good of individuals. The educational system in this model is thought of in structural functionalist terms as a set of institutions which simultaneously provide for equality of opportunity, social enlightenment and the skills, knowledge and motivation necessary for an efficient workforce. Neither the state nor education is rent by class contradiction. Both operate to reproduce a consensual unity for the good of society and the benefit of individuals.¹⁹⁵

The continued acceptance of this model was, of course, necessary for the continued legitimacy of the education system in society. The task which confronted the Committee was the restructuring of the education system to take into account the restructuring which was ongoing in the economy while maintaining the legitimacy of the education system. The Report attempted to do this by reorienting the value of education away from a direct relationship with economic growth, to one which was mediated by its value in producing technological advancements, and thus the capacity and potential to affect economic growth. The Report adopted John Stuart Mill's judgements on new technology as a sufficient condition for economic growth,¹⁹⁶ in an attempt to pre-empt criticism and discussion of other, less quantifiable stimulæ. King suggested that

one might suggest that technological invention is not the primary factor in economic growth. Perhaps it is the pecuniary motive that is of most import. Such suggestions, though, force the value issues to the centre and this opens up controversy. Reliance on the hard condition of the existence of device, on the other hand, allows for indirect endorsement of a range of accepted values.¹⁹⁷

He noted that the Report's description of educational development in these terms, with the development of skills based in research and development, adaptation, and utilisation, coincided with the three sector development of tertiary education, and in fact, served as a justification for it. There was no discussion in the Report of the role of the

education system, in socialisation, of the reproduction of the social relations of production in society, or its relation to social stratification or class. But as Butler noted,

Inherent in the recommended hierarchy of educational institutions there is precisely the view that education is to reproduce the relations of a society in which there are quite distinct classes.¹⁹⁸

McLaren suggested that

the Report stands as a testimony to the failure of our systems of education to prepare and select people who will understand either the society in which they function as leading members or the assumptions which they bring with them to their tasks of analysis and leadership.¹⁹⁹

He suggested that the Report contained a great deal of detail and argument, with which it had failed to come to grips, and of which it had little understanding. This was particularly so in relation to the relationship between education and economic growth.

The relationship between the education system and the economy had been the major direction in which the Committee had been steered by its terms of reference. In this it was not unique, for the Walker, Murray and Martin Committees had all accepted this relationship as central to their reports, and their recommendations were accordingly based. The major difference between the earlier reports and that of the Williams Committee was the state of the Australian economy, which at the time of the previous inquiries had been buoyant within a political context of optimism. The climate in which the Williams Committee found itself, however, was one of economic recession and contraction, without the optimism for the future which had characterised the earlier climate, and one in which the restructuring of capital had produced a potentially damaging crisis of legitimacy in regard to its capacity to cater for the aspirations which had been engendered in the working class as the basis for the political alliance upon which social stability had been predicated in the post-War period. Encel offered a typically liberal

critique of the Report's concentration on the relationship, as well as a critique of radical alternatives to it, in which he argued that its over-emphasis on vocational and occupational content in educational provision "corresponds neither to human aspirations nor to economic requirements".²⁰⁰ He suggested that a closer relation between theory and practice was required to meet these needs, failing to recognise the class bases of society, nor the role of the education system in the hegemonic process. However, Encel's underlying assumptions match those of the Report, and his critique is one of detail rather than of substance. In fact, the Report never attempted to situate the economic problems facing Australia in a global setting which might have explained the nature of the Australian economy and the process of restructuring it was undergoing. While it assumed that the example of the Depression suggested a return to economic growth it did not attempt to draw distinctions between that Depression and that which had prompted its establishment. It accepted that the Long Boom in the Australian economy had passed, but did not attempt to analyse its legacy.²⁰¹ As McLaren noted,

There is no attempt to compare the causes of the two depressions nor any mention of the role of the second world war in creating the conditions of growth in the forties, or of the end of the Vietnam war in causing the present economic troubles. Above all, the issue of technological unemployment is ignored...²⁰²

The assumptions on which the Report rested in relation to new technology was that technologically induced social problems such as unemployment would be solved by the development of further technological advancements. In positing the mediation of new technology between the education system and economic growth, the Report provided a further important function. The breaking of the causality between the two allowed the social wage to be reduced in the cause of raising profitability and so aid economic growth. It accepted that Keynesian

solutions to economic problems were no longer acceptable, and based its view of education on monetarist foundations of cost effectiveness, maximum output, minimum wastage and "an invocation of the market forces' capacity to efficiently allocate available labour power and to indicate the most appropriate distribution of educational opportunities".²⁰³ At the same time, however, it couched its discussion in more traditional liberal rhetoric, which disguised the logical outcomes of the monetarist model which emphasised inequality.²⁰⁴ Nevertheless, the logic of capital accumulation which had led to the recession as a means of capital restructuring, also led to pressures on other areas of society to restructure to meet the needs of capital, and the Report provided justification for this within the traditions which had been established during the post-War development of tertiary education in Australia. These pressures illustrated the qualifications which existed in the relationship between the education system and economic growth: "the expanded education that continued growth makes possible must maintain the social relations upon which this growth is dependent".²⁰⁵ Previous reports had been able to link the two causally because of prevailing economic conditions which to be fully realised required the concurrence of the working class. However, the Williams Committee was situated in a climate when "a surplus of demanding articulate graduates has now come to be seen by some as a positive hindrance to trouble free economic growth".²⁰⁶ The nature of the debate on credentialism and changing notions of work were part of the attempt to break down the aspirations which had been built up during the expansionary period of educational development. The hegemonic nature of the debate restricted its scope, so that the relationship between theory and practice, between research and application, and between vocational and occupational were left untouched. The Report failed to get past the employment related aspects of tertiary education to which it had been directed by its terms of

reference, a critique of which was apparently beyond the capacity or comprehension of members of the Committee. This was particularly so in relation to technical education, where its proposals for modular development and increased compartmentalisation ignored those theoretical developments regarding deskilling, and where Butler suggested that

the Committee took the general view that the technical education must be more adaptive and must contribute to ensuring that an insufficient supply of appropriately trained workers never impedes whatever development of Australia's industrial structure is in the interests of large scale capital.²⁰⁷

The Report was, in fact, a catalogue of justification for prevailing trends in tertiary education in Australia. Its criticisms of Government policies were of detail rather than of substance. There were no major structural re-adjustments recommended, nor substantial changes in educational practice to take into account even those reforms which had been recommended by similar reports in the States and overseas. Freeland and Sharp suggested that the findings of the Report showed it

as being primarily an ideological exercise, legitimating development in education and training which had already been prefigured by earlier reports on school work transition policy and other developments, initiated before and during the Williams Committee's deliberations.²⁰⁸

The establishment of the Committee had continued the tradition which had been established in the post-War period for the legitimization of developments in tertiary education by committees of inquiries directed by terms of reference and membership toward particular requirements. The nature of the economic crisis facing Australia in the mid to late 1970s which had forced a period of restructuring of capital had altered the conditions in which post-War social relations had been developed, and other sectors of the society, including the education system, faced strong pressures to restructure to meet the changes. The Williams Committee was the vehicle by which the bourgeoisie presented its planning for future educational development. It confirmed those decisions which

had been taken and implemented, and justified trends to strengthen the hierarchy of institutions and sectors in tertiary education upon which its role in the hegemonic process was based. In reconciling the pressures for change with the liberal rhetoric which had underlined justifications for the development of the system in the post-War period, the Williams Committee provided capital with the means to overcome potentially damaging challenges to the legitimacy of tertiary education, and because of its position in the processes by which bourgeois hegemony was maintained, to that hegemony itself.

FOOTNOTES

1. See J. Freeland and R. Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment: The Decline and Fall of Karmelot", Intervention, 14, 1981, pp. 56-58, for an outline of the changed economic and political conditions and their relation to the changing structures of world capitalism.
2. R. Birrell, "The Demographic and Social Context of Tertiary Education", in T. Hore, P.R. Chippendale and L.H.T. West (eds), A New Era for Tertiary Education, proceedings of a Conference convened jointly by the Higher Education Policy Research and Evaluation Unit at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and the Higher Education Advisory and Research Unit of Monash University, in Toowoomba, August 21-24, 1980, pp. 55-56.
3. G. O'Byrne and J. Brown, "Higher Education and the Labor Market" in ibid., p. 115.
4. Z. Cowen, "The Nature of Higher Education in Australia", in E. Gross and J.S. Western (eds), The End of a Golden Age (St. Lucia, 1981), p. 10; and Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 54.
5. M. Fraser, CPD (Vol. H of R 100), 9 September 1976, pp. 876-879; and G. Butler, "The Legitimation of Australian Education", Journal of Australian Political Economy, no. 5, July 1979, pp. 84-85.
6. Butler, "The Legitimation of Australian Education", p. 85.
7. J. Craney and C. O'Donnell, "Tertiary Fees in Context: A Consideration of Proposals in the Williams Report", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 52, no. 3, 1980, p. 277.
8. P.H. Partridge, "Educational Issues in the Eighties", Current Affairs Bulletin, 1/1/80, p. 25; see also, Butler, "The Legitimation of Australian Education", pp. 85-87; and J.S. Western and E. Gross, "Introduction", in Gross and Western (eds), The End of a Golden Age, p. 2.
9. A. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 36.
10. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 59.
11. P.H. Partridge, "A Non-Controversial Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, p. 9.
12. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 59.
13. Education, Training and Employment, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training, (B.R. Williams - chairman), February 1979, (Canberra, 1979), Vol. I, pp. 2-3. Here-in-after referred to as Williams Report.
14. ibid., p. 3.

15. University of Melbourne, SU118 p. 5. The submissions to the Committee are held in the National Library of Australia, MS6033. They are referred to here by the reference number allocated by the Committee.
16. Standing Committee of Convocation, University of Sydney, p. 1, SU187.
17. University of Newcastle, p. 2, SU241. A note in the margin from a member of the Committee states "Nonsense"!
18. ibid., p. 1.
19. University of Queensland, p. 83, SU287.
20. Macquarie University, pp. 2-5 and p. 21, SU100.
21. Australian National University, p. 3, SU450.
22. ibid., p. 8.
23. ibid., pp. 18-19.
24. ibid., p. 19.
25. ibid., pp. 8-11.
26. Mt. Lawley C.A.E., p. 1, SU168.
27. S.A. Board of Advanced Education, p. 1, SU311.
28. W.A. Post Secondary Education Commission, pp. 1-2, SU454.
29. ibid., pp. 3-5.
30. S.A. Board of Advanced Education, p. 2 and pp. 10-11, SU311.
31. S.A. Department of Further Education, p. 19, SU452.
32. N.S.W. Department of Technical and Further Education, pp. 4-5, SU422.
33. S.A. Department of Further Education, p. 23 and p. 11, SU452.
34. N.S.W. Department of Technical and Further Education, p. 17, SU422.
35. ibid., p. 17.
36. ibid., p. 15.
37. ibid., p. 24.
38. Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee, p. 5, SU405.
39. ibid., p. 5.
40. ibid., pp. 7-8.
41. ibid., p. 9.
42. ibid., p. 10.

43. ibid., p. 17.
44. ibid., pp. 14-15.
45. Conference of Directors of Central Institutes of Technology, pp. 5-11, SU261.
46. Federation of University Staff Associations, p. 32, SU476.
47. ibid., p. 12.
48. ibid., p. 19.
49. ibid., pp. 33-36.
50. ibid., p. 46.
51. Melbourne University Staff Association, p. 1, SU343.
52. N.S.W. Institute of Technology Staff Association, p. 1, SU172.
53. Australian Teachers' Federation, pp. 15-19, SU416.
54. Queensland Technical and Further Educator's Professional Association, p. 14, SU381.
55. Australian Union of Students, p. 4, SU563.
56. ibid., p. 3, citing F.C.L. Beighton and A.P. Gallagher, "Socio-Economic Differences Between University and C.A.E. Students", Australian University, Vol. 14, no. 2, September 1976, p. 166.
57. ibid., pp. 10-19.
58. ibid., p. 5.
59. ibid., p. 5.
60. ibid. pp. 37-39.
61. ibid., pp. 40-41.
62. ibid., pp. 67-68.
63. S.A. Institute of Technology Union, p. 2, SU242.
64. ibid., p. 2.
65. University of N.S.W. Student Union, p. 3, SU282.
66. C. Duke, pp. 1-2, SU73.
67. T. Schuller, p. 1, SU527.
68. S.S. Dunn, p. 1, SU475.
69. Academy of Social Sciences, p. 3, SU601. This submission was prepared by P.H. Karmel.
70. R.T. Fitzgerald, p. 4, SU589.

71. Department of Productivity, paras. 1.3-1.7, 2.4-2.5, and 4.3, SU559.
72. ibid., para. 4.2.
73. ibid., para. 4.3
74. Commonwealth Department of Education, p. 2, SU512.
75. ibid., pp. 3-4 and pp. 11-13.
76. ibid., p. 14.
77. Commonwealth Public Service Board, p. 3, SU448.
78. S.A. Department of Labour and Industry, pp. 21-26, SU577.
79. ibid., pp. 29-30.
80. ibid., p. 31.
81. ibid., p. 32.
82. ibid., p. 37.
83. N.S.W. Department of Public Works, p. 2, SU147.
84. N.S.W. Department of Labour and Industry, p. 6, SU570.
85. Heavy Engineering Employers' Association, p. 14, SU72. See also, Printing and Allied Trades Employers' Federation of Australia, SU80; and Western Industries Association, SU550. (This Association represented companies such as B.H.P. and I.C.I.).
86. ibid., p. 15.
87. Australian Institute of Building, pp. 1-2, SU200.
88. Melbourne Chamber of Commerce, p. 2, SU574.
89. ibid., p. 16.
90. ibid., p. 18.
91. Master Builders Federation of Australia, pp. 17-19, SU421.
92. National Retail Motor Industry Training Committee, pp. 5-12, SU561.
93. At one end of the scale see the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia, SU437, p. 39, which simply made the statement. At the other end of the scale, the Bank Education Service, SU1673, (representing the major private trading banks) pointed out that it was actively involved in education in schools and tertiary institutions, and the Australian Insurance Institute, SU268, noted that the insurance industry had moved virtually all its training into the T.A.F.E. colleges or the colleges of advanced education. The submission of the Central Industrial Secretariat, SU535, pp. 26-27, suggested that all governing bodies of tertiary education institutions should be reformed to include industry representation, as should the membership of the T.E.C. and other government agencies dealing with education. The Secretariat was obviously not

acquainted with the provisions for membership or the members of such groups, which already included substantial industry and commerce, as well as other community group representation. There was an obvious need for two way communication.

94. Mt. Isa Mines Ltd., SU541.
95. C.S.R. Ltd., pp. 1-4, SU271.
96. Simpson Pope Ltd., p. 1, SU188.
97. ibid., p. 2.
98. ibid., p. 3.
99. I.C.I. Ltd., p. 5, SU546.
100. ibid., p. 15.
101. Commercial Bank of Australia Ltd., p. 16, SU598.
102. ibid., pp. 25-27.
103. Institution of Engineers, Australia, pp. 21-22, SU178.
104. Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, p. 4, SU207.
105. Australian Institute of Training and Development, para. 3.2.4, SU336.
106. Australian Workers' Union, SU99.
107. Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, p. 1, SU480.
108. ibid., p. 1.
109. ibid., pp. 3-6.
110. National Training Council, Vol. 1, pp. 8-10, SU568.
111. ibid., pp. 19-20.
112. ibid., Vol. 3, p. 3.
113. Williams Report, p. 7.
114. ibid., pp. 16-19.
115. ibid., p. 21.
116. ibid., p. 22.
117. ibid., p. 23.
118. ibid., p. 24.
119. ibid., p. 28.
120. ibid., p. 29.
121. ibid., p. 30.

122. ibid., p. 30.
123. ibid., p. 31.
124. ibid., p. 33.
125. ibid., p. 33.
126. ibid., p. 34. Public recurrent expenditure in 1957 was 50 per cent primary, 35 per cent secondary and 15 per cent tertiary, while in 1977 was 32 per cent each for primary and secondary and 36 per cent for tertiary.
127. ibid., p. 34.
128. ibid., p. 39.
129. ibid., p. 43.
130. ibid., pp. 43-44.
131. ibid., p. 41.
132. ibid., p. 42.
133. ibid., p. 69.
134. ibid., chart 3.4, p. 75.
135. ibid., p. 78.
136. ibid., p. 78.
137. ibid., Chapter 4, pp. 132-133.
138. ibid., p. 189.
139. ibid., p. 190.
140. ibid., p. 192.
141. ibid., p. 192.
142. ibid., p. 193.
143. ibid., p. 194.
144. ibid., p. 195.
145. ibid., p. 197.
146. ibid., p. 200.
147. ibid., pp. 202-204.
148. ibid., p. 204.
149. ibid., pp. 205-206.
150. ibid., pp. 206-213.

151. ibid., p. 211.
152. ibid., p. 259.
153. ibid., p. 260.
154. ibid., pp. 259-260.
155. ibid., pp. 260-263.
156. ibid., p. 266.
157. ibid., pp. 266-267.
158. ibid., p. 271.
159. ibid., p. 272.
160. ibid., pp. 275-276.
161. ibid., pp. 276-277.
162. ibid., pp. 278-279.
163. ibid., pp. 323.
164. ibid., p. 324.
165. ibid., p. 324.
166. ibid., p. 325.
167. ibid., p. 329.
168. ibid., pp. 336-337.
169. ibid., p. 338.
170. ibid., p. 339.
171. The Report addressed more specific issues in the rest of its 1,500 page, 3 volume Report. These supported the general thrust of the Report noted here. Unfortunately, this is not the place to offer a more thorough analysis of them, although one would be valuable as a future area of research.
172. B.R. Williams, "Some Reflections on the Work of the CIET", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 51, no. 3, 1979, p. 15.
173. B.R. Williams, "Why all these Inquiries into Education?" Search, Vol. 9, no. 3, 1978, p. 90.
174. B.R. Williams, "Education to the Year 2000", Current Affairs Bulletin, 1/10/79, p. 25.
175. B.R. Williams, in J. Hoffman, "A Deceptive Innocence: Professor Williams Interviewed", Education News, Vol. 16, no. 9, 1979, p. 15.
176. B.R. Williams, "Governments and Universities Since 1959", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 7.

177. Williams, "Some Reflections on the Work of the CIET", pp. 14-15.
178. Williams, in Hoffman, "A Deceptive Innocence", pp. 14-15.
179. Williams, "Why all these Inquiries into Education?", p. 91.
180. ibid., p. 91.
181. Williams, in Hoffman, "A Deceptive Innocence", p. 15.
182. Williams, "Education to the Year 2000", p. 26. See also, Williams, in Hoffman, "A Deceptive Innocence", p. 13.
183. M. Fraser, CPD (Vol. H of R 113), 22 March 1979, p. 1056.
184. W. Hayden, CPD (Vol H of R 113), 22 March 1979, p. 1058.
185. ibid., p. 1059.
186. ibid., p. 1060.
187. J.L. Carrick; "The Government and the Williams Report", in Australian Universities to the Year 2000, A.V.C.C. Occasional Papers, no. 2, 1979, p. 43.
188. ibid., p. 46.
189. K.E. Beazley, "Blue Print till 2000? - The Williams Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, p. 5.
190. ibid., p. 5.
191. ibid., p. 7.
192. Williams, "Governments and Universities Since 1959", p. 8.
193. Partridge, "Educational Issues in the Eighties", p. 28.
194. N. Haines, "Post Secondary, Sub Adult? The Williams Way to A.D. 2000", Unicorn, Vol. 5, no. 4, November 1979, p. 392.
195. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", pp. 64-65.
196. Williams Report, p. 47.
197. R.B. King, "A Consideration of the Role of People's Conceptions in the Australian Educational System by Reference to the Williams Report", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1981, p. 39.
198. Butler "The Legitimation of Australian Education", p. 39.
199. J. McLaren, "Encyclopaedia of Trivia", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, p. 12.
200. S. Encel, "The Social Significance of the Williams Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, p. 16.

201. See, Craney and O'Donnell, "Tertiary Fees in Context", p. 276; McLaren, "Encyclopaedia of Trivia", p. 12; and Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 60.
202. McLaren, "Encyclopaedia of Trivia", p. 12.
203. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 60.
204. ibid., pp. 61-62.
205. Butler, "The Legitimation of Australian Education", p. 89.
206. Birrell, "The Demographic and Social Context of Tertiary Education", p. 59.
207. Butler, "The Legitimation of Australian Education", p. 89. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 75, noted the contradictions in government policies. They cited I. MacPhee, Minister for Immigration; "at the moment all our skilled requirements can be met by immigration", Australian Financial Review, 2/12/80.
208. Freeland and Sharp, "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment", p. 70.

Conclusion

The development of the post-War system of tertiary education in Australia occurred during a period of increasing sophistication of Australian society. The role of hegemonic institutions in society became more complex, more differentiated and more important to the bourgeoisie as the consent of the working class was required if sustained economic growth were to proceed in a context of political stability. The education system, particularly at the tertiary level, was intimately involved in this process. A detailed examination of those Reports which resulted from expert committees of inquiry into the tertiary education system illustrates how bourgeois hegemony was promoted and consensus reached. The processes, which seemingly allowed open enquiry, discussion and deliberation, were more important to the acceptance of the notions of hegemony than the ideas themselves, the aim of which was to become accepted rather than understood.

Nevertheless, the progress of tertiary education was by no means smooth. The problems of constitutional responsibility, and the Federal/State conflicts engendered in this area, presented delays and diversions in its development. However, the pressures of industrialisation and increasing sophistication of capital ensured that a centralised development which had characterised tertiary education from the outset continued. The committees of inquiry played an important role here, for, in addition to their importance to the bourgeoisie as a whole vis-a-vis the working class, they also provided an important vehicle for the maintenance of dominance within the bourgeoisie for those fractions and alliances linked with centralisation. As Smart noted, the committees played an important role.

Following sustained pressures and demands on the federal government for more systematic financial assistance and on inquiry into the needs of the sector in question, the government would appoint a committee, chaired by an eminent educationalist, to prepare a report recommending a course of action to the government. Such recommendations usually resulted in the establishment of a permanent Commonwealth education commission for that sector, to advise the federal

government on national policy guidelines and appropriate levels of triennial financial assistance.¹

Even so, throughout the period 1939 to 1979, conservative governments, in particular, were reticent to openly support Commonwealth control of tertiary education. The growth of Commonwealth control which accompanied its control of funding was tempered with political rhetoric renouncing the notion, except where it was politically advantageous.²

The reports of the committees of inquiry paved the way for successive Commonwealth governments to take over more of the responsibilities for tertiary education. While they varied somewhat in emphasis and recommended procedures, the reports all accepted a number of common aims: education for national survival and industrial progress, education for individual aspiration, education for citizenship and democracy, and education for advancement through scholarship and learning. They promoted the notion that education was an effective agent for social mobility, and that programmes for equal opportunity in education would achieve this and, per se, social justice.

It would be simplistic, however, to suggest that centralised control of tertiary education was an inevitable result of 'the march of progress' and a desire to ensure accountability of government funded institutions. As Bessant noted,

This is only the outward manifestation of the State's concern with schooling in general. What goes on in the schools (and universities and colleges) is vital to those concerned with the preservation of the established order and the shape of the evolving society.³

The development of government interest in education was directed toward the values of its participants and the type of skills to which they could be channelled. These were related to the development of the Australian society and economy, and the interest which governments showed in tertiary education, confirmed the role of the education system in the hegemonic process. The sporadic involvement of the Commonwealth in

tertiary education continued well after the strong pressures brought to bear on it by the War and the demands of post-War reconstruction plans, and it was not until the acceptance of the Murray Report that it was formalised on a continuing basis. But even prior to this, State governments had also shown little interest in either the universities or the technical post-school sector, preferring to concern themselves with primary and secondary schooling which encompassed the limits of the educational experiences of most people. The non-mass nature of the later part of secondary education and both technical education and the universities, combined with their relative autonomy from the restrictions of government scrutiny, assisted in the hegemonic process. The growth of participation in secondary education, and the post-secondary sectors, was followed by increasing government interest in them. The short-comings in the post-school education sectors, which the onset of World War II had graphically demonstrated, and the national importance of a more skilled work-force for post-War reconstruction, ensured that Commonwealth interest would become more permanent. The major recommendation of the Murray Report to establish a university grants committee was translated into the establishment of the Australian Universities Commission with a wider brief than that recommended. Although the inclusion of advice on coordination

was played down by the government and almost ignored by the academic community, it was to have a profound influence on the future development of Australian universities.⁴

The functions that it assumed through the power of the purse became a model for the Commission on Advanced Education and the Technical and Further Education Commission when they were established, and to some degree were translated into statutory powers with the creation of the Tertiary Education Commission. This assumption of powers was encouraged, both by succeeding committees of inquiry, and government and political leaders, all anticipating continued economic growth with subsequent

demands by employers and individuals for higher educational qualifications.

The threat implied in such a centralisation of power was ameliorated by proposals to increase expenditure per student substantially, proposals which made increasing accountability less threatening to the universities and later the colleges. Before the acceptance of the Murray Report recurrent expenditure per equivalent full-time students (EFTS) was \$872. The Murray recommendations lifted this figure to \$883, much lower than was intended as EFTS rose by over 40 per cent and costs by 25 per cent. By 1966, expenditure per EFTS had risen to \$1,131 and in 1968 reached \$1,223, even though there had been dramatic rises in the numbers of EFTS.⁵ From then on, expenditure per EFTS declined, although growth continued until 1975 when political and economic factors led to a breakdown of the triennial system of funding which had resulted from the Murray Report. Although the three commissions were all assuming a continuation of growth in their reports which led to the suspension of triennial funding, the change in government at the end of 1975 ensured that this was not likely in the immediate future. Real reductions in expenditure continued in tertiary education into the next decade. The breakdown of the funding system enabled the Commonwealth to revise fundamentally the role of the commissions. The introduction of guidelines which set defined parameters within which advice could be offered eliminated any pretence of independence for the T.E.C., which became openly and effectively an organ for implementing government policy.⁶ According to Bessant, it was difficult, for instance,

to escape the conclusion that the T.E.C.'s efforts at labour market forecasting have been dominated by government pressure to provide a justification for the Federal Government's tertiary education policies. In this way the T.E.C. is now functioning in much the same way as any department of government.⁷

It was in this climate, in which the premises which had formed the base

for discussion in the Walker, Murray, and Martin Reports were reversed, that the Williams Inquiry was established and reported. It was not, however, isolated in education, but part of a general political and economic climate, in which

domestically we are witnessing a conservative counter-offensive designed to recapture command of political, economic and social ground ceded under pressure during the full-employment years of the nineteen-fifties, 'sixties and early nineteen-seventies.⁸

Nor was it confined to Australia but related to an effort to redeploy global capital and create a new international division of labour.

The major development in tertiary education which allowed for its rapid centralisation was the creation of the advanced education sector. The proposals of the Martin Report were quite far-reaching in terms of centralised control, although they were resisted within the bourgeoisie where the fractional struggle typified by the federal/state conflict delayed their development. The Martin notion of the advanced education sector was substantially different from the Murray notion of higher education, predicated as it was on level rather than function. The Martin notion recognised that the hegemonic functions of the universities would be much more difficult to preserve if they were to undertake that mass role that a unitary system of higher education would thrust upon them. The Murray division of labour was rejected by Martin and, instead, a functional division proposed which, nevertheless, promoted the superior position of the universities. Development of the two sectors was to be coordinated by the establishment of a tertiary education commission which would subsume the A.U.C. Delays occurred in the implementation of these proposals, with the rejection of over-arching coordination and of the notion of degree granting non-university institutions by the Menzies Government. Even so, the centralising alliance within the bourgeoisie dominated, and the convergence of the two sectors, with their differences on function rather than level preserving the status of the universities,

occurred during the next fifteen years. Williams pointed to the hegemonic nature of the development of the advanced education sector when the Commonwealth government decided that "there was a need for a less autonomous, more varied, more directly vocational sector of higher education".⁹ The establishment of the advanced education sector also allowed the Commonwealth a direct and specific interest in tertiary technical education, which in the mid-1970s was to prove important in the development of its role in the technical and further education sector.

Struggles within the hegemonic process which have been centred on tertiary education have taken the form of the issue of the coordination of the three tertiary sectors. Lindsay suggested that the coordination problem, as it was portrayed, stemmed from the Menzies Government's refusal to establish the Australian Tertiary Education Commission as recommended by the Martin Committee. He argued that the problem was made by governments not educational institutions as is so often stated. What cooperation there was developed from compromise and bargaining, between the tertiary commissions and councils, institutions themselves, and Federal and State governments. Nevertheless, this had not prevented a move of power and control from the institutions to the bureaucracy, from the States to the Commonwealth, and from the commissions to government departments.¹⁰ Lindsay and O'Byrne noted that these problems were exacerbated by the nature of the federal system, and the issues arising from constitutionally based conflict.¹¹ Williams suggested that at no time did the A.U.C., nor the Martin Committee in proposing the advanced Education sector, give explicit guidelines to what might constitute a balanced development of tertiary education,¹² and the Williams Report failed in this respect as well.¹³ While these commentators are describing how the hegemonic process proceeds - through recommendations of an expert committee which justify proposed governmental policies, and subsequent struggle within the bourgeoisie on if and how the proposals

are to be implemented - they fail to recognise the process itself. The delays and frustrations occurring in the struggle for dominance within the bourgeoisie illustrated by Federal/State conflict and complex compromises and bargaining, did not negate the ongoing nature of the process, which resulted in continuing centralisation of power and control. The tensions apparent in the development of tertiary education which grew out of the fundamental incompatibility of the underlying aims espoused by educational authorities waxed and waned according to the strength of the dominant bourgeois alliances, and the strength of working class opposition and/or alternatives. Nevertheless, centralisation of power and control had not only occurred, but was generally accepted. As Abbey noted, the biggest criticism of the Martin Report was

the apparent profanity of importing the instrumental logic of the market into consideration of an activity thought to be adequately understood and defended by reference to its intrinsic worthwhileness and character-forming capabilities.¹⁴

The Williams Report, on the contrary, did not receive the same criticism. The political climate facing tertiary education had changed to such an extent, that few commentators

thought it worth complaining about the fact that the Report's perspective on education was anchored in and structured by the discourse of economic calculation.¹⁵

The importance in the hegemonic process in Australia of the four major Commonwealth committees of inquiry dealt with in this thesis is clear through an examination of their deliberations and reports. They provided a framework for the directions in which tertiary education was developing, and a legitimacy for government policies aimed at controlling and containing that development. The nature of the inquiries, as they evolved as a form of machinery for these tasks, became more sophisticated in line with the more general development of Australian society. This was clear in relation to their size, their membership and the response which they elicited from the community. The apparent consistency of

operation of the inquiries masked the contradictory and uneven development of capitalism in post-War Australia, especially in relation to tertiary education. Their success is a measure of the acceptance in Australian society of the processes of bourgeois hegemony and the tenets on which it is based.

FOOTNOTES

1. D. Smart, "The Accelerating Commonwealth Participation 1964-1976", in I.K.F. Birch and D. Smart (eds), The Commonwealth and Education 1964-1976: Political Initiatives and Developments, (Richmond, 1977), p. 27.
2. A. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", Vestes, Vol 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 39. Such times were the late 1960s under Gorton, and the mid to late 1970s when the Fraser Government moved to contain expenditure.
3. B. Bessant, "The Erosion of University Autonomy in Australia", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, p. 27.
4. ibid., p. 28.
5. B.R. Williams, "Governments and Universities Since 1959", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, pp. 3-4.
6. See for instance, ibid., p. 6; B.R. Williams, "Education to the Year 2000", Current Affairs Bulletin, 1 October 1979, p. 24; R. Birrell, "Some Demographic and Economic Constraints" in T. Hore, R.D. Linke and L.H.T. West (eds), The Future of Higher Education in Australia, (South Melbourne, 1978), pp. 9-10.
7. Bessant, "The Erosion of University Autonomy", p. 30.
8. B. Abbey, "Postsecondary Education in the Australian Economy of the Eighties", in T. Hore, P.R. Chippendale and L.H.T. West (eds), A New Era for Tertiary Education, Proceedings of a conference convened jointly by the Higher Education Policy Research and Education Unit at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and the Higher Education Advisory and Research Unit of Monash University, in Toowoomba, August 21-24, 1980, p. 36.
9. Williams, "Government and Universities Since 1959", p. 4. For other comments see also, J. Webb, "Diversity in Higher Education - Some Problems Relating to the Genesis and Implementation of the Martin Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 21-22; L.N. Short, "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 5, no. 1, April 1967, pp. 14-17; N.L.C. Batt, "The University as a Servant to the Needs of the Community", paper issued by the Office of Minister for Education, Tasmania, April 1977, p. 4; and above Chapt. 4, p.122.
10. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", pp. 34-40.
11. A. Lindsay and G. O'Byrne, "Accountability of Tertiary Education at the National Level: A Chimera?", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, p. 29.
12. B.R. Williams, "Universities and the Universities Commission", in Birch and Smart, The Commonwealth and Education, p. 30.
13. Lindsay, "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", p. 32.
14. Abbey, "Postsecondary Education in the Australian Economy", p. 52.
15. ibid., p. 52.

Bibliography

Reports of the Committees Investigated

Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Education, (Dr. E.R. Walker, Chairman), October 1944, in Tannock, P.D., The Government of Education in Australia, (University of W.A. Press, Nedlands, 1975) pp. 91-116.

Report of the Committee on Australian Universities, (Sir Keith Murray, Chairman), September 1957, (Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra, 1958).

Tertiary Education in Australia, Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia, (Sir Leslie Martin, Chairman), Vol. 1 & 2, August 1964, Vol. 3, August 1965, (Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra, 1965).

Education, Training and Employment, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training, (B.R. Williams, Chairman), 3 Vols., February 1979, (Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1979).

Documents of the Committees of Inquiry

Walker Committee Documents, Australian Archives, Canberra, SP433/2; SP433/3; SP433/4; CRS A1361, 1/17/1 pt. 1 to 1/17/17 pt. 1; MP463/1, 2, 15, 115 and 215; A2473 (1); A2703/XM; National Library of Australia, Canberra, MS987/8/1-79 Box 9; MS987/7/1799-1820 Box 9; MS987/5/256-257 Box 5.

Murray Committee Documents, 18 bound volumes, Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Canberra. The papers in the volume "Murray Committee Documents: General" would be numbered CAU/GEN/1 and onwards.

Martin Committee Documents, Australian Archives, Canberra, A1326. The documents are numbered CF1 and onwards.

Williams Committee submissions, National Library of Australia, Canberra, MS6033. The documents are numbered SU1-691.

Other Commonwealth Government Papers

Australia: Parliament, Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates.
Parliamentary Papers.

Papers and Theses

Batt, N.L.C., "The University as a Servant to the Needs of the Community", April 1977, 19 pp.

"Equality or Excellence: A Dilemma in the Politics of Education", May 1977, 25 pp.

"Labor's Social Policy and Objectives", August 1977, 17 pp.

"Tertiary Education: Structure and Funding", August 1977, 17 pp.

"Information Power", August 1977, 10 pp.

"Federalism: The Implications for Education", August 1977,
14 pp.

The New Federalism: Joint Funding of Education", June
1977, 12 pp. mimeographs, issued by the Office of Minister for
Education, Tas. 1977.

"A Crisis in the Finances and Development of the Australian Universities",
(Melbourne University Press with the Australian Vice-Chancellor's
Committee, Carlton, undated [1952?])

Davies, S., "Establishing the Martin Committee: A Study of the Setting
Up of the Committee and its Preliminary Discussions", unpublished
M.Ed. thesis, Monash University, 1981.

Harman, G.S., "The Political Environment of Australian Higher Education",
paper delivered at a seminar, 21 April 1977, on "The Environment of
Higher Education: Politics, Consumers, Community", Department of
Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland, mimeograph, 14
pp.

Hughes, C.A., "The Murray Report Fifteen Years After", a Working paper
for the August, 1972, meeting of the Federation of Australian
University Staff Associations, mimeograph, 48 pp. + Appendix 5 pp.

Murray-Smith, S., "A History of Technical Education in Australia: with
Special Reference to the Period before 1914", unpublished Ph.D.
thesis, University of Melbourne, 1966, 3 vols.

Tannock, P.D., "A Study of the Role of the Government of the Commonwealth
in Education Since Federation, 1901-1968", unpublished Ph.D. thesis,
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1969.

Articles

Andersen, W.E., "The Role of the Universities in Teacher Education:
The Perspective of the Martin Report", Journal of Christian
Education, Vol. VIII, no. 2, September 1965, pp. 94-103.

Anderson, D.S. et al., "Students in Australian Higher Education: A study
of their social composition since the abolition of Fees", A report
to the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, Education Research
and Development Committee, Conference of Principals of Colleges of
Advanced Education, (Tertiary Education Research Centre, University
of New South Wales, Sydney, 1978).

Anderson, P., "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci", New Left Review, 100,
Nov. 1976-Jan 1977, pp. 5-78.

Auchmuty, J.J., "The Pursuit of Excellence", Australian University, Vol.
13, No. 1, May 1975, pp. 3-7.

Bannon, J., "Excellence, Elites and the Community", proceedings of a
Seminar on The Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities,
University of Adelaide, 6-7 October 1978 (University of Adelaide,
Adelaide, 1979), pp. 29-41.

Barcan, A., "Exciting Times for C.A.E.'s", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 50,
no. 1, April 1978, pp. 37-50.

- Batt, K.J., "The Universities and Co-operation in Higher Education", Australian University, Vol. 7, no. 2, August 1969, pp. 92-109.
- Baxter, J.P., "The Impact of the Murray Report Upon Universities", Proceedings of the Royal Australian Chemical Institute, June 1958, Vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 261-263.
- Bayliss, N.S., "The Murray Report", Educand, Vol. 3, no. 2, November 1958, pp. 119-124.
- Beazley, K.E., "Blue Print Till 2000? - The Williams Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 5-7.
- _____, "The Commonwealth Ministry of Education: An Experience in the Whitlam Government, 1972-1975", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1980, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1980), pp. 1-60.
- _____, "Whither Tertiary Education?", Adelaide University Graduates' Union Gazette, Jan./Feb. 1973, pp. 3-5.
- Bessant, B., "The Erosion of University Autonomy in Australia", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, pp. 26-33.
- _____, "Robert Gordon Menzies and Education in Australia", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1977, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1977) pp. 75-101.
- Brezniak, M. & Collins, J., "The Australian Crisis from Boom to Bust", Journal of Australian Political Economy, No. 1, 1977, pp. 4-33.
- Bucpleugh, K., "The Murray Report", Outlook, Vol. 2, no. 1, Feb. 1958, pp. 14-15.
- Buckley, K.D., "The Crisis", Outlook, Vol. 6, no. 5, Oct. 1962, pp. 11-12.
- Butler, G., "The Legitimation of Australian Education", Journal of Australian Political Economy, No. 5, July 1979, pp. 84-90.
- Cairns, J.F., "The Government, the A.U.C. and the Universities", Vestes, Vol. III, no. 1, March 1960, pp. 9-13.
- Campbell, K.R., "J.D. Lang and the Establishment of the University of Sydney" in R.J.W. Selleck (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1970, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1970) pp. 214-232.
- Carnoy, M., Education as Cultural Imperialism, (David McKay Co. Inc., New York, 1974).
- Carrick, J.L., "The Government and the Williams Report", in Australian Universities to the Year 2000, AVCC Occasional Papers, No. 2, 1979, pp. 43-47.
- Carrick, J.L. Interview, College News, 26/3/79, pp. 17-18.
- Catley, R., "Socialism and Reform in Contemporary Australia", in E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley (eds), Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism, Vol. 2, pp. 15-80. (Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1978).

- "Commonwealth Assistance for Research at the Universities", Memorandum by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, University Gazette, (Melbourne), Vol. II, no. 4, 27 May 1946, pp. 27-28.
- "The Commonwealth Office of Education", Education News, Vol. 1, no. 1, August 1947, pp. 4-5.
- Craney, J. & O'Donnell, C., "Tertiary Fees in Context: A Consideration of Proposals in the Williams Report", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 52, no. 3, 1980, pp. 273-288.
- Currie, G.A., "The Report of the Committee on Australian Universities: An Evaluation", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 2, no. 1, April 1958, pp. 29-33.
- Derham, D.P., "Universities and Australia", The Australian Director, Vol. 8, April 1978, pp. 56-61.
- _____ "Universities, Governments, and the Assumption of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 3, November 1975, pp. 201-213.
- Dufty, N.F., "Some Notes on Resource Allocation in Tertiary Institutions", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. XIV, no. 2, October 1976, pp. 220-235.
- "Education as Investment", Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 36, no. 8, August 30, 1965, pp. 115-128.
- Encel, S., "The Martin Report: Tertiary Colleges", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 81-85.
- _____ "The Place of Technology", Outlook, Vol. 6, no. 5, October 1962, pp. 9-11.
- _____ "The Social Significance of the Williams Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 14-17.
- Forbes, A.J., "The Commonwealth Government and the Australian Universities Commission", Vestes, Vol. III, no. 1, March 1960, pp. 15-20.
- Foster, J.F., "University Commentary", Universities Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 1, November 1957, pp. 189-193.
- Frearson, K.S., "The Nature of Economic Growth", in N.T. Drohan and J.H. Day (eds), Readings in Australian Economics, (Cassell, Melbourne, 1965), pp. 27-40.
- Freeland, J., & Sharp, R., "The Williams Report on Education, Training and Employment: The Decline and Fall of Karmelot", Intervention, 14, 1981, pp. 54-79.
- Gallagher T., & Beighton, F., "Who Pays? A Survey of Incomes and Expenditure Patterns of Australian Tertiary Students in 1974", Education News, Vol. 15, nos. 11/12, pp. 26-33.
- Haines, N., "Post Secondary Sub Adult? The William's Way to A.D. 2000", Unicorn, Vol. 5, no. 4, November 1979, pp. 391-404.

- Hall, S., "The 'Political' and the 'Economic' in Marx's Theory of Classes", in Hunt., A. (ed), Class and Class Structure, (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1977), pp. 15-60.
- Ham, D.H., "Duality in Higher Education: Are there Two Systems?", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 1, May 1975, pp. 19-38.
- Harman, G.S. & Selby Smith, C., "Some Current Trends and Issues in the Governance of Australian Colleges of Advanced Education", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 20, no. 2, June 1976, pp. 129-148.
- Hill, B.V., "The University in Australian Tertiary Education", Australian University, Vol. 6, no. 2, August 1968, pp. 136-156.
- Hoffman, J., "A Deceptive Innocence: Professor Williams Interviewed", Education News, Vol. 16, no. 9, 1979, pp. 8-15.
- Hogg, A.C., "The Future of Teacher Education in Australia", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. III, no. 2, September 1965, pp. 85-93.
- Hook, E.J., "The Universities Commission and its Functions", Public Administration, Vol. V., no. 8, December 1945, pp. 343-354.
- Houston, H.S., "The Impact of 'Open Tertiary Education in Australia' on the Colleges of Advanced Education", Australian University, Vol. 13, no. 2, 1975, pp. 180-189.
- Howie, M., "The Martin Report: Teacher Education", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 103-107.
- Hyde, J., "The Structure of Higher Education in Australia" in P. Sheldrake & R. Linke (eds), Accountability in Higher Education, (George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1979) pp. 1-16.
- Jardine, B., "The University Sell-Out", Prospect, Vol. 4, no. 3, 1961, pp. 13-15.
- Johnston, G.K.W., "The Crisis in University Education", Prospect, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1961, pp. 26-28.
- Karmel, P., "The Educational System of the Labour Market", in J.P. Nieuwenhuysen & P.J. Drake (eds), Australian Economic Policy, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1977), pp. 202-217.
- _____, "The Pattern of Tertiary Education in the 1960s", Australian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 1, November 1962, pp. 31-37.
- _____, "Some Economic Implications of Educational Policy", Search, Vol. 6, no. 7, July 1975, pp. 266-272.
- King, R.B., "A Consideration of the Role of People's Conceptions in the Australian Educational System by Reference to the Williams Report", Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1981, pp. 37-54.
- Lindsay, A., "National Policy-Making for Higher Education", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, pp. 34-41.
- Lindsay A., & O'Byrne, G., "Accountability of Tertiary Education at the National Level: A Chimera?", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 27-33.

- Little, M., "The Martin Report and the Universities", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. VIII, no. 2, September 1965, pp. 63-74.
- Lodewyckx, A., "Australian Universities Adrift", Australian Quarterly, June 1947, pp. 62-71.
- Matthews, J.F. & Fitzgerald, R.L., "Educational Policy and Political Platform: The Australian Labor Government", Australian Education Review, Vol. 7, no. 4, 1974, pp. 1-70.
- Murphy, P., "The Fiscal Crisis of Higher Education" Alternative News Service, no. 72, 21/3/77, pp. 11-15.
- "The Murray Report on Australian Universities", Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 21, no. 11, March 24, 1958, pp. 163-176.
- Murray-Smith, S., "The Martin Report: Technical Education", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 85-89.
- _____, "Technical Education in Australia 1788-1914: A Select Bibliography", in R.J.W. Selleck (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1967, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1968), pp. 210-245.
- _____, "Tertiary Education in the Melting Pot", Outlook, Vol. 13, no. 6, December 1969, pp. 16-17.
- McCaig, R., "A New Approach to the Administration of Higher Education in Australia", Vestes, Vol. XIII, no. 2, July 1970, pp. 115-121.
- McFarlane, B., "Economic Policy", in R. Forward (ed), Public Policy in Australia, (Cheshire, Melbourne, 1974), pp. 93-126.
- McLaren, J., "Encyclopedia of Trivia", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 12-14.
- O'Byrne G., & Lindsay, A., "An Analysis of the Tertiary Education Commission's Case for a No-Growth Policy in Higher Education", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 50, no. 4, December 1978, pp. 10-29.
- Oliphant, M.L., "Science and the Report of the Committee on Australian Universities", Nucleus, Vol. 4, no. 1, April 1958, pp. 2-4.
- Partridge, P.H., "Educational Issues in the Eighties", Current Affairs Bulletin, January 1, 1980, pp. 24-31.
- _____, "The Martin Report", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 71-81.
- _____, "A Non-Controversial Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 8-11.
- _____, "The Universities and the Democratisation of Higher Education", proceedings of a seminar on The Defence of Excellence in Australian Universities, University of Adelaide, 6-7 October 1978, (University of Adelaide, Adelaide, 1979), pp. 10-22.
- _____, "Universities in Australia", Comparative Education, Vol. 2, no. 1, November 1965, pp. 19-30.

"The University System", in E.L. French (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1960-61, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1962), pp. 51-71.

Philp, H., "The Piper and the Tune - From Murray to the Fourth A.U.C. Report", Australian University, Vol. 8, no. 1, May 1970, p. 3-33.

Playford, J., "Big Business and the Australian University", Arena, 17, Summer 1968-69, pp. 20-39.

"The Prevention of the Universities", Prospect, Vol. 5, no. 1, 1962, pp. 3-4.

Pyke, L.H., "Levelling Australian Tertiary Education", Vestes, Vol. XVIII, no. 1, June 1975, pp. 36-50.

Ross, I.G., "The Martin Report: Research", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 91-96.

Rowley, S., "The Martin Report: Scholarships", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 99-100.

Sanders, C., "The Martin Report", Australian Quarterly, Vol. XXXVII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 79-84.

Schonell, F.J., "Australian University Expansion - Problems and Promise", Australian Journal of Science, Vol. 24, no. 1, July 1961, pp. 13-21.

Segall, P. & Fitzgerald, R.L., "Finance for Education in Australia: An Analysis", Quarterly Review of Australian Education, Vol. 6, December 1973, pp. 1-77.

Short, L.N., "Changes in Higher Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 5, no. 1, April 1967, pp. 1-41.

"Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education: Defining the Difference", Australian University, Vol. 11, no. 1, May 1973, pp. 3-25.

Silver, C., "The Economic Cycle in Post-War Australia", Arena, 49, 1977, pp. 64-72.

Smart, D., "Federal Government Involvement in Australian Education 1964-1975", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. XIV, no. 2, October 1976, pp. 236-251.

Spann, R.N., "The Murray Report and the Universities", Quadrant, Vol. II, no. 2, Autumn 1958, pp. 9-16.

"Summary of Martin Report's Major Recommendations and Commonwealth Government's Modifications", Vestes, Vol. VIII, no. 2, June 1965, pp. 69-71.

Tannock, P., "The Development of the Commonwealth Government's Role in Australian Education", Forum of Education, Vol. XXX, no. 2, September 1971, pp. 152-155.

- Tannock, P.D. & Birch, I.K., "Defining the Limits of Commonwealth Education Power: the Drummond Case, the Federal Government and the Universities", in S. Murray-Smith (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1973, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1973), pp. 163-174.
- Tomlinson, D., "Finance for Education in Australia: Developments 1969-75", Australian Education Review, no. 5, 1976, pp. 1-69.
- Webb, J., "Diversity in Higher Education - Some Problems Relating to the Genesis of Implementation of the Martin Report", Vestes, Vol. 22, no. 2, 1979, pp. 18-26.
- White, M.A., "Portents of Integration in Tertiary Education", Forum of Education, Vol. XXX, no. 1, March 1971, pp. 54-64.
- Williams, B.R., "Australian Universities to the Year 2000", in Australian Universities to the Year 2000, AVCC Occasional Papers, no. 2, 1979, pp. 9-17.
- _____ "Education to the Year 2000", Current Affairs Bulletin, October 1, 1979, pp. 22-27.
- _____ "The Escalating Costs of Universities", Australian University, Vol. 10, no. 2, September 1972, pp. 91-113.
- _____ "Governments and Universities Since 1959", Vestes, Vol. 25, no. 1, 1982, pp. 3-11.
- _____ "Resources Per University Student 1957-75", Australian University, Vol. 14, no. 1, 1976, pp. 7-14.
- _____ "Some Reflections on the Work of the CIET", Australian Quarterly, Vol. 51, no. 3, 1979, pp. 4-15.
- _____ "Why all These Enquiries into Education?", Search, Vol. 9, no. 3, 1978, pp. 87-91.
- Williams, G.A., "The Concept of 'Egonomia' in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes on Interpretation", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. XXI, no. 4, Oct.-Dec. 1960, pp. 586-599.
- Williams, H.S., "Directions in Advanced Education - Indicators & Influences", Australian Journal of Advanced Education, Vol. 6, no. 1, 1976, pp. 4-12.
- _____ "The Martin Report and After", Australian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 2, no. 3, December 1966, pp. 252-260.
- _____ "Tertiary Technical Education in Australia", Australian University, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1963, pp. 89-119.
- Williams, P., "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", in R. Dare, G. Esland, and M. MacDonald (eds), Schooling and Capitalism, (Routledge and Kegan Paul with the Open University Press, London, 1976), pp. 202-210.
- Wood, J.F.D., "The Martin Report - Its Implications for Technical Education", Journal of Christian Education, Vol. VIII, no. 2, September 1965, pp. 75-84.

Books

- Ashby, E., Challenge to Education, (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1946).
- Austin, A.G., Australian Education 1788-1900, (Pitman Pacific Books, Melbourne, 1972, 3rd Ed.).
- _____ (ed.), Selected Documents in Australian Education, 1788-1900, (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., Melbourne, 1963).
- Birch, I.K.F., Constitutional Responsibility for Education in Australia, (Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1975).
- Birch, I.K.F., & Smart D. (eds), The Commonwealth and Education 1964-1976: Political Initiatives and Developments, (Drummond, Richmond, 1977).
- Blake, J.D., Revolution from Within, (Outlook, Sydney, 1971).
- Boehm, E.A., Twentieth Century Economic Developments in Australia, (Longman, Camberwell, 1971).
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H., Schooling in Capitalist America, (Basic Books Inc., New York, 1976).
- Cochrane, P., Industrialization & Dependence, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1980).
- Connell, R.W., Ruling Class, Ruling Culture, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977).
- Connell, R.W. & T.H. Irving, Class Structure in Australian History, (Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1980).
- Ely, J., Reality & Rhetoric, (Alternative Publishing Cooperative Ltd., Sydney, 1978).
- Fitzpatrick, B., The British Empire in Australia 1834-1939, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1949).
- Forster, C. (ed), Australian Economic Development in the Twentieth Century, (George Allen & Unwin, London, 1970).
- Gallagher, A.P., Coordinating Australian University Development, (Queensland University Press, St. Lucia, 1982).
- Gollan, R., Radical and Working Class Politics, (Melbourne University Press with the Australian National University, Melbourne, paperback edition 1970).
- Gross, E., & Western, J.S. (eds), The End of a Golden Age, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1981).
- Harman, G.S., The Politics of Education: A Bibliographical Guide, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1974).
- Harman, G.S., & Selby Smith, C. (eds), Australian Higher Education: Problems of a Developing System, (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1972).

Readings in the Economics and Politics of Australian Education, (Pergamon Press, Sydney, 1976).

- Harman, G.S. et al. (eds), Academic Becalmed, (Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1980)
- Hoare Q., & Nowell Smith, G. (eds and translators), Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1976).
- Hore, T., Chippendale, P.R., & West, L.H.T. (eds), A New Era For Tertiary Education. Proceedings of a Conference convened jointly by the Higher Education Policy Research and Evaluation Unit at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and the Higher Education Advisory and Research Unit of Monash University, in Toowoomba, August 21-24, 1980.
- Hore, T., Linke, R.D., & West, L.H.T. (eds), The Future of Higher Education in Australia, (Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1978).
- Hunter, A. (ed), The Economics of Australian Industry, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1963).
- Jones, P.E., Education in Australia, (Nelson, Melbourne, 1974).
- Marx, K., Capital, Vol. 1, (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970).
- Miliband, R., The State in Capitalist Society, (Quartet Books, London, 1978).
- Maclaine, A.G., Australian Education, (Ian Novak, Sydney, undated [1974?]).
- McCaig, R. (ed), Policy and Planning in Higher Education, (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1973).
- McLaren, J., A Dictionary of Australian Education, (Penguin, Ringwood, 1974).
- McLellan, D., The Thought of Karl Marx, (Macmillan, London, 1974).
- New Directions in Australian Education, (Australian College of Education, Carlton, 1976).
- Partridge, P.H., Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, (Pergamon Press, Sydney, Revised Edition 1973).
- Playford, J., & Kirsner, D. (eds), Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique, (Penguin, Ringwood, 1972).
- Price, A.G. (ed), The Humanities in Australia, (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1959).
- Rowe, A.P., If the Gown Fits, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1960).
- Rowse, T., Australian Liberalism and National Character, (Kibble Books, Melbourne, 1978).

- Shaw, A.G.L., The Economic Development of Australia, (Longman, Melbourne, 1965).
- Tannock, P.D., The Government of Education in Australia, (University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands, 1975).
- Treyvaud, E.R., & McLaren, J., Equal But Cheaper, (Melbourne University Press, The Second Century in Australian Education Series (15), Melbourne, 1976).
- Westbury, I., "The Sydney & Melbourne Arts Courses, 1852-1861" in French, E.L. (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, 1961-62, (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1964), pp. 256-284.
- Wheelwright, E.L., Capitalism, Socialism or Barbarism? The Australian Predicament, (Australia & New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1978).
- _____ (ed), Higher Education in Australia, (Cheshire, Melbourne, 1965).
- _____ Radical Political Economy, (Australia & New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1974).
- Wheelwright, E.L. & Buckley, K. (eds), Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism, Vol. 3, (Australia & New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1978).
- Wilkes, J. (ed), Tertiary Education in Australia, (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1965).
- Williams, R., Marxism and Literature, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1977).
- Windschuttle, K., Unemployment, (Penguin, Ringwood, 1979).