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ABSTRACT

The foundation of the University of Sydney marked the beginning of a pattern of higher education in Australia in which sacred or religious influence and content was to be separated from the secular character and teaching of the universities. Denominational residential colleges were established not only to provide care and supervision, but also to satisfy in some measure the concerns of those who believed that a university without the teaching of religion was no university at all. Systematic religious instruction, therefore, could be given in the colleges, but the residents must attend classes and be examined in the secular instruction of the university. The relationship between Church, College and Campus was a unique compromise, and was seen as a very difficult experiment. Indeed, it was feared that the colleges might sectarianise the secular university.

This thesis seeks to determine the nature and success of this experiment, first of all in relation to Australia's first universities and then with particular reference to denominational colleges established in association with universities founded in the period 1945 to 1975. It notes that by the mid-1900s very few affiliated colleges fulfilled the original intention of conducting systematic religious instruction. While providing valuable opportunities for the sharing of ideas and the common activities of community life, the colleges catered for only a small - albeit potentially influential - proportion of students. However, rather than sectarianise the university, if anything, the university had secularised the colleges.
With renewed interest of Churches in work among students after World War II, the much increased demand for university entry and for residence, together with a significant injection of Commonwealth funds, gave opportunity for various denominational groups to establish colleges in the new post-war Australian universities. This thesis – which draws particularly on interviews and archival research – examines a range of approaches to this task: ecumenical, theologically liberal, conservative, and, in the case of the New University Colleges Council, evangelical. The latter and more dogmatic approaches particularly tested the relationship between the sacred and the secular at a time of volatile student unrest.

The very difficult experiment has succeeded only in part, and few denominational colleges have been established since 1975. Nevertheless, the thesis suggests that such colleges can play an important part not only in promoting collegial association within the modern “enterprise” university, but more especially, in reclaiming something of the distinct role originally intended for the sacred, in a relationship of tolerant “cohabitation” between Church, College and Campus.
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INTRODUCTION

A Very Difficult Experiment:

Uniting Secular Universities in Australia with Denominational Residential Colleges

“... in this University we are trying an experiment which is a very difficult one, but which I hope will succeed – that is, to unite the general secular teaching of a University with independent denominational Colleges ...”

- Dr John Woolley, ‘Principal Professor in the University of Sydney’, 1859

The foundation of the University of Sydney in 1850 marked the beginning of a pattern of higher education in Australia in which sacred or religious influence and content was to be separated from the secular character and teaching of the universities. Dr Woolley’s hope for the success of the “very difficult experiment” of uniting “the general secular teaching” of Sydney University with the establishment of “independent denominational Colleges” was expressed against a background of controversy in the Colony about the place of religion and role of the churches in the University as well as in the wider community, and of reform and change in the nature of universities overseas, especially those in England. It reflected, despite his wish for success, a certain unease about the relationship between a University that was founded to be a place of learning for all, free of any sectarian teaching and control, and church Colleges set up to provide for students of the University not only “domestic supervision” and “efficient assistance in preparing for the University lectures and examinations”, but also

---

1 John Woolley, Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Sydney University, Legislative Assembly, NSW, 23rd September 1859, p.23
“systematic religious instruction”. The experiment was inescapably bound up between the past and the future; between traditional practice and the demands of an increasingly industrial age; between what Edward Gibbon referred to as “a dark age of false and barbarous science” and the ‘Enlightenment’; between the domination in education of the church and the clergy and the growing strength of anti-clericalism; between religious dogma and the application of reason; between the established order and privileges of English society and the more egalitarian sentiments of a Colony of emancipists and free-settlers; between the sacred and the secular.

It was, as Professor Woolley noted, a scheme “which has never been tried before anywhere” and which he felt would be “liable to considerable and obvious dangers.” Chief among them, it appeared, was that the fundamental principle upon which the University was founded as a strictly secular establishment might be endangered by “a spirit of violent antagonism” among the Colleges against the “secular principle” and that, unchecked, the Colleges might “completely sectarianise” the University. Woolley noted the “thoroughly bitter and unmitigated hostility on the part of the … clergy of the Church of England – at least the great majority – against us”, but believed, nevertheless, that the “great
advantage” of the Colleges was in the provision of “tutorial instruction and academic discipline”, especially for students from the country. Denominational Colleges, each professing a distinctive sectarian character, must not abuse the privilege and terms of their affiliation with the University; in their exercise of care for resident students, and in providing “the option of religious education and discipline”, they must not intrude into the secular teaching of the University any sacred dogma that might give rise to quarrel and division, contrary to “a spirit of union”.

Church, College and Campus – Background of Change and Reform:

Church colleges had existed in all medieval universities, but none of them persisted as residential institutions providing teaching as they did in England, where “from the end of the sixteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth they overshadowed the university in every way, and a few dominant colleges determined university policy.” Until the establishment of the University of Durham in 1832, Oxford and Cambridge were the only officially recognised universities in England, with each being a federation of colleges where the clerical heads of the colleges sat on and dominated their respective governing bodies. At Oxford, all candidates for degrees were required to have a knowledge of the “Rudiments of Religion” – the gospels in Greek, the Evidences of

---

6 Ibid p.26
7 Ibid p.25
Christianity, and the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England (to which matriculants had to subscribe); to gain a degree at Cambridge, students had to swear they were *bona fide* members of the Church of England. Governance, preferment, tuition and daily life were very much subject to the established order in Church and State - the prerogative of an elite whose values and aspirations, and propensity to sinecure, were enshrined in the colleges. Religious tests determined the exclusiveness of collegiate life; the universities were as much if not more for the training of clergy than for doctors and lawyers; and until the nineteenth century, an alliance of religion and science – natural theology – dominated the intellectual landscape. Church, College and Campus were indistinguishable; in the unity of knowledge and social order under God, Church and State, revelation and human reason, religion and science, the sacred and the secular were “in happy accord”.

But this was all to be challenged in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the pace and diversity of scientific change quickened; as particularly an evangelical emphasis on revealed theology increased; as historical and linguistic studies brought to bear new perspectives on the Scriptures and the traditions of the Church; as “scientists grew more assertive about their professional standing” and “increasingly resentful of traditions which suggested that their work should be justified by reference to other than scientific goals”

---

9 John Gascoigne *op.cit.* p.6
industrial society came to rely more upon advances in technology than upon arguments in theology; and as social and political reform gave expression to the needs and aspirations of dissenters – to those not of the Established Anglican Church.

By the early nineteenth century, clear distinctions by comparison with Oxford and Cambridge had emerged in the Scottish pattern of university education – the universities of St.Andrew’s, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh – with the ‘Senatus’ having increasing control over finances, appointments and curriculum. There was a greater dependence upon the resources and dictates of the State, with lectures given by professors of the university to audiences comprised of students from a variety of social backgrounds. The expensive requirement of college residence was removed, with Scottish university education being characterised by “plain living and hard learning – and open to a very wide social clientele.”

There was distaste for any undue sectarian influence, and by the early nineteenth century they were essentially secular institutions with no religious tests applied to students. The non-residential and more secular pattern of university education was established in Ireland when, in 1845, the government set up a system of non-residential, non-denominational teaching Colleges – the Queen’s Colleges in Cork, Galway and Belfast. No State money was to be directed towards theological or religious education, though privately endowed religious instruction

---

12 Ibid pp.8-9
could occur within each College. These Colleges were linked by Royal Charter in 1850 as the Queen’s University of Ireland.\textsuperscript{13} William Gladstone noted that this Irish scheme of Colleges was “framed in a spirit friendly to religion as well as to liberty of conscience”.\textsuperscript{14} It was a view that helped form the “experiment” at Sydney University.

A significant development in contrast to the collegiate pattern of Oxford and Cambridge had also occurred in England by the mid-1800s. Greatly influenced by “the mutual tolerance of protestant and catholic, and by the liberal treatment accorded to the Jews”\textsuperscript{15} in German universities, Scottish poet Thomas Campbell called for the establishment of a university in London that would combine such toleration and inclusiveness with the Scottish preference for professorial teaching and non-residence. Support grew, especially among the growing scientific, industrial and commercial groups and among non-conformists, Catholics and Jews. They were further influenced by Jeremy Bentham’s doctrine of ‘utilitarianism’ that gave emphasis to the more practical and professional pursuits and to the widest possible access to education.\textsuperscript{16} A non-residential and non-
sectarian University of London opened on Gower Street in 1828; its exclusion of religious teaching earned it the name of the “Godless College on Gower Street”. In 1829, King’s College was founded as an Anglican institution that would include the teaching “of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, as inculcated by the United Church of England and Ireland”\textsuperscript{17}, receiving its Royal Charter in 1831. The re-named Gower Street ‘University College’ was awarded its Charter in 1836, with the University of London established as an examining and degree-granting body for courses conducted within University and King’s Colleges and in other colleges, religious or otherwise, that would come into association with it.

With growing pressure for reform, Royal Commissions into both Oxford and Cambridge Universities resulted in Reports in 1852 that opened the way for a more significant role of the University and of a teaching professoriate, and for the breaking down of restrictions for entry, especially those based upon profession of the Anglican tenets of faith.\textsuperscript{18} The latter eighteenth and early to mid nineteenth century period also saw the growth of more State and secular higher education institutions in the United States of America, where, in the colonial period, teaching and residential Colleges had been founded by men of a number of Christian persuasions and denominations. In Massachusetts, Puritans founded Harvard College in 1636 to train “a learned clergy and a lettered people”.\textsuperscript{19} Their background was in Oxford and Cambridge, “and it was the

\textsuperscript{17} H.Hale Bellot \textit{op.cit.} p.218
\textsuperscript{18} Clifford Turney et al \textit{op.cit.} pp.12-15
\textsuperscript{19} Frederick Rudolph \textit{The American College and University: A History} Alfred A.Knopf, New York, 1968, p.6
colleges, rather than the university, that the founders of Harvard had in mind when framing their earliest laws and statutes.\textsuperscript{20} Other denominational teaching Colleges followed, such as the Anglican College of William and Mary in Virginia (1693), the Puritan ‘Yale’ in Connecticut (1701), the Presbyterian College of New Jersey at Princeton (1746), and the Dutch Reformed ‘Queen’s’ at New Brunswick in New Jersey (1766). Though with Christian foundations, Harvard soon became more tolerant, broad and diverse in character, and Princeton, for example, “promised there would be no religious tests for students” and “that it would be not so much a seminary for Presbyterian divines as a school for statesmen.”\textsuperscript{21} In the period from the War of Independence to the Civil War, higher education came increasingly under Enlightenment influence and to be marked by greater diversity and toleration. Many saw a number of the old Colleges as too sectarian and too undemocratic\textsuperscript{22}, and, though not anti-religious, new State universities embodied a more secular and scientific spirit, such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1795) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1865). While serving an emerging industrial technological society, these universities were nevertheless born of a society influenced by the sectarian dominated colonial years and their foundation was in varying measure a part of a “cultural mission” to serve both God and the nation.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} Samuel Eliot Morison \textit{The Founding of Harvard College} Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1995 (1\textsuperscript{st} Ed.1935), p.36. The original name of the place where Harvard was located was ‘Newtown’. It’s name was soon changed to ‘Cambridge’.

\textsuperscript{21} Frederick Rudolph \textit{op.cit.} pp.11-12. In 1744, Harvard refused permission for a visit by the English “revivalist” George Whitfield, causing some to refer to the College as “godless Harvard”! (p.17)

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid} p.245

\textsuperscript{23} George M.Marsden \textit{The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief} Oxford University Press, New York, 1994, p.4
Newman’s Idea and the Very New Thing:

Thus at the time of the foundation of the University of Sydney in 1850, and of the passing of an Act to set up its first residential College, St. Paul’s, in 1854, the issue of the relationship between the sacred and the secular in the arrangement and content of university education had become significant well beyond the bounds of a colony whose governing legislature was determined to counter sectarian rivalry, influence and interference, and to provide a liberal education to as wide a range of people as possible, including those of any religion or none. Indeed at this time “the sharp separation of religious from secular education was … a very new thing in most parts of the world.”

A series of discourses delivered by John Henry Newman in Dublin in 1852, which collectively became known as The Idea of a University, was in many ways a response to the growing demands to remove the study of religion from the curriculum of universities. Such separation was a threat to the unity of all knowledge: “Religious Truth is not only a portion, but a condition of general knowledge. To blot it out is nothing short, if I may so speak, of unravelling the web of University Teaching. It is, according to the Greek proverb, to take the Spring from out of the year; it is to imitate the preposterous proceeding of those tragedians who represented a drama with the omission of its principal part.”

Theology, he argued, must be a part of the teaching of a true university, where knowledge is not just taught in the

---

26 Ibid p.74
abstract sense, but gained through the collegial experience of association, debate, argument and example: “a University … is not a Convent, it is not a Seminary; it is a place to fit men of the world for the world.”

The “very difficult” experiment of denominational colleges in association with the secular University of Sydney was in many ways an attempt to bridge the gap between Newman’s idea and the insistence that the new University should be free from the teachers of any religion whatever. It was indeed a scheme which had “never been tried before anywhere.” The Sydney colleges were to be in association with a University that largely adopted the Scottish model of a teaching professoriate, but which also rejected the need for collegiate residence; they were to assume many of the terms and traditions of the Oxbridge colleges, but not their pre-eminence in the function of the University; like the Queen’s Colleges of Ireland, they were to impose no religious tests for membership, but could conduct religious instruction; their students, like those of the Colleges of the University of London, were subject to the examinations of the University, but unlike London, they lived in them but were not taught in them; and though sectarian interests gave birth to the first American residential teaching colleges, competing sectarian interests in the early Colony of New South Wales set the seal on the determination to separate the teaching of Australia’s first university from the religion of its residential colleges. This beginning of an Australian pattern of relationship between the sacred and the secular in the founding of

---

27 *Ibid* p.177
denominational residential colleges might well have given rise to the fears expressed by Professor Woolley, but in his hope for the scheme’s success, it also boded not only of challenge but of compromise.

**Beyond the First Universities and Colleges – 1945 to 1975:**

How, then, did this experiment proceed and develop in relation to the founding of Australia’s first universities in each of the State capital cities? This thesis seeks to show whether Professor Woolley’s fears were realised in any way, and to what extent the experiment succeeded. In outlining, in Chapters 1 to 5, the association in Australia’s first universities between Church, College and Campus, the determination to separate the sacred from the secular will be seen perhaps as not so much anti-religious as anti-sectarian. Having considered the pattern of denominational colleges established within one hundred years following the foundation of the first University and College, the thesis, in Chapters 6 to 11, will focus on the three decades following World War II in which the so-termed “second wave” of Australia’s universities were established.

The relationship between the sacred and the secular in this period, 1945 to 1975, is of particular interest in that these decades witnessed significant advances in science and technology; a large increase in the tertiary student population; a fervour among the churches for both ecumenism and evangelism, especially in their work among students (Chapter 6); an increasing involvement of the federal
government in all levels of education, both State and independent, and a massive
injection of Commonwealth funds into universities and into residential colleges
and halls (Chapter 7); and the era of liberation – of Gay rights, feminism, anti-
censorship, anti-conscription, student rights, and a decided concern for academic
freedom. In this period of significant change and growth in university education,
why and in what ways did the Churches or Church-related groups seek to build
on the Australian pattern of denominational residential colleges in the new
universities? What enabled some to do so, and prevented others?

The thesis will focus especially on certain colleges founded in these universities,
and in particular, in Chapter 8, on the motives and moves of an evangelical
Anglican group, the ‘New University Colleges Council’, in its founding of New
College at the University of New South Wales and of Robert Menzies College at
Macquarie University. In also considering other developments, in Chapter 9, in
the founding of colleges at the Australian National University, the University of
New England and at Monash University, the thesis will note both denominational
and inter-denominational approaches taken at this time.28 How much might the
aspirations and concerns of Professor Woolley in the relationship of the sacred
and the secular apply to these colleges and universities founded a century later?

---

28 With key issues and developments evidenced in these universities and colleges in NSW, the
ACT and Victoria, the denominational colleges set up in association with James Cook University
in North Queensland have not been discussed.
He might well have regarded the matters, discussed in Chapters 10 and 11, that
gave rise to the Committees of Enquiry into Warrane College and Robert
Menzies College, as clear examples of “considerable and obvious dangers”.

Rationale, References and Sources:

This thesis has developed from my interest in the foundation of New College
within the University of New South Wales where I have been Dean since 1994.
Perhaps as a consequence it has a certain Anglican perspective and emphasis,
though, of course, for centuries the Anglican Church has been closely involved
with colleges and universities. What is, however, of special interest is evangelical
Anglican involvement. The nature of that involvement is therefore particularly
developed by reference in Chapter 5 to the growth of the Evangelical Union
within the University of Sydney; and in Chapter 6 to Sydney Anglican
evangelical involvement in a Consultation at Queen’s College, Melbourne, in
1961 on Christian work among students, and, in the same year, a controversy
about academic freedom that arose from a sermon delivered at St. Andrew’s
Cathedral, Sydney, by Archbishop Hugh Gough.29 Nevertheless, all this is
considered in the broader context of a range of denominational residential
colleges in association with Australian campuses. Indeed, the discussion in

29 Most of the information on these matters has been sourced from letters, archives and
interviews. Little, if anything, has been published. Much of the oral history has been taken from
founders and others involved in the setting up of New and Robert Menzies Colleges. Two of
those interviewed – Emeritus Professor Alex Mitchell, first Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie
University, and the Reverend Noel Pollard, first Master of New College – died not long after their
respective interviews!
Chapters 5 and 6 point to the larger theme throughout the thesis of the interaction between Church and Campus, with the denominational colleges demonstrating a particular and significant aspect of it.

Histories have been written of each of the first six universities in Australia, and while each describes something of the establishment and growth of its residential colleges, only the very substantial Clifford Turney et al’s *Australia’s First: A History of the University of Sydney, Volume 1* and, to a lesser degree, Geoffrey Blainey’s *A Centenary History of Melbourne University* 30 and Fred Alexander’s *Campus at Crawley* 31, reflect in any detail the issue of the separation of the sacred from the secular. Journal articles by Kenneth Cable are particularly helpful in understanding the nature of that separation that became so much a part of the pattern in Australia’s universities. 32 By the mid-twentieth century, as will be discussed in the thesis, the overall position is perhaps well reflected in W. F. Connell et al’s comment in *Australia’s First ... Volume 2* that “the colleges played a much less substantial part in university affairs than some of the university’s founders a century before had expected of them.” 33 Some histories of

---

30 Geoffrey Blainey *A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne* University Press, Melbourne, 1957.
31 Fred Alexander *Campus at Crawley: A Narrative and critical Appreciation of the First Fifty Years of the University of Western Australia* F.W.Cheshire, Melbourne, 1963, Ch.X: “Problems of Residence”.
the early colleges - such as St. Andrew’s and St. Paul’s at Sydney; Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s at Melbourne; and St. John’s at Queensland – together with biographies of diocesan bishops and heads of colleges – such as Charles Perry, Augustus Short, St.Clair Donaldson, Charles Riley, Howard Mowll, Ernest Burgmann, J. S. Moyes, Alexander Leeper, and Arthur Garnsey – provide further insight into the working out of the very difficult experiment in Australia’s first universities. For the period 1945 to 1975, something of the controversy concerning funding for denominational colleges on an equal basis with that for residential halls is reflected in S. G. Foster and Margaret Varghese’s *The Making of the Australian National University*; the relationship of the Churches with Monash University, and especially in the setting up of its Religious Centre, is outlined and described in Louis Matheson’s *Still Learning* and Peter Jannsen’s *Monash University Religious Centre*; and the challenge of Church involvement at Macquarie University in issues related both to chaplaincies and to colleges is presented in Bruce Mansfield and Mark Hutchinson’s history of Macquarie University, *Liberality of Opportunity*, and in more detail in two journal articles written by Mark Hutchinson.34

There is no overview of the establishment and development of denominational colleges in Australian universities, and especially of those established in the

immediate decades following World War II. This thesis attempts such a task, as well as seeks to focus on the distinctive and difficult role assigned to them in the founding of Australia’s first university and colleges – that of relating the sacred with the secular; John Woolley’s “very difficult” experiment. The wider context of such a relationship, beyond the university, is reflected in works such as Ian Breward’s *A History of Australian Churches*\(^{35}\), and in articles such as those by David Hilliard.\(^{36}\) Particularly in relation to the post World War II period, much use is made of oral history and of archival research, with, for example, material in relation to colleges at the Australian National University, UNSW and Macquarie University, and to the proposed Churches Collegiate Community at Monash University and the Consultation on Christian Work among Students at Melbourne University in 1961, being ‘published’ for the first time. In so far as there is some bias towards Anglican involvement in the universities, this thesis perhaps makes some contribution to addressing Professor Jill Roe’s lament that “the history of Anglicanism in Australia is a neglected subject, lamentably so.”\(^{37}\)

---


CHAPTER ONE

Politics, Priests and Professors:

Sydney University and Its Affiliated Colleges

"... a grievous mistake has been made in the establishment of Affiliated Colleges ..."

- Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of NSW, September 1859

In its Report, the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of NSW, appointed on the 13th September 1859 to “inquire into the present state of the Sydney University”, concluded that “a grievous mistake has been made in the establishment of Affiliated Colleges, which are not only not at all necessary as adjuncts to the University, but actually involve in their association with it a violation of the great principle on which it was founded as a strictly secular institution.”\(^1\) The Report went on to quote evidence given by William Sharp Macleay, a distinguished naturalist and son of a former NSW Colonial Secretary, who noted when asked about the affiliated colleges that he thought “... it was a retrograde step. At a time when the two great Universities of England are every day becoming more liberal, and sinking those bitter sectarian animosities which have so long prevailed, we are, by the establishment of these Colleges, doing what we can to revive them. I think that bitter sectarianism will be the result of this system.”\(^2\)

\(^1\) Report from the Select Committee on the Sydney University, Votes & Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, NSW, Sydney, 1859-1860, p.9
\(^2\) Minutes of Evidence taken before The Select Committee on the Sydney University, op.cit. p.70
The University of Sydney’s Act of Incorporation had received the Governor’s assent on 1st October 1850. It included the provision that “no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a Student of the said University, or to hold office therein, or to partake of any advantage or privilege thereof.” ³ It also provided that the Senate consist of sixteen Fellows, of whom twelve must be laymen ⁴, and that a student must reside “with his parent or guardian, or with some near relative or friend selected by his parent or guardian, and approved by the Provost or Vice Provost, or in some collegiate or other educational establishment, or with a tutor or master of a boarding house licensed by the Provost or Vice Provost.” ⁵

At that time, the University had no home, and affiliated residential colleges were not to be established until after the passing of an Act to provide for the establishment and endowment of Colleges within the University of Sydney in 1854. The University was inaugurated in October 1852 in the Hall of the former Sydney College, what is now the Sydney Grammar School, but lectures did not commence at its permanent site at Grose Farm, in the then unfinished Blacket buildings, until 1857. ⁶ The first residential college, St. Paul’s, also designed by Edmund Blacket, received its first resident students in February 1858. ⁷ That in just over one year a parliamentary committee was to conclude that the

³ *An Act to Incorporate and Endow the University of Sydney* Clause XX, printed in C. Turney et al *Australia’s First: A History of the University of Sydney Vol 1 1850-1939*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1991, p.634
⁵ *Ibid* Clause XVII, p.634.
⁷ *Ibid* p.106.
establishment of such a college, and proposals for others like it, was a “grievous mistake” in relation to what it declared was the foundation principle of the University in it being “a strictly secular institution”, is an indication of the significant tension and dispute that surrounded the birth of university education in Australia. What was proposed as a system of higher learning free from sectarian religious influence was clearly viewed by some as particularly threatened by the presence and official recognition by State and University authorities of residential colleges founded by Christian denominations or groups that represented them. It was an even greater compromise of the strictly secular character of the University and the ‘grand principle’ that “boys of all religious denominations should be instructed in common, in all that relates to secular knowledge” ⁸ that such colleges should be endowed by the State, as was provided for in the Act of 1854. The Select Committee therefore concluded that all connection between the University and the affiliated colleges should cease; that those involved with St. Paul’s College be paid out and the buildings used to house the professors of the University; and that in relation to the proposed colleges “it would be far wiser on the part of the Government to pay over to the denominations interested any sums to which they are at present by law entitled – such sums to be applied as they may think fit – than to suffer the affiliated Colleges to be proceeded with.” ⁹

⁸ Report from the Select Committee on the Sydney University op.cit. p.9
⁹ Ibid p.12
The Committee’s Report highlighted both the more immediate and the more complex background issues that were central to the foundation of the University of Sydney and to the pattern of university education to be established throughout Australia in the second half of the nineteenth and the first decades of the twentieth centuries. They were issues related to the nature of reform and change in university education in the United Kingdom, and dissent from the traditional and established role of the Church of England, as has been outlined in the ‘Introduction’; to the growing and more material vocational demands of a new scientific, industrial and commercial age; to the denominational rivalries in a developing colony far less inclined towards establishment and privilege; to the need, particularly expressed by William Charles Wentworth, of appropriate education for colonial self-government; and, indeed, to the place of religion in education. These issues were played out in the formative years of colonial settlement in parliament and the press, amongst the public, and in priestly and professorial circles.

Bourke and Broughton - the Sacred and the Secular in early NSW:

In the same year as the creation of the new University of London in 1831, an ‘Act to Promote the Building of Churches and Chapels and to Provide for the Maintenance of Ministers of Religion in New South Wales’, initiated three years earlier by Governor Richard Bourke, became law. This was an important step that gave recognition in the early colony to the growing diversity of
denominational adherence, to the decline of any ‘establishment’ view of the position of the Church of England in the colony, and to a developing policy of the separation of Church and State; the sacred from the secular. Part of an inscription on a statue in honour of Governor Bourke outside the Public Library of NSW, reads: “He established religious equality on a just and firm basis and sought to provide for all, without distinction of sect, a sound and adequate system of national education.” ¹⁰

Also in 1836, an English cleric and graduate of Cambridge University, William Grant Broughton, who played a significant part in the provision and development of education in the Colony in the first half of the nineteenth century, became the first and only Anglican bishop of the newly created ‘Bishopric of Australia’.¹¹ Bourke sought equality in the recognition of the denominations represented in the Colony; Broughton, while not opposed to some recognition of them, clung tenaciously to the view that an English colony ought to be loyal to the established English Church. However, as was being evidenced in the establishment of new universities in Britain, in the moves for reform of the older establishments, and in political reform, the position favoured by Broughton became “identified in England with anti-liberalism, and in Australia … as reactionary by those seeking

¹¹ In 1847 other dioceses were formed out of the Diocese of Australia, and Broughton became Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan of Australasia.
a new economic and political basis for the expanding colony and striving to
develop egalitarian and democratic institutions.”

Up until this time, the Church of England was clearly in a dominant position in
the Colony, if not in an established position by law. Part of Captain Arthur
Phillip’s instructions prior to leaving England with the First Fleet was to “by all
proper methods enforce a due observance of religion and good order … and …
take such steps for the due celebration of publick worship as circumstances will
permit.” The first Chaplain, the Reverend Richard Johnson, was clearly
chaplain to the new settlement as much as he was officially part of the military
establishment. Johnson was a product of the Methodist and Evangelical Revivals
of the eighteenth century, which gave rise to the setting up of the Church
Missionary Society to supplement the work of the earlier established societies –
the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and the Society for the
Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG). The evangelicals emphasised
the importance of justification by faith alone and the worth of the individual,
especially in terms of the individual’s need for salvation. Evangelical leaders
included Henry Venn, John Newton, William Wilberforce, and John Venn.
Johnson attended Cambridge University, where Charles Simeon introduced him
to Wilberforce and to Newton. It was out of humanitarian

12 Ross Border op.cit. p. 153
13 Ibid p.16
14 Ibid p.15. John Venn formed the ‘Clapham Sect’, a group of mainly wealthy laymen and
merchants living near Clapham Common, who were noted for their piety, philanthropy, and
missionary zeal.
concern and religious conviction that such men turned their attention to the prisoners sentenced to transportation, and secured the appointment of Johnson as chaplain. Thus began the building of an evangelical tradition within the Anglican Church in Sydney that was to be developed by Johnson’s assistant, the Calvinist Evangelical Samuel Marsden; by William Cowper and Robert Cartwright; and firmed under Broughton’s successor in 1855, Frederick Barker, who had also come under the influence of Charles Simeon at Cambridge.  


The Growth of Sectarian Rivalry in the early Colony:

In May 1825, the Reverend Thomas Hobbes Scott took up appointment as the first Archdeacon in the Colony – a position proposed in the Bigge Report on the administration of New South Wales. Scott had been secretary to Commissioner Bigge and was his brother-in-law. The archdeaconry was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Calcutta, but the Archdeacon was given wide powers that not only established his authority in relation to the Anglican clergy in the Colony, but clearly determined his influence in civil affairs and especially in relation to schools. He took rank and precedence after the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, and he was appointed “Visitor to all schools maintained throughout the Colony by His Majesty’s revenue.”  

16 Ross Border op.cit. p. 45
inseparably connected\textsuperscript{17}, and with a view to establishing the Church as financially secure and independent of State grants, the Government established ‘The Church and School (Lands) Corporation’, with the Governor as President and the Archdeacon as Vice-President. The Corporation was to receive one seventh of all lands surveyed in the Colony, with the quality and value of the land to be of average standard with a fair share of the available water supply.\textsuperscript{18} Future funds from sale or lease of parts of the land and from its produce were to be directed towards such things as land clearing and improvement, the building and repair of churches and parsonages, and to the support and maintenance of clergy, schools and schoolmasters. It wasn’t, however, until 1829 that the first land was made available to the Corporation, signifying great difficulty in the surveying and determination of the land to be brought under such control. There was little capital available to begin operating the land, and though schools certainly expanded, resentment grew among officials, landowners, non-conformists and Roman Catholics over the privileged position given to the seemingly ‘established’ English Church.\textsuperscript{19} The Colony’s only Catholic priest, Father John Therry, publicly protested the rights of his flock for provision for Catholic schools, and, for example, for separate places for burial. A typographical error in an article he wrote to the \textit{Sydney Gazette} made it appear that Father Therry had insulted Anglican clergy, and despite the \textit{Gazette’s}
apology, his status as a Government Chaplain was withdrawn until 1837. Therry received support, however, from the *Australian* newspaper, founded in 1824 and co-edited by lawyers William Charles Wentworth, who was to play arguably the most significant role in the foundation of Sydney University, and Richard Wardell. Much of the paper’s editorial comment was critical of the Colony’s administration, the ‘exclusives’ and privilege, and supportive of a free press and the ‘emancipists’. When, as a result of difficulty and opposition to the Corporation, and personal attack, Archdeacon Scott resigned in 1829 and word was received that the Corporation’s charter was to be revoked, the *Australian* editorial declared: “thanks to a ‘Free Press’ – to the spread of liberal principles - to the fallen influence of Mr Scott ... not only is the Church Schools Corporation virtually dissolved, but the seventh of all the lands in the Colony ... will have to revert to the crown for the benefit of the colonists at large ... To talk of saddling the Colony with an enormous Church Establishment ... was as absurd as it was unjust.”

By the time the Corporation was dissolved in February 1833, the mood and movement for toleration and recognition of religious bodies other than the Church of England were growing much stronger. The Presbyterians were vigorously led by the Reverend John Dunmore Lang who had arrived in 1823. He and his clergy represented something of the liberal spirit that was being demonstrated by dissenters in England, where there was heightened activity on

---

20 *Ibid* pp.75-76
21 E.C.Rowland *op.cit.* p.54
the part of Non-Conformists to break the power of the Established Church over their lives.\textsuperscript{22} This was evidenced, in part, in the foundation of the University of London. Governor Richard Bourke’s policies and proposals were to recognise the reality of the growing mix of the Colony’s population, to acknowledge the need for greater ‘voluntaryism’ rather than state involvement in the financial support of churches, and to set what he described as the “three grand divisions of Christians”\textsuperscript{23} (Anglicans, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics) on a more equal footing. In a letter to the British Government he wrote: “In a new country, to which persons of all religious persuasions are invited to resort, it would be impossible to establish a dominant and endowed church without much hostility.”\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Separating the Sacred from the Secular in Schooling:}

Scott’s successor in 1829 as Archdeacon was William Grant Broughton. Though he saw his task as essentially ecclesiastical rather than temporal, the rights and privileges of the terms of Scott’s appointment were maintained, including membership of the Legislative Council, and Broughton viewed his role as very much continuing Scott’s work, especially in relation to the development of the parochial schools. In an address to clergy soon after his appointment, Broughton praised the work of Scott in promoting a system of religious instruction in which

\textsuperscript{22} Ross Border \textit{op.cit.} p.71
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid} p. 91
\textsuperscript{24} E.C.Rowland \textit{op.cit.} p.53
he was persuaded “the best hopes of this colony repose.” Education was to be a primary pre-occupation with Broughton. As Archdeacon and as Bishop, he was to come into conflict with those who, in accord with the growing spirit of the times and in response to the demands of a colony groping for an identity distinct if not independent from its origins, increasingly advanced the cause of separation of the sacred from the secular; of ‘established’ religion from public education – at least in its control and influence, if not entirely removed from it. In the same address to clergy, Broughton noted: “a distinguished rank must be assigned to the truly Christian scheme of affording general education founded upon the basis of revealed religion. Upon any other system, the population of a country may acquire knowledge but not wisdom.”

It could not be argued that Governor Bourke, with whom Broughton differed, and who had begun to curtail some of the Archdeacon’s civil powers and responsibilities, was opposed to the Church. Rather, he was concerned for social and religious cohesion. Indeed, while they would reduce the privileged position of the Anglicans, the ‘Church Acts’ allowed for the retention of existing churches and schools, and of the stipends of their chaplains and teachers. It was Bourke who proposed the raising of the Archdeaconry to the status of a Bishopric or Diocese. Bourke was an Anglican, but of Anglo-Irish background, and he

---

25 Broughton at St.James’ Church, 3 December 1829, in Ross Border op.cit. p.79
26 E.C.Rowland op.cit. p.73
28 Stephen Judd & Kenneth Cable op.cit. p.23
was more than aware of the national system of education in Ireland which aimed at harmony by subsidising schools and allowing for religious instruction and the visit of local clergy. Such a ‘national’ system was at the heart of his proposals; such common schooling would bring greater unity. Broughton, however, was not in favour of legislation that he believed posed a threat to the supremacy of the main doctrines of the Church of England, which declared the sufficiency of the Scriptures and the authority of the Church in matters of faith.29

As Archdeacon, Broughton proposed and gained support for the establishment of church secondary schools, and in 1832 two ‘King’s Schools’ were opened, one in Sydney and one in Parramatta. Broughton drew-up a syllabus in classical, mathematical and general studies that excluded the teaching of English, but provided for the teaching of Latin at nine years of age and Greek at twelve.30 Despite some expressed concern that the schools might impose on the Colony a style of education that was contrary to the character of liberal developments in England, all classes were to be admitted to the schools, though, of course, religious teaching was to be grounded in Anglican faith and tradition.31 Religious instruction would “sedulously and systematically be combined with the course of study”, and unless exempted by the wish of their parents, pupils were to attend “Divine Service in the Established Church, every Sunday morning and

29 F.T.Whitington William Grant Broughton, Bishop of Australia Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1936, p.107
30 E.C.Rowland op.cit. p.76
31 Ross Border op.cit. p.87
afternoon.”32 The Sydney ‘King’s School’ lasted only a short while, due to the
death in September 1832 of its Head Master, the Reverend George Innes. The
Parramatta school was much in demand.

Competition, however, came from ‘The Australian College’ established by John
Dunmore Lang in December 1831, and from the ‘Sydney College’, forerunner of
the ‘Sydney Grammar School’, opened in 1835. Lang had discussed with
Broughton his possible involvement with the King’s Schools, but withdrew out
of concern for what he saw as inevitable Anglican dominance in the project. He
had shared some of Broughton’s misgivings about the proposed Sydney College,
but in its initial stage turned to give it his support. The College was to be non-
denominational, though classes would begin and end each day with a prayer of a
form approved by the College’s committee.33 Nevertheless, the College was to be
open to all parties of whatever religious persuasion, and no religious books were
to be used except the Old and New Testaments “without note or comment.”34
Broughton stayed away from the laying of the Sydney College’s foundation stone
to “avoid any appearance of giving public approval or commendation to a
venture whose consequences he feared. Education like that to be offered at the
Sydney College, which fell only a little short of totally excluding religion from
among its business, worked an evil effect upon the community.”35

Sydney, 1989, p.17
33 Ibid p.13
34 K.R.Campbell John Dunmore Lang. Presbyterianism and Tertiary Education in New South
Wales, 1831-1875, Thesis submitted for the degree of MA at the University of NSW, February
1967.
35 G.P.Shaw op.cit. p.27
Lang, on the other hand, attended and offered a prayer for divine blessing on the venture, reminding those present that if the Lord was the builder “the college would be one means of delivering the heathen in these uttermost parts of the earth into God’s hands.”36 Lang’s support and involvement, however, lasted only a short time, and he set about the foundation of his own school in Jamieson Street, the Australian College. Reflecting a more liberal Scottish tradition, the College was to be accessible to persons of all denominations; there was to be no proselytizing, though instruction “in the principles and duties of the Christian religion” was to be afforded “to those Pupils only whose Parents and Guardians should not object to receiving it.”37 It seemed Broughton was well aware that his opposition, particularly to the Sydney College, was viewed as going against the tide of the liberal trends in education in Britain, and those developing in the Colony.

As Bishop, Broughton maintained his opposition to proposals and legislation that aimed to reduce the teaching and impact of ‘revealed Christian truth’ in public education. “I am fully persuaded”, he said to a meeting in Sydney of the SPG and the SPCK, “that no system of education can be sound that is not based on the principles of revealed religion.”38 Governor Bourke’s proposal for the Irish national system of education to be introduced in the Colony failed, very much as a result of Bishop Broughton’s opposition gathering sufficient support in the

36 Ibid p.26
37 C.Turney et al op.cit. pp.22-23
Legislative Council. Nevertheless, the Church Act of 1836, in its grants to clergy and subsidies for the building of churches and other religious buildings by the main denominations, which came to include the Wesleyan Methodists as well as the Anglicans, Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, meant the end of the Anglicans’ privileged position. It also signalled a greater spirit for equal consideration in the future. Further proposals in 1839 by Governor George Gipps and in 1844, following a Legislative Council committee into educational reform, of which William Wentworth was a member, were blocked by denominational opposition. As a compromise in 1848, under Governor Sir Charles Fitzroy, two Boards of Education were set up, with one responsible for national non-sectarian schools, and the other responsible for the denominational schools. The non-sectarian schools allowed, however, for general religious instruction.39

Both Broughton and Lang no doubt envisaged their secondary schools, King’s and the Australian College, as forerunners of a tertiary institution. In 1831, Lang had implied that a course in medicine would eventually be offered at the Australian College.40 But their greater concern, and that of John Bede Polding, who had arrived in Sydney in 1835 as its first Catholic Archbishop, was for securing and training men for the ministry. Broughton set up St. James’ College in 1845, which moved in 1847 from St. James’ Church to the property “Lyndhurst” in Glebe. It might have been seen as a future university, but it did not attract large numbers or professional teachers, and it closed in 1849. Polding

38 F.T. Whitington op.cit. p.103
39 Stephen Judd & Kenneth Cable op.cit. p.40
nurtured a seminary at St. Mary’s, and in 1852 it moved, rather ironically given Bishop Broughton’s known distaste for the Catholic prelate and for the Catholic Church in general, to ‘Lyndhurst’. Polding certainly had a concern for raising the educational standard of his clergy, especially those who came from the remoter parts of Ireland, where the disturbed conditions made a tradition of scholarship the exception rather than the rule.\textsuperscript{41} However, neither St. Mary’s, nor Lang’s Australian College grew to be in a position seriously to develop into the beginnings of a university.

Near the end of the first half of the nineteenth century, therefore, with the growth and expansion of a colony increasingly made up of a mix of emancipists and free settlers, of immigrants from continental Europe, Scotland and Ireland as well as from England, of professionals, merchants, artisans, and labourers, and of many classes and creeds, the dominant role of any one denominational group in colonial life was on the wane. Official recognition and support for other denominations meant fairer and more just recognition of the needs and aspirations of the whole population, but it also seemed to give vent to a greater and more competitive denominational rivalry. This was particularly evident in the development of schooling and in the whole matter of education. Denominational or sectarian interests and rivalry had, in the setting up of two Boards, been in a sense put to one side, while the 'State' had taken direct involvement in the development of a 'national' and more secular system of

\textsuperscript{40} K.R.Campbell \textit{op.cit.} p.51
schooling, albeit with provision for general religious instruction. Indeed, the denominational system was to be subject to State supervision and inspection of curricula and standards. The development of a system of education that reflected the needs and aspirations of a diverse colony, with a vocal free press and with increasing calls to train leaders for eventual self-government, was seen as essential. The most appropriate education for the demands of these new times, and certainly at a tertiary level, arguably should reflect much of the sentiment and direction of the change and reform occurring in Britain, which had led to the foundation of the University of London as a secular examining and degree-granting body with affiliated teaching colleges, religious or otherwise.

**William Charles Wentworth:**

A factor that had an impact on colleges and schools, including those of Broughton, Lang and Polding, and indeed on the Colony as a whole, was an economic depression in the early 1840’s. The more secular Sydney College did not escape the downturn in enrolments as a result of the inability of parents to pay fees, and by the late 1840’s, with the loss of a number of Headmasters and other staff, and increasing apathy on the part of most of the College’s committee of management, the College was almost moribund.\(^\text{42}\) The College eventually closed at the end of 1850, but not before one of its proprietors, Legislative Council member, pastoralist, lawyer, former owner of the *Australian* newspaper,

---

\(^{42}\) Frances O'Donoghue *The Bishop of Botany Bay: The Life of John Bede Polding, Australia’s First Catholic Archbishop* Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1982, p.83
and campaigner for civil reforms, W.C. Wentworth, presented a petition on behalf of the proprietors of the Sydney College to the Legislative Council on the 4th September 1849 “praying for the adoption of measures to convert the institution into a University.”

William Charles Wentworth was born on Norfolk Island, the son of assistant surgeon D’Arcy Wentworth and Catherine Crowley, a convict whom D’Arcy met on the “Neptune”, a transport vessel in the Second Fleet. D’Arcy had been ‘encouraged’ to take a position on the Fleet, having escaped convictions for highway robbery that had left him with quite a reputation and a strong presumption of guilt. Though he would eventually fill numerous important offices in the Colony, including Principal Surgeon, Superintendent of Police, Magistrate, and an original Director of the Bank of NSW, he was excluded from the inner social circle, with many assuming that he was of convict origin. It was believed that he acquiesced in this “because he knew that he would fail to impose himself on a social group of which the strongest binding tie was hostility to all of convict origin.” This had an abiding impact on William, who, though desiring the acceptance and esteem of the ‘established’ families in the Colony, knew his father was slighted and was determined “to redress the indignity by attacking the pretensions of the exclusives.” D’Arcy sent William and his brother to England

42 Clifford Turney op.cit. p.20
43 Ibid p.23
46 John Ritchie op.cit. p. 135
for their schooling, following which William returned to Sydney, being appointed Acting Provost Marshall and obtaining a grant of land on the Nepean. In 1813, he accompanied Gregory Blaxland and William Lawson in the first crossing of the Blue Mountains by European settlers. Though his father thought him unsuited to farming and wanted him to join the British Army, William decided to study law in England with the hope of acquainting himself with “all the excellence of the British Constitution” and of “at some future period to advocate successfully the right of my country to participate in its advantages.” He enrolled at the Middle Temple in 1817, but because he had not attended university he noted that it would be five years before he could be called to the Bar. In a letter to his father he wrote of his decision not to proceed with his intention to enrol for a degree at Oxford, “since all the noblemen and gentlemen of fortune who go to the universities live in a style which precludes everyone of inferior fortune from their society ... In fact they preserve at college the same distance from the vulgus of which they are so observant afterwards; and it is morally impossible, unless your means corresponds with theirs, or you degrade the dignity of your nature by turning parasite, that you can become acquainted with them ... therefore one of my powerful motives for desiring to be a member of one of the universities has ceased.”

After being called to the Bar in England in 1822, and despite his earlier comments about the colleges of Oxford, he decided to spend “a few terms” at
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47 Ibid p.165
48 A.C.V.Melbourne op.cit. p.22
Peterhouse College at Cambridge University: “There is a good deal in the name of having been at college!”49 He returned to Australia in July 1824, and soon after, with Robert Wardell, launched the Australian newspaper. In 1843 he was elected to the Legislative Council.

Whatever conflict William Wentworth may have felt in carrying the sense of his father’s lack of acceptance among the social elite of the Colony and his own desire to be so accepted, he clearly had a distaste for privilege and dominance at the expense of others, and therefore for any sectarian control that excluded others from fair and just participation and benefit. Through the Australian, Wentworth had been a strong critic of Archdeacon Scott, the ‘Church and Schools Corporation’, and of privileges enjoyed by “ruddy-faced chaplains”.50 He saw, in his desire for self-government in the Colony, the need to train young people, to cultivate their hearts and minds, in order to fit them for the future responsibilities of leadership.51 Opportunities to receive the highest education should be provided in the Colony, without the necessity to make a pilgrimage, as he had done, to the other side of the world. In considering the kind of higher education that would be desirable, he was also, no doubt, very much aware of the moves for reform at Oxford and Cambridge, and of the changes that had occurred in the setting up of the University of London. He was further motivated by the encouragement, in 1848, of Henry Gratton Douglas, a Sydney physician who had trained in Dublin

49 Ibid p.36
50 Ross Border op.cit. p.68
51 K.R.Cramp William Charles Wentworth – Explorer, Scholar, Statesman Vaucluse Park Trust, Sydney, 1918, pp.32-33
and practised in France, and to whom it was suggested that his friend, William Wentworth, might be interested in taking up his enthusiasm for the founding of a university.

**A University Proposed:**

Whether or not there was something of a conflict of interest, as a proprietor, in Wentworth’s presentation to the legislative Council of the petition on behalf of the proprietors of the Sydney College, it was nevertheless seen by Wentworth as an opportune time to further the cause of a university. Some argued that it was premature, given the difficulties being experienced by the secondary colleges and schools. However, on the 6th September 1849, Wentworth moved “that a Select Committee be appointed … to report upon the best means of instituting a University for the promotion of literature and science to be endowed at the public expense.”  

52 In speaking to the motion, Wentworth commented that any publicly endowed collegiate institution “must be kept entirely free from the teachers of any religion whatever … that no religion at all should be taught in an institution such as he proposed … If a university on these principles were founded, he should be willing to allow other denominational collegiate institutions to affiliate themselves to it – such institutions might, if they thought fit, establish foundations for degrees of divinity, and share in the advantages of the university
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52 H.E.Barff *A Short Historical Account of the University of Sydney* Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1902, p.3
by attendance on its lectures.” The central institution should be “free from any sectarian influence … it should be open to all, though influenced by none.”

The Select Committee was approved and eight members were appointed, including the Speaker of the Legislative Council, Charles Nicholson, and with Wentworth as Chairman. It completed its work within fifteen days and reported to the Council on the 21st September. The Report urged that a university should be established without further delay. It should be founded upon a liberal and comprehensive basis “and should be accessible to all classes, and to all collegiate or academical institutions which shall seek its affiliation.” The Report insisted that it must belong to no religious denomination, nor require any religious test. It also proposed the exclusion of clergy from the University’s governing body, the Senate, and from the teaching professoriate. It emphasised that secular education was the only education that could be imparted within the University’s walls. A Bill to incorporate and endow the University of Sydney was introduced into the Legislative Council on the 2nd October 1849. In moving its second reading, Wentworth noted that much of it had been derived from the provisions of the Bill for the foundation of the University of London; like it, the University of Sydney would be an examining and supervising authority over a number of university colleges. No doubt seeking to please all denominations, he stated that, while clergy would be excluded from the administration of the University, affiliated colleges could be established in which “peculiar religious views” could be
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53 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7th September 1849, p.2
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enforced. Nevertheless, the principle of secular education “was absolutely indispensable, (for) if they once introduced the principle of sectarian interference, all government of such an institution was at an end, because if any one sect asserted its supremacy, all other sects would retire from it, and thus be virtually excluded from participation in its benefits.”

“Instilled” Religion in an “Infidel Institution”!

Wentworth insisted that the University proposal was not irreligious, in that religion, though not taught, would nevertheless be instilled. Like the University of London, the Bill’s preamble stated that the purpose of the University was for “the better advancement of religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge.” The cause of Christianity, he argued, was not promoted by stunting the intellect 58, which no doubt he believed occurred when only one particular interest was served. The University would be accessible to all. There would be no class or denominational distinctions; the University could embody “common Christianity – the moral, social component”, but must separate from it “dogmatic Christianity – the theological component.”

Not everyone shared Wentworth’s optimism! One of a number of letters to the
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Sydney Morning Herald noted: “... ministers of religion, as a class, are not more incompetent than any other class to fill those Professorships with credit to themselves, and advantage to their pupils ... The learned member for Sydney is, in truth, afraid of them. Why? Lest the institution should become sectarian, and lest religion should be taught there. Let him say what he pleases – the express exclusion of no other portion of the community than that class whose office it is to uphold the interests and teach the principles and practice of religion, proves beyond question to every reasoning mind that the Sydney University is intended to be an infidel Institution.”

The Bill’s procedure through the Legislative Council had been delayed, largely because of a dispute over the proposed appointment of the Chairman of the Sydney College, Dr William Bland, a former convict, to the Senate of the University. The delay meant that a revised Bill was not introduced until the next Session of the Council, in August 1850. By that time, opposition from the churches, and especially the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, had grown. Bishop Broughton, the clergy and some lay members presented a petition expressing concern that public funds should be spent on a University “which the members of the Church of England would not frequent.” It suggested that the

---

60 ‘B. A.’ Sydney Morning Herald 8th October 1849, p.3. Another writer, 'Laocoon', expressed a similar sentiment: “It is a fact which may be substantiated by the most convincing proofs, that academical institutions founded upon the principle of excluding religion are generally nurseries of infidelity, and I greatly fear that this much lauded University of Sydney will be no better; but like a deadly upas-tree, planted in the midst of our capital, will produce a blighting and ruinous effect upon those immortal minds which may come within the sphere of its influence.” (17th October 1849, p.3)
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University might confer degrees in Arts, Law and Medicine on those whose previous education in separate colleges or seminaries included religious instruction without any interference on the part of the University. The petition went further along this line, to request that financial provision be made to support the establishment of a Church of England college whose students could be candidates for degrees in the University. It would be something akin to King’s College in the University of London. Archbishop Polding and other members of the Roman Catholic community expressed condemnation that public revenues would be spent on providing “a certain amount of classical, scientific and other information, to the exclusion of any professedly religious teaching.”

Wentworth remained firm on the bar to religious teaching and religious teachers in the University, which, at this stage, he envisaged as an examining and degree-granting body to which would be attached a secular, non-sectarian University College for the purposes of teaching classical, mathematical and scientific studies. He recognised that, apart from the teaching at the King’s School, Parramatta, there was no adequate preparation of students in the Colony for the proposed University. Other colleges, secular or otherwise, similarly could be attached in the future. Some believed that this meant that colleges established outside Sydney could be joined, such as in Bathurst and Goulburn, leading the Reverend John Dunmore Lang to propose that the new university be called the

---
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‘University of New South Wales’.\textsuperscript{65} The degree to which Wentworth and others were “indifferent to religion” is unclear; it is clear that Wentworth was anti-clerical and anti-sectarian. He saw the University, to be founded upon liberal and enlightened principles, as “a fountain of knowledge at whose springs all may drink, be they Christian, Mohammedan, Jew or Hindu.”\textsuperscript{66} His opposition to clergy representation on the governing body of the proposed University, the Senate, was therefore strong. While clergy were represented on the governing body of the University of London, they could be drawn from a large number who were in support of the principles upon which the University was founded. In the Colony, and especially within the Church of England and Roman Catholic denominations, this would not be so easy.

The strength of opposition to the total exclusion of clergy, however, forced Wentworth reluctantly to take a more pragmatic view and to compromise in agreeing to increase the number of fellows of the Senate from twelve to sixteen, allowing for clerical representation from the four main Christian denominations. At least twelve members must be laymen. Beyond that, he was opposed to any sectarian representation or influence in the University, and, while not “hostile” to their establishment, opposed to any claim on the endowment for the University for the setting-up and support of any denominational foundation.\textsuperscript{67} Church colleges would need to be otherwise endowed. However, in the process of

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid p.246
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amendment that included the increase of the membership of the Senate, provision was made for allowing the Senate to apply any portion of the endowment fund to the establishment and maintenance of a college in connection with and under the supervision of the University. Unlike the University of London, but more like the Queen’s Colleges in Ireland, the University itself was to employ professors and to engage in secular teaching in a State funded college. The University and the ‘University College’ would virtually be one and the same.

The Bill was passed by the Legislative Council on the 24th September 1850, and received the assent of the Governor, Sir Charles Fitzroy, on the 1st October. Section 20 of the Act declared that “no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a Student of the said University, or to hold office therein, or to partake of any advantage or privilege thereof: Provided always, that this enactment shall not be deemed to prevent the making of regulations for securing the due attendance of the Students, for Divine Worship, at such Church or Chapel as shall be approved by their parents or guardians respectively.” Apart from the provision allowing the Senate to regulate outside attendance of students at divine worship, the lack of reference to religious instruction or religious observance in the Act “extended the secular principle in the idea of the university in the British tradition to new limits”.

---
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“The Great Emporium of False and Anti-Church Views”:

Three clergymen were among the members of the first Senate: the Reverend William Binnington Boyce, a Wesleyan Methodist; the Right Reverend Charles Henry Davis, assistant bishop to Archbishop Polding, and later Bishop of Maitland; and the Reverend William Purves, a Presbyterian. In the same month as the enactment of the Sydney University Bill, Bishop Broughton called together in Sydney a meeting of the Bishops of the province of Australasia – the Bishops of the newly formed dioceses of Melbourne, Adelaide, Newcastle, Tasmania and New Zealand. Among their resolutions was one dissociating themselves from any recognition of schools established under the recently formed Boards that fostered a system of “erroneous, defective, and indefinite religious instruction”. While they welcomed the establishment of a University in Sydney, they disapproved of any system that caused students to withdraw from Church colleges to be subject to the effects of the secular character of the University.71 No doubt Bishop Broughton greatly influenced the resolutions, and it is perhaps not surprising that he refused the Governor’s offer of a place on the University Senate. “It will be the great emporium of false and anti-church views in this hemisphere”, he declared.72
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It is interesting to note that in the appointment of the first three professors – in Classics, Mathematics, and Chemistry and Experimental Philosophy – the person appointed to Classics, combined with the position of Principal, was John Woolley, a graduate of Oxford and an ordained clergyman of the Church of England. There was, of course, some concern and argument over the choice made by the Selection Committee in England. However, the Committee argued that many had testified to Dr Woolley’s acceptance by persons of all religious persuasions, and that in a letter to a member of the Committee he had written: “I took orders simply to qualify myself as a schoolmaster in England. I have taken, nor intend to take, no part in English ecclesiastical matters – and, if I am so fortunate as to proceed to Sydney, I should consider myself entirely as a layman.”

Professors Woolley and Pell arrived in July 1852, and Professor Smith in the following September. As a result of their representation to the Senate, they were to be styled ‘Professors of the University’, and their lectures were to be compulsory for all matriculated students, except those belonging to an affiliated college. This latter exception was to be changed, but it established more definitely the pattern of supremacy of the central secular teaching university over any attached or affiliated colleges. The essentially lay Senate, with appointees of and endowed by the State, confirmed the developing dominance of the State in all levels of education.

73 C. Turney et al, op.cit., p.69
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At the University’s inauguration on the 11th October 1852 in the hall of the Sydney College building, where the University’s first teaching was conducted, the speeches of the Vice-Provost, Charles Nicholson, and the Principal, John Woolley, reflected both the English tradition and the process of reform in university education. Such reform included not so much a denial of religion or an indifference to it, but the need to separate it from the central business of the University while at the same time acknowledging the important role of others in the provision of religious instruction. Woolley invoked the spirit of Alfred, the founder of Oxford, including the spirit of his religion in which “true religion and sound learning cannot brook to dwell apart … the effect of science … cannot but be to awaken the consciousness of our spiritual nature, the desire to satisfy our spiritual longings, and to enter into our spiritual relations.” Over time, however, the passions and misconceptions of men had caused division and a lack of unity, and therefore, declared Woolley, “in a national school of learning, theology would now tyrannically usurp that pre-eminence which she blamelessly enjoyed of old.” It was therefore important not to “enforce upon all the religious convictions of a part”\(^75\); that would only cause greater division, misunderstanding and jealousy.

\(^{75}\) H. E. Barff *op.cit.* pp.31-32
A Complementary Role for Denominational Colleges:

In his speech, Charles Nicholson acknowledged the role that affiliated denominational institutions might play, as well as that of parents and guardians, in more effectually providing for the religious training and general behaviour of students of the University. “Dispensing mere secular instruction”, he said, “and leaving the inculcation of religious truth to the spiritual guardians of each denomination … the University presents the widest possible area for all who are willing to come within her precincts … (To) make revealed religion a special element in our teaching would be at once to destroy the catholic character of the institution, and limit its influence merely to one single class of religionists. Such a proposition would be totally inconsistent with the spirit of an institution established and maintained from public funds, to which all alike contribute, and in the benefits of which all have a right to share.” He noted that a refusal to blend secular and religious teaching was not an indication of indifference “to those higher objects of revealed truth”, but of a desire to leave such teaching to those “whose special function it may be to assume and to exercise such a trust.”

Nicholson, who was also Speaker of the Legislative Council, indicated that the establishment of ‘suffragan’ or affiliated denominational residential colleges was contemplated by the Legislature, and that they would assume a complementary rather than a competitive role with that of the University: “Their action might be carried on simultaneously, and in perfect harmony with that of the University – those multifarious branches of secular instruction, which educated men of
whatever creed must know, being communicated by the one institution, the religious training and moral superintendence of the student being entrusted to the other.”76

Despite the publicly declared overtures, and the growing support among some Anglican clergy and laity, the bishops were resolutely opposed to the setting up of a Church of England college in connection with a University avowedly secular in its teaching. As Bishop Broughton was in England, Bishop Tyrrell of Newcastle led the fight against the establishment of a college, strongly supported by Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand. In a letter to the Sydney Morning Herald, Tyrrell wrote that “endowing affiliated colleges would not remove the objectionable principle of the University – neither would it practically cure the fearful evil of the absence of religious teaching, because only those students residing in a college would be subject to the teaching of the college, and while there were twenty students of any denomination residing in its college, there might be 200 out of college, who would still be destitute of all religious teaching.”77 He indicated that he had not the slightest doubt as to the opinion of the Bishop of Sydney, and that his Lordship would never countenance any connection with the University of Sydney while it had no provision or encouragement for, nor recognition of the teaching of religion. While objecting to a University in which religion was expressly excluded, the Rector of St. James’ Church in King Street, Robert Allwood, expressed concern about
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assumptions being made on behalf of Bishop Broughton and whether in fact his objection would remain if, as petitioned by the professors of the University, the University ‘College’ was abolished thus removing what appeared to be a model educational establishment with religion left out.”78 The professors had argued that the name ‘College’ was associated “in English ears” with complete education and moral relations between pupils and tutors, and it was therefore inappropriate to apply such a name to education that excluded religious teaching.

Nicholson responded the next day by stating that Tyrrell’s views, and a memorandum signed by Tyrrell and Archdeacon Cowper which called for funds to be allocated to support a Professor of Divinity in each of any denominational college, were not representative of the sentiments of the clergy of the diocese. He rejoiced that his friend, Mr Allwood, had declined to support such a proposal, which, he wrote, he knew “to be in opposition to the declared wishes of many of the clergy and influential laity of the Church of England, who are anxious to participate in the advantages of that liberal system of education, which is held out to them, in common with all other classes in the colony.”79

A Church of England College:

In 1852, Broughton had been trying to get the British government to approve a greater freedom for the bishops, clergy and laity of the colonies to determine in

---

78 Ibid p.3
79 Sydney Morning Herald 9th November 1852, p.5
their own synods rules for the government of their respective dioceses. He also saw it important that the Province (composed of a number of dioceses, presided over by a bishop or archbishop called the ‘Metropolitan’) be autonomous in dealing with its internal affairs and not tied to Canterbury.80 His moves, however, were viewed by a number of prominent Sydney Anglican laymen, including Nicholson, as an attempt to increase the power of the Bishop over his clergy and over the laity. They were men not only involved in the professional and commercial life of the Colony, but also in its administration and in the quest for responsible government. Though respectful, they did not easily warm to dominant, even dictatorial episcopal authority such as they believed was evident in the Bishop of Sydney. Many saw the opening for financial aid to be given for the establishment of a Church of England college in connection with the University and did not share the same fears that had been expressed by Bishops Broughton, Tyrrell and Selwyn. Any approval of the Church’s official position could be seen as a victory for the bishops and their authority in general.81

In December, the Chief Justice, Sir Alfred Stephen, chaired a large meeting which, in part, resolved that it had become “the duty of Members of the Church of England promptly to make provision for the moral and religious superintendence of their youth by the establishment of a separate College; independent as to its internal discipline and rules, but in permanent alliance with
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the University as at present constituted.”82 While Tyrrell expressed to Broughton
his concern and disappointment that the Chief Justice had lent such support to the
University, the move to establish a Church of England college was given further
encouragement by a committee of the University Senate which recommended
that, in fixing upon the site of a permanent home for the University, a locality be
chosen “where a number (say four) of colleges of Residence may also be erected
within such a distance of the University itself as may enable the students to
attend the lecture rooms of the University.” 83 This was a wise move on the part
of the Senate, as it meant that the colleges could not claim that distance
prevented their students being taught by the professors of the University! In
April 1853 the committee for the Church of England college put out a prospectus
for what was to be called ‘Queen’s College’, and requested government
assistance. The co-operation between the committee and the University was
clear, and Bishop Selwyn wrote to Bishop Tyrrell urging that they come to some
agreement with the University. Among proposals they made were (i) that “before
any degree or honour be conferred by the University, every student shall be
required to produce a certificate of competent religious attainment from the
Principal of the affiliated College of the religious Denomination to which the
said student belongs … And if there be no such College in connexion with the
Denomination to which the student belongs, that a similar certificate be required
from such religious teacher or other responsible person, as the Senate of the
University may, in each case, accredit for the purpose”; and (ii) that students of
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the affiliated colleges be not compelled to attend the lectures of the professors of
the University.\footnote{C.Turney et al \textit{op.cit.} p.84}

\textbf{The Affiliated Colleges Act 1854:}

At a conference in July, the University insisted that in all the branches of purely
secular instruction, attendance of all matriculated students, whether living in
affiliated colleges or not, should be compulsory. In line, however, with Clause 20
of the University Act that permitted the Senate to secure the attendance of
undergraduates at divine worship, the University agreed to the Church’s proposal
concerning a certificate of competent religious attainment. Both these conditions
were written as Clauses into the ‘Act to provide for the establishment and
endowment of Colleges within the University of Sydney’ (the Affiliated Colleges
Act) which received the Governor’s assent on 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 1854. The latter
clause inevitably gave rise to a great deal of concern and protest within the
University; it seemed to contradict the requirement that there be no religious
tests, and, according to the professors, it endangered the peace of the
University\footnote{H.E.Barff \textit{op.cit.} p.49}. The Clause was never enforced, and was removed by amendment
to the Act in 1858.

Whatever activities were conducted within the College, whether of a religious
nature or in support of the courses taught within the University, they had no
official bearing upon the requirements for the awards of the University. The College met a definite need for residence and care; it afforded the opportunity for extra tuition and assistance in preparing for University lectures and examinations; and it could provide the systematic religious instruction desired by the Church according to the particular denomination. Such instruction was indeed seen by many who insisted on only secular instruction within the University as a most valuable adjunct to the student’s tertiary training. While perhaps seeking to emulate in structure and style the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the foundation colleges in Sydney were to be anything but; nor were they like those of London University - teaching institutions in their own right presenting candidates to the University for examination and award. Albeit in a context of religious principles and purposes, the colleges were primarily places of residence, autonomous as to their internal arrangements, but subordinate to the educational authority of the central secular teaching University.86 While Sir Charles Nicholson noted that great care had been taken to ensure that the colleges would be essential members of the University87, the secular institution clearly had succeeded in consigning the ‘sacred’ to the sidelines.

The Affiliated Colleges Act provided for an amount of up to twenty thousand pounds from government revenue to match whatever the College founders raised for the cost of the college building, but not before ten thousand pounds had been so subscribed by the founders. A sum of five hundred pounds would be allocated
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in perpetuity to support the salary of the college Principal. Of the 126 acres set aside in 1854 for the University at Grose Farm, sub-grants of at least 18 acres each, selected by the Senate, were to be made for the erection of colleges in connection with the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and Wesleyan Methodist churches. The colleges were to be built within five years of the Deed of Grant being issued, and the Senate was to approve the building designs. The authority of the University was again dominant. The direct aid given by the State, however, was to be seen by some as compromising the secular nature of the University and would not be given in the foundation of colleges in Australia’s other ‘first’ universities.

**St. Paul’s College and Thomas Moore’s College:**

The foundation stone of a Church of England College, now to be called St. Paul’s, was laid on 25\(^{th}\) January 1856. Its architect was Edmund Blacket, who had also been commissioned to draw the plans for the University which was then under construction. Bishop Broughton had died in England in February 1853, and the new Bishop, Frederic Barker, was present and offered prayers at the ceremony.\(^{88}\) Barker was an evangelical, influenced by Charles Simeon at Cambridge, and chosen by the evangelical Archbishop of Canterbury, John Bird Sumner, under whom Barker had served when Sumner was Bishop of Liverpool. He was a “plain evangelical” whose mission was “to transform a crudely
materialistic colony by the power of the word of God.” Barker was to establish a permanent Evangelical character to the diocese over the twenty-eight years of his episcopate, and the matter of collegiate training for Australian clergy was pressingly important to achieve his purposes. Very much as a result of the disputes over the establishment of a Church of England college, and the suspicions held by significant members of the laity concerning episcopal power, the Bishop of Sydney was only given the right of Visitor to St. Paul’s College. He had no real say in its affairs. Furthermore, all members of the College were to be matriculated students of the “godless” University. St. James’ College had closed. The Bishop needed another college to train colonial candidates for the ministry. He acted quickly, taking advantage of the bequest of the house and grounds at Liverpool of Thomas Moore, who had died in 1840. Moore had been a carpenter, master boat builder, land holder and magistrate, and was involved in the foundation of the Bank of New South Wales, an auxiliary of the Bible Society in NSW, and an auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society. He admired Bishop Broughton, and, in the terms of his will, he left his house and land “for a College or Establishment to be called Moore’s College, for the education of Boys or Youths of the Protestant persuasion in the principles of Christian Knowledge.” The trustees agreed with Bishop Barker’s request to found a college to be known as Moore Theological College. “We believe”, wrote the

88 Judd & Cable op.cit. p.68. Bishop Selwyn declined the offer to translate to Sydney, and New Zealand was detached from the jurisdiction of Sydney; the Governor of NSW, Fitzroy, advised against Tyrrell, as he had so alienated the laity over the matter of the University and Colleges.  
89 Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable op.cit. p.70 
90 William James Lawton The Better Time to Be: Utopian Attitudes to Society Among Sydney Anglicans 1885 to 1914 New South Wales University Press, Sydney, 1990, p.15
Bishop, “that we act in accordance with the intentions of the late Mr. Moore in making this a theological training College where those who desire to enter the ministry of the Church of England will generally be required to reside.”\textsuperscript{92}

The College, which, towards the end of the century, was to move to its present site in Newtown, adjacent to St. Paul’s College, was opened on the 1\textsuperscript{st} March 1856. Its foundation and opening so close in time to the foundation of St. Paul’s; its lack of any connection with the University, yet intimate association and favour with the Bishop and the diocese; its evangelical fervour and teaching; and later its location alongside St. Paul’s and the University, all made for an interesting juxtaposition, that would continue to be somewhat representative of the different emphases of Anglican involvement in universities and colleges well into the future. A report in the \textit{Australian Churchman} in December 1867, noted “We know that even at the SPG Office in London, there is an unfounded impression that Moore College is merely a narrow Calvanistic Seminary, got up in opposition to the more liberal one of St. Paul’s!”\textsuperscript{93} Nevertheless, what would be the basis and character of Sydney diocesan involvement and influence in university affairs and in colleges had been set.

The opening of Moore College was one factor that contributed to the failure for some time of St. Paul’s to attract residents: “I do not think the College (St.
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Paul’s) is in high favor at head quarters of the Church of England”, commented Professor Maurice Pell to the Committee of Inquiry in 1859. St. Paul’s College opened on a permanent basis in February 1858, with eight resident and three non-resident students, while in the following year there were four residents and four non-residents. There were none in 1861 and only two in 1862! These numbers, however, also reflected the low numbers of undergraduates enrolled at the University in its early years. Most undergraduates were from Sydney town, and there were those who did not like the move to the outskirts at Grose Farm. Sir Charles Nicholson noted that there had been complaints “that stables are not provided for the horses of the young men.”, and Professor Woolley found it objectionable that those who rode were therefore forced to keep their horses at neighbouring hotels! Fees for College were high, keeping enrolments low, but the fees could not be lowered until there were higher enrolments! The University, let alone the College, was seen by many as a place for the rich and privileged. It was difficult for the non-resident students to make a return journey from the town for College tuition in the evening. A small number of residents in a building that some considered more than adequate in size to house the whole University in its early years, would also not have been conducive to fostering a sense of collegiality. The first Warden, the Reverend Henry Hose, was
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confident, however, that numbers would increase “when families residing in the
country begin more and more to send their sons to the University.” Mr Hose
was not to see such an increase; he was dismissed in 1861 after being seen drunk
on a Manly ferry.

St. John’s College:

Archbishop Polding, who, unlike Bishop Broughton earlier, had accepted a place
on the University Senate in 1856, encouraged in the late 1850s the building of a
Catholic college. “If we have not been the first in the field”, he wrote, “let us, as
befits our name, redeem the delay by an energy and devotion so much the more
noble and sustained.” A Bill to incorporate the College of St. John the
Evangelist, along much the same lines as that for St. Paul’s, was passed in the
Legislative Assembly in November 1857, and it received the Governor’s assent
in July the following year. A site of eighteen acres on the corner of Parramatta
and Missenden Roads was selected, and the foundation stone of the William
Wilkinson Wardell ‘Gothic Revival’ building was laid by Archbishop Polding on
the 3rd January 1860. The first Rector, the Very Reverend John Forrest, opened
the College and conducted classes for resident and non-resident students in
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temporary premises in Newtown Road (now City Road) in 1861. The new building was occupied in September 1863, but like St. Paul’s, the early years saw a very low enrolment, there being only two residents in the year of the College’s move to its permanent site! Numbers fluctuated, never rising above ten in the 1860s, but in 1874, on the arrival in Sydney of Roger Bede Vaughan as Coadjutor Archbishop and on his taking up residence at St. John’s, he commented: “I found it a ruin without a student!”

Collegiate numbers did not grow until after the opening of the Presbyterian St. Andrew’s College in 1873, with twenty-eight resident students enrolled in the College by 1878. By this time, all three colleges had adopted schemes to allow non-matriculated students to be enrolled, provided they matriculated within a given period of time. It had taken considerable time, and a great deal of internal dispute and division, much of it centred around the Reverend John Dunmore Lang, for the Presbyterians to open a college following the passing of appropriate legislation in 1866. When they did, they provided for graduates of the University to continue at the College to take courses in divinity. Such a provision for and restriction to men with a degree to train for the ministry, unlike the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics, brought to St. Andrew’s “men and money and the strong interest of the Church.” The fourth denomination to have been favoured with the opportunity to take up a site in relation to the University, the
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Wesleyan Methodists, did not do so until 1917, even though an Act of Incorporation had been passed in 1860!

Conclusion:

The finding in the Report of the Select Committee on the Sydney University that it had been a “grievous mistake” to establish affiliated colleges, certainly reflected a sense, on the part of a number of those interviewed, of great apprehension about the future role of the colleges, and especially about the role of any sectarian representation in and consequent influence upon the affairs of the University. Strong criticism came from the professors. Professor Pell indicated that part of the reason for the difficulties being faced by the University in attracting numbers was, notwithstanding the affiliated colleges, the influence of the clergy whose “notion is ... that secular and religious instruction should not be in any degree separated.”¹⁰⁵ He felt that any membership of the Senate by Fellows of affiliated colleges would endanger the fundamental principle that the University was secular in its character, and that, unless the Professors of the University were also on the Senate, it would be “fatal to put the Wardens of the Colleges on the Senate.”¹⁰⁶ John Smith, Professor of Chemistry and Experimental Philosophy, stated that he had never liked the affiliated college system, preferring the Scottish model of colleges which are “merely different buildings where the studies go on”, but are not places of residence; “the students

¹⁰⁵ Select Committee Minutes op.cit. 27th September 1859, p.38
¹⁰⁶ Ibid p.43
merely go there to hear lectures."\textsuperscript{107} He believed that “sectarian education should not be given in the great educational institutions supported by the Government”, and that the existence of sectarian colleges “withdraws public sympathy and support in a great degree from the University itself.”\textsuperscript{108} He agreed that the greatest support for the colleges was in their provision of lodging and care, and that while they might be useful in supplying the branches of education that cannot be afforded in the University, such “usefulness would be very much circumscribed on account of its denominational nature.”\textsuperscript{109} William Charles Windeyer, one of the first graduates and a member of the Legislative Council, and later Attorney-General, Vice-Chancellor and Chancellor of the University, stated that it was inadvisable to have affiliated colleges, and that he objected to the recognition by the University of any religious sects at all. There was the danger that the religious character of the colleges may encroach on the secular teaching of the University. He believed it was objectionable that many of the Fellows of the affiliated colleges were also in the University Senate.\textsuperscript{110}

The Committee found that there had been “no desire on the part of the religious denominations generally to establish Affiliated Colleges ... in connection with the University”, but that because there was the movement to establish St. Paul’s College, other denominations had been stirred into similar action “more, perhaps, from a simple desire to acquire the same status, than from any confidence in its

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Ibid} 12\textsuperscript{th} October 1859, p.80  
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Ibid}  
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Ibid} p.81  
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid} 28\textsuperscript{th} September 1859, pp.47-49
importance on other grounds.” 111 The Committee noted that if, however, the denominations wished to establish such colleges, they could do so but not receive State support.

The Report of the Select Committee was largely ignored, though it resulted in professorial representation on the University Senate. The University, something of a mix of the patterns of London, Scotland and Ireland, with nevertheless something of the ‘airs and graces’ – even the pretensions – of Oxford and Cambridge, had established its dominance and authority as the teaching institution, with residential colleges, autonomous as to their programs, on the side. John Woolley and Francis Merewether, a Fellow of the Senate and also a later Vice-Chancellor and Chancellor, noted that the collegiate arrangements were in harmony with the report of the Commission into Oxford University in that the colleges had other important objects than being established exclusively for imparting religious instruction: “they are boarding houses for students, where they are submitted to proper discipline, and they also supply the tutorial instruction, and thus form a tutorial system subordinate to a professorial (one).”112 In the politics of establishing university education in a developing and diverse colony, the pragmatic view tended at times to take precedence over principle: priests and professors, Church, College and Campus could co-exist if

111 Report from the Select Committee on the Sydney University, op.cit.p.10
112 Ibid p.122; Select Committee Minutes op.cit. 3rd February 1860, pp.125-126. The University, however, had been unable to carry out the provisions of its Act of Incorporation both to secure the attendance of undergraduates at their respective places of worship, and to undertake the licensing of boarding houses (C.Turney et al op.cit. p.129)
not conjoin. In the first few difficult decades of the University in Sydney, the affiliated denominational colleges, contrary to the fears of the Select Committee and of Professor Woolley, were rather inauspicious and, arguably, largely ineffectual.
CHAPTER TWO

Aspirations After The Divine:

Further Sydney Colleges

“The Divine blessing can never be expected to rest upon an Institution so iniquitously originated as the St. Andrew’s College.”

- John Dunmore Lang, April 1875

The view of the Select Committee into the Sydney University (1859) that State support should not be given to denominational colleges, reflected not just a concern for the possible interference and intrusion of divisive sectarian teaching into the secular curriculum of the University, but a growing sense of the increasingly diverse and egalitarian nature of colonial society by the mid 1800s. It was a view held among churchmen, as well as among the professors and some promoters of the University - most notably, John Dunmore Lang, a member of the Select Committee and founder of The Australian College. The matter of State aid to religion, embodied in Governor Bourke’s ‘Church Act’ of 1836, and the role played by the Reverend Mr Lang in the development of the Presbyterian denomination in the Colony, were significant in the delayed but eventual establishment of a Presbyterian college affiliated with the University. They are more importantly significant to the whole pattern of relationships between church, college and campus that was developed during the later decades of the 1800s.
Presbyterian Divisions and the Issue of State Aid:

The Presbyterian denomination was one of the beneficiaries of Governor Bourke’s determination to break the monopoly of the Church of England and give equal recognition to the other three main Christian churches in the Colony. State financial aid was given to match voluntary donations for the building of churches or ministers’ houses, and to pay the minister’s stipend where at least one hundred people lived within a reasonable distance of a proposed church. However, just after 1836, the Presbyterian church in the Colony was beset by a period of division and dispute that frustrated both the widest distribution of Government support for the denomination and efforts to promote Presbyterian involvement in secondary and tertiary education for nearly thirty years. Dissatisfied with the quality of other clergy in the Sydney Presbytery and with the control of the Presbytery’s affairs by the Church of Scotland, Lang formed a break-away ‘Synod of New South Wales’ in 1837. The break was healed for a short time in 1840, with the formation of a united ‘Synod of Australia’, linked with the established Church of Scotland, but in 1842 Lang again withdrew and later, in 1850, formed once again the ‘Synod of New South Wales’. In 1843, the more fundamental Calvinist evangelicals broke away from the more moderate members of the Church of Scotland and, from this “Disruption”, formed the ‘Free Church of Scotland’. In 1846, in similar vein, three clergymen and one

---

elder broke from the ‘Synod of Australia’ to form the ‘Synod of Eastern Australia’. While not opposed to State aid for religion, this latter group was opposed to what they believed to be indiscriminate State endowments in support of erroneous teaching in other churches. The group refused aid rather than be party to such support. So, by the 1850s, there was the Synod of Australia, the Synod of New South Wales, and the Synod of Eastern Australia.

By the 1850’s, Sydney’s population had grown to nearly one hundred and ninety thousand people – emancipists and free immigrants, labourers, artisans, merchants and professional men – professing a variety of beliefs and attitudes. There were churches other than the four denominations recognised in 1836, such as the Baptists and the Congregationalists, and there were those of the Jewish faith. When the Affiliated Colleges Act was passed in 1854, with grants of land to the four churches to establish colleges, the Empire newspaper attacked the exclusive nature of the Act, and noted that it counteracted the very design and purpose of the ‘Church Act’ of 1836. Bourke’s Act sought justice and equality against the monopoly of the Church of England; nearly twenty years later, with the position of the other major denominations entrenched, selective State aid was seen as anything but ‘just and equal’ in a society seeking to establish and affirm its own distinct character. Many Protestants were both opposed to any measure that might continue to maintain a position of privilege for any denomination,

---

2 K.R.Campbell op.cit. p.20.
3 In 1854 there was added a congregation, under the Reverend Adam Thomson, associated with the ‘United Presbyterian Church of Scotland’, a dissenting body that had come into existence in 1847.
such as the Anglicans, and to the support of the teaching of what was regarded as Roman error. It was seen as increasingly intolerable, and as a stumbling-block to a united society, that the State should discriminate in the support it gave and that in so doing sustained sectarian division. State assistance to the Churches, and to their schools, with a consequent growth of denominational schools, “meant a fragmentation of effort and great inefficiency; many children were denied access to the 3 R’s, let alone religion.” In 1855, Lang wrote an article in the Empire about the need for a Presbyterian College, but clearly blamed State aid as an issue dividing the Presbyterian church and thus preventing a united effort in establishing a college embracing all divisions of the Church. The following year he formed the ‘Society for the Abolition of all State Support for Religion in New South Wales’, having revised and reprinted three lectures he had given in 1842 on ‘The Impolity and Injustice of State Aid to Religion’.

Sectarian Competition or Secular Cohesion:

In 1836, the wider distribution of state aid to the churches was a decided act reflecting the growing demand for a less exclusive and more equal society; by 1860, somewhat ironically, the increasing demand for its abolition was a

---

5 Ian Breward *Australia “The Most Godless Place Under Heaven”?* Melbourne College of Divinity Bicentennial Lectures, Beacon Hill Books, Melbourne, 1988, p.21
7 Ibid p.189
8 K.R.Campbell *op.cit.* p.231
reflection of the same thing. It was a time, however, when the society was even more jealousy seeking to guard its developing character as being open to all and giving special favour to none. The Churches had a role to play, but it was not central to the cohesion, growth and good government of the colony. Religion was not denounced, but, as represented by the Churches, it was no longer seen as the means of bringing people together and infusing them with the nourishment required for building a strong self-governing colony. That task was being given to education; and it was seen by many as essential that education be secular and non-sectarian. By the 1850s “denominationism was an odious thing. The ‘mundane competitiveness’ which infected denominational policies in education was openly deplored and liberal politicians were accusing the churches of blocking educational reform. Legislatures were restive at the cost of State support of religion and the prospect of the repeal of the Church Acts tended to heighten denominational divisions and to poison the atmosphere in which university constitutions were debated.”

In a sense, the term ‘secular’ – sometimes implying the things of this world with no particular reference to the realities or otherwise of the things of the next, and often to educational instruction which was religiously neutral, free of dogmatic teaching – normally came to be associated with “non-denominational”, free of any particular sectarian influence. That view of education was winning out over what had been Bishop Broughton’s aim and that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy

---

9 J.D.Bollen op.cit. p.56
in the role that education could play in building a better society than the one from which most European inhabitants and settlers had come. All this was clearly reflected in the foundation articles governing Sydney University, and a short time later, in the establishment of a university in Melbourne.

**Abolition of State Aid to Religion, and Presbyterian Union:**

Supported by Lang, the ‘Grants for Public Worship Prohibition Act’ was eventually passed in December 1862, prohibiting the granting of allowances or stipends to ministers of religion who were not in receipt of them at the time. Those who were would continue to be supported. The Act removed one of the major stumbling-blocks to unity within the Presbyterian church, and to cooperation in the setting up of a Presbyterian college at the University. The Act of abolition was not anti-religious, but an acknowledgement by the State “that religion must be left unhampered by man-made laws to permeate society.”

This would not be easy, however, as had been evidenced in the process of negotiation and expedient compromise in relation to the ‘Act of Incorporation of the Sydney University’ and the ‘Affiliated Colleges Act’. Nevertheless, the power of the more conservative supporters of the churches had been weakened, and “the liberal radicalism of Lang, and many who had been Dissenters in England or Voluntaryists in Scotland, proved a natural ally of the more secular liberalism

---

10 Ian Breward *A History of Australian Churches* Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1993, pp.68&79
11 Naomi Turner *op.cit.* p.249
and radicalism which sought to assert public control over education." Religion, somewhat in William Wentworth’s terms, would be “instilled” rather than dogmatically taught; denominational activity, in the form of schools and colleges, could play, as Sir Charles Nicholson had noted, a complementary rather than a competitive role in the educational process. Pragmatic considerations determined a proper place for religious teaching – but in its place, subordinate to the overriding principle that education for the Colony’s European inhabitants was to be inclusive and free of sectarian influence, dominance or control. Denominational colleges could co-exist with and make a contribution to, but not be central in the life of the University; though the colleges themselves would see their task as enhancing and adding an extra dimension to the lives of their student residents.

In 1865 the four Presbyterian groups, including Lang’s but excluding a small number of Free Churchmen, came together in a united Church. As previously noted, Lang had a long association and involvement with education, especially through his Australian College. He very much wanted that College to engage in tertiary level activity and be associated with the new University. He desired a training institution for the clergy. Unity now gave opportunity for the realisation of that goal, though the Australian College venture had failed and any new

---

12 Ian Breward *Australia “The Most Godless Place ...?”* p.31
institution would most likely need to be located and organised according to the terms of the ‘Affiliated Colleges Act’ of 1854.

**John Dunmore Lang and Moves for a Presbyterian College:**

In seeming contradiction to the ‘Act of Abolition’, this would mean the acceptance of State aid in the provision of funds for the setting up of the College and for its Head or Principal as provided for in the ‘Affiliated Colleges Act’. But this would be a different relationship. Lang’s quarrel with State support of religion was in its consequent support of the teaching of sectarian dogma. While he preached dogmatically to the members of his church, to the faithful, to those outside the church, “he abandoned dogma and propounded instead a non-denominational Christianity emphasising what was common to the major Protestant groups … in schools … religion should be taught but dogma avoided.”¹³ Lang believed that it was possible to have schools in which a common Christianity provided the basis for morality.¹⁴ Thus, he had rejected Broughton’s overtures of involvement with the King’s School but had for a short time been associated with the non-denominational Sydney College, where the Bible was to be read without note or comment. Indeed, in a letter to the *Sydney Gazette* just prior to the laying of the foundation stone of the Sydney College, he had defended the College’s stance, and the authority and self-sufficiency of the Bible, by noting that “the Bible Society sends forth the word of God into all

---

¹³ D.W.A.Baker *op.cit.* p.22
¹⁴ Ian Breward *A History of Australian Churches*, p.31
lands, without note or comment, or explanation, trusting to the might of that instrument from the divine armoury for the wished-for effect … No, no, Mr. Editor, the grand principle of Protestant Christianity is this: ‘God is his own interpreter, and he will make it plain’.”\(^\text{15}\)

Prior to the foundation of Sydney University, Lang had suggested that each denominational college within the proposed university should be staffed by four professors, funded and approved by the University, teaching all the courses within the Faculty of Arts – the University providing teaching in Medicine, Law and the Physical Sciences.\(^\text{16}\) Nevertheless, despite the rejection of this proposal, Lang had no quarrel with acknowledging the teaching authority of the University, free of sectarian influence and dogmatic religious teaching. He accepted that a Presbyterian College could properly play an adjunct role in its provision of residence, tutorial assistance, care and moral supervision of those attending the University, though he was concerned that the State should not appear to give particular support to the provision of theological teaching. However, he was concerned for the training of men for the ministry and believed that the ‘Affiliated Colleges Act’ would allow for theological candidates to reside in the College. In the end, candidates for the ministry would be trained following their graduation from the University. Presbyterian young people were already


\(^{16}\) David S. Macmillan ‘The University of Sydney – The Pattern and the Public Reaction 1850-1870’ The Australian University Vol.1, No.1, July 1963, p.41
attending St. Paul’s College, and it was inequitable that the Presbyterian Church
should be forfeiting what was rightfully its own in terms of a resident student
population and the physical and financial provisions already enjoyed by the
Anglicans and the Roman Catholics. He was suspicious of both.

During the late 1850s and early 1860s, prior to their coming together in a united
Church in 1865, Presbyterians argued about the nature and provisions of a
Presbyterian College within the University. A Select Committee of the
Legislative Assembly established in October 1859 to consider a Bill for the
Incorporation of St. Andrew’s College within the University of Sydney – a Bill
urged upon the Legislative Assembly by the St. Andrew’s College Committee -
received petitions from clergy and members of the various branches of the
Church, objecting, for example, to such proposals as (i) naming the College
‘Saint Andrew’s College’ “as being an unmeaning and sectarian designation …”;
(ii) the inclusion of “systematic religious instruction” as this “would imply an
approval of the principle of State support for religion – systematic religious
instruction being understood by all Presbyterians to signify … the instruction
afforded by a Professor of Divinity to candidates for the Christian ministry”; (iii)
the distinction between ministers of religion and laymen concerning those who
could be elected to the Council by subscribers to the College, as it should be left
“to the good sense and patriotism of the subscribers generally to choose the fittest
persons, whether ministers or laymen”; and (iv) the requirement that “the
Principal shall always be a minister of religion, as contrary to the recent Act of
the Imperial Parliament for the better government of Colleges and Universities of Scotland, in virtue of which Sir David Brewster, a distinguished layman, has just been elected Principal of the University of Edinburgh.” 17 Lang, a member of the Assembly, supported the petitioners; indeed, the petitions were probably drawn up by him.18 The Committee’s report left a number of issues unresolved, but it essentially reported against the proposed Bill. At the same time, Lang introduced a Bill for a Presbyterian College, without reference to “systematic religious instruction” and emphasising the College’s secular function – priority should not be given to any immediate setting up of a Theological Hall for the training of clergy. The Bill however lapsed with the end of the Assembly’s 1859-60 session. It should also be noted that, with the lack of a tradition within Scottish universities of residential colleges, there were those who felt that the need for such a college in Sydney was not a priority.

St. Andrew’s College - "So Iniquitously Originated":

Little progress was made until after the union of 1865, though debate continued over issues such as the name of the College, the composition and method of election of the Council, and the way in which theological training would be offered. Following a number of introductions and re-introductions, amendments and withdrawals, lobbying and conflicts of personality, a Bill to incorporate a

17 Proceedings of the Committee 1859-60 ‘St. Andrew’s College Bill Report’ Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly (NSW) 1859-1860, p.8
18 K.R.Campbell op.cit. p.222
college was passed in December 1867. The incorporation was not “gazetted” until 1873, following the election of the first Principal, but the College marks the date of its foundation as the 29th November 1870 (St. Andrew’s Day eve) when the first meeting of the College Council was held. The College was to be called ‘St. Andrew’s’ – the term ‘Presbyterian’, in the end, was regarded as too restrictive – and the Principal, who was required to be a “duly ordained Presbyterian minister”\(^{19}\), was to be elected by the College’s Council rather than by the General Assembly of the Church. All students were to be afforded systematic religious instruction, though the Principal might exempt non-resident students from any or all of the subjects offered. Theological instruction – “such branches of learning as may not be taught in the University” - would be provided for ministry candidates when arrangements were completed with the Church.\(^{20}\)

Following consultation with the University Senate, the Wesleyan Methodists, and the promoters of the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital concerning available land on the Missenden Road end of the University Reserve, St. Andrew’s was allotted ten acres on the corner of Missenden Road and Bligh Street (now Carillon Avenue).

The election of the Principal proved much more difficult. Lang wished to be Principal, but his manner and methods had alienated many, and his age – he was 73 when the College was finally incorporated in March 1873 – was seen by

\(^{19}\) This requirement was changed with the appointment in 1999 of Dr W.L.(Bill) Porges to the position of Principal.

\(^{20}\) C.Turney \textit{et al.} \textit{op.cit.} pp.165-166 (After 1878, candidates were to be graduates of a university. Theological instruction was given in the manses of the teachers prior to the Theological Hall being established within the College building in 1894-5)
members of the College Council as a disadvantage. The Council first elected the Reverend John Kinross, Free Church minister at Kiama, on 27th February 1872. Lang, however, challenged the election on the basis that it had been held on a declared Public Thanksgiving holiday, and consequently Kinross requested that his election be declared null and void.21 In September, Adam Thomson, who was the first Moderator General following the union of 1865, was elected. Again, Lang challenged on the basis of Thomson being a member of the Council – there were to be 12 members of Council and a Principal – but the Supreme Court upheld Thomson’s election.22 Though he would have been subject to the same challenge had he been elected, Lang threatened an appeal to the Privy Council, but later, while in England, withdrew from such a course. In a letter to a friend, dated 23rd April 1875, he wrote in a somewhat resigned manner: “The Divine blessing can never be expected to rest upon an Institution so iniquitously originated as the St. Andrew’s College, and I am sure Divine Providence will vindicate my procedure in the matter in some way.”23

The foundation stone of the permanent building was laid by the Moderator, John Kinross, in May 1874. Within a year, Kinross was unanimously called to be Principal following Thomson’s untimely death in November 1874. The Main building was largely completed in 1877, and the College numbered some twenty

21 R.I.Jack The Andrew’s Book: St. Andrew’s College within the University of Sydney 3rd ed., The Principal and Councillors of St. Andrew’s College, Sydney, 1989, p.19
22 Ibid.
23 K.R.Campbell op.cit. p.297
students in 1880. Kinross was clearly loved and respected, and under his leadership till his retirement in 1901, the College grew physically and in numbers; it attracted generous donations and benefactions from the Presbyterian community, and its Divinity Faculty built a strong reputation. While not gaining the position of Principal, nor realising the establishment of a college that would teach the Arts and be affordable and available to those with ability in every class in society, Lang had in no small way contributed to the College being a place of influence yet independence within the University and the wider community. It would afford more than just residence, general and moral superintendence, and tutorial assistance. It gave recognition to the professorial teaching and examining role of the University, while at the same time its inclusion of theological training within a framework associated with the University was a significant and distinctive feature of its activity. Emerging from the debates about State aid to religion, and from the divisions and debates within the Presbyterian denomination – a background of “factionalism, legalism, conspiracy, and ‘artful dodging’” - St. Andrew’s College certainly met the Church’s need for a training institution for its clergy, and the University’s need for places of accommodation and care; and it sat, as required, on the sidelines.

---

24 C.Turney et al. op.cit. p.165. Prior to the building of the present St. Andrew’s, Thomson negotiated the lease of “Cypress Hall” on City Road, previously used by St. John’s College as temporary premises and now accommodating St. Michael’s College and the Catholic chaplaincy.

25 P. Cameron Finishing School for Blokes: College life exposed Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards
Three Colleges - Pious Aims, Practical Constraints:

The numbers in the three colleges did not grow significantly in relation to the growth in University enrolments, from 76 to 397, during the 1880s. There were approximately 30 college students in 1880 and nearly 80 in 1890.26 In contrast to St. Andrew’s College, graduate candidates for the Anglican ministry could not reside at St. Paul’s while attending Moore College; the Bishop insisted that all candidates must reside at Moore College. In 1879 the Bishop of North Queensland noted after a visit to St. Paul’s that the “sight of those empty bedrooms had haunted him like a nightmare.”27 Archbishop Vaughan, who became Archbishop of Sydney on the death of Polding in 1877, had a similar reaction to St. John’s when he took up residence there in 1873. An English Benedictine, he found the Irish Rector, John Forrest, to be “a most objectionable whisky-drinking, purple-nosed, little Irish priest”.28 He soon had Forrest removed and himself installed as Rector until his appointment as Archbishop, though he continued to reside there. He saw it “as being pre-eminently fitted to become the main fortress amongst us of Catholic Christianity”29, and a place where “would be produced the really Christian gentleman … a pattern of what is morally and intellectually beautiful in the teachings of the Gospel.”30

---

26 C.Turney et al op.cit. p.332
27 Ibid pp.159-160
28 A.E.Cahill op.cit. p.42
29 Ibid
30 P.O’Farrell The Catholic Church and Community: An Australian History NSW University Press, Sydney, Revised Ed. 1992, p. 178
Such pious aims did not help the numbers which, in the three colleges, were to be less during the depression of the 1890’s. The small numbers residing in large and imposing buildings led the Chancellor, Sir William Manning, to ask in his Address at the University Commemoration in 1880 “whether the Colleges could not be made to increase their usefulness by admitting non-resident or partially resident University students to a participation and use of the benefits for which they were designed.”

The *Sydney Morning Herald* in July 1879 complained that the Colleges were simply “a price that had to be paid before the ecclesiastical authorities of the day would consent to the establishment of the University”, but that it was to be hoped that they might some day realise their intention as numbers within the University grew.

**A Wesleyan College - Beginning at the Wrong End:**

By the turn of the century, a Wesleyan Methodist College, anticipated in the Affiliated Colleges Act, had not materialised. At the First Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Australasia in January 1855, the hope was recorded that “the liberal offers of the Colonial Governments in New South Wales and Victoria will be embraced by the friends of Methodism in these Colonies and that Wesleyan Colleges may be affiliated in connection with the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne.”

---

31 K.J.Cable *op.cit.* p.212  
32 *Ibid* p.213  
33 W. Cresswell O’Reilly *Wesley College, A Historical Outline* Typescript, Methodist Conference offices, Sydney, 1952, pp.3-4  (Fisher Library, University of Sydney)
was held in the York Street Chapel, chaired by the Governor, Sir William Denison, which was “verynumerously attended; the chapel was quite full, and everything passed off very satisfactorily – favorably to the establishment of the College.” Despite the expressed enthusiasm and subsequent promises and donations, the Conference in 1859 still sought an indication of likely financial support, and a private Bill to Incorporate a College did not pass till 1860. This meant that the provision of land granted to each of the proposed Colleges by Deed of the State in 1855, on condition that requirements for public endowments be complied with within five years from the Deed of Grant, had lapsed. Following the grant of ten acres to St. Andrew’s College, the area likely to have been given to a Wesleyan College was granted to the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital in 1873. It was to be sixty years from the date of the York Street meeting before such a College opened.

It appears that three factors were chiefly responsible for this delay: the view that a secondary school ought to be established first, to then feed a college within the University; the perception that the move for a college was clergy rather than lay initiated – at the time, the Methodist Conference was a clerical body; and the later concerns of the University and the Parliament that arose over the proposal for the College to be both a theological institution for non-matriculated residents as well as a place of residence for students of the University. Many felt that the College proposal was beginning at the wrong end, “and that a University College

---

34 Minutes of Evidence taken before The Select Committee on the Wesley College Bill. 26 October 1859, p.11, Legislative Assembly of New South Wales (Votes and Proceedings 1859-1860)
without a Secondary School to feed it would have a poor chance of success.”

In 1863 the Conference established the “Wesleyan Collegiate Institution” at
Newington on the Parramatta River, later moving to its present site at Stanmore
in 1881. A proposal in 1896 that the Institution might be an Affiliated College
with the University and share the site at Stanmore with a Boys’ College, failed
particularly because of the more widespread financial problems of the 1890s:
“Once more Wesley College faded into thin air.”

It wasn’t until 1909 that a Committee recommended to the Conference that
immediate steps be taken to apply for a new Act of Incorporation to establish a
College in affiliation with the University that would be for both theological and
other students, and that such a project be linked with celebrations to mark the
Centenary of Australasian Methodism in 1912. The Conference accepted the
recommendation, deciding that the College would be named ‘Wesley’ and that
the Principal would be a minister of the Methodist Church and appointed by the
Conference. A site between the then established Women’s College, near St.
Paul’s, and the University Oval seemed to be most favoured. Later in 1909, the
University Chancellor, Sir Henry MacLaurin, expressed some concern that the
provisions of the proposed Bill for Incorporation differed from those of the other
Colleges, especially in relation to the matter of resident students being
matriculants of the University, and in the nature of the election of the Council
and the Principal. In October, the University Senate resolved that it would prefer

35 C.J.Prescott ‘The Evolution of Wesley College’ The Methodist Nov.1942, quoted in W.
Cresswell O’Reilly op.cit. p.6
the Wesley constitution to be as far as possible framed “on the model of the constitutions of other Colleges established within the University which have been found to work so well.”

Quite a contrasting view to that expressed fifty years before.

Legislative Council amendments made it clear that it would be unacceptable to have non-matriculant students, theological or otherwise, resident in an affiliated college, and that the College Council, with the exception of the clerical members, would be elected by subscribers and later by graduates, rather than by the Methodist Conference. The debate that followed in the Conference, early in 1910, led to the passing of a motion for the establishment of a separate Theological Institution to be financed from the Centenary Celebration Fund. The fear was loss of control of theological training if it remained in an affiliated college set up as required by the Senate and the Legislative Council. A minority opinion against that view believed that the minimum standard for candidates for the ministry should be matriculation, and that “it would be better for students to go to the University than to be brought up in an ‘ecclesiastical hot house’.”

The Conference thus went more along the lines of the Anglican evangelical hierarchy in theological training than along the path forged by the Presbyterians in Sydney. The Anglicans had Moore and St. Paul’s; the Methodists would have Leigh and Wesley, though their affiliated College would be somewhat more representative of the Conference than St. Paul’s was of the Diocese. In each case,

36 Ibid p.8
37 W. Cresswell O’Reilly *op. cit.* p.10
however, the aspirations in the foundation years of the University, of religious
instruction being a key part of the colleges, was not realised.

Wesley's Men:

The Act to Incorporate Wesley College was assented to on the 27th August 1910.
The project was well supported financially; plans for the building were prepared;
the first Councillors were elected in 1915; and in that same year, the Reverend
M. Scott Fletcher of King’s College, Queensland University, was appointed
Principal or, as later termed, Master. Foundation stones were laid in December
1916, and the College building was officially opened by the Lieutenant Governor
of NSW and Chancellor of the University, Sir William Cullen, on the 1st
December 1917. Just after the door had been opened, a figure of austere mien
and draped in black appeared dramatically at the door, and walked forward a few
yards. “I, the Shade of John Wesley”, he said, “welcome you to these my
abodes.”39 In its report of the Opening, The Methodist noted that the “spiritual
children of John Wesley have carried out those principles which Wesley himself
so persistently advocated – the union of knowledge and piety. It went on to
commend the words used by the Hon. W. E. V. Robson MLA in his address at
the Opening of the College: “Give us men; for the great need of Australia to-day

38 Ibid The Hon.W.Robson, p.12
39 Ibid The Sydney Morning Herald 3 Dec 1917, p.18
is men – consecrated, intelligent, fearless and thoroughly educated men. May Wesley College help to supply this pressing need!”

The University's Women:

The University was “given” women in 1881, with the decision of the Senate to “admit women to all University privileges, and to place them in all respects as regards University matters on an equal footing with men.” Melbourne University also agreed to the admission of women to degrees in 1881, as did Adelaide University that had permitted them to attend lectures and examinations as non-matriculated students when teaching first began in 1876. The year was also significant in England in this regard, where women were granted entry to the Cambridge Tripos Examinations, though their admission to degrees did not occur until much later, in 1948! Along with a growing movement for the franchise in the second half of the 1800s in England, educational provision for women was also expanding. Queen’s College and Bedford College were opened in London in 1848 and 1849 respectively; by 1870 girls were admitted to the Local Examinations conducted by Oxford and Cambridge Universities, which had been instituted in 1858 to provide a convenient external standard by which boys’ schools could have the work of their pupils assessed; Girton and Newnham Colleges were established as residences for women at Cambridge in 1869 and

---
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41 C.Turney et al op.cit. p.183
42 W.Vere Hole & Anne H.Trewweke *The History of the Women’s College within the University of Sydney* The Women’s College, Sydney, 1953, p.32
1871, and Lady Margaret Hall and Somerville College at Oxford in 1878 and 1879. Women were admitted to degrees and all other privileges at London University in 1878.43

Similar to the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations, the University of Sydney conducted Junior and Senior Public Examinations to which women were admitted in 1871. The better provision of secondary education for girls, both private and State, contributed to significant success for women in these examinations. On a number of occasions between 1878 and 1881, the Chancellor of the University, Sir William Manning, expressed the view that women should be admitted to the University on an equal basis with men. In announcing the Senate’s decision to do so in 1881, he noted that he believed “the right course was to settle and declare the principle of women’s right to equality within the University”, and that he could see no obstacle to their attendance at lectures with men “provided that the Lectures … should contain nothing of a nature to shock female delicacy.” In this regard, he noted, professors had undertaken to eliminate “offensive passages” from “certain eminent writers of antiquity!”44

A Non-denominational College for Women:

The first two women matriculants enrolled in the Faculty of Arts in 1882, graduating in 1885. By 1890 there were seventy-four women undergraduates,

43 Ibid p.15
44 C.Turney et al op.cit. p.185
and in that year the Senate decided that a ‘Tutor to the Women Students’ should be appointed to “take charge of the Women’s Common Room and to look after the interests of female students.”\textsuperscript{45} By this time, interest had grown, initially it seems within the University and then in the wider community, in the establishment of a residential college for women. A hostel for women had been established in association with the Anglican ‘Trinity College’ at Melbourne University in 1886, named ‘Janet Clarke Hall’ in 1891. But while the impetus for each of the male colleges at Sydney had come in the 1850s and 1860s from particular denominational interests, by the 1890s there was more favour in the case of a residence for women for a non-sectarian institution. The Churches had perhaps come more to terms with the withdrawal of State aid from denominational schools and the dominant role given to the State in the control of education under the Public Instruction Act of 1880. Certainly it seemed that while there was a desire on the part of the Churches to attend to the spiritual as well as the general welfare of women students, their numbers were still too small to warrant separate denominational colleges.\textsuperscript{46} Mixed residences were not considered until the mid to later 1900s. Much, of course, of the debate between the Churches and the University over the articles of incorporation of the colleges related to theological training for the ministry and the residence of non-matriculated students within them. Education and training for the ordained ministry was not an issue for women.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid p.186
\textsuperscript{46} W.V. Hole & Anne H. Treweweke \textit{op.cit.} p.36
There appears, therefore, to have been a more co-operative effort on the part of the University and the various Churches in seeking the establishment of a Women’s College. Early in 1887, a group of “earnest friends to the higher education of women”, including the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, Bishop Barry and other leading denominational clergy, met to plan for a college in accordance with the Affiliated Colleges Act. A larger public meeting was then held in May of that year, presided over by the Governor, Lord Carrington. The Warden of St. Paul’s and the principal of St. Andrew’s attended, along with twelve representatives of the Churches, as well as members of the University, the Legislature, and the wider public. There were some women present, but notably the future first Principal of the Women’s College, Miss Louisa Macdonald from England, who was visiting her brother, and who had been invited to attend the meeting by Lady Carrington, wife of the Governor.47

Provisions and Patronage:

There was agreement that the College, unlike those then established in England, should have a status equal to that of the men’s colleges. In the matter of the provision of “systematic religious instruction”, as provided for in the ‘Affiliated Colleges Act’, it was Canon Sharp, Warden of St. Paul’s, who proposed and had endorsed a resolution that such instruction should be subject in the case of women to two provisions drawn from the London School Board: (i) “that no religious catechism or formulary which is distinctive of any particular
denomination shall be taught, and that no attempt shall be made to attach
Students to any particular denomination”; and (ii) “any Student shall be excused
from attendance upon religious instruction or religious observances on express
declaration that she has conscientious objections thereto.”  

Interestingly, Bishop Barry, who at the time was on his way to England, sent a letter of support for the establishment of the College on a non-denominational basis. It was also moved that the governing body of the College be composed of twelve members, of whom not less than four were to be women, elected in the first instance by the subscribers; and also that there would be two members of the Senate of the University, appointed by the Senate from time to time. The Senate representation was in place of the Church representation on each of the Councils of the denominational colleges, which it was believed afforded to those colleges “powerful patronage, ready sympathy, and valuable advice.”

A Ladies Committee, with the Governor’s wife as President, was formed to assist in raising the necessary funds. Women associated with the intellectual branch of the growing Women’s Movement – a movement perhaps more oriented towards the working class at the time – were also associated with the College: Rose Scott, Margaret Windeyer, Dora Montefiore. Certainly they had to contend with negative attitudes, not only towards the higher education of women, but to the
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47 C. Turney et al op. cit. p.336; and W. Vere Hole & Anne H. Treweeke op. cit. p.73
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appeal for general and government assistance for what was seen as an institution for an elite section of the community. In this case, it wasn’t a concern for the support of sectarian interests, but rather for the support of the interests of a small and privileged section of society. In its then rather typical fashion The Bulletin argued that higher education was a “monstrous farce” and was only of use as “a badge of class superiority.” It noted that women have “no judgement, only imitative faculty”, and that “a girl who has received ‘higher’ education is generally a prig, or a poser.” Support, however, outweighed such opposition and sufficient finances were eventually collected and donated for meeting the requirements for establishing the College. A site of nearly four acres was selected adjacent to St. Paul’s College; the first Council was elected; and the Chancellor of the University was appointed the Official Visitor, providing perhaps an even closer tie with the University than was the case with the other colleges whose Visitors were the Heads of their respective Churches. Arrangements were made in 1891 to commence the College in the following year in temporary premises at Glebe Point until the completion of the College building, which occurred in 1894.

Principal and Principles - Louisa Macdonald:

A large number of applicants, mainly from England, applied for the advertised position of Principal, whose task it would be to “provide residence and domestic

---
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supervision for Women ... of all religions without any distinction whatever, together with tutorial assistance in their preparation for University lectures and Examinations.  

Miss Louisa Macdonald, a Fellow of University College London, where she had taken her first degree in Arts, and her MA in classics, was appointed in 1891. Her brother, who lived in New South Wales, had shown her the advertisement for the position, and she had also been encouraged to apply by an English protagonist for women’s rights, Millicent Fawcett. She left her research position with the British Museum, and arrived in Sydney in March 1892.

The 1890s was a difficult period for enrolments, as it was generally for the other colleges and the University. Four students enrolled at the College in 1892, and by 1900 there were only fifteen. This clearly disturbed Miss Macdonald, but she nevertheless developed a warm, intellectually stimulating and encouraging spirit among the residents. She was in a sense a “gentle” feminist, though determined and forceful in her assertion of the role of women in professional and public life. She corresponded regularly with her friend and mentor, Eleanor Grove, who was the first Principal of College Hall, University of London – the College and University that had an enormous influence on her life.
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54 Ibid p.64  
55 Ibid p.66  
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While the College was undenominational and made provision for exemption from any religious instruction, and while Louisa Macdonald desired a proper spirit of freedom to pervade the atmosphere of the College where there were few formal rules, she insisted on an observance of set times for meals, on the submission of an application for leave if a student wished to be out after 9.30pm, and on attendance at morning prayers. In a letter to Eleanor Grove in 1895, she wrote:

“... prayers are an excellent means of enforcing punctuality. I can understand and sympathize with the feeling that it is desecration for a prayer to be anything but voluntary, and with one or two of the girls to whom – I know – the whole thing meant nothing, I used to feel rather wretched. I think yours is the more excellent way, but then here, as I said, things are different, and the more excellent way which is fitted for girls and women trained by the tradition of centuries to thought and reverence, is not suited for us here when there is nothing to remind us of human aspirations after the divine, save a few modern churches built chiefly by means of bazaars and other aids to giving, with all about one climate and surroundings whose first effect is to relax the moral and delight the physical senses.”

58 Jeanette Beaumont & W.Vere Hole op.cit. p.70. Nevertheless, essentially she upheld the non-sectarian and tolerant nature of the College, and, in a later letter to Eleanor Grove, she expressed her concern for what seemed to be the impact of the more evangelically zealous Christian movement in the University. Her senior student had asked her if anything could be done to prevent residents working in the library on Sundays: “It was rather trying as much to my temper as to my gravity, for an attempt to enforce conformity to the letter of some other person’s belief always makes me angry ... ” She pointed out that everyone must follow their own conscience where it did not interfere with the general order and peace of the College. She noted that the senior student appeared to understand at once, but expressed the concern that this was “an
Catholic Women and ‘Sancta Sophia’:

The Principal of the Women’s College was clearly conscious of the distinctive place occupied by the College in standing, as it were, between the denominational colleges and the Churches they represented, and the University. Following a visit to the Catholic Archbishop, Cardinal Moran, at his palace at Manly in 1894, accompanied by Monsignor O’Brien, Rector of St. John’s College, she wrote: “It was a great satisfaction to me, I own, as well as a pleasure, for it is important as head of the one undenominational College of the University to be on friendly terms with the heads of the different Churches, especially here where sectarian feeling runs very high.”59 There was to be a close relationship with the Women’s College and a college for Catholic women students, to be known as ‘Sancta Sophia College’, which was opened on a site next to St. John’s College in August 1926. The idea for such a college was promoted by Archbishop Kelly in 1919, with strong support from the Rector of St. John’s, Dr Maurice O’Reilly, who was anxious that it be established as an extension of and under the direction of St. John’s.60 However, the Sisters of the Sacred Heart, who were invited to run the proposed college, sought autonomy and opened a Centre in City Road in 1923 as a meeting place for Catholic women graduates and undergraduates. With the encouragement of Archbishop Kelly and the Bishops of New South Wales, the costs of establishing a college were met by

59 Ibid p.58
60 C. Turney et al op. cit. p.465
gifts and donations from the dioceses and individuals, and the foundation stone of the College was laid on the 26th March 1925. An Act of Incorporation in 1929 settled the matter of the College’s autonomy and the name by which the College was to be known. By this time, ‘Sancta’ was already fully occupied, with applicants being turned away.61

Conclusion:

By 1929, with the incorporation of a Catholic women’s college, the pattern of collegiate life in Australia’s first university, and of the relationship between church, college and campus, had been well established. Seventy years before, in 1859, the college system was seen as being “a grievous mistake” from which would result “bitter sectarianism”. Twenty years later, in 1879, the Sydney Morning Herald stated that the colleges were “a price that had to be paid” to satisfy influential ecclesiastical authorities, and that they had potential to serve a larger student population. There was a rather resigned acceptance of their inevitability, despite John Dunmore Lang’s dire warning about the “so iniquitously originated” St. Andrew’s. It was also, perhaps, an indication of the role a cross-section of churchmen, and especially those of the non-conformist churches, were playing in the community and particularly in education. Within another thirty years, the Chancellor believed the colleges had “been found to work so well.” There had clearly been compromise in co-existence. The colleges,

61 Ibid pp.465-466
for the most part, had not become places of “systematic religious instruction”, let alone dogmatic dominance, with the Anglicans and the Methodists establishing separate theological schools, away from the University. Cardinal Moran’s ‘St. Patrick’s College’ at Manly and not St. John’s at the University became the training seminary for priests, if not, as Archbishop Vaughan had desired for St. John’s, “the main fortress … of Catholic Christianity”. On the other hand, the University reflected much of what had been established for school education in New South Wales under the ‘Public Instruction Act’ of 1880. While there was no direct State aid to private, especially church organisations, the catch-cry of the system’s secularity needed to be seen in the light of the provision for departmental teachers to give non-denominational scripture lessons and visiting clergymen to give separate religious instruction.62 Though the University was strongly opposed to sectarian influence and division, the colleges provided moral supervision and discipline as well as supplementary tutorial instruction, albeit for a much smaller proportion of the University’s population than had originally been envisaged. The pattern in Australia was essentially one of day attendance. The colleges, however, as was the goal of Louisa Macdonald even in her non-denominational Women’s College, were, with their pious aims yet practical constraints, at least a reminder of “human aspirations after the divine.”

CHAPTER THREE

God-fearing Benefaction:

Melbourne University and its Colleges

“The equally difficult problem of uniting a University training, which does not enter upon the domain of religion, to a system of collegiate residence, which affords a home life with its recognition of religious truths and sanctions, has been solved also.”

- In support of the award of a Doctorate to Sir John Macfarland, Master of Queen’s College & Chancellor of Melbourne University, 1891

It took much longer for a College to open in association with Australia’s second university than it did with Sydney University. While the Anglican Bishop of Melbourne, Charles Perry, had called a meeting on the 26th May 1853 to determine “the expediency of establishing a college in connection with the proposed University”1, Trinity College did not enrol its first student until July 1872, seventeen years after the opening of the University of Melbourne. However, the Melbourne denominational colleges were to enjoy in their early years much less factional division in their founding, greater provision in their funding, and far greater influence in their function within the University and the wider community than their counterparts in Sydney. Where the Sydney colleges were bound to require their student residents to attend the lectures of the University, matriculation or the granting of degree status of Trinity residents was required within six months of taking up residence. The establishment of a strong tutorial system at Trinity, to be emulated at Ormond and Queen’s; the

benefactions received from “wealthy God-fearing pastoralists who believed that
the church colleges were more deserving than the university itself” 2; and the role
of the long-serving and highly influential first heads of the colleges, each of
whom was a member of the University Council, all contributed to a position in
the late 1800s in which the colleges challenged the dominant teaching role of the
University. Nearly half a century after the Report of the Select Committee into
the Sydney University expressed the view that the establishment of affiliated
denominational colleges had been a “grievous mistake”, a Royal Commission in
1902 into the teaching at Melbourne University expressed serious concern about
the position of the colleges in being seemingly able to dictate to the professors of
the University in educational matters, and that college tuition was being seen as a
substitute for rather than as an auxiliary to the lectures of the professors. 3 God-
fearing benefaction rather than State endowment, as provided in the 1854 Act in
Sydney, no doubt helped to temper any views that the colleges in Melbourne
were a mistake and that their connection with the University should cease!

A University under God's Providence:

Nevertheless, a strong anti-sectarian mood, rather than an anti-Christian or anti-
religious one, prevailed in the newly separated colony of Victoria, as it did in
New South Wales, at the time of the founding of Melbourne University. The

2 Geoffrey Blainey A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne University Press,
Melbourne, 1957, p.85
3 Ibid pp.84-85
impetus for its founding was not just that Sydney had a university and that therefore “before long Melbourne would be able also to boast of one”\textsuperscript{4}, but that in this new colony which was beginning to reap the benefits in population and finance of the gold rushes, there was a strong desire to develop the institutions and trappings of responsible government, to train its youth for the professions, to foster commerce and trade, and to have a means of exercising a moral influence, so as “to improve the character of her people: to raise her in the respect and admiration of civilised nations.”\textsuperscript{5} As the founding fathers of Sydney University sought for the “better advancement of religion and morality”, so the moral aims of the Melbourne founders were to be under “God’s Providence”, but in no way subject to the divisive influence of sectarian doctrines. It would be a liberal institution, open to all, reflecting the spirit of this new place and the new times. There could be no more than four clergymen among the twenty members of the University Council, and none of the professors could be a clergyman, nor could they lecture on religious topics inside or outside of the University.\textsuperscript{6}

Nevertheless, while Bishop Broughton had protested and declined a seat on the Senate of Sydney University, the first Anglican Bishop of Melbourne, Charles Perry, in accepting a place on the University Council, declared that religious education was not so necessary for young men going on to university as it was

\textsuperscript{4} Budget Speech to the Victorian Parliament by H.C.Childers, 4\textsuperscript{th} November 1852, in Ernest Scott \textit{A History of the University of Melbourne}, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1936, p.2
\textsuperscript{5} Select Committee on the Establishment of the University of Melbourne, 11\textsuperscript{th} January 1853, in Geoffrey Blainey \textit{op.cit.} p.5
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid}
for scholars of an earlier age, and that colleges contemplated in connection with
the University and with the “different branches of the Church of Christ” would
provide for religious education.\footnote{Charles Perry \textit{The School and the Schoolmaster; Their Religious Character} p.6, in A.de Q. Robin \textit{op.cit.} p.104 It should be noted that there was no particular reference in the Act (Section 8) to denominational colleges, but rather to “any colleges”.
} Perry was a very different person from
Broughton. He was more comfortable with the role of the laity in church
government and in the conduct of services and Sunday School.\footnote{Bruce Kaye \textit{A Church without Walls: Being Anglican in Australia} Dove, North Blackburn, Vic., 1995, p. 164} He was more
charitable in his acceptance of the pluralist nature of colonial society and much
more inclined to cooperation rather than confrontation with the secular
university. He seemed not to sense any real threat from the exclusion of clergy
from its teaching ranks and divinity from its courses; thus contributing, perhaps
somewhat ironically as an evangelical, in some significant measure to the later
more ecumenical and consensual character of the Melbourne diocese to that of
Sydney.\footnote{After his retirement as Bishop of Melbourne in 1876, Perry was instrumental in founding the evangelical Ridley Hall at Cambridge University, which opened in 1881, and he was the Chairman of its Council. He was chiefly responsible for the appointment of the Reverend Handley C.G.Moule, later Bishop of Durham in succession to J.B.Lightfoot and B.F.Westcott, as its first Principal.}

There seemed in Melbourne to be no need for concession and negotiation in
determining whether there should be denominational colleges, as occurred in
Sydney; they were assumed. Redmond Barry, the first Chancellor of the
University, while a strong advocate and supporter of the Arts and of the non-
sectarian nature of the University, in 1853 donated a significant sum to the
Church of England, in the hope that it would be seen that he had “not been unmindful of the necessity of supporting the Church Establishment.”\textsuperscript{10} Even the inscription on a copper plate placed under the foundation stone of the University, laid on 4\textsuperscript{th} July 1854, bore testimony to a place “instituted in honour of God for establishing young men in philosophy, literature and piety, cultivating the talent of youth, fostering the arts, extending the bounds of science.”\textsuperscript{11}

As in Sydney, Melbourne University initially had great difficulty in attracting and keeping students. The forty acres of land set aside for the University to the north of the town seemed more than adequate, and, indeed, like Sydney, there were complaints that the first buildings were an extravagance, far in excess of what was required. In addition, nearly sixty acres were set aside for residential colleges, particularly with the hope of attracting country students.\textsuperscript{12} There was clearly willingness on the part of the University to encourage and to support the eventual establishment of such colleges. Hugh Childers and Anthony Brownless, the first two Vice-Chancellors, were sympathetic, as was William Stawell, a foundation member of the University Council, Attorney-General, and later Chief Justice of Victoria.\textsuperscript{13} Dr Brownless believed that denominational colleges in

\textsuperscript{10} Ann Galbally Redmond Barry, \textit{an Anglo-Irish Australian} Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Vic., 1995, p.85. This, in part, could be attributed to the influence exercised by the evangelical, though diplomatic Bishop Perry. (p.72)

\textsuperscript{11} Geoffrey Blainey \textit{op.cit.} p.8. It is perhaps somewhat ironical that the first graduate of the University, T.C.Cole, became an Anglican clergyman. It is also interesting that in 1884 Bishop James Moorhouse, who succeeded Perry as Bishop of Melbourne in 1876, became the University’s third Chancellor.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid} p.77

\textsuperscript{13} Stawell was so influenced by a sermon of Bishop Perry in 1848 that “he resolved with God’s help to lead a new life” (Mary Stawell, in Ann Galbally \textit{op.cit.} p.71)
which religious training occurred would be in accord with the desire of the founders of the University. 14 In 1861, the Government agreed to a request from the Council to allocate ten acres to each of the four main denominations from the land set aside for use by organisations in affiliation or connection with the University. The remaining land was eventually determined for recreational use by members and students of the University and the affiliated colleges. Unlike Sydney, State funds were not to be provided for the colleges.

**Bishop Perry and Trinity College:**

Though more concerned with setting up a college for students of the University than with establishing simultaneously a theological institution for the training of ordinands, Bishop Perry agreed in 1865 with the appointment of a committee to bring about the establishment of a college, including a theological institution, in connection with the University. Members of the committee included Sir William Stawell as chairman, and Professor William Wilson, the University’s first Professor of Mathematics. There was no division, as in Sydney, between Bishop and laity; nor was there any significant dispute between the Church and the University. In 1869, an earlier proposal by the Government that it appoint the trustees for the grant of land was changed with the government’s offer only to appoint those nominated by the churches. 15 The trustees of the proposed Anglican college included Charles Perry, H. B. Macartney (Dean of Melbourne),
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14 Geoffrey Blainey *op. cit.* p.78
15 *Ibid* p.79
William Stawell, James Stephen (later Minister of Education), and Professor Wilson; a firm representation of Church, State and University. In a circular seeking funds from “loyal Anglicans”, it was stated that the College was founded: (i) “to provide for youths from a distance, pursuing their studies at the University, a residence under proper superintendence where they will enjoy facilities for obtaining assistance in their work”; (ii) “to provide a residence for students who have completed their undergraduate course, and desire to continue their studies and at the same time contribute to their own support by engaging in tuition, before entering on their professional life”; and (iii) “to provide Theological training and instruction for such as desire to take Holy Orders.” ¹⁶

The foundation stone of Trinity College was laid by Bishop Perry in February 1870, and two years later, the building opened to its first student residents under an Acting Principal, the Reverend George Torrance, Assistant Curate at St. John’s, La Trobe Street. In January 1876, the position of Principal, called Warden from 1881, was offered to Alexander Leeper, the son of an Irish clergyman and a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, and of Oxford University.¹⁷ He was not required to be an ordained clergyman, as at Sydney’s St. Paul’s College.

Whereas the affiliation of St. Paul’s College with the University of Sydney was

¹⁶ James Grant *Perspective of a Century: A volume for the Centenary of Trinity College, Melbourne, 1872-1972* The Council of Trinity College, Melbourne, 1972, p.4

¹⁷ *Ibid.*. Leeper had been teaching at Melbourne Grammar School, and, at the time of his appointment to Trinity, was twenty-seven years old.
established prior to the opening of the College, no such status had been agreed to when Leeper took charge of Trinity. Terms of affiliation at Sydney, under the Affiliated Colleges Act 1854, had been crucial to the granting of land and to the provision of funds. They were also means of placating disaffected and influential churchmen. The need for such terms was not so strong in Melbourne, though affiliation was seen as essential for the College seriously to be recognised as a place of learning, and for it to give support to the University and “add strength to its operation.” 18 Dr Leeper, nevertheless, recognised the secular nature of the University, noting that “for the University to take cognisance of the religious question in any form would be to intrude into the prohibited sectarian domain ... it is not in the least her concern to enquire whether the houses, halls or colleges affiliated teach any or what religion.” 19 However, the editor of the Age newspaper warned that to affiliate a college “you give its principal the leverage from which he may shake the whole University system.” 20 In Melbourne, it came close to the truth! Opposition also came from Charles Pearson, a former Professor of History at Kings College London and Headmaster of Melbourne’s Presbyterian Ladies College, and Alexander Morrison, Principal of Scotch College, who were wary of Anglican influence and domination over the students of the University and who believed affiliation would undermine the secular character of the University. 21 There were Presbyterians who saw the college system as English in character and tradition, such as the Reverend G. Mackie,

18 Ibid p.71 The words were those of Professor W.E.Hearn, foundation Professor of Modern History and Literature, Political Economy and Logic, and from 1873 the first Dean of Law at Melbourne University. Professor Hearn was a Trustee of the College.
19 Ibid p.70
minister of the South Yarra Presbyterian Church, who in 1870 wrote to the Age:

“Withal, a University or college residence is not at all desirable. They have been foul blots upon the great schools of England ... Such establishments are wholly unnatural ... let our college-bred men be boarded in well-regulated Christian homes, and the temptations of a gregarious college life will be reduced to a minimum.”22 Nevertheless, the “Statute for the Affiliation of the Educational Establishment called Trinity College” was passed by the University Council on the 11th April 1876.

**Ormond College:**

Though both colleges began with small numbers, Trinity’s first building was much more modest than that of St. Paul’s at Sydney University. There was no government funding, and the Principal’s Residence, which could also house the first students, was built with money from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), a bequest, some donations from Anglican parishes and people, and a loan from the Bishop.23 With reluctance on the part of some, the Presbyterians had been slow in making any move to take advantage of the land set aside for them. However, when in 1877 it seemed the Government might sell
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20 *Ibid*
21 *Ibid* p.76
22 Don Chambers ‘The Creation’, in Stuart MacIntyre (Ed) *Ormond College Centenary Essays* Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1984, p.23. Others, such as the Reverend A.J.Campbell of Geelong, a part-time professor of theology at the struggling Victorian Presbyterian Theological Hall in Collins Street. advocated the need for the Presbyterian Church to establish an affiliated college. (p.26)
23 James Grant *op. cit.* p.7. The debt to the Bishop was not finally discharged until 1888, following a bequest from James Hastie, a Presbyterian who held Bishop Perry in high regard.
the land, efforts were made to raise sufficient funds for a College. Approaches were made to wealthy Western District Scottish pastoralists, culminating in particular in a gift from Francis Ormond, who, since arriving in Victoria at the age of fifteen, had accumulated significant wealth from his father’s and his own properties. He came to appreciate the value of education, and later gave generous donations to schools in England that taught the children of the poorest class in the country. He saw great purpose in providing facilities that would allow for the best possible development of the abilities and talents of young people, and was especially keen to promote the education of Presbyterian clergy. A further gift of £10,000, on condition that it be equally matched, was rewarded by the College committee resolving to name the College ‘Ormond’. In England at the time of the opening of the College in 1881, Francis Ormond sent a letter indicating that he “shall be happy to pay whole cost of erection of building, which will amount to £22,571.” He was then instrumental in securing the College’s first Master, John Henry MacFarland, a teacher of mathematics at Repton School and a graduate of Queen’s College, Belfast, and St. John’s College, Cambridge. Ormond College had been established under much less contentious circumstances than its counterpart at Sydney, St. Andrew’s. Ormond continued to give generously to the fabric and extension of the College, and left a further £30,000 from his estate following his death in 1889.

24 Ernest Scott op.cit. p.77
25 Jim Davidson Francis Ormond, Patron, in Stuart MacIntyre (ed.) op cit p.5
26 Ibid p.11. His beneficence also extended to the establishment of a Chair of Music at Melbourne University and to the founding of a Working Men’s College designed especially to assist those
A Wesleyan College:

The Wesleyans in Melbourne more deliberately pursued the establishment of a theological institute within an affiliated University college than they did in Sydney, where funds were directed towards the secondary Newington College instead of towards an establishment within the University. Methodism had expanded rapidly in Victoria during the period of the gold rush, and the need for the most appropriate theological training for local ministerial candidates was realised. Concern that the University of Melbourne might require conditions that would make it impossible to function a Theological Hall within a College were allayed, the University only insisting that all residents matriculate within six months of their entry to the College. This requirement, it was believed, could be variously interpreted and/or managed 27, and, unlike Sydney, the University did not deprive the Victorian Conference of its control over College affairs. An Affiliated College Committee, set up by the Conference in 1878, steered much of the preparation and fundraising, particularly under the guidance of the Reverend W. A. Quick, and the building was ready for the first student intake in 1888. To mark the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee in 1887, it was resolved to name the College ‘Queen’s College’. At the laying of the foundation stone in June 1887, the President of the Wesleyan Conference noted a connection between the Wesleyan Church and the University in that John Wesley was a Fellow of Lincoln College, engaged in more practical pursuits in the trades and the professions – the forerunner of the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, in front of which stands Ormond’s statue.
Oxford, and Charles was an Oxford graduate. He was no doubt aware that Wesleyan Methodists had in some quarters a reputation for not giving as high a priority to tertiary education as, for example, the Anglicans and the Presbyterians. It was noted, however, that John Wesley based the training of his preachers on intense and wide reading – the 1746 reading list covering Divinity, Science, Poetry, Greek, Latin, Hebrew and History. When one of his preachers protested “But I read only the Bible”, Wesley replied “If so, you need preach no more”.

In July 1887, the College Committee accepted the recommendation of a group appointed in England to seek a Master for the College. Edward Holdsworth Sugden, a young Yorkshire Methodist clergyman and teacher was appointed, with the encouragement that he should add to his Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees from London University an MA from a university in association with the University of London. At this time, the number of resident and non-resident members of Trinity and Ormond had grown significantly, and, with the first students at Queen’s, one third of the students enrolled at Melbourne University were associated with one of the colleges.

---

27 Owen Parnaby *Queen’s College University of Melbourne: A Centenary History* Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1990, p.11. If some failed the matriculation test, they would move out of College and attend as day students.
28 Ernest Scott *op cit* p.79
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The ‘Girton’ of Australia - providing for women:

Among students attending lectures conducted at Trinity College in 1888, supplementary to those of the University, were fourteen women, though they were not formally enrolled on the books.32 Ormond College had accepted non-resident women members in 1885, and Queen’s accepted women from the start, with a few women residents living in the Master’s lodge. This contrasted with the decidedly all male Paul’s, John’s and Andrew’s at Sydney University, where, as at Melbourne, women had been permitted to enrol in 1881. Nevertheless, the decision in 1886 to open a hostel for women in association with Trinity was arguably taken by most members of the Trinity Council with a concern for any possible financial risk in doing so rather than with any great zeal for the tertiary education of young women.33 Two terraces were rented close by in Sydney Road in the name of the Council, but the Warden was required to pay the rent. This he willingly did, for it was clear that Alexander Leeper was very much in favour of providing accommodation and support for women students in an environment as close as possible to that afforded to men in the College. In 1884 he had visited English universities and was impressed with the halls for women at Cambridge and Oxford – Girton, Newnham and Somerville. The Reverend T. Jollie Smith, a tutor at Trinity, and his wife were appointed to supervise the women at the hostel, with Jollie Smith’s hope that the hostel would become “the ‘Girton’ of

33 Ibid p.3
Australia” and not “degenerate into a mere boarding-house.” 34 Though the Council established the hostel on a trial basis for one year, it met with good success and it remained open well beyond the initial twelve months. Leeper worked to have a permanent women’s hostel established in association with the College and with the Church of England, but he was challenged in 1888 when a group of women graduates urged the establishment of a non-denominational, though not “agnostic” 35 residence, and sought government assistance to do so. Theirs was a concern to provide for women who did not wish to be part of a denominational collegiate institution, and, indeed, they sought the support and understanding of Leeper in their aims. The Warden demonstrated some sympathy, but he was nevertheless determined permanently to establish the Trinity hostel as “a fair Home of Religion and Learning.” 36

Unlike the support given in Sydney for the opening of a non-denominational Women’s College, there was no Government assistance forthcoming in Melbourne. The University of Melbourne Women’s College, in 1975 to be known as ‘University College’ when it became co-residential, did not open until 1937. A generous donation from a Melbourne establishment figure and philanthropist, Janet, Lady Clarke, encouraged and enabled the decision by the Trinity Council to build a permanent residence for women on part of the College land on Sydney Road. As the Council had stipulated that only ladies of the

34 Ibid p.5
35 Farley Kelly Degrees of Liberation: A Short History of Women in the University of Melbourne The Women Graduates Centenary Committee of the University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1985, p.25
Church of England could reside in the hostel, concern arose that donations for the building of the new residence would be hindered if such a requirement continued and if the residents were required to go to Church of England services. Such requirements would also hinder residence of women who were members of the other Colleges, though Trinity Council had also stipulated that women residents should attend the lectures at Trinity. Lady Clarke’s benefaction was also on condition that the permanent residence should be open to members of all denominations.

Though the new hostel, later named “Janet Clarke Hall”, was opened with “academic pomp and pageantry” in April 1891, its early years were marked by much tension and dispute over relationships with the College, its Council and Warden. While, on the one hand, Miss Emily Hensley, Principal at the time of the opening, exhorted all at the ceremony, including the four residents, to “make this house an abode of peace and love, a home of joy and delight … and a glory to the name of God” 39, there was clear confusion and disappointment on the other with the seeming lack of recognition by the College of the status, authority and role in the residence of the Principal and the Ladies’ Committee. The Ladies’ Committee, or Council as it came to be known, objected for example to having financial responsibility for the residence but not responsibility for appointments

36 Lyndsay Gardiner op cit p.8
37 Ibid. In later practice, this was not enforced.
38 Ibid p.20
39 Ibid p.21
and educational matters.\textsuperscript{40} The Ladies proposed an Anglican Women’s College on the same lines as Trinity, but totally independent of it. This was not acceptable, though attempts were made for compromise. In September 1892 the Ladies’ Council resigned, as did Miss Hensley, who nevertheless remained in the colony for a further five years and much more successfully founded Merton Hall, an Anglican girls’ school which became the Melbourne Church of England Girls’ Grammar School. It had been felt that one of the reasons why the Trinity hostel had struggled was the lack of a feeder girls’ school like the Presbyterian and Methodist Ladies’ Colleges. In the same year as Louisa Mcdonald became Principal of the new Women’s College at Sydney University, Alexander Leeper appointed Mr J. T. Collins as Principal, a position that remained subordinate to that of the Warden until Janet Clarke Hall finally gained its independence in 1962.

\textbf{Other colleges:}

By the turn of the nineteenth century, Melbourne therefore had three distinct denominational colleges – Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s – with a denominational hall of residence for women under the governance of Trinity College; while Sydney had St. Paul’s, St. John’s and St. Andrew’s, and a non-denominational Women’s College. Melbourne’s colleges were all Protestant, accepting of women, significantly influenced by their respective church councils, and largely

\footnotetext{\textit{Ibid} p.35}
dependent upon private benefaction for their development. The Sydney colleges were both Protestant and Catholic, exclusive of women and, in the case of ‘Women’s’, of men. They were less directly influenced by their respective church hierarchy and councils, and their development occurred with significant government assistance. Apart from the early difficulties in establishing the Janet Clarke Hall, the Melbourne colleges were founded in much less factious circumstances than those in Sydney, and, despite the secular character of both universities, there was probably a greater rapport between the sacred and the secular in Melbourne, and certainly a greater involvement of College leaders in the life of the University.

Although the Roman Catholic Bishop of Melbourne, Bishop Goold, sought advice in 1861 as to how to get land for a Catholic college at the University, such a college for men was not established until 1916, when the foundation stone of Newman College was laid by Archbishop Carr. The Archbishop had been reluctant to divert money from Catholic congregations that was so sorely needed for schools, but he initiated a strong fundraising effort when a Sydney layman, John Donovan, donated £30,000 for assisting Catholic students at the University on condition that a Catholic college was built within a certain time. The money was raised, the donation given, and Walter Burley Griffin was engaged to design the College. The Very Reverend J. O’Dwyer SJ was appointed as the first Rector. Newman College established a women’s annexe in 1918. St. Mary’s Hall was located away from the University and was conducted by the Loreto Order. It
became St. Mary’s College when it moved to a site adjacent to Newman College, but independent of it, in 1966.41

A threat to the University professors:

What particularly marked the development of the denominational colleges at Melbourne in the second half of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth centuries, especially Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s, were (i) the institution of a strong tutorial system; (ii) the establishment of their theological halls; and (iii) the extraordinary length of service and influence, both within the colleges and within the University, of their heads. With his Vice-Principal, John Winthrop Hackett, later a founder, benefactor and Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, Alexander Leeper began a program of lectures and tutorials in the College that was noted by the late 1800s as rivalling that of the University itself. It was a significant factor in attracting to the College students who for many years won the majority of the University’s prizes and scholarships.42

Leeper taught Classics, and Hackett taught Law, Logic and Political Economy. Other scholars were recruited from overseas as well as locally. In 1877 the lectures and tutorials were made available to male non-resident students, and in

41 St. Mary’s became co-residential in 1977. With the much increased demand for places of residence for university students, other church colleges were also eventually affiliated with the University in the 1960’s: St. Hilda’s (1964), built on land given by Queen’s College and associated with both the Presbyterian and Methodist (later Uniting) churches; Whitley College (1965), a Baptist Theological College since 1891; and Ridley College (1966), an Anglican Theological College founded in 1910.

42 Geoffrey Blainey op. cit p.80
the same year Dr Leeper formed the ‘Trinity College Dialectical Society’ which offered opportunity for debate and discussion particularly on topics of public interest. Prior to 1883, Trinity and Ormond Colleges shared tuition in Classics and Mathematics, but in following years, tutors and lecturers in the Humanities and the Sciences, largely drawn from universities in England, Scotland and Ireland, and supported by facilities supplied by the money of Francis Ormond, established Ormond College as a strong competitor in the provision of tutorial support.

By 1888 “Ormond exchanged tutorial skills and facilities with its Methodist neighbours at Queen’s.”43 There developed at Queen’s a similar pattern of tutorials and lectures, to the point where the tuition in the three colleges was viewed by the Royal Commission into the teaching at Melbourne University in 1902 as a useful auxiliary but as a clear threat to the lectures and the authority of the University’s professors. Unlike Sydney, the colleges seemed much freer to discourage attendance of residents at the lectures of the University, where, for example, lectures in arts and law were not compulsory.44 A pattern of “friendly rivalry” together with practical co-operation in academic support and provision became a mark of the Melbourne colleges.

43 Don Chambers *op cit* p.35
44 Geoffrey Blainey *op cit* p.85
Theological training:

Before the opening of Trinity, Bishop Perry sent candidates for ordination to Sydney’s Moore College at Liverpool, with an allocation for each trainee of £200 per annum. He was increasingly criticised for not employing a theological lecturer in Melbourne, with a number believing that the Sydney training was “characterised by a narrow party spirit.”45 It wasn’t until 1877, when Bishop Moorhouse succeeded Bishop Perry, that arrangements were made for a theological school to be established at Trinity, with candidates receiving £100 per annum for three years of study at the College, with each undertaking to serve, on completion of his course, for seven years in the diocese of Melbourne. Bishop Moorhouse was a strong supporter of the College and of its Warden, and was himself involved in the wider life of the University, serving as Chancellor from 1884 to 1886. The Trinity Theological School continued to be hindered, nevertheless, by the College’s terms of affiliation that prevented any recognition by the University of degrees in Divinity, and by evangelicals who viewed the School as “too much given to High Church teaching and influences.”46 The Warden’s reference to the College, in a seeming attempt to overcome the divisions of churchmanship, as “Evangelical High Church of Broad sympathies”, did not help.47

---

45 A.de Q. Robin op cit p.129
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The Presbyterian Theological Hall was established within Ormond College by 1880, with funding for two professorships provided from the bequest of J. D. Wyselaskie, a Western District grazier. The Reverend Professor J. J. Rentoul, appointed in 1883 as one of the first two professors, supported the location of the Hall within the College where “surrounded by a collegiate atmosphere, and on university ground, it has an environment worthy of its aims and of Presbyterian traditions.”[^48]

In the same year, 1883, the Reverend Charles Strong, a founding member of the Ormond Council, lost his position as minister of the Scots Church over his liberal theology, and the staff of the Theological Hall struggled with the demands of traditional religion, the colonial secular culture, and the pressures of scientific scrutiny and biblical criticism. Andrew Harper, Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies College and a lecturer at the Hall in Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, noted in 1892 that “the change in understanding of the nature of biblical inspiration implied changes to the whole fabric of evangelical doctrine.”[^49]

In 1901, Andrew Harper was appointed Principal of St. Andrew’s College, Sydney University, where the only Theological Hall among the Sydney colleges was later to be the focus of accusations of heretical teaching. The pattern of theological teaching that became a mark of the Halls at both Ormond and St. Andrew’s, was furthered in 1907 with the appointment at Ormond of the Reverend David Adam from Scotland to the Chair of Church Doctrine and Church History. With a reputation of having a conservative attitude towards the great doctrines of the Christian tradition, he nevertheless sought to relate and

[^48]: Don Chambers *Theological Hall* in Stuart MacIntyre (ed.) *op cit* p.105
[^49]: *Ibid* p.109
adapt them to the changing scene of his day. In doing so, he came to represent a more radical strand of Protestant liberalism than had been espoused at Ormond before.\textsuperscript{50}

The Master of Queen’s, E. H. Sugden, was also known as “a liberal humanist in the best nineteenth-century meaning of those terms”\textsuperscript{51}, but he brought together in his teaching a firmly committed evangelical Wesleyan zeal for converting others, with sound scholarship and a particular love of literature, theatre and music. He was an avid collector of John Wesley’s works, with the Queen’s College Library now having one of the most significant collections of Wesley’s works anywhere. Dr Sugden tutored in Literature, and he lectured to theological students at Queen’s in Greek, Biblical exegesis, logic and ethics. He proudly proclaimed that at heart he was first and foremost a Methodist preacher, but “he never felt within himself any conflict between Christianity and culture, or between Hebraism and Hellenism.”\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{The Three Rulers – Leeper, MacFarland, and Sugden:}

The extent and impact of the colleges’ tutorial system, and the lively centres of theological instruction and debate established within them, were matched by the extraordinary length of service and impact upon the colleges, university and

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Ibid} p.114
\textsuperscript{51} Owen Parnaby \textit{op cit} p.36
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid} p.29
wider communities of the first Warden and Masters. Alexander Leeper’s vision and persistence in building up a strong academic reputation for Trinity College, in sustaining and developing much of its finances under the ‘farming’ arrangement 53, and in expanding the facilities and fabric of the College, overcame some initial concern about his youth and relative inexperience. He was also to weather a significant storm as a result of his determination to exercise discipline. The consequences of his exclusion of a student from the College in 1890 bore some similarity to incidents that would occur in university colleges in Sydney nearly one hundred years later. The demonstration against the Warden’s authority by some forty residents and the burning of his effigy, resulted in further expulsions and a demand by the College Council for apologies. Some refused, and they too were expelled. The latter group included Stanley Argyle, later Premier of Victoria!54 Alexander Leeper remained Warden until his retirement in 1918, having served in the position for forty-two years. During this time he was an active member of the University Council and, for example, also held office as President of the Public Library and the National Gallery of Victoria.55

John MacFarland was to exercise an even greater influence upon the University. He successfully brought together the functions of university college residence and theological hall during the long period of his Mastership from 1881 to 1914. He very much fostered the development of the ‘Students’ Club’, setting a pattern

53 The Warden received the fees but was personally responsible for the day-to-day provision for the students.  
54 James Grant op cit pp 18-22  
55 Ibid p.27
of student organisation and community life that would be emulated in other places, and that stood out against the lack of similar student activity within the University generally. Noted as “a masterly chairman and the most capable committee-man one could expect to meet in a lifetime”\textsuperscript{56}, he was an active member of the University Council, and from 1910 to 1918 its Vice-Chancellor. He served as Chancellor of the University – a stronger position at the time, as the position of Vice-Chancellor was not salaried - from 1918 until his death in 1935.\textsuperscript{57}

Although a member of the University Council, E. H. Sugden, the only clergyman of the three, was remembered more for the warmth of his personality and his talents as a pastor and preacher, a scholar and musician. He modelled his Mastership on his mentor, Benjamin Hellier of Headingley Theological College, whom he remembered as someone who always tried to find something in every person that he could respect and build on, and to be tolerant of their failures.\textsuperscript{58}

His close friend and fellow organist, A. E. Floyd, then organist and choirmaster at St. Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, described him as “always very human and kind and bubbling with good humour – one of the finest people I have known”\textsuperscript{59}, and a former College resident and later Chancellor of Melbourne University, Roy Douglas Wright, though an agnostic, recalled the warmth of his “liberal face of

\textsuperscript{56} Ernest Scott \textit{op cit} p.78
\textsuperscript{57} James Grant \textit{op cit.} pp.18-22. Sir James Darling recalled in 1971, when he retired from the University Council, that when he first joined the Council in 1933 “Sir John MacFarland sat at one end of the long table and Sir James Barrett (who succeeded MacFarland as Chancellor) at the other; I don’t remember who sat in between, but it didn’t matter.
\textsuperscript{58} Owen Parnaby \textit{op cit} p.44
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid} p.33
Methodism”, and his voice in chapel as “a superb instrument which made music of anything he delivered.” Edward Sugden retired in 1928, having served as Master for forty years. He died in 1935, one year after Alexander Leeper and on the same day as John MacFarland!

**Turning the Tide of Secularism?:**

Geoffrey Blainey, in his centenary history of the University of Melbourne, attributes the strong influence and “power” of the colleges at Melbourne University at the turn of the century largely to the “three men who ruled them and courted the wealthy churchmen.” There had not been in Melbourne the same degree of division and debate between the churches, and between the churches and the proponents of the University, as there had been in Sydney. The issue of the separation of religion from the teaching of the University was almost a ‘given’ when Melbourne University was founded, as, eventually, was the view that such teaching appropriately could be located within denominational residential colleges on the periphery of the campus. Land was set aside from the start, not with any need to satisfy protest or to settle controversy, but simply to hold it in reserve for educational purposes in subordination to the University that might include residential colleges – denominational or otherwise. A more cooperative and cohesive effort between clergy and laity of the denominations was

---
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evidenced in the planning and development of the Melbourne colleges than in Sydney, and, despite the wariness of Melbourne Anglican evangelicals, theological training was seen as being appropriately located within them. There was also the benefit of well-established feeder denominational secondary schools. The support and provision of benefactors, and the vision, energy and tenacity of the first Heads of the colleges, ensured the promotion of a highly successful system of college teaching and of a vigorous community life that clearly rivalled that of the University itself.

Although the 1902 Royal Commission into the teaching of the University expressed concern about the dominant influence of the colleges in the life of the University, and insisted that the University Council should accept the opinion of the professors of the University in the case of any dispute with the colleges, a strong influence continued for many years. In 1936, for example, Raymond Priestly, who had become Vice-Chancellor the year before and had had experience at Cambridge, was attracted to a proposal particularly fostered by the Dean of Law and former Vice-Master of Queen’s, K. H. Bailey, and the Master of Ormond, D. K. Picken, that would have every student of the University become a member of a college, with access to facilities, sporting competition, and to academic supervision.63 The scheme was strongly resisted within the University, but consideration of it nevertheless gave further indication of the

prominence of the colleges at a time when the their Heads and that of Janet Clarke Hall were also in the midst of long periods of office.

Attempts however to have the University change its view on the award of degrees in Divinity were unsuccessful. In 1905 the Council of Churches in Victoria sent a letter to the University asking it to consider making such awards, but a move by Alexander Leeper to have the University Council receive a deputation about the matter was rejected. In an address on “Christian Education in the University” in 1906, Dr Leeper noted that the colleges had “turned the tide of secularism” in Victoria64, and that there was every reason why the universities should include the teaching of theology in a scientific spirit:“no academic system can be thought complete which refuses absolutely to deal with the supernatural side of man’s being.”65 With the passing of the years, he was perhaps somewhat less conciliatory in his view than he was when seeking the affiliation of Trinity College. The University, however, remained resolute in its determination not to compromise the secular nature of its teaching. Thus, both in Melbourne and in Sydney, despite the presence of Theological Halls and Schools within the colleges, the pattern of theological education in Australia became largely “separate from any significant engagement with the broader intellectual activity of the universities.”66

64 John Poynter *Doubts and Certainties … op cit* p.309
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Perhaps the position and relationship of the colleges to the University in Melbourne, and to a lesser degree at Sydney University, are reflected in supporting documentation for the award by the Royal University of Ireland at Belfast of a doctorate to John MacFarland in 1891: “In these affiliated colleges the problem of uniting the class lecture system of the Irish, Scottish, and German Universities, with the tutorial system and social advantages of residence found in Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, has been successfully solved. The equally difficult problem of uniting a University training, which does not enter upon the domain of religion, to a system of collegiate residence, which affords a home life with its recognition of religious truths and sanctions, has been solved also.”67

Conclusion:

The claim of solving the problems in the relationship between college and campus - between the sacred and the secular - was no doubt overly generous and premature. It nevertheless reflected much of what the University founders, both of Sydney and Melbourne, intended in their exclusion from the University of sectarian divisions and rivalry, and their desire for the provision of student residences. Religion had its place within collegiate relationship with the University, rather than by regulation within its curriculum. Religion was not opposed so much as dogmatism and rivalry between the churches. There was to be no hint of favour towards any particular sectarian interest. The Melbourne

67 Don Chambers “The Creation”, p.36
collegiate pattern, more than that established at Sydney, became the one for Australia’s other ‘first’ universities. It was Melbourne University’s responsibility to determine affiliation or connection with any college or educational establishment, and it was the University that asked the Government to set aside land for such institutions. Unlike Sydney, no funds were provided by the State. Nevertheless, despite a more determined effort to separate the sacred from the secular in the University, there was a stronger degree of support from the Churches for the place and role of the University and of the relationship of colleges to it than there was in the foundation years of the University of Sydney. The Melbourne pattern was marked by a degree of collaborative effort and by a significant involvement in the life of the University of both Church and College leaders.
CHAPTER FOUR

Supplying Spiritual Yearnings:

Australia’s Other ‘First’ Universities and Colleges

“The prospect of being able to have our College at the University in the near future has given me a keen desire to live a few years longer.”

- Archbishop C. O. L. Riley, Archbishop of Perth, 1926

The pattern established at Melbourne University, based upon that at Sydney, was certainly different, for example, from both the traditional Oxbridge collegiate system and the pattern of teaching colleges in association with the University of London. While the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne borrowed much from the Scottish model of professorial teaching, they differed from this model in their affiliation of church colleges of residence that particularly provided for care and supervision, tutorial support and the opportunity for religious instruction. The sacred and the secular – separate, but significantly associated in the developing Australian pattern of relationship between Church, College and Campus.

The University of Adelaide:

The pattern was even more firmly established in the founding in 1874 of Australia’s third university, the University of Adelaide. Adelaide society was more influenced by Protestant non-conformists than that of Sydney or Melbourne, and any hint of establishment or domination by one group or another was strongly resisted: “South Australia had been founded as a ‘paradise of
dissent’, in the aftermath of the 1832 Reform Bill. In the new colony Protestant non-conformists would enjoy full religious liberty, and secular radicals would escape Anglican Tory dominance.”¹ The University was to be representative of all classes, and, like Sydney and Melbourne, no religious test was to be administered for the purpose of admission. The Government was keen that “sectarian or denominational tendencies would be avoided in the teaching and management” of the University.² Though affiliated colleges and institutions were envisaged, no land was set aside for the purpose, and the University itself received only some five acres of parkland on North Terrace. Thomas Elder, a benefactor and member of the Legislative Council, even thought that five acres was too much.³ Adelaide was a planned city, and many jealously guarded the parklands from the encroachment of buildings, for whatever purpose.

It is somewhat ironic, however, that not only did the Anglican Bishop of Adelaide, Augustus Short, support the establishment of the University, but he was its first Vice-Chancellor, second Chancellor, and first recipient of a degree. He saw the University as, among other things, “the domain of Intellect ... the birthplace of Liberty and Order; the sanctuary of Truth and Natural Law”⁴, though there is no doubt that he was disappointed that there would not be a Chair

¹ W.J.Gardner Colonial Cap and Gown: Studies in the Mid-Victorian Universities of Australasia University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ, 1979, p.35
³ Ibid p.5
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in Theology. Nevertheless, Bishop Short had long been a proponent of a University for the city to which he was appointed Bishop in 1847, and in his address at the University’s inauguration in April 1876 he noted that he did not believe that “Philosophy, Science, the spirit of investigation, and the feeling of personal independence” were “inconsistent with the faith of a Christian”, and that the teaching and culture of the University “will supply spiritual yearnings over and above material knowledge.”

Indeed, the University of Adelaide had been born from the wish of a wider group of church and civic leaders, and, more especially, from the founding in 1871 and development of a nonconformist lay studies and theological training institution, Union College. In seeking funds for the College, a donation of £20,000 was promised and received from Mr Walter Watson Hughes, a retired Scottish sea captain who had made a fortune from the discovery of copper on his South Australian sheep property. The unexpectedly large amount was far more than the small college required, and its Council decided to direct the money towards the founding of a University that would have a wider secular curriculum with theological studies undertaken in a separate but affiliated institution. A Congregational minister, James Jefferis, was particularly influential in this decision. He was a graduate of the new University of London, and “there was no man in Adelaide for whom it would be easier to make a swift leap from

---
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interdenominational college to secular university, and the strength of his lead showed the growing strength of tolerant dissent in Adelaide.” Bishop Short, who, with the foundation in 1849 of “The Church of England Collegiate School of Saint Peter” envisaged “a future University or College of Professors wherein our rising youth may obtain instruction in all branches of Human Learning,” was persuaded to become President of a representative committee of all interested parties, including the Council of Union College. The committee formed “The University Association”, and its work culminated in the passing by the South Australian Parliament of ‘The Adelaide University Act 1874’.

The Bishop’s intimate association with the foundation of the University as a secular institution reflected not only his abiding belief that the free pursuit of higher learning, and especially the study of Science, did not give licence for the promotion of agnosticism, but also his astute awareness of the nature of Adelaide’s free colonial society. It was one in which, in 1851, a bill in support of state aid for religious purposes had been decisively defeated as, some expressed, “a ‘sinister’ way to ‘pet and pamper the Establishment Episcopacy of our fatherland’.” The Bishop had supported the Bill, but he had also proposed a “conscience clause” in the 1848 Bill to incorporate St. Peter’s School, by which nonconformists were not required to join in worship or religious instruction “in accordance with the principles of religious liberty on which the colony had been
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founded.”\(^{12}\) Augustus Short’s skill in bringing people together in support of the University and in overseeing its formative years was clearly acknowledged by the Vice-Chancellor, Chief Justice Samuel Way, at the first conferring of degrees ceremony in May 1877: “it was felt that it was due to His Lordship’s position and to his general character that the first Degree of The University of Adelaide should be conferred upon its Chancellor.”\(^{13}\)

The Adelaide Colleges:

While the first residential college in association with the University of Sydney was established within a few years of the opening of the University, and at Melbourne University within fifteen years of its opening, it was to be some fifty years before such a college was established in association with the University of Adelaide. While some generous donations were given in support of the growth of the University, there was little willingness to compromise the separation of Church and State by giving any priority to the founding of denominational residential colleges. This was especially so during the economically depressed final decade of the nineteenth century, particularly with the impact of drought on the colony. There was also the strong influence of the Scottish tradition that

\(^{12}\) *Ibid* p.53

\(^{13}\) *Ibid* p.223. Bishop Short continued as Chancellor till 1883, the year of his death following his return to England. Samuel Way succeeded him and held the position until his death in 1916.
students learn best as they survive on “haggis in a hovel”\textsuperscript{14} rather than in supervised care, and that they did not need special tutorial assistance but rather should depend upon the lectures of the professors. It was, perhaps, a particularly pious Presbyterian precept of the Protestant work ethic. There was also no land set aside for colleges, as in Sydney and Melbourne, and moves in the early 1900s to relocate the University to larger sites that would allow for colleges were opposed as unnecessary and a threat to the advantages enjoyed by the University’s central location.\textsuperscript{15} A similar argument had been lost in Sydney with the re-location of the University from College Street to Grose Farm. The intervention of the First World War did not help any moves to promote the establishment of a residential college.

It was not until 1919 that a group of masters at St. Peter’s College proposed the setting up of a residential college for the University. They were supported by the Headmaster of St. Peter’s, who was an Oxford graduate, and by the Bishop of Adelaide, A. N. Thomas, though a meeting to set up a committee and launch an appeal was not held until 1922. The appeal raised £12,000 and the committee purchased the home of the late Sir John Downer and an adjoining two acres of land in North Adelaide, which provided room for a College, to be known as St. Mark’s, to house up to 150 men.\textsuperscript{16} The site adjoins that of St. Peter’s Cathedral
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and is a short walking distance from the University. The first Master was Dr (later Sir) Archibald Grenfell Price. As well as care and tutorial supervision, the College, which opened in 1925, was to provide opportunity for worship and religious instruction to men of all religious denominations.

A decade later, in 1936, following a meeting of the Aquinas Society, an association of Catholic students and graduates, a committee was formed to work towards the establishment of a Catholic residential college in association with the University. However, just as the First World War had delayed the setting up of St. Mark’s College, the outbreak of World War II slowed any progress towards a Catholic College. With the support of the Catholic Bishops of Adelaide and Port Pirie, the former home in North Adelaide of Sir Samuel Way, who succeeded Bishop Short as Chancellor, was purchased in 1948, and Aquinas College opened in 1950. Like St. Mark’s, Aquinas College was established to accommodate students of any religion or none, but provision was made for the conduct of religious services and instruction. Neither college, however, made any formal provision for theological training.

In 1938, the South Australian Conference of the Methodist Church appointed a committee to set up a residential University college, but it too was delayed in its task by the outbreak of the War. Various sites were sought, but in 1951, with funds provided from the Methodist Conference and the Epworth Trust, a residence in Brougham Place, North Adelaide, was purchased. Named after John
Wesley’s College at Oxford, ‘Lincoln College’ received its first resident male students in March 1952, with the Reverend Dr Frank Hambly as Master. Women were not admitted to the College as residents until 1973.

A Presbyterian College, St. Andrew’s, was formed in 1928, but in a property some distance from the University, and this, together with the impact of the years of the Depression, forced its closure in 1936. A move in 1946 to involve the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches in the Methodists’ plans for a residential college also failed. A more successful move to form a Women’s College began in 1937, with strong support from influential women, including the wife of the Master of St. Mark’s College, the wife of the Headmaster of St. Peter’s College, and the one woman representative on the Adelaide University Council, Dr Helen Mayo. Like the Women’s College at Sydney University, the College, to be known as St. Ann’s, was to be non-denominational. Financial assistance came from a range of groups and individuals, and a home in Brougham Place was made available for the purpose of establishing the College, which opened in 1947.

The residential colleges of the University of Adelaide, like those of Sydney and Melbourne Universities, were founded with a need to provide residence and
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17 Ibid p.135
18 Ibid p.134
19 Ibid p.136
20 Some twenty years later, in a new era of funding for universities and colleges, with a gift from Mrs Kathleen Lumley matched by the State, and the combined amount matched by the Commonwealth, ‘Kathleen Lumley College’ opened in 1968 as a residence for post-graduate students of the University – the fifth college to be affiliated with the University.
support for students of the University, especially those from the country. Also like Sydney and Melbourne, the denominational colleges provided opportunity for students to engage in religious discussion, instruction and worship within the wider framework of the secular campus and curriculum. The “very difficult scheme” of compromise between college and campus, of co-operation and coexistence, had become the Australian pattern. Nevertheless, unlike Sydney, but like Melbourne, the State played no direct part in the establishment of the colleges and no funds were provided.\textsuperscript{21} Their association and terms of affiliation were determined by the University. Unlike Sydney and Melbourne, the Adelaide colleges were not allocated land within or adjacent to the University campus. The colleges were much later developments in association with the University, with the majority of them, though mooted before, opened after World War II. None of the Adelaide colleges were established with theological halls or formal courses of training for the work of ordained or lay ministry. This was to be the task of separate Protestant colleges and a Catholic seminary, which, in 1979, combined as the Adelaide College of Divinity in association with the Flinders University.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21} Kathleen Lumley College, however, benefited from the provisions of government funding following the Murray Report of 1958.

\textsuperscript{22} Parkin-Wesley College (Uniting), St. Barnabas’ College (Anglican), and the Catholic Theological College (the academic arm of St. Francis Xavier Seminary) now share a common campus at Brooklyn Park and teach for the degrees in theology of the Flinders University. The ACD also includes Nungalinya College in Darwin. In 1986 the then Warden of St. Barnabas’
The University of Tasmania:

Australia’s fourth university, the University of Tasmania, was inaugurated in 1890. It was the last of the nineteenth century universities - but only just, since finance and support in other ways were much less forthcoming than had been the case in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. The weight and the wealth of Sydney and especially Melbourne supporters ensured the establishment of the universities and, to a large degree, the residential colleges. Many of the supporters were significant figures in Church, State and the colonial community at large. In Adelaide there was sufficient support, with more indifference than opposition on the part of others.

In the convict colony of Tasmania there was much more scepticism about the need for a university. It seemed incongruous to focus on issues of higher learning akin to those espoused in Britain in the context of a colony that was “originally established to absorb the refuse of British society”23, and which demanded more attention to practical training at the secondary level. There were, nevertheless, moves to establish secondary institutions, like ‘The Kings School’ and the ‘Australian College’ in Sydney and like ‘St. Peter’s College’ in Adelaide, each of which, it was envisaged, might become a university. In 1840, the Tasmanian Governor, Sir John Franklin, established ‘Christ’s College’ as a State institution

---

23 Richard Davis Open to Talent: The Centenary History of the University of Tasmania 1890-1990 University of Tasmania, Hobart, 1990, p.1
but run according to Christian principles. Rivalry among the churches as to what form of Christian teaching would be taught contributed largely to the failure and closure of the College in 1843. The first Anglican Bishop of Tasmania, Francis Nixon, re-established the College as a church foundation in 1846, with the Hutchins School in Hobart and the Launceston Grammar School as feeder institutions. The College, it was hoped, would form the basis of a future university as well as provide training for those preparing to enter the ordained ministry.\textsuperscript{24} Financial difficulties and the distance of the College from Hobart caused its closure in 1856. In 1850, on a non-sectarian basis similar to that of ‘The Sydney College’, the ‘Hobart High School’ was established on Hobart’s Domain.\textsuperscript{25} Its supporters included the Governor, Sir William Dennison, and a Quaker missionary and wealthy businessman, George Walker.\textsuperscript{26} In 1855, however, this venture also closed particularly for lack of financial support.

In 1859, the Tasmanian House of Assembly established a Tasmanian Council of Education (TCE) as an examining body for the ‘Associate of Arts’, essentially a matriculation qualification upon which, for example, two scholarships were offered each year at English universities. While some argued that sending scholars to England was an extravagance, the role of the TCE was close to what a number argued as more appropriate for Tasmania – an examining tertiary body

\textsuperscript{24} O.S.Heyward (later Bishop) \textit{A Brief History of The College 1846-1971} Paper provided by Christ College, The University of Tasmania, p.1
\textsuperscript{25} Also like ‘The Sydney College’, the Gothic ‘Hobart High School’ building was to be the site of the opening of the University of Tasmania, and of its campus until the move to Sandy Bay.
\textsuperscript{26} Richard Davis \textit{op cit} p.5
along the lines of the University of London, rather than an institution of teachers and scholars. Some, including the Reverend George Clarke, a Congregationalist and member of the TCE, saw an examining body as a step towards a full teaching university. It was also argued that the TCE could introduce further courses and itself award a BA degree after three years, though, for example, the Chancellor of Melbourne University, Sir Redmond Barry, “warned that his university would not accept Tasmanian degrees unless from a chartered institution”. In one way or the other, the Council saw itself as the forerunner of a university, though “it was accused of elitism, being a narrow coterie, and showing excessive sympathy to Anglican Church interests”.

The debate over whether a university should be a teaching institution or an examining body, and indeed whether a teaching university should be based upon a residential hall or lecture room, continued till 1889. In October of that year a bill was introduced to Parliament for the establishment of an examining and teaching university based more on the Scottish tradition of professorial lectures, as was the case in the other Australian universities. Like the other universities, there were to be no religious tests and only four clergy could be members of the Council, with the Tasmanian Attorney General declaring that the churches “had too much control of education and had exercised a narrowing and pernicious influence on it.” After strong debate in the Assembly, the bill was passed and

27 Ibid p.10  
28 Ibid p.9  
29 Ibid p.18  
30 Ibid p.19
given royal assent, with it becoming operative on 1st January 1890. Tasmania had a secular University, though the Council included, as did those of Melbourne and Adelaide, the Anglican Bishop, Henry Montgomery, who was also the first to be admitted to a degree of the University ad eundem. Like Melbourne and Adelaide, the University had the right to affiliate related institutions.

‘Christ’ and Other Colleges:

The University found a home in the building on the Domain in Hobart that had been the Hobart High School until 1855. The building had been leased since 1885 by Christ’s College, which had re-opened in 1879, but again it chiefly functioned as a secondary school in competition with others, with theological students taught elsewhere. The College’s lease was not renewed at the time of the University’s foundation, and, following debate and an enquiry, it was recommended that the College should prepare senior students for entry to the University, and that it should also provide theological training and provide accommodation for University students. The funds of the College were used to establish a matriculation college at The Hutchins School and to purchase the old Rectory of Holy Trinity Church in Hobart, to be used as a hostel for theological and university students. Some rivalry between The Hutchins School and Launceston Grammar eventually contributed to the passing in 1926 of the ‘Christ
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31 Ibid
32 Bishop Montgomery was the father of Viscount Bernard Montgomery of El Alamein.
33 O.S.Heyward op.cit.p.3
College Act\^34, whereby the matriculation sections of each school were seen to be fulfilling the secular intentions of the founders of the College, and each was given one third of the capital assets of the College. The remaining third was used to up-grade the theological college/hostel site.\^35 In 1929 the theological college closed, but accommodation for university students remained. The College was affiliated with the University of Tasmania in 1933, and a further wing of twelve rooms was added in 1945. In 1962, in the early period of major funding from Commonwealth and State governments following the Murray Report, Christ College moved to the University’s new site at Sandy Bay. At that time there were fifty residents, and by 1971, when the completed College buildings were opened, there was provision for some one hundred and fifty male and female residents. There continued at that time to be some teaching of theology in evening classes, but this function decreased as that of providing care and tuition for resident university students increased.\^36

Two more denominational residential colleges were established in association with the University, but not until the post World War II period. Jane Franklin Hall, named after the wife of the early Governor, Sir John Franklin, was founded by the Tasmanian Council of Churches in 1950. Situated between the city and the Sandy Bay campus, the College was to be open to men and women students of all creeds and persuasions, but chaplains were appointed and Christian services

\^34 The name had changed from ‘Christ’s College’ to ‘Christ College’

\^35 Ibid p.4

\^36 Ibid p.5. In 1991 the ownership and management of the College passed to the University. The agreement made provided for the continuation of the College’s Anglican traditions.
occasionally held. It was to become the largest college, with some two hundred resident students. To meet the needs of Catholic graduate and undergraduate students living away from home, the then Catholic Archbishop of Hobart, Sir Guilford Young, established St. John Fisher College in 1963, with a particular aim to integrate religious faith with secular culture. Neither Jane Franklin Hall nor St. John Fisher College were established as theological institutions, but primarily, as had clearly become the Australian pattern by the mid twentieth century, as places of residence which provided care and tuition, and opportunities for intellectual engagement, religious practice, and service to the wider community. With the University itself having great difficulty in securing funds for development and for its services and programs, all the colleges faced financial challenges in their establishment and growth. Certainly new impetus was given for them in the 1960s by the federal Government’s acceptance of the Murray Report recommendations.

The University of Queensland:

Though founded in the early 1900’s, the Universities of Queensland and Western Australia are considered as among Australia’s first universities – or at least among the ‘first wave’. The first group of residential colleges of the University of Queensland, founded in 1909, were established much sooner than, and indeed

37 The College was named after the beheaded Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester and Chancellor of Cambridge University in the early sixteenth century. It became co-residential when it merged with the smaller Ena Waite women’s college in 1980.
prior to those in affiliation with Adelaide and Hobart Universities; and, as a
group, even sooner than those of Sydney and Melbourne. Emmanuel
(Presbyterian) and St. John’s (Anglican) Colleges were established in 1911;
King’s College (Methodist) in 1912; Women’s College (undenominational) in
1914; and St. Leo’s (Catholic) in 1917 – all within eight years of the University’s
foundation. Like Adelaide and Hobart, however, the colleges were not located on
the University campus. In Brisbane, the site chosen for the University,
Government House, was also within the city and was considered, particularly by
parliamentarians and government officials, to be of sufficient size for the
purpose. This was to be a short-sighted view, as in Hobart, but at the time the
imperative of opening a University to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of
Queensland’s independence from New South Wales determined the choice of the
most expedient option. While one of the proposed sites, Victoria Park, was noted
in the *Telegraph* newspaper as being ideal in size as it would allow for a sports
oval, parkland, and residential colleges38, others saw it as too inaccessible to
students from the southern side of the river or, in places, too unsuitable for
development.

The possibility of locating residential colleges on campus, however, was a reason
for one politician not to choose a larger site. The Minister for Public Instruction
1903-1908, A. H. Barlow, feared that the construction of residential colleges and
the provision of playing fields would make the University too like Oxbridge,

38 M.I.Thomis *A Place of Light and Learning: The University of Queensland’s First Seventy-five Years*, University of Queensland Press, St.Lucia QLD, 1985, p.26
would encourage idleness, and that “the evil of sectarianism would creep in to an organisation required by law to give no official recognition to political or religious creeds”.

Barlow made it clear in further parliamentary debates on the University that he opposed denominational residential colleges, and that if required, residences could be run in the town as boarding houses under University Senate regulations: “I am entirely opposed to (affiliated denominational colleges). I do not think they do any good. We want a thoroughly unsectarian University.”

There was a determination to establish a University more attuned to the contemporary and practical needs of the State than one reflective of the traditions of the older universities of England and, it was argued, of the University of Sydney. Barlow viewed those who sought a larger site as trying to establish “a copy of the old world universities. Queensland did not want that – it wanted a practical teacher, which would be accessible to the poorest child in the State”. In supporting the secular nature of the University, and in opposing moves that would allow for denominational colleges on the University site, other politicians argued that the State had nothing whatever to do with theological matters and that in a University paid for and maintained by the people
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39 Ibid p.97 (The Act to Incorporate and Endow the University of Queensland included, as the earlier Australian universities, a clause (Clause 29) preventing the administration of religious tests for the purposes of admission, the holding of any office, or the enjoyment of “any benefit, advantage or privilege”)
40 Philip Raymont Donaldson’s College: Archbishop St Clair Donaldson and the Foundation of St.John’s College, The University of Queensland , Unpublished MEd thesis, University of Melbourne, p.56
41 Ibid p.6
42 Ibid p.34. A.H.Barlow reported in The Brisbane Courier 15/12/1911
there should be no support for anything that represented or recognised class, caste or creed.43

**Colleges and “the virtue of character”:**

One of those who sought a larger site was the Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane, St. Clair Donaldson, who expressed the hope that the Government would provide land for denominational colleges “where the undergraduates may obtain the advantages of that social life, which contributes at least one half of the benefit of University education”.44 Archbishop Donaldson’s background as a schoolboy and student at Eton and Cambridge no doubt influenced his position on the role and importance of colleges in the life of the university. His uncle was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and his eldest brother became Master of Magdalene College and, during 1912 and 1913, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University.45 Colleges represented, contrary to the view of the secularists, the “indissoluble relationship between religion and education, out of which came the virtue of character”.46 The secular university alone could not best develop the intellect; it could propagate knowledge but not produce character. Residential colleges provided opportunities for academic stimulation, companionship, free interchange of ideas, and for moral and spiritual development, all of which were essential, in Donaldson’s view, for the production of character.

43 Ibid pp.58-59  
44 Ibid p.31. Reported in The Church Chronicle 1/9/1911  
45 Ibid p.53  
46 Ibid p.47
The Archbishop’s views were not unsupported in the University. Though in favour of the Government House site, the foundation Vice-Chancellor, Reginald H. Roe, noted that affiliated residential colleges would not only supply a home and supplementary tuition for country students, they would also allow for the development amongst them of friendships, loyalty and keen public spirit.47 Nevertheless, the secularists – so keen to establish in a new century a university relevant to the practical and professional needs of Queensland - would have been irked by the Archbishop’s attitude as expressed in a letter he wrote a couple of years after the foundation of St. John’s College: “St. John’s College represents an attempt to reproduce the atmosphere of our English Universities in the Dominions of the Empire, for we feel that there is no better way of inculcating the best traditions of our race in these new countries.”48 This view was in stark contrast to the conditions and reasons that encouraged the government to promote and establish a “people’s university” that would particularly foster practical and scientific instruction.49

The “frontier” nature of Queensland, with an essentially rural society scattered over a vast area and with a minority of the population centred in the south-east, in and around Brisbane, had posed a barrier in the latter 1800s to the promotion of the idea of a university. A university was seen as a luxury and among the least of priorities. In 1874 Sir Samuel Griffith, Minister for Public Instruction, stated

47 Ibid p.39  
48 Ibid p.44  
49 M.I.Thomis op.cit. pp.22-23
that a university was a future issue, not an immediate one. However, with the view that a university could develop the material resources of the colony, Griffith became involved in the University Extension Movement launched in 1893, which provided lecture courses in adult education and classes leading to Sydney University matriculation qualifications and towards examinations for Melbourne degrees. In 1906 a University Congress was held at which a draft Bill for a Queensland university was prepared. J. D. Story, Under-Secretary for Public Instruction, attended the Congress and was encouraged by it to consider a university alongside plans already in place for the department to be more involved with secondary and higher education, particularly in establishing a Teachers’ College. It made sense to have a comprehensive primary to tertiary system of education under the control of the Government and administered by the Department. In line with the ‘State Aid Discontinuance Act’ of 1860, it would extend the principle that State money would not be directed towards religious groups in association with a university. The aim to establish a secular university to commemorate the State’s fiftieth anniversary in December 1909 gained momentum.

When the University was inaugurated on 10th December 1909, an Anglican theological college for the training of candidates for the ministry had already been established in 1897, and had moved to a site at Nundah in 1907. Named ‘St.
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50 Ibid p.8  
51 Ibid p.13  
52 Ibid p.16
Francis College53 in 1910, it had been the intention that the College eventually would be affiliated with a university and function both as a theological college and as a residence for students of the University54, rather like St. Andrew’s at Sydney, and Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s at Melbourne. Archbishop Donaldson, however, preferred the separate theological college with the hope that it would be a centre for the whole province of Queensland, and a place to which candidates would proceed whether graduates of the University or not.55 The College’s second Principal, appointed in 1910, Canon Philip Micklem56, strongly supported Donaldson’s view, noting the importance of having university students who aspired to be candidates for the ministry living alongside those who aspired to other professions, in a residence that was not a theological college.57 In 1912, at much the same time as the Presbyterians opened Emmanuel College, and the Methodists established King’s College, St. John’s College opened as an Anglican residential college in association with the University of Queensland. Both Emmanuel and King’s, however, had theological halls. A non-denominational Women’s College, the third in Australia, was established in 1914, while a Catholic college for men, St. Leo’s, was founded in 1917. Each college was on a site close to but apart from the University, and was established without State assistance. While St. John’s College initially was established and generously supported by Archbishop Donaldson58 as a private company, not dependent upon

53 Named after the parish church at Nundah
54 Philip Raymont op.cit. pp.74-75
55 Ibid pp.75-78
56 Canon Micklem was later Rector of St. James’ Church, King Street, Sydney.
57 Philip Raymont op.cit. pp. 80-81
58 Thus the title of Philip Raymont’s thesis: “Donaldson’s College ...”
the diocese for its funds, on-going financial difficulties led to the company being wound up and the Diocese of Brisbane assuming responsibility for the continuing work of the College.

These early colleges were in what were seen as temporary residences, much as the University was itself in the old Government House, and the boards of the colleges were supportive of proposals eventually to re-locate the University to a more appropriate site, hopefully with land set aside for the colleges.\textsuperscript{59} This did not occur until after the Second World War, when the University moved to its present site at St. Lucia. The post-war period saw not only the re-location of the first colleges, but the opening of new ones – Union (1949: non-denominational, co-residential), Cromwell (1950: Uniting, co-residential), Duchesne \textsuperscript{60} (1959: Catholic, women), and Grace (1970: Uniting and Presbyterian, women). It had taken some fifty years to overcome the objections of some of the founders of the University, and for the colleges to be located, like those of Sydney and Melbourne, on or adjacent to the University’s site. In many ways, contrary to the previously noted views, and reflecting the post World War II pressing demand for university student accommodation, the University was attuned to the contemporary and practical needs of the State in allowing for residential colleges – denominational and otherwise - on its new site, albeit that the colleges no doubt reflected something of the traditions of the older universities of England and of the University of Sydney. Like the denominational colleges of Sydney,

\textsuperscript{59} M.I.Thomis \textit{op.cit.} p.98
\textsuperscript{60} Duschesne College had begun in Toowong, QLD, in 1937.
Melbourne, Adelaide and Tasmania, those of Queensland were separate in religious foundation and style, but in relationship with the University, they were supportive of it, and it of them.

The University of Western Australia:

The terms of the Queensland University Act, along with the patterns adopted by the other universities of the Australian eastern states, had the greatest influence on the recommendations of a Royal Commission established in Perth in 1909 on the establishment of a University for Western Australia. While other overseas models were considered, it was found that for the most part the constitutions of the other Australian universities, themselves formed from a mix of overseas patterns, best suited the needs of a developing state and new nation. The Commission adopted “the model which is just entering upon its work in Queensland and which in many ways is the most liberal and most in accord with modern requirements.”

By the early 1900s, a combination of the development of responsible government, gold discoveries in the Kimberleys, Coolgardie and in Kalgoorlie, and significant population growth, led to a greater sense of confidence and progress in the State, and to a more determined focus on the role that education
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61 F. Alexander *Campus at Crawley: A Narrative and Critical Appreciation of the First Fifty Years of the University of Western Australia* F.W.Cheshire, Melbourne, 1963, pp.24-29
62 *Ibid* p.29
63 *Ibid* p.10: The population in 1883 was 31,700; in 1895 it was 101,143; and 239,000 by 1904.
should play in such development. “The advisability of at once establishing a University or University Institute”, moved John Winthrop Hackett in the Legislative Council on 24th September 1901, “demands, in the best interests of the State, the immediate consideration of the Government.”\textsuperscript{64} A university had been proposed in 1883 by Sydney-based Anthony Hordern, who was interested in land and railway development between Perth and Albany. He gained more interest in a proposal for the establishment of an agricultural college, though much less interest in his wish to receive 25 million acres in return for the cost of the college!\textsuperscript{65} Greater interest was fostered by the conduct in Perth of extension courses and examinations of the University of Adelaide. Further impetus was given by the work of the trustees of an endowment established by the Government in 1903 for the purchase of land for a future university, and by that of a Graduates Union formed in 1906. In 1907, representatives of the extension courses committee, the endowment trustees, and the Graduates’ Union proposed to the Government that a Royal Commission be established to inquire into the setting up of a university.

Through two members of the Royal Commission, the Church – and especially the Anglican Church – was closely associated with the foundation of the University of Western Australia, although similar restrictions as those in the other Australian universities were placed on the influence and involvement of sectarian

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid p.11
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid p.5
interests. In addition to his being part proprietor and editor of *The West Australian* and a member of the Legislative Council, John Winthrop Hackett, the Commission’s Chairman and later first Chancellor of the University, was Chancellor to and Registrar of the diocese of Perth. He was the son of a clergyman, and a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, where he was a fellow student with Alexander Leeper, later to be Warden of Trinity College, University of Melbourne. He studied law and was called to the Irish Bar and then, following his emigration to Sydney, to the New South Wales Bar in 1875. His interest in journalism was taken up with work for the *Sydney Morning Herald*, but he went to Melbourne in 1876 to be Leeper’s deputy at Trinity College. Though receiving little remuneration at the College, where he remained until 1882, he contributed greatly to it, and “especially to the Dialectic Society and the first play”. 66 His address as first ‘Prelector’ of the Dialectic Society in 1879 was on the topic of “The History and Hopes of the University Movement”. 67 The hope of a university remained a driving force with Hackett after he moved to Western Australia.

Also a member of the Royal Commission and its Deputy Chairman was the Anglican Bishop of Perth 68, Charles Riley. A graduate of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Riley was offered the Perth diocese on delegation by the
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66 James Grant *op.cit.* p.18

67 Ibid p. 87

68 In 1914, with the establishment of a Province, the Bishop of Perth became Archbishop.
Bishop of Manchester, James Moorhouse, in 1894. While Riley was more evangelical than Anglo-Catholic, he “revealed a tolerance, liberalism and catholicity of mind” that contributed much to the “avoidance and elimination of party friction in the diocese of Perth”. It also accounted in large measure, certainly in contrast to Sydney some fifty years before, for a seeming lack of any significant sectarian rivalry, as Bishop Riley, for example, was on good terms with his Roman Catholic counterparts, Matthew Gibney and Patrick Clune. There was some evidence, however, of disquiet among other Protestant leaders who were somewhat in Riley’s shadow and felt their positions to be rather disregarded. It is possible that their representations led to or reinforced a view to exclude all clergy, including Riley, from the first Senate of the University. The Bishop was clearly affronted by this exclusion, declaring that he was “left out in the cold” and that he was “disgusted with the place”. He nevertheless accepted the position of Warden of Convocation, which elected him to the Senate in 1914. Riley had supported the move in Western Australia to make public education, as in New South Wales, free, compulsory and secular, with the right, however, of clergy to give religious instruction in the State schools – a move opposed by the Roman Catholics; and he “recognised, for example, that in a secular state it was often impossible to impose Christian conditions upon people who would not

69 Moorhouse had been Bishop of Melbourne and the third Chancellor of the University of Melbourne – a position that Riley would assume in Western Australia on the death of Hackett in 1916.
71 F. Alexander Campus at Crawley op. cit. p.36
72 Ibid p.49
73 Ibid p.49, and P.J. Boyce op. cit. p.82
accept them.”74 This meant that Bishop Riley, while not compromising his firm stance on the imperatives of faith, was able to exercise significant influence in the affairs of the University that he helped to establish. He came to be known as “the people’s Archbishop”75, respected in the wider community of Perth and beyond.76 Both J. W. Hackett and C. O. L. Riley, who became close friends, were men with practical purpose rather than pious hope in their efforts to bring about the foundation of a university in Perth. In the process, each was able to accommodate the changes in government and to relate to political leaders on both sides. Hackett “more than any other single man gave the University its ‘practical’ character”77, though he did not entirely oppose the traditions and character of the older universities.

**Colleges at Crawley:**

The ‘University of Western Australia Act’ of 1911, based upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission, drew much from the ‘University of Queensland Act’ of 1900. Convocation, however, unlike Queensland, had a role of review and approval of “legislation” passed by the Senate - a fact that made Riley’s position as first Warden of Convocation a not insignificant one. Also unlike Queensland, the first site of the University, in Irwin Street, was definitely
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74 P.J.Boyce *op.cit.* p.64
75 *Ibid* p.106
76 In 1901, Bishop Riley was invited to preach at St.Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, at a Service to mark the opening of the inaugural federal parliament.
77 F.Alexander *op.cit.* p.126
seen as temporary, though years of argument followed as to the most appropriate permanent site before the Crawley site was chosen in 1922. A firm of Melbourne architects had prepared a design concept for the new University site in 1915, well before the decision to establish at Crawley, and, with reference to the 1915 plan, a more permanent plan of development was prepared by Professor Leslie Wilkinson, foundation Professor of Architecture at Sydney University, in 1926-27. Both plans provided for a colleges’ precinct across the road from the main entrance to the University’s administrative and ceremonial buildings. There was little question in the early years that colleges would be closely associated with the campus, in much the same way as they were at Sydney and Melbourne. Inevitably, however, as in the other States, there were critics, such as William Somerville, a member of the Senate, who believed that residential colleges were survivals of the bad, old world tradition of the University as an exclusive community; that they would preserve “the old school tie” and would be places for the rich. Colleges, he believed, in their “herding together of young men in small coteries under a clergyman”, were inconsistent with Australian democracy. These objections, while perhaps signalling the later development of university halls and hostels, did not carry sufficient weight, and the Western Australian Parliament passed in 1926, on request of the University Senate, the University Colleges Act. This enabled the Senate to set aside land, to a maximum of five acres, for the purpose of any body of persons who desired to establish a College.

78 Ibid pp.514-515
79 Ibid
In 1913 the Methodist Conference in Perth heard its retiring President express the view that, like the Methodists of Oxford, their trainee students should be associated with the University, both to enrich them and they to “exercise an influence for good” in the University.\textsuperscript{80} The sentiment was warmly received, but there was no corresponding warmth in financial support. A residential college for Anglican theological students, St. John’s College, was located in premises close to Irwin Street, which had been the site of various schools since 1858. By 1918, the college was being used more by university students than theological candidates, and in 1920 the Perth diocese agreed to a proposal by the Guild of Undergraduates for the theological college to be designated as a university hostel. The hostel operated until 1930, when, despite the financial support of Archbishop Riley, his successor, Archbishop Le Fanu, closed it, with a determination “to draw a sharp distinction between the church’s future college on the campus (Crawley) and its sometime University hostel in the city.”\textsuperscript{81}

By 1926, in anticipation of the establishment of colleges, land had been allocated by the Senate of the University to the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches. While the other denominations were unable to proceed at this time with building colleges, a substantial bequest from Sir Winthrop Hackett allowed work to commence on the Anglican ‘St. George’s College’. In 1926, Archbishop Riley wrote: “The prospect of being able to have our College at the University in the near future has given me a keen desire to live

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid p.506
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid p.508-509
a few years longer, that I may see this great work an accomplished fact.”

On 8th March 1929, just over three months before his death, he laid the foundation stone of a building that in style resembled that of his old Cambridge College, ‘Gonville and Caius’, with the Oxbridge ‘staircase’ arrangement of rooms, rather than the corridor arrangement, and with a chapel dominating the quadrangle. The College opened in 1931 under the Acting Wardenship, and later Wardenship, of the former Headmaster of Guilford Grammar School, Canon Henn. It was very much a college of the diocese, with either the Warden or the Sub-Warden to be a priest of the Church of England, with the Archbishop as Chairman of the Board (a number of whom was appointed by the diocese), and an expectation that all members of the College would attend services in the Chapel, unless granted exemption by the Warden.

Nevertheless, it was not a theological institution, with the view that the College would provide, together with the University, a good liberal education for any candidates for the ordained ministry. Through the 1930s, St. George’s College grew and developed in the same form and character as the older colleges of the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne.

Lack of funding proved to be the main obstacle to the establishment of the other colleges and halls at the University. Moves began, for example, in 1925 for the setting up by the Young Women’s Christian Association of a women’s hostel and, in 1927, of an undenominational women’s college supported by a ‘Fund

---
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Committee’ formed by the Western Australian Association of University Women. The University’s first Vice-Chancellor, Professor H. E. Whitfeld, was particularly supportive of the latter proposal, though following a visit to the United States in 1938, he saw value and potential in encouraging the setting up of co-operative residential halls in association with the Guild of Students. The dormitories and shared dining halls of American campuses made “the University campus a real centre of life in the community”, and he noted the benefit for students of the opportunity to exchange ideas and to make life-long friends.85 With Professor Whitfeld’s death in 1939, and the intervening period of World War II, the co-operative scheme did not progress and there was further delay in the setting up of a residential facility for women. Nevertheless, the scheme perhaps signalled the significant development in Australia after the War of the growth of university residential halls or hostels, rather than of the more traditional, and in most cases denominational, affiliated colleges. In 1945, however, temporary ‘Batchelor Officers’ Quarters’ used by the United States Navy during the War and located close to the Crawley campus, were taken over by the University for use as a hostel for men and women, with thirty-four women in 1946 forming a Women’s College within the one hundred and thirty room facility.86 Following various plans and proposals for building on a permanent site, it wasn’t until after the adoption by the Federal Government of the Murray Report into universities in Australia in 1957, that work proceeded towards the
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opening of St. Catherine’s (Women’s) College in 1960. The men’s hostel in the temporary war time huts, became an undenominational hall of residence. Named “Currie Hall” after the University’s second Vice-Chancellor, it did not move into permanent buildings until 1974.

The Catholic ‘Newman Society’, together with successive Archbishops of Perth, Clune and Prendiville, made various representations to the University from 1925 for a site to establish a Catholic residential college. There was no objection from the University, but, again, funding was the major stumbling block to work being commenced on a site adjacent to St. George’s College. Eventually opened in 1955, it took the name ‘St. Thomas More’. While first mooted in 1913, a Methodist college did not open until 1963. Though funding was an issue, there were difficulties in relation to the degree of control the Methodist Conference might have over the College Council, and, given the desire of Conference for the college to be a theological as well as a university residential college, to the status of any theological students who were not students of the University. The Conference was persuaded by the University that it had sufficient influence through its representatives on the College Council, and that unmatriculated students, with the approval of the University Senate, could receive theological

---

87 *Ibid* p.552. Named after Catherine of Alexandria, learned in sciences and defender of Christians against their persecution by Emperor Maximus. The choice of name is interesting for an undenominational college; there was considerable discussion before it was chosen!

88 *Ibid* p.550. The Minutes of an Appeal Committee meeting in July 1952 noted that the Archbishop had suggested the name ‘St Thomas More’ College. The name of ‘Newman College’ was considered too likely to be confused with the Catholic College at Melbourne University. There was even concern that, if referred to as ‘More’, St. Thomas More College might be confused with the Anglican Moore Theological College in Sydney!
instruction at the College provided they were non-resident. Named after Kingswood School, founded by John Wesley near Bristol in 1748, the College sought to be a place, within the University, of training for ministry as well as a place of residence for those training for other professions. In 1971, with plans for the State’s second university, Murdoch, already underway, the Presbyterian Church opened the co-residential St. Columba College on a site in line with the other University of Western Australia colleges.

**Strengths and Strains in the Partnership between College and Campus:**

The establishment of the residential colleges of Australia’s first six universities, in particular those founded by the churches or by religious groups, spanned over a century of development in extending the “very difficult experiment” of uniting, in Professor John Woolley’s terms “the general secular teaching of a University with independent denominational Colleges”. The foundation of Sydney University and its colleges was at a time when higher education increasingly was being seen as having moral and social force, as well as practical import in meeting the needs of new professions; and, in particular in the new colony, as Sir Charles Nicholson wrote to his friend Archibald Cunningham, as “a nursery of the future legislators and rulers of this country, providing the high moral and intellectual cultivation which are alone calculated to save society from the evils
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wherewith it is threatened.”90 With strong opposition from church leaders in New South Wales, and especially those of the Church of England, Bishops Broughton and Tyrrell, who saw the new University as “godless” and “anti-church”, the Act of Incorporation borrowed phrases from the charters of the new University of London and from the Queen’s Colleges of Ireland that gave expression to the view of dissenters and of the movement for liberal reform. The University would be “for the better advancement of religion and morality, and the promotion of useful knowledge” and “no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a Student of the said University”. The University would be open to all classes and denominations, “without any distinction whatsoever” and dominated or influenced by none. Melbourne University was “instituted in honour of God”, but would be “open to all classes ... who will be unchecked in their career by the imposition of any intrusive test or comprise of religious belief.”91 Sectarian or denominational rivalry, so much a part of the provision of schooling in the early years of the colonies, narrow dogmatism and any assumed religious status, would play no part in the universities. It was perhaps far better to ride the protest against the secular university, than to incur “the additional danger of alienating a host of more implacable foes by (the University) becoming a centre of religious controversy.”92 Rather, noted Wentworth, religion would be “instilled”93, in
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perhaps much the same way as Bishop Augustus Short of Adelaide believed the University would “supply spiritual yearnings over and above material knowledge.”

Though arguably the setting up of denominational colleges was in some way a measure to placate the enormous influence of the churches and of churchmen in colonial affairs at the time - a compromise between church and campus - there was clearly on the part of government and university as well as church leaders, not only a genuine concern for the setting up of places of residence for university students, but a view that religious instruction and moral teaching and supervision in the colleges would enhance the well-being of those attending the lectures of the university. The early years were of a time when, despite the emerging focus on more professional and practical needs, and of the aim “to extend the secular, non-sectarian principle of National Education from the elementary school to the higher branches of learning”94, essentially there was still a “high” view of the role of the university and its affiliates as one of a moral and social improver.95

Nevertheless, in the foundation of the first universities and of the residential colleges, the separation and, to some degree, the strain between church and campus continued to be present. Affiliation of a denominational college would give its Principal, wrote the editor of the Melbourne Age, “the leverage from

94 Ibid p.76
95 David S.Macmillan op. cit. p.4
which he may shake the whole University system”. 96 “Sectarian or denominational tendencies” were to be avoided in the teaching and management of the University of Adelaide; the churches “had exercised a narrowing and pernicious influence” on education, warned the Tasmanian Attorney-General in relation to the establishment of the University of Tasmania; and the Queensland Minister for Public Instruction, A. H. Barlow, in wanting a “thoroughly unsectarian University”, feared that denominational colleges would introduce the “evil of sectarianism ... in to an organisation required by law to give no official recognition to political or religious creeds.”  In association with the first universities, only the Sydney colleges received state funding and direct provision of land; the other universities could determine the allocation of land for any colleges. Just as state assistance was withdrawn from church schools in the second half of the nineteenth century, so the majority of the colleges established before the mid-twentieth century in association with Australia’s first universities had to raise their own funds. The latter three of the universities - Tasmania, Queensland and Western Australia - reflected in name, around the turn of the nineteenth century and into the early years of the twentieth, a stronger and broader sense of state needs in the provision of higher education and training. They were places characterised by a more ready acceptance of functional purposes, rather than the more traditional view of the university as a “liberalising” and moral force in society. They came more often to be seen by the general public in the early years of the twentieth century as mere training schools

96 John Poynter Doubts and Certainties, p.70
for professional men. Against this, affiliated colleges of the older style of Sydney and Melbourne, were seen by many, apart from their provision of accommodation, supervised care and tuition, as places of privilege and out-of-touch with the demands of modern life. They were, according to William Somerville, for “a select number of silvertails” and they epitomised the conservative and anti-democratic sentiment of “the old school tie”.

Much, however was countered by the strong “establishment” links that existed or were forged between the churches and the universities. Despite the insistence on the separation of the sacred from the secular, significant roles were played in the universities by clerics and lay churchmen who were able to dispel, by their diplomacy and skill, any real fears that they represented divisive sectarian interests. Sir Charles Nicholson, a Church of England layman and the University of Sydney’s first Vice-Provost (later called Vice-Chancellor), was largely instrumental in bringing about co-operative agreement between the churches and the University, despite the strong protest of the Anglican bishops; and the Reverend John Woolley, Principal and first Professor of Classics, in his Inaugural Address at the University’s opening was firm in his view that the University in its secular instruction was by no means seeking to ignore or profane “the essence of our common faith”. Though his words did not do much to appease the concerns of William Tyrrell, Bishop of Newcastle, they won praise

97 David S.Macmillan op cit p.12
98 Fred Alexander (ed.) op cit pp. 514-515
99 C.Turney op cit pp. 76-77
from Henry Parkes who commented that the address showed “a remarkable freedom from religious dogmatism which we cannot too highly applaud.”\textsuperscript{100}

Anglican Bishop Perry and Catholic Bishop Goold were both members of the first Council of Melbourne University, with Perry having a particular friendship and influence with Hugh Childers, member of the Victorian Legislative Council and the University’s first Vice-Chancellor. This relationship was significant in the granting of land for denominational colleges.\textsuperscript{101} Melbourne’s second Anglican bishop, James Moorhouse, was Chancellor of Melbourne University from 1884 to 1886, when he became Bishop of Manchester; and John MacFarland, first Master of Ormond College, was Vice-Chancellor from 1910 to 1918, when he was elected Chancellor, a position he held until his death in 1935. Augustus Short, first Anglican Bishop of Adelaide, was Adelaide University’s first Vice-Chancellor, its second Chancellor, and its first recipient of a degree; and Bishop Henry Montgomery was first to be admitted to a degree of the University of Tasmania. Perhaps with some exaggeration, though reflecting the enormous energy he gave to the cause, the Bishop of North Queensland wrote on the occasion of the death of Archbishop Donaldson that Donaldson “was largely instrumental in the founding of Queensland’s University”.\textsuperscript{102} John Winthrop Hackett, Chancellor of the Anglican diocese of Perth and former Deputy to Alexander Leeper, first Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne, was the first

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid p.78
\textsuperscript{101} A.de Q.Robin \textit{op.cit.} p.104
Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, followed by his close friend, “the people’s Archbishop”, Charles Riley.

Conclusion:

The “very difficult experiment” to which John Woolley referred in 1859 had in large measure resulted, by the early years of the 1900s, in denominational and some non-denominational collegiate residences affiliated with their respective universities in which supervised care and tuition were provided for students attending the lectures of the university. Relatively few of them provided any theological training or even very much religious instruction, but all gave opportunity for the sharing of ideas and the common activities of community life. In this, perhaps, they did not realise the aims of the early founders. Religious expression was largely confined to the college chapel, meeting room or hall. In the wider context of the university, acknowledgement of religion was usually confined to formal debate, special occasion, club, committee or council meeting. Church and curriculum were separate, while college and campus formed a bond of co-existence and corporate life from which, it was hoped, in Archbishop Donaldson’s words, came “the virtue of character”.

Certainly by the mid 1900s, all the colleges of Australia’s first six universities, with the exception of the Adelaide colleges, had sites on or adjacent to the university, with the Tasmanian, Queensland and Western Australian colleges
being located respectively at the new sites of Sandy Bay, St. Lucia and Crawley. The new sites, however, very much reflected a new scene that was developing in the early 1900s, but which became the major thrust of university growth after World War II - that of the more vocational, professional and technological character of tertiary education. In many respects, the period between the first and the second world wars was one of continuity and consolidation for the universities and for the colleges, but with the post World War II demands and pressures of student numbers and scientific and industrial development, came new requirements for residence and new challenges for the role of denominational colleges. The inter-war period saw, for example in Western Australia, moves towards larger non-denominational co-operative halls or hostels. Within the universities, the growth of student Christian activity, particularly evangelical activity, and of opposition to it, formed much of the concern that led to the establishment of new denominational colleges, especially in Sydney.
CHAPTER FIVE

Consolidation and Challenge:

The Early 1900s to the 1950s

“If I were to build a monument to any man who exercised an influence on me at that time, it would be to Picken (Master of Ormond College, Melbourne University).”


By the period of the First World War, the establishment of denominational residential colleges in Australia’s secular universities had resulted in a pattern of compromise and co-existence that could simultaneously give rise to the seemingly conflicting claims that “the difficult problem (of uniting secular university training with collegiate residence of particular religious character) … has been solved”\(^1\), and that the colleges were rather exclusive and inconsistent with Australian democracy.\(^2\) There was, especially in the colleges of Australia’s first four universities, a certain Oxbridge character and style to them. This was despite the universities being born out of a desire to break away from ‘Establishment’ tradition and to embrace the ‘modern’ principles of secular teaching and equality of access.\(^3\) In the face of the colonial secular challenge, the setting up of the colleges could be seen as an attempt to maintain the old European religious and cultural order in a world of perplexing if not frightening change.\(^4\) The earlier universities and colleges no doubt needed to incorporate
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many of the Oxbridge traditions and trappings in order to gain respectability\footnote{K.J.Cable \textit{op.cit.} p.193} and to win students who might previously have been sent to Europe for further education. In the context, however, of colonies seeking and attaining self-government; of scientific, technological and commercial development, with a growing demand for more professionally focused courses; and with backgrounds involving the mixed aspirations, needs and demands of convicts, emancipists and free settlers, the residential colleges were seen by some as irrelevant, out-of-touch and exclusive. The Universities of Queensland and Western Australia, being founded early in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, reflected much more the contemporary aspirations of the State.

**A Distinctly Australian Pattern:**

Nevertheless, the provision of residence of some kind was an inescapable need for all the universities and certainly such residence was viewed in the light of an obligation to provide appropriate supervision, support and care for students of the university, especially those coming from country areas. They would have moral if not religious force, though the denominational colleges were recognised by most authorities as places where particular religious teaching could occur provided there was no religious test for membership and no hindrances put in the way of resident students receiving the teaching of the university. While perhaps in some ways not in tune with egalitarian sentiments expressed about the nature
of Australian democracy and society, the ‘solution’ to the separation of the sacred from the secular was seen in the development of a distinctly Australian pattern of relationship between church, college and campus, with characteristics that became well established during the first half of the twentieth century. Whatever the benefits for students of collegiate life, the nature of residential colleges in Australia was not only much determined by the exclusion of religion from the teaching of the university and by the insistence that resident students must attend the lectures of the university professors, but also by the fact that the majority of university students in Australia, unlike in other countries, lived at home and travelled each day to and from the university. The early universities were located in coastal capital cities and were separated by vast distances. There was little thought of attending a university in another State.

A.P. Rowe, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide from 1948 to 1958, noted that while there was much evidence of the benefits of student residence in terms of academic performance, breadth of understanding and social contact, and initiative and leadership, the established Australian pattern was that most students lived at home. While he felt that all students should spend some of their university years in a residential college, he acknowledged that perhaps the greatest obstacle to this was “an unfortunate Australian trait … a fear that students in residence will get something that others do not and the Australian reaction to a circumstance of this kind is too often to want to take away from those that have, rather than to make a great effort to extend the benefits to as
many as possible. Often in interviews with students I have encountered a feeling that residence is an undesirable class distinction.6 Earlier, around the turn of the century, George Arnold Wood, first Professor of History at Sydney University, lamented the fact that the colleges housed only a minority of the University’s students “most of whom dispersed to their homes or lodgings at the end of the day … he did not believe that the full richness of university life could be achieved in a non-residential university.”7

Richly Supportive, but Rather Exclusive:

So the colleges of Australia’s first universities, having fewer student residents in proportion to the total numbers in the universities than had been originally envisaged, came to be regarded as rather exclusive places, albeit places which gave opportunity for support, stimulation and social contact well beyond that experienced by many day students. Inevitably the costs of collegiate life together with those of attending university itself meant that residence could only be afforded in the main by those who were already regarded as fortunate or privileged, though some colleges were able to offer scholarships or provide significant bursary assistance to those who demonstrated strong academic ability. There were those whose families made particular sacrifices in order to support them in residence at university, but the impact, for example, of the depression of

6 A.P. Rowe If the Gown Fits Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1960, pp.82-83
the 1890s, the period of ‘The Great War’, and that of the ‘Great Depression’ in
the early 1930s made the possibility of residence in a college a more than
difficult prospect for many. Indeed, the universities themselves, let alone the
residential colleges, were exclusive places. Roy Douglas Wright, later to be
Chancellor of Melbourne University, entered medicine at Melbourne in 1925
following a year at the still very small University of Tasmania. Although his
farming family in Tasmania was regarded as prosperous if frugal, the opportunity
to study medicine and to live at Queen’s College came only as a result of
obtaining a scholarship. He entered a University “ten times the size of the
University of Tasmania but just as socially exclusive: at that time far fewer than
one in ten children completed secondary school, and almost all who did were
from private schools. The offspring of wealthy families often felt no particular
urgency to complete degrees; for others, particularly the tiny minority of children
from state schools, it was a privileged and exciting world of learning.”

While the colleges at Sydney University were faring quite well with enrolments
in relation to their physical size by the mid 1920s, the proportion of college
residents to the total University population around that time was only
approximately 11 per cent. This fact worked against a further proposal in 1925
by the colleges, led by the Warden of St. Paul’s, the Reverend Arthur Garnsey,

---

8 Peter McPhee op.cit. p.20
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college buildings and facilities.
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for the colleges to be represented on the University Senate, as they were on the Council of the University of Melbourne. Arthur Garnsey had been an elected member 1918-1919, and any further representation would similarly have to be by nomination and election.\textsuperscript{11} Recognising that residency had benefits for developing ‘spirit’ within the University, and at the same time that many students could not afford college fees, a Senate ‘Advisory Committee on University Life’ considered the question of establishing University lodgings or hostels within or close to the campus. Its report to the Senate in 1927 acknowledged the importance of the matter but because of lack of funds it did not make any recommendation for such development to occur.\textsuperscript{12} Halls and hostels became another activity for the Church, rather than the University, after World War II when there was a significant increase in the demand for both university and residential places.

The affiliated residential colleges of Australia’s first universities were, by the 1920s, places which provided a significant level of personal and academic support and supervision with opportunity for the expression of a range of talents and interests, but which by their size and cost, and by the proximity of the homes of the majority of students to the universities, were restricted to a small number of the total university population. The Scottish rather than the English model of attendance at lectures by professors within the universities rather than teaching conducted within the colleges in order to prepare for examinations, made the role

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid} pp.463,466-467: a request for representation had been made in 1917.  
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid} p.467
of the Australian colleges far less crucial in the academic life and progress of resident students than their traditional counterparts at Oxford and Cambridge, or even at the University of London where teaching was still based in non-resident colleges. Nevertheless, the provision of tutorial assistance within the colleges was, despite its ‘unofficial’ status in relation to the examinations and the granting of degrees, a significant difference between the nature of collegiate residence and residence in hostels or private lodgings. The colleges clearly had “educational vocations integrally connected with the tertiary system”.13

A ‘Seminary’ Model of Theological Instruction:

While most of the denominational colleges established by the 1920s provided opportunity for religious instruction and study, as well as for worship, few combined the roles of theological college and residence for students attending university lectures. The Melbourne colleges - Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s - were particular exceptions, with, for example, the Trinity College Theological School being founded within Trinity College in 1877 by Bishop Moorhouse. By no means all applicants were accepted, with W. Macmahon Ball, later foundation Professor of Political Science at Melbourne University, recalling that when he applied in 1921, the Warden of Trinity, Dr J. C. V. Behan, wisely and rightly told

13 Bruce Kaye A Church without Walls: Being Anglican in Australia Dove (Harper Collins), North Blackburn, Victoria, 1995, p.110. As noted in a previous chapter, a pattern of tutorial teaching to supplement the teaching of the universities developed, which, particularly in the case of the Melbourne colleges, rivalled the lectures and tutorials of the University. “There was no doubt”, wrote Geoffrey Blainey (op.cit. p.84), “that the colleges had elevated the academic standards of the university at a time when they could easily have deteriorated through the tepid teaching of some of the professors.”
him that he could not support his application as he believed the young aspirant for ministry was not only losing his faith but was “losing it fast” – a fact that Macmahon Ball attributed particularly to the impact of his study of Descartes.\footnote{Hume Dow (ed.) \textit{More Memories of Melbourne University: Undergraduate Life in the Years Since 1919} Hutchinson of Australia, Hawthorn, Victoria, 1985, pp.8-9. Nearly a century later, in 1969, the three theological schools came together to form, along with the Jesuit Theological College and later the Uniting Church Theological Hall, the United Faculty of Theology, linked for the conferring of degrees to the Melbourne College of Divinity.}

St. Andrew’s College was the only college at Sydney University to have a theological hall\footnote{Theological education ceased at St. Andrew’s in 1982 following the formation of the Uniting Church and the desire of the more conservative continuing Presbyterian Church, which retained its association with the College, to remove theological training for ministry from the College.}, with, as previously noted, the Sydney Anglican Diocese setting up its own theological college, Moore College, separate from the lay established and controlled St. Paul’s. While chapel attendance had been compulsory for resident students at St. Paul’s College, at the request of the Warden in 1921 compulsory attendance was abolished as it “operated to the detriment of true religion in College”.\footnote{Hamish Milne \textit{op.cit.} p.78} While attendance was required on Sunday, and first and second year students were required to attend at least twice a week, the students noted in the College magazine that “the new Chapel regulations have met with the sincere approval of all, and especially of those enlightened men who have been in residence for two or more years.”\footnote{Ibid pp.78-79} Neither St. Mark’s College, opened in 1925, nor the other later established denominational colleges affiliated with the University of Adelaide conducted theological courses. Christ College, though not affiliated with the University of Tasmania until 1933, provided some
theological training up until 1929, with none of the later affiliated colleges being established as theological institutions. St. Francis’ College rather than St. John’s College provided theological training for Anglican clergy in Queensland, though the Presbyterian Emmanuel College and the Methodist King’s College both had theological halls. The Anglican St. George’s College, opened within the University of Western Australia in 1931, did not provide theological training, though there was an expectation that all College members would attend services in the Chapel.

Apart from their location, the theological schools and halls that were established within affiliated colleges had no formal links with the universities, and even within the colleges the theological students were often seen as separate and distinct from the university undergraduates. Macfarlane (later Sir Macfarlane) Burnet, as a medical undergraduate resident of Ormond College for five years from 1917, engaged in supper conversations with the theological students but found after one particular discussion with a college theologian that “for a man of his intellect to use his brains on theology is almost pitiful.”\textsuperscript{18} The scepticism of Roy Douglas Wright in matters of religion was likely to have been reinforced, it has been suggested, by the “dour morality of the theological students.”\textsuperscript{19} Overall, the confined and limited degree of theological education associated with denominational residential colleges, together with the setting up of theological

\textsuperscript{18} Christopher Sexton \textit{Burnet: A Life} Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, 1999, p.27
\textsuperscript{19} Peter McPhee \textit{op.cit.} p.30. Wright’s proposal that students should wear academic gowns to meetings of the Sports and Social Club might well have been aimed at annoying the theological students, “many of whom had not matriculated and therefore were ineligible to wear gowns.”
colleges separate from any association with the universities, saw the emergence of a “seminary model of training clergy which has been separate from any significant engagement with the broader intellectual activity of the universities … (a model that has been largely) undergraduate and clericalised.”20

The established pattern by the decade following the First World War of denominational collegiate residence within the Australian universities was one that for a relatively small and select portion of the university population was adjunct to the teaching role of the university, and, though providing opportunity for the promotion, encouragement and practice of Christian faith and life, was restrained from having any significant theological engagement with the intellectual life of the university. That is not to say there was none at an informal level, nor that the religious life and example within the colleges did not have some influence and impact upon residents who were later to have important roles and positions in academic activity. Sir Macfarlane Burnet returned to Ormond College at the invitation of the Master, Dr J. Davis McCaughey, in 1973 following the death of his wife. The engagement of this Nobel laureate in the life of the College he had attended some fifty years before was a solace to him, as was, it seems, his friendship with and respect for the Master who noted that on most occasions when he preached in the Chapel, Sir Macfarlane Burnet would come in and sit quietly and unobtrusively at the back.21

20 Bruce Kaye op.cit. p.108
21 Christopher Sexton op.cit. pp.222-223; and Interview with Dr J. Davis McCaughey AC, Melbourne, 9th July 1998. Dr McCaughey was asked to give an address at the funeral of Sir
Engagement with the universities and the wider community at formal and informal levels was associated particularly with some of the Heads of the colleges and with one or two of the theological professors, most notably Samuel Angus at St. Andrew’s College, Sydney University. At Melbourne University, where the colleges had a marked degree of private financial support, a strong tutorial system and official representation on the University Council, the foundation Masters – Alexander Leeper (Trinity), John MacFarland (Ormond), and Edward Sugden (Queen’s) – exercised considerable influence beyond their respective colleges, as noted in Chapter Three. Leeper served for forty-two years before his retirement in 1918, and was credited with much of the development and success of the Melbourne collegiate tutorial system.\textsuperscript{22} Leeper had been a strong supporter of conscription and the duty of service in the War, and the Melbourne \emph{Argus}, in reporting Dr Leeper’s retirement, noted that perhaps the greatest tribute to him was that few men were at the College to farewell him – they were at the War: “The instinct of duty is in the last analysis the final test of teaching.”\textsuperscript{23} John MacFarland was Master of Ormond for thirty-three years and then successively Vice-Chancellor and, from 1918 to 1935, Chancellor of the University. He was very much “in command” of the University, and Sir George Paton, who later became Vice-Chancellor from 1951 to 1968, recalled that when
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as a young Professor of Jurisprudence he approached the Chancellor to ask for a Student Union building, he was given two and a half minutes: “I did my best and he looked at me … and said, ‘No Paton, no Paton, thank you Paton, good morning Paton, no’.”

Edward Sugden held office as foundation Master of Queen’s College for forty years, and was President General of the Methodist Church in Australia in 1923. He was widely admired and respected as a warm-hearted and generous leader, and an authority on the works of John Wesley and Shakespeare. His friendship was firm and dependable.

Sir Roy Wright recalled the feeling of acceptance and belonging at the Master’s “open house” held on Sunday evenings.

Dr J. C. V. Behan was Warden of Trinity from 1918 to 1946. He was Victoria’s first Rhodes Scholar, and from 1922 to 1952 he was the first General Secretary in Australia to the Rhodes Trust. He was awarded a Doctorate of Laws degree by Melbourne University in 1923 and was a member of the University Council from 1932. He gave strong support to the establishment of St. George’s College at the University of Western Australia and of St. Mark’s College, Adelaide. In 1949 the government of Victoria, led by a former student, T. T. Hollway, recognised Behan’s services to education and the community with the award of a knighthood.

Sir John MacFarland’s successor as Master of Ormond was a
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mathematician, D. K. Picken, who held office for twenty-nine years from 1914.\textsuperscript{28} Former Governor-General of Australia, Sir Zelman Cowen, declined a resident scholarship at Ormond College in 1936, but accepted a non-resident one which entitled him to attend tutorials. He recalls that he was keen just to study law, but the Master advised and urged him that if he wanted a “true education” he should take a combined degree in Arts and Law. He did so, majoring in political science, and notes: “If I were to build a monument to any man who exercised an influence on me at that time it would be to Picken. It was precisely the right advice, and so many things flowed from that. It really was an important decision.”\textsuperscript{29} Edward Sugden was succeeded in 1928 by the Reverend F. W. Kernick. On his death after only six years in office, Dr R. C. Johnson was appointed Master – a position he held for the next thirty years. Following the short Rectorships of the Very Reverends J. O’Dwyer and A. Power, the Very Reverend Jeremiah Murphy SJ, “one of the most lovable and scholarly men in the University and the confidant of two Vice-Chancellors”\textsuperscript{30}, commenced his term of office at Newman College. Noted as “pungently gifted”\textsuperscript{31} and given to “outrageous statements”\textsuperscript{32}, he was nevertheless amiable and influential, and the University honoured him with a doctorate on his retirement.

Though the birthplace of the denominational colleges, the Sydney University scene stood in some contrast to that of Melbourne where the colleges and their

\textsuperscript{28} John Poynter & Carolyn Rasmussen \textit{op.cit.} p.42
\textsuperscript{29} Interview with the Rt.Hon.Sir Zelman Cowen AC, Melbourne, 16\textsuperscript{th} March 2000.
\textsuperscript{30} Geoffrey Blainey \textit{op.cit.} p.174
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heads exercised significant influence and leadership. Involvement in the University, particularly through Newman College, was a major priority for the Jesuits in Melbourne and this was fostered and encouraged by Archbishop Daniel Mannix. The College was at the centre of much of Victorian Catholicism and the wider sphere of Catholic intellectual life. Apart from Roger Vaughan, the Catholic Archbishops of Sydney did not see St. John’s College in the same light, and the Jesuits distanced themselves from the College and from Sancta Sophia (Women’s) College. Archbishop Vaughan relished the atmosphere of the College, where he lived, commenting that “to me collegiate and academical pursuits have ever been very sweet indeed”; Archbishop Kelly, who succeeded Cardinal Moran in 1911, emphasised that “Catholics appreciate the religious life before any advantage they may receive through passing university examinations.” Kelly’s suspicion of the universities, and of the secular Sydney University in particular, was typical of much church leadership in Sydney across the denominations then and later in contrast with a much more accommodating view in Melbourne. Unlike Jeremiah Murphy, the Vincentian Rector of St. John’s, the Very Reverend Dr Maurice O’Reilly, though outspoken, did little to attract support from the Catholic and University hierarchy or from Catholics of wealth and position. An advocate for the ‘Catholic Federation’, formed in Melbourne in 1911 to advance more stridently the Catholic cause in Australian
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society, he became, like Daniel Mannix in Melbourne, the leading public opponent in Sydney of the moves for conscription during World War I. Both were seen as Irish opponents of Britain and as disloyal, and despite support from many of the Catholic ‘rank and file’, the views of Maurice O’Reilly, who asserted his love and loyalty for Australia, gained little sympathy among those who could best lend support to the College.  

Following the Wardenship of William Hey Sharp, 1878-1909 – a period of low enrolments both for the University and the College – and that of L. B. Radford, who “tried to give the University a Christian presence and influence through the College … a good scholar and thinker”  

the Reverend Arthur Garnsey was appointed Warden of St. Paul’s College in 1916 on Radford’s appointment as Bishop of Goulburn. Though he failed to gain official representation for the colleges on the University Senate, and despite periods of difficulty with some troublesome students, his twenty-eight years as Warden were significant in the growth and development of the College and in the relationships he established within the University. He was firm, but clearly identified with and developed strong bonds of friendship and respect among the students.  

He was twice elected a member of the Senate, and he was a key figure in the successful moves, supported by the Vice-Chancellor, Robert Wallace, to have a Board of
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Studies in Divinity established within the University, with teachers being mainly drawn from the theological and residential colleges.41 They were approved by, but not appointed or paid by the University, which, despite the secular and non-sectarian position of the Act of Incorporation, had approved in 1916 of degrees in divinity. Archbishop Kelly declared this to be a move to “Protestantize the University”.42 Though opposed by the Chancellor, Sir William Cullen, who saw the move as contrary to the wishes of the founders, the Government amended the University Act in 1936 to allow for such degrees.43 The teaching would not be doctrinal in character and content, avoiding any sense of introducing to the University the sectarian divisions that the founders so strongly opposed. The University Registrar, W. A. Selle, gave most credit for this development in the University’s position with regard to religion to Arthur Garnsey, indicating that the granting of degrees in divinity courses “had, for too long a period, remained outside the portals of the University.”44 The late Sir Hermann Black, when Chancellor of the University, recalled that Canon Garnsey’s time as Warden was one of “memorable distinction” and that “He won the regard from the men of the College, and greatly from the wider University community.”45

The inter-war period saw lengthy terms of office for the Principal of St. Andrew’s College, Dr Edward Anderson (1920-1937) and the foundation Master

41 Ibid pp.123-127
42 Clifford Turney et al. op.cit. p.519
43 Ibid pp.519-520
44 David Garnsey op.cit.p.127
of Wesley College, the Reverend Leslie Bennett (1924-1946). Anderson, who was also ‘Hunter Baillie Professor of Old Testament’ in the Theological Hall, was greatly challenged by difficult student behaviour and especially by an “uncontrolled and terrific” fresher system in his early years as Principal.\textsuperscript{46} In time he was better able to cope, and was admired for the way he stood up to the challenges. Gradually “Uncle Ted” became more at one with the resident collegians.\textsuperscript{47} Leslie Bennett had been foundation Master of King’s College at the University of Queensland prior to his appointment to Wesley College in 1924. Unlike Anderson, from the start he had an easy rapport with the students and was regarded within the College and the University as a scholar and a friend.\textsuperscript{48}

Despite the relative smallness of resident numbers and perhaps the lesser role than originally envisaged for the colleges by the universities’ founders, the influence exercised within the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne by the heads of the colleges on their students, many of whom rose or have risen themselves to positions of influence in a range of professions, and on various aspects of university life, cannot be dismissed.\textsuperscript{49} This became true elsewhere as new colleges were established, such as St. Mark’s at Adelaide, where the foundation Master was historian Dr (later Sir) Archibald Grenfell Price.

\textsuperscript{46} Dr Ian Nish, in R. Ian Jack (Ed) \textit{The Andrew’s Book: St Andrew’s College within the University of Sydney} 3\textsuperscript{rd} Ed., The Principal and Councillors of St. Andrew’s College, Sydney, 1989, pp.42-43
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid
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\textsuperscript{49} While Melbourne colleges had official representation on the University Council, Arthur Garnsey’s elected membership of the Sydney University Senate, was later followed, for example, by the Reverend B.R.Wyllie of Wesley College (who, like Davis McCaughey in Melbourne,}
The Ancient Deities – Venus and Bacchus:

In some way or another, however, each head of college, particularly during the inter-war period, had to contend with the so-termed ‘fresher system’ that had come to be an integral part of collegiate life. Though high-spirited activity, ribaldry, and the occasional misdemeanors associated with excessive drinking were perhaps inevitable consequences of bringing together a number of undergraduates into the one community, albeit under some supervision, the procedures of student initiation and occasions of binge drinking that were entrenched as “traditions” within the colleges between the wars and beyond clearly promoted the view that the colleges were places of privilege and irresponsibility, out of touch with the more civil conventions and expectations of the “outside” world. They also weakened the colleges’ credibility as places of particular Christian influence and care. The “system” went well beyond any notion of ‘muscular Christianity’; it was “bastardisation” in the guise of “bonding”. The view was that new undergraduates, fresh from school, needed to be “humbled” and brought together in communal relationship, placing college spirit and duty above personal satisfaction and desire: it was regarded as one of the essential things required to distinguish a college from a mere boarding-house.50 The “system” perhaps really developed its force with the influx of returned servicemen into the colleges after World War I, with their war-hardened
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worldiness that tended to be aped by the younger post-war undergraduates. Sir Roy Wright was impressed by some of the returned servicemen at Queen’s who did not join the gowned students at chapel but who “were more inclined to the ancient dieties, Venus and Bacchus”! However, so important was the fresher system to the colleges within the University of Sydney, that when Wesley College was established in 1917 as an all male college, the first freshmen year was “initiated” by a combined group of senior men from St. Paul’s and St. Andrew’s Colleges. The British boarding school activity of “fagging” was prevalent whereby freshmen were required to be at the beck and call of a more senior resident, often to purchase food: “we were paraded every night, addressed as Scum, chastized with our own knotted towels … we fagged for seniors, cut bread at table … medicos had the reputation of being the toughest (on freshers) of all. They were sophisticated, knew about the functioning of the human body, and knew that whether you liked them or not, they would get you in the end”!

‘Soup Night’ was another ritual common to a number of the colleges when the rooms of freshers were invaded during the night and/or their furniture was distributed in the staircases or placed in other parts of the college, such as the quadrangle. “The fresher system was uncontrolled and terrific; College
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property was there to be smashed or damaged without excuse or reason"57 Those who survived it had their turn to have the upper hand the next and in later years.58

**Liberalism and Modernism – The “Enemy Within”:**

St. Andrew’s College and its Theological Hall were also to make a particular mark, albeit on a much higher plane, through its controversial Professor of Exegetical Theology of the New Testament, Samuel Angus. He was to represent in the inter-war period what some of the more conservative evangelical Christian churchmen, particularly in Sydney, saw as the increasing failure of the denominational residential colleges to reflect within the context of the universities the authenticity and authority of the Bible in its revelation of the person and work of Jesus Christ. This was particularly in relation to fundamental tenets of evangelical doctrine, such as the atoning sacrifice of Jesus and his bodily resurrection. While the secular nature of the Australian universities had always been a challenge and even an affront to a broad spectrum of clerical and lay Christian educators and church leaders, and not only in Sydney, Samuel Angus, who himself was greatly concerned about the overtly secular nature of
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58 Occasionally reports were placed in the press about “systematic bullying” at the colleges, such as in 1928 in relation to St. Paul’s College. (Hamish Milne *op.cit.* p.108) While much has changed since then, especially with the impact of anti-discrimination and harassment legislation, Dr Peter Cameron, Principal of St. Andrew’s College at Sydney University, 1991-1995, recalls, among many incidents related to the fresher system, the first Student Club Annual Meeting he attended at which it was customary for the Principal to give a brief address. As part of the humbling process, of being “broken-in”, much of the meeting and afterwards involved various acts of verbal and physical intimidation of the freshers: “The freshers are all crammed into a narrow corridor with their gowns over their heads and subjected to various forms of abuse. This
Australian society and the exclusion of religion from tertiary institutions, came to be regarded among conservatives and fundamentalists as the “enemy within”. His scholarly, yet at times outspoken and provocative articulation of “modernist” theology rallied the forces of conservative opposition at a time of heightened debate within the churches over the nature of traditional doctrine and its relevance to and application in a post-war world.

There had been similar concerns at the time of the establishment of the Ormond College Theological Hall in Melbourne in the 1880s. Bitter disputes about the liberal theology of the Reverend Charles Strong of Scots Church, Melbourne, led to his resignation in 1883 and a determination by the General Assembly of the Church to ensure that the new Theological Hall did not become a hot-bed of heresy. One of the first professors, Murdoch Macdonald, remained essentially true to the “old paths”, but J. L. Rintoul and Andrew Harper cautiously introduced the German ‘Higher Criticism’ in biblical teaching, with Harper being the more radical of the two. In 1892, Harper, who was appointed Principal of St. Andrew’s College in Sydney in 1901, stated in the *Presbyterian Monthly Messenger* that the change in understanding of the nature of Biblical inspiration implied changes to the whole fabric of evangelical doctrine. The appointment
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in 1907 of the Reverend David Adam following the retirement of Professor Macdonald introduced an even more radical approach, with Adam’s wish “to teach the theology taught by the apostles and their successors, but adapted to the minds and needs of Australians.” Such adaptation was seen by conservatives as, at the least, compromise and as a weakening of revealed truth in the Bible. Others came to see it as heresy.

Following doctoral studies at Princeton University and an assistant lectureship at the Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut, USA, Samuel Angus, an ‘Ulster Scot’, went to Edinburgh in 1910 where he continued to do research, to write and occasionally to teach. He regarded Germany as the centre of New Testament scholarship, and found to his liking in Edinburgh a greater acceptance of modern Biblical scholarship, and a growing view of the ‘Westminster Confession’ as an historical document rather than a fixed standard of orthodoxy. He longed for a more permanent teaching position, and was persuaded in 1914 to accept appointment at St. Andrew’s College. He soon came under strong criticism from conservatives in Sydney such as H. S. Begbie and H. G. J. Howe of the Anglican Church; C. Benson Barnett, a Congregationalist and Principal of the Sydney Missionary and Bible College at Croydon; and R. J. H. McGowan, minister at the Ashfield Presbyterian Church, who had also been a strong critic of Ronald McIntyre, then Professor of Theology at the St. Andrew’s
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Theological Hall. The Croydon Bible College came to regard St. Andrew’s as a place where the “Word of God” was no longer taught. Opposition was not confined to Sydney, and a growing concern among evangelicals in Melbourne about theological liberalism led to the formation in 1923 of the ‘Bible Union of Victoria’. Its first President was the Reverend C. H. Nash, Principal of the Melbourne Bible Institute, and a regular speaker was Thomas Jollie Smith, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Studies at the Ormond College Theological Hall – interestingly enough, in the light of the Hall’s then recent history. The aim was to present a reasoned and learned defense of the Bible, and to take a stand against modernism that, it was believed, was not being taken by bishops, synods or church councils. In 1933-1934, C. H. Nash was invited, as “a kind of elder statesman of Melbourne evangelicalism” to give a series of talks at the Upwey Convention in response to the views of Samuel Angus. While not referring directly to Angus, Nash spoke on ‘The Efficacy of the Death of Christ’, giving “a straightforward, eloquent and magisterial evangelical statement of the topic.”

Professor Angus nevertheless developed a strong following, especially among school and university students, and he became a sought-after speaker at camps and conferences and especially at meetings of the Student Christian Movement.
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(SCM). His frequent message was that Christianity was bigger than the Bible, which contained great riches, but that people should not be afraid to subject the Bible to the recognised methods of literary and historical criticism. Students, including Garfield Barwick, later Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, spoke of Angus’s “sparkling wit and epigram”, and identified with what they saw as his refusal to be enslaved to a particular form of Christianity just because it was considered traditional or orthodox. He was also associated with more moderate or ‘middle’ (in the Anglican sense of between ‘High’ and ‘Low’) churchmen, including A. H. Garnsey, Warden of St. Paul’s College. Despite the separation between St. Paul’s College and Moore College, and, for that matter, between the University and Moore, Garnsey was also a good friend of Archdeacon David Davies, Principal of Moore College, 1911-1935. Davies, “a Protestant in churchmanship, a Liberal in scholarship” developed close relationships with the University and lectured in History and Economics for the University Extension Board, and in 1918 became a Fellow of St. Paul’s College. In 1922 Davies keenly supported a proposal for a Faculty of Theology at Sydney University to conduct lectures for students of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches. It did not come to fruition. Marcus Loane, later Principal of Moore College and Archbishop of Sydney, noted that “for those who reflect on the troubles which soon arose in the
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Presbyterian Church on account of the teaching of Dr Angus and others, this was an escape for which they remain deeply thankful.”\textsuperscript{76} There could, however, have been no strong link between Davies and Angus, and on Davies’s death in 1935, there would also be no strong link even between Garnsey and the new Principal of Moore.

**A Particular Tradition of Evangelicalism:**

At the height of Samuel Angus’s influence in the 1930s, the Sydney Anglican diocese re-affirmed Bishop Broughton’s deep suspicion of the University as “an emporium of false and anti-church views”\textsuperscript{77} and Bishop Barker’s commitment to a theological college of “decided Evangelical teaching”\textsuperscript{78}. In 1933, following the death of Archbishop Wright, the Right Reverend Howard West Kilvinton Mowll, an English evangelical missionary bishop in China, was elected Archbishop, and in 1936 the Reverend T. C. Hammond, an Irishman and “stout defender of evangelical Protestantism”\textsuperscript{79} was appointed Principal of Moore College.

Howard Mowll entered King’s College, Cambridge, in 1909, where he savoured the traditions of Charles Simeon.\textsuperscript{80} He joined the evangelical ‘Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union’ (CICCU) which at the time was linked with the
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Student Christian Movement, formed in 1905 from the combined ‘British College Christian Union’ and the ‘Student Volunteer Missionary Union’. In 1910, CICCU severed its links with the SCM over the desire of the latter to align itself more with the school of modern criticism and to broaden the scope of its membership.\textsuperscript{81} Howard Mowll became President of CICCU in 1911 and 1912, a position later to be held by Hugh Rowlands Gough who succeeded Mowll as Archbishop of Sydney after his death in 1958. After further study at Ridley Hall, Cambridge\textsuperscript{82}, Mowll was ordained in 1913 prior to taking up a position as a tutor and later Professor of History and Dean of Residence at Wycliffe College, Toronto, an evangelical college for “the careful training of men in the Reformation Theology of the Bible and the Prayer Book.”\textsuperscript{83} Mowll had a heart for missionary service, and though he regarded the Canadian “outback” as a mission field, he commented that “I do still long to be in lands more definitely heathen.”\textsuperscript{84} Australia was not yet in mind! In 1922 he accepted the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to be Assistant Bishop in Western China. He became Bishop of Western China in 1926, and his experiences and zeal in this difficult area won him the admiration of evangelicals throughout the world.\textsuperscript{85} He was a “simple proclaimer of the Gospel rather than a theologian”, and he had limited exposure to different schools of churchmanship.\textsuperscript{86} Following a two weeks’ visit to Sydney in 1931, he was seen by conservative Anglican
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evangelicals as an ideal candidate to be the next Archbishop. In a letter he wrote to England early in 1933, he noted: “Sydney is such a beautiful spot … It would be very nice to have English-speaking work again and I should love to continue the pastoral ministry of a Bishop. The University and the big boys’ schools too are a very attractive opportunity”87 – clearly for evangelism, as he had experienced at Cambridge and in Canada.

Mowll’s election in 1933 was not without some controversy, with the more liberal churchmen, such as Arthur Garnsey, David Davies, and the Dean of Sydney, A. E. Talbot, supporting Joseph Hunkin, the Rector of Rugby and Archdeacon of Coventry.88 Hunkin was regarded as someone who would exercise a more unifying influence in the diocese. The conservatives, perhaps more as a result of guilt by association, attacked him as a ‘modernist’, thus placing him in the same ‘league’ as Samuel Angus. The supporters of Hunkin regarded new knowledge, gained from inquiry and study, as a gift from God rather than a threat to his Word.89 Howard Mowll was elected by a decisive majority. This was a time in Sydney when, especially in the Anglican Church, the divisions between ‘High’ (Anglo-Catholic) and ‘Low’ (evangelical), liberal and conservative were in sharp focus. In 1931, the Reverend David Knox, father of a later Principal of Moore College, Broughton Knox, claimed that two different systems of religion “were side by side in the Church of England …

87 Marcus L.Loane *Archbishop Mowll* p.125
88 Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable *op.cit.* p.227
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Eventually one must drive out the other, for they are not complementary phases of thought but contradictory systems of religion.”

Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane has noted that “it was as though the Church had to house two rival and totally incompatible bodies.”

Some months after Mowll’s election, the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Philip Game, wrote to Cosmo Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, commenting on the factions within the Sydney Anglican diocese and the impact of them on the process of election of Mowll as Archbishop. Mowll’s election, however, was a clear and significant indication of the strength of the conservative evangelical position in the diocese, and a pointer to its growth and dominance in the decades ahead. Together with the growth of the Evangelical Union, it was certainly to have a significant impact upon the nature of Anglican and evangelical ministry within the University of Sydney, and upon moves to establish new residential halls and colleges.

On the death of Archdeacon Davies, Principal of Moore College, in 1935, Howard Mowll moved to place a more conservative stamp on the leadership of the College, and to improve its funding and academic standing. The Reverend Thomas Chatterton (‘T.C.’) Hammond was appointed Principal, having come to the particular notice of H. L. Tress, a trustee of the College, during Hammond’s
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visit to Sydney in 1931. A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, where “the largely evangelical nature of the nineteenth century Church of Ireland was well represented among students and professors”, Hammond was a strong academic and also a forceful public speaker and debator, often facing rowdy and physically threatening opposition at open-air meetings. He was particularly targeted in the largely Catholic Dublin by ‘Catholic Action’ and the ‘Legion of Mary’, with placards sometimes accusingly stating: “By just standing here you may be committing a Mortal Sin”. In 1919 he had been appointed Superintendent of the Irish Church Mission, a strongly Protestant organisation in an overwhelmingly Catholic Ireland. He was well used to controversy and division in asserting his conservative evangelical position, and he was a strong opponent of liberalism in theology and Anglo-Catholicism in practice. He soon made his mark in Sydney. One of his first students recalled after a lecture: “he has a philosophical approach not always appreciated by those unacquainted with the rules of syllogism”! Others were not as impressed, such as Warden Garnsey of St. Paul’s, who, after Hammond had preached in the St. Paul’s College Chapel in 1937 commented: “I don’t think he made any impression at all on the men, and certainly I did not get anything helpful out of the sermon. He put me right off at the start by remarking that it wasn’t much use talking about the Kingdom of God, unless one was sure one was ‘in it’” Perhaps Garnsey’s reaction was not surprising, especially as
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he also noted that his heart wasn’t in the invitation for Hammond to preach, but felt that he had to invite such a close neighbour at least once!\textsuperscript{99} He had been very opposed to Hammond’s appointment.\textsuperscript{100} Sir Marcus Loane, who was Hammond’s Vice-Principal and succeeded him as Principal in 1954, has referred to him as “a great man … whose like we may not see again.”\textsuperscript{101} He evoked strong responses in the Synod, and in committees, councils and in the church at large and the wider community, but there is little question that the coming together in the Sydney Anglican diocese in the 1930s of Howard Mowll and T. C. Hammond resulted in the more liberal evangelicals being marginalised and excluded, and a particular tradition of Evangelicalism being consolidated before the Second World War in a way that was to shape and form the character of the diocese\textsuperscript{102}, and its approach to student work in universities and colleges in the post-War years.

\textbf{The Challenge of Professor John Anderson:}

Whatever the differences at this time between the liberals and modernists and the evangelical conservatives and fundamentalists - between those who would support the views of Samuel Angus and those whose views were represented very much by T. C. Hammond - a common cause of concern in the inter-war period and for some time beyond was Professor John Anderson, who at the age
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of thirty-three was appointed Challis Professor of Philosophy at Sydney University in 1926, a position he held until 1958. A graduate of the University of Glasgow in 1917, where he was involved in working and speaking for the Socialist cause, he became a lecturer at Cardiff, Glasgow and Edinburgh universities. At Edinburgh, especially following what he saw as the weak approach of the Labour Party and the Trade Union Council in support of the strikers in the General Strike of 1926, he became more closely associated with the Communist cause. He was to promote this cause in his earlier years in Sydney, but after 1932 he came to criticise it for its lack of emphasis on the role of the working class movement in revolutionising society and bringing about general political freedom, and for the growing evidence locally and in the Soviet Union of uncritical and illiberal Communism characterised by bureaucracy and authoritarianism. He was no supporter of Stalinist totalitarianism; nor was he of anything that appeared to restrict freedom of thought and inquiry. “Anderson was a remorseless realist. He was a critic of those illusions in which men and women wrapped themselves – religion, patriotism, romanticism, moralism”. Those who adhered to this view formed in 1930 the ‘Society for Free Thought’, to be called the ‘Free Thought Society’ in 1932. Anderson was its President. In 1931 he faced censure by both the NSW Parliament and the University Senate for a speech in which he associated patriotism with prejudice and superstition and with restriction on inquiry. He also referred to war memorials as political idols
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and that the memorials and the religious ceremonies connected with them prevented “critical thinking about the character and conditions of the last war and thus about war and social relations in general.”

The Member for Willoughby called Anderson “anti-Christian … a curse to the country; and that the sooner the Senate of the University takes steps to put him out of his job and send him back to Glasgow … or make him abide by the laws of the country, the better it will be for the country.”

Nothing came of the Parliamentary move, but the University Senate passed a motion that “while asserting the principle of free speech in universities” … (the Senate believed Professor Anderson) used “expressions that transgress all proper limits, and for so doing severely censures him, and requires him to abstain from such utterances in future.”

He was not dismissed, and he certainly did not abstain as directed: “The fight for freedom of thought and speech does not stop; it goes on. I have done nothing deserving of censure.”

Anderson rejected religion. There were only ‘facts’ or occurrences in space and time, and God was not one of them.

In the 1930s and 1940s he engaged in a number of debates about religious questions, with again a major controversy ensuing as a result of a lecture he gave in 1943 as part of a series of lectures organised by ‘The New Education Fellowship’ on “Religion in Education”. As
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with snakes in Iceland, there is no religion in education! Religion is opposed to
education because it precludes examination by observation and experiment; “it
encourages either a cynical pretence to believe or else a credulous, submissive
outlook.”\textsuperscript{111} There was a public outcry. This time the NSW Legislative Assembly
passed a motion condemning Anderson’s statements as “a travesty of the
Christian religion and … calculated to undermine the principles which constitute
a Christian State.”\textsuperscript{112} The terms of the motion were conveyed to the Sydney
University Senate which, on this occasion, defended Professor Anderson’s right
to free speech. It seemed that the State was defending the sacred against the
secular. The Senate, in a letter of reply signed by the Chancellor, Charles
Bickerton Blackburn, to the Legislative Assembly, affirmed the conviction
expressed in the University and University Colleges Acts that no religious test
shall be applied to the teachers or the students of the university, and that “nothing
but harm could follow the stifling in a university of the spirit of free inquiry.”\textsuperscript{113}
Anderson’s colleague, Professor A. K. Stout, noted the comments of the
chairman of the series of lectures, the Reverend C. T. Parkinson: “the address has
served a good purpose in stimulating interest in, and discussion of, religious
questions”.\textsuperscript{114} Warden Garnsey of St. Paul’s reflected much the same view:
“Admitting that discord exists in the University to-day on the subject of religion,
I would urge that this is an inevitable concomitant of free discussion. But the
value of discussion, despite the accompanying discord, is twofold. On the
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positive side it gives believers opportunity to set forth the truth as they see it … and negatively it compels students to examine the foundations of their faith – a proceeding which surely makes for honesty.”

Samuel Angus believed that the anti-sectarian nature of the University was, under the influence of Anderson and the Free Thought Society, in danger of becoming anti-God. It was this, in large part, that motivated him to promote the setting up of studies in divinity in the University. He felt that Anderson’s views simply fed the attitude of those who believed the University was a seedbed of atheism. While he did not participate in a debate in 1931 between the Student Christian Movement and the Free Thought Society, he used a number of speaking opportunities with the SCM to defend Christianity against what he saw as materialistic and atheistic attacks. T. C. Hammond directly opposed John Anderson in 1941 in a debate arranged by Donald Robinson of the Evangelical Union. Anderson had charged that “credulity”, strongly opposed by the Arts Faculty at the University, was represented in the University by the Labour Club (which included Marxists) and the “fundamentalists of the Evangelical Union”. Both sides no doubt felt they had “won” the debate on the topic: “Are

---

115 Ibid 4th May 1943, p.3
116 Susan Emilsen op.cit. p.182
117 Ibid
118 Ibid pp.183-184: Angus and Anderson both attended the debate.
119 Vice-Principal of Moore College 1959-1972; Anglican Archbishop of Sydney 1982-1993
120 Warren Nelson op.cit. p.112; and the Papers of Archbishop D.W.B. Robinson, ‘The Samuel Marsden Archives’, Moore Theological College Library, Box 1
Christians Credulous?”; some felt they had merely passed each other by like ships in the night.121

In his defense of “free discussion” in the University, Arthur Garnsey noted that students were able to support each other in taking whatever position they espoused, as the various societies afforded to most of their members a valuable fellowship in their University life.122 He would have had particularly in mind the Student Christian Movement. The Chancellor made much the same point in his letter to the Parliament: “The Senate desires also to inform the Legislative Assembly that every facility and encouragement is given to societies and groups within the university whose object is to foster the Christian religion and to promote the knowledge and observance of Christian principles.”123 He would have had in mind the Student Christian Movement, the Catholic ‘Newman Society’, and the Evangelical Union. Though each stood in opposition to the views of John Anderson, the differences between the Student Christian Movement and the Evangelical Union were in many ways of equal or even greater strength, and mirrored the wider and more public conflict between the views represented by Samuel Angus and those represented by T. C. Hammond and Howard Mowll.
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The Student Christian Movement:

The Student Christian Movement developed, perhaps ironically, from evangelical activity in both Great Britain and the United States in the nineteenth century, particularly as a result of missions conducted by the American evangelist Dwight L. Moody and the work of a New College, University of Edinburgh, theological graduate, Henry Drummond. In the United States, the ‘Young Men’s Christian Association’ (YMCA) had formed in Boston in 1851, and an Inter-Collegiate YMCA came together in 1877.\textsuperscript{124} From them, in the 1880s, students gathered for a Summer School conducted by Moody, as a result of which was formed the ‘Student Volunteers for Foreign Missions’. Associated with it were John R. Mott, a graduate of Cornell University, and Robert P. Wilder, a graduate of Princeton.

In Britain, various student Christian associations had formed in the mid to later 1800s, at universities such as Cambridge, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. D. L. Moody conducted Missions in 1873 and 1874, with his Edinburgh meetings to have a great impact on the life of Henry Drummond.\textsuperscript{125} In 1877 the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union was formed, and in 1879 a similar Union was formed at Oxford. As a result of a Mission conducted by D. L. Moody at Cambridge in 1882, the already famous cricketer, C. T. Studd, and the Captain of Boats at Cambridge, Stanley Smith, joined with five others to offer for missionary service with the China Inland Mission. The ‘Cambridge Seven’ included W. W. Cassels,
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who became the first Anglican Bishop in Western China - a predecessor of Howard Mowll.\textsuperscript{126} In 1893, with the growth of evangelical student associations, the Inter-University Christian Union was formed, to be named the British College Christian Union in 1895.\textsuperscript{127} The BCCU was therefore an over-arching organisation which included CICCU. Through exchange visits by people such as John Mott and Robert Wilder from the United States and Henry Drummond from Great Britain, the BCCU and the Student Volunteer Missionary Union (formed in Britain along the lines of the Student Volunteers for Foreign Missions), with its aim “The Evangelisation of the World in this Generation”, came together in 1898, with the combined organisation being called the Student Christian Movement in 1905.\textsuperscript{128}

With a visit to Australia in 1896 by John R. Mott, the Australian Student Christian Union was formed at a meeting held at Ormond College, Melbourne University. It was at this University that Mott noted what he regarded as the strongest secular spirit he had ever encountered in a university, and that “the Chancellor was opposed even to my speaking in the university buildings … he wished me ‘to do nothing which would in any way interfere with the secular character of the university’.\textsuperscript{129} At a meeting in the Great Hall of Sydney University, however, Sir Philip Sydney Jones, later Vice-Chancellor of the
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University, commented that Mott’s address was “a remarkable revelation”.

The ‘Student Christian Movement’, as it came to be known as in Britain, grew in all the Australian universities and, along with its British counterpart, became a member of the ‘World Student Christian Federation’. In the early 1900s, and with the view that as a university movement no dogma should not be subjected to the test of criticism, the Student Christian Movement began to encompass modern Biblical criticism and to embrace as broad a cross-section of Christian beliefs as possible, including “considerable numbers of Anglicans and other Church members who were unhappy about the early associations of the SCM with a literalist view of the Scriptures and a dogmatic approach to students.”

It was felt that the Movement’s basis of a belief in “Jesus Christ as God, the Son, and only Saviour of the world” was too definitive and was excluding from membership the very persons it was wishing to help; that there should be no requirement of a personal declaration of faith in Jesus Christ in order to join; and that there was a need to consider modern views of the Bible. In 1909 the SCM in Britain decided to allow into membership a much wider cross-section of people interested in its work and wishing to explore their faith, and issued an ultimatum to CICCU, which was resisting such moves, that it must accept the broader platform or be disaffiliated. In March 1910, CICCU decided by
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seventeen votes to five to withdraw from the SCM.\textsuperscript{133} It was the year that Howard Mowll joined.

**The Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions:**

In April 1928, CICCU, along with other evangelical unions in Britain formed the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions. Hugh Gough, President of CICCU in 1926 and 1927, became the first Chairman of the IVF, with a medical student, Howard Guinness, as Vice-Chairman. Guinness accepted a challenge to go on behalf of the IVF to Canada for six months “to establish a truly evangelical witness in the Universities”\textsuperscript{134}, and while there in 1929 he received an invitation from Mr James Nicholson to establish the work of IVF in Australia. A number of evangelical students at Sydney University, concerned about the developments in the Student Christian Movement, had formed the ‘Sydney University Bible League’, holding “Tower Meetings” since 1919 in one of the carillon tower rooms.\textsuperscript{135} By 1929, the SCM membership at Sydney University had grown considerably from around two to three hundred in 1902, and was very much influenced by Samuel Angus. Its program of lectures involved a number of speakers from within the University, including Professors Mungo McCallum and George Arnold Wood, with Professor Wood asserting that the ‘Christian Union’, as it was then known, was “the next best thing to a faculty of theology in the
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University.”  

Howard Guinness arrived in Sydney in January 1930, and on the 13th April the Bible League at Sydney University changed its name to the ‘Evangelical Union’ (EU). Its first leaders included H. D. M. Hercus, Neville (later Bishop) Langford Smith, Ian Holt and Paul White. The focused message of the need for personal acceptance of salvation in Jesus Christ was preached by Howard Guinness in conferences, camps, schools and colleges: “School … was the place in which to confront students with the living Christ before their attitudes hardened and spiritual truths were rejected in the name of reason or expediency.”

At Melbourne University he met with evangelicals who were “unhappy in SCM because it did not give them the spiritual food they needed or the opportunity to...
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present to the University the Gospel of Christ as the power of God to
salvation.”

An Evangelical Union was formed at Melbourne University in May
1930. A. H. Garnsey rather reluctantly invited Howard Guinness to speak at St.
Paul’s College, Sydney University, agreeing to “let him loose in the Common
Room”. He was clearly irritated by the talk and the following discussion: “Isn’t it
curious … that such a lop-sided gospel as his should win acceptance? His
presentation of Christ seems to me to knock over one’s belief in God. Now I
shall have to take particular pains, as St Paul says, to speak the truth in love.”

Howard Guinness did not find in these early years, especially in the colleges, it
easy to speak his message and to confront criticism: “I had never understood the
modernist and had never sympathetically tried to do so. This was a serious flaw
when higher criticism was so common in the theological and university colleges
visited.”

Following a further visit to Australia in 1933, during which IVF branches were
established in all Australian universities, Guinness commented that “at present
there is no body more evangelistic in spirit than the Sydney University
Evangelical Union.” In 1935 the EU held its first Mission at Sydney
University with the Irish evangelist W. P. Nicholson. It was an event that Arthur
Garnsey did not look forward to, as he resented the American style of advertising
used for it and the aggressive approach constantly used by the EU people which
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he felt threatened to harm rather than help the cause of religion. \textsuperscript{144} Nevertheless, he opposed the Senate’s decision not to allow the Mission to take place in the Great Hall; he did not oppose the right of the EU to hold a Mission. Others, however, were determined to disrupt it. Permission was granted by the University Union to use its Hall, but during the first meeting throw-downs, cat calls, stamping of feet, and sneezing powder were used to disrupt the speaker, and the running-carpet was pulled from under the feet of the EU President, Ian Holt, while he was closing in prayer. \textsuperscript{145} This prompted the Reverend David Hughes of the Annandale Methodist Church to move forward and to seize one of the disrupting students by the throat and to push him aside. Never had he heard the name of the Deity, of the Divine Son, Jesus Christ, so derided and dishonoured by a “cowardly group of students”. \textsuperscript{146} “It is high time”, he commented, “that the religious and other authorities at the University took steps to purge this so-called seat of learning of its irreligion.” \textsuperscript{147} The Students’ Representative Council, however, protested to the Union Board about its permission for the EU to use its Hall for five consecutive days, “thereby inviting riot and civil disaffection.” \textsuperscript{148} These, indeed, were challenging times for “the better advancement of religion” on campus, and for the relationship between the sacred and the secular.
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Ecumenism, Evangelicalism, and a Decade of Missions:

As they sought to contend with both the challenges of the ‘Andersonians’ and of the ‘Anguses’, the leadership of Sydney University EU, which included Harvey Carey, later Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at UNSW, and Donald Robinson, later Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, saw the membership grow from around ninety in 1939 to more than two hundred and fifty in 1950. It was the beginning of a decade of significant evangelistic activity on campuses and in the cities beyond, especially in Sydney and Melbourne. In Sydney, a cast of strong evangelicals dominated much of the church scene: Anglicans Howard Mowll, T. C. Hammond, and Stuart Barton Babbage, appointed Dean of Sydney in 1947; Baptist Principal G. H. Morling; and Methodists Frank Rayward and Alan Walker. In 1948 Archbishop Mowll attended both the Lambeth Conference and the inauguration in Amsterdam of the World Council of Churches. He had taken a keen interest in the foundation of this world ecumenical body, but many evangelicals, especially in the Inter-Varsity movement, were suspicious of it and feared that it would be another vehicle of compromise, with a politically social rather than a personal ‘salvation’ emphasis. He was at the time President of the IVF in Great Britain, but was also President of the Australian Council of the World Council of Churches and a member of the World Council’s Central Committee. He clearly recognised the value of inter-church and world-wide fellowship, but he was also keenly aware of and wary of any moves which might
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weaken the Evangelical cause. Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane recalls that in 1948 there was great pressure for the appointment of an ecumenical chaplain at Sydney University: “The idea was that bodies like the SCM and the EU would sign their own death-warrant, and all Christian work would come under an ecumenical chaplain to be appointed by the Council of Churches”.150 Archbishop Mowll took up Marcus Loane’s suggestion that he appoint an Anglican chaplain in order to circumvent such a move. There had previously not been a chaplain at the University. Howard Guinness was appointed as both Rector of St. Barnabas’ Church, Broadway, and as Chaplain to Anglican students at the University: “He got his feet on the ground before the other pressure (to appoint an ecumenical chaplain) came to a head.”151 A more determined effort for an ecumenical approach to Christian work among university students was to be made at a conference at Ormond College, Melbourne, in 1961.

Howard Guinness was particularly involved in evangelistic missions to university students throughout the 1950s, a decade which culminated in the 1959 Billy Graham Crusades. A Mission to mark the twenty-first anniversary of the Evangelical Union at Sydney University was held in June 1951, with greater support from the University than had been the case in 1935. A special edition of Honi Soit detailed all the activities over the week of the Mission, the Great Hall was made available for lunch time addresses by Howard Guinness and for a Mission Service, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor A. G. Mitchell, later
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foundation Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University, chaired one of the meetings when the topic was “The Sanity of Faith”.

Stuart Babbage chaired a ‘Brains Trust’ to “deal with intellectual difficulties which may be barriers to the reception of the Gospel”

and Assistant Missioners, including John (later Bishop) Reid, Archdeacon (later Bishop) Frank Hulme-Moir, and Stanley Kurrle (later Headmaster of the Kings School), were resident for the week in St. Paul’s, St. Andrew’s and the Women’s Colleges. The Mission, it was claimed, was to be “the greatest single attempt so far made to confront Australian University students with the claims of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Notices were placed around the University, stating “He that is not for us is a Guinness!” Howard Guinness attributed this to college students, following a meeting in the Women’s College at which St. Andrew’s students entered, dressed in an array of clerical garb, and carrying a beer barrel with the words, “Guinness is good for you”!

The University Mission was followed almost immediately by a Mission to the city, organised by Dean Barton Babbage, with Englishman, the Reverend Bryan Green addressing some thousands of people each day in the Town Hall and the Cathedral. Howard Guinness conducted university Missions in Melbourne and in Adelaide in 1953, the latter attended by the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Philip Messent, and at the University of Queensland in 1954, involving special
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evening meetings in the residential colleges.\textsuperscript{158} Howard Guinness resigned as Chaplain at Sydney University in April 1957 on his move from Broadway to the parish of Vaucluse. It was the year in which American evangelist Dr Billy Graham accepted invitations, chiefly from Archbishop Howard Mowll, to conduct Crusades throughout Australia commencing in February 1959.\textsuperscript{159} Hundreds of thousands also attended Crusade meetings in Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide, with special meetings held in the universities. At Melbourne University at the end of Orientation Week, the Registrar introduced Dr Graham to thousands packed into and around the Wilson Hall; and at Sydney University some four thousand staff and students “thronged the rolling lawns in front of Sydney’s majestic stone Great Hall and Carillon Tower” – albeit with the disruption of smoke-bombs and a student dressed as the Devil!\textsuperscript{160} The seal, nevertheless, had been set on the ascendancy, especially in Sydney, of the Evangelical Unions in Christian activity on campuses, at a time of enormous university growth and development throughout Australia, and of demand for significant expansion in the provision of student residences – collegiate or otherwise.
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\textsuperscript{159} S. Barton Babbage and Ian Siggins \textit{Light Beneath the Cross: The Story of Billy Graham’s Crusade in Australia} William Heinemann Ltd, Melbourne, 1960, p.12. Nearly one million people attended the Sydney Crusade meetings, with Billy Graham paying a special tribute to Archbishop Howard Mowll who had died in November 1958: “I have never visited any city in the world where one man was so highly respected or where the influence and spirit of one man was so evident as Archbishop Mowll in Sydney.”
Conclusion:

During the 1900s to 1950s decades, the residential colleges - denominational or otherwise - of Australia’s universities consolidated a position and pattern of relationship with the universities that provided a significant level of personal and academic support and supervision, with opportunity for the expression of a range of talents and interests, for students attending the courses of the university. The level of tutorial assistance at the Melbourne colleges was seen to challenge the adequacy of the teaching within the University. While this level of support and opportunity was regarded by many as desirable for the majority if not all students, the proximity for most of their homes to the university, and the costs involved in living at college, meant that the number of students in residence was relatively small compared with the total number of students at the university. The colleges were generally seen as somewhat exclusive and, in their character and style, rather ‘Oxbridge’ and out-of-touch with the perceived egalitarian nature of the relatively new and developing democratic nation.

Though with an expectation of the university founders that the denominational residential colleges would provide what the universities, as decidedly secular institutions, would not – the teaching of religion – few combined the role of theological college with providing residence for students attending the lectures of the professors of the university. Theological education in Australia developed as
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a more seminary model, separate and distinct from the universities and from most of the colleges. Through chapel services, occasional lectures and discussion, however, a moral if not a religious influence could be exercised among the residents. Certainly, while there were few formal or officially established means of engagement with the universities, a number of the heads and the professors of the colleges made a significant impact within the university and wider community, and on the lives of their resident students. Some gained positions on Senates and Councils, even to the levels of Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor.

More controversially, there developed within the colleges a ‘Fresher System’ that, on the one hand, was seen as bringing about loyalty and commonality among new collegians, and, on the other, as being an unwarranted form of debasement, unbecoming of a civil community let alone one founded upon religious faith – it was bastardry in the guise of bonding. The colleges, and particularly those with theological halls, also came to be associated with the more liberal and the modernist view of Biblical interpretation, as particularly espoused by Professor Samuel Angus. Especially in Sydney, this was challenged by conservative evangelical church leaders such as Archbishop Howard Mowll and Archdeacon T. C. Hammond. Both ‘sides’, however, confronted the challenges of the realist and atheistic views championed by Professor John Anderson and the ‘Free Thought Society’. The principle of academic freedom, of free speech and free inquiry, was a challenge to church, college and campus, and would continue to be so well beyond the end of the Second World War. It would test the
legislated requirement in university acts of incorporation and in the terms of the affiliation of residential colleges that there be no religious tests.

Within the universities and the colleges, the arguments concerning academic freedom and the positions taken by the liberals and modernists as opposed to the conservative evangelicals and the more ‘fundamentalist’ Christians, were played out in the role and development of the Student Christian Movement and in the growth and ascendancy of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions. Ecumenism as an effective way of engaging with the university was challenged, especially in Sydney, by an enthusiastic determination to evangelise, free of any association that would compromise the view that “the revelation of God in Jesus Christ is unchangeably enshrined in the written Scriptures” and that “the core of that revelation is the death of Jesus Christ on the Cross”.

Concerns about the somewhat exclusive nature of the more traditional church colleges, and the impact of behaviour associated with the entrenched ‘Fresher System’ within them, together with a conservative evangelical view that these colleges were largely centres of liberalism and modernism and were of little ‘Gospel’ influence and impact, played a significant part in the moves, for example, to establish new Anglican residential colleges in Sydney after World War II. In so far as the colleges were places, as the early founders envisaged them, of religious instruction - albeit apart from the university - they appeared on

the whole to many evangelicals to have failed. Other conservative, especially Catholic, approaches were to be involved, but elsewhere, more ecumenical and liberal approaches would mostly be taken in the efforts to establish denominational residences affiliated with the new post-war Australian universities.
CHAPTER SIX

Ecumenism, Evangelism, and Freedom of Expression:

Consultation and Controversy, 1961

“In any university the fight between secularism and religion is intense”

– Professor John Anderson, July 1961

Two events in 1961 highlighted the developing and different approaches taken by the Churches, and especially the Protestant Churches, to Christian work and involvement on university campuses, whether through the colleges, the student societies, chaplains, or through wider public discussion and debate. In May 1961, the Australian Council of the World Council of Churches sponsored a ‘Consultation on Christian Work among Students’ at Queen’s College, University of Melbourne; and in July of that year the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, the Most Reverend Hugh Gough, preached a sermon at a service in St. Andrew’s Cathedral to commemorate the twelfth Legal Convention of the Law Council of Australia, in which he condemned the teaching of “soul-destroying philosophies” in the universities. These events brought into focus the contrasting views taken by more liberal and ecumenically-minded church men and women and by conservative evangelicals who, for the most part, were wary of any broad association that might hint of compromise. In essence, the former were largely represented by the Student Christian Movement and the latter by the Evangelical Unions of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. These views were very much a part of the motivations for and the different approaches taken in the moves to establish
new denominational residential colleges in the new Australian universities after World War II.

**A Zeal for Ecumenism:**

While the immediate post-War decade was one of significant growth in the development and influence of the Evangelical Unions, and one in which evangelistic missions culminated in what has been called “the most conspicuous expression of the evangelical synthesis of Spirit, word and world in Australia’s history”\(^1\) - the Billy Graham Crusades of 1959 – the decade was also marked by a growing zeal for ecumenism. This is not to say that evangelicals were necessarily anti-ecumenical. In its report for the period 1947-1948, the Executive of the Australian Section of the World Council of Churches expressed its gratitude for the leadership of Archbishop Howard Mowll, noting that his presidency “has done so much to forward our cause and to commend it to many whose interest has been kindled by his consistent enthusiasm and steady service”\(^2\); and a major feature of the Billy Graham Crusades was the level of co-operation among the Protestant Churches.\(^3\) Nevertheless, there was neither universal support for the Billy Graham Crusades, with, for example, Anglican Bishop E. H. Burgmann of Canberra and Goulburn referring to Graham’s view of the Bible as “idolatrous”\(^4\),
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nor an overwhelming commitment of conservative evangelicals, especially in Sydney, for the work of the Council of Churches. What commitment there was, was essentially determined and shaped by the interest and involvement of Howard Mowll.5 There would be little enthusiasm for moves to bring evangelical witness and work on university campuses under a Council of Churches initiated ecumenical umbrella, as already evidenced by the appointment in 1948 of Dr Howard Guinness as chaplain to Anglican students at the University of Sydney.

With the presence after the war of a number of Christian societies on campuses in addition to the SCM, the Evangelical Unions, and the Catholic Newman Society,6 there was a concern that such diversity and division might well be seen as a new form of sectarianism, and therefore as ‘grist to the mill’ of the secularist cause within the universities. The Australian Council of Churches (ACC) noted that the growth of denominational societies during the 1950s “intensified divisions among students and added to the problems which young Christians have to face … This division, instead of strengthening (the Christian student) to resist the forces that assault his integrity, such as literalism, intolerance and obscurantism, merely adds to his confusion.”7 The then Methodist chaplain at the University of New England, Dr James Udy, noted that he had “been constantly
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6 ‘Anglican Societies’ were formed on Sydney and Melbourne campuses, as well as Baptist and Lutheran groups; in later decades, other evangelical organisations, such as ‘Navigators’ and ‘Campus Crusade for Christ’, were also to be present on campuses.
7 Australian Council of Churches (ACC) Archives *op.cit.* Box 69: Paper outlining the purpose of calling together a Consultation on Christian Work Among Students, 14th December 1960.
appalled by the great chasm between the Evangelical Union and the Student Christian Movement within the university … This split in the Christian societies on the university campus is far greater than any split in the Christian Church.”

The Reverend E. K. Robins, Anglican chaplain to students at Melbourne University, however, felt that the number of Christian societies and denominationalism were not the problems that some believed they were, but that “secularism inside the university is an intellectual opposition to Christianity as such.”

The Reverend David Taylor, Assistant General Secretary of the ACC in 1961, emphasised the importance of unity among Christians on the campuses, as such unity was a reflection of God as ‘one’. The university itself, and its search for truth, is part of God’s will: “no part of His creation is outside the area of His knowledge and concern.”

Christians should therefore be at one with themselves and with the university, and, indeed, show that “the university itself has, by excluding theology, lapsed into the cultivation of the incomplete, into a form of sectarianism.”

The ‘boot’ of sectarianism was really on the other foot.

The great desire for unity expressed in the ecumenical movement was emphasised in a ‘Message to the Australian People’ from the Annual General Meeting of the ACC in February 1955. People were urged to discern afresh for themselves “this ecumenical movement as the chief revitalising force for our day
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9 E.K.Robins Ibid p.23
10 D.M.Taylor Ibid p.4
11 Ibid p.5
… Divisions in the Church have been caused in times past by sincere concern for the Gospel. Today it is concern for the Gospel that is driving us together … we must consider now whether we should not act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel us to act separately.” 12 At the Annual General Meeting in 1958 much discussion focused on the possibility of the ecumenical appointment of chaplains to places such as universities, hospitals, gaols, and schools. 13 As evidence of the wider focus on ecumenism, the first National Conference of Australian Churches was held at Melbourne in February 1960, with just over four hundred delegates and observers attending. 14 Following a request from the Methodist General Conference in May 1960 that the Council of Churches convene a consultation of Church leaders on Christian work among students in Australian colleges and universities, and a request from the Victorian State Committee of the Council of Churches for the Australian Council to examine the advisability of inviting the Churches and other relevant bodies to establish an Australian Universities Christian Council, the Annual General Meeting of the ACC in July 1960 resolved: “That the Council convene a national consultation of leaders of churches and other relevant bodies on Christian work among students in Australian colleges and universities during 1961.” 15
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12 ACC Archives op.cit. Box 4
13 Ibid
A Consultation on Christian Work among Students:

The ACC Executive appointed a committee to plan and prepare for the Consultation. The Committee was chaired by the Reverend Dr Alan Watson, Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, and included the Reverend B. R. Wyllie (Master of Wesley College, Sydney University), the Reverend Professor C. W. Williams (Master of Queens College, Melbourne University), Mr (later Sir) Harold Knight (later Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia, representing Mr Charles Troutman, General Secretary of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship in Australia), Professor J. McManners (Professor of History, Sydney University), Dr Kevin Westfold (Professor of Mathematics, later Dean of Science and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Monash University), Bishop Clive Kerle (Anglican Assistant Bishop in Sydney), the Reverend Bernard Gook (Rector of St. Barnabas’ Church, Broadway and Chaplain at Sydney University), and the Reverend David Taylor. During the Committee’s first meeting at ‘Bible House’ in Sydney in November 1960, Bernard Gook noted that the Christian societies were the largest bodies on the Sydney University campus; Dr Westfold believed that only if the Roman Catholic Church was included in a combined scheme would it become respectable in the eyes of universities; while Professor McManners warned that fundamentalism and intolerance were ‘deadly’ to the cause of ecumenism.
In a paper outlining the purpose of calling together a Consultation, the ACC noted that while the ecumenical movement had begun to reduce the concerns within the universities about sectarianism and their traditional wariness of denominationalism, the growth of denominationalism as witnessed in some of the Christian societies was beginning to reverse the process whereby the universities might recognise that it is possible for a university to study religion without “quarrelling and spreading prejudice”. With not only the growth in number and influence of the Christian societies on campuses, but the growth in the number of the campuses themselves after World War II, the Consultation was promoted as an opportunity to gain a greater recognition and acceptance of the place of religion within the universities; it was “thought to be a good idea to see if a common approach by the Churches was on the cards.” The Consultation was arranged for Queen’s College, University of Melbourne, from 23rd to 26th May 1961. Chaired by Bishop J. C. Vockler, Assistant Anglican Bishop in Adelaide, the Consultation involved nearly fifty participants representing Protestant and Orthodox churches throughout all the States, university staff, the Student Christian Movement, the Inter-Varsity Fellowship, ACC staff, university chaplains and heads of church colleges within or near universities. In addition to most of the members of the Committee, those attending included Dr Felix Arnott (Warden of St. Paul’s College and later Archbishop of Brisbane), Mrs Commissioner B. L. Coutts (Salvation Army NSW), the Reverend Frank Engel

17 Ibid
18 Ibid
19 Dr J. Davis McCaughey: letter to Ian Walker following interview, 30th July 1998.
(later General Secretary of the ACC), Professor Malcolm Jeeves (University of Adelaide), Bishop (later Archbishop Sir) Marcus Loane, the Reverend Dr. J. Davis McCaughey (Master of Ormond College and later Governor of Victoria), the Reverend Harvey Perkins (General Secretary of the ACC), the Reverend (later Bishop) John Reid, the Reverend (later Archbishop) Donald Robinson, Dr. L. N. Short (Director of the Educational Research Unit at the University of NSW), and Mr Charles Troutman (General Secretary of the IVF).

Role for Denominational Colleges – “Fishers of Men”?:

In a preliminary paper particularly dealing with the pastoral needs of students and staff on campus, Mr Charles Troutman, paid special attention to the role of the denominational colleges which, he believed, provided a significant springboard for effective pastoral counselling. He noted that SCM and IVF staff often envied the position of the staff of the colleges who had at least a “semi-official” standing within the university and therefore were seen as more credible by students and university academic staff. He felt that the colleges had not been as effective as they might have been, and saw the possibility of them becoming much more centres of “spiritual and intellectual stimulation” as they provided personnel and facilities to engage with university staff. There could be a much closer link between the Christian societies and the colleges, and denominational involvement and financial support could be directed through the

---

20 ACC Archives op.cit.
colleges to the societies. In his opinion “the strength of the Roman Catholic student societies is due largely to its leaders being based upon their colleges and thus are a part of the universities.”21 While arguing for co-operation, he believed that it was desirable and more effective to have as many undergraduate student religious societies supported by the denominations as the students themselves wished to have.

The General Secretary of the SCM in Australia, the Reverend D. B. Hobson, in his preliminary paper, emphasised the co-operative and comprehensive approach taken by the SCM, but he too noted that the colleges had a continuing role in the new universities of being something of a solution “to the tensions that existed between the desire for a secular university and the recognition that there was a place for the churches in the university.”22 This, he commented, had been much of the reason for their establishment in the older Australian universities, and such a role in the new universities “need not be regarded as dated”.23 The Reverend David Taylor, however, put the view strongly that a non-co-operative, fragmented Christian work on campuses reflected a “small gospel”, was negative, and “repelled superior minds”.24 He was clearly referring in particular to the evangelical ‘confessional’ societies that, he believed, saw the university as “a neutral institution which has got into evil hands; as a pond from which they as fishers of men must land as many catches as they can; … as a place where the

21 Ibid
22 Ibid
23 Ibid
24 Ibid
powers of evil are strong, and where every materialistic temptation vigorously assaults the student.”\textsuperscript{25} David Taylor urged what he believed to be a much more positive position. The university was part of God’s will; God is the God who created Aristotle and who rewarded the Arab philosophers in their search for truth; chemistry is just as much God’s subject as religion is; “If God is one, then it follows that no part of His creation is outside the area of His knowledge and concern.”\textsuperscript{26}

Here was a view that reflected again the arguments in the founding of Sydney University, and of the other ‘first’ universities and colleges in Australia. Bishop Broughton’s “great emporium of false and anti-church views” was W. C. Wentworth’s place for “the better advancement of religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge”, free of sectarian influence and division. The university in David Taylor’s view was very much a place where, despite the exclusion of religious teaching, in Bishop Augustus Short’s words, “spiritual yearnings” would be supplied “over and above material knowledge”. The need for unity and a more effective integration with and involvement in the university gave the imperative for there to be a Consultation: “We cannot avoid being in strong disagreement with those fellow Christians who have a small-minded religion, which shuts them off not only from the rationalistic unbelievers but from all great minds, past and present.”\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid
A Sacred Responsibility and Trust:

The only formal address given at the Consultation was delivered on the first day by Professor L. Charles Birch of the Department of Zoology at Sydney University. On the topic of “Freedom of Thought and Religious Commitment in the University”, Professor Birch developed views similar to those of David Taylor, though conservative evangelical representatives would have no doubt regarded what he said as being in the mould of Samuel Angus. Freedom of the mind and religious commitment were not incompatible; the quest to distinguish truth from falsehood, an objective of the university, is not just having a mind that is free to roam but one that is free to discover that which is most worth discovering.28 If God is the creator of all, religion needs to take his creation – the world – seriously: “there is nothing which does not concern him.”29 The church should therefore take account of the facts that modern science reveals; there is no truth which is discovered which does not reveal some aspect of God’s creation.30 The cleavage between the sacred and the secular, argued Professor Birch, was something of our own making; it is the measure of the extent to which we have been estranged from God, who is one and undivided: “Happy the University man who finds a faith which makes all his work a sacred responsibility and trust.”31 Thus the university as a community of scholars was an ideal place to discover the

27 Ibid
28 L.C.Birch Freedom of Thought and Religious Commitment in the University pp.1-2: the Papers of Frank Engel, National Library of Australia, NLA MS 9073
29 Ibid p.4
30 Ibid p.6
31 Ibid
meaning of life in religious terms. Professor Birch believed the sense of community in an academic setting that allowed for this relationship and search for meaning was strongly developed in the residential colleges. At the same time, he condemned those who, in the name of religion, regarded independent inquiry as dangerous, and who sought to restrict such inquiry by ensuring that religious study and teaching was conducted by “thinkers of approved orthodoxy”. “A university must be highly suspicious”, he noted, “of a religion which does not encourage independent inquiry and the broadest possible associations with the thought of the day. Fundamentalism may flourish for a day, but it can find no enduring home in the University. I am greatly disturbed that so much of the present religious appeal to students in Australia is of this nature … This anti-intellectualism is unfortunately not uncommon in religion on the Australian campuses. Its effects on some lives is nothing less than disastrous. This Consultation should be concerned at ways of salvaging the wrecked lives such as religion leaves in its wake.”

A Bad Start!

Whether intended or not, Professor Birch’s address would have been viewed as a ‘throwing down of the gauntlet’ to the IVF and the conservative evangelical participants. It would certainly have done little to build a bridge to those who had come to the Consultation suspicious of its aims and wary of its possible

---

32 Ibid.
33 Ibid. pp.2-3
outcomes. Indeed, the then Bishop Marcus Loane was of the view that the outcomes had already been decided! He had been asked “at the last moment” to attend by Archbishop Gough, and therefore received the preliminary papers from the Reverend David Taylor just before the Consultation: “He came over to see me and he gave me something – I could hardly believe my eyes – he gave me something which purported to be the report of the Conference, which hadn’t met! Hadn’t even met! It was all written out, recommending all sorts of things. I could hardly believe it! I fell out with him then and there. It was a bad start!”³⁴

Bishop Loane had discovered, recalls Bishop John Reid, who was an IVF representative at the Consultation, that the pre-arranged goal was to close both the SCM and the IVF and to replace them with an ecumenical body under the control of the ACC.³⁵ It is unlikely that he was handed a document not meant to be seen by others. Certainly various positions and proposed resolutions had been put in preliminary documents, and the subject areas of discussion, to be considered in Section meetings and followed by Plenary sessions, had been outlined: “What is the gospel as proclaimed relevantly to students? How is it to be communicated?”; “Pastoral care – the needs of students and how they are to be met”; “Denominational and Inter-denominational societies”; and “The place, status and function of chaplains”. Whether it was these documents or another, it

³⁵ Interview with Bishop John Reid, Avoca, NSW, 27th August 1998. John Reid attended Melbourne University and was a member of the E.U. He became a travelling representative for the IVF in Australia, before training at Moore College in Sydney for the ordained Anglican ministry. At the time of the Consultation he was Rector of ‘Christ Church’, Gladesville, NSW.
is clear that Marcus Loane believed from what he had seen that the Consultation was part of an ACC agenda to determine the nature of Christian witness in the universities, to the detriment of an evangelical witness. The General Secretary of the ACC, the Reverend Harvey Perkins, stated in his opening address to the Consultation: “None of us knows where we shall end or what this consultation is going to decide … We meet, not to protect certain particular interests, but as churchmen to seek the guidance of God upon specific problems.”36 Marcus Loane, who followed T. C. Hammond as Principal of Moore Theological College in Sydney, 1954-1959, was by no means convinced. He really didn’t want to be there, but since he was, his voice was “loud and clear” as he resisted strongly any statements or moves to compromise what he saw as the tenets of evangelical faith, especially the substitutionary death of Christ.37 “We had a tremendous argument at that conference”, recalls Marcus Loane, especially in response to statements of Dr Davis McCaughey.38 There would, however, have been no personal animosity. That was not nor is the nature of either Davis McCaughey or Marcus Loane.39

**Colleges as Centres of Christian Intellectual Activity:**

Discussion of the roles, problems or otherwise of the growing number of
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36 ACC Archives *op.cit.*
37 Interview with Bishop John Reid *op.cit.*
38 Interview with Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane *op.cit.* John Reid remembers that, at the end of the Consultation, Donald Robinson mentioned an ABC children’s program called ‘Bernard the Bull’ in which the bull had been bitten by a bee. The sting was intolerable. Robinson thought that Marcus Loane was like that bull at the conference.
39 Davis McCaughey has reflected on their friendship in later years. (Meeting with Davis McCaughey, 9th July 1998)
denominational or interdenominational student societies resulted in the somewhat exasperated conclusion that “there are unresolved tensions and differences of outlook here with which we shall have to live for a considerable time, trying to discern the mind of the Spirit.” 40 It was noted that the Evangelical Unions were convinced they must continue to maintain their independent identity in order to present their particular interpretation of them. 41 What seemed to be more positively recognised was the role and position of the church colleges in the universities, which were generally regarded as academically respectable institutions able to make a contribution to university life.

Nevertheless, it was felt that if the colleges were to be a base for a more active involvement of churches in the pastoral care of students in the university, the colleges would need to be better equipped for the task. They were seen, however, as centres of Christian intellectual activity that could “show and act upon the concern for the well being and life of the whole university”, and in this way “demonstrate that the Christian interest in this sphere is wider than that which is normally described as ‘pastoral’ or ‘evangelistic’. 42 It was also felt that the colleges could be much more effectively used in bringing, for example, “outside students” in for courses in religious instruction, provided there were sufficient resident tutors of Christian conviction. 43 The Consultation passed a resolution that, in part, drew attention to the opportunities “for greater use of residential

40 ACC Archives op.cit. Notes taken by David Taylor.
41 Ibid
42 Ibid
43 Ibid. Report of Section II
colleges as a means of making a strong Christian witness in the academic setting."  

“Where do we go from here?”:

The Consultation concluded with a plenary session on “Where do we go from here?” The Master of Queen’s College, Professor Williams, particularly commended the needs for ecumenical life and witness in educational institutions and urged the setting up of a combined Student Christian Council that would plan, organise and co-ordinate student Christian activities on a co-operative basis with the societies and churches willing to participate.  

This was something along the lines of what Marcus Loane had feared, though Professor Williams’s proposals were in more conciliatory terms than those which had “stung” the Bishop prior to the Consultation. Nevertheless, it was made clear that it would be unlikely that IVF groups would participate in forming and working with such a council. Charles Troutman commented that the IVF representatives had no authority to vote for such a move, and Donald Robinson firmly stated his support for the work of the various student societies which gave choice and opportunity for the exercise of student leadership: The more societies you have, the more Christians there are, and so much the better.”  

The ACC was, he believed, at liberty to do what it liked, but Donald Robinson’s response reflected the view
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46 Ibid. Notes taken by David Taylor
that the IVF was doing well independently and that diversity, rather than division, meant strength.

Some saw the IVF and conservative evangelical positions as rather arrogant and decidedly unhelpful, with the Reverend Frank Hambly, Master of Lincoln College, University of Adelaide, noting that he had the impression that some IVF students regarded him as an “object of mission” rather than a “colleague in mission”, and Bishop Vockler giving reason for some of the intransigence the difference of the Diocese of Sydney from “all the rest of the Church of England in Australia”.

According to John Reid, it was widely reported that Marcus Loane had wrecked the Consultation, but Reid believes this view was exaggerated and unfair as the goals of the Consultation were unrealistic.

In the end, the Consultation passed a resolution moved by Davis McCaughey and seconded by Charles Troutman, that reflected lack of agreement, yet some sense of goodwill in agreeing to differ: “We the members of this Consultation thank the Australian Council of Churches for convening the present Consultation and for the opportunities which it has provided for meeting together; as individuals we would be happy that this Council should continue to take such similar action as it

47 Ibid. Donald Robinson had noted, for example, that the ‘Anglican Society’ at Sydney University was in no way connected with the Church of England.
48 Interview with Bishop John Reid op.cit. There was no doubt, however, that Loane was the arch-antagonist to the ACC cause: “others of us, like Gook, Troutman and myself, supported him to the hilt, but none of us had that strength to get up and let fly!” Indeed, Reid notes that Marcus Loane’s opposition to the thrust of the Consultation and his “discovery of the conference conclusions before it was held”, made him suspicious of both the ACC and the World Council of Churches, “and that was one of the reasons why he distanced himself from both bodies during his time as Archbishop”.

deems wise in this matter." The Council could, as Donald Robinson had suggested, do what it liked, but the differences in approach were clear and conservative evangelicals would have little truck with conciliatory ecumenists in the matter of Christian work and witness in the universities.

In a letter to David Taylor, Dr James Udy, Methodist chaplain at the University of New England, expressed his frustration with the lack of agreement at the Consultation, and his view that this would continue to fragment Christian witness within the university. It had seemed to him “from the outset that the IVF members were quite decided in what they intended to do and that they were extremely successful in curtailing discussions when we were in areas that threatened their complete independence.” Frank Hambly also wrote to David Taylor expressing his concern for the difficulty of any genuine rapprochement between the SCM and the IVF, which he felt to be the real problem in the universities rather than just the issue of the number of denominational societies. He urged that in some way the ACC must continue to play a role in bringing the two together to “hammer” the issue out. In August 1961, Frank Engel wrote to Dr Alan Watson, giving something of a more positive and perhaps overly generous view of the Consultation. While it had not achieved any common policy or organisation, “it did bring together extremes of theological opinion and it was the means of mutual understanding and trust being established between them …

49 ACC Archives op.cit. Report of the Consultation p.6
50 Ibid. Letter from James Udy to David Taylor, 27th June 1961.
51 Ibid. Letter from Frank Hambly to David Taylor, 29th June 1961.
In fact, the Consultation refrained from pushing ahead with plans for unified work in order that the conversation with the ‘Conservative Evangelicals’ might not be ended. This was largely due to the reconciling leadership of Professor McCaughey. It is important and significant that this Consultation was one of the rare occasions in any part of the world at the present time where there has been real meeting between those of this conservative tradition and others. This was all the more remarkable as there was no indication beforehand that there would be any amicable meeting or agreement.52

A Second Consultation?:

Marcus Loane was much more dismissive of the Consultation: “It fizzled-out; nothing ever happened”!53 Frank Engel’s view might well have been too generous, but Archbishop Loane’s view is perhaps too dismissive. David Taylor was keen to follow-up the resolution that there be “similar action” taken by the ACC to further the opportunity of meeting to discuss the issues raised at the Consultation.54 It was not until April 1963, however, that the ACC Executive resolved to conduct a second Consultation in May 1964. In preparation for this second Consultation, the Reverend John Neal, then ‘Executive Secretary’ of the ACC, sought responses from a number of church and university people in

52 Papers of Frank Engel op.cit. Letter from Frank Engel to Dr Alan Watson, Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, 11th August 1961. Frank Engel was a member of the Central Committee of the WCC, 1961-1968, and General Secretary of the ACC, 1969-1975.
53 Interview with Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane op.cit.
relation to three questions: (i) “What are the universities doing in Australia today?”; (ii) “What is God’s purpose for the universities in Australia today?”; and (iii) “How can the churches help forward the accomplishment of that purpose?” A number of responses particularly spoke of the need for an ecumenical rather than a denominational approach to Christian work in the universities, with, for example, the Reverend Errol Towner, Methodist Chaplain at the University College, Newcastle, regarding the development of ecumenical religious centres in universities as more effective than having denominational colleges. The Reverend Frank Engel again referred to what he felt were “the long over-looked values of the first Consultation”, which he regarded as significant in its bringing together Christians of differing positions and opinions. The second Consultation should build on that, but priority must be given, he noted, to the “promotion of ecumenical life and witness in the university”. The Reverend Donald Robinson was concerned as to who can know what God’s purpose is for the universities, and wondered if the time was really opportune for a second Consultation. He nevertheless asked to be kept informed of any developments. Dr John Nevile of the Department of Economics at the University of New England thought the proposal was “very exciting”, but was unable to help at that time.

55 Ibid. Letter from the Reverend John Neal to “various Christians who are continuing members of their University communities”, 20th June 1963.
56 Ibid 11th September 1963; the University College at Newcastle was under the University of NSW, and later became the University of Newcastle.
57 Ibid 20th June 1963
58 Ibid 10th July 1963
59 Ibid 4th July 1963. John Nevile was later Professor of Economics and Dean of the Faculty of Commerce at UNSW. He was also a member and Vice-Chairman of the Board of New College from the 1980s until 2000.
God’s Purpose for the Universities - Professor Philip Baxter’s View:

One of the most thoughtful and detailed responses came from Professor Philip Baxter, Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales. His letter gave indication of an openness to Christian work and witness, especially in the pastoral care of students, on the secular campus, and revealed a much more reflective if not particularly religious nature than his public persona often appeared to convey. A somewhat remote and aloof person, he was seen by many as representing the pre-eminence of science; determined, austere, authoritarian – some felt he was ruthless. Those who worked closely with him, such as Rupert Myers, saw a much more compassionate person who, though described by Patrick O’Farrell as “nothing religiously”, no doubt had contributed significantly to “that environment of tolerant broad-mindedness which became the hallmark of the new university.” Indeed, his letter suggests ‘something’ religiously. He thought that it was an excellent idea that the churches should look seriously at their work in the universities, and noted that the University of New South Wales was fortunate to have chaplains appointed by a number of churches. Within resources available, the University had given the chaplains as much help as possible, and there were plans to set up a non-denominational university chapel and to provide the chaplains with better physical facilities. In addition to
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61 Ibid p.133
62 ACC Archives. Letter from J.P.Baxter to John Neal, 10th September 1963. At the time there were chaplains, mainly part-time, from the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, and the Churches of Christ.
preparing large numbers of students for professional and semi-professional positions of many kinds, the University attempted to impart some general knowledge, some understanding of culture, “to develop the capacity to think independently and to establish some basic ideas about ethics in the mind of the student.” He regretted that there was a considerable number of academic staff who appeared to be more interested in their research than in the welfare of their students. He felt, however, that some progress was being made to overcome that problem.

In terms of “God’s purpose for the universities in Australia”, Professor Baxter could not see “why God’s purpose for the universities should differ from His purpose for any other part of our community.” However, he saw a very particular purpose for the role of chaplains in the University and indirectly, though none existed within the University at that time, for the role of church colleges. There was much to do in dealing with the personal needs of staff and students. “I am always impressed”, he wrote, “by the fact that a substantial proportion of the students who come to a modern Australian university come from homes which are not Christian and have had during their childhood and up to adolescence no exposure to Christianity at all. In general they have no firm Christian beliefs and little understanding of what Christianity means. By the time they come to university they are developing inquiring minds and are becoming interested in problems of a moral, philosophical and religious character. They are

63 Ibid
64 Ibid
becoming aware that life is a much more complicated business than it had seemed to them when they were school-children."\textsuperscript{65} While the University tried to establish personal contact and to meet the needs of students through, for example, counselling and medical services, Professor Baxter believed that there remained “a most important need which can be best met by the activities of the Christian chaplains working within the University. Their duties essentially … should be those normally associated with the minister of the church working within his parish. They should combine evangelical activity with ministration to all those who are in need of help.”\textsuperscript{66}

Philip Baxter urged the appointment of full-time chaplains and noted that while the University would provide every facility and opportunity for them, their work “must be largely in their own hands”.\textsuperscript{67} He asked to be kept informed of progress made towards the proposed conference. There is, however, no record of a Second Consultation ever taking place.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid
\textsuperscript{68} Frank Engel has no reference to it in his 1964 diaries, but rather there is reference to a planning committee of the ‘Church and Life Movement’ to prepare for a national study program of the ACC in 1966: “I suspect that that crowded out the idea of a second Consultation …I am pretty sure that a second one was never held.” (Frank Engel to Ian Walker, 25\textsuperscript{th} May 1999) Davis McCaughey has “absolutely no recollection of a second Consultation on Church and University in 1964” (Davis McCaughey to Ian Walker, 31\textsuperscript{st} May 1999), and John Neal is “sure if a specific further Consultation had been held I would have remembered it better!” (John Neal to Ian Walker, 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 1999) John Neal agreed with Frank Engel’s reference to the ‘Church and Life
Melbourne’s Ecumenism – Sydney’s Evangelicalism:

The Consultation of May 1961 represented a significant point in the nature of the relationship between church and campus in Australia, as it did between church and church, in the early decades following World War II. At a time of challenge, change and growth in the universities, it highlighted the continuing concern of all churches for the role of Christian work and witness in the universities, while at the same time, it defined the very clear differences of views and approaches between the more liberal ecumenists and the more conservative evangelicals; differences that had very much developed between the SCM and the IVF. These differences were particularly expressed on the one hand by people such as Charles Birch, C. W. Williams, and Davis McCaughey, and on the other by Marcus Loane, Donald Robinson, and Charles Troutman. In many ways, the differences were those evidenced in the involvement of the churches, especially the Anglican Church, in the foundation of Melbourne University and of Sydney University; between the attitudes and approaches taken by Bishop Perry and by Bishop Broughton, though ironically Perry was seen as the more evangelical of the two. Melbourne represented much more the thrust of liberal ecumenism and engagement with the University, while Sydney seemed decidedly conservative and separatist.

Movement’, but noted that “it was also a time when we were contemplating taking on a full time Faith and Order Secretary who would have been expected to have some input.”
There had been general agreement at the Consultation that residential church colleges, in having some degree of official standing within their respective universities, could be developed more as centres of spiritual and intellectual stimulation, and of stronger Christian witness not only to their residents but to the wider community as well. Their original purpose and their potential had by no means been fulfilled nor fully exploited. However, the differences expressed at the Consultation were to be clearly exemplified in the moves to establish denominational colleges in the new Australian universities after World War II, such at Monash and the Australian National Universities, and at the University of New South Wales and Macquarie University. They would also be reflected in the moves, albeit unsuccessful, by the Anglican founders of colleges at UNSW and Macquarie University to establish another church college at Sydney University. In particular, these new Anglican colleges would represent the desire of conservative evangelicals in Sydney to break away from the more liberal and Anglo-Catholic tradition of church colleges, with the association of the ‘fresher system’ and drinking, and to set up places of residence and care that would give opportunity for a more definite expression of evangelical faith. They would be seen as part of a ‘mission’ of Christian work and witness within universities that, it seemed, were increasingly subject to rationalistic and atheistic teaching and ideas. This view was to be demonstrated and reinforced by a controversy that occurred shortly after the conclusion of the Consultation in Melbourne.
Soul-Destroying Philosophies:

Evangelicals were greatly encouraged and confident at the beginning of the 1960s, particularly following the success of the Billy Graham crusades in Australia in 1959. The coming decade was seen as one of clear opportunity to build on the growth in religious commitment of the 1950s. The ‘golden age’ for growth of universities as a result of the ‘Murray Report’ (1958) could well be matched by a ‘golden age’ of church growth. Particularly in the area of moral leadership “the opinions and prejudices of (Church) leaders received respectful attention in the news media.”\(^\text{69}\)

At a Service in Sydney’s St. Andrew’s Cathedral on 6\(^{\text{th}}\) July 1961 marking the opening of the twelfth biennial legal convention of the Law Council of Australia\(^\text{70}\), the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia, Dr Hugh Gough, spoke of the grave threat the world faced from the teachings of Marxist communism: “The basic philosophy of Marxist Communism is that there is no God … Here in the Western world, in Great Britain, in America and Australia – even in Sydney – we have those who are shamelessly teaching in our universities the same soul-destroying philosophies. I am not saying that such lecturers are Communists, but they are teaching ideas which are breaking down the restraints of conscience. They are decrying the institution of marriage, urging

\(^{69}\) David Hilliard *op.cit.*

\(^{70}\) The Service was attended by, among others, the Lord Chief Justice of England (Lord Parker), the Chief Justice of the United States (Earl Warren), the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia (Sir Owen Dixon) and the Chief Justice of NSW (Dr H.V.Evatt).
our students to premarital sexual experience, advocating free love and right of
self expression.” 71 The Archbishop believed that such teaching threw the door wide open to Communism, and he noted that “if it is true that empires and nations have fallen because of moral corruption which has sapped the mental vitality and physical strength of the people, is it not the duty of governments to take note of this decline in morals and to take action?” 72 Peter Coleman records that while journalists had been tipped off that something unusual was to be expected at the Service, “few foresaw the furore that followed the sermon of the Anglican Primate … (After the sermon) reporters were delighted and some perhaps sang the offertory hymn with real feeling: ‘Praise to the Lord, who doth prosper thy work’. 73 The comments led to a ‘field day’ in the Sydney press. Archbishop Gough’s sermon was immediately seen and condemned as an attack, not so much on Communism and on a decline in the morality of young people, but on academic freedom of discussion and expression; of the Church seeking to interfere with the proper pursuits of secular academic institutions. More particularly, the subject of Gough’s attack was assumed to be Sydney University’s Professors John Anderson and A. K. Stout, and the University’s Department of Philosophy. 74

72 Ibid.
73 Peter Coleman Memoirs of a Slow Learner Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1994, pp.155-157. Peter Coleman was then working with The Bulletin of which he became Editor. He was later NSW Leader of the Opposition and Liberal member for the federal seat of Wentworth.
Archbishop Hugh Gough – Anglican Primate:

Hugh Rowlands Gough had succeeded Howard Mowll as Anglican Archbishop of Sydney following his election by the diocesan Synod in November 1959. Like Mowll, he had been President of CICCU (1926-1927) and was the first Chairman of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions when it was formed in England in April 1928. Howard Guinness was Vice-Chairman. As Howard Mowll championed the coming of the Billy Graham Crusades to Australia, Hugh Gough, as Bishop of Barking in the Diocese of Chelmsford and Chairman of the Evangelical Alliance of Great Britain, virtually stood alone amongst English bishops in his promotion and leadership of the Billy Graham London Crusade in 1954. A graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, he was not regarded as a particularly gifted scholar, but his evangelical stance, together with his distinguished service as a chaplain in World War II and his position in the English Church, made him of strong appeal to a broader cross-section of the Sydney Synod. The conservative evangelical vote was split between other Australian candidates, the Sydney coadjutor bishops Hilliard, Kerle and Loane. There was a view that an Englishman may not only be a person of detachment in the divided Sydney scene, but be someone whose character would “sustain the place of the Church in an age of widespread tertiary education and very clever

---

74 Coleman suggests that the controversy was as much fed by the Fairfax media as by the Archbishop himself, as there had been a long-standing antipathy between Sir Warwick Fairfax and Professor Anderson.

75 Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable op.cit. p.265
wordly men.” Though an English evangelical who wore a pectoral cross, which placed him on the higher side of centre in the view of some Sydney evangelicals, he was nevertheless known as a person keen to spread the message of Christ to all people. He was also seen as someone who “speaks his mind even when, perhaps, he should not have made it up … His critics and many of his friends rather wish that he were less blunt and not quite so spontaneous: that he would realise that the citadels of evil may be taken by patient mining and that heroic frontal attacks far from winning everything not infrequently lose all.”

The “citadel of evil” – Bishop Broughton’s “great emporium of false and anti-church views” – Sydney University, had come under attack before as a result of the views and teaching of Professor John Anderson. Indeed, in 1936, Archbishop Mowll and other Anglican bishops had signed a petition to the Senate of Sydney University complaining that philosophy was taught there exclusively from an anti-theistic viewpoint “deeply prejudicial to the best interests of students, and particularly to those of the students who are contemplating service in the Christian ministry.” The University responded by agreeing to the establishment of a separate chair in Moral and Political Philosophy, with, however, Professor Anderson securing the appointment in 1938 of A. K. Stout, who became a strong supporter of Anderson. Stout was reported as saying, no doubt in jest: “Of

78 Jim Franklin The Gough-Kinsella Affair Unpublished chapter of a work in progress (1998) by Dr Jim Franklin, School of Mathematics UNSW, Ch.6, p.6
course, it made no difference to John. He went on corrupting the youth just as much as before, and damn it all, he corrupted me too!” Gough had been sent a copy of a booklet, ‘Empiricism and Freedom’, prepared in 1958 by a Roman Catholic retired medical specialist, Dr Victor Kinsella, in which the empirical philosophies of John Anderson were attacked. The empiricist, claimed Kinsella, “advocates for our young people experiments on the sensual and sexual level.”

The booklet was included by Dr Kinsella in a submission he made to a NSW Government Youth Policy Advisory Committee chaired by Judge Adrian Curlewis. Curlewis sent a copy to Gough.

Reactions and Responses:

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, Professor Stephen Roberts, responded quickly to the reports of Archbishop Gough’s sermon. Reflecting the growth of the student religious societies on the campus that were much of the subject of the Melbourne Consultation, he noted that “the morals of students are higher today than ever before. Students in universities throughout the Western world have turned to religious philosophy in one of the most striking revivals I have ever known. The most active of the University’s societies are the religious societies.” He reported that in the days just prior to the Service at the Cathedral, over one thousand students had attended each of four meetings of the

79 Ibid p.7
80 Sydney Morning Herald op.cit.
81 Jim Franklin op.cit. p.1
82 Sydney Morning Herald op.cit.
Evangelical Union at Sydney University.\textsuperscript{83} In a later reply to the NSW Council of Churches, which had supported the Archbishop’s views, Professor Roberts noted that it was nonsense to say that only non-Christian views were taught in the University, as there were courses of study leading to the Bachelor and Doctor of Divinity degrees. He further commented that “it has always been the policy of the Vice-Chancellor to grant remission of all fees to students taking degrees in Divinity in an effort to encourage religious education.”\textsuperscript{84} This was an interesting revelation from a man regarded as adhering to no particular religious view\textsuperscript{85} and in charge of a decidedly secular institution. He was, however, firmly of the view that the University was a place of free inquiry and discussion in whatever context, religious or otherwise, and it promoted no one view. He warned the Archbishop and those who claimed that certain teaching within the University was corrupting young people, that they should make specific charges, quote individual cases and “submit to the law of libel”.\textsuperscript{86}

The Vice-Chancellor of Melbourne University, Sir George Paton, felt that the Archbishop must be completely out of touch with university life as he knew it, and the President of the Sydney University Students’ Representative Council, Mr Peter Wilenski, declared that he was tired of the university being labelled a hotbed of free love and that the moral outlook of students was extremely

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Daily Telegraph} 7\textsuperscript{th} July 1961
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} 19\textsuperscript{th} July 1961
\textsuperscript{85} D.R.V.Wood \textit{Stephen Henry Roberts, Historian and Vice-Chancellor: A Short Biography} Sydney University Monographs No. 2, 1986, p.11
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Ibid} p.87; and \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} \textit{op.cit.}
conventional. 87 Professor Rupert Myers, then Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of NSW, said that the majority of students did not take courses that involved the subjects raised by the Archbishop, and that those who studied philosophy considered the whole range of human thought. 88 The President of the University of NSW Staff Association, Professor J. B. Thornton, defended the role of free inquiry in the university: “The important question to be asked about the work of any university lecturer is whether it conforms to the canons of scholarly and impartial inquiry. It may well be that university lecturers from time to time question accepted moral codes or other conventional views precisely because the prime function of universities is criticism.” 89 Mr H. L. Rogers, President of the Sydney University Staff Association, called on Archbishop Gough to apologise if he could not produce proof of his “allegations”, and invited him to address a lunchtime meeting of the Association. 90 The Archbishop offered to meet the Association at the end of August that year, but Mr Rogers saw this as the Archbishop’s lack of a sense of urgency in substantiating his charges. 91 The President of the University of NSW Students’ Representative Council, John Niland, when asked about the Archbishop’s comments on the advocacy to students of “free love”, replied “maybe it’s all right for the few, but free love wouldn’t fit in with civilised living for the majority.” 92

87 Sydney Morning Herald 7th July 1961
88 Daily Telegraph 7th July 1961
89 Ibid
90 Ibid 14th July 1961 p.5
91 Sydney Morning Herald 15th July 1961
92 Pix, 62(8), 29th July 1961, pp.54-55.
Dr Gough had his supporters. The Reverend Gordon Powell of St. Stephen’s Presbyterian Church in Macquarie Street, Sydney, believed that the Archbishop was not making a blanket condemnation of university staff but was referring to an “immoral minority” who were “sheltering behind academic privileges and claiming intellectual freedom”. He was sure that many parents had not complained out of fear of recrimination against their children.93 Mr Malcolm Mackerras, in a letter to The Sydney Morning Herald, wrote that while he thought the Archbishop’s opinions had been overstated, the teaching of the Philosophy Department at Sydney University did strike at the fundamentals of Christian morality and that therefore Dr Gough had good reason for his general complaint.94 The Council of Churches in NSW, in a joint statement by the President, Dr E. H. Watson, and the Secretary, the Reverend Bernard Judd, defended the Archbishop against his critics, noting that some professors at Sydney University were known for their agnosticism and cynical attitude towards the claims of the Christian faith. “The leaders of the Christian Church”, they said, “have a sacred duty to speak out against any threat which they may consider inimical to the spiritual well-being and moral health of the younger generation.”95 They also expressed concern that approaches made to the State Government for there to be church representation on the Curlewis committee had been “fobbed off” by the Minister for Education, Mr Wetherell. All this reflected an anti-Church bias that, in turn, reflected “the militant secularism which has

93 Sydney Morning Herald 10th July 1961; Daily Telegraph 10th July 1961
94 Ibid 11th July 1961 p.2
95 Ibid 19th July 1961 p.6
invaded not only our universities but even the most responsible levels of government.”

The Vice-Chancellor of Sydney University, Professor Roberts, referred to the Council of Churches statement as “a tarradiddle of verbose frustration”. The Council of Churches took strong exception to the Vice-Chancellor, under cover of using a “bizarre” word, referring to them as “liars”! However, leaders of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and Congregational Churches dissociated themselves from the Council of Churches statement, claiming they had not been involved in its preparation and that the Council did not speak on their behalf.

The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the Right Reverend Hugh Cunningham, noted that the Assembly would not engage in such criticism of the University as it was a grave injustice to be a party to general accusations which cast suspicions on all members of a teaching staff. He said that in 1951 the General Assembly stated: “We believe that a university must guard freedom of inquiry and research, limited by nothing but truth itself, and a university which would be limited in any other way could not produce the scholarship and leadership necessary to the development of a democratic State.”

That statement, he said, still applied. The Honorary Secretary of the Presbyterian Faculty of Theology (NSW), J. Haultain Brown, wrote that “if

---

96 Ibid
97 Ibid
98 Ibid 20th July 1961 p.6
99 Ibid
100 Ibid 26th July 1961
101 Ibid
young people are too easily led away from faith, a more important explanation may be the intellectual torpor which characterises large sections of the Churches”.102

The Savour of ‘McCarthyism’:

Rejection of Archbishop Gough’s views came notably also from heads of denominational and non-denominational residential colleges. Dr Felix Arnott, the Warden of St. Paul’s College at Sydney University, thought the Department of Philosophy at Sydney was “excellent” and that the Archbishop’s views were “grossly uninformed”.103 The Principal of St. Andrew’s College, the Reverend Alan Dougan, described the content of the sermon as “fantastic” and “amazing”, while the Principal of the Women’s College, Miss Doreen Langley, commented that “none of my girls has ever talked about any such lectures.”104 A strong defense of freedom of speech and inquiry, particularly in the university, came from the Anglican Dean of Melbourne, the Very Reverend Dr Stuart Barton Babbage. Dr Babbage had been appointed Diocesan Missioner in Sydney by Archbishop Mowll in 1946 and within a year was appointed Dean of Sydney. He was responsible for the Canon Bryan Green Mission to Sydney in the early 1950s, and was a gifted communicator with students. He took part in the Howard Guinness E.U. Mission at Sydney University in 1951. In 1953 he was appointed

102 Ibid 14th July 1961 p.2
103 Ibid 8th July 1961 p.5
104 Daily Telegraph 8th July 1961
Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, and also Dean of Melbourne. He chaired the organising committee of the 1959 Billy Graham Melbourne Crusade, and in 1960 he became President of the Melbourne College of Divinity. As an undergraduate at Auckland University College in New Zealand he had been President of the Evangelical Union, and he had maintained a long association with the Inter-Varsity Fellowship during his time in England and then in Australia. He was a definite evangelical of great intellectual strength who was, as Archbishop Loane has described him, "the delight of the press, as he could always be relied upon for a tart or pithy comment on current affairs".105 Commenting in St. Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, on the controversy that had arisen in Sydney, he declared: “If freedom of speech is forbidden, the next step is the rubber truncheon and the concentration camp … (it would be) an alarming state of affairs if, in a university, a man was forbidden to speak the truth as he saw it.”106 In a later reflection, Dr Babbage noted that he believed the Archbishop was misinformed and that he seemed unaware that what he was advocating savoured all too obviously of ‘McCarthyism’.107 Dr Babbage saw the attempt to censure university teaching as akin to censorship, both of which smacked of “totalitarian tyranny whether political or ecclesiastical”.108

105 Marcus L. Loane These Happy Warriors op. cit. p.67
106 Sydney Morning Herald 10th July 1961
108 Ibid. Academic Responsibility and the Rights of Free Enquiry An article written for publication at the request of the ‘Daily Telegraph’. This of course would have marked him as a liberal in the eyes of many conservative evangelicals; indeed, some no doubt would have consequently regarded him as something of a traitor to the evangelical cause. ‘Intellectual evangelicals’ can often run the risk of seemingly exceeding the constraints of a more simplistic conservative confessional conformity. Though Stuart Babbage had focused on what he regarded as the “fundamental issues” in the controversy, he believes this “well-meaning attempt misfired: the Archbishop interpreted my intervention as a personal attack on himself. And this distressed me.”
Professor Stout, who had succeeded Anderson as head of the Philosophy Department on Anderson’s retirement in 1958, emphatically denied that he had ever in his twenty years at Sydney University advocated free love, extra-marital relations or trial marriage: “I am quite certain that not one of the thousands of students who have attended my university lectures could say anything of the sort.”

In a submission to the Curlewis committee, he claimed that Dr Kinsella’s booklet had grossly misrepresented the teaching of philosophy at the University, and that it was based on a view of Scholastic (i.e. Roman Catholic) philosophy that he doubted “would be accepted by some of its leading exponents.”

In March 1962, the journal *Vestes* published a quotation from a paper read by James McAuley, Professor of English, University of Tasmania, at the Sixth Christian Social Week in Melbourne on 5th September 1961: “The pamphlet on philosophical wickedness which was the basis of Archbishop Gough’s recent attack on the Philosophy Department in Sydney University was originally offered to me for publication in *Quadrant*. I was at some pains to try to persuade the writer, a Catholic medical man, that he did not know what was taught in the Philosophy Department and did not appreciate the nature of a modern university, and that he would do harm if he published his text. Unfortunately my powers of persuasion failed.”

---

109 *Sydney Morning Herald* 8th July 1961
110 *Ibid* 13th July 1961
The Fight between Secularism and Religion is Intense:

Professor Anderson felt it was a “disgrace” that Dr Gough had based his comments on a pamphlet that “no-one could take seriously”.112 In a lunch-hour address on “Academic Autonomy and Religion” to over six hundred students at Sydney University on 14th July, he stated that it was the right of and may well be the duty of a university teacher to put forward a definite view “no matter how it runs across legalistic and ecclesiastical opinions of marriage.”113 He warned of the need to resist the encroachment by the churches onto the campuses, stating that there was a “permanent incompatibility” between the churches and universities. With clear reference to the growth of societies referred to by the Vice-Chancellor, Stephen Roberts, he declared “if religious societies are flourishing in the university, this is a sign of the decay of the university.”114 Such societies cultivated a servile ethic of avoidance with the idea of salvationism instead of unending inquiry.115 There was constant and loud applause from his audience which ironically comprised “the forward scouts of all the creeds of the sixties against whose coming (Anderson) had spoken so eloquently – the liberationism, the relativism, the irrationalism.116 At a similar meeting at the University of NSW on 20th July, Professor Anderson stated that Communism had stimulated men’s minds far more than Christianity: “Christianity is a conventionalism. For a long time it hindered the progress of those immersed

112 SMH 8th July 1961
113 Daily Telegraph 15th July 1961
114 The Bulletin 22nd July 1961, p.5
within it. The academic world has to attack any religion which tries to lay down requirements not in accordance with reality. In any university the fight between secularism and religion is intense.”117

It might have seemed otherwise at the silver jubilee dinner of the Australian-American Association in Sydney when the Prime Minister, Mr Menzies, whose government had not long before initiated an enormous injection of funds into Australian universities following the Murray Report and yet was facing a difficult ‘Credit Squeeze’ election, greeted the Primate with a bow: “I am pleased to see His Grace here. Nothing brings so much balm to the spirit as to see a man who, like oneself, is in trouble.”118 The Prime Minister was as much an opponent of the philosophies of John Anderson and of Communism as the Primate. His sympathies would have been more with Gough’s ‘englishness’ than his evangelicalism, but both the Primate and the Prime Minister were traditionalists and held to an ‘established’ connection between church, college and campus. This would be evident in Menzies’ clear support for the funding of denominational residential colleges, new and old, in Australian universities. The warm response of the Archbishop to the support of the Prime Minister drew the reply from Menzies: “Thank you, sir. Thank you for being so considerate to a mere Presbyterian. This brings the union of the Churches closer and closer.”119

115 Peter Coleman op.cit. p.165
116 Ibid
117 Sydney Morning Herald 21st July 1961, p.5
118 Ibid ‘Column 8’ 14th July 1961
A Deliberate and Calculated Attack:

An article in *Nation*, an independent fortnightly journal, took a swipe not only at the Archbishop’s sermon but at the nature of Sydney Anglican evangelicalism which had played such a part at the Melbourne Consultation in keeping any such union with the churches in the matter of student ministry from anything but, in organisational terms, close. “It passes understanding” said the article, “that (Dr Gough) should rush into a subject where he is so ill-practised and play the Billy Graham sin-and-hellfire role, on no factual basis, in the pulpit of St. Andrew’s Cathedral. But again, Dr Gough’s tastes were known in 1959. Sydney’s special brand of evangelicalism, rampant, gone to seed, prompting desperate Anglican wrigglings in that Synod, has now been given an invitation to look at itself hard in the mirror.”

The Standing Committee of the Synod certainly looked hard at the article, and at the controversy concerning the Archbishop’s sermon. A statement in reply to the *Nation* article was prepared by Bishops Clive Kerle and Marcus Loane, and tabled at the Standing Committee meeting on 31st July 1961. Copies were sent to the journal and to the diocesan magazine *Southern Cross*.

The article was “a deliberate and calculated attack on the leaders, past and present, of the Church of England in the Diocese of Sydney … it is a planned attempt to destroy confidence in the Church of England in Sydney … It trades in untruth and slander … it is sinister in policy and intention”.

---

119 Ibid
120 *The Primacy of Graham …* op.cit. p.10
Committee resolved to place on record its strongest possible disapproval of the article.\textsuperscript{122} On receipt of a letter from a member of Standing Committee, Dr Ron Winton, concerning the debate surrounding the Archbishop’s sermon, the Committee also placed on record its full support for the Archbishop in the stand he had taken.\textsuperscript{123}

**Conclusion:**

The year 1961, in consultation and controversy, highlighted a post-war decade that, through both zeal for ecumenism and evangelism, demonstrated something of a renewed and vigorous interest of the Christian churches in university work and witness. Growth in the number and size of Australia’s universities and in the number and size of the student religious societies enlivened the debate between the sacred and the secular and emphasised the differences of approach that the churches would take in most effectively meeting the campus challenge. While seeing the enacted exclusion of religion from the universities as contrary to the unity of knowledge and, as the Reverend David Taylor noted, a form of sectarianism in itself, the broader and more liberal Christian view was, in the main, to seek a unified approach that would, it was hoped, find greater acceptance and consequent influence in the academic community. All university work and intellectual pursuit ought to be seen, in Professor Charles Birch’s

\textsuperscript{122} Minutes as above.  
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. Letter of Dr.R.R.Winton dated 26\textsuperscript{th} July 1961. Dr Winton will be referred to in a later chapter as a founder of New College, UNSW.
terms, as a “sacred responsibility and trust”. There ought to be no fear of free inquiry and debate; engaging with it was very much a part of what was written into the aims of Australia’s first university, that of the “better advancement of religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge”.

Conservative evangelical resistance at the Consultation in Melbourne did not signal any less of a desire to engage the Christian gospel with the life of the university. Combined effort, however, threatened compromise of the tenets of reformed evangelical faith and, it was believed, a muzzling of the evangelical student movement that had grown and developed in reaction to the all too inclusive Student Christian Movement and its various associations with and affirmation of liberal and modernist views. In many ways, it seemed, the university was true to Bishop Broughton’s description of it as a “great emporium of false and anti-church views” - Peter Hastings’ “citadel of evil”. The controversy initiated by Archbishop Gough’s sermon was clear evidence of it. Though accused of being characterised by “intellectual torpor” and a “servile ethic of avoidance”, and in presenting, according to Charles Birch, an “anti-intellectual appeal to students”, many conservative evangelicals, especially in Sydney, were convinced of a “sacred duty” to speak out, as the NSW Council of Churches declared, against “militant secularism” in the universities and beyond. There is little doubt that the conservative response to John Anderson’s statement that “in any university the fight between secularism and religion is intense” would have been a resounding “Amen!”.
Aside from the student religious societies, there was agreement, as indicated in the Consultation report, that the denominational residential colleges were in a unique position more effectively to be centres of Christian witness on campus; indeed, they perhaps needed to regain if possible the purposes for which they were originally established, some more than others. Their potential was as places of Christian intellectual activity. In demonstrating concern for the life of the whole university they could show an interest and involvement that is wider than what is normally described as ‘pastoral’ or ‘evangelistic’. The proceedings and outcomes of the Consultation, however, clearly signalled that different approaches would be taken and emphases placed, especially in the establishment of new colleges in new universities. The nature of the controversy over Archbishop Gough’s sermon in St. Andrew’s Cathedral clearly warned of the sensitivities within the universities to any attack, perceived or otherwise, on academic freedom.\footnote{124}

The mid-to-late 1950s till the mid-1970s were to see, amidst even greater demands for freedom of expression and the questioning of authority in universities, opportunity given through the massive injection of Commonwealth

\footnote{124 This was an issue already recently tested in, for example, the refusal in 1956 of the University of NSW to appoint Dr Russell Ward as a lecturer in History (Patrick O’Farrell \textit{UNSW, A Portrait}...pp.70-71), allegedly because of his former Communist Party connections, and an earlier controversy in 1961 concerning views expressed by Dr Frank Knopfelmacher about Communist influences at Melbourne University (‘The New Scare Campaign’ \textit{The Observer} 21st January 1961, Vol. 4., No.2, pp.4-5). As Professor Julius Stone warned in response to Dr Knopfelmacher’s article: “When our universities cease to provide manœuvring space for uncoerced minds, disaster will not be far from them, and from the society whose standards they should inform and inspire” (‘A Net to Catch Professors’, \textit{The Observer} 4th February 1961, Vol.4, No.3, p.5).}
funds for the practical expression of the different approaches - ecumenical and evangelical - by the churches to the setting up of residential colleges within Australia’s new universities. In particular, Archbishop Gough, Bishops Kerle and Loane, and Dr Ron Winton would be among those involved in various capacities in the founding of ‘New College’ at the University of NSW and of ‘Robert Menzies College’ at Macquarie University.
CHAPTER SEVEN

New Colleges - Ancient Virtues:

Commonwealth Funding and Support in the 1960s and 1970s

“In my declining years ... I retain my belief in the ancient virtues, and value the services which the church schools and colleges render to them.”

- Sir Robert Menzies, 1970

The massive injection of Commonwealth funds into university education in Australia at the beginning of the 1960s included provision for the extension of existing or the building of new student residences to meet the ever-increasing post-War demand for accommodation. Particularly in the new universities founded after the War and by the beginning of the 1960s – the Australian National University (ANU), the University of New South Wales, the University of New England (UNE), and Monash University – halls of residence as distinct from denominational colleges were being established and run by the universities themselves. Commonwealth ‘largesse’, however, provided a window of opportunity for church and church-related groups to establish denominational colleges.

Concern for Autonomy:

In July 1965, Dr R. B. Madgwick, Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England, wrote a letter on behalf of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee
to the Minister-in-Charge of Commonwealth Activities in Education and Research, Senator John Gorton.¹ In it, Professor Madgwick expressed the Committee’s concern that while they welcomed “very warmly the generous assistance which the Commonwealth Government has provided towards solving the problems of residential accommodation”, the manner in which additional places should be provided should be left to the universities concerned. The letter was written in response to the Federal Government’s policy that had been determined by Cabinet in October 1963, that “within overall budgetary limits ... affiliated colleges are to have access equally with halls of residence on a £ for £ basis to Commonwealth assistance.”² Professor Madgwick was particularly concerned. The University of New England, formerly a University College of the University of Sydney and granted autonomy in 1954, was dependent upon the provision of accommodation for the maintenance of its student numbers. The Government’s policy had caused the deferment of funds for the construction of Earl Page College until, in the overall allocation of funds available, affiliated colleges received equal support and provision. In January 1965, Professor Madgwick wrote a letter to the federal member for New England, Mr Ian Sinclair, in which he noted: “I will be most grateful for anything you can do to secure a reversal of the decision taken because otherwise the implications for the University will be extremely serious through until 1970.”³

¹ Australian Archives AA1969/212(16) Folders of Correspondence maintained by Senator John Gorton as Minister for Education and Science, 2nd July 1965
² Ibid Robert G Menzies to Sir Leslie Martin,, 16th October 1963
³ Ibid R.B.Madgwick to Mr Ian Sinclair, 11th January 1965
The policy was also causing some controversy at the Australian National University, the first Australian university established after World War II, and, unlike the State universities, a direct Commonwealth government responsibility. The University had established University House in 1954 and Bruce Hall in 1961.\textsuperscript{4} The University also had set aside land for and, in 1962, had approved certain general conditions on which it would be prepared to affiliate residential colleges.\textsuperscript{5} The Joint Faculties of the Research Schools of Social Sciences and Pacific Studies, while acknowledging the decision “properly taken by the University to establish conditions for the affiliation of residential colleges”, expressed its appreciation of the University establishing its own halls of residence, and asked that the Council “follow a clearly defined policy of seeking to provide this type of accommodation on a scale adequate for the needs of all students of appropriate intellectual calibre who do not wish to live in affiliated colleges.”\textsuperscript{6}

Clearly the concern was that, under its policy of equal access to funds, government assistance would be directed to denominational bodies for the building of affiliated colleges at the expense of further provision of university controlled halls. The universities, it was felt, ought to be, within the limits of the funds available, free to determine the nature, variety and extent of

\textsuperscript{4} Lennox House existed as a hostel until taken over in 1967 as a temporary home of John XXIII College.

\textsuperscript{5} Leonard Huxley (Vice-Chancellor ANU) to Alex Mitchell (Vice-Chancellor, Macquarie University), Australian National University Archives, Affiliation of Halls or Colleges, 2.2.1.28, 22\textsuperscript{nd} August 1966

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, Affiliation of Residential Colleges and Halls 1493/1963
accommodation provided on campus. It seemed that the Commonwealth was dictating conditions in relation to the provision of student residence that threatened the autonomy and, perhaps ironically, the secular nature of the University. With a background of the separation of religion from the university in Australia, and in the context of post-War promotion of science and technology and the opening up of university education to a larger and broader cross-section of society, why was such Government support being so determinedly given to religious foundations?

**Increasing Student Numbers:**

At the outbreak of World War II in 1939, enrolments in Australian universities totalled approximately 14,000 students\(^7\), and immediately after the War, in 1946, there were nearly 26,000.\(^8\) By 1957 there were nearly 37,000, and by 1963 some 69,000 students were enrolled in universities, representing an increase in the proportion of university students in the total population of 0.2% in 1939 to just over 0.5% in 1963.\(^9\) It was estimated that the proportion would increase to around 1% in 1970. The increase and the demand reflected the general population growth after the War – the “baby boomers” were of university age in the 1960s; the policies of manpower planning and quotas on university “reserved

---

\(^7\) W.H.Maze, *Address given at a Symposium on ‘The Australian Universities – 1970’* held at the University of NSW, 6-7 December 1960 (statistics from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics)

\(^8\) Susan Davies *The Martin Committee and the Binary Policy of Higher Education in Australia* Ashwood House, Melbourne, 1989, p.163

faculties” during the War, followed by the influx of ex-servicemen and women under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme; the growth in courses in science and technology - of applied research for commercial, scientific and industrial development, spurred on by the age of Sputnik and the “space race”; the increasing focus on professional training; and the view that all who qualify should have the opportunity of a university education, irrespective of social or economic status. As the older and the new universities, including ANU, the University of NSW, and Monash University, sought to respond to the curriculum imperatives of this new age and to the pressure for places, and as further universities were planned, so concern grew not only about the means of funding but also about the nature of the universities – their size, their facilities, the make-up of their student populations, and their support services, including the provision of residential accommodation. Demand for such accommodation was particularly noted for students arriving in Australia from countries in Asia under the Colombo Plan, which by 1957 had brought two thousand students to Australia; and for students from country areas seeking to undertake courses in the large metropolitan centres.

At a symposium held at the University of NSW in December 1960, the inevitability and arguably the desirability of much larger universities were recognised, as well as the need for the establishment of more universities. Professor D. W. Phillips, then Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales, nevertheless recognised the impact of such growth on the more
personal relationships that had existed between teachers and students. He referred to the struggle for teachers to get to know their students, which seemed more and more to be a hopeless effort: “The tendency is to say we are too big and too busy.”

He then went on to describe the efforts of the University to establish colleges in which more of the “real value of a university education”, rather than just “being taught”, might be experienced. Professor Louis Matheson, Vice-Chancellor of Monash University, in referring to the size and costs of universities, noted that “it is generally recognised that students educate one another most effectively when they live together as well as work together”, and suggested that it might be more economical to build dormitories “with a minimum of social facilities and to use the Union for feeding and recreational purposes.”

The Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee convened a conference at the University of Melbourne in August 1964 on the theme of “Student Residence in Australian Universities”, at which Professor Philip Baxter acknowledged the need for greater provision of accommodation and the “admirable” job that had been performed by the small colleges of the traditional collegiate system. Nevertheless, he felt it would be inappropriate to require all students in need of
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residence to be housed in the more regimented and costly “Southern Hemisphere” copies “of the old Oxford and Cambridge tradition.”

**Sir Robert Menzies - Preserving the ‘Newman-type’ Traditions:**

It was, however, much of that tradition that gave rise to the support that was provided by the Commonwealth Government, particularly in the 1960s, to affiliated residential colleges as well as to university halls and hostels; and the chief advocate was undoubtedly Sir Robert Menzies. With a view “firmly based on British academic and scholarly traditions, (Robert Menzies) had more to say about education than any other Australian Prime Minister ... (these traditions) were the focus of his interest. They gave him his faith in the value and efficacy of education.”

The impetus that he gave to the vast expansion of Australian universities in the late 1950s and the 1960s was given with the conviction that such expansion must “preserve in every Australian university (old and new) the Newman-type traditions of nineteenth century British universities.”

Menzies did not support the separation of religion from education. He acknowledged that “a religious background was of the greatest educational significance in the building of character.” He was opposed to sectarianism, which “nauseated”
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15 *Ibid* p.90
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him\textsuperscript{17}; he believed that the best way to break down division was to give opportunity and support to all, whether of a particular religion, denomination or none. Secularism, in its exclusion of religion, was just as divisive and damaging as sectarianism. “If you detach education from religion”, he stated in a speech at Essendon Grammar School in 1960, “you do incredible injury to education ... Society doesn’t want clever pagans; it needs educated Christian gentlemen.”\textsuperscript{18} At the ‘Cardinal’s Dinner’ in Sydney in 1964, he commented: “I have always been a tremendous believer in schools and in colleges at universities which have a background of religion ... I would get no satisfaction in thinking that we had pledged ourselves to a highly intellectual ... but highly pagan future. The world is full of talent. Not quite so full of character.”\textsuperscript{19} He was later to reflect: “In my declining years, witnessing a world in which moral values are treated with such complete contempt in some intellectual, or more accurately, pseudo-intellectual circles, and in which the powerful influence of the Press seems to be all too frequently hostile to all received standards of social behaviour, I retain my belief in the ancient virtues, and value the services which the church schools and colleges render to them.”\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid p.91  
\textsuperscript{18} Bob Bessant \textit{op cit} p.86  
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid p.87  
\textsuperscript{20} R.G.Menzies \textit{op.cit.} p.93
State Aid to Church Schools:

Schools, however, represented to Menzies a much more difficult area in which to extend Commonwealth aid than to universities and colleges. They were much more bound to the States, and he believed that federal assistance would lead to control and uniformity, rather than the promotion of variety befitting such a vast nation. When, however, Sir Robert Menzies called an early federal election in October 1963, with a working majority of only one and the need for greater certainty and stability at a time of important foreign policy and defense issues, the issues of education and state aid to church schools became crucial.

Along with the determination in the mid to late 1800s that the universities be secular places, free of sectarian influence, so the States determined that primary and secondary education should be, as the NSW Act of 1880 phrased it, ‘free, compulsory and secular’. No aid was to be given to denominational schools, though provision was made within State schools for there to be general religious instruction conducted by the clergy of different denominations. Catholic schools had most to lose and continued to be vocal in their arguments for assistance, though from 1911 some government bursaries were made available to Catholic school children.\(^{21}\) Immigration after World War II began to place enormous strains on all schools, but particularly upon the local Catholic schools. In 1955 the Catholic Coadjutor (Assistant) Archbishop of Melbourne, J. D. Simmonds,  
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claimed that Catholics in Melbourne were being fined over £2m a year for following the dictates of their conscience.\textsuperscript{22} Accepting responsibility for bringing large numbers of public servants into the ACT, and with the careful negotiations of Archbishop Eris O’Brien of Goulburn and Canberra, the Menzies government provided interest-free loans to Catholic secondary schools from 1956, and to primary schools from 1961.\textsuperscript{23} In July 1962, Catholic schools in Goulburn closed as a protest over lack of funding, forcing over one thousand pupils to attempt enrolment at local State schools. As only just under half could be enrolled, the political point was made and the schools re-opened after one week.\textsuperscript{24} Publicity increased, as did pressure on political parties to abandon opposition to State aid. Sectarian arguments arose again, with some opponents of State aid claiming that the Catholic Church was seeking to increase its power and authority, and that “to give money into the control of a sectarian hierarchy would mean the semi-establishment of a religion.”\textsuperscript{25}

While Menzies insisted prior to 1963 that education was essentially a State matter, and that only in tertiary education had the Commonwealth government begun to give direct aid, increasingly indication was given that there would be support for non-State schools. This was particularly occurring in the area of

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid p.96
\textsuperscript{23} In that year an association of Catholic parents and friends was formed in Wagga Wagga, invoking the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights that affirmed the right of parents to choose the kind of education to be given to their children, and asserting that the people’s taxes should support the education of all children.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid pp.98-99
\textsuperscript{25} Alison Lyons ‘A Case Against Aid to Church Schools’, \textit{The Bulletin}, 5\textsuperscript{th} August 1961, pp.20-21. At this time, Alison Lyons was a member of the New University Colleges Council that was seeking to establish Anglican residential colleges at Sydney and New South Wales Universities.
science education, seen as essential for the nation’s progress and development in the post-War years. A private industry-sponsored fund was beginning to direct money towards the building of science laboratories in independent secondary schools, a move praised by Menzies who was invited to open a number of them.\textsuperscript{26} With division in the Labor Party, which was still coping with the 1950s break-away formation of the Democratic Labor Party, Menzies took hold of the electoral opportunity and announced in his 1963 Policy Speech that the Commonwealth government would provide ten thousand scholarships to students on merit, irrespective of their schools, and also promised £5m per year for science building and teaching facilities in both State and non-State secondary schools.\textsuperscript{27} The election was won by Menzies with a majority of twenty-two. While Menzies clearly and successfully saw electoral advantage in the provision of Commonwealth aid, he had “a genuine concern at the plight of schools”, and that this ‘was of a piece with his work for universities.’\textsuperscript{28}

Universities, however, did not pose the same difficulties as schools. At a time of great social and economic development, they were seen as representing much of the aspirations of the nation after the War and would have much to do with

\textsuperscript{26} A.W.Martin \textit{Robert Menzies: A Life, Volume 2 1944-1978} Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, Vic., 1999, p.471. At such an event at Sydney’s Waverley College in 1963, he declared his support for “variety and versatility in education” and the importance of parents being able to choose their own schools. Earlier in that year, at the opening of the Catholic Teachers’ Training College in Canberra, he stated that “the Christian churches provided an essential background to civilised education”.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Ibid} p.476

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid} pp.476-477. When, in 1964, Menzies was a guest of honour at the ‘Cardinal’s Dinner’ in Sydney, the \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} reported: “It is doubtful whether a gathering of Roman Catholic dignitaries has ever looked upon a Presbyterian with such benevolence as Cardinal Gilroy and his bishops did upon Sir Robert Menzies on Thursday evening.” (p.507)
Australia’s international reputation and acceptance. The Universities Commission had been established by the Labor Government in 1942 to provide funds for students in selected university departments, and, in 1945, the Government initiated the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme for ex-servicemen and women. The Chifley Government established the Australian National University in 1946, primarily as a research institution, and in 1949, shortly before its defeat, announced the setting-up of a committee of inquiry into the finances of the universities under the chairmanship of Professor R. C. Mills, Chairman of the Universities Commission and formerly Professor of Economics at Sydney University. In 1950, the new Menzies Government defined the Committee’s role to examine the finances of the universities, having regard to their facilities for teaching and research; to report on present needs and future development; and to recommend what action, if any, the Commonwealth should take to assist universities. During the course of the Committee’s inquiries, the Prime Minister was informed that residential colleges were being excluded from consideration because they were considered to be luxuries that should only be paid for by churches or people who wanted them. Menzies, who considered such a view “strange”, instructed the Committee that it should “pay attention to the position of these colleges.” Indeed, at the 1964 Cardinal’s Dinner in Sydney, he indicated that he conveyed to the Committee the view that he might well ignore the Committee’s report unless it made a recommendation regarding the financing of residential university colleges. 
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A New Deal for Universities and University Residence:

An interim report of the Mills Committee was received in August 1950, with its short-term recommendation of the Commonwealth Government contributing one quarter of the recurrent costs of universities being implemented under the “States Grants (Universities) Act” of 1951. The universities continued, however, to have enormous difficulty in raising the remaining three quarters in order to qualify for the grant. There was a small allocation to colleges\(^{31}\), but it wasn’t until the Menzies Government set up a Committee on Australian Universities in 1957 that the particular matter of residential colleges was addressed. Menzies, who wrote in his autobiography that he “had a strong feeling that the Commonwealth must be the saviour of the universities”\(^{32}\), invited the Chairman of the British University Grants Committee, Sir Keith Murray, to chair the Australian Committee which was charged with the task of indicating ways of providing for the long-term needs and development of universities in Australia. Sir Keith Murray shared similar views to those of the Prime Minister, and the Murray Report, presented in September 1957, expressed in many ways the traditional British interpretation of the aims and functions of a university.\(^{33}\) Nevertheless, in terms of funding, the Report and its enthusiastic adoption by the Government brought about a vast increase in provision for the capital and recurrent costs of universities over the following decade. The task was given to the Australian

\(^{31}\) R.G.Menzies *op cit* p.83  
\(^{32}\) *Ibid*  
\(^{33}\) Bob Bessant *op cit* p.93
Universities Commission, established in 1959 on the recommendation of the Murray Report and under the chairmanship of Professor Sir Leslie Martin of the University of Melbourne, to review and recommend the levels of funding to the universities on a triennial basis, the first being for the period 1961 to 1963.

The Murray Report gave strong support to the university residential colleges, most of which were acknowledged as denominational foundations. “We would wish to pay tribute”, the Report said, “to the founders, and also to the universities which have provided sites for many of them, and which had the foresight to see the importance of residence if university life is to attain full richness. Practically all the colleges have abandoned any traces of sectarianism and students of all religions and even agnostics are welcomed in all the denominational colleges.”34 The college system was believed to be working well, and the granting of assistance was seen as an incentive or encouragement to founding new colleges and extending the existing ones.35 It was noted that religious bodies had a diminishing ability to find money for such colleges, which, the Report emphasised, had played a prominent part in the social, cultural, sporting, and academic life of the universities. The need of overseas students was particularly noted, and the Report also commented that “the College experiment in the universities has been an invaluable one and we wish that more students had the opportunities of receiving these benefits.”36 It concluded that the need was

35 Ibid p.56
36 Ibid p.55
urgent and that the Commonwealth Government should encourage without delay further developments by making a special offer of capital assistance “for the next three years.”

It recommended grants on a £ for every £ provided by State Governments and from other sources, “with the limitation that the total grants so given shall not exceed £200,000 in the first year, £400,000 in the first two years, or £600,000 in the whole three-year period.”

Not a great deal occurred in the 1961 to 1963 triennium, but, in a letter to Sir Leslie Martin in October 1963, Prime Minister Menzies noted the Cabinet decision to have affiliated colleges treated equally with the university halls of residence for Commonwealth assistance on a £ for £ basis within overall budgetary limits. He indicated that the decision was influenced by what he understood to be a lesser demand on the public purse for each student in residence, and “by the fact that affiliated colleges are traditionally a part of the Australian university system and that over the years they have made an outstanding contribution to values and leadership in this country.”

It was also a time, as evidenced in Archbishop Gough’s attack, of concern about communist activity and influence in the community, and in particular in universities. Early in 1961, Dr Frank Knopfelmacher of Melbourne University wrote an article in Observer under the heading ‘The New Scare Campaign’. In it he questioned the motives of those who were claiming that the Government was promoting right-
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wing conformism and attempting to stifle radical opinion in the universities, and that after the War and up until the middle fifties the Communist party had a grip "on staff and student affairs through the control of important student and staff organisations." The resignation in 1956 of Professor R. M. Hartwell as professor of Economic History and Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of New South Wales over the refusal of the University to proceed with the appointment of Dr Russell Ward, a former member of the Communist Party, as a lecturer in history was also mentioned. Hartwell had revived the case in 1960, raising again the question of political tests being applied for university appointments – a view rejected by Knopfelmacher. It might well have been that the Prime Minister saw support for denominational colleges and, in turn, their associated religious bodies, as a means of countering “soul-destroying philosophies” in the universities.

Although the decision to fund affiliated colleges equally with university halls was announced to Federal Parliament soon after Sir Robert’s letter to Sir Leslie Martin, it is clear from a submission to Cabinet in August 1964 by Senator John Gorton, appointed in that year to be Minister-in-Charge of Commonwealth Activities in Education and Research, that Sir Leslie was not keen for funds to be drawn away from the Universities Commission’s recommendations for halls of residence, but that additional funds should be found to provide for affiliated

41 Ibid
colleges.42 The submission suggested, however, that funds could be found for example by postponing the construction of a Hall of Residence at the Newcastle University College, and by reducing the amount of assistance for a Hall of Residence at the University of New England. It was recommended that “Cabinet inform the Commission clearly, firmly and unequivocally that during the next triennium (1967-1969) Cabinet requires affiliated Colleges in State Universities, should there be a real demand for them, to be given equal access to Commonwealth Funds with Halls of Residence.”43 While not included in the final submission, Senator Gorton had noted in a draft submission that “there ought to be advantages for the universities in the community links which affiliated colleges provide and in the relief they would receive in the burden of managing large residential facilities.”44

Senator John Gorton:

Senator John Grey Gorton was different in many ways from his mentor, the Prime Minister, but he was strongly supportive in carrying out the policy towards affiliated colleges. He was the product of very conventional schools (‘Shore’ and ‘Geelong Grammar’) and, with the encouragement of Geelong’s Headmaster, Dr John Darling, of Oxford University where, in 1932, he joined Brasenose
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At Geelong he was noted as a good all-rounder, participating in debating, rowing and rugby, and was a prefect and House Captain. At Oxford he pursued his interest in the study of history and also read politics and economics. He became Captain of the College’s rowing club, and he appeared in all ways to enjoy the camaraderie and challenges of college life. His history tutor, Stanley Cohn influenced Gorton considerably in developing Gorton’s interest in politics. Though he opposed developing national socialism and the Tory policy of ‘appeasement’, he “was always strongly anti-Communist”, detesting what he saw as the loss of individual freedom in totalitarian Russia. College life had a strong influence on Gorton’s life; his “style became established at Brasenose.” While there is no particular evidence that Gorton favoured the denominational or religious character of college life, he nevertheless expressed a view of education that gave, as he noted in an address in 1948, pre-eminence to the appreciation of “goodness, beauty and reason” as the things which, more than anything else, “raises man above the savage”. The sources for these qualities, he noted, were “religion, literature and history.” These qualities were perhaps another expression of what Sir Robert Menzies referred to as the “ancient virtues”. Like Menzies, Gorton saw the wider view of religion, rather than any narrow sectarianism, as part and parcel of the civilising nature of education, and the provision of support for both denominational schools and colleges, as well as for
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State and non-denominational ones, as breaking down rather than creating barriers to opportunity for all.

**Something So Wonderful and Stimulating:**

In September 1964, Senator Gorton wrote to the States, to the universities, and to bodies responsible for or interested in establishing affiliated colleges, apologising for the delay in dealing with the matter of assistance, and indicating that final allocation of funds for the 1964-66 triennium would be made promptly and that proposals for the 1967-69 triennium would be both encouraged and treated on an equal basis with halls of residence. There would be no “arbitrary upper limit” on the assistance given £ for £, but the Commonwealth would need to be satisfied that the “standard of accommodation is sufficiently high to warrant Commonwealth support and yet not so high as to be extravagant.”50 While, in 1965, Professor Madgwick wrote to Senator Gorton on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor’s Committee expressing concern about the implementation of the Cabinet policy, particularly as it seemed to effect the ability of universities such as New England and ANU to proceed with the construction of halls of residence, not all Vice-Chancellors seemed as concerned as the Vice-Chancellor of New England. Though representative of older universities, in letters to Senator Gorton, Professor Sir George Paton noted that Melbourne University had eight affiliated colleges as opposed to two halls of residence, and that therefore the development of affiliated colleges had been encouraged; and Professor Sir Fred Schonell
indicated that, while Queensland University planned to open a further hall of residence in Townsville (now James Cook University) but had no plans to establish halls at its St. Lucia (Brisbane) campus, he hoped for the 1967-69 triennium that “collegiate institutions will take advantage of your Government’s generous subsidy policy and commence a building programme at the Ross River area ... and also provide for the further extension of residential accommodation at St. Lucia.”  

In responding to the policy on behalf of the University of NSW, Philip Baxter wrote: “We look forward to a balanced development of colleges in this University including those operated by outside organisations, presumably in the main religious organisations, and those operated by the University itself. We welcome the Government’s decision to give equivalent support to both kinds of college developments.”

Needless to say, the response from interested religious bodies was appreciative and warm. The Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Hugh Gough, wrote to Senator Gorton that there were plans for church colleges and that the Government’s policy was very encouraging. The Warden of St. George’s College, the Anglican College within the University of Western Australia, was much more effusive: “The aid given to the Colleges by the Federal Government after their 100 years’ fight for the residential principle has been something so wonderful and stimulating that we will always be most deeply grateful for it … we feel that
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the present Government has aided something of, if we may be permitted to say so, great potential value.”

Following the announcement of grants for the 1967-69 triennium, the Council of St. Paul’s College at Sydney University thanked Senator Gorton for his sympathetic consideration and understanding of the needs of the College and the ideals of collegiate life; and the Anglican Archbishop of Melbourne, Sir Frank Woods, who chaired a committee for a proposed ecumenical village at Monash University, encouraged the Senator: “Next time you have a few minutes to spare in Melbourne, do ring up and come and see me.”

In response to Ian Sinclair’s letter on behalf of the University of New England, Senator Gorton, in February 1965, noted that for the 1964-66 triennium, the Government had decided not to accept the Universities Commission’s proposal that more should be provided for halls of residence than for affiliated colleges. While new student numbers at New England might not be as large as the University hoped for a couple of years, the Government believed favour should be given to the building of affiliated colleges elsewhere. Later, in reply to Professor Madgwick, he offered the reason of financial savings to governments, in that affiliated colleges in state universities contribute to cost per place in a way that “represents a considerable saving to State Government funds as compared with a Hall of Residence”, and that “in the case of the Australian National
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University an affiliated college provides a given number of places for approximately three-quarters of the cost to Commonwealth funds which would be required by a Hall of Residence.” 58 He believed this allowed for the maximum number of places to be provided for a given amount of money available. He did not include in his letter words suggested by the Prime Minister’s Department, that the Government “without neglecting the part that can be played by halls of residence … has the right to encourage the provision of places by affiliated colleges which have made such a valuable contribution in the provision of student places in the past.” 59 That, no doubt in the circumstances, would have been too inflammatory!

The Australian Universities Commission:

The reports of the Australian Universities Commission, from its establishment in 1959 to the mid 1970s, reflect in relation to university and college funding the early dominant influence of Menzies, and in the later 1960s the increasing role of Gorton as Minister responsible. Towards the end of the 1960s there was a push for greater accountability in the distribution of funds, with a clear shift in the 1970s from a focus on affiliated colleges and collegiate-style university halls towards ensuring that support was given for a greater diversity in style and cost of accommodation alternatives in the universities. The first report noted that colleges and halls of residence “play a vital role in the general education of a
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student and the development of his personality … residence in college or hall promotes the cross-fertilisation of ideas between students in different faculties and with different outlooks … The meeting between mature and immature minds, between those searching for standards of values and those who have found them, is encouraged by such contact … Like the Murray Committee before it, the Commission is convinced that, in the Australian scene, residential colleges and halls of residence are not only desirable but necessary, provided they can cater, with adequate facilities, for a reasonable number of students.”60

The second report, for the triennium 1964-1966, reflected a continuing desire for a greater proportion of full-time students to be resident at university, but at the same time, if this was to be achieved, a greater emphasis on economy of design in providing the essentials for residence. The third report commented that “student residences have become an accepted part of university planning”, and that “affiliated colleges and halls of residence offer students unique opportunities for study, discussion and thought not to be found in other lodgings or indeed in some homes.”61 It also noted the increasing proportion of residences providing for both men and women students. At the same time, perhaps reflecting the feelings of Sir Leslie Martin, it noted the importance of the development of the newer concept of halls of residence which, in a number of places such as the

Kensington Colleges at the University of New South Wales, meant more than one hall sharing common catering/dining room and other facilities.\footnote{Ibid p.170. It is interesting to note that the Commission was not willing to support a proposal for Macquarie University, whereby students in residence would dine in the University Union. The traditional collegiate concept of dining in hall was still regarded as too important.}

The fourth report, presented in 1969, acknowledged with reservations the desirability of supporting the construction of accommodation blocks of flats, especially in the cities where, it was believed, alternatives existed if students did not wish to live in affiliated colleges or halls of residence. However, in its fifth report, the Commission noted that there was widespread support for some experimentation with non-collegiate accommodation, and that, while student representatives indicated that many found the traditional accommodation “congenial and convenient”, many others because of the cost and institutional nature of collegiate accommodation “strongly preferred non-collegiate arrangements, that is, the grouping of students in flats or houses.”\footnote{Fifth Report of the Australian Universities Commission Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, May 1972, p.180} It is clear that by the mid 1970s, with nothing like the projected proportion of students in residence and with greater and more vocal student demand for alternative forms of housing, emphasis had begun to move to providing “a better balance between the several types of accommodation.”\footnote{Sixth Report of the Australian Universities Commission Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, May 1975, p.323} In May 1975, the Commission noted that “at most universities a view often expressed to the Commission by students was that all residential places built in future should be of non-collegiate character. This view is not, however, universal, and it is evident that some students prefer
the more ordered life-style of a traditional college or hall. The Commission wishes to provide a range of alternative types of accommodation."65 By that time the so-termed “golden age” for Australian universities was decidedly on the wane; it was certainly so for affiliated residential colleges.66

**Sir Lenox Hewitt:**

It was probably the person appointed by Gorton to succeed Sir Leslie Martin as Chairman of the Universities Commission in 1967 who most clearly signalled significant change in the approach to funding and support since the Commonwealth government’s enthusiastic acceptance of the Murray recommendations nearly a decade before. Sir Lenox (then Mr C. L.) Hewitt was one of two Deputy Secretaries in the Treasury, who, with responsibility for defence matters, came to John Gorton’s notice when Gorton was Minister for the Navy in the early 1960s. Hewitt was noted for “his gift for merciless destruction of an imperfectly prepared argument or submission”67 and for being “a third-degree exponent not noted for his observance of the niceties.”68 As Chairman of the Universities Commission for the short period of one year prior to his being asked to go with Gorton to the Prime Minister’s Department, Hewitt earned the
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ire of Vice-Chancellors for his concentrated and detailed, and some argued unnecessarily intrusive, questioning of university management and expenditure. Louis Matheson, first Vice-Chancellor of Monash University, recalled that “perhaps it was Gorton’s rather puckish sense of humour that led him eventually to appoint C. L. Hewitt, a senior public servant with a considerable reputation for probing extravagances … he was a past master at the art of delaying consent, by endless ‘please explain’ letters, until the last possible moment.”69

Sir Lenox recalled that Menzies had a high regard for the virtues and the quality of denominational education, and that there was no doubt that Menzies and Gorton would have wished anyone well if they could get into a church college.70 However, the matter of support for denominational colleges was largely, he felt, part of the “great question of the day”, that of State aid. Certainly electoral circumstances – particularly the electoral shock suffered by Menzies in 1961, together with the split in the Labor Party – coincided with the demand for colleges in the universities. In the latter 1960s, Hewitt’s concern was that the seemingly unbridled support that the universities were receiving as a result of the Murray Report, had got out of hand and “the community was increasingly disapproving of the amount of cream they were taking out of the ‘cow’s udder’ –

69 Louis Matheson Still Learning Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980, p.74. Sir Zelman Cowen’s appointment as Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England coincided with Hewitt’s appointment to the Universities Commission. He recalls: “I walked straight into Hewitt! … He was highly interventionist, and at one stage he asked some questions and … I, well I didn’t use the language of ‘bugger off’, but I said it in other words! But he came back slightly hurt. Well, I thought if he was hurt there was some vulnerability in the man!” (Interview with Sir Zelman Cowen, 16th March 2000)
70 Interview with Sir Lenox Hewitt, New College UNSW, 30th December 1999
the consolidated revenue fund.”71 His attempts to seek statistics from each university concerning face to face teaching hours for each member of staff caused, as he termed it and as reflected in Sir Zelman’s comments, “total outrage”.72 He clearly had Gorton’s confidence in seeking information, unlike Sir Leslie Martin who, it seemed, had not appreciated Gorton’s stepping between the relationship that Martin enjoyed with Menzies. “It was an interesting jungle in Canberra”, reflected Hewitt. “Martin hadn’t spoken with Gorton for at least twelve months prior to his retirement. They communicated via an official in the Department of Education and Science, so that didn’t make, I would believe, for the easiest of relationships.”73 Hewitt was clearly successful in conveying to Gorton his view that the era opened up by the Murray Report was being abused by the academics: “The academics … fought like Kilkenny cats … There was wild opposition, obstructionism, antagonism, unwillingness to contemplate change of any kind … There was always the great crap about research and corrections and preparation”!74

**Conclusion:**

The enormous growth in university education after the War and an increasing demand for student residences, together with the funds which became available as a result of the Murray Report, saw the establishment during the 1960s and
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1970s of halls of residence and university controlled colleges at universities founded after World War II, such as ANU, New England, Monash, La Trobe, and the University of NSW. Various church groups expressed interest in taking advantage of this ‘window of opportunity’ to establish affiliated colleges at that time, though a number were not able to gather the resources to match the government grants on offer. With those that did, the period was one that has not been repeated since in the development of this kind of religious presence on Australian university campuses.

As much as this is attributable to the funds provided at that time, to universities keen to meet demand, and to particular denominational groups ready to ‘seize the day’, the impetus rests in large measure with the influence and direction of Robert Gordon Menzies and his concern for the “ancient virtues”. Professor Allan Martin, Menzies’ biographer, notes: “The phrase (“I retain my belief in the ancient virtues”) fits well Menzies’ general stance on tradition, and particularly on British institutions as things which carried almost a kind of sacredness because they were not ‘contrived’, but had grown over a long period out of the very character and needs of the British people. Though never displaying religiosity (he was not a regular church-goer, for instance) Menzies valued, as both politician and traditionalist, ‘the services which the church schools and colleges render to them’. As usual with him (or at least as I think of him), politics and tradition were mixed. He did Australia a great service in the 1960s by
bringing the 100-year-old State aid controversy to a close.”75 Perhaps the mix of
tradition and politics is reflected in a comment made by Sir Zelman Cowen: “I
think that there is a distinction between what Menzies did and what Menzies
thought. I think he really had a fairly low opinion of university types … I’m sure
that he knew what he was doing was right. I think he got pleasure out of having
been the ‘saviour’ of the universities, but yet fundamentally he didn’t admire the
institutions or the people in the institutions which he was helping.”76 Perhaps the
“university types” were those whom Menzies saw as attacking the “virtues”
embedded in the British tradition and especially in the Newman ‘idea of the
university’, so marked in the more traditional residential colleges? Perhaps they
were those in the 1950s and 1960s who were regarded as spreading communist
philosophy in the universities? As Dame Leonie Kramer noted: “So far as
Menzies is concerned, education is the indispensable instrument in the protection
of democracy.”77 Professor Hugh Stretton, then Dean of Arts at Adelaide
University, saw the Menzies-Murray recommendations and reforms as a “noble
revolution”.78 Recently he noted that: “I do think Menzies served the universities

75 Allan Martin to Ian Walker, 26th December 1999. Allan Martin wrote: “I think I once saw that
he (Menzies) left money for one or two of them (colleges) in his modest Will, but don’t quote me
unless you find corroboration elsewhere.” The NUCC Minutes of 16th May 1979 record a gift of
$2,000 from the estate of Sir Robert Menzies to Robert Menzies College, Macquarie University.
76 Interview with Sir Zelman Cowen Sir Zelman recalls that when in 1951 Menzies tried to
outlaw by referendum the Communist Party, he and three other professors opposed him: “We
were right and he (Menzies) was wrong … He said some pretty nasty things about it; Menzies
could play dirty politics! And I doubt that he ever liked me again, although he was always
extremely civil. In many ways our politics were very different!”
77 Dame Leonie Kramer Education, Politics and Democracy 10th Sir Robert Menzies Lecture, Sir
Robert Menzies Lecture Trust, Monash University, 1987, p.6
78 Hugh Stretton to R.G.Menzies, 29th November 1957, in Allan Martin op.cit. p.389
very well … I knew numbers of people … who were rescued in valuable ways by college life from dismal family situations or from dreary boarding houses …” 79

Undoubtedly Sir Lenox Hewitt’s short term as head of the Australian Universities Commission signalled the beginning of the end for this “noble revolution”, with a much greater accountability in funding and a growing fear within the universities of a lack of autonomy in their development. Nevertheless, the period of the 1960s and early 1970s was one of significant Commonwealth largesse and of opportunity for the development of university student accommodation, and in particular the establishment of affiliated denominational residential colleges.

79 Hugh Stretton to Ian Walker, 25th July 2000. Professor Stretton received no answer from Menzies to his letter. “I did not take that hard: thousands of letters to such folk must go unanswered.”
CHAPTER EIGHT

A Unique Opportunity for an Evangelical Diocese:

The New University Colleges Council and the foundation of New College within the University of New South Wales, and Robert Menzies College at Macquarie University

“In the course of living in New College if men hear the good news about Jesus Christ and accept Him for themselves they will understand more fully the motivation of its founders.”


The massive increase in Commonwealth funding for universities following the Murray Report of 1957, including funds for residential halls and colleges, coincided with the coming together of a group of Anglican clergy and laity in Sydney who were concerned with the provision of accommodation and care for university students, based upon Christian faith and values. It was very much a ‘Sydney’ group – for the most part, over the period of the 1930s to the 1950s, educated at or associated with the University of Sydney and with the Evangelical Union, and espousing the conservative evangelical position of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney as it had become under Archbishop Howard Mowll, and had been expressed, for example, at the Consultation in Melbourne in 1961.

With various experiences of residential life in association with Sydney, London, Oxford and Cambridge universities, and with views reflecting much of the attitude of Archbishop Gough towards “soul-destroying philosophies” in the universities, the group sought to establish on secular campuses residential
colleges that would bring to bear a counter influence to the seemingly pervading forces of materialism and humanism. In contrast to what they regarded as the failure on the whole of the older church colleges to foster environments conducive to the promotion of Christian faith and values, they aimed to establish places that would give opportunity for the Christian message to be seen and heard in both word and example. Their concern was that “there are particular aspects of education which the universities have neglected and are still neglecting to their loss”, and that residential colleges helped to overcome that “neglect” by enabling students to mix together in a way that would “encourage discussion of matters of the spirit and of the intellect at the highest level.”¹

**Anglican Colleges:**

The group, which came together in a more formal way in 1957 and was incorporated in 1960 as the ‘New University Colleges Council’ (NUCC), was conscious of the traditional association of the “Church of England with tertiary education”.² By the 1930’s Anglican residential colleges had been established in each of the then six Australian universities, with the Anglican St. Paul’s at Sydney (1856), Trinity at Melbourne (1872), St. Mark’s at Adelaide (1925), Christ College at the University of Tasmania (1929 - though some would argue its existence in various forms well before the foundation of the University in 1890), St. John’s at Queensland (1912), and St. George’s College at the

¹ Dr John Hawke ‘Foundation of New College’, *New College Magazine*, Vol.1, 1969, p.4
² Ibid
University of Western Australia (1931). By the late 1950s there were no Anglican colleges, nor, for that matter, other denominational ones in the new post-War universities – the Australian National University, the University of New South Wales, the University of New England and Monash University – though some new denominational colleges had been opened in the older universities, such as Aquinas (1950) and Lincoln Colleges (1951) at Adelaide, Cromwell College (1954) at Queensland, and St. Thomas More College (1955) at the University of Western Australia. While Bishop Broughton would have nothing to do with the University of Sydney, Anglican bishops had been closely involved with the first universities in the other capital cities prior to World War II – Perry and Moorhouse in Melbourne, Short in Adelaide, Nixon and Montgomery in Hobart, Donaldson in Brisbane, and Riley in Perth.

The links that had been established between church, college and campus since the foundation of Sydney University in 1850 represented something of a compromise between the positions of faith and knowledge in the context of the secular university. Religion and even the Church *per se* were not opposed, so much as sectarianism and dogmatic religious teaching. Particularly at Sydney and Melbourne universities, the colleges, though ‘on the side’, had provided support for students who had come to exercise “a major influence on Australian academic, professional and public life.”

---

3 Ian Breward, in Mark Hutchinson ‘A Scottish Name and an Irish Master: College and Creed in a New Secular University’, *Lucas – An Evangelical History Review*, Nos 25 & 26, June & December 1999, p.79
lives of some “extraordinarily gifted leaders”. That potential remained, though after World War II, with the vastly increasing numbers entering the universities, the proportion of those in the existing denominational colleges significantly declined. The overall pattern continued, however, to be one in which the universities jealously guarded their freedom from religious involvement and influence. While college and campus had formed a bond of co-existence and corporate life, church and curriculum - the sacred and the secular - remained well apart. With an awareness of both the relationship and the potential that existed in the role of the denominational colleges, together with an appreciation of the new pressures and demands of expanding post-War tertiary education in Australia and in Sydney in particular, the members of the New University Colleges Council sought to find opportunity to express conservative Christian thinking in a more institutional way on the city’s secular campuses.

The New University Colleges Council (NUCC) – the Founders:

The founding members of NUCC were Ronald Richmond Winton, a medical graduate and Colonel in the Army Medical Corps, then Assistant Editor and later for twenty years Editor of the Medical Journal of Australia; Lawrence (Laurie)

---

4 Ibid p.80
5 For 20 years from 1952, he was also Honorary Warden of the ‘International Friendship Centre’, a hostel at Drummoyne for overseas students established in 1952 by Archbishop and Mrs Mowll. He notes that years later he has heard, often indirectly or by letter, of former residents who have come to Christian faith and have acknowledged that it began at ‘Wingham’: “When I get those, I want to weep.” (Interview with Dr Ron Winton, 14th August 1997) He was also Chairman of the International Congress of Christian Physicians, and Chairman of the Council of the World Medical Association.
Ernest Lyons, then a lecturer at Sydney University in physical chemistry and, from 1963 to 1987, Professor of Chemistry at the University of Queensland; Alison Charlotte Lyons, a secondary school teacher; John Hawke, then a tutor and lecturer in chemistry with Laurie Lyons at Sydney University, and later Associate Professor and Professor of Chemistry at Macquarie University; Edwin Arthur Judge, then a Reader in History at Sydney University, and from 1969 to 1994, Professor of History, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Macquarie University; David Broughton Knox, Vice-Principal from 1954 and Principal of Moore College from 1959 to 1985; and Ronald Clive Kerle, then Coadjutor Bishop in Sydney and later Bishop of Armidale, who was the founding Chairman. Archbishop Hugh Gough became President on NUCC’s incorporation in August 1960.

---

6 Laurie’s wife. In the 1960s, Alison was an often published correspondent opposed to State Aid to church schools.
7 From 1961 to 1964 Edwin Judge was Warden of University Hall that had been set up by the Anglican Church in the 1950s as a residence for male students of the University of Sydney. This will be referred to later in this chapter.
8 These people may well be called the founders, though others became members of NUCC during the 1960s, prior to the opening of New College in 1969 – Archdeacon Bert Arrowsmith, Bishop A.W. Goodwin-Hudson, Justice Norman Jenkyn, Dr A.L. Webb, Justice Athol Richardson, Bishop (later Archbishop Sir) Marcus Loane, Mr C.A. Williams, Mr P. McRae, Mr J.H. Elliott, Bishop Jack Dain, Mr (later Sir) Harold Knight, Professor Keith Watson and the Reverend Stanley Kurrle. Gough, Kerle and Knox, the three clergy members of the original Council, have died in recent years. Ron Winton is (2001) in a nursing home in Sydney; Laurie and Alison Lyons live in retirement in Brisbane; and John Hawke lives in retirement on a property at Byng, near Orange NSW. I wrote to Bishop Gough in April 1997. Bishop Jack Dain replied in a letter dated 25th April 1997: “I had written to tell Hugh about Clive Kerle’s death and Madeline (Mrs Gough) phoned and asked if we could visit them as they were anxious to see us again and Hugh would like some help with his papers. One of the matters Hugh raised was your letter of April 11th asking if you could have the opportunity of talking to him about the issues involved in your doctoral studies. I am afraid Ian this is just not possible. Hugh is 93 and had a stroke some time ago and another recently. He finds it very difficult to speak … I am quite confident Marcus Loane would know far more about this whole area of research than Hugh. Hugh asked me to write, to thank you for your letter but to explain that it was not possible.”
Ron Winton grew up in Campbelltown, attended St. Peter’s Church, was Dux of Parramatta High, and commenced Medicine at Sydney University in 1929, the same year as Marcus Loane began part-time studies. He recalls coming to a deeper faith and commitment as a result of a lunchtime meeting organised by the newly formed Evangelical Union at which the subject was ‘Hell’! He was greatly influenced by Howard Guinness and Baptist Theological Principal G. H. Morling, and also by Mervyn Archdall, then Editor of the Medical Journal of Australia, who taught his Assistant that “you don’t have to be a so-called ‘dyed-in-the-wool’ evangelical to have a personal faith”. Mervyn Archdall nevertheless approved of a small book that Ron Winton wrote to be distributed at the 1951 EU Sydney University Mission.

Ron Winton often used to go across to the University from his office in Arundel Street, Glebe, to have lunch and to talk with Laurie Lyons, whom he and others refer to as the chief “engine driver” in the formation of NUCC: the “ideas man”, the “prime-mover … (who) dominated NUCC and forced the pace on every issue unless Broughton (Knox) stopped him. He and Broughton were marvellous sparring partners, and loved and trusted each other.” Archbishop Loane recalls that it was Laurie Lyons more than anyone else who persisted with

---

9 Interview with Dr Ron Winton, Courtlands Retirement Village, North Parramatta, 14th August 1997. Only Methodists talked about hell and being “saved”, he thought, but he admired the way the speaker dealt with questions put by the ‘Free Thought’ people, and later responded to discussion with one of the EU leaders and especially to the words put to him of John 5:24: “He who hears my word and believes Him who sent me has everlasting life, and shall not come into judgement but has passed from death to life”.

10 Ibid.

11 Interview with Bishop Donald Robinson, Pymble, 21st April 1997

12 Interview with Emeritus Professor Edwin Judge at New College, UNSW, 29th April 1997
the aim of establishing colleges rather than just halls of residence, and who was reinforced by Broughton Knox: “they worked together very hard.”13 Laurie Lyons entered Sydney University from Sydney Boys’ High School in 1939, ten years after Ron Winton. He had been converted at school, and he recalls being shown around in Orientation Week at Sydney University by Dr Allan Lane, Broughton Knox’s brother-in-law and a member of the EU: “I can still remember him on the balcony outside the old Fisher Library looking over the University scene and saying ‘Wouldn’t it be fine if all these people were in the kingdom of the Lord!’ I think that thought stuck with me.”14 He became a lecturer at the University in 1945, and ran a Bible Study each week in his somewhat “medieval lab”.15 In 1950 he went on to University College, University of London, to do a Ph.D., and while there stayed at the ‘International Language Club’ in Croydon, a collection of old houses sharing a common dining room and housing some three hundred students. The communal life and sharing of ideas greatly impressed and influenced him, and on his return to Sydney at the end of 1953 he applied to be a tutor at St. Paul’s College, “but the Warden of the day didn’t see any place for me there”.16 He already had in mind, however, the idea of starting a college at Sydney University that would have a more evangelical emphasis and draw upon

13 Interview with Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane, Warrawee, 20th May 1997. John Hawke (op.cit. p.5) wrote: “Great credit for the initial impetus must be given to Dr Lyons, and the (New) College we see today is largely the result of his vision.”

14 Interview with Emeritus Professor Lawrence Lyons at Kenmore, Queensland, 28th May 1997

15 Ibid. The Reverend Bruce Smith attended as an undergraduate. As a member of staff he did not stand for the Presidency of EU, but became a member of the committee along with John Knox and Roslyn Ormiston; he found it easier to attract people to meetings of the EU than to meetings of the Science Association, of which he was Secretary.

16 Ibid.
his experiences overseas. He believed that Christian halls and colleges should provide opportunity but not compulsion for hearing the Christian message; the hope was that there would be a number of Christians among the students and that the “flavour of the salt” would spread.

Alison Lyons (née Hargreaves), who married Laurie Lyons in 1956, entered Sydney University in 1951, the year of the EU Mission. One of the leaders of the Mission was Dr Roslyn Ormiston who had encouraged Alison in her membership of Crusaders at school and in her involvement at St. Martin’s Anglican Church, Killara. She remembers with great warmth people associated with the Mission, such as Howard Guinness, Dudley Foord, Justin Rickard, and Bruce Smith, and others associated with Moore College, the EU Graduate Fellowship, and the Women’s College in the mid to later 1950s. She recalls that it was Marcus Loane who encouraged her involvement in the committee to oversee the setting-up of halls of residence for students at Sydney University in the 1950s, and that these were to be places that would provide proper accommodation, an academic environment, the opportunity for the exchange of ideas and for Christian influence. It was, however, the special intention and focus of her husband, she notes, to establish an evangelical college at the University of Sydney, and it was

---

17 Ibid. He recalls that at a conference in Emmanuel College at Cambridge University “you walked half a mile to find the ‘loo’ … I thought we could make a better college than that!”
18 Ibid. Laurie Lyons’ views were also influenced by one of his “heroes”, Robert Boyle, son of the 8th Earl of Corke and the ‘Father of Modern Chemistry’, whom he describes as “the perfect Anglican”. His was an “integrated life” that combined a biblical faith with scientific research and development for the benefit of mankind.
19 Mrs Alison Lyons: Interview at Kenmore, Queensland, 27th May 1997. Among them was Peggy Hardy, then the College’s Vice-Principal, a CSIRO scientist, and Secretary of the EU Graduate Fellowship.
particularly Laurie Lyons and Broughton Knox who were “the drive” behind things: “they had common ideas and the same sort of level of activity and sharpness of thinking … They understood one another and one another’s ways of operating.”

John Hawke studied science at the University of Adelaide during the years of the Second World War, and was President of the Evangelical Union. Because of restrictions on travel between states, he rode his bicycle from Adelaide to Sydney for Inter Varsity Fellowship meetings and conferences, thus allowing other members of his committee to travel by train. After graduation he spent two years at Moore College, but decided that he really wanted to work as a Christian layman before being ordained. He was, however, to be a professor not a priest. Following a junior appointment at the University of New England, where he completed a Master’s degree, he moved to Sydney, first working in the School of Chemistry at the developing University of NSW with the foundation professor, A. E. Alexander. In the later 1950s he moved to the University of Sydney where, as a junior to Laurie Lyons, he completed his PhD in Chemistry. Along with Laurie and Alison Lyons, Ron Winton, Edwin Judge and Broughton Knox, he became involved with the university halls and hostels established at that time, but he recalls: “essentially I saw them as boarding houses. I saw really to have an

---

20 Ibid. Alison Lyons also recalls how others, such as Bishop Clive Kerle and Justice Norman Jenkyn, were “taken aback” by the way in which they used to “argue like cat and dog …(but) they were scrapping … nothing like a good argument to turn Broughton on, as you know. He was mischievous, and he would deliberately say provocative things.”

21 Interview with Dr John Hawke at “Springfield”, Byng (near Orange) NSW, 23rd May 1997
effective ministry in the University, not just for undergraduates but at the intellectual level – engaging the university with evangelical theology – one needed a proper base and a proper standing or status … I saw (the setting-up of colleges) as a unique opportunity for an evangelical diocese to make its imprint on the University system. Therefore a full college backed by the University, fully affiliated with it, financed partly by the government, with proper academic staff, could be a base for that in the long term. That was the motivation.” 22 When Laurie Lyons moved to Brisbane in 1963, John Hawke became Secretary of NUCC for the next fifteen years and bore in large measure the detailed work and negotiation in the setting-up of New and Robert Menzies Colleges.

Edwin Judge grew up in Christchurch, New Zealand, and as a teenager was greatly influenced by the Anglican Bible teacher, the Reverend William Orange; he was an “Orange Pip”! 23 He became a lecturer in classics, especially ancient history, at the Victoria University of Wellington and then, in 1953, went to Kings College, Cambridge, for further study in ancient history. Following a research fellowship at Kings College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he came to Sydney University in September 1956 and took up residence at St. Andrew’s College. In 1957, as a result of an invitation – though he cannot remember why – he lived in

22 Ibid.
23 Interview with Edwin Judge op.cit. Many “Orange Pips” formed the nucleus of the Evangelical Union in New Zealand and became involved in the work of full-time ministry, such as the late Basil Williams who was first Travelling Secretary for IVF in New Zealand and later a member of the staff of Moore College, Travelling Secretary for IVF in Australia, and for 16 years Rector of St. Michael’s Wollongong.
Moore College, but in 1958 he moved back to St. Andrew’s College as a tutor. In many ways he “loved” St. Andrews, with the camaraderie of the staff and the Senior Common Room. At the same time, however, he was shocked by what the College “did systematically every year to the new students who came in … a heavy indoctrination into deliberate debasement, deliberate physical debasement and moral intimidation of the grossest kind. I had come from Cambridge where, of course, there was elegant drinking all the time, and I had seen a totally different kind of College life – also quite alcoholic in content and with a good deal of serious alcoholism – but nothing remotely like the brutality of the Australian system.” Though not a teetotaller, he was nevertheless determined, despite opposition on NUCC, to have a teetotal rule in the new colleges: “I remember a very difficult vote at which it was decided by a narrow majority, but on my heavy arguments, I thought. But I had it on my conscience… that I had forced it through – my one contribution, I may say, to these colleges! It’s interesting that it has lasted. I didn’t think it would.”

Edwin Judge particularly wanted to create an alternative college system in ethos to the one he had both loved and abhorred at St. Andrew’s, and by implication at

---

24 His time in Moore College had brought him into close contact with people associated with the EU, but as a classicist he no doubt felt a certain comfort in the Moore milieu which was imbued with a significant focus on Greek: “There is a long succession of teachers at Moore College, including Broughton (Knox) particularly, and advanced students who took advanced studies in Greek at Sydney, and there is an unstated symbiosis between the Department of Greek and Moore College which is of great importance.”

25 He married while there, and his son “was the first person legitimately born in St. Andrew’s College .. apart from ones born in the Principal’s House!”

26 Ibid

27 Ibid
the other Sydney colleges. He longed to see new colleges which would be more liberal at the human level, opening up the world of learning and rising above the “bastardry tradition”; colleges which would also have low fees: “we actively wanted to cater for any student who had to live (at the University).”28 While Warden of the University Hall in the early to mid 1960s, he required students to listen at dinner each night of the working week to a brief exposition of a Bible passage, partly because he had heard that Broughton Knox thought he wouldn’t do it! It was his view, nevertheless, to see how the polarity between the classical and biblical traditions worked-out “in a lived community in a way that did not merge them but gave due weight to the significance of academic work, but also … to the significance of the Bible in our culture.”29

Edwin Judge came to know Broughton Knox well, and describes him as having been a “key figure” in the coming together of NUCC: “Broughton’s role in all this, I think, was as a standard setter; I don’t think he was the main driving force …He had a compelling grip on principle and clarity in argument that we all loved. People loved it, you know.” 30 David Broughton Knox was a somewhat enigmatic figure, more in sympathy with the nature of Puritan non-conformity than with Anglican traditions and ethos. He was a person whose focus in all that he did, whether in theological teaching, involvement in the Council of Churches

28 Ibid.
29 Ibid. Edwin Judge has no idea how productive this was, nor if it was the right thing to do, but he feels that such a didactic approach in a close community “would simply be unthinkable to-day … I just don’t think it would be the way students would want to live, and I don’t think that I would like to have it like that now.”
and in Synod and its committees, writing for the *Australian Church Record*, or in the setting-up of university hostels and colleges, was a greater knowledge of God as revealed in the Bible. His father, Canon D. J. Knox, came to Australia as a boy and, like H. S. Begbie and G. A. Chambers (founder of Trinity Grammar School, Summer Hill, and later Bishop of Central Tanganyika) was greatly influenced at Moore College by Nathaniel Jones, Principal from 1897 to 1911. “(Jones’s) oratory was born of evangelical zeal, his wisdom was circumscribed by the Scriptures”, writes Dr Bill Lawton, “but his doctrine of the Church, formed by Brethrenism, has continued to disturb Sydney Anglicanism.” None the least through the influence of Broughton Knox, who became Moore College’s longest serving Principal from 1959 to 1985. Educated at Knox Grammar School, he enrolled in Arts at Sydney University in 1935, studying Greek for a time under the professorship of Enoch Powell and alongside Gough Whitlam. He didn’t join the young Evangelical Union at Sydney University, but formed his own apologetics group. Following a year as catechist under his father at Christ Church, Gladesville, he entered St. John’s College Highbury (the London College of Divinity) in October 1939, graduating two years later. He was ordained by the Bishop of Ely and served in the parish of St. Andrew-the-less in

---

30 *Ibid* Archbishop Loane has noted that “there were few who could say ‘No’ so persistently and so effectively”; what the General Secretary of the IVF in England in 1941, Dr Douglas Johnson, described as Broughton’s “sevenfold ‘No’”!


32 William J. Lawton “Nathaniel Jones: Preacher of Righteousness” in Peter T. O’Brien & David G. Peterson *op cit* p.364

33 See also Stephen Judd & Kenneth Cable *op.cit.* pp.286-291

34 D.W.B.Robinson *op cit* p.xiii
Cambridge, also becoming a member of Fitzwilliam College. It was in England that he became involved with the Inter Varsity Fellowship, and, while in Cambridge, with the ‘Biblical Research Committee’ whose honorary secretary at the time was Stuart Barton Babbage. It was the aim of this group to counter the accusation of anti-intellectualism levelled against English evangelicals, and out of it was formed the Tyndale Fellowship and Tyndale House, Cambridge, a residential research library.\textsuperscript{35} After service during the war as a Naval chaplain, Broughton Knox returned to Sydney in 1947 and became a tutor and lecturer at Moore College. He undertook further study for his DPhil degree at St. Catherine’s College Oxford from 1951 to 1953, lecturing at Wycliffe Hall, and then returning to Moore College as Vice-Principal to Marcus Loane in 1954. His was a background and experience of home Bible reading and prayer; of academic pursuit in the study of theology; and of involvement in Christian student activity, both in the context of university churches in Cambridge and Oxford and in the communities of college and hall. Donald Robinson recalls that Broughton Knox certainly came back from England with ideas about university colleges: “he would have wanted to see a Christian presence of a very positive kind, a Broughton Knox kind … there’s no question about Broughton’s zeal for evangelism … and that’s got to be seen as a factor.”\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid p.xiv; also Marcus L.Loane op cit p.55  
\textsuperscript{36} Interview with Bishop Donald Robinson, who notes that in the latter 1960s/early 1970s Broughton Knox was keen for Moore College to become an affiliated college with the University of Sydney, as Ridley College in Melbourne had become in 1965. Donald Robinson was opposed to the idea, as he believed it would have resulted in a split between university and theological students – “oil and water … That dichotomy has never done any good for Ridley”. The move was also opposed as the University required the College land to be alienated from the control of the Church, a requirement that also blocked a move by NUCC to have a college built on land to be provided by Moore College in Carillon Avenue.
The University Halls:

In 1953 Ron Winton suggested to Laurie Lyons that he speak with Broughton Knox about his ideas of founding a college at Sydney University. Broughton Knox suggested that Laurie Lyons should see the Archbishop.\(^{37}\) There was no doubt that Archbishop Mowll was keenly interested in Christian work among university students, as evidenced by his appointment of Howard Guinness to St. Barnabas’ Broadway, and in the setting-up of the ‘International Friendship Centre’ at Drummoyne\(^{38}\). With a significant increase after the war in Australian students seeking university admission, and with the number of Asian students coming to Australia under the Colombo Plan, the pressure for accommodation was being felt keenly. Apart from the Friendship Centre, limited accommodation could be provided at the Girls’ Friendly Society (GFS) Hostel in Arundel Street, Glebe, established in 1920, and by the Church of England National Emergency Fund (CENEF) which had originally provided hostel accommodation in the city for servicemen and women during the 1940s. The ninety-nine year leases of

\(^{37}\) Interview with Laurie Lyons *op. cit.*

\(^{38}\) Shortly before his death, Archbishop Mowll wrote to diocesan clergy (15th August 1958) commending a ‘Survey of Church of England Opinion on Secondary and Higher Education’. The survey was being co-ordinated by Dr Harold Falding of Sydney University. Included in the survey questions were: (20) Do you think the existing church colleges adequately fulfil their function of providing religious training for university students?; (21) In view of the fact that the existing residential colleges only provide for a very small proportion of present-day students, do you think that new church colleges should be established within the University?; (23) At the Universities of New England and New South Wales new residential colleges have been established by the university independently of the churches. Is this a better solution than churches providing new colleges?; (28) Do you think that ‘academic freedom’ includes the right for a university teacher to teach or practice a way of life which is considered immoral by prevailing opinion, provided he is sincere in his own belief? There appears to be no record of the results of the survey, apart from some rough tabulations held in the New College Archives. Nevertheless, the questions reflect areas of concern at the time.
two hotels on the Church of England Glebe Estate, the University Hotel on the
corner of Glebe Point and Parramatta Roads and the nearby smaller Kentish
Hotel on Parramatta Road, were about to come to an end. They were prime sites
for university accommodation, as well as for other purposes that the expanding
University of Sydney might have in mind.

As soon as the hotels became vacant it was decided to occupy them, and Laurie
Lyons and Dr Harold Fallding, then a research sociologist at Sydney University
and later Professor of Sociology at Waterloo University in Canada, took sleeping
bags and camped in the University Hotel. Laurie Lyons was to be woken by a rat
crawling across his face!\(^39\) At the start of the Moore College term in 1954,
Marcus Loane, newly appointed Principal, organised most of the students and a
number of others, including his wife and her brother, Broughton Knox, to go to
the University Hotel to clean it up: “the stink from beer was dreadful … the dirt
almost an inch thick”.\(^40\) The hotel, re-named ‘University Hall’, accommodated
men, and the Kentish accommodated women. The residents of University Hall,
recalls Edwin Judge, “were to be attracted to this rat-infested derelict building for
one shilling a night.”\(^41\) Attracted they were; especially overseas students,
including Lawrence Chia, who became a professor at the National University of
Singapore and a marvellous host to people whom he knew during his time in

\(^{39}\) Interview with Laurie Lyons. To eliminate the rats, Broughton Knox in clerical collar was sent
to the chemist to buy ‘thallium chloride’ which was then put on bread, wrapped in newspaper, and
spread about the building which, as a result, stank of dead rats for two weeks!
\(^{40}\) Interview with Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane \textit{op.cit.}
\(^{41}\) Interview with Edwin Judge \textit{op.cit.}
Sydney, including Edwin Judge and Donald Robinson.\textsuperscript{42} The Standing Committee of the Diocese set up a Halls and Colleges Committee to oversee the management of these student residences that also included after 1960, and under the control of NUCC, ‘Latimer House’, formerly known as ‘Arleston’ and previously run by the Home Mission Society, in The Boulevarde at Petersham.\textsuperscript{43} The name ‘Latimer House’, commented Laurie Lyons, “suited our evangelical view of the world. Latimer is a great hero.”\textsuperscript{44}

**NUCC - the Desire for a College:**

The concern and desire remained, however, for the establishment of colleges that would have a more official link with and position in relation to the Universities. The particular desire in the mid-to-late 1950s was for a Church of England women’s college at Sydney University. To some degree, the management of the halls of residence and hostels seemed diverting to those who were particularly concerned for the establishment of colleges, especially as “the hostels were never...

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid; and interview with Bishop Donald Robinson. Looking back at his time as Warden of University Hall from 1961 to 1964, Edwin Judge notes the profound bonds which developed in the Hall, especially with and among students from Asia, and that this was also true of other halls and hostels throughout the country: “I think people … ought to know that this close bond with Asian students was alive and well on a big scale…” (Interview with Edwin Judge op.cit.)

\textsuperscript{43} NUCC Minutes 13\textsuperscript{th} September 1960; the Home Mission Society intended to use ‘Arleston’ as a home for unmarried mothers (it had accommodated some 39 men students of the University of Sydney), but was persuaded by NUCC to use the proceeds of the sale to commence work with unmarried mothers elsewhere. Latimer House mainly accommodated part-time students and was never very successful. There were concerns at times about the appropriate management of students and difficulties in financing the upkeep of the property. It was eventually sold in the 1970s. Ref. Also Minutes of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Sydney, 26\textsuperscript{th} September 1960, Minute Book 15, Sydney Diocesan Archives, St.James Building, Phillip Street, Sydney.

\textsuperscript{44} Interview with Laurie Lyons op.cit.
a planned thing, they just happened.”45 In 1957 the New University Colleges Council was formed from the Halls and Colleges Committee, and enquiries began about possible sites for a College at Sydney University, a process that continued into the 1970s. A Presbyterian committee convened by Miss Dorothy Knox, then Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies College, Pymble, sought to do the same thing, particularly as there was concern that the Women’s College at Sydney University was too focussed on academic achievement and that country girls were disadvantaged in seeking admission.46 Both committees experienced similar difficulties in finding a suitable site and, to some degree, in gaining sufficient funds.47 The most likely site was a section of (Church of England) Glebe land, originally an area of some 10 acres going back from Arundel Street to the west of St. Barnabas’ Rectory, to be divided among the Anglicans, Presbyterians and the University itself.48 The area was later reduced by the Glebe Board, which suggested a “high rise” development that would allow other land to be used for commercial purposes that would bring a more profitable return.49 There was even a joint proposal for a college for 100 men and 100 women in 1970 between the Residential Halls Committee and NUCC, when the cost of purchase of a much smaller area of land was around $300,000.50 Both the joint

45 Ibid.
47 The Presbyterian Committee founded Dunmore Lang College at Macquarie University, which opened in 1972.
48 Minutes of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Sydney, 24th February 1964, Minute Book 19, op.cit.
49 NUCC’s frustration with the Glebe Board was expressed at the end of 1968: “it was a clear case of priorities between the Glebe Board’s proposal for large commercial development in the Arundel Street site, or the planning of good low rise student accommodation to provide a setting for evangelistic work among university students.” (NUCC Minutes, 16th December 1968)
50 Ibid., 4th December 1970.
proposal and the acquisition of the land eventually were abandoned in the 1970s, with the focus shifting to Macquarie University where land had been set aside for student residences at no cost.

Other sites had been proposed at Sydney University, including a section of St. Paul’s College land, the site of the present ‘Merewether Building’ on City Road, the ‘IXL’ factory on City Road opposite Moore College, and land in Carillon Avenue owned by Moore College, opposite the Women’s College. The Moore College site, which was proposed for the first stage of a College for 100 students, was considered seriously enough as to gain a $250,000 grant from the Australian Universities Commission for the cost of the building. The State Government was willing to donate a block of Education Department land adjacent to it. 51 The stumbling block, however, was the requirement for the Moore College Council to alienate its land to the University – the threat of the secular encroaching on the sacred, the possible compromise of the college by the campus. 52 For the most part, the University authorities were co-operative with the representations made by NUCC in seeking to find a suitable site, and indeed the Senate of the University in 1966 approved the application by NUCC for the affiliation and development of the proposed Carillon Avenue college. 53 While the University indicated it had considerable commitments that prevented the allocation of funds for the purchase of land for colleges, and that if it helped one denominational

52 Interview with John Hawke op.cit.
group there would be demand from others, it was happy to support the founding of colleges similar to those already existing in preference to residential halls.54

**Funding and Incorporation:**

It became clear to the members of NUCC that in order to negotiate and to enter into arrangements with the universities and to make submissions for funding from the Universities Commission the Council must be incorporated as an ‘Association Not for Gain Limited by Guarantee’. This occurred in August 1960, the signatories of the application being Archbishop Gough, Bishop Kerle, Broughton Knox, Edwin Judge, Ronald Winton, Lawrence Lyons and Alison Lyons. John Hawke was at that time on leave at the University of Chicago. The objects of the Council indicated a broad and confident vision to found and establish “anywhere within the Commonwealth of Australia” men’s and women’s tertiary residential colleges in connection with the Church of England, especially noting the University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales.55 They were to provide religious services, tutorial assistance, medical

---

54 Report of a Conference concerning proposed developments on the Bishopthorpe Estate with particular reference to University Colleges, Minutes of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Sydney, Minute Book 15, October 1960. Laurie and Alison Lyons, and in a more guarded way, Edwin Judge, refer to what they saw as the antagonism of the Sydney University Vice-Chancellor, Sir Stephen Roberts, in the early years of negotiation towards the proposal for another denominational college. “He was the deadly enemy of them”, commented Laurie Lyons in his interview. Stephen Roberts publicly defended the rights of academics in the University following Archbishop Gough’s sermon in St.Andrew’s Cathedral on 6th July 1961. More favourable support seemed to be given by the then Deputy Vice-Chancellor, A.G. Mitchell, who then became the founding Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University. Laurie Lyons notes that at a meeting with the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor in 1959, the Chancellor, Sir Charles Bickerton-Blackburn, commented: “I don’t see why they shouldn’t have their own college if they want it.”

55 *Memorandum and Articles of Association of the New University Colleges Council*, 9th August 1960, pp.1-2, New College Archives, Kensington NSW.
support, transport and “conveyance anywhere”, recreational and sporting facilities “of all and every kind of description”, training and instructions “both theological and secular to students for the sacred ministry”, and full board and lodging “under academic supervision and control for students of any race nationality and colour and irrespective of the religious creed of such students.”

With the evangelistic zeal of the immediate post-Billy Graham Crusade year and with the encouragement of the post-Murray Report promise of funding, hopes and expectations were high! New colleges, doing new things, in a new decade, for a new era in tertiary education. Initially the Company was free of any official diocesan representation and control; deliberately so, as such connection was seen as a hindrance rather than a help to the process of negotiation with the universities and related bodies. While NUCC didn’t want to be under the control of the diocese, Edwin Judge notes that it was something of a paradox in that “every single person on NUCC was totally dedicated to the diocese … and totally … embraced the reigning ethos of the diocese which was emphatically evangelical.”

It was Broughton Knox who therefore proposed that a declaration of faith should be signed by members of the Company, tying them to “classical Anglicanism in the Protestant sense” by signed agreement with the 39 Articles.

The governance of Christian faith and values in these colleges was to guard

---

56 Ibid
57 Interview with Laurie Lyons op.cit. He viewed the Standing Committee as a “bureaucratic handicap ... centralised bureaucracy at its worst ... a great impassive jelly; doesn’t matter where you give the knock, it just wobbles around a bit and doesn’t move!”
58 Interview with Edwin Judge op.cit.
59 Ibid. In particular, Council members had to declare that they believed “(a) that the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the ultimate rule and standard of faith given by inspiration of God and containing all things necessary to salvation; and (b) that men are justified before God by faith only.” (Memorandum of Articles and Association)
against “the enemy within” as well as without, reflecting the character and aims of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship as opposed to those of the Student Christian Movement, and to the emerged and emerging excesses of modernism and ecumenism.

**The University of New South Wales:**

The NSW University of Technology which came into being on 1st July 1949 began its move from Ultimo to Kensington in 1953. In that year, timber and fibro huts on the Kensington site, once used for migrant accommodation, were used to house some eighty resident students, the majority of whom were students from Asian countries under the ‘Colombo Plan’.60 Hostel accommodation and facilities were increased during the 1950s, and in 1959 the University opened, under the Mastership of Dr Malcolm Mackay (later a Minister in the Gorton government) the first of three residential colleges, Basser College, which would come under the administration and control of ‘The Kensington Colleges Limited’, a University established non-profit-making company. Goldstein College opened in 1964 and Philip Baxter College in 1966. In its submission to the Australian Universities Commission in 1962 for the triennium 1964 to 1966, the University noted: “Were the University asked to underline one deficiency beyond all other deficiencies, it would probably select halls of residence … Even if the plans (to set up another two colleges plus an International House) come to fruit there will be, in residence at Kensington, only about the same number of
students as the University of Sydney had in 1960, and some hundred fewer than Queensland had in the same year.\textsuperscript{61} The young University needed all the help it could get in the provision of student residences; denominational colleges of similar kind to those at Sydney University would also help to overcome the view that “Kensington Tech” was not a real university – an attitude that no doubt influenced in some measure the introduction of the faculties of Arts and Medicine in 1960. Sir Rupert Myers (foundation Professor of Metallurgy, Pro-Vice-Chancellor 1961-1969 and Vice-Chancellor 1969-1981) noted that in the more traditional circles it was seen as an “affront to scholarship at that time in Australia to have two universities in the one city … and (for the second university) to be focussed principally on science and technology, then it wasn’t a real university.”\textsuperscript{62} Some in the University regarded the introduction of Arts and Medicine as a sell-out to the old regime of tradition\textsuperscript{63}, as inevitably others later on would regard the presence of denominational colleges as a sell-out to the forces opposed to academic freedom in the context of the secular university. In seeking to do a “new thing”, however, NUCC felt quite comfortable in relating to this less traditional, albeit secular, campus.

Philip Baxter, the first Vice-Chancellor and foundation Professor of Chemical Engineering, who had a background with ‘ICI’ in Britain and who had worked on

\textsuperscript{60} Patrick O’Farrell \textit{UNSW A Portrait} p.56.
\textsuperscript{62} Interview with Emeritus Professor Sir Rupert Myers at New College, 13th May 1997.
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Ibid} p.76
the Atomic Bomb project at the end of the War, was seen by critics as representing the pre-eminence of science and technology in the secular post-War world.\(^{64}\) So was the University. The Newman Society in 1956 held a seminar on ‘Technology and Theology’, and in 1957 on ‘Technology and Human Happiness’.\(^{65}\) Nevertheless, despite his apparent lack of adherence to any particular religious beliefs and the view that his attitude towards the churches tended to be governed by what investment they might be prepared to bring to the university in terms of residential colleges\(^ {66}\), Philip Baxter was certainly supportive of the role that chaplains could play in the University. His views on this, as expressed in his letter to the Reverend Dr John Neal in 1963,\(^ {67}\) perhaps reflect greater sympathy for the cause of denominational colleges than just the motive of allowing church bodies to help meet a pressing university problem. Nevertheless, Rupert Myers has noted that to meet the enormous demand, the University needed colleges that attracted “substantial government support” and that had the backing of an interest group – “traditionally a church group” – to oversee it and provide the necessary leadership.\(^ {68}\) Certainly Philip Baxter was regarded by members of NUCC to be much more in sympathy with the idea

\(^{64}\) Ibid p.77  
\(^{65}\) Ibid  
\(^{66}\) Ibid p.164  
\(^{67}\) Referred to in Chapter Six.  
\(^{68}\) Rupert Myers *Rupert Horace Myers*, An interview conducted by Sue Knights, University of NSW Archives, p.81.
of denominational colleges than Sir Stephen Roberts appeared to be; they felt welcomed by him and believed that for the most part he showed nothing but goodwill towards the college proposal.  

A College in Association with the Church of England:

On behalf of NUCC, Laurie Lyons wrote to Professor Baxter on 1st July 1959 requesting a meeting and seeking to determine the University’s attitude towards establishing a college in association with the Church of England. He indicated that approaches were also being made to Sydney University. Earlier in June, the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church had written to the Chancellor indicating that the Church had set up a committee to investigate the possibility of establishing a college within the University. He noted, however, that “we do not intend to act alone. I am informing Archbishop Gough, Cardinal Gilroy and the President of the Methodist Conference of the existence of our committee and of our hopes and inviting their co-operation.” A meeting of church

---

69 Interviews with Laurie Lyons and Edwin Judge op.cit. Professor Baxter had ideas to establish an ecumenical centre or chapel in the University in the early 1960s. Patrick O’Farrell refers in his history (p.164) to “Low Church intransigencies” that prevented any such ecumenical move and that also prevented the introduction of a proposed Bachelor of Divinity course. This proposal, notes Donald Robinson in my interview with him, was seriously considered as it involved a partnership between the University and a number of theological colleges, but the University would have had ultimate control of the curriculum. Professor O’Farrell also refers to “division among Anglicans” that “reached in the early 1980s a point at which Anglican New College and the Anglican chaplaincy had completely fallen out, to the extent that the college was unwilling to grant even the term ‘Anglican’ to a chaplaincy devoted to Bible fundamentalism so extreme and illiberal as to put the mission of the college under threat, and expose its own students to the pressures of militant evangelism.” (pp.164-165)

70 Lawrence Lyons to Professor J.P. Baxter, Affiliated Colleges file, UNSW Archives, FN. 63/U136/16727

71 Copy of extract from the letter dated 24th June 1959, New College Archives.
representatives, including Laurie Lyons, took place with the Vice-Chancellor on 28th September, after Professor Baxter had notified the then State Minister for Education, Mr R. J. Heffron, that a number of churches, including the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and Methodist churches, were interested in establishing affiliated colleges of the University. At a meeting with the Australian Universities Commission on 22nd October 1960, representatives of the church groups outlined their plans, but made no concrete proposals. Unlike what was to occur in Melbourne in relation to Monash University and in Canberra in relation to the ANU, there appears to have been no firm move in Sydney for an inter-denominational committee or for a proposal for a combined college. As with the appointment of an Anglican chaplain at Sydney University at a time when the Council of Churches was considering joint activity, the approaches by the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics would be decidedly denominational. Little progress was made by the Presbyterians and the Methodists, especially in securing any funds required in addition to those available through government grants. The Anglicans and the Roman Catholics pushed ahead with the chief tasks of finding suitable sites and sufficient funds.

Initially the University appeared concerned about losing any section of its Kensington site to the colleges, and proposals were considered in 1961 for the use of land bordering High Street on Randwick Racecourse, and at Little Bay adjacent to Prince Henry Hospital. The AJC was in no mood to lose any of its

---

72 Affiliated Colleges file *op.cit.*
73 NUCC Minutes, 6th March 1961.
land, and Little Bay was considered by NUCC to be far too removed from the University. “Why don’t you put your oval out at Little Bay”, commented Laurie Lyons to the Vice-Chancellor, “and put us where the oval is?”74 In 1962, State government land at Daceyville between the Bonnie Doon and The Lakes golf courses was mooted for the Anglican and Roman Catholic colleges, and one also proposed by the YMCA. The site was much closer than Little Bay and there was a great deal of space for accommodation and recreation, but the desire was to be on the University campus.75 NUCC expressed its concern to Professor Baxter that if a suitable site could not be found soon there would be little chance of going ahead with construction in the 1964-1966 triennium.76

On 8th June 1963 the University Council noted that its Building and Equipment Committee would be prepared to consider the construction of affiliated colleges on the Anzac Parade/Barker Street corner frontages of the campus.77 Following a meeting on the 17th June at which Professor Baxter indicated to Laurie Lyons that a site on Anzac Parade was likely to be available “very shortly”, Laurie Lyons wrote to the Vice-Chancellor on 28th June stating that NUCC was glad to accept such a proposed site, preferably the one immediately south of the main pedestrian entrance to the University.78 It was evidently felt that it was important

---

74 Interview with Laurie Lyons op.cit.
75 Interview with John Hawke op.cit. Also NUCC Minutes, 11th June 1962. At the same time, NUCC took the opportunity to borrow from the Church Property Trust and purchase No.1 Kennedy Street, at the top of the Barker Street hill, and some months later No.12 Norton Street. Both properties were fully let within a short time (NUCC Minutes, 11th March 1963). These properties provided something of a foothold on the University campus.
76 NUCC Minutes, 11th March 1963
77 Affiliated colleges file, UNSW Archives.
78 Ibid.: L.E.Lyons to Professor J.P.Baxter, 28th June 1963; and NUCC Minutes 27th June 1963.
to be close both to the main entrance on Anzac Parade and to the centre of student life on the campus, the Roundhouse. NUCC expressed its gratitude to Professor Baxter for his interest and activity in the matter and also noted that a letter had been sent to the Universities Commission indicating NUCC’s willingness to “go ahead on this site in the next triennium”. Professor Baxter indicated his delight with NUCC’s acceptance of the site, and the University Council’s willingness to proceed accordingly. It was decided that the temporary name of ‘The Anglican College’ would be used for the purpose of drawing up a lease, and, at Laurie Lyons’ suggestion, no permanent name would be given for the time-being in case a large donor was forthcoming.

**Raising the Funds:**

Large donors proved impossible to find. Early in 1961 plans were made for a Building Fund Appeal, with names suggested for an Appeal Committee. The plans, however, for a major fundraising campaign never really got off the ground. Various people were approached to be involved and to give support, and while

---

79 John Hawke *New College Magazine* 1969, p.6
80 L.E.Lyons to Professor J.P.Baxter 28th June 1963.
81 J.P.Baxter to Dr L.E.Lyons, 16th September 1963.
82 NUCC Minutes 16th December 1963. The Catholic authorities were advised in November of 1963 that the University was “favourably disposed” to a Catholic college being established on the site it now occupies. Warrane College, operated by *Opus Dei*, is referred to in a separate chapter.
84 *Ibid*. 12th December 1960. With favourable reports from Mr Norman Jenkyn and from Principal Allan Dougan of St. Andrew’s College, The ‘National Fund Raising Counsel’ (a financial ‘counselling’/fundraising service under the direction of Mr A.L.Knight) was engaged to advise on procedures and strategy.
85 Such as Mr David Lloyd Jones, Judge Lesley Herron, Mr C.H.Locke, Mr Mick Grace, Sir Kenneth Street, Sir Robert Webster, Sir Walter Scott, Mr (later Sir) Vincent Fairfax, and Sir
most had goodwill towards the College and were happy to give advice when
possible, none was able to give time to any on-going commitment. Funds for the
construction of the College, which would cost in the vicinity of $1m, were
chieflly obtained through Commonwealth and State grants totalling some
$750,000, and diocesan authorised Church Property Trust advances in 1960 of
$100,000 from funds held on behalf of the Church of England Television
Society, and in 1966 of $150,000, a loan from the MLC Insurance Company. 86

In 1962 NUCC was granted exemption from income tax. 87 Dr Keith Watson,
who was later the Chairman of the first Board of New College and a member of
NUCC, gives a deal of credit to Sir Harold Knight, then a member of NUCC and
later Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia (1975-1984), for his confident
encouragement that if three quarters of the funds required were to be given,  

---

Frank Packer, who in 1968 agreed to be listed as an advisor on an Appeals Brochure. Mr Fairfax
declined as he was too committed to Burgmann College in Canberra.

86 Minutes of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Sydney, 2nd May 1966, Minute Book 21;
25th March 1968, Minute Book 23. Canon J.R.L. Johnstone challenged the ability of the Standing
Committee to guarantee an application for a loan of $150,000 by NUCC. He was not opposed to
the foundation of a college, but as NUCC was “not a body appointed by or under the control of
the Diocese … its property is not held ‘for or for the use, benefit, or purposes of the Church of
England in any diocese’, it could not come within the scope of the Church Property Trust and that
therefore the Standing Committee “has no power to pass an ordinance giving such an authority as
has been proposed.” (Letter to Mr W. Hutchinson, Secretary of Standing Committee, 28th April
1966, Minute Book 21). The Standing Committee authorised the Church Property Trust to secure
the loan and then to advance the money to NUCC (“University of NSW College Financing
Ordinance No.11 1966”). This issue gave rise to further moves for Standing Committee to seek
representation on NUCC. In 1960 (7th July) Bishop Kerle wrote to Laurie Lyons, noting that the
Archbishop “and other bishops feel that the College at the University of NSW should be brought
under Synod and that the Constitution adopted by the NUCC should be submitted to Standing
Committee for adoption. I agree with this point of view as it will help our Appeal and I rather
think Sir Kenneth Street would imagine that such a College would be connected with the Diocese
officially.” (New College Archives) At a meeting on 10th June 1968, NUCC agreed that Standing
Committee should appoint two members of the Company; amendments to the Articles, providing
for this, were unanimously ratified by NUCC on 9th October 1968.

87 NUCC Minutes 13th April 1962.
NUCC could probably raise the remaining 25%. Sir Harold, who feels that most of his work with NUCC was done out of committee meetings, in turn gives great credit to John Hawke, “who really was at the heart of this … an academic with a very precise mind. He saw the logic of borrowing to found such a College, because if you borrowed about a quarter and raised about a quarter, you had your College. The College, if it was well run, would carry the one quarter debt.” As much as it was hoped the Universities Commission would provide the necessary funds for work to commence in the triennium 1964-1966, the Commonwealth money was not available until the period 1967-1969. Although a site had been decided, the Commonwealth needed firm plans for the building and also required that the proposed college be recognised by the University through the terms and conditions of affiliation. In response to a letter from Archbishop Gough, Senator Gorton wrote that preliminary plans for the proposed college at the University of NSW were not at a stage where funds could be allocated for the 1964-1966 triennium but that there was every reason why the College should qualify for assistance at the beginning of the next triennium, 1967-1969.

---

88 Interview with Dr Keith Watson, Beecroft, 24th June 1999. Keith Watson was on the staff of UNSW for some 37 years and was Associate Professor of Civil Engineering. He is a former Chairman of Scripture Union in Australia, and is a Life Fellow of New College.
89 Interview with Sir Harold Knight, Waverton, 22nd July 1999
90 This was clear from a letter written by Father James Albrecht of Opus Dei to the Vice-Chancellor, dated 10th March 1964, concerning the proposal for a Catholic college (Warrane College Enquiry file, UNSW Archives).
Plans and Designs – “It’s still got an unfinished look”:

Preliminary sketch plans for the Anglican College were presented by architect Robert Woodward of the firm ‘Woodward, Taranto & Wallace’ to a meeting of NUCC on 9th October 1964. He had previously come to Laurie Lyons’ attention as the designer of the El Alamein Fountain at Kings Cross, and Laurie Lyons liked one or two other “things he had done”.92 Laurie Lyons was determined to see an arrangement somewhat akin to the ‘staircase’ idea of Oxford and Cambridge where students were grouped together in small areas, sharing common access and some common space.93 Mr Woodward, following a trip overseas to inspect similar facilities, incorporated the small group idea into his plans.94 Delays were experienced at this time in the approval of plans by Randwick Council, especially over the lack of provision of parking, though an appeal on behalf of NUCC to the State Planning Authority was successful, with “extensive evidence” being given by John Hawke who had succeeded Laurie Lyons as Secretary of NUCC at the end of 1963.95 Early in 1967 Mainline Constructions, the company also building the Applied Science building on the

---

92 Interview with Laurie Lyons. He had first consulted Harry Seidler, but was not impressed with plans that Mr Seidler showed him that had long corridor arrangements.
93 Ibid.
94 Soon after detailed working drawings for the College building were completed, Mr Woodward left the architectural partnership to concentrate on the design of more fountains, and the architectural work came under the supervision of Phillip Taranto. The ‘staircase’ group arrangement remains one of the strong features of community life in the College.
95 Ibid., 27th October 1966. The SPA required that no vehicular access be made from Anzac Parade and that an internal road to the rear of the College be provided on the campus. It also referred to a prohibition on student parking on the site and to a NUCC proposal that students shall not park their vehicles within one mile of the college. (Minutes of the UNSW Council, 14th November 1966, New College Archives)
lower campus, was selected as the builder. However, further delays were experienced later in the year, when a dispute occurred with the off-form concrete sub-contractors, who subsequently walked off the site. NUCC was satisfied that a better standard of work was being performed at the end of the year by the builder, who had taken over the pouring of concrete, and it was noted early in 1968 that “no pressure should be put on the builders to speed up the rate of construction”. The aim, nevertheless, was to have the building completed and ready for occupation at the start of the 1969 academic year. In August 1968, Professor A. D. Trendall and Dr A. W. Knight, Commissioners of the Australian Universities Commission, inspected the College building. They apparently were not impressed by aspects of the “modern look” of the building, especially the exposed concrete and the dark bricks, as well as the ventilators in the courtyard and the water-spouts from the verandahs! The architect believed it was unfortunate that the visit had occurred before finishes were applied which would soften the starkness of the building. “Situated on the perimeter of the campus”, notes Dr Stuart Babbage, Master of the College 1973 to 1982, “its stance appears to be defensive, a bastion and a refuge against the forces of an aggressive humanism … There is no sense of the College reaching out towards the

---

96 Ibid 8th May 1967.
97 Ibid 31st October 1967.
98 Ibid 8th February 1968.
99 Ibid 14th August 1968.
100 Ibid. Tharunka interviewed a resident in August 1969: “When we first moved in there we found a lot of things unfinished … It’s still got an unfinished look … The plaster work on all floors has been a rush job … The courtyard on the ground floor, it’s just cement … nothing to look at, just cement …. The hard appearance of the brickwork in the whole set up …” (Tharunka 5th August 1969, New College Archives) John Hawke noted in the 1969 College Magazine that “although the College is simple in lines and a little austere, I have no doubt that in the years ahead, the addition of bright furnishings and pictures will achieve a pleasing and suitable environment.”
University; the architecture seems to exemplify and proclaim an uptight, introverted, defensive, nervous pietism.”  

**Affiliation and the Lease with the University:**

The matter of affiliation with the University, required by the College for Commonwealth funding, was also a significant issue for the University authorities. Despite the need for student accommodation and much apparent goodwill towards those who were prepared to undertake the task of providing it, the “new” universities were very conscious of and cautious about the sensitivities involved in giving recognition to religious organisations on secular campuses. Academic suspicion and opposition could easily be aroused, as evidenced by the public debate that followed Archbishop Gough’s sermon in St. Andrew’s Cathedral in July 1961.  

Mr (later Justice) Norman Jenkyn QC was asked to draw up proposed terms of affiliation with the University of NSW, with those of St. Paul’s College and Basser College in mind. The process of considering the terms of the lease continued for some time. In April 1964, the University Bursar, Mr J. O. A. Bourke, wrote to the State Crown Solicitor, Mr R. J. McKay, concerning the

---

101 Dr Stuart Barton Babbage, ‘Master of New College’, *op.cit.*
102 Staff and student opposition to the affiliation of denominational colleges would later be seen concerning the role of *Opus Dei* on the UNSW campus, and in relation to the Jeremy Fisher case at Robert Menzies College, Macquarie University, in 1973.
103 NUCC Minutes, 14th November 1960.
conditions under which affiliation would be granted to the proposed Anglican and Catholic colleges and to the nature of lease arrangements. He indicated that it had been generally agreed that the lease should be for a term of ninety-nine years at a nominal rental with an option for renewal for a similar period, and he also noted that “the conclusion is now reached that the University will not require to extend its authority into each College but will leave the responsibility for the control and discipline of students therein to the Rector of the College.” Provided there was no breach of specific conditions of the lease arrangement with the University, the matter of the management of the affairs of the students within the College was the responsibility of the College itself. Nevertheless, the Vice-Chancellor, was clearly concerned that the terms of the lease establish the right of the University to uphold the principle of open entry to the colleges, as to the University, free of any religious test or condition. In a handwritten note to the Bursar, Professor Baxter wrote: “the College is part of the University and must comply with the (‘Technical Education and New South Wales University of Technology’) Act (1949), and any resolutions of Council which are relevant. There should be arrangements for some annual report to Council. Should Council have representation somewhere in the College? The College must accept Section 44 of the Act.” On 15th December 1964, the Bursar informed the Deputy

---

104 Affiliated Colleges file, UNSW Archives op.cit. Negotiations for a Catholic college were taking place at much the same time as those for the Anglican college.

105 J.A.O.Burke to Mr R.J.McKay, 17th April 1964, Ibid. This is significant, both in relation to the later Committee of Inquiry into Warrane College and of the Committee established by Macquarie University to investigate the Jeremy Fisher case at Robert Menzies College.

106 J.P.Baxter to the Bursar, Ibid.; date not clear, though possibly 7th December 1964. Section 44, in like manner to the Sydney University Act nearly one hundred years before, provided that “no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a
Crown Solicitor, Mr Levy, that the Vice-Chancellor would not sign a lease that cut down or affected the principles of Section 44.107

Other post-War universities were also struggling with the nature of affiliation of denominational colleges. The Vice-Chancellor of Monash University, Professor J. A. L. Matheson, wrote to Professor Baxter on 2nd March 1964: “In view of my conversation with you in Canberra the other day it would be very helpful if I could have sight of the conditions which your University is writing into the affiliation agreement with church colleges established on or near your site.”108 Professor Baxter replied that he would do so when the conditions were in their final form.109 In response to a request for information in June 1965 from the Assistant Registrar of the Australian National University, the University of NSW Bursar noted that while the terms of the leases with the denominational colleges had not been finalised, it was the intention of the University to “recognise formally by way of resolution each college by name, the recognition (affiliation) to be operative when the authority concerned signs a lease approved by the Council of our University.”110 On 13th April 1965, the Vice-Chancellor had reported to the University Council that “in order that (Opus Dei and NUCC) may receive the Commonwealth grants, it is necessary for them to be accepted as ‘Affiliated Colleges’ of the University of New South Wales. It is not very clear

---

107 Affiliated Colleges file, UNSW Archives op.cit.
108 Ibid. J.A.L.Matheson to Professor J.P.Baxter, 2nd March 1964
109 Ibid. J.P.Baxter to Dr J.A.L.Matheson M.B.E., 5th March 1964
110 Ibid. J.O.A.Burke to Miss H.Cumpston, 1st July 1965
what this phrase means but it is the phrase used in the States Grants Act and in order that the grants may be paid, it is necessary for the Council to recognise them as being affiliated Colleges. It is felt that this can best be done by a simple resolution, so recognising them and subject to their having signed the appropriate lease.”111 Such a resolution was passed at the meeting of the Council on 10th May 1965.112 The Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England, Professor R. B. Madgwick, also wrote to Professor (then Sir Philip) Baxter asking if he could see what was proposed for the affiliation of the University of NSW denominational colleges.113 Sir Philip Baxter replied by sending a copy of the draft lease, noting that the lease must be signed in order for the college to be affiliated with the University.114 The lease with NUCC was eventually signed on 22nd December 1966.115

The First Master:

The first approach to head the College was made to the Reverend Canon Dr A. W. Morton, then Rector of St. John’s Darlinghurst (later Dean of Sydney) in August 1963 when NUCC resolved to invite him “to take an active interest in the

111 Ibid J.P. Baxter to members of the University of NSW Council, 13th April 1965. Opus Dei was a Catholic order responsible for establishing Warrane College.
112 Ibid Copy of Resolution 65/61
113 Ibid R.B.Madgwick to Sir Philip Baxter, 3rd November 1965
114 Ibid J.P.Baxter to Dr R.B.Madgwick, 22nd November 1965
115 Ibid 14th February 1967. In accord with Section 44 of the University Act, item 2(j) of the lease provided “that no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a student of the said college or to enjoy any benefit advantage or privilege thereof.” The lease was signed on behalf of the University by Professor Baxter and the University Registrar, Mr G.L.Macauley, and on behalf of NUCC by Archbishop Loane, Dr A.L.Webb and Dr John Hawke.
planning and development of NUCC’s proposed College at the University of NSW on the understanding that should the Board be in a position to develop the College he will be invited to become the first Warden.” 116 Canon Morton was willing to do this provided it was on a full-time basis from the outset. 117 It was not. Further names were not suggested until early in 1967 when those of the Reverend Dr Stuart Barton Babbage, a former Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, and Dean of Melbourne and Dean of Sydney, and the Reverend Noel Pollard, then Librarian and a lecturer at Moore College, were mentioned. 118 On 28th February 1967 it was decided unanimously to offer the position to Dr Babbage, who had moved to the United States in 1963 and was then Visiting Professor of Practical Apologetics and Church History at Columbia Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Georgia. While he expressed “considerable interest” in the invitation 120, he declined, partly on financial grounds. 121

Noel Pollard’s name was again suggested, along with the Reverend Dudley Foord, the Reverend Dr Alan Cole, Canon Donald Robinson, Canon Arrowsmith

116 NUCC Minutes 29th August 1963.
117 Ibid 22nd October 1963.
118 Ibid 14th February 1967.
119 Ibid 28th February 1967. A salary was set at the base rate of a Coadjutor Bishop ($5,500), the total figure to be about the equivalent to an Associate Professor or Reader, namely $8,600. The position was to be titled ‘Master of New University College’.
120 Ibid 2nd May 1967.
121 Ibid 31st May 1967. In my interview with Stuart Babbage at New College on 19th May 1997, he commented that enormous efforts had been made to secure the position for him in Atlanta, including the involvement of Dr Billy Graham. The fares for his whole family had been paid as well as other expenses. He felt it was too soon to leave the States. “So I declined it, which may have been a mistake.” Archbishop Loane suggested that the “high figure” offered to Dr Babbage as a man of “suitable standing” was no longer warranted, and that the salary should be more in line with other clergy. It was decided that the salary level should be that of an Archdeacon or the Principal of Moore College.
and the Reverend R. A. Hickin. All withdrew from consideration except Noel Pollard, who was unanimously offered the position of Foundation Master at a meeting at the home of Bishop Jack Dain on 7th July 1967. He was no doubt a suitable choice for the position, combining a background in university research and collegiate life with a clear evangelical faith and focus. He had pioneered the teaching of Australian church history at Moore College. His lectures, remarked Dr Peter Jensen, “were delivered with academic integrity, but also with a deep, clear, obvious sympathy for the Protestant and Evangelical movements.” Noel Pollard accepted the position following approval in principle by the Vice-Chancellor that a garden area at the northern end of the College building could be used by the Master, though such an area would not form part of the lease.

Noel Pollard was educated at Sydney Boys’ High School and Cranbrook School, where he was influenced by the Headmaster, Mr (later Sir) Brian Hone, and the Chaplain and former Headmaster, the Reverend F. T. Perkins. It was as a boarder at Cranbrook that he found that “living and working in a collegial community satisfied him, and it became the staple of his whole life.” He attended St.

---

123 The Reverend Dudley Foord, who had been part-time Chaplain at the University of NSW 1958-1965, gave it “serious consideration”.
124 Professor Ken Cable, Address at a Memorial Service for the late Noel Pollard, New College, 29th April 1999. Noel Pollard was a lifelong friend of Professor Cable’s since their days at Sydney Boys’ High.
125 The Reverend Dr Peter Jensen, then Principal of Moore College, Address at a Memorial Service for the late Noel Pollard, New College. Peter Jensen noted the valuable work Noel Pollard did in building-up the College Library and that, thanks to him “there is every incentive for the College to be the centre for the study of the English Reformation in this country.” Peter Jensen was elected Archbishop of Sydney in June 2001. Sir Harold Knight remembers Noel Pollard as an “austere” person, but “with a fun-loving personality behind the austerity.”
126 NUCC Minutes 26th July 1967.
127 Professor Ken Cable *op cit.*
Michael’s Vaucluse where his Christian life was further influenced by the Rector, Canon Powys, and by Allan and Frances Podger.\textsuperscript{128} He was a House Tutor at Cranbrook while he studied Arts at Sydney University, but in his fourth year he was awarded the ‘Parnell and Bundock Scholarship’ to attend St. Paul’s College. Though in his honours year, he was still given the full fresher initiation, an experience which taught him “how not to run a church college”.\textsuperscript{129} Nevertheless he continued at St. Paul’s while he undertook the further degree of Bachelor of Divinity, during which time he was Vice-President of the Evangelical Union with the President being Dudley Foord. He became associated with Howard Guinness at St. Barnabas’ Broadway and with Stuart Babbage, then Dean at St. Andrew’s Cathedral, where he became a Lay Clerk in the choir. Without attending Moore College he was ordained by Archbishop Mowll in 1953 and served as a curate at St. Michael’s Vaucluse and as an Assistant Minister at St. Andrew’s Cathedral. He conducted chapel services at St. Paul’s College, though, despite the “good influence” of the Warden, the Reverend Dr Felix Arnott, he found little fellowship there and “not much in the way of active Christian witness.”\textsuperscript{130} He was appointed Precentor of St. Andrew’s Cathedral in 1955, and in 1956 was awarded the ‘Lucas Tooth’ Scholarship to Christ Church, Oxford, and then to Cambridge where he did research at Trinity College and lived at the IVF Tyndale House. He returned to Sydney in 1961 to be Librarian and a lecturer at Moore College. He became a member of the Council of the

\textsuperscript{128} Interview with the Reverend Noel Pollard, New College, 11\textsuperscript{th} November 1997.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid
University Halls. After his appointment as Master of New College in 1967, Noel Pollard set about the arduous task of overseeing the building of the College and the recruitment of its first intake of students.131 When John Hawke undertook a period of leave for one year at Yale University commencing at the end of 1967, Noel Pollard was appointed Acting Secretary of NUCC.132 Dr Phillip Grouse, a lecturer in the Faculty of Commerce at the University, was appointed ‘Vice-Master’, the term later changed at his request to ‘Dean’.

‘New’ College:

In June 1968, NUCC approved Noel Pollard’s recommendation that the College be referred to as ‘The New College at the University of NSW’ as a temporary title which, he said “might in the end be a useful one if no other title can be arrived at.”134 The Master wrote to Sir Philip Baxter requesting his approval for the use of the name ‘New College within the University of New South Wales’, noting that “It is of course still possible that if at a future date we find a founder that we may wish to change this name, but if nothing happens along these lines then we will probably keep the name that I have suggested.”135 Professor Rupert

131 Bishop John Reid recalled that Noel Pollard “struggled with a building where the drains had been deliberately filled with concrete by spiteful labourers.” (Address at a Memorial Service for the late Noel Pollard, New College, 29th April 1999)
132 NUCC Minutes, 16th November 1967.
133 Ibid 11th December 1968.
134 Ibid 10th June 1968. No significant donor had come to light after whom the College might be named. The suggestion of ‘Broughton College’, in recognition of the first Bishop of the diocese, was seen as difficult as there was a Broughton Hall associated with the then Callan Park Psychiatric Hospital, and ‘Saint Somebody’s College’ would most likely have “turned students off”? New College, Oxford, was seen as a long-standing precedent in continuing to use the rather neutral title of ‘New’. (Interview with Noel Pollard op.cit.)
135 N.S.Pollard to Sir Philip Baxter, 20th September 1968, New College Archives.
Myers, then Acting Vice-Chancellor, replied on behalf of Sir Philip, suggesting that simply the title ‘New College’ would be appropriate, to which Noel Pollard replied that this was the title that he really had in mind, but that the longer title would be used on letterhead so as to locate the College.136

New College, the first denominational college on the campus, opened with a full intake of male students in February 1969, and was officially opened later that year by the Governor-General of Australia, Sir Paul Hasluck, on 12th October, in the presence of the Archbishop of Sydney, the Most Reverend Marcus Loane, and the new Vice-Chancellor of the University of NSW, Professor Rupert Myers. The occasion was widely reported in the press – not so much for the opening of the College, but, in the light of the mood of the times at the end of the 1960s, for Sir Paul Hasluck’s remarks. “Stop the bitching!” was the heading of the editorial in the Daily Mirror the next day: “Sir Paul Hasluck has learnt to have a go – quite rightly – at university students who bitch, grizzle and grumble about society, but who do nothing to try to change it.” The Australian reported Sir Paul’s plea that protest be intelligent, and the Sydney Morning Herald recorded his challenge that “students should be the custodians of clear, exact thinking.” He was speaking to the ‘converted’ in more ways than one. The residents of the College demonstrated their clear, exact thinking when, as reported in the 1969 College Magazine, a carefully planned raiding party diverted the attention of a tutor on guard over the plaque to be unveiled, with the result that when the

136 Ibid. N.S.Pollard to Professor Rupert Myers, 2nd October 1968.
Governor-General drew back the curtain over the plaque, a sign was revealed that announced “Brew College”! It was reported that “the Vice-Chancellor’s face lit up, but unfortunately the Master’s and the Dean’s showed signs of despair.”

Noel Pollard clearly had to tread a very difficult path as Foundation Master at a time when universities were facing not only the pressures and demands of growth in numbers and of the many requirements of more technical and specialised courses, but also a great deal of student unrest and protest. It was the period of Vietnam and conscription, of the triumph of technology in the landing on the moon, of women’s liberation, and the Beatles ‘Imagine’. The College’s facilities were somewhat basic, and there was none of the envisaged “transport and conveyance anywhere”. There were the buses along Anzac Parade, and “recreational and sporting facilities” were those of the University. Noel Pollard was determinedly in favour of an all male College at the beginning of its life, and he had to implement the no-alcohol rule. Both conditions met quite a deal of opposition from students. The first President of the New College Students’ Association, Steve Webb, reported at the end of the first year that “at a time when rules and regulations were being formulated, representations were made to NUCC regarding the no-alcohol rule. A postal vote by NUCC members firmly rejected any relaxation of the rule … Representations were also made to have women residents in College. This was firmly rejected by the Board, mainly on

137 New College Magazine op.cit. p.13
138 Articles and reports in the New College Magazines and in University papers expressed opposition to this rule.
financial grounds. More pressure in this direction next year could lead to the introduction of women to New College, a very desirable state of affairs that has the backing of almost every resident.”\(^\text{139}\) The Ball was held across the road in ‘Unisearch House’ and called the ‘Prohibition Ball’! In 1973, the Student President, Tony Lord, reported: “There will be an attempt at the last Board meeting of this year to obtain at least a partial relaxation of the alcohol rule.”\(^\text{140}\) This and later attempts failed, but also in 1973, under the new Master, the Reverend Dr Stuart Barton Babbage, the Board decided to admit women to the College.\(^\text{141}\) “We need and want women in New College” wrote Ian Brighthope, Student President in 1972.\(^\text{142}\) His hope was realised when the first women took up residence in the College in 1974 under the supervision of Sister (later Dr) Ruth White whom Stuart Babbage had appointed ‘Dean of Women’: “The New University Colleges’ Council were afraid lest co-residence become an excuse for co-habitation. I said it was not necessarily so and did my best to reassure them. Within a year of my arrival the College was co-residential.”\(^\text{143}\)

As Foundation Master, Noel Pollard trod carefully, concerned not to impose Christian beliefs but rather to welcome everyone and to encourage those of Christian conviction in their influence upon those with whom they lived and

\(^{139}\) New College Magazine op.cit. p.11  
\(^{140}\) New College Magazine 1973, p.6, New College Archives.  
\(^{141}\) NUCC Minutes, 12th September 1973, New College Archives. The position of Master had been offered to Professor Alan Friend, then working in the West Indies. He declined the offer (NUCC Minutes 14th February 1973), but was later appointed by Stuart Babbage as his deputy at New College.  
\(^{142}\) New College Magazine 1972, p.2  
\(^{143}\) Dr Stuart Babbage, unpublished autobiography.
studied. The most effective evangelism, he believed, was not organised from the top but was student run.\textsuperscript{144} There were inevitable criticisms of the College’s conservative evangelical character, and a cover page photo of the Master, the Dean and the Tutors in the 1971 College Magazine was titled ‘The Soul Patrol’ – a halo was superimposed above the head of the Dean, Phillip Grouse. There was also, however, consistently warm and supportive reflection on student Christian activity in the College, especially opportunities for fellowship, prayer and Bible study.\textsuperscript{145} The balance and the sensitivity that Noel Pollard had to exercise in promoting and managing this new and different College were perhaps indicated in a note he received from Phillip Grouse whom he had asked to look over an article he had prepared for the \textit{Diocesan Digest}. He had written at the bottom of the second page of his draft: “a student committee will organise the affairs in the day to day life of the College. These matters will no doubt include the organising of cultural, social and sporting activities, similar to those in most Colleges.”\textsuperscript{146} Phil Grouse had deleted the words “similar to those in most Colleges”, and wrote: “I’ve taken the liberty of deleting a clause at the bottom of page ‘2’ since it could be construed as a permissive note by permissively inclined students. If I were to add anything at all, it would be to state more specifically the Christian aims of the College, but I suspect that this is best not published so openly.”\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{144} Interview with Noel Pollard \textit{op.cit.}

\textsuperscript{145} New College Magazine 1973, p.17

\textsuperscript{146} Draft of article sent to the \textit{Diocesan Digest} 18\textsuperscript{th} September 1968, New College Archives.

\textsuperscript{147} Phil Grouse to Noel Pollard, undated, New College Archives. Stuart Babbage notes that there was an “undercurrent of antagonism and hostility” when he arrived at the College in 1973, partly due not only to the rules about alcohol and behaviour, but to the manner with which they were enforced, especially by the Dean. He found his more conciliatory approach subject to accusations that he was “no true evangelical”. He further notes, however: “When I first arrived at the College the student body was deeply polarised and Christians, as a body, were resented … When I left the
Colleges at Macquarie:

The first Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University, Professor Alex Mitchell, would certainly have agreed with Phil Grouse’s note of caution if applied to a church college there. “I think there’s a benefit in having a church affiliation”, he reflected, “particularly if … it’s not a heavy church involvement … I think parents value the religious (connection) … particularly parents of young women.” 148 Alex Mitchell, who prior to his move to Macquarie was Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Sydney University, was conscious of the value of the care and support provided in colleges but at the same time wary of any intrusion of dogmatic sectarian doctrine into the life of a secular university. Particularly at Macquarie, which he saw as an opportunity for a fresh start in university education in Sydney: “Macquarie was just wonderful … We were on our own completely, and that was a very stimulating experience … We were able to think things through afresh and discard a lot of old attitudes and ways, and really revitalise the whole thing.” 149 In the planning for Sydney’s third university there would be deliberate consideration of and scope for a variety of student residences, including colleges, as well as a sense of openness and innovation within a context of maintaining what was considered to be “the State’s tradition in higher education that was based on ‘liberality of opportunity’.” 150 Despite

148 Interview with the late Emeritus Professor A.G. Mitchell, Longueville, 5th May 1997
149 Ibid
Professor Mitchell’s vision and enthusiasm, that combination – rather like NUCC’s openness to all, yet its requirement for affirmation of particulars of the Christian faith – would not be an easy blend.

Unlike the University of New South Wales, Macquarie University in its foundation did not seem to be in opposition to or in competition with Sydney University. Its aim was to relieve Sydney of the increasing demand for places in its faculties, especially with the introduction in the early 1960s at Sydney of quotas for entry\textsuperscript{151}, and to provide a new university in the northern region of Sydney, among a university-going population\textsuperscript{152}. Nevertheless its founding committee, established by the State government in June 1960 under the chairmanship of Mr Philip (P.G.) Price, then Deputy Director-General of Education in NSW, struggled with the challenges of seeking to meet unsatisfied demand in arts, science and economics; of responding to concerns that groups in the city area and beyond were not participating in higher education because of various handicaps and disadvantages; and of developing services and courses to meet needs previously unrecognised and unsatisfied\textsuperscript{153}. Philip Price’s zeal was for a university that reflected breadth in teaching and research as well as inclusiveness in its range of students. He was, recalled Alex Mitchell, “a very humane man, one of the most humane men you’ll ever meet; but not a religious

\textsuperscript{151} W.F. Connell et al Australia’s First: A History of the University of Sydney Volume 2 1940-1990 Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1995, pp.70-72
\textsuperscript{152} Bruce Mansfield & Mark Hutchinson op.cit. p.21
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid pp.20-27
man.”

Price’s faith was in the force of education to release human energies, and that “Christianity was not necessary for framing a civic morality that would secure both personal and public life.” In following the trend of naming new universities in Australia after significant people in Australia’s history, the University was to be named after Governor Macquarie, the “great builder”; its symbols the Macquarie lighthouse, the “first building of architectural significance in Australia”, and “the star Sirius, the guide star to the ships coming to Australia.” The endeavours and achievements of humankind would be the guiding principles of this new University. The first Chancellor, Sir Garfield Barwick, was also, according to Professor Mitchell, not religious “but he valued the church as part of the State’s ‘constitution’ … for its ceremonial (place) … and for its general moral influences. But he had no belief.”

A church college would have its place, but in its place.

A Sense of Community:

In the functional diagram adopted in 1964 by the Interim Council for the North Ryde site, perimeter areas were set aside by the Architect/Planner, Mr Walter Abraham, for ‘Halls of Residence’, ‘General Housing’ and ‘Residential Parking’.

The University was to be a “place with spirit”, and the provision

---

154 Interview with Alex Mitchell *op.cit.*
155 Bruce Mansfield & Mark Hutchinson *op.cit.* p.27
156 Interview with Alex Mitchell *op.cit.* The first lightkeeper was Robert Watson (Watson’s Bay), who had been quartermaster on board HMS ‘Sirius’ in the First Fleet.
157 *Ibid*
158 Bruce Mansfield & Mark Hutchinson *op.cit.* pp.98-99
159 *Ibid* p.94
of student residences provided not just the practical means of meeting the requirements of students in need of accommodation, but “a body of inhabitants around which a sense of ‘community’ could grow.” No significant areas of land were set aside for recreational use, rather the aim was for the residences to be integrated with the whole University in the use of its facilities. In November 1967, eight months after teaching had begun at Macquarie, Dr John Hawke reported to a meeting of NUCC that, having been in negotiations with the University since 1965, the University Council had approved NUCC’s proposal to build colleges for two hundred men and for two hundred women on two of the sites (sites 7 and 8) set aside for student residences. In August 1966, Professor Mitchell had written to the Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University, Sir Leonard Huxley, requesting information about decisions the ANU had taken concerning appropriate terms and conditions for the affiliation of residential colleges. Sir Leonard Huxley sent copies of the ‘general conditions’ prepared in 1962 and the ANU’s ‘Residential Colleges Affiliation Statute’ adopted in 1965. He noted that “formal affiliation of each college will depend on approval of the constitution and inauguration as an operating college with a duly appointed governing body. Provisional affiliation is a declaration of intention to affiliate and will help the embryo college to obtain funds from the Australian Universities Commission.” He also indicated that the University was closely considering the terms on which University land would be leased to

---

160 Mark Hutchinson *op.cit.* p.85
161 NUCC Minutes 16th November 1967, New College Archives
162 A.G.Mitchell to Sir Leonard Huxley, 10th August 1966, ANU Archives: A8144, 2.2.1.28, part 2
the colleges. The Statute required that the constitution of the affiliated body must be approved by the University Council and provide for a University ‘Visitor’ to the college, and that members must be students or staff of, or engaged in research at the University. There were to be no religious tests imposed as a condition of membership. The University also required that the councils or boards of affiliated colleges include a University representative and a representative of the student body of the college.

**Funding:**

The realities of funding no doubt led to consideration early in 1968 of only building initially a college on one of the sites, to accommodate one hundred and fifty people – fifty women and one hundred men. On advice that the Universities Commission considered the original ‘two colleges’ plan too expensive, NUCC decided to go ahead with building a single co-residential college to accommodate one hundred and fifty, with the possible expansion to four hundred at a later period. AUC support for ‘Stage 1’ was reported to the meeting of NUCC in September 1969. In 1970 a Women’s Auxiliary was formed to conduct fundraising and to “pray for the project.” Led by Alison Hawke, wife of Dr John Hawke, and Lorna Kurrle, wife of the Headmaster of

---

164 NUCC Minutes 8th February 1968.
165 *Ibid* 10th July 1968. Consideration was given to seeking co-operation with the Methodist Church about a proposed Methodist College, with joint use of facilities (dining etc.). Similar considerations were given to the Presbyterian, ‘Dunmore Lang College’, especially when it appeared there was no immediate likelihood of a Methodist venture.
166 NUCC Minutes, 10th September 1969
The Kings School, Stan Kurrle, the group raised $57,000. 168 Such fundraising was under the advice from NUCC “not to approach or accept donations from business houses whose prime activity is the manufacture, distribution and sale of alcoholic beverages.”169 A $500 donation from ‘Tooth & Co’ was to be refunded. Donations were received from a number of church schools and parishes, as well as in addition from a ‘Macquarie University Anglican Colleges’ Building Fund’ established in 1972 under the Patronage of the wife of the Governor of NSW, Lady Cutler, and the Chairmanship of the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Marcus Loane.170

**Terms of Affiliation:**

In finalising the terms of affiliation, the University followed the pattern determined at the ANU. There were clearly some concerns about this among NUCC members, who requested that, for example, the powers suggested for the ‘Visitor’ be reduced and that the University Council’s nominee be required to sign the declaration of faith.171 The University, however, was not going to have a ‘sacred tail wagging a secular dog’, and the Vice-Chancellor wrote to NUCC rejecting its requests and indicating that the NUCC articles were being examined.172 The Vice-Chancellor assured NUCC that their fears concerning the

---

167 Ibid 10th February 1970
168 Mark Hutchinson op.cit. p.94
169 NUCC Minutes, 20th April 1971. Archbishop Loane was not happy about this being done in this particular case (NUCC Minutes 8th July 1971).
170 Ibid p.95
171 Ibid 25th June 1970
172 Ibid 10th September 1970
role of the ‘Visitor’ were unfounded. In December 1970, NUCC passed a resolution indicating that the terms of reference for the Board of the College would include a nominee from the University Council and a member elected by the residents, neither of whom shall “be subjected to any religious test.” Nor would the ‘Visitor’. Affiliation was approved in July 1971, with the lease required by the University to be executed directly with the Church Property Trust of the Diocese of Sydney and then sub-leased to NUCC. Sir Garfield Barwick insisted that the lease, unlike that at the University of NSW, had to be with a formal Church body, not with an independent group like NUCC. Work on the building, designed by Noel Bell and Ridley Smith, commenced on 4th January 1972.

An Anglican College, a Scottish Name, an Irish Master:

In June 1972 the Chairman of the Appeal Steering Committee, Mr K. Utz, reported to NUCC that the fundraising consultants, the ‘National Fund Raising Council’, had advised that the name ‘Robert Menzies’ should be given to the College in recognition of the former Prime Minister’s support for church colleges. There was a view that the name would carry significant weight among circles that potentially could be significant donors, especially in the ‘Liberal’ heartland of Sydney’s north shore. Opposition was expressed by some

---

173 *Ibid* 8th October 1970
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175 *Ibid* 17th February 1972
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members of NUCC on the grounds that the name should not be used to attract financial support. It was resolved, however, to ask the Archbishop to write to Sir Robert to determine whether he would agree to have the College named after him, and that the name of ‘Robert Menzies’ be adopted in principle for the College. Sir Robert’s approval was confirmed at a “naming ceremony” at the Sebel Town House, with the Daily Mirror reporting that the new College had the singular distinction of becoming “an Anglican college with a Scottish name and an Irish Master.” The Reverend Dr Alan Cole, an Irishman and at the time a lecturer at Moore Theological College, had accepted NUCC’s unanimous offer of the position of Foundation Master. In a fundraising brochure, Sir Robert wrote of his pleasure in knowing that residential colleges were being established at Macquarie, and that his name had been proposed to be associated with the Anglican college. There was no doubt a degree of his Scottish Presbyterian sense of irony and wit, as had been demonstrated in his meeting with Archbishop Gough a little over a decade before, when he wrote: “I accept this proposal with much gratitude and more than a little humility since, at my time of life I am more conscious of the things that I have not done than of the things which I have.”

As the ‘General Confession’ in the Anglican ‘Book of Common Prayer’ states: “We have left undone those things which we ought to have done …”!
Not all had been done by the time of the official opening by Dame Pattie Menzies of Stage I of Robert Menzies College in May 1973. At the beginning of the first term, women students were able to move into ‘Block C’, but for some weeks until the completion of ‘Block A’ and ‘Block B’, male students resided at the nearby Christian Brothers’ ‘Vaughan College’. The neighbouring Dunmore Lang College\(^{182}\), opened a year before Robert Menzies in April 1972, catered for some forty to fifty Menzies students while the Robert Menzies College kitchen was being completed.\(^{183}\) Stage 2 of the original project was never commenced.

**Conclusion:**

The founders of the New University Colleges Council came together in the 1950s to find ways and means of establishing residential colleges within universities in Sydney and throughout Australia that would give expression to evangelical Christian faith through the provision of care and support for the physical, intellectual and spiritual well-being of student residents. Their experiences, though varied, were grounded in traditional patterns of university life and in the growth of the Evangelical Unions of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship; their aims, though broad, were centred around the person and work of Jesus Christ as

\(^{182}\) A Presbyterian Council, headed by Miss Dorothy Knox, Principal of PLC Pymble, had earlier attempted unsuccessfully to set up a women’s college at Sydney University. It was perceived as much less governed by the strictures of faith than Robert Menzies College (Macquarie University Students’ Council Annual Report 1972-73, *Arena*, 24\(^{th}\) July 1973, MUA). Following the inauguration of the Uniting Church in 1977, direct Church involvement in the College was withdrawn.

\(^{183}\) Mark Hutchinson *op.cit.* p.96. Dr Cole reported that 20 men were housed at Vaughan College and had their meals at Dunmore Lang. A total of 44 men and women students were dining at Dunmore Lang. (NUCC Minutes 14\(^{th}\) March 1973)
expressed in the Anglican ‘39 Articles’ of faith, and in the need for personal salvation and commitment; and their expectations, though governed by the realities of the availability of funds and of the co-operation of university authorities, were nevertheless driven by a desire to help in whatever way possible what was seen as a student generation that was “a world completely adrift, with all the old seamarks gone, and no course to steer by.” 184 Hostels and halls of residence were regarded as useful opportunities, but the foundation of colleges was seen as a much more effective way of bringing about the integration of mind and spirit; of “a genuine and natural fusion of spiritual values with intellectual achievement.” 185 At a time when universities in Australia experienced a ‘golden age’ in funding, and in which residential halls and colleges were needed and encouraged, the aims and expectations of NUCC were not ones that necessarily would sit comfortably in the context of the new secular universities, and especially in the later 1960s and 1970s era of protest and liberation, of the ‘morals revolution’. The potential for confrontation was palpable. The reality of limitation, moderation and compromise was inevitable. Like those of the founders of the first colleges, the expectations of the founders of these new colleges might need to be modified.

The growing need for student accommodation in each of Sydney’s three universities by 1970, together with Commonwealth support and funding, gave

184 Robert Menzies College invitation brochure to an ‘open morning’ at the College, April/May 1973, MUA.
185 Dr John Hawke, New College Magazine 1969, op.cit.
the churches and related groups entrée to the highest echelons of each institution. Each was not averse to new denominational colleges: sites, however, could not be found at Sydney; they had to be found at New South Wales; and they were already earmarked at Macquarie. The universities were wary of dogmatic intrusion and influence, but they welcomed the opportunity of the further provision of supervised care, and perhaps the influence of the “ancient virtues” that church colleges were perceived to imbue. Christian care and influence were clearly exercised in a variety of ways, particularly through the growth within each of the NUCC colleges of strong student Christian fellowships, in the exercise of pastoral supervision and academic support, and in the conduct of services and meetings which gave opportunity for teaching, discussion and debate. The style and manner with which this was done perhaps reflected the approaches of the Masters who, in the early years, were all clerics but whose differences were perhaps clearly seen in the warmth and wit yet missionary-minded intensity of Alan Cole, and in the more urbane, patrician yet gently compassionate Stuart Barton Babbage. Certainly denominational and, in the case of NUCC, evangelical zeal were able to rally personal and financial support in a way that proved either difficult or impossible in relation to interdenominational and ecumenical efforts in some of the other new Australian universities, such as the University of New England and Monash University. In part, however, they also gave rise to conflict between the sacred and the secular, and the setting-up of committees of enquiry into Warrane and Robert Menzies Colleges.
CHAPTER NINE

Bridging the Gap:

Colleges at the Australian National University, the University of New England, and Monash University

“I would remind you that the promoters of the Centre, within and without the University, hoped that it would make some contribution to bridging the gap between religion and the mainly scientific ethos of any modern university and of the community at large.”


The University of New South Wales, representing the new scientific and technological thrust of post-war education, and demonstrating the rapidly growing need and pressure for greater opportunities at the tertiary level, was in many ways a bold new venture, breaking the established traditions of what a ‘real’ university ought to be. In seeking to meet new demands in a new age and environment, pragmatism inevitably involved a blend of technology with tradition - a compromise between creative change and conservative convention. Science and technology still ‘ruled’, but the first church college, New College, had opened in 1969. Macquarie University, founded in the 1960s, not only grew from the need for a greater ‘liberality of opportunity’, but in a period of greater liberality that posed in all the universities challenges to the nature of their administration, authority and teaching, and clearly to the role of any kind of religious or church representation on campus. In each university there were keen sensitivities to the relationship between the sacred and the secular, and while welcomed by authorities as solutions for practical needs and problems, church
denominational colleges were warily regarded as essentially conservative institutions with the potential for unwarranted interference and influence.

Denominational colleges were to be established in only four of the other eleven new universities in Australia in the period 1945 to 1975 – ‘John XXIII’, ‘Burgmann’ and ‘Ursula’ at the Australian National University; ‘St. Albert’s at the University of New England; ‘Mannix’ at Monash; and ‘St. Raphael’s, St. Mark’s, ‘St. Paul’s, and ‘John Flynn’ at James Cook University in North Queensland. La Trobe University in Victoria began with a special non-denominational collegiate arrangement, while of the remaining six universities – Newcastle, Flinders, Murdoch, Griffiths, Deakin, and Wollongong – only Wollongong much later was to have an affiliated denominational (Anglican) residential college, ‘Richard Johnson’, named after the first chaplain to the colony of NSW. A number of denominational colleges in the older universities, while envisaged and planned, were not established until the post-World War II period, largely due to the difficulty of raising sufficient funds prior to the Murray Report.

The Development of Residential Halls:

A particular development in these post-War years was the setting up by universities of their own residential halls and colleges. The first Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, Professor H. E. Whifield, had envisaged
just prior to the War the setting up of ‘co-operative residential halls’ in association with the Guild of Students. The increasing demand for accommodation, especially in the housing of overseas students under the Colombo Plan, made it imperative for some and later most universities to establish their own residences, irrespective or even instead of moves by churches to do so. The University of NSW opened ‘Basser’ (1959), ‘Goldstein’ (1964), and ‘Philip Baxter’ (1966) Colleges – ‘The Kensington Colleges’ – before the church colleges were opened. ‘Bruce’(1961), and ‘Burton & Garran’(1965) Halls were established at the Australian National University (ANU) before the church colleges; and, with being essentially a university based upon residence, the University of New England (UNE) opened ‘Mary White’(1957), ‘Duval’(1959), ‘Robb’(1960), and ‘Earl Page’(1963) Colleges prior to the Dominicans opening ‘St. Albert’s College’ in 1969. Though a combined churches group worked with Monash University to establish a ‘Christian Collegiate Community’, the move was unsuccessful and the University opened its own Halls – ‘Deakin’(1962), ‘Farrar’(1965), and ‘Howitt’(1966), prior to the Dominicans opening ‘Mannix College’ in 1969. While there was the possibility of churches being involved in the development of a special plan for colleges at La Trobe University, the prospect of difficulty in raising sufficient funds in addition to government grants, as was experienced at Monash University, saw the churches regarding such an opportunity as impracticable.1 The involvement of the churches in seeking to

1 Robert J. Magee ‘The Colleges’, in William J. Breen (ed.) Building La Trobe University: Reflections on the first 25 years, 1964-1989 La Trobe University Press, Melbourne, 1989, p.126. ‘College-unions’, instead of colleges and a central student union, were planned for La Trobe, whereby residents and non-residents would all be attached to a college, each with union (study,
establish denominational colleges in other universities contrasted somewhat to the approaches in Sydney, and certainly demonstrated at the ANU and at Monash University the ecumenical and more liberal approach that was so resisted by conservative evangelicals at the Consultation in Melbourne in May 1961.

The Australian National University:

In 1929 a small group of residents of the nation’s new capital formed the ‘University Association of Canberra’, and in early 1930 the Canberra University College took in its first students. The aim of the Association was for a full university, as those in the States, but in the meantime the College was to have a loose association with the University of Melbourne. The period of Depression and the outbreak of war in 1939 saw only small development in the growth of the University College, but the war years brought into play a number of concerns about the vital need for scientific, social and industrial research for eventual post-

recreational, eating, etc.) facilities. The proposal was patterned on Warwick, Kent and Lancaster universities, UK, and aimed to come to grips with the problems in large Australian universities of anonymity, discipline and alienation. Academic staff of the University were to be involved in each college for the conduct of tutorials and the provision of general guidance. Glenn (1967) and Menzies (1968) colleges were built and opened with this purpose in mind, but by the time Chisholm College was underway (1972) dissatisfaction with the scheme had grown significantly. Academic involvement was unclear, and non-residents simply felt the colleges only provided locker-space. Increasing demand for a central student union facility, and eventual lack of support from the AUC, forced the “Colleges and Housing Committee”, chaired by Professor Davis McCaughey and including Sir Macfarlane Burnet, to abandon the scheme. Many felt that the Committee was out of touch with current demands for student participation in decision-making, and that it was trying to develop a modern collegiate university on the pattern of relatively elitist and conservative affiliated residential colleges. Further discussion of the colleges of La Trobe University are found in: P.W. Matthews ‘From College-Unions to Colleges and a General Union at La Trobe University, 1964-71’, in Vestes: The Australian Universities’ Review Vol XVI, No.1, 1973; and Neil Marshall ‘La Trobe University: the Vision and the Reality’, in Stephen Murray Smith (ed.) Melbourne Studies in Education Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Vic., 1981.

2 S.G. Foster & Margaret M. Varghese The Making of the Australian National University Allen & Unwin, St Leonards NSW, 1996, p.8
war redevelopment and economic strength. Despite education being essentially a State responsibility, these needs were increasingly seen as national in scope and significance. The concerns brought together a number of key ‘players’ in government, public service and university spheres – among them Sir Robert Garran, Secretary to the Attorney-General’s Department and later Solicitor-General; Roy Douglas ‘Pansy’ Wright, Professor of Physics and later Chancellor at Melbourne University; R. C. Mills, Professor of Economics at Sydney University and Chair of the Commonwealth Universities Commission; Alfred Conlon, head of the Army Directorate of Research; John Dedman, Minister for War Organisation of Industry; and H.C. ‘Nugget’ Coombs, appointed by Treasurer Chifley in 1943 as head of the Department of Post-War Reconstruction. It was very much Coombs who brought together the final submission to the Federal Cabinet for a national research university that he saw as “a kind of intellectual power house for the rebuilding of society”.3 The ‘Australian National University’, to be built on a site set aside in 1911 in the design of Canberra, came into being on 1st August 1946, and initially comprised Research Schools of Medicine (named after John Curtin), Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, and Pacific Studies.4 Sir Douglas Copland, Australia’s Minister in China and former economics advisor to the Prime Minister and Professor of Economics at Melbourne University, was appointed Vice-Chancellor.5 A Board

3 Ibid p.19
4 Advisors in the setting-up of the Schools and the appointment of staff included distinguished Australian scholars Mark (later Sir Mark) Oliphant, Howard (later Lord) Florey and Keith (later Sir Keith) Hancock.
5 S.G.Foster & Margaret M.Varghese op.cit. pp. 31-32
of Graduate Studies was set up to give advice in all matters of academic policy and practice. In accord with the pattern established in Australia’s first universities, Section 36 of the Australian National University Act required that no religious tests should be administered for admission, graduation, student office or for the enjoyment of “any benefit, advantage or privilege thereof”.  

The Australian National University, though envisaged in some form since the establishment of the Canberra University College, was born out of the experiences and exigencies of war and the desire to harness new research and discovery for the greater good of the Australian community in the post-War years. It aimed to draw from a much wider field than the then six State universities and, as a post-graduate research institution, it saw residence as a key element of its being. A university of a new era, secular in the Australian pattern, but seeking to establish a respected reputation alongside the great and more traditional universities such as Oxford and Cambridge. The University set itself a target of having at least half its undergraduate population in residence.  

One of its earliest buildings, and perhaps the grandest, was a hall of residence, University House. Its purpose, in addition to being a residence for single students and staff, was to be a social centre for the whole university. Collegial association and activity was seen as vital for a research community of scholars, and scholarly

---

6 The *Australian National University Calendar 1954*, p.7  
7 Australian National University Act 1946, Section 32.  
8 S.G.Foster & Margaret M.Varghese *op.cit*. p.205
tradition was imbued in the style of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. While buildings for the Research Schools of Medicine and Physical Sciences were to be functional, inexpensive, and in keeping with the local landscape, the University architect Brian Lewis’s design for University House was very much reflective of the Oxford tradition. It provided space for the entertainment of wives and their guests, quiet reading rooms, special accommodation for distinguished visitors, and a three-storied Dining Hall with the traditional High Table. Rooms were arranged, as at New College at the University of NSW, on the Oxbridge ‘staircase’ model rather than opening onto long corridors. All single post-graduate students were required to live there, under the oversight of a Master who was seen as second in status to the Vice-Chancellor. The first Master, Professor Dale Trendall, had held the chairs of Greek and Archaeology at Sydney University and had experienced collegiate life at Trinity College, Cambridge. Mark Oliphant expressed the view that he thought the Master should, more than anyone, set the atmosphere and spirit of the University. In opening the building in 1954, the Duke of Edinburgh commended its “ancient pattern” as a place where scholars may “live as a household and enjoy in dignity and relaxation the company of each other”.

---

9 Ibid p.71
10 Ibid p.76
11 Ibid
12 Ibid p.203. Prime Minister Robert Menzies would have warmed to the “ancient pattern” as akin to his “ancient virtues”; but, despite its size and expense, he was not so warm about the building itself, describing it as looking like an orphanage or a seaside block of flats.(p.73)
The Affiliation and Funding of Colleges and Halls:

With increasing requirement and demand for residence, and with many preferring a less ‘formal’ style than that offered at University House, the University opened ‘Bruce Hall’ in 1961 for one hundred and sixty-five students, with Lennox House and a nearby motel purchased by the University accommodating a further one hundred and thirty or so students. While having no religious character, Bruce Hall accommodated ‘Fellows’ appointed from University staff and others “interested in the wellbeing of the University” who were also referred to as “Moral Tutors”. ‘Burton Hall’ and ‘Garran Hall’ were opened along similar lines in 1965. The first ‘religious’ approaches to the University concerning the establishment of a college appear to have been made by the Ursuline Sisters at the beginning of the 1960s, with the University Council recording in May 1961 that the application raised questions relating to the conditions on which the University would approve the affiliation of such colleges or halls. The University appointed a committee to consider and report on this matter. Its report was received in October 1962, with recommendations that while it favoured such affiliation there should be certain safeguards.

13 ANU Archives: ANU:A8144, 14.4.5.17 , File: Burgmann (Affiliated College) Building, ‘Burgmann College News’ Number 1, April 1968. ‘Lennox House’ was originally a Commonwealth Hostel for unmarried public servants (originally named the ‘Bachelors’ Quarters’), and consisted of temporary wooden buildings/huts located on the ANU site. By 1962 the majority of its residents were male university students.
14 S.G.Foster & Margaret M.Varghese op.cit. p.205
15 ANU: A8144, 2.2.1.28, part 1: Affiliation of Halls or Colleges, Council Committee on Affiliation of Residential Colleges and Halls, 451/1963, p.2
16 S.G.Foster & Margaret M.Varghese op.cit. p.205
17 ANU: A8144, 2.2.1.28, part 1 op.cit. Standing Committee Minutes 12th October 1962, p.9
18 Ibid
safeguards did not include any specific reference to religious colleges but were to apply generally. Affiliated colleges should primarily aim to house full-time students of the University, with the number of those who were neither graduates nor undergraduates of the University being strictly limited; the governing body of the College should include one or more representatives of the University; tutorials should be provided for both resident and non-resident members of the College; and the College should accommodate a maximum of about two hundred people, with sixty residents regarded as the minimum for any first stage of development. At a meeting in March 1963, the Committee further noted that the term “colleges” was preferred for institutions established by church bodies or other outside bodies, and “halls” for those established by and under the full control of the University.

Clearly with the recognition that the University Council had approved in principle the affiliation of outside bodies, and with the view that such bodies would most likely be Church sponsored colleges, members of the Faculty Board of the School of Pacific Studies expressed concern that funds should not be diverted from University halls of residence in order for church colleges to be built. With requests for the establishment of colleges being received in 1963 from the Dominican Fathers and from the Methodist Church, concern increased among staff of the University about the conditions under which religious bodies

---

19 Ibid p.10
20 Ibid Committee on Affiliation of Residential Halls and Colleges 451/1963
21 Ibid Minutes of the Faculty Board, R.S.Pacific Studies, 31st July 1963
22 Ibid Minutes of the ANU Council, 13th September 1963
would be granted affiliation. Members of the Research Schools of Social Sciences and Pacific Studies asked that the University ensure that such colleges applied no tests of nationality, race or religion; that they admitted at least one quarter of applicants who did not belong to the sponsoring denomination; and that the governing body of the College include representatives of its undergraduate members.23 Professor Geoffrey Sawyer, Professor of Law in the School of Social Sciences and a reputed constitutional lawyer, advised the University Registrar that the University’s regulations concerning religious tests must apply to colleges since the colleges could be deemed a “benefit, advantage or privilege” of the University.24 The Joint Faculties of Social Sciences and Pacific Studies urged that the provision concerning religious tests be written into the terms of affiliation, though it recognised that there was a “liberal record” with regard to admissions and religious requirements in the church colleges within Australian universities. The Joint Faculty nevertheless believed that the University should provide accommodation for all those who did not wish to live in affiliated colleges.25

In May 1964 the President of the Students’ Association, Mr A. G. Hartnell, conveyed to the Registrar a motion that had been passed, opposing in principle the affiliation of denominational colleges and asking the University not to proceed with any affiliation until it was certain of the wishes of the majority of

23 Ibid Note on Affiliation of Denominational and other Colleges, 5th September 1963
24 Ibid Geoffrey Sawyer to Ross Hohnen, 11th September 1963
25 Ibid Joint Faculties of the Research Schools of Social Sciences and Pacific Studies, 26th September 1963, p.2
the academic and undergraduate members of the University. He noted, however, that the motion was by no means a unanimous vote.\(^{26}\) The Vice-Chancellor, Sir Leonard Huxley, responded on behalf of the Council, explaining that discussion among and decision by the “academic boards of the Institute of Advanced Studies and the School of General Studies” and by the Council, that included representatives of both the staff and the students, had accepted the principle of affiliation of residential colleges, church or otherwise.\(^{27}\)

Further indication of clear support for the presence and affiliation of denominational colleges, subject to the appropriate conditions, may be seen in a letter from the Registrar, Herbert Burton, to Professor Robin Sharwood, then a member of the Faculty of Law who had just been appointed Warden of Trinity College, University of Melbourne. Professor Sharwood, who was also on the governing bodies of University House and Bruce Hall, and was a member of a group seeking to establish an inter-denominational college on campus, had been asked by the Students’ Association to give a defense of church-founded colleges being established in association with the ANU. In it he argued that there was a desire to “make manifest” at the University the Church’s “historic sense of responsibility for the encouragement of learning and higher education”, and that the provision of residential University colleges, as an expression of this

\(^{26}\) *Ibid* A.G.Hartnell to the Registrar, 6\(^{th}\) May 1964

\(^{27}\) *Ibid* L.G.H.Huxley to A.G.Hartnell, 28\(^{th}\) May 1964. The School of General Studies was formed from the Canberra University College that had conducted undergraduate courses particularly for part-time students. Emeritus Professor Herbert Burton noted in the *Burgmann College News* (No.1, April 1968) that the College’s former council had been convinced that residential colleges were invaluable in the educative process, especially if the College was to raise its academic status and cater for a majority of full-time students.
responsibility, had become “an accepted part of the Australian pattern.”

He was certain that there was no intention of such colleges to be “centres of missionary activity amongst students, actively seeking converts” and that he couldn’t imagine the University allowing such a situation to develop. He believed that, on the pattern of colleges in the older Australian universities, the colleges would be “free and open societies”, and that he could see “no reason to expect in colleges established here a narrow liberalism, or religious discriminations or compulsions of any kind.”

Nevertheless he supported the view expressed by Mr Arthur Burns of the Institute of Advanced Studies, that in upholding the liberty of belief of its students, the University should not only guarantee individual liberty but also recognise that “some beliefs have full expression in a corporate life”, for example in acts of worship, meditation, or dietary habits, and that affiliated denominational colleges thus “give room for corporate as well as individual expression of belief”.

In the granting of funds, governments did not see such colleges, he argued, as obsolete but that they had a distinctive role to play as did the University halls; church colleges added a “welcome and stimulating diversity to the University scene”; and they would make a significant contribution in meeting the demand for residence. He also argued that as at least twenty-five per cent of the funds for establishment of such

---

28 Ibid., part 2, Robin Sharwood Independent Colleges at the ANU, April 1965
29 Ibid
30 Ibid Mr A.L.Burns was a member of a committee appointed by the ANU Staff Association in September 1963 to discuss the possible future status of affiliated colleges, and to prepare a report for discussion by the Staff Association as a whole. Professor Sharwood was also a member, and became convenor at the request of the first convenor, Dr Sol Encel. Encel was appointed Professor of Sociology at UNSW following the death in 1965 of Professor Morven Brown.
31 Ibid
colleges had to be raised privately, public moneys would be available for other purposes within the University.\textsuperscript{32} Having been sent a copy of Professor Sharwood’s arguments, the Registrar wrote to him: “Your views tally almost exactly with mine on this subject and I think it is rather sad to see signs of secular intolerance that would deny a place for denominational colleges in the life of the University.”\textsuperscript{33}

The matter of funding and the federal government’s policy towards affiliated denominational colleges, however, gave rise to serious concern among academic staff at the ANU, as they did at the University of New England. It was clear from its decision of October 1963 that the Government wished to support the role of church colleges, and, despite assurances that halls would continue to be funded, this was seen by many academics as a threat to the establishment of what they saw as the more desirable form of student residence on a secular campus.

\textbf{Burgmann College - an Inter-Denominational College:}

While the Ursulines and the Dominicans began to combine in their approaches to the University for a suitable site for their colleges, the Registrar received a letter from the Anglican Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, the Right Reverend

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid}

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid} Herbert Hohnen to Robin Sharwood, 30\textsuperscript{th} April 1965. Although Professor Sharwood’s defence made no specific mention of the provision of care and tutorial support, these were no doubt assumed as they were considered essential elements of any residential college, denominational or otherwise.
Kenneth Clements, indicating that various member churches of the Australian Council of Churches, including the Anglican Church, were considering a joint proposal for the building of an inter-denominational college and that, while discussions were at a preliminary stage, they wished the University to have this in mind when considering future college sites. An inter-church committee was formed, chaired by Bishop Clements, that initially represented the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches. Professor Sharwood was the committee’s Secretary. It met with the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Leonard Huxley, and the Registrar, Mr Hohnen, at University House in August 1964, with a particular concern being the location of the proposed College. The preference was clearly for a site on the campus.

The combined churches approach reflected both the financial reality of having to raise sufficient private funds to supplement the government grants, as well as what was seen “in these ecumenical days” as a logical and effective way of engaging with the University. Such a college could be a base for “well-trained theologians” to meet with “secular scholars”. The College would seek to provide care and tuition for undergraduates and also a “focal point for those staff members and scholars working on problems of both secular and theological

34 ANU:A8144, 2.2.1.28, part 1, op.cit. Kenneth ‘Canberra & Goulburn’ to Mr Ross Hohnen, 4th February 1964
36 Ibid
37 ANU:A8144, 14.4.5.17, op.cit. ‘Burgmann College News’ No.1, April 1968, p.3
38 Ibid
significance\textsuperscript{39}; it would be a place where, as with the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge as well as in the “senior universities” in Australia, religion would give “a spiritual motive and discipline in learning”, but free of any imposition of religious tests.\textsuperscript{40}

The name of the College was also a recognition and reflection of the broad ecumenical nature of its Christian foundation. Ernest Henry Burgmann, as Anglican Bishop of Goulburn since 1934, became the first Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn in 1950, an office he held until 1960. “Burgie” grew up near Taree and though leaving school at fourteen he began to develop his interest in theology and the study of Greek at the same time as felling timber for his father.\textsuperscript{41} He was greatly assisted by Bishop Stretch\textsuperscript{42} of Newcastle in gaining matriculation to Sydney University and a scholarship to St. Paul’s College. He became involved with the SCM and, with a background in Newcastle and at St. Paul’s College, he was not inclined towards the conservative evangelical line that came to dominate the Sydney diocese in the 1930s. He was instrumental in establishing St. John’s (Theological) College at Morpeth near Newcastle, and became widely known for his outspoken support for the unemployed, the poor and the disadvantaged. He campaigned against the Menzies Government’s proposal to outlaw the Communist Party in 1951, and he was a strong advocate

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid \\
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid p.4 \\
\textsuperscript{41} Peter Hempenstall \textit{The Meddlesome Priest: A Life of Ernest Burgmann} Allen & Unwin, St.Leonards, NSW, 1993, p.34 \\
\textsuperscript{42} John Francis Stretch was the first student to be enrolled in 1872 at Trinity College, Melbourne, at the request of Bishop Perry. He became the first Australian-born bishop, first as coadjutor in Brisbane in 1895 and then as Bishop of Newcastle in 1906.
of Australia becoming more closely involved with issues concerning the Asia-Pacific region. Bishop Burgmann’s concern for sound theological teaching and research, strategically placed in association with the Nation’s parliament and with the National University, resulted in the opening in 1956 of St. Mark’s National Memorial Library, of which he remained as Warden for four years following his retirement as Diocesan in 1960. He saw the church’s role as being the “soul of the nation-in-the-making” and a key to its task was to find “a language that was convincing in the world created by science, technology and political revolution”.43 In all kinds of ways Bishop Burgmann built bridges between research and reality, theology and technology, English tradition and Australian temperament, and between church and campus – the sacred and the secular. It was a non-Anglican member of the combined churches’ committee that proposed the name ‘Burgmann’ as fitting for the College.44 Proposals for a Chair of Religious Studies at ANU, with its Centre at Burgmann College, as well as an ecumenical training unit at Burgmann, did not eventuate.45 St. Mark’s Library, rather than Burgmann College, perhaps came to represent more Bishop Burgmann’s desire to “stake a claim for the ‘Anglican way’ in the thinking of the nation’s decision-makers.”46

43 Archbishop Peter Hollingworth, ‘Preface’, Peter Hempenstall op.cit. p.v
46 Ibid p.61
Despite Commonwealth support, the Burgmann College Council\textsuperscript{47}, formed in 1966 from the interim churches committee, faced significant difficulties in raising the necessary additional funds. Early intentions were for the College to house some one hundred students, expanding later to two hundred, the number desired by the Commonwealth; while the University would only grant a site if the Council agreed to an eventual number of five hundred, with two hundred initially. The much larger outlay required to meet this expectation caused some members of the Council to have serious doubts about continuing. This applied to John XXIII and Ursula Colleges as well.\textsuperscript{48} In a joint letter to Senator Gorton, the college councils reflected on the impact of running costs on their fees which, without the degree of assistance given to the Halls of Residence through the University budget, would have to be much higher. Ursula College by this time had commenced building; John XXIII was about to call for tenders; and Burgmann was about to launch an appeal.\textsuperscript{49} It was pointed out that the new colleges had particular difficulties in competing with halls already established as they had no established body of supporters nor tradition of membership. It was also noted that similar attempts at the University of New England and at Monash University to establish inter-denominational colleges were seriously threatened.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47}ANU: A8144, 14.4.5.17 \textit{op.cit.} ‘Burgmann College Foundation Fund’ brochure: the Council included the Rev’d A.Dougan, Principal of St.Andrew’s College, Sydney University; the Rev’d B.R.Wyllie, Master of Wesley College, Sydney University; Bishop Felix Arnott, former Warden of St.Paul’s College, Sydney University; and Dr Davis McCaughey.

\textsuperscript{48}Bishop Jack Dain, a member of NUCC at this time, had serious misgivings about continuing the New College project at UNSW as a result of what he heard about the difficulties at ANU. Dr John Hawke recalls a terrible argument about this.

\textsuperscript{49}ANU: A8144, 2.2.1.28, part 3, \textit{Affiliation of Halls or Colleges}, Letter to the Hon. J.G.Gorton, Minister for Education & Science, 14\textsuperscript{th} April 1967.

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Ibid}. This will be referred to later in this chapter.
In June 1967, Bishop Clements, representing Burgmann College, and Father Hooper, representing Ursula and John XXIII Colleges, wrote to the Vice-Chancellor seeking a meeting with him to discuss the difficulties of covering costs of running the colleges, and difficulties that had arisen with the colleges using their sites as collateral for bank advances.\(^{51}\)

With co-operation from both the Commonwealth Government and the University, together with modifications of plans by the colleges, the college authorities were able to proceed with building on the sites allocated on the University campus. The Dominicans used the Lennox Hostel as a temporary residence from 1967, with both the new buildings for John XXIII and Ursula Colleges opening in 1969. An appeal launched in 1968 for Burgmann College received endorsement from Senator Gorton, who believed the colleges would “greatly enrich and diversify the life of the University”, and from the then Vice-Chancellor, Sir John Crawford, who spoke of his friend Bishop Burgmann as a man of “great liberality and tolerance” and of Burgmann College as an “educational institution which will be important to the development of this nation’s leaders.”\(^{52}\)

Burgmann College finally opened in 1971, but with a much reduced capacity than the five hundred students that was desired by the University. By 1976, the colleges were more on the periphery of the academic community, with more

---

\(^{51}\) Ibid 2\(^{nd}\) June 1967

\(^{52}\) ANU:A8144, 14.4.5.17 *op.cit.* ‘Burgmann College Foundation Fund’ brochure, March 1968.
students opting for the self-catering style of accommodation found in ‘Toad Hall’\textsuperscript{53}. The Anglican “College of Ministry”, established in 1970-71 in association with St. Mark’s Library for the training of clergy for the diocese, required all its unmarried students to reside at Burgmann College.\textsuperscript{54} However, lack of satisfactory facilities for worship and the general life of the College made it difficult for this arrangement to be sustained: “The College is excessively noisy … The pagan attitude of the great majority of college students means that … (the trainees) are a small group in a society that is often hostile to Christian values … It is unreasonably difficult for our students who greatly need Christian nurture and the strength of Christian fellowship in these formative years.”\textsuperscript{55} This comment clearly reflected the openness of the College to a wide range of students and to the fact that much of the fears and concerns expressed about the setting-up of religious colleges on campus during the early to mid 1960s were not realised, apart from the matter of Commonwealth funding. The co-operative venture between the Anglican and other Protestant churches had succeeded and perhaps the broad inter-denominational character of Burgmann College, reflecting much of the character of the person after whom it was named and the spirit of ecumenism, enabled it to sit more comfortably in the secular milieu than it might have done otherwise. It was not, however, a centre of theological or

\textsuperscript{53} S.G.Foster & Margaret Varghese \textit{op.cit.} p.206. Toad Hall opened in 1974 and was so named because of the nearby Sullivan’s Creek and its willows.

\textsuperscript{54} C.A.Warren \textit{op.cit} p.157

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Ibid} David Durie. The Reverend David Durie, then a teacher at Canberra Grammar School, was appointed the first Supervisor of the training program, and later Principal of the College. He was succeeded by the Reverend Bruce Wilson, formerly Chaplain at UNSW and Rector of Paddington in Sydney. Bruce Wilson was at the same time appointed Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Canberra Goulburn.
religious training and instruction. Nevertheless, at the same time, the Catholic colleges with their strong focus on pastoral care, tutorial assistance, intellectual and sporting prowess, and on Catholic tradition and practice centred on the Chapel of St. John the Evangelist, became an accepted part of the wider campus community.\textsuperscript{56} Indeed, at both the University of New England and at Monash University, the Dominicans were the only group successfully to establish denominational colleges.

The University of New England:

As in Canberra, Armidale in the New England area of northern New South Wales had a University College as a precursor to a later University. Canberra University College had been linked with Melbourne University; the New England University College, opened in 1938, was even more directly linked with the University of Sydney. Since the mid 1800s Armidale had become a centre for the establishment of various schools with, for example, a New England Boys’ Grammar School being opened in 1873, Mrs Spashartt’s Ladies School in 1875, and an Ursuline Convent in 1882.\textsuperscript{57} In 1887, with the decline of Mrs Spashartt’s School, the Anglican Bishop of Armidale, James Turner, opened in St. Peter’s Hall the New England Ladies’ College, which moved to a new building, ‘Girrahween’, adjacent to Mrs Spashartt’s former property, in 1889; and in

\textsuperscript{56} Yvonne M. Parry History of John XXIII College 1967-1994 John XXIII website: www.anu.edu.au/res/jxxiii/info/collegehistory.html p.2. Cardinal Wojtyla, later Pope John Paul II, visited the Chapel on 16\textsuperscript{th} February 1973. A friend from his student days, Professor J. Zubrzycki, was a member of the Senior Common Room of John XXIII.
1893, the foundation stone of the New England Proprietary (Boys’) School, later ‘The Armidale School’, was laid.\textsuperscript{58} In 1891, an Anglican clergyman visiting from overseas, the Reverend Edward Doyle, noted that from his observations “no city in Australia will have greater advantages, as a centre of educational work, than Armidale… it is not improbable that in course of time an Armidale university, with its family of colleges, may be, to New South Wales, what Oxford is to England, and the ‘bush cathedral city’ may become familiar with masters, dons, proctors, undergraduates, and all the varied characteristics of university life.”\textsuperscript{59} In their general thrust, they were prophetic words. Armidale held great attraction both for education and for the church. On the election in 1929 of John Stoward Moyes to succeed the Right Reverend W. F. Wentworth-Shields as Anglican Bishop of Armidale, the Dean of Newcastle, W. Herbert Johnson, wrote to Moyes, noting that “it is a good diocese in a very beautiful part of NSW. Splendid schools there too.”\textsuperscript{60} In such a “centre of educational work” and with such “splendid schools”, a concern for university education to cater for those in rural areas, over and above any scheme of correspondence or extension courses, was expressed in the formation in Armidale in 1924 of the Armidale University Establishment Committee.\textsuperscript{61} A key member of that committee, which aimed for the establishment of a University College linked with a ‘parent’ University until

\textsuperscript{57} Lionel Gilbert \textit{Mr Smith, Mr Jones and a Time of Bliss: An Outline History of S.H.Smith House, Armidale} ACAE Publications, Armidale NSW, 1987, pp.3-4  
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Ibid} pp.5-13  
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid} p.18  
\textsuperscript{60} Paul Lamb \textit{The Conscience of the Church: John Stoward Moyes, Bishop of Armidale 1929-1964} The Dioce of Armidale, Brolga Press Pty Ltd, Gundaroo, NSW, 1997, p.5. Moyes’ nomination had been supported by Ernest Burgmann, then Warden of St.John’s (Theological) College, Morpeth.  
\textsuperscript{61} Clifford Turney \textit{et al. op.cit.} p.615
it could become independent, was Canon H. K. Archdall, Headmaster of The Armidale School.62

The Armidale Teachers’ College opened in 1928, and, with the support of the local member of parliament and Minister for Public Education, David Henry Drummond, and the Vice-Chancellor of Sydney University, Robert Wallace, the move for a University College seemed assured of success. Considerable delay occurred however with the Depression, a change of government, and a degree of opposition from Sydney University led by the Deputy Chancellor, Sir Mungo MacCallum.63 There was concern that rural areas were not ready to sustain such a College, with the more industrial and commercial centre of Newcastle seen as a more likely location.64 Nevertheless, with the return of Drummond to government and to his Education portfolio, and with continuing encouragement of the Sydney University Senate by Wallace, together with the urging of what was then termed a ‘Provisional Council’ for the establishment of a University College, it was agreed that a College would be established, provided that teaching staff appointments were made by Sydney University and that students of the College proceeding to a degree must pass the Sydney matriculation examination.65 Drummond recalled that Bishop Moyes ably presented the principal case for such a College.66 With the Armidale Teachers’ College

62 Paul Lamb *op.cit.* pp.56-57
63 Clifford Turney *et al* p.616
64 *Ibid*
65 *Ibid* p.617
66 Paul Lamb *op.cit.* p.58. Moyes had noted that the “northern area is an ideal ground for research into agriculture, and all matters that concern cattle, sheep, dairying, pastures, etc. A University
property considered too small, the Senate accepted the offer from Mr T. R. Forster of the property ‘Boolominbah’, where Bishop and Mrs Moyes stayed when they first came to Armidale\textsuperscript{67}, as the most suitable site. It had been offered first to the Anglican diocese, but, with indication of future difficulty in establishing denominational or church colleges, the costs of servicing and of upkeep were beyond the financial capacity of the diocese, and Bishop Moyes suggested that Mr Forster might consider offering it to the State for setting up a university.\textsuperscript{68} The College at ‘Boolominbah’ would become an autonomous university when it had absolute support.\textsuperscript{69}

In April 1944, the New England College Advisory Council, with the view that the College was “beyond the experimental stage”, resolved to request the State government to grant autonomy to the College as a University.\textsuperscript{70} A joint proposal was put by the Council and the Senate of Sydney University to the Minister for Education at the end of 1945.\textsuperscript{71} Post-war considerations and the focus on the setting up of the NSW University of Technology no doubt contributed to some delay in the process, but the creation of the University of New England was finally enacted in 1954. Dr R. B. Madgwick, then Warden of the College and a former lecturer in Economic History and Secretary of the Sydney University

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid p.6  
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid p.60  
\textsuperscript{69} Clifford Turney \textit{et al.} op.cit.  
\textsuperscript{70} W.F.Connell \textit{et al.} op.cit. p.36  
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid
Extension Board, was appointed the first Vice-Chancellor.\textsuperscript{72} He had visited Armidale in 1933 to conduct matriculation examinations for the University of Sydney and had met with Bishop Moyes and others to discuss the possibility of the University starting tutorial classes or extension lectures in the city. The aim of the Armidale citizens, however, was to work towards the newly established University.\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{The “Holiest Campus in Australia”:}

At the time of gaining its autonomy, there were some two hundred and fifty students enrolled in courses at the University.\textsuperscript{74} The students were mainly drawn from country towns and rural properties in northern NSW, with a minority mainly from metropolitan Sydney. Even more so than Canberra, most students required accommodation and this was to be found in somewhat makeshift housing both on the campus and in the town.\textsuperscript{75} Because of its size and its relationship with the Armidale community, the College and then the University in its early days were themselves something akin to a collegiate community in terms of clubs and societies. Student life was closely knit and, in a sense, religious activity infused much of what was done. The SCM was the largest

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Ibid} p.17. He had also been Director during the Second World War of the Army Education Department

\textsuperscript{73} Paul Lamb \textit{op.cit.} p.57. The first faculties were Arts and Science, with Rural Science added in 1956, Agricultural Economics in 1958, and, in the 1960s, Economic Studies (incorporating Agricultural Economics), Education, and Resource Management.


\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ibid}
society on campus in the 1940s and 1950s, with many students participating in its and other Christian societies’ activities such as daily or weekly worship, Bible-study and tutorial groups, conferences, camps and retreats. In the latter 1950s and early 1960s, as in other universities in Australia, the Evangelical Union and evangelicalism were to play a much greater role, but in the early days of the University there was certainly a great deal of Christian activity on and around the campus and there were strong links with the Armidale churches. Bishop Moyes was a prominent figure in the SCM, as well as a member of the University Council. He was Deputy Chancellor from 1960 till 1967, three years after his retirement as Bishop of Armidale in 1964. In the mix of its student intake from rural towns and properties, from families of skilled or white-collar workers, non-degreed teachers, farmers and graziers, the University of New England tapped “the more religiously conservative section of Australian society – as compared with metropolitan centres”. Its reputation came to be in the early years as “the holiest campus in Australia.”

While there was a significant rise in the number of internal students at the University by 1964, and a consequent demand for residential accommodation, there was no doubt the view that the pattern of student Christian activity and the ‘inter-play’ between city, church and campus at Armidale had established a
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76 Ibid p.322
77 Ibid pp.323-325
78 John Rymer had been appointed Anglican Chaplain at the University in 1954.
79 Ibid p.325
80 Ibid p.321
81 Ibid p.319 There were 1,143 internal full-time students out of a total of 3,513 (external studies was introduced in 1955).
milieu that would inevitably have influence within any new college, hostel or hall of residence. Religious belief was accepted as part of the scene; there was little criticism of or hostility towards it.82

Denominational colleges might have seemed inevitable. However, despite Commonwealth funding in the 1960s, financial considerations played a major role in the churches considering whether or not to establish residential colleges. Bishop Moyes urged the diocesan Synod as early as 1945 to consider raising from the churches and from private donations some £30,000 to be divided equally for the purpose of setting up Church of England men’s and women’s residential colleges. Some initial gifts were received as well as some money for the ‘Church College Scheme’ from the legacy of Mr T. R. Forster, but the necessary funds proved too difficult to raise and the amounts received were handed over to The Armidale School in the late 1960s.83 Professor Madgwick recalled that “well before it was established the Bishop had stated that he believed the University College should be fully residential, because living and working together would not only benefit the students academically but would also help them to develop a proper sense of society and of social responsibility. As a result he always took a keen interest in the working of the residential system of the University College and subsequently of the College system as it developed in the University. I know that he would have welcomed any move for the

82 Ibid p.326
83 Paul Lamb op.cit. p.60
affiliation of an Anglican College, but that was beyond the resources of the Church.”

If there had been any strong desire for and realistic possibility of achieving the goal of church colleges it surely would have been advanced by Moyes’ successor as Bishop of Armidale, 1965-1976, Ronald Clive Kerle, founding Chairman in 1960 of the New University Colleges Council. The Right Reverend Peter Chiswell, who succeeded Clive Kerle as Bishop of Armidale (1976-1999), feels that the Anglican Church was more concerned in the early days with providing chaplaincy services, and that the changes of Bishop and Chaplain during the early 1960s meant that strategic thinking about a possible role in a college was lacking. When thought was given to it, Bishop Chiswell believes “three factors were decisive in the Diocese not moving ahead: (i) the 60s was a period of student reaction against authority and we did not relish mixing the policeman and pastor roles. At the same time it was becoming popular for students to live out of college; (ii) government funding (in the later 60s and the 70s) declined dramatically; and (iii) there was a time limit on the bequest (of Mr Forster for a church college) which was to go to The Armidale School if not used for a College.”

---


85 Bishop Peter Chiswell , Email to Ian Walker, 29th June 2001. The latter two reasons, as Bishop Chiswell recalls, also “overtook the thinking” about building flat-type accommodation for postgraduates.
Non-denominational colleges:

With the strikes and economic depression of the 1890s, the New England Ladies’ College closed in 1894, and in 1895 Miss Florence Green, the sister of the new Anglican bishop, opened her ‘New England Girls’ School’ (NEGS). The Armidale Girls’ High School began in ‘Girrahween’, the Ladies’ College building, though it too closed at the end of 1908. The building continued as a boarding house, and, in 1928, it became a hostel to house women students of the new Teachers’ College. Named ‘S. H. Smith House’, after the Director of Education in NSW, it remained a women’s student hostel until 1973 when it became a co-residential Hall of Residence in association with the Armidale College of Advanced Education. While there was no denominational link with the ‘House’ after its days as a Ladies’ College, the second Warden, Miss Edith Roulston, noted among the duties of the Warden “the development of the religious, national and civic sense by suggestion and encouragement to engage in practical work in these fields.”

The college system that developed at UNE, however, did not quite reflect the predictions of the Reverend Edward Doyle in 1891. Armidale would not be like Oxford, though UNE’s second Vice-Chancellor, Professor (later Sir) Zelman Cowen, initially saw its potential as a cross between a liberal arts university and an Oxford college. However, he believes this was just the rationale he used in accepting the position in 1967; it was “sort of low-grade patter. It was not on.”

In 1957 Mary White College was founded by the University as the first on-
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86 Lionel Gilbert *op.cit.* p.20
87 *Ibid* p.24
88 *Ibid* pp.27 & 84
89 *Ibid* pp.61 & 71
90 Interview with Sir Zelman Cowen *op.cit.*
campus residential college, initially for women and later becoming co-residential. It was followed by Duval College in 1959; Robb College, for men and later co-residential, in 1960; Earle Page College in 1963; Drummond College in 1970, later to be merged with S. H. Smith House; and Austin College in 1972.

St. Albert’s:

The only religious group formally to propose the establishment of a college at the University was the Dominican Order. In a response to the Prior Provincial, the Very Reverend J. O’Rorke, the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Madgwick, noted that the Council had agreed in principle to the affiliation of the proposed College with the University, but that conditions were still to be approved. While Professor Madgwick well regarded churchmen such as Bishop Moyes and, for example, was a member of the Councils of the New England Girls’ School and of The Armidale School, and perhaps like Philip Baxter saw a positive moral and social force in the religious activities of chaplains and student societies, his letter to Professor Baxter in November 1965 about the Dominicans’ proposal is revealing of something less positive. Baxter had mentioned at a meeting of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee that lease arrangements were being prepared for the affiliation of denominational colleges at the University of NSW, and Madgwick was keen to see Baxter’s terms. He noted that “there is a good

92 Paul Lamb *op.cit.* pp.47-48
deal of opposition here to affiliated colleges and it would help me considerably if I could be sure of my ground when I have to steer a legal document through the Council. I am not particularly animated about the affiliated colleges myself but there seems little point in opposing the inevitable.”93 It would seem he was reflecting something of his own and others’ reactions to the Commonwealth Government’s policy on equal funding and perhaps something of the increasingly secular and liberal mood of the mid to later 1960s. At the same time, however, residences were needed and the Government strongly supported church colleges. Also, Armidale was still the “bush cathedral city”.

Denominational Influence and Involvement:

St. Albert’s College opened in 1969, the same year as the Dominican colleges at the ANU, John XXIII, and at Monash University, Mannix College, moved into their new buildings. The Catholic presence on the UNE campus was enhanced by the popular Master of St. Albert’s, Father Fitzgerald, and the use of the College’s resources and Chapel. The Newman Society was subsumed by the work of the College, which became the ‘official organ’ of the Catholic Church on campus.94 While there were no Protestant colleges, and though membership of Christian societies such as SCM and EU declined in the later 1960s95, active Christian

93 R.B.Madgwick to Sir Philip Baxter, 3rd November 1965, UNSW Archives op.cit.
94 D.R.Beer op.cit. p.331
95 Ibid p.332. The Methodist Youth Fellowship had about 30-50 members in the late 1960s; the EU in the 1970s had only small numbers of mainly students from the Churches of Christ, Baptist and Presbyterian churches. The EU especially noted the strength of the secular college system as making its work among students increasingly difficult.
evangelistic ministry was particularly encouraged by Bishop Kerle and developed through the work of the Reverend John Chapman, Anglican Diocesan Youth Director, 1960 to 1968, and the Reverend Maurice Betteridge, Anglican Chaplain at UNE, 1965 to 1972. With the opening in 1971 of a new Anglican St. Mark’s Chapel at the University, evangelical ministry gained a new focus, with large attendances at ecumenical services on Sunday evenings. Professor Madgwick had originally proposed an ecumenical University Chapel, but when funds proved difficult to raise, Bishop Moyes, who was not keen on an ecumenical Chapel, moved to establish an Anglican one instead. Armidale seemed to be more imbued with denominationalism than with the co-operative determination that brought about the founding of Burgmann College at the ANU. Though by no means exclusively Anglican, the St. Mark’s Christian Fellowship and the Dominican St. Albert’s College, to which the Roman Catholic chaplains were attached, were “the centres of student religious activity in the 1970s at UNE.”

Bishop Moyes retired from the University Council at much the same time as Professor Zelman Cowen became Vice-Chancellor. The University was beginning to grow out of its provincial character and to become a more national university, with special research interests and reputations and with many of the
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97 D.R.Beer op.cit. p.333
98 Sir Robert Madgwick op.cit. pp. 126-127
99 D.R.Beer op.cit.
pressures and demands that were facing the major metropolitan universities. It was a University that “was getting ready to get better”. Its foundation years, however, while not in the end resulting in the establishment of denominational colleges apart from St. Albert’s, had a church ‘stamp’ on them, especially through the involvement of Bishop Moyes; rather like, for example, that of Augustus Short at the University of Adelaide, James Moorhouse at the University of Melbourne, and Charles Riley at the University of Western Australia. The Bishop loved the University and his influence within it was considerable. His portrait hangs in the J. S. Moyes Room of the Dixson Library at UNE, a room in which also are placed the Charter of the Freedom of the City of Armidale that had been granted to him, and his insignia as a Companion of the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George.

**Monash University:**

Ecumenism was to be strongly demonstrated at Monash University, Melbourne’s second university, but not, apart from Mannix College, in the eventual establishment of a denominational college such as Burgmann at the ANU. Instead, it came to fruition in the setting up of a Religious Centre that was quite unique in the history of universities in Australia. At much the same time, however, though with little or no reference in the histories of the University,
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there was also a decided move by a combined churches group to establish a
‘Churches’ Collegiate Community’ at Monash, a move which had the support of
the University Council.\(^{103}\) That this should occur in a university that, like the
University of New South Wales, reflected the new priorities of the sciences and
technology\(^{104}\), and that from the beginning had an almost aggressively secular
tone\(^{105}\), again demonstrated a degree of practical consideration and of
compromise in meeting both the needs of an increasingly large and diverse
student population and of satisfying the sentiments of many of those with
significant influence in the governance and support of the University. In the case
of Monash, religion was not to be represented on the periphery of the campus,
but as an integral part of its “inner space, the ‘Forum’.”\(^{106}\). It was as if to
acknowledge that this was a new university in an age of ecumenism that
represented, not so much a surrender by secularists, but a kind of secular triumph
over sectarianism; a recognition that, just as the various schools and departments
of particular faculties made up the whole, so the various denominations and,
indeed, religions formed a significant part of the community of knowledge.
Nevertheless, it could not have occurred without the co-operative relationships
between the heads and leaders of Christian churches and of other faiths, of
government and of the University.

\(^{103}\) Peter Janssen’s history of the Monash University Religious Centre refers to the Collegiate
Community in a reference: No.14, p.29
\(^{104}\) Sir Robert Blackwood *Monash University: The First Ten Years* Hampden Hall, Melbourne,
1968, p.14
\(^{105}\) John Rickard ‘The “University-in-a-Hurry”’, in *Making Monash: A Twenty-Five Year
Pictorial History* Monash University Gallery, Clayton, Vic., 1986, p.10
\(^{106}\) Louis Matheson *Still Learning* The Macmillan Company of Australia, South Melbourne, Vic.,
1980, p.40
This co-operation and influence was to be demonstrated at the time of the founding of the University. The idea of a second higher tertiary institution in Melbourne went back to at least 1940 when Professor Aubrey Burstall, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering at Melbourne University, proposed the establishment of a technical institute, over and above the Melbourne Technical College (later the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology) to provide advanced study and training in various fields of engineering. Various proposals followed, including one to merge the Faculty of Engineering with the Technical College, as an affiliate of the University. The setting up of the NSW University of Technology (later UNSW) clearly encouraged supporters of a new tertiary institution in Melbourne, and in 1956, after changes in and procrastination by government, the recommendation by the Ramsay Committee for a Victorian University of Technology was accepted. The pressures and demands from the expectations of industry and commerce, and from an increasing student population, were by this time equalling those of Sydney, which already had a second university and would soon contemplate a third. The Commonwealth Government’s ‘Murray Committee’ gave further weight to the urgent need for such an institution and recommended that a ‘University of Victoria’ be established, giving priority to science, engineering and technology, but also emphasising the importance of these in relation to the arts, social sciences, commerce and law which should be included soon after if not initially.

107 Sir Robert Blackwood op.cit. p.1
108 Ibid pp.2-3; and Simon Marginson Monash: Remaking the University Allen & Unwin, St Leonards NSW, 2000, p.8
109 Ibid pp.8-9; Sir Robert Blackwood op.cit. pp.8-9
Following a suggestion made in 1956 by Dr R. G. Gillis of the Defence Standards Laboratories and Dr J. M. Swan of the CSIRO, and with the knowledge that both Canada and New Zealand had ‘Victoria’ universities, the name of ‘Monash’ was selected for the University. Lieutenant-General Sir John Monash had been a distinguished First World War soldier, Chairman of the State Electricity Commission of Victoria, and Dean of Engineering and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne from 1923 until his death in 1931. He was a linguist and a lover of music; and he demonstrated his opposition to ethnic, religious and class-based prejudices. In religious terms, he was a Jew who represented by his success “a striking response to the anti-semitism that still lingered at all levels.” He therefore represented much of what the University was intended to be. A site was chosen at Clayton in the south-eastern suburbs of Melbourne, and an Interim Council was established under the Chairmanship of Sir Robert Blackwood, then the General Manager of ‘Dunlop’ and a former Dean of the Faculty of Engineering at Melbourne University.

Removal of the Secular Clause:

As with Sydney University and the University of NSW, Monash University saw the need to draw from the University of Melbourne the sense of tradition and respectability that would allow for the easier acceptance of its credibility. This
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111 Simon Marginson op.cit. p.5
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was particularly so in the structure of its faculties and the nature of much of its curriculum. In fact, the ‘Monash University Act’, passed in the Victorian Parliament on 27th May 1958, “directly precluded educational approaches that were substantially different from Melbourne’s”.113 The Act was drawn almost word-for-word from the Melbourne University Act, including Clause 23(1): “Subject to the Statutes and regulations of the University the Council may after examination confer any degree or diploma in any faculty except Divinity.”114 This had been the pattern in Australia’s universities, along with the ‘No Religious Tests’ clause. The Melbourne churches, however, sought to do something about it. The Anglican Archbishop, Frank Woods, recalled in his address on the occasion of his receiving the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Monash University on 23rd May 1979, that at the time just prior to the Bill’s passing he received a phone call from Sir Edmund Herring, Chief Justice and Deputy Governor of Victoria, asking if the Archbishop could do something about ‘the secular clause’.115 The Archbishop immediately phoned Professor Davis McCaughey, then Master of Ormond College (later Governor of Victoria), and Mr (later Sir) Frank Rolland, “two people of influence in the community and in church circles.”116 The concern was not necessarily that divinity might not be taught - there were already, for example, theological schools at the Melbourne colleges - but that there were wider implications for the nature and character of

113 Ibid p.13
114 ‘A Bill to provide for the Establishment and Incorporation of a University to be known as Monash University, and for other purposes.’ Monash University Archives, A/0/1 PT1
116 Ibid
this new University. In his history of the setting up of the Religious Centre at Monash University, Peter Janssen offers a reason as to why there was to be an effective response to the issue:

“At Melbourne there had always been a clear division between university affairs and college affairs, with the churches being free to operate in the latter sphere. This had been one way of approaching university-church relations, but it had its disadvantages. It meant that while the churches were guaranteed independence within their respective colleges, they were also effectively isolated from the university. For instance, there was no chapel on campus, for it was argued that the churches could provide services in their own college chapels if they so desired. In the minds of many churchmen and chaplains this made the task of assisting students to adopt an integrated approach to studies and faith more difficult, contributing to an unnecessary dichotomy between them. Thus, in the awareness of the wider problem at Melbourne, churchmen hoped that they would be consulted about the nature and direction of the proposed University in the south-east.”

An approach by church representatives to the Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, was also supported by the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Daniel Mannix. The Premier noted that the detailed wording of the Bill, being largely that of the University of Melbourne Act, had not been closely examined and felt that the exclusion of Divinity could be struck out without any difficulty. This was done in
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117 Peter Janssen *Monash University Religious Centre* Monash University, Clayton, Vic., 1984, p.2. A copy was given to me by Dr Davis McCaughey following a meeting in Melbourne on 9th July 1998
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Parliament the next day, with no objection.\textsuperscript{119} This seems to have been very much the result of effective ‘establishment’ connections between Church and State, and of a great deal of “ecumenical spadework” carried out among the Victorian churches in association with the Australian Council of Churches\textsuperscript{120}, much the same “spadework” that brought together the Consultation on Christian work among students at Queen’s College in 1961.

The Development of a ‘Religious Centre’:

The way was therefore at least symbolically open at Monash University for what Archbishop Woods described as “something wider … We were determined that whatever were eventually to be set up should be fully representative not only of the Christian traditions but should be a place where study and research would be facilitated for members of any and all religious traditions.”\textsuperscript{121} With the support of Archbishop Woods, a ‘Churches’ Committee’ came together to prepare a proposal to the Interim Council of Monash University for a ‘Chaplaincy Centre and Collegiate Library’ that would provide a place of intellectual research into the relationship between religion and culture, a place of worship, facilities for chaplains, and a base for involvement in the University’s residential establishments.\textsuperscript{122} The proposal, which provided for the appointment of a

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid}. This was also confirmed in my meeting with Dr McCaughey.

\textsuperscript{120} Brian Meredith Porter Frank Woods, Archbishop of Melbourne 1957-77, Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia 1971-77 Unpublished thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Theology, Australian College of Theology, December 2000, p.182. The degree was awarded by the Primate, Archbishop Peter Carnley, at Trinity College, Melbourne, on 21\textsuperscript{st} May 2001.

\textsuperscript{121} Sir Frank Woods, Occasional Address \textit{op.cit.} p.3

\textsuperscript{122} Peter Janssen \textit{op.cit.} p.7
Warden by the University, was approved in principle by the Interim Council in 1960. It received support from the newly appointed Vice-Chancellor, Professor (later Sir) Louis Matheson, formerly Professor of Civil Engineering at Melbourne University and, at the time of his appointment, at the University of Manchester. While supportive, Matheson was careful to keep the proposal and its associated activities within the confines of collective church responsibility and under the authority of the University in matters of facility and proper relationships with the staff and student community. On hearing complaints about a Catholic chaplain who had been endeavouring “to convert the young lady secretaries and had been saying Mass in one of the lecture rooms”, the Vice-Chancellor noted that: “I thought the girls could probably look after themselves but I did say that the University’s teaching facilities were to be reserved for the objective study of scholarly problems and not for practices of any dogmatic kind.” Again it was the case of the University being anti-sectarian, rather than anti-religious.

The proposal for a Warden and collegiate library, however, met opposition from the Professorial Board which was uneasy about what it considered potentially to be a quasi-academic organisation functioning independently within the University. The professors were willing to accept the appointment of a Reader

---

123 Professor Kevin Westfold, Dean of Science and later Deputy Vice-Chancellor, was also very involved and supportive. Archbishop Woods noted that “he was always ready with help and advice and knew what would be acceptable to the University and what would not.” (Occasional Address)
124 Louis Matheson op.cit. p.107
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or Professor in Comparative Religion within one of the University faculties, and were supportive of the concept of a Centre for religious and related activities which might include facilities for worship, discussion, and for chaplains. They also stressed that the Centre should be available for use by other faiths.\textsuperscript{126} However, apart from the Churches’ dissatisfaction, the University was unable to consider diverting scarce staff funds at the time for such a readership or professorial appointment.\textsuperscript{127} Under the Chairmanship of Professor McCaughey, the Churches’ Committee eventually dropped the idea of a collegiate library and proposed a Centre that would contain a large and a small chapel, with vestries, a common room and associated facilities. The Centre would be available to all groups holding “coherent religious beliefs”.\textsuperscript{128} Plans were approved by the University Council and an Appeal was launched by the Churches’ Committee in 1964; the Religious Centre was to be a gift to the University, with no argument that the University was directing its resources into a religious institution instead of towards academic needs. \textsuperscript{129} Funds were received from the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Churches, together with moneys from the State Government and from a public appeal.\textsuperscript{130} As a mark of community support for the project, the Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, took part in a ‘peg-driving’ ceremony in March 1967, and in April, the Governor, Sir Rohan Delacombe, laid the foundation stone. The ceremony involving the Premier, at which he also

\textsuperscript{126} Peter Janssen \textit{op.cit.} p.15
\textsuperscript{127} Sir Robert Blackwood \textit{op.cit.} p.226
\textsuperscript{128} Peter Janssen \textit{op.cit.} p.20
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid p.21
\textsuperscript{130} Brian Meredith Porter \textit{op.cit.} p.183. After some persuasion, the Jewish community also made a contribution, though with the view that Jewish students would use only parts of the Centre and not the chapels, as these had Christian connotations (Peter Janssen \textit{op.cit.} p.22).
announced the Government’s donation to the Appeal, took place with little fanfare as any attention drawn to the Premier’s presence on campus at that time would most likely have sparked a student protest\textsuperscript{131} – not against the Centre, but against the Premier and his government, which, despite appeals for clemency from leaders of the Churches and the community, had just hung Ronald Ryan. The Committee clearly didn’t want to hang its Appeal. The Religious Centre was opened in 1968; a “monument to the ecumenical temper of our times.”\textsuperscript{132}

The rather distinctive nature of the Religious Centre project no doubt attracted the funds that were necessary for its completion. Finance, however, as at the University of New England and to a limited degree at the ANU, was to be the main obstacle to the setting up of a number of denominational colleges at Monash. The Interim Council was given to understand that the Churches, even acting together, did not contemplate the establishment of individual colleges.\textsuperscript{133} The Council was willing to affiliate them if they became a reality, though it was not willing to alienate any of its land. Churches would have to purchase sites alongside the University.\textsuperscript{134} With the thought that up to forty per cent of full-time students might need to be housed on the campus, the Interim Council designated areas on the north-east and south-east corners for residential halls and set up a planning sub-committee.\textsuperscript{135} While realising that dormitory-style accommodation,

\textsuperscript{131} Peter Janssen \textit{op.cit.} p.24
\textsuperscript{132} Sir Frank Woods, Occasional Address \textit{op.cit.} p.5
\textsuperscript{133} Sir Robert Blackwood \textit{op.cit.} p.224
\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Ibid}
\textsuperscript{135} Louis Matheson \textit{op.cit.} p.103
as in many American universities, was probably the most economical way of meeting housing needs, the Council was convinced that, as with more traditional colleges, the provision of common dining and social amenities “was most likely to promote tolerance, understanding and mutual respect among students, and to provide a corporate atmosphere with sufficient supervision and discipline to ensure the proper promotion of study.”  

Each residential hall was to have a Warden, with other senior residents designated, as at ‘Bruce Hall’ in Canberra, as “moral tutors”. As AUC funding allowed, ‘Deakin Hall’ was opened in 1962; ‘Farrer Hall’ in 1965; and a tower block of twelve stories, ‘Howitt Hall’, was opened in 1966. ‘Richardson’ and ‘Roberts’ Halls were opened in the early 1970s.

**Archbishop Woods and a ‘Churches’ Collegiate Community’**:  

Despite financial realities and the greater focus on the development of the Religious Centre, Archbishop Woods was still keen for the establishment of a combined churches’ college if not an Anglican one. He had originally assumed that individual churches would establish colleges on the campus, but came to the view that individual church colleges were unlikely to gain the necessary funds.  

The Reverend Frank Engel, then General Secretary of the Student Christian

---

136 Sir Robert Blackwood *op. cit.* p.226  
137 *Ibid* p.227  
138 These latter two contrasted the Howitt tower, with rooms grouped in traditional clusters, as at Newman College (Melbourne University) and New College (UNSW), as opposed to Howitt’s narrow corridors which “lit coldly by cheap-looking fluorescent fittings, twist and turn to give variety, but finally imply a journey into windowless darkness.” (*Making Monash op. cit.* pp.57-58)
Movement in Australia and a member of the Churches’ Committee, believed that the decision to pursue the aim of the Religious Centre followed a decision against the idea of denominational colleges.\footnote{Ibid p.182} However, Frank Woods was not to be deterred, at least in seeking an ecumenical approach if not a denominational one, as in Sydney. Here was the difference of approach witnessed at the 1961 Melbourne Consultation: Melbourne and Sydney; Woods and Gough, both “quintessentially English”\footnote{Ibid p.263} - the former, however, more liberal evangelical and the latter more conservative; the background of one in the SCM and of the other in the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. The diocese of Melbourne’s “evangelical ethos was always milder” and its reputation was more one of “tolerance and acceptance of diversity.”\footnote{Ibid p.262. Darrel Paproth ‘Henry Varley and the Melbourne Evangelicals’, in The Journal of Religious History Vol. 25, No.2, June 2001, gives a helpful background to the development of a more ecumenical evangelicalism in Melbourne, esp. pp.185-186} Archbishop Woods was much more comfortable in Melbourne’s ecumenical climate.

In August 1962, following a visit of the Australian Universities Commission, the University Council noted that the Commission was prepared to give immediate, though limited, support for the establishment of church colleges, and that this information should be conveyed to Archbishop Woods.\footnote{Monash University Archives AF/930/COL: Council Minutes 13th August 1962} It was emphasised that the Churches’ support for colleges would not necessarily involve withdrawal of support for the Chaplaincy (Religious) Centre project. It was not, however, until 1964 that, with a loan from the MLC Insurance Company, some fourteen

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Brian Meredith Porter \textit{op.cit.} p.182}
\item \footnote{Ibid p.182}
\item \footnote{Ibid p.263}
\item \footnote{Monash University Archives AF/930/COL: Council Minutes 13th August 1962}
\end{itemize}}
acres of land was purchased opposite Deakin Hall for the purpose of establishing a church college or community of some kind. The trustees, with no personal liability, were Archbishop Woods, Sir Robert Knox and Mr F. E. Trigg. A committee representing the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches and the University was formed, which included Bishop Felix Arnott (a former Warden of St. Paul’s College, Sydney University, then Assistant Bishop in the diocese of Melbourne and later Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane), and Dr Robin Sharwood (formerly of the ANU, Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne University). It was planned to develop a student village, patterned along the lines of accommodation found in Scandanavian and some German universities, though it was believed that costs would restrict the development initially to a main residential block as a first stage. It was not thought that a Chapel would be necessary as students could use the Religious Centre when it was built, but there was a proposal to incorporate if possible a Secondary Teachers’ College, particularly, though not exclusively, for independent school teachers. The need for such a collegiate facility to be affiliated with the University in order to obtain Commonwealth grants was recognised, as was the concern that any public appeal for funds should not be made until the Appeals for the Religious Centre and for the Monash ‘Great Hall’ (named the Robert Blackwood Hall) had been concluded.

---

144 Ibid: Proposed Churches’ Collegiate Community at Monash University: Submission to the Australian Universities’ Commission on its visit to Monash University, 2-6 August 1965
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There is no question that the Vice-Chancellor of this “almost aggressively secular” University was warm to the involvement of the Churches in this way. Professor Matheson wrote to Archbishop Woods of his delight in the proposal and informed him that the Council was enthusiastic about it. He concluded by saying how much he valued the interest that Archbishop Woods had always shown in Monash University. With the provisional title for the project ‘The Churches’ Residential Project, Monash University’, Archbishop Woods along with Sir Robert Knox, Dr Robin Sharwood, and Professor Wardlaw (representing the Presbyterian Church) met with Sir Leslie Martin, Chairman, and other members of the Universities Commission at Deakin Hall on 5th August 1965. The Chairman, who was known to be more in favour of residential halls of a dormitory kind than of denominational residential colleges, was clearly not as warm to the proposal as the Vice-Chancellor, who also attended the meeting. Professor Matheson expressed sympathy to Archbishop Woods for the “dreadful meeting with the AUC” and for “such rough handling” of the proposals. It was clear to the Vice-Chancellor that the AUC would support residential accommodation for students but not any other proposals for things such as provision for married students, or for theological or teacher training. In response, Dr Woods wrote to Louis Matheson: “Dear Matheson … Many thanks for your kind note. I was not in fact seriously worried by the Commissioners: I had not really expected anything different (having heard Davis McCAughey on them!), and whilst hoping for more, was satisfied with the assurance that student

148 Ibid Letter of Louis Matheson to Archbishop Woods, 13th April 1965
149 Ibid Letter of Louis Matheson to Archbishop Woods, 13th August 1965
accommodation would be approved … I hope that your own Monash requirements were not entirely frustrated by the Commission! Yours sincerely, Frank Woods.\footnote{Ibid 18\textsuperscript{th} August 1965} Professor Matheson replied: “Your Grace … I look forward to the next meeting on September 14\textsuperscript{th} when a plan of action may become apparent. A letter from Senator Gorton to the Chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee indicates that the Government is firmly committed to the idea of affiliated colleges. Martin is known to take a different view and this may account for your chilly reception. I think that a letter from you to Senator Gorton (or the P.M.?) might not be out of place – not asking for anything special but just inviting his interest. It is clear that a college for undergraduates should be our first target.”\footnote{Ibid 25\textsuperscript{th} August 1965}

The Secretary of the Monash University Council confirmed the view that other goals and purposes of the proposed Collegiate Community could fall outside the conditions for affiliation, advising the Vice-Chancellor that these could be considered later by the Council, separate from the affiliation of the student residence. He saw risks in interpreting the word “College” more widely than the University statute envisaged.\footnote{Ibid GA/2/COL Memorandum from N.F.Perry to the Vice-Chancellor, 8\textsuperscript{th} September 1965} Professor Matheson passed on this advice to Dr Sharwood.\footnote{Ibid AF/930/COL 13\textsuperscript{th} September 1965} This was not a major stumbling block for the proposed Community, but from late 1966 the implications of the financial requirements for the proposal certainly began to pose problems. While an offer of a grant of
$346,000 from the Commonwealth “was noted with satisfaction”, and the Premier had promised a grant equal to half the Commonwealth grant, it was clear that the Churches’ Collegiate Community Committee would also have to raise “at least a similar amount” to that of the State. 154 The trustees of the loan for the land sought an extension of the repayment date. 155 A further difficulty arose when it also became clear that “the fees which would need to be charged to residents of this Community would be so high that there is great risk that all places would not be filled … it seems quite possible that the project may not be practical in spite of the promised Commonwealth and State Government grants.”156

The fears were realised at a meeting of the Churches’ Committee in May 1968 when, noting the amount of interest to be paid on the loan for the land and the “impossibility” of finding sufficient funds to build, the decision was taken “with deep regret” to abandon the project. 157 Archbishop Woods particularly expressed his regret that the project had not been successful. 158 The Vice-Chancellor advised the Australian Universities Commission of the decision, noting that it would mean that there were just two affiliated Catholic colleges and no other denominational residences, and expressing the hope that Commonwealth funds would be transferred to the University to enable it to complete more

154 Ibid  GA/2/COL  Confidential Minutes, Committee meeting in the Archbishop’s Room, St Paul’s Cathedral Buildings, 16th December 1966.
155 Ibid
156 Ibid  R.Selby Smith (Dean, Faculty of Education) to Professor R.R.Andrew (Acting Vice-Chancellor), 4th July 1967
157 Ibid  Minutes, 24th May 1968
158 Ibid
accommodation in halls of residence.\textsuperscript{159} It appears that this occurred, as reported by Mr T. H. Timpson, Honorary Executive Officer for the Trustees, in June 1969: “Although everyone concerned has been very disappointed by not being able to proceed with the scheme as originally proposed it is gratifying to be able to record that no financial loss has been incurred by the Trustees and, further, that Monash University proposes to use the land (which it purchased from the Trustees) for the extension of residential colleges. To a considerable degree, therefore, the original hopes and plans of the Trustees and their Advisory (Churches’) Committee will be satisfied.”\textsuperscript{160} Archbishop Woods took greater satisfaction in the completion of the Religious Centre which, located at the centre of the campus, was to him “an outward and visible sign” of some bridging of the gap between religion and the mainly scientific ethos of any modern university and of the community at large.\textsuperscript{161}

\textbf{Mannix College:}

While Daniel Mannix, Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, had been supportive of the development of a Religious Centre, like Archbishop Woods he was keen to see the establishment of a church residential college. He had expressed strong support for university education on the day of his arrival in Melbourne in 1913, and was instrumental in the raising of funds for Newman College at Melbourne

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Ibid}  J.A.L.Matheson to Sir Henry Basten (Chairman AUC), 29\textsuperscript{th} May 1968

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Ibid}  26\textsuperscript{th} June 1969

\textsuperscript{161} Sir Frank Woods, Occasional, p.5
University.\textsuperscript{162} Near the end of his long episcopate and life, he wrote in September 1959 to the Interim Council of Monash University seeking a site within the University for a residential college like Newman College. He was informed that the University welcomed the idea of such a College, but that the University would not be able to alienate any of its land. The Catholic Church already had a site intended for a future parish church opposite the main entrance to the University, and it was therefore designated as a site for a College.\textsuperscript{163} It was, however, not until after the death of Archbishop Mannix in November 1963, that the first meeting of the Council of the Residential College for men students “proposed to be erected on land owned by the Roman Catholic Trusts Corporation for the Diocese of Melbourne” was held on 6\textsuperscript{th} December 1963 in the presence of the new Archbishop, Justin Simmonds.\textsuperscript{164} The meeting adopted a draft constitution and, following application to the University, the proposed College was granted affiliation on 9\textsuperscript{th} December. It was this application that prompted the University to enact an Affiliation Statute which contained as its “most important condition” the requirement that residents be students and staff of the University, and that “the rules of admission … shall not provide for any religious, racial or political test save that a residential institution sponsored by a religious or similar organisation may, when selecting entrants, give some

\textsuperscript{162} Gabrielle L. McMullen *Omnia Omnibus – All things to all Collegians: The first twenty-five years of Mannix College* Monash University Publications, 1993, p.1
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid p.1
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid p.3
preference to members of that organisation."\(^{165}\) This was indeed something of a further concession in giving official recognition to a religious body working in association with a secular campus. The Vice-Chancellor noted that he looked forward to a “long and fruitful association with the Catholic College”, which was named ‘Mannix College’ as a tribute to the late Archbishop and “as fitting in with the University’s own policy of naming its buildings after outstanding Australians."\(^{166}\) Archbishop Simmonds invited the Dominican Order to conduct the College on behalf of the Archdiocese.\(^{167}\)

The Catholic community was more successful in raising the necessary one quarter of the funds required for the building of the College, the other three quarters coming from Commonwealth and State grants.\(^{168}\) It was not to be for the 1964-1966 triennium, but the foundation stone was eventually laid by the next Archbishop, James (later Cardinal) Knox, on 23\(^{rd}\) May 1968, and the College was officially opened on 28\(^{th}\) February 1969, initially as an all-male college and, from 1974, as co-residential.\(^{169}\) At the laying of the foundation stone, the Chancellor, Sir Robert Blackwood, noted that the occasion was “another milestone in the progress of the University. It is a distinctive one in that it is the first residential affiliated college.”\(^{170}\) It has remained so.

\(^{165}\) Louis Matheson \textit{op.cit.} p.105
\(^{166}\) Gabrielle L. McMullin \textit{op.cit.} : from a joint press statement by the Catholic Archdiocese and the University.
\(^{167}\) \textit{Ibid}
\(^{168}\) \textit{Ibid} p.4
\(^{169}\) \textit{Ibid} pp.3-8
\(^{170}\) \textit{Ibid} p.4
From 1969 to 1977, the Marist Order ran a ‘Marist College’ on Normanby Road to the north of the campus. It was much smaller than Mannix College and the Halls of Residence, and in its early years managed to function with full occupancy. In 1974, sharply increased costs in maintenance and catering were reported\(^{171}\), and in 1975, in addition to continuing economic difficulties, it was noted that demand for places was simply a result of a shortage of alternative accommodation rather than from a preference for “the formal and institutional living style of the university college.”\(^{172}\) Clayton was not Carlton, but the 1970s was a period of an increasing preference for university halls, or for self-catered accommodation both on and off campus. In May 1977, the Dean of the College, Brother Desmond Crowe, wrote to the new Vice-Chancellor, Professor R. L. Martin, indicating that declining numbers and increasing costs made it impossible for the College to continue functioning in its present form and under its present title.\(^{173}\) The College was subsequently sold to the University, which re-opened it as a student residence and later also as the location for the Monash University English Language Centre.

**Conclusion:**

Though Anglican bishops – Ernest Burgmann, Kenneth Clements, J. S. Moyes, Frank Woods, Felix Arnott - were in the forefront of church relations with these

---
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new universities, there were mixed outcomes in the desire to set up denominational residential colleges. Unlike at the University of New South Wales and at Macquarie University in Sydney, no Anglican or other Protestant denominational college was established, with the inability to raise sufficient funds being the most significant stumbling block. Inter-denominationalism and ecumenism played a major part, however, in the establishment of Burgmann College at the ANU and of the Religious Centre at Monash. Denominationalism was more pronounced at New England, expressed particularly in the later 1960s through the work of the chaplaincies. Armidale, however, was not a place as subject to the growth of student unrest and protest in the mid to late 1960s, as were the campuses in Canberra and Clayton. Any perception at the ANU and at Monash of sectarian division or the demands of dogma, or any hint of contravention of terms of affiliation, were clearly mollified by the co-operative nature of relationships between the churches and those of other faiths, and between church and campus. Religion was represented more broadly and inclusively; at the ANU, Burgmann College was on the periphery along with the other colleges and halls, and while at Monash the Religious Centre was located at the ‘heart’ of the campus, it was “as if to say that through the scientific eye all religions were the same.” Monash particularly had its turbulent times at the end of the 1960s and in the early 1970s, with demonstrations and protests – as Louis Matheson recalls, almost continual insurrection of one kind or another”.  

174 Simon Marginson op.cit. p.16  
175 Louis Matheson op.cit. p.138
It was “a dreadful time”. But the Administration, and not the Religious Centre, was the target. Before “a quieter time in Australian education” after 1975, when, for example, Commonwealth funds and the desire for the more traditional collegiate style of residence declined, what were perceived as the more denominationally and dogmatically distinct new colleges in Sydney - at UNSW and Macquarie University - were to be very much the subject of campus protests. At these universities in the early 1970s, the sacred and the secular came into widely publicised conflict.
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CHAPTER TEN

More Than Just A Case Of Old Testament Meets Gay Liberation:

Robert Menzies College and Jeremy Fisher, Macquarie University, 1973

“It wasn’t a comfortable position for the University or for me …”

On Saturday 26th May 1973, Jeremy Fisher, then a first year student at Macquarie University, attempted suicide in his room at Robert Menzies College, where he was a resident. The Master of the College, the Reverend Dr Alan Cole, was called to his room, and Jeremy was taken to the nearby North Ryde Psychiatric Centre. Following treatment and observation, he was discharged the next day. Dr Cole spoke with Jeremy’s parents and told them that, in view of the impending exams and the consequent pressure amongst residents of the College, it would be best that Jeremy did not return until after the exam period.

The Master had by this time discovered, from documents in Jeremy’s room, that he was Secretary of the Gay Liberation Association at Macquarie. In a meeting he had with Jeremy a number of days later, Dr Cole noted again his concern that he not return to College for the time-being, and, further, questioned him about his involvement with Gay Liberation, asking if it was simply a crusading concern on
his part or more personal. In response to Jeremy’s reply that it was the latter, Dr Cole indicated that he regarded homosexuality as a sickness that required treatment, and that he could not permit an active homosexual to be resident in a Christian college. If he was to move back, he would need to accept help to overcome the problem of his sexuality. Allan Cole recalls: “I had to say to him ‘I’m sorry, I cannot accept the responsibility of you coming back into the College. If you want to accept Christian help, I can make it available to you. If you want to accept medical help or psychological help, I can introduce you. I can’t do anything other than that’ … I think I made it quite clear to the students that I would not take … active practising homosexuals or active practising heterosexuals in the College, because this was our Christian standard, and that was that.”

**A Religious Test?:**

Though convinced that he neither wanted treatment for something he regarded as “so fundamental” to his life, nor that he wanted to return to the College, Jeremy Fisher noted that he was aware of the University By-Laws; by which, no doubt, he meant in particular By-Law XVI.5 of the Macquarie University Act, that stated that an affiliated college “shall not impose any religious test as a condition of membership of the college and shall not require of any member that he
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1 Statement submitted by Jeremy Fisher to the Registrar, Macquarie University, 15th July 1973, p.1, Macquarie University Archives (MUA) PS 22
2 Interview with the Reverend Dr Alan Cole, Mosman, 26th May 1997.
3 Statement by Jeremy Fisher *op.cit.* p.3
participate in any religious observance.” 5 The day after his meeting with Dr Cole, on the 5th June, Jeremy Fisher therefore sought advice from the Macquarie University Students’ Council, whose President in that year, Jeff Hayler, was also President of Macquarie’s Gay Liberation Association. Jeremy Fisher believed that the Master's actions constituted a religious test and were therefore in breach of the By-Law.

There followed a period of protest that was to involve both students and staff of the University, as well as, for example, officials and members of the Builders Labourers’ Federation. The issue was even brought to the attention of the Federal Senate, with Senator R. E. Gietzelt asking the Attorney-General, Senator Lionel Murphy: “Will the minister take steps to see that all institutions receiving …Federal funds accept the fundamental principle that no student will be discriminated against on the grounds of race, creed, politics or sexuality?”6 On the 29th June, following a meeting of the Macquarie University Council, the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Alex Mitchell, issued a press release concerning “certain events said to have happened recently at Robert Menzies College.” He noted that the Council “is concerned that the facts about the situation are not currently known and is anxious about the possible effects of the continued spread of rumour and suspicion.” 7 In order to establish the facts as far as possible, the Council decided to set up, from its members, a Committee of Enquiry to be

4 Ibid p.2
5 Macquarie University Act , as amended by Act No.56, 1970, By-laws Chapter XVI Paragraph 5
6 ‘Murphy takes up ban on student’ Sydney Morning Herald 12th September 1973
chaired by Professor Bruce Mansfield, the University’s first Professor of History and Head of the ‘School of History, Philosophy and Politics’, and later Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Also on the committee was Lindsay Allen, the student representative on the University Council and a member of the Gay Liberation Association.

A Background of Tension and Unrest:

The issue brought into play a background of student unrest concerning the nature of on-campus accommodation, and of tension that had arisen over the efforts of churches to have recognition by the University of chaplains working among its students. The period was, as already noted on campuses throughout Australia and beyond, one in which the mores of student life and activity was marked by what Patrick O'Farrell in his history of UNSW refers to as anti-authoritarianism, anti-religion, and aggressive personal laxity.\(^8\) Robert Menzies College had opened “in the most explosive period of (Macquarie) University’s experience with student activism.”\(^9\) Not only was there seen to be an issue in relation to Jeremy Fisher of discrimination on the grounds of sexuality, but also, in the context of a new secular university, one of violation of academic and individual freedom by the imposition of a religious test or condition, in breach of the College’s terms of

\(^8\) Patrick O'Farrell *UNSW A Portrait*, p.162

\(^9\) Mark Hutchinson ‘A Scottish Name …’ p.75
affiliation with the University. The sacred, it seemed, had encroached upon secular ground.

Two years after teaching began at Macquarie in 1967, with increasing demand for accommodation, nearly sixty students occupied a “tent city” on the University’s front lawn in protest against the lack of funding for university housing, and against the University’s failure to provide more of the houses it owned on its land for lease to students. It was claimed that of twenty-one houses owned and leased by the University, only two were leased to Macquarie students.10 It was finally agreed to lease another two properties to the Macquarie University Students’ Council. It was always envisaged that there would be both self-catered housing and collegiate style accommodation on campus, but Commonwealth and State funds were more readily available to groups wishing to establish colleges, rather than ‘housing-style’ accommodation. The University saw the development of residences as important to the growth of a sense of community and as essential for meeting the needs of groups for which its charter particularly provided – the disadvantaged, rural students and those involved in distance education vacation schools.11 Early plans, however, for tower block residences met funding obstacles from both the Federal and State governments, as did later proposals for the preferred housing-style rather than apartment-type accommodation.12 The University was caught in a difficult situation in trying to meet a variety of housing preferences while at the same time trying to meet the

10 ‘Tent City: the sheriff didn’t come to town’ *Arena*, 14th October 1969, p.5
11 Mark Hutichinson *op.cit.* p.85
requirements of gaining government funding. Dunmore Lang College, opened in 1972, and Robert Menzies College, opened in 1973, had more easily attracted government support and in 1973 offered the only significant campus-based accommodation for students of the University. Writing in Arena, Jeff Hayler, the President of the Macquarie University Students’ Council at that time, noted: “We were less than enthusiastic when the first accommodation on this campus arrived in the form of Dunmore Lang College, which is associated with the Presbyterian Church. Our concern at this type of accommodation is not because we might object to it ‘per se’ but because there is no alternative type of accommodation on campus.”

While in many ways this situation was not the fault of the University authorities, it inevitably seemed strange in a University that was determined to be secular in character, as was the tradition of Australian universities; that, in the words of its first Vice-Chancellor, Professor Mitchell, was to be “non-committal as to any philosophy of life or belief.” Certainly, for some time, the University resisted approaches from the churches to provide facilities for and to recognise chaplains, arguing that it had “itself no function in the promotion of the religious or spiritual

12 Ibid pp.86-89
13 Jeff Hayler ‘Because It’s a Christian College’, Arena Vol.6 No.8, 24th July 1973, p.4
14 Interview with Emeritus Professor A.G.Mitchell op.cit. Alex Mitchell recalled that when it was suggested to him that the University’s coat of arms include a cross from the coat of arms of Governor Lachlan Macquarie, he thought: “God, have they gone mad?” You know, a religious symbol for a secular institution ... I was determined I was not going to have that.” Instead, he suggested the Macquarie lighthouse, celebrating Macquarie the builder.
life of the students who are admitted to it.’"

For Alex Mitchell, it was a matter of balance and fairness, of intellectual honesty and of a duty to the State – a view he recalled as being “very stringent … pretty rigid in some ways; but it was motivated by the need … to insist that the University was a secular body, and that it was non-committal as to any philosophy of life or belief.”

Following continuing representations, especially from Cardinal Gilroy and Anglican Archbishop Marcus Loane, the University eventually allowed for the listing by the Registrar of “advisers” to students, though the churches began to appoint “chaplains”. Facilities were not provided until after 1976, when Edwin Webb became Vice-Chancellor.

In allowing for colleges, there was clearly a sense that they could be contained, whereas chaplains, noted Alex Mitchell, had been known in other places to challenge the content of courses and to evangelise students on campus. As had occurred in the other Australian universities since the foundation of Sydney University in 1850 and its first college, St. Paul’s, the terms of affiliation included the requirement that no religious test could be administered to any person as a condition of entry. In this context, the Jeremy Fisher case triggered a trenchant response: (given the situation with accommodation) “the exclusion from the Robert Menzies College of a male homosexual, Jeremy Fisher, by the

---

16 Interview with A.G.Mitchell *op.cit.*
17 M.Hutchinson ‘Religion and University Education …’ p.362. The Anglican Chaplain was the Reverend Peter Taylor, then Curate at South Turramurra. Around that time, he had let it be known that he could be found at a certain reader’s desk on the third level of the library.
Master of the College the Rev Alan Cole is made even more monstrous than the inherent oppressiveness of the act deems it to be … *Arena* calls upon the University Council to force the powers-that-be at Robert Menzies to cease the oppression of homosexuals and any other minority group which may in future offend the Christian principles of the Master.” 19

**The Master and His Motives:**

The man appointed as the first Master of Robert Menzies College, Alan Cole, was a graduate of Trinity College Dublin and London University. A linguist and theologian, he came to Sydney in 1951 to join the staff of Moore College. From 1952 to 1972, he “see-sawed” between missionary work in Taiwan, China and Singapore, and lecturing at Moore College and Sydney University, where he was Head of the Old Testament Department within the Board of Studies in Divinity. During this time he declined invitations to become Principal of Moore College and an Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Sydney. He was attracted to Robert Menzies College by the challenge of a new work, and the seeming opportunity to be on his own and to try out some of his own ideas - what he recently acknowledged, in looking back, as “somewhat exaggerated ideas of what a Christian college could be and what it could achieve.” 20 His friend and colleague, Sir Marcus Loane, who was Archbishop at the time of his appointment

---

18 *Ibid* p.358  
19 *Robert Menzies College – support action against oppression*, *Arena op.cit.* p.1  
20 Interview with the Reverend Dr Alan Cole *op.cit.*
to Robert Menzies, describes him as a man with “a quick and fertile mind ... often racy, always spontaneous, sometimes scintillating ... He was both by nature and by desire a man whose aim was to conciliate warring factions, but he would not budge in personal conviction.” 21 Others, such as the Vice-Chancellor, were also drawn by his quick mind and Irish wit, but, in the midst of the Jeremy Fisher matter, were clearly frustrated by his ever-ready public defense of his personal convictions: “I liked Alan and I had a lot to do with him, but ... I wished he would just shut up. I think that would have helped things.”22

Familiar with undergraduate work, but much more used to life in theological colleges, Alan Cole acknowledges that he was not prepared for the tougher scene that a more open and yet to be developed university college was to present; nor, indeed, was he perhaps fully attuned to the degree of sensitivity that existed within the University concerning its secular position. He recalls that his motives were “(i) to evangelise non-Christian students (ii) to build up Christians in their university years (iii) to build a Christian environment, moulded by Christian values for all students of whatever faith or none, and (iv) to foster a Christian approach to academic study.” 23 The College’s fundraising publicity was much more general. The College environment would “encourage discussion at the highest level on matters of the spirit and of the intellect.”24 The College would

21 Marcus L.Loane These Happy Warriors op.cit. pp.120-121
22 Interview with Alex Mitchell op.cit.
23 Letter from Dr Alan Cole to Ian Walker, 26th June 1997
24 The Case for a Residential College Fundraising Brochure for Robert Menzies College, MUA op.cit.
help to meet an ever-growing need for graduates of a special type, combining professional competence and knowledge with “a developed self-awareness, a humane tolerance of individual differences.”  

Press Release, Pink Ban, and Radical Scholars:

Jeremy Fisher approached the Macquarie University Students’ Council on the 5th June 1973. He noted that his parents “discovering the fierce note of evangelical Christianity rising in tumultuous abandon from the depths of the college, thought it best for me to stay away from the college permanently.” The next day, members of the Students’ Council, led by Jeff Hayler, met with Dr Cole: “Cole answered all our questions with considerable frankness and a disturbing naivety”, wrote Jeff Hayler; “He struck me as an honest and well-meaning man completely out of touch with modern campus reality.” The ABC TV program ‘This Day Tonight’ aired the story on the night of Monday 20th June, and the next day, the Students' Council Executive issued a Press Release indicating that Dr Cole would not budge from his position of excluding a male homosexual student unless he agreed to sublimate his sexual preference and seek help for what Dr Cole had referred to as “a perversion of God's Law.” The exclusion was seen as an imposition of the Master's personal religious and philosophical beliefs upon a resident of the College, based upon the Master's particular Christian belief about

25 Ibid
26 ‘A Sermon on Satanism’ Arena Vol. 6, No.8, 24th July 1973, p.5
27 Arena op.cit. ‘Because It’s a Christian College
28 Macquarie University Students’ Council, Press Release, 18th June 1973 MUA op.cit.
homosexuality. The Students' Council therefore saw this as the imposition of a religious test. The Press Release also noted resentment that had built up over collegiate accommodation being the only type of accommodation on campus, and that while the Commonwealth Government had finally indicated support for the construction of what was believed would be less costly non-collegiate accommodation, the State Government refused to contribute. There was little criticism about Dunmore Lang College, but because it was always fully occupied, the only option was Robert Menzies College with its “repressive atmosphere”. The Press Release signalled that Lindsay Allen, the Vice-Chairman of the Students' Council and student member of the University Council, would move at the next meeting of the University Council for the disaffiliation of the College. It also indicated that contact had been made with Jack Mundey of the Builders Labourers' Federation (BLF), whose members were working on the completion of the College building and on other sites at the University.

The BLF placed what came to be known as the “pink ban” on all construction work at Macquarie, with the demand that the University should make an “unequivocal statement” that there be no discrimination against homosexuals, and that “human dignity” should be restored. A “silent, peaceful, orderly

29 Ibid
30 Meredith & Verity Burgmann Green Bans, Red Union: Environmental activism and the NSW Builders Labourers’ Federation UNSW Press, Sydney, 1998, p.141. Meredith Burgmann, has noted that, at a time when, despite the emergence of Gay Liberation, there was still a great deal of anti-homosexual feeling in society, the ban was regarded as reflecting more an attitude towards the “dictatorial attitude” of the Master than one concerned with the issue of homosexuality.
demonstration” was called by the Students’ Union for outside the Council building on the afternoon that Lindsay Allen was to put the motion for disaffiliation. On the day of the meeting, the 28th June 1973, members of the Macquarie University ‘Radical Scholars Association’, mostly from the Schools of History, Philosophy and Politics, Behavioural Sciences, and Modern Languages, wrote to Council members, strongly criticising the behaviour of the Master towards Jeremy Fisher, and asking the Council “to demand of the College that Mr Fisher be immediately and unconditionally re-admitted.” Following the Council meeting, at which the Committee of Enquiry was established, the Vice-Chancellor responded to the ‘Radical Scholars’ that the Council had no authority to issue to an affiliated college “whose autonomy is respected by the University, the kind of demand that (they) proposed.”

A Missionary Task:

Alan Cole firmly believed that he had been misrepresented; that he had acted on medical advice, and on an objection to homosexuality that was based on something “far more basic” than religious grounds. He believed that what he had done and said were within clear guidelines that had been issued or stated to the College residents, and that he was acting with due regard both to the welfare

---

31 Macquarie University Students’ Council Another Message to Students, and an Appeal 26th June 1973 MUA op.cit.
32 MUA op.cit. Signatures included those of Max Kelly, Colin Doxford, Mervyn Hartwig, Jill Roe and Bev Kingston.
33 Ibid
34 Notes made by Alan Cole to Alex Mitchell, and passed on to Bruce Mansfield, 2nd July 1973, MUA op.cit.
and happiness of a student who had attempted suicide, and to the welfare of the College as a whole. “The real trouble is, he reflected, you can't stand up in public and say the whole truth; say ‘this wretched fellow tried to commit suicide’… you would ruin the fellow if you say that.” 35 A member of the New University Colleges Council and an Associate Professor in History at Macquarie, Bruce Harris, wrote to Professor Mansfield, indicating his strong support for the Master: “Alan Cole has acted in (Jeremy Fisher’s) best interests on medical advice … The case is being used by the Gay Libbers as part of their confrontation campaign, and they have spread deliberate distortions and untruths … A College has the right to arrange its own internal affairs, and the Master has the full support of the Board in declining to have active practising homosexuals as residents, having regard to the interests of the College as a whole.”36 In a diary entry following a meeting with Alan Cole early in July 1973, Bruce Mansfield noted the difficulty of a situation involving the sensitive issue of suicide, the more controversial issues at the time concerning homosexuality, and the baiting of a zeal openly to defend deeply held convictions about Christian beliefs and standards. He believed much of the difficulty arose from Alan Cole's “public expression of opinion on homosexuality”, even though, he noted, the so-called “exclusion” of Jeremy Fisher could have been explained without reference to those views.37 He acknowledged, however, that the Master had probably been badly advised by “Anglican PR people” - whether this was the case or not - but

35 Interview with Alan Cole op.cit.
36 Bruce Harris to Bruce Mansfield, 28th June 1973, MUA op.cit.
that it had “coincided in any case with his (Cole's) own inclination, since he does see this as a missionary task - to confront (the) secular world of (the) University by imperatives of faith.”\textsuperscript{38} It was certainly a challenge to the Committee of Enquiry to determine the facts as to whether, in all this, a religious test had been applied in breach of the College's terms of affiliation with the University. The committee decided that it should take a rather strict and narrow view as to what the Council required it to do, and therefore it determined not to consider or express views on the general issues of principle.\textsuperscript{39}

The Committee sought only to interview Jeremy Fisher, Dr Cole, and members of the College's Board. Jeremy Fisher made a written submission, and was also interviewed.\textsuperscript{40} The College Board, the New University Colleges Council, and the Master, declined interview and sought written details from the University Council on the complaints made. Alan Cole, nevertheless, in a note to the Vice-Chancellor pointed out that “Jeremy Fisher was not ‘expelled’ from the College: it was a question of re-entry after absence. His room is still held: but it is true that it is ‘re-entry under conditions’… Jeremy Fisher doesn’t even want to come back! That is the absurdity.”\textsuperscript{41} In response to questions put by the University, based on the complaints, Dr John Hawke, on behalf of NUCC, wrote to the

\textsuperscript{37} Copy of diary entry sent by Bruce Mansfield to Ian Walker, 18th May 1999. The diary has been lodged with the Macquarie University Archives as the ‘Mansfield Macquarie Diary (2)’ as part of PS 022 ‘The Mansfield Collection’.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid}

\textsuperscript{39} Bruce Mansfield: Notes following a meeting of the committee, 9th July 1973, MUA \textit{op.cit.}

\textsuperscript{40} Jeremy Fisher's statement, with a letter to the Registrar, is dated 15th July 1973, MUA \textit{op.cit.}

\textsuperscript{41} Alan Cole to Professor Mitchell; notes passed on by Alex Mitchell to Bruce Mansfield, 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 1973, MUA \textit{op.cit.}
Registrar asserting that the conditions of re-entry did not constitute exclusion; that it was Jeremy Fisher who severed his association with the College; and that a religious test had not been applied.42

Under the heading “Trouble at Macquarie - The Robert Menzies College”, Gavin Souter in a lengthy article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* noted that until the 18-year-old first year student tried to commit suicide in his room at Robert Menzies College, things had been fairly peaceful at the “concrete fortress of Macquarie.”43 Four days later, the Macquarie University Staff Association held a “Special General Meeting” in which it deplored “the fact that a university college largely supported by public funds (had) discriminated against a student at least partly on the basis of his sexual preference, and that such discrimination constituted a violation of academic freedom.”44 Jill Roe, on behalf of the ‘Radical Scholars’, wrote to Bruce Mansfield urging the University Council to dissociate the name of the University from any action that could be construed by the general public as discrimination on the basis of sexual preference, and to call upon NUCC to show why the College should not be disaffiliated.45

---

42 John Hawke to Registrar, 17th August 1973, MUA *op.cit.*
43 Gavin Souter, *Sydney Morning Herald* Saturday 14th July 1973
44 MUA *op.cit.*
45 Jill Roe to Bruce Mansfield, 14th August 1973 MUA *op.cit.*
The Common Weal and the Committee Report:

It seems clear that, while the College Board and NUCC gave their support to the Master, various members were concerned about the impact this matter was having in the University and, indeed, the impact it might have on future enrolments. Alan Cole recalled that one or two said that they had great sympathy for him through the trouble, but that they didn't like to be seen going in and out of his house! 46 He was also disappointed by the unwillingness of some “very fine … academics, fine committed Christians” at the University, to give support: “Our tradition of academic disinterest has made many of our people reluctant to take that sort of stand.” 47 When some members of the Board urged him not to do anything that would make the situation worse, Alan Cole replied: “If it’s right, we’ve got to do it, whatever happens.” 48 In his first year as Master of New College, and in the light of the events at Macquarie, Stuart Babbage wrote: “I have been increasingly concerned about the strategy we should adopt here at New College in relation to students who are alienated from the Church and whose lives are disordered and messed up. What is required is not coercion but compassion. I am troubled about forms of personal evangelism that are manipulative and coercive … I hope that we can demonstrate that, as a community, we are both loving and accepting …” A homosexual student in

46 Interview with Dr Alan Cole op.cit.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid.
College, knowing that the pressure was on, asked me whether I wished him to leave. I said that, if he did, I would greatly regret it."^{49}

The University sought an opinion from the law firm ‘Stephen Jaques & Stephen’ on the general interpretation of By-Law XVI.5, related to religious tests. The opinion noted, among other things, freedom of religion is not absolute: “beliefs entertained by a religious body as religious beliefs may be inconsistent with the maintenance of civil government … freedom of religion may not be invoked to cloak and dissemble subversive opinions or practises and operations dangerous to the common weal.”^{50} The opinion concluded that the By-Law prevented the College from requiring anyone to “subscribe to any article or formulary of faith, or make any declaration, or to take any oath respecting his religious belief or profession” in order to gain admission to the College; but, the By-Law did not prevent the college “endeavouring to create an atmosphere … conducive to the advancement of a particular religion or a particular form of it … The By-Law does not protect unsocial actions or those prejudicial to the college community as a whole.”^{51} The opinion seemed to give sufficient grounds to argue that if a student was not required to subscribe to a particular set of beliefs or belief, the College was not imposing a religious test if it took other actions believed to be for the good government and preservation of the College community; measures

^{49} Stuart Babbage, ‘Master of New College’, op.cit..
^{51} Ibid p.10
taken in the interests of the “common weal” of the College. The Committee presented its report to the University Council on the 27th September 1973. It expressed its regret that neither members of the New University Colleges’ Council nor the Master met with the committee, though it understood the reasons that had been given. It was therefore “unable fully to carry out its task ...(or) to reach a firm conclusion.” 52 Nevertheless, the Council having considered the facts as far as they were able to be determined by the Committee, and the legal opinion, concluded that “it had not been established that a breach of By-Law XVI.5 had occurred.” It noted that “except as provided in the by-laws, the colleges of the University are autonomous bodies which are exclusively responsible for their own administration.” 53

The Council’s decision was noted in the minutes of NUCC on the 14th November; it was also sufficient for the BLF to lift its bans! 54 As best as could be done, the matter of any breach of the University By-Laws by the imposition of a religious test had, it seemed, been determined in favour of the College. The Council's terms of reference for the committee had been, as far as possible, satisfied, and the Committee discharged. The Master's requirement of treatment as a condition of re-entry - either in relation to Jeremy Fisher's attempted suicide or to his homosexuality, or both - was not able to be seen clearly as an imposition

54 M & V Burgmann op.cit. p.142
of a religious test, even though Alan Cole spoke of homosexuality in terms of it being “contrary to God's will and law.”

**Academic Values and Civil Liberties:**

Nevertheless, Dr Cole, perhaps in the first instance somewhat unwittingly, had indeed challenged the secular world of the University. The issue of whether a religious test had been applied or not, became subsumed in the wider view that an organisation officially associated with the University had discriminated against a student on the grounds of his sexuality. Many believed the discrimination to be a consequence of the personal and particular beliefs of Dr Alan Cole, and that he only increased that view by his public pronouncements about homosexuality. It was further believed that the University, in confining its conclusions to a rather narrow view of the meaning of ‘religious test’ and not considering what might be seen as wider issues of principle, had condoned the practise of discrimination. This was held to be in contravention of academic values “which presupposed adherence to civil liberties.” Thus many contended that the declared Christian beliefs of the Master of Robert Menzies College had violated the tenets of academic freedom. Church and College had compromised the Campus.

---

56 Minutes of a meeting of the School of Historical, Philosophical and Political Studies, 15th November 1973, p.2, MUA *op.cit.*
On the 15th November 1973, some forty members of the School of History, Philosophy and Politics attended a special meeting of the School requested to discuss whether University regulations denied the School an “assumed right to express views on civil liberties which may be alleged to be infringed within the University and its affiliated bodies from time to time.” 57 Colin Doxford, a Senior Tutor in History and member of the ‘Radical Scholars’, in a note to Bruce Mansfield as Head of School, condemned the moralism and legalism with which there had been a refusal of the “Establishment mind on campus … to speak out against persecution”, and that Bruce Mansfield had seemingly “accepted the humiliation of a student of the University - a student of 08101 (one of your students) - by an institution associated with the University, without any sign of protest.” 58 At the meeting, three motions were passed by a large majority: (i) “In the opinion of the School the Regulations Governing the organisation of the Schools do not deny the School the right to express views on matters pertaining to civil liberties within the University community; (ii) … the recent matter at the Robert Menzies College of a case of alleged discrimination against a student of this University is relevant to its academic programme; and (iii) … the School considered the statement of the University Council on the Menzies College affair to have been inadequate and unsatisfactory because no positive attempt was

57 Ibid
58 Colin Doxford to Bruce Mansfield, 22nd October 1973, MUA op.cit.
made to dissociate the name and practice of this University from discrimination against homosexual persons.” 59

Opposing views included what was considered to be the impracticability of a School concerned essentially with academic affairs taking up the cause of any alleged infringement of civil liberties; and that it was unrealistic to expect the University Council, “when no actual discrimination had been proved, to utter a gratuitous statement about discrimination against homosexuals.” 60

**Conclusion:**

Gavin Souter, in his *Herald* article, commented: “Whatever the outcome, the incident at Robert Menzies raises the question of how relevant traditional university colleges are to a rapidly changing campus.” 61 In a sense, though, it was not so much any “traditional” nature of the College that was the problem. Indeed, in a number of respects, Robert Menzies College, like New College at the University of New South Wales, was intended to be somewhat different from the earlier colleges of Australia’s first universities. Alan Cole, for example, discarded the trappings of traditional colleges – platforms, high tables, and the like – as “nonsense”.62 It was, however, more in the deliberately non-traditional evangelical style of the College, and more particularly of its Master, that the

---

59 Minutes, School of HPPS, MUA *op.cit.* One of the main speakers in favour of the first motion was Professor Don Aitkin, then Professor of Politics, and later Vice-Chancellor of Canberra University.

60 *Ibid* p.6
problem arose. Evangelism was seen as a primary task in relating to the students of the College and in engaging with the University. The College and the Master were seeking to do a new thing, founded upon Christian faith and values; imperatives chiefly expressed through a well established evangelical tradition in the Sydney Anglican diocese, and fostered by the early to mid-twentieth century growth and impact of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, especially at Sydney University. Macquarie University and the Vice-Chancellor were also seeking to do a new thing, founded upon a developed tradition within Australian universities of secularism. This tradition was strengthened in the post-World War II years by the imperatives of ever-increasing advances in science and technology, and, almost ironically, by the seeming reaction to those imperatives of the radical forces of free expression. It might be said that such determinedly held views of evangelism and secularism inevitably would come into conflict.

The clash that occurred between College and Campus, the sacred and the secular, over Jeremy Fisher was, as Gavin Souter described it, “more than just a case of Old Testament meets Gay Liberation.”63 At the same time, however, with the continuing demands for campus accommodation, and, it must be said, with wider community connections in common, it seems that more realistic perspectives were gained about the role of a new denominational college on a new campus,

61 Gavin Souter op.cit.
62 Alan Cole op.cit.
63 Gavin Souter op.cit.
though neither the Master nor the Vice-Chancellor would have resiled from the imperatives that initially formed the vision and hope for their work. Alan Cole would not do so now, though he has described his and his wife’s years at Robert Menzies College as “probably the hardest years of our lives.” 64 The late Alex Mitchell noted that “it wasn’t a comfortable position for the University or for me, but … it settled down pretty quickly.” 65 In their history of Macquarie University, Mark Hutchinson and Bruce Mansfield note that Alex Mitchell saw the Robert Menzies College and the Jeremy Fisher affair as one of a few episodes that preceded what was regarded as the University’s most stormy year, 1974 – a year in which Bruce Mansfield reflected that, had the Jeremy Fisher case occurred then, he probably would not have been appointed to chair the Committee of Enquiry.66 It was also a year in which the Council of the University of NSW appointed Justice Gordon Samuels to chair a Committee of Enquiry into whether the mode of management of Warrane College was “contrary to the interests of the University generally.” 67

64 Alan Cole op.cit.
65 Alex Mitchell op.cit.
66 Interview with Emeritus Professor Bruce Mansfield, Gordon, 15th September 1997
67 Committee of Inquiry into Warrane College, UNSW Council, November 1974, p.1
CHAPTER ELEVEN

God’s Mafia:

*Opus Dei* and the Enquiry into Warrane College

“I learned what it took to have the guts to be a Vice-Chancellor on the day of that turmoil in the Roundhouse.”


On the 9th August 1971 a group of several hundred students marched, or in the words of their resolution, “adjourned” to Warrane College, a Roman Catholic residential college for men on Anzac Parade within the campus of the University of NSW, following a lunchtime meeting in the Roundhouse attended by an estimated two thousand students. The meeting had passed a resolution demanding that the University end the lease of the College held by *Opus Dei*, a lay organisation officially recognised then by the Catholic Church as one of its ‘Secular Institutes’. The College had only been officially opened in June of that year.¹

Accusations, Protests and Demands:

The accusations made at the meeting were that *Opus Dei* (‘Work of God’) was an authoritarian, repressive, and anti-democratic organisation that had no place on a university campus.² Writing in *Tharunka*, the University’s student newspaper,

---

¹ ‘Students Besiege Uni College’ *Sydney Morning Herald* 10th August 1971
² Ibid
about his reasons for leaving the College in April of that year, Stan Correy referred to *Opus Dei* as “a very deadly form of cancer”, and that it was “the duty of every thinking Christian student in the college to eradicate it by the best means available.”³ In the same issue it was reported that two students of the College, Mike Smith and Phillip Moraghan, had been expelled, it seemed to the writer of the report, “as an attempt to silence the critics amongst the College residents.”⁴ There was ridicule of the College’s rules concerning visitors, especially as they applied to women who, when allowed to visit, were not permitted to proceed above the first floor. It had also been reported in an earlier issue of *Tharunka* that personal facts of College residents given in confidence and friendship “are filed and fed back to exploit in times of emotional weakness.”⁵

The mood of the meeting reflected the “sense in which all this was a standing affront and challenge to emergent student mores, marked by anti-authoritarianism, anti-religion, and aggressive personal laxity.”⁶ Some of the hundreds of student protestors gained entry to the College by climbing through a side window. The Master of the College, Dr Joseph Martins, called police and seven arrests were made. By 3.15pm, twenty-one police cars were parked beside the median strip in Anzac Parade.⁷ Particularly incensed by the involvement of the police and the arrests, the next day students held a further protest meeting in

---

³ *Tharunka 27th April 1971*
⁴ *Ibid*
⁵ *Ibid* 6th April 1971. It had also been claimed at the Roundhouse meeting that *Opus Dei* had been behind the recent disappearance of several thousand specially printed sex manuals which were to be distributed to students.
⁶ Patrick O’Farrell *UNSW – A Portrait* p.162
⁷ *Ibid*
the Roundhouse. This time it was estimated that there were some three thousand
students present. The then Vice-Chancellor, Rupert Myers, recalls: “it was a
dreadful day … I learned a lot about myself … I learned what it took to have the
guts to be a Vice-Chancellor on the day of that turmoil in the Roundhouse.”8 He
commented that “it was a sort of blooding of the Vice-Chancellor.”9 The
Roundhouse “was packed to the rafters … it was being led by a small coterie of
people who were opposed either to the churches – anything to do with the church
– or with Opus Dei … Warrane College (was) the embodiment of all that was
evil … as far as they were concerned.”10

The Vice-Chancellor had been monitoring the meeting from the Chancellery, but
decided he should be closer to the Roundhouse and so moved to the Metallurgy
building next to the Union. He then felt he should observe the meeting first hand.
He noted that “the principals were standing there, whipping up the crowd,
making assertions about what was wrong …”11 As the Vice-Chancellor moved
around the perimeter of the Roundhouse, closer to the platform, he was
recognised by one of the leaders of the meeting and was called on to speak. “I
wasn’t prepared for it. My knees were knocking; it was a terrifying
experience.”12

8 Interview with Sir Rupert Myers op.cit.
9 Sue Knights Rupert Horace Myers p.83
10 Interview with Sir Rupert Myers op.cit.
11 Sue Knights op.cit. p.83
12 Interview with Sir Rupert Myers op.cit.
Professor Myers was prepared enough to have taken with him a bell on a leather thong and a referee’s whistle, both of which had been given to him by Ian Channel, the University ‘Wizard’. “I gave a tinkle on the bell and blew the whistle just to get attention, which scared us all out of our wits because it came over rather loud!”\(^{13}\) There had been calls at the meeting for a further march on Warrane and a march to the Chancellery, but surprisingly the crowd for the most part gave its attention to the Vice-Chancellor. He indicated that if the conditions of the lease agreement with *Opus Dei* for Warrane College had been breached, the lease could be terminated, but he had found no evidence of this. He had not been consulted about police coming to the College, but while it had been his practice not to call police in such domestic matters, the lessees of the College had the right to make such a decision.\(^{14}\) He recalls: “I started talking about the role of the university and its relationship with the colleges … I said that a university is a place where there is freedom to study, and where my job was to make sure that students could come and learn, and people could come and teach and do research … and that if I saw it necessary to preserve this, I wouldn’t hesitate to call the police. I got thunderous applause. I learned a hell of a lot about life that day. I learned that the people who were shouting ‘no pigs on campus’ didn’t have the numbers.”\(^{15}\) A proposal to march to the Chancellery was defeated, though it was resolved to give legal support to those who had been arrested; that police should

\(^{13}\) Sue Knights *op.cit.* pp.83-84. It was reported that he blew the whistle into the microphone.

\(^{14}\) ‘March on Uni is Averted’ *Sydney Morning Herald* ‘11th August 1971

\(^{15}\) Interview with Sir Rupert Myers *op.cit.*
not be allowed on campus, and that Opus Dei should get out of Warrane College. The immediate crisis seemed to be over.

_Tharunka_, however, continued to publish comments, letters and articles concerning Opus Dei, with the 1st September 1971 issue featuring a long and critical article titled ‘Crossing Opus’. It was reported in the following issue that the President elect of the Students’ Union had, in response to a tip-off from a Warrane College resident, recovered some two hundred and fifty copies of the ‘Crossing Opus’ edition in one of the College toilets! There were also reports that the Professorial Board and the Staff Association had moved to set up committees of investigation into the whole matter.\(^{16}\)

In 1972 further expulsions from Warrane followed a protest within the College over the rules concerning visitors. Although the three expelled students were soon reinstated, the College made it clear that the rules would not be relaxed.\(^{17}\) A concession was made, however, by giving permission for women to attend the Saturday evening meal, but in the first half of 1973 this was withdrawn – some

\(^{16}\) _Tharunka_ 13th September 1971. On the University’s ‘Open Day’ that year, a group of protestors against Warrane printed some one thousand cards, on behalf of “The Master and Ladies Auxiliary of Warrane College”, inviting all visitors to a free buffet luncheon at the College, beginning at 1pm. Some three hundred people turned up, and were politely turned away! (26th October 1971)

\(^{17}\) The Chairman of the New College Students’ Association, Stephen Duckett, deplored the expulsion and stated that the students of New College supported the move for reform of the rules: “How can students at a university adequately pursue their course if they cannot discuss it with their friends? … The rule is completely unreasonable and out of touch with contemporary university life.” (‘Students Criticise Expulsions’ _Sydney Morning Herald_, 5th June 1972). Stephen Duckett became Head of the Commonwealth Department of Health, and is now a Pro-Vice-Chancellor at La Trobe University.
believing as a result of a direction from the Opus Dei hierarchy in Rome. There were to be further expulsions, and towards the end of the first session in 1974 an issue of Tharunka was headed “May God save Australia from the Holy Mafia”. Letters from Warrane residents and interviews with expelled students were published, expressing concern with the practices and rules of Opus Dei. A number of the complaints related for example to room searches and the fact that the rooms could not be locked; the procedure of having to clear a floor of residents before the maids were allowed to clean the rooms on that floor; and, of course, the festering issue of regulations concerning visitors and visiting hours. Anti-Opus slogans appeared on walls around the campus, with “God’s Mafia” appearing on the wall of Warrane. Calls were made for students to join a procession to Warrane College: “The time has come … Revoke the 99 year lease! Install a more acceptable Catholic group: one which does not rely on authoritarianism and anti-intellectualism for its survival. Support the struggle of the Warrane students!”

**Setting-up an Enquiry:**

Following a meeting in the Roundhouse, a coffin with the words “Opus Dei R.I.P.” inscribed on it was carried in procession to the College. An effigy of the Master, Dr Martins, was flung from an upper floor window, and placed in the

---

19 *Tharunka* Vol.20, No.12, 1974
21 *Ibid* No.13
The coffin was then set alight. After this, students marched to the Chancellery and occupied the Council Room, with the President of the Students’ Union, John Green, demanding the immediate termination of the lease granted to Opus Dei. Justice Gordon Samuels recalls that the view that Opus Dei was a subversive organisation had fairly wide currency on the campus: “Even the Wizard (Ian Channel) was unable to defuse (the resultant unrest). The obvious solution was to have an enquiry – investigate it, lay it all out, and see what evidence there was of these foul conspiracies asserted against Warrane.” Rupert Myers was overseas at the time, but the Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Vowels, agreed to look into ways, in consultation with the Student Union President, of conducting an investigation into matters concerning the Warrane College lease: “It’s not in our (the Administration’s) interests to have this matter a continuing and running sore.” On his return from overseas, the Vice-Chancellor decided to propose to the University Council, that a Committee of Enquiry be set up to look into the issues concerning the management of Warrane College. On the 8th July 1974 the Council resolved to establish such a committee, and following its first meeting on the 22nd July, an advertisement appeared in the

22 Ibid No.14
23 Interview with His Excellency, the Hon. Gordon Samuels AC, Governor of NSW, Governor’s Office, Macquarie Street, Sydney, 27th July 1999. Mr Justice Samuels joined the UNSW Council in 1969 and was Chancellor 1976-1994. He had attended Balliol College, Oxford, 1941-42 & 1946-47.
24 Ibid
“The Council of the University (of New South Wales) has established a committee ‘to enquire into the recent public criticism and protests over the management of Warrane College and to investigate whether there are any grounds for the assertions being made that the present mode of management of the College is contrary to the interests of the University generally’.”

Cardinal Gilroy and the Coming of Opus Dei:

When early approaches were being made to the University of New South Wales, expressing interest in setting up denominational residential colleges, the Catholic Archbishop of Sydney was Norman, Cardinal Gilroy. Though he was to rely heavily on his assistant, Bishop James Carroll, and on the Rector of St. John’s College at Sydney University, the Rev’d Dr John Burnheim, for much of the detailed preliminary work in promoting a college, Cardinal Gilroy’s background, character and attitudes no doubt had much to do with the involvement of Opus Dei in Sydney.

---

25 The University of New South Wales Council Committee of Enquiry into Warrane College Report, November 1974, p.1. Submissions were to be made to the University Registrar, Mr Colin Plowman, by the 30th August 1974, and the Committee was to report to the Council not later than the November meeting that year.
Described as a man of “monastic simplicity”, austere, and a person who shunned alcohol and smoking\textsuperscript{27}, Gilroy had a “rigid concept of authority and obedience” which imposed a certain “order and stability in life.”\textsuperscript{28} His conservatism did not make him a keen supporter of the sweeping changes of Vatican II (1962-1965). “No intellectual, and not disposed to trust them”\textsuperscript{29}, it seems he was never comfortable in the free, secular environment of universities, and in particular, Sydney University. Nevertheless, he was keen in the early 1950s to establish a Catholic University in Sydney. However, with the amount of money required for such a project, and with the financial plight of Catholic schools, the move was abandoned. His focus was to switch to establishing a Catholic college at the NSW University of Technology. Kensington was becoming fertile ground. It was probably in Rome, while attending a meeting in the mid to late 1950s, that Cardinal Gilroy had contact with members of \textit{Opus Dei}, and became aware of the association’s experience in running university colleges and hostels in places such as Ireland, France, Italy, the United States and Spain. The combination of experience, structure, resources and religious conservatism might well have appealed to the Cardinal.

\textsuperscript{26} Born in Glebe in 1896, and following service as a wireless operator on a troop ship during World War I, including service at Gallipoli in April 1915, Gilroy trained for the priesthood and was ordained in 1923. He became assistant bishop of Sydney in 1937, and Archbishop in 1940.
\textsuperscript{27} Graham Williams \textit{Cardinal Sir Norman Gilroy 1896-1977} Alella Books, Sydney NSW, 1971, pp.5-7 “Most priests never dared smoke or drink in his presence … He rarely read books, never looked at television or listened to the radio.”
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid}
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid}
The Background of Opus Dei:

The beginning of Opus Dei is fixed on a precise date of the 2nd October 1928, when, in a retreat house on the outskirts of Madrid in Spain, where he was chaplain to the university, a priest by the name of Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer gained an idea – some would refer to it as a vision – of what his particular role and life work was to be. He “received into mind and heart”, says a plaque on the wall of the belfry of the nearby church of Our Lady of the Angels, “the seeds of Opus Dei”. Spain was a country where there had been a strong and pervasive link between Church and State, between loyalty to the Pope and patriotism. Traditional Spanish life was imbued with Catholicism. Nevertheless, a greater freedom of thought and expression, and the growth of agnosticism, had begun to spread in the Spanish universities and among Spanish intellectuals. Agnostic socialism spurred on political action that led to the abdication and exile in 1931 of King Alphonso, and the proclamation of a Republic. In all this, it would seem that Escriva and a small, but growing group of followers, felt the need for a strengthening and revitalisation of spiritual life, to be expressed in the tasks of daily work: “What Spanish Catholicism, indeed, the universal Church required, were men as dedicated and unworlly as monks, who nonetheless lived in the world, apparently as ordinary men and women.” A wide cross-section of lay

---

29 Patrick O’Farrell The Catholic Church and Community op.cit. p.367
31 Mark Lyons, Report submitted to the UNSW Committee of Enquiry into Warrane College, 1974, p.3. Dr Lyons was a lecturer in history at Mitchell CAE, and was asked by the Students’ Union (UNSW) to update and expand a report he had prepared previously on Opus Dei.
people were to take on a life-style characteristic of religious orders – a commitment to poverty and obedience to authority, and, for some but not all, chastity. While living in small communities, religious devotion was to be expressed, not in isolation or withdrawal, but in interaction with others and in a continuing involvement in secular, particularly professional, working life.

In talks and discussions with friends and fellow priests and religious, in contact with students, by writing letters to people (often aristocrats and those with influence in commerce both within and outside Spain), by conducting groups for young men and boys in his mother’s flat in Madrid, by gaining entrée and permission to give religious instruction to delinquent boys in a reformatory conducted by nuns, and by setting up training classes and an Academy, Escriva’s Opus Dei grew. In February 1930, believing that women were called to the same commitment in spiritual life as men, a Women's Section was founded. However, as applied in much of Spanish traditional life, the work and place of women were seen as distinct from and often servile in relation to that of men.32

Spain at this time saw the growth, especially under the socialist republic in the early 1930s, of anti-clericalism and anti-Catholicism. The wealth of the Church was attacked, and some churches and convents destroyed. However, the Spanish

32 There was, for example, a small but significant difference between a prayer that Escriva instructed to be used to close meetings of the male branch of Opus, and the prayer to be used by women. The men were to pray: “Holy Mary, Our Hope, Seat of Wisdom, pray for us”; the women were to pray: “Holy Mary, Our Hope, Handmaid of the Lord, pray for us.” Subordination, not wisdom, was the invocation for women.
Civil War (1936-1939) dramatically changed the scene for the Catholic Church, and for Opus Dei. Pope Pius XII sent General Franco a telegram congratulating him on his “Catholic” victory, and under Franco religious studies became compulsory for all university students, and halls of residence were placed under the strict control of religious orders. Opus members were chosen more and more to fill vacant chairs in Spanish universities. As Opus Dei centres were established in other Spanish cities, such as Valencia and Barcelona, opposition as well as growth became evident, especially in areas that had opposed Franco and from some Jesuit lay organisations. Opposition particularly focused on what was perceived as unwarranted secrecy and undue influence and association in high places. Despite this, the organisation began to establish centres outside Spain – during the 1940s in Portugal, England, Italy, France, Ireland, the United States and Mexico. It was to extend much further during the 1950s and 1960s. In 1946, Escriva moved to Rome where Opus Dei established its headquarters. Escriva was named a Monsignor by Pope Pius XII, and in 1947 Opus Dei was recognised as the first of the Secular Institutes within the Church, under the care of the Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes.

The setting up of residential colleges for university students was a key feature in the spread of Opus Dei during the 1950s and 1960s. Involving those who are

---

33 Michael Walsh op.cit. p.43
34 In 1950, the Vatican approved the Constitution of Opus Dei. There have been some revisions of the Constitution, especially following the establishment of Opus Dei as a ‘Personal Prelature’ of the Church by the Pope on the 28th November 1982, placing it under the Congregation of Bishops and thus creating it as a kind of diocese without geographical boundaries.
highly educated and seriously committed was and continues to be a high priority. Residences were set up, for example, in London (1952) and in Manchester (1958). Invitations were extended to meetings, lectures, group discussions and seminars that were followed by a time for informal contact to build up association and friendship, and knowledge of a person’s work and interests. Such contact may lead to a point referred to as the ‘crisis of vocation’, in which, following a period of regular meetings and meditation, of regular spiritual counsel, reading and confession, a person is guided into a commitment of vocation in Opus Dei. This process has been referred to as “holy coercion”.

The Foundation of Warrane College:

In March 1963, Peter Kelly wrote an article in The Bulletin magazine under the heading “Opus Dei Moves Into Sydney?” He reported that concern had been expressed at a recent meeting of the more “mainstream” Catholic students’ society, the Newman Society, at Sydney University, about reports that Opus Dei

---

35 Michael Walsh op.cit. p.70. Difficulty arose in Oxford with the University authorities and with the Archbishop of Birmingham - a “formidable Archbishop … a blunt Englishman with little time for the Hispanic affectations of Opus” - in whose diocese most of Oxford lies. A house was found in Oxford, across the river in the diocese of Portsmouth.

36 Fergal Bowers The Work: An Investigation into the History of Opus Dei and how it operates in Ireland To-day Poolbeg Press, Dublin, 1989, p.30

37 Ibid p.24. Andrew Byrne in his pamphlet Sanctifying Ordinary Work contests this, and notes that those who join ‘The Work’ in their youth freely make up their minds and in due course prepare themselves for the career or job of their choice, just as they would have done if they had not been connected with Opus Dei (p.11). Fergal Bowers nevertheless asserts that discussions about potential recruits take priority in conversations at get-togethers of members. Recruitment is dealt with regularly in the internal newsletters and the weekly “confidence chat” with the spiritual director where each member gives a detailed account of his “apostolate”. Members are expected to have at least a handful of friends of whom a number are being worked on actively to join. (p.18)

38 The Bulletin 2nd March 1963, p.7
was going to establish a college at the University of NSW. Reports had been strengthened by a photo which had appeared in January that year in the Catholic Weekly of an Opus Dei chaplain and lecturer at Chicago University, Father Salvador Ferigle, who, the paper indicated, was visiting Sydney on his way home from Japan, and would be having a look around the University of NSW. Peter Kelly noted that “the normal clerical gossip going the presbytery rounds was “Norman (Cardinal Gilroy) thinks highly of him”. Kelly concluded his article: “the advent of Opus Dei will probably receive support from the members of Sydney’s Catholic hierarchy. But unless Opus Dei proves its bona fides openly to Sydney’s Catholic intellectuals, and endeavours to prove conclusively that it is not another secret quasi-Fascist organisation, it will have a fight on its hands if and when it moves into the University of New South Wales.”

Following the various approaches and a meeting of church representatives with Professor Baxter in September 1959, and the further meeting in October of that year with the Australian Universities Commission, Bishop Carroll, writing on behalf of Cardinal Gilroy, had assured the Vice-Chancellor of the Catholic Church’s interest in commencing an affiliated college with the least possible delay. Depending upon a suitable site being obtained, and Commonwealth grants for the triennium 1961-63, the Church would match the available finance to provide a college for up to two hundred residents. Finding a site for the

---

39 Ibid p.8
40 Mr C.Plowman, Registrar UNSW: briefing paper to Committee of Enquiry, 25th July 1974, UNSW Archives, FN. 29367 CN.461/1
college proved to be difficult, as previously mentioned in relation to New College. On the 8th June 1963, the University Council noted that its Building and Equipment Committee would be prepared to consider the construction of affiliated colleges on the Anzac Parade/Barker Street frontage of the campus.41

At this time, the Very Reverend Dr John Burnheim of St. John’s College was acting on behalf of the Catholic Church. On the 12th June he wrote to Professor Baxter: “I am very happy to be able to tell you that a Catholic organisation called Opus Dei is very anxious to push ahead with the project for a College at the University of N.S.W., and that the Church authorities are giving them every encouragement and support. Two of their members, Father James W. Albrecht and Christopher Schmitt are now in Sydney and are empowered to take immediate steps towards making a foundation … In the near future I shall no doubt be handing over any negotiations concerning a college at the University of N.S.W. entirely into their hands. I know that they will pursue the project with great vigour, and I hope that they will enjoy the same very cordial and understanding relationship with you and the University that I have enjoyed over the past few years.”42

On 20th September 1963, Dr Burnheim wrote to the Vice-Chancellor, indicating that he was almost certain that the Church would proceed with building a College during the coming triennium (1964-66), and that investigations would need to

41 Minutes of the Council, UNSW Archives op.cit.
42 UNSW Archives op.cit.
proceed in relation to both the cost and the nature of the building to be constructed on the Anzac Parade site.\(^43\) In a memorandum to the Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Bursar (Property), Mr Fletcher advised that it would be sufficient for the conduct and discipline of the students within the college to be the responsibility of the person “in control” of the college, with those outside the precincts of it subject to the regulations and rules of the University. He suggested that “if it were deemed necessary to exercise specific control in the future”, this could be arranged by “way of by-law”.\(^44\) This view and advice was to have significance in relation to the University’s position concerning the protests a decade later. The conduct and discipline of students within the college was essentially to be the responsibility of the college and not that of the University.

In March 1964, Cardinal Gilroy wrote, in a letter addressed to the Very Rev. James W. Albrecht, a representative of Opus Dei living in Randwick: “As you know, for some years now, the Archdiocese has had a desire to establish a Residential College at the University of New South Wales under Catholic auspices. I am pleased that Opus Dei has come to Sydney and is providing an opportunity for this desire to become a reality … While I was in Rome, I had the opportunity to visit one of your international student residences there. I was very pleased with the spirit of the people in the residence and the work Opus Dei is accomplishing there. I am happy that you plan to establish a residential college.

\(^{43}\) Ibid
\(^{44}\) Ibid
in order to carry on this work here, and I wish you every success and assure you of my blessing.”

In April 1964, the University Bursar, Mr J. O. A. Bourke, wrote to the State Crown Solicitor, Mr R. J. McKay, concerning the conditions under which affiliation would be granted and the nature of the lease. He noted that the Catholic Church had yet to form a company similar to the company limited by guarantee that the Anglican authorities had formed, known as the “New University Colleges Council”. He indicated that it had been generally agreed that the lease should be for a term of ninety-nine years at a nominal rental with an option for renewal for a similar period. He noted that “the conclusion is now reached that the University will not require to extend its authority into each College but will leave the responsibility for the control and discipline of students therein to the Rector of the College.”

In May 1965, the Council of the University of NSW passed a resolution recognising the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Colleges, to be built on the Anzac Parade frontage of the University’s site, as affiliated colleges of the University, with such recognition becoming operative when the bodies concerned had signed a lease approved by the University Council. Essentially, the lease

---

45 Ibid 3rd March 1964. Father Albrecht had arrived in Australia from the USA in 1963 and, with another priest and two laymen, occupied a house at No.8 Silver Street, Randwick. Father Albrecht continued the negotiations for the setting up of the College.

46 Ibid 17th April 1964


48 Minutes of the Council, UNSW Archives
for Warrane College, eventually signed on the 16th March 1967, was the same as that signed for New College by the New University Colleges Council. The premises were to be used as a residence for the accommodation of students attending a course of study conducted by the University of NSW, and “that no religious test shall be administered to any person in order to entitle him to be admitted as a student of the said College or to enjoy any benefit advantage or privilege thereof.” The lease also required, however, that the Rector, Principal or Warden of the College “shall be responsible for the administration of the said college and in particular for the conduct and discipline of students attending or resident in the said college.”

In October 1968, Cardinal Gilroy wrote to Mr Michael Steuart, then Secretary of the Warrane Development Committee and later Chairman of the EDA Board, expressing his gratitude for the efforts of Opus Dei and the Development Committee to establish Warrane College, and extending his encouragement and good wishes for the period of construction that was about to commence. He observed that “it is especially pleasing to know that you have the co-operation of men of different faiths who have the common desire to establish Warrane College in the knowledge that its benefits will be extended to students of all faiths.” In November, the Chancellor of the University, Mr Justice Clancy, wrote to Mr Steuart: “As Chancellor of the University I am particularly pleased

49 Ibid Copy of the Lease, FN. 29367 CN. 461/1
50 Ibid
51 Spelt as printed – not with a “w”!
52 Ibid 30th October 1968
to see the efforts of private initiative, as exemplified by your committee, in the establishment of affiliated colleges, which are so sorely needed. I am also pleased that the direction of Warrane is to be entrusted to Opus Dei, an Association which has had wide experience in this field.”53

Growing Opposition to Opus Dei:

Prior to the signing of the lease, Tharunka had published a number of letters, articles and editorials, mainly urging the University not to allow Opus Dei on campus. These included, for example, a claim by the editors in June 1966, that at a Newman Association dinner, the Chancellor, Mr Justice Clancy, along with Mr Justice McClemens, had attacked Opus Dei and suggested that a committee be formed to approach the Cardinal and the University Council with the purpose of urging them to re-consider the proposal of having Opus Dei run the Catholic College.54 One letter attacked the claim that denominational colleges contributed to diversity within the University; rather, the second year Arts student believed, they reinforced and extended the essentially separate and often exclusive channels in which the college individual develops. Paul Brennan, then President of the Students’ Union, claimed he was proud to think of himself “as an enemy

53 Ibid. 25th November 1968
54 Tharunka Vol 12, No.7, 7th June 1966, p.7. Mr Justice Clancy’s concerns seem to have been mollified by the Education Development Association’s (EDA) acceptance of the terms of the lease. The same article noted the opening in 1965 of the ‘Nairana Cultural Centre’ - now ‘Creston College’, the Opus Dei college for women - at 4 High Street, just opposite the gate to the upper campus of the University. Here various courses, programs and activities, such as in the creative arts, computing, and study techniques, were conducted by Opus Dei for university and high school students.
of Opus Dei and its totalitarianism.”55 Mark Lyons, then a fourth year history student and member of the Newman Society, wrote: “One can only hope and pray that either the University Council, or Cardinal Gilroy, or both, will have second thoughts about the suitability of Opus Dei in an Australian University environment.”56

Not all comments were opposed to Opus Dei. In a letter to the editor, ‘B. Fair’ stated that “surely Tharunka is employing pressure tactics, tactics which they accuse Opus Dei of …The important question is: can Opus Dei be a real threat to the intellectual development of students who, though still free to obtain accommodation at other colleges, choose to go to the Opus Dei College, with full awareness of its rules and regulations, and with full freedom to leave it if they don’t like it … the one-sided journalistic efforts of Tharunka pose, to my mind, a far greater threat.”57 In another issue, ‘Spectator (Science III)’ wrote: “Perhaps there is a good case against Opus Dei. I can, however, sympathise with Opus Dei since they have been judged before being fairly examined. The efforts of the Newman Society have met with little success – which is quite natural considering their preconceived notions of the nature of Opus Dei and their attitude of ‘explain yourselves or else’.”58

55 Ibid
56 Ibid p.11
57 Ibid Vol.12, No.9, 28th June 1966
58 Ibid Vol.12, No.10, 12th July 1966
Wendy Bacon became editor of *Tharunka* in 1970, a year marked by a much more radical and strident presentation of issues related to women’s liberation, sexual liberation, conscription and the Vietnam War, freedom of thought and expression, religion and academic freedom. It was the year of publication in *Tharunka* of the poem ‘Eskimo Nell’ and other sexually explicit and provocative material, leading to the ‘obscenity trials’, when the editors of *Tharunka* were brought before the courts. Wendy Bacon and a group of other women turned up to the hearing of their summonses dressed in nuns’ habits on which were painted lines from another allegedly obscene poem! The following year, 1971, also saw the sentencing at the ‘Old Bailey’ in London of Australian Richard Neville and his fellow editors of *Oz* magazine, having been found guilty on charges of obscenity. Of that period, and of Wendy Bacon, Rupert Myers recalls: “There was a real stir in the community over this and subsequent issues (of *Tharunka*). When they got into the homes of students, parents would be outraged and would ring up their local MP, who would ring the Minister. All hell broke loose … The whole world changed as a result of those publications and newspapers became much more explicit … in a way, Wendy Bacon started a new wave. I knew quite a bit about her and had quite a bit of contact with her, but I didn’t find her a palatable personality at all.”

---

59 In a report of a UNSW Archives’ survey of student experiences at UNSW in the 1960s, it was noted that many students in the late 1960s “eagerly awaited” each issue of *Tharunka*. Many respondents “revealed a kind of vicarious participation in student politics through the paper”, and one indicated that she and her friends “couldn’t wait for the next issue, fascinated as they were by the ‘open discussion of sexual matters, lewd poems and the like’.” (Alison Holland ‘Students, Sandhills and Sex’, *Origins* Newsletter of the UNSW Archives, No.4, November 1998, p.2)

60 Sue Knights *op.cit.* p.88
University Council in 1969, recalls that when a dinner meeting was held by the Council to host student members of a newly established ‘Communications Committee’ of Council, the students went out of their way to shock members of the Council, not only by presenting a series of non-negotiable demands, but by couching them in the most strikingly obscene language! This was done to such effect that his colleagues declined to continue with the meeting and he found himself the only one left. He confesses that he thought “that as a Veteran (World War II) I could swear much more wildly and more fluently than any of them … I had done this a bit before my colleagues left, and so I shocked them as well … It was really very funny!”61

**The Push and the Priest:**

Wendy Bacon was recognised as a member of what was called the ‘Sydney Push’, “a generation of Sydney intellectuals in the 1950s and 1960s … politically radical without being either committed socialists or communists. Intellectually they were anarchists, but they didn’t do much in the way of anarchist activity. They were tough, in a laconic fashion, opposed to the Church, the State, wowsers and censorship. They read and talked and argued constantly.”62 Originating in the late 1940s under the influence of Professor John Anderson and the ‘Free Thought Society’ at Sydney University, the Push included people such as Germaine Greer, Eva Cox, Margaret Fink, George Molnar, Darcy Waters, and

---

61 Interview with the Hon. Gordon Samuels *op.cit.*
62 Anne Coombs *op.cit.* p.viii
Liz Fell. By 1970 the core of the *Sydney Push* had shifted from Sydney University to the University of NSW. The then Anglican Chaplain at the University, Bruce Wilson, later Anglican Bishop of Bathurst, recalls how he and some other Christians engaged with members of the *Push* in such a way as to become friends. He remembers that some of the radical students used to say that the only place on the campus where real thought took place was the Chaplaincy. For a time he was the art critic for *Tharunka*, and he became President of the Sociological Society, involving both staff and students. He was particularly accepted by Liz Fell, a lecturer in the Sociology Department, in a way that he describes as “nothing more than a very intellectual friendship. She was an anarchist; but she found me as a Christian a quite fascinating person because I could talk to her and make sense!” Such was Bruce Wilson’s acceptance among the circle of the *Push* that when there was, as he describes, a “fun burning” of *Tharunka* in which he and members of the Evangelical Union and the Student Christian Movement were involved, the *Push*, and Wendy Bacon in particular, blamed “the chaplain” as the person who was behind the action – except they mistook the then Master of New College, the Reverend Noel Pollard, as the chaplain! “There’s no doubt that Noel had to bear the opprobrium of the hard Left thinking that he was the one behind the Christian critique of what they were doing.” While the strongest opposition was directed towards Warrane

---

63 *Ibid* Ch.13
64 Interview with the Right Reverend Bruce Wilson, Bathurst, 23rd May 1997
65 *Ibid*
66 *Ibid*
67 *Ibid*
College, New College came in for its share of ridicule, and not just from the *Push*. A report of a Baxter College raid noted: “The target was that squat blockhouse just this side of the gutters of Anzac Parade; that cradle of religious fervour, that bastion of antisex, that fanatical survivor of prohibition … New College!”68 New, however, was perhaps fortunate to be in the shadow of Warrane, which was the greater *cause célèbre.*

Bruce Wilson further recalls that opposition to *Opus Dei* certainly came from the *Push* Left, and that they were the ones who sought to expose *Opus Dei* as “General Franco in disguise … extremely Right Wing, anti-women, anti-sex, and so on … Could you get anything that epitomised everything they (the Push) needed to throw-off more than *Opus Dei*?”69 Nevertheless, he comments that the Push definitely saw New College, as a very conservative institution “with a clergyman in a black suit and collar as its Head, who was somehow or other involved in infiltrating their groups in such a way as to know what they were doing … and they really didn’t work out that it was me the whole time!” In fact, Bruce Wilson regarded his independence from New College as important to the effectiveness of his ministry to the whole campus. The College was “down in the corner – it didn’t bother me … it would have been detrimental to my ministry to have been too closely associated with New College … it would have cut the ground from underneath me, I think, for my relationships with the broader community of Christian students and even more with the broader secular students

68 ‘Where is the Baxter Clock?’ Tharunka, 14th April 1970
69 Bishop Bruce Wilson *op.cit.*
with whom I built up quite a relationship through all these things in which I was
involved in.”70 He remembers that when *Tharunka* published the issue ‘Crossing
Opus’, “somebody broke into the *Tharunka* offices and stole all the copies.
There was a police enquiry. I certainly had nothing to do with it, but I’m thankful
the police never approached me to ask who had done it, because I think I
knew!”71

In March 1970, *Tharunka* 72 featured another critical article in which Wendy
Bacon and ‘P. D.’ concluded: “if *Opus Dei* is here to stay, the least those who are
opposed to it can do is publicise its methods, reveal as many of its secrets as
possible, and subject the organisation to a close, on-going analysis of its
development in Australia.”73 The President of the Warrane College House
Committee responded that he was sure all the students in Warrane College would
agree that the article was an insult to each one of them.74 Another member of the
House Committee believed that “journalistic responsibility had been thrown to
the wind” in the article. A Senior Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering considered
that “we are fortunate in having this organisation, and that the university will
benefit from Cardinal Gilroy’s foresight and good judgement in inviting *Opus

70 *Ibid.* Bruce Wilson commented that “when Stuart Babbage came as Master, I was seen as some
kind of junior Curate who was the chaplain and that that was going to be our relationship. Of
course, that was nothing by formal definition, and it was not the treatment I expected … I admire
Stuart enormously … He certainly came with a vision that he wasn’t just going to be sitting down
there in that geographical corner of the campus … he saw that you went from there out into the
University; and with his particular sophisticated, cultural and intellectual style, that was going to
be very effective … We ended-up, as equals, getting on very well … I found his style winsome.”
71 *Ibid*
72 UNSW Archives , 18th March 1970
73 *Ibid*
74 *Ibid* 14th April 1970
Dei to run the Catholic College on this campus.” Dr Martins wrote that “the truth of the matter is that the College has an eminently academic aim, namely to help the students affiliated with it to derive the maximum benefit – intellectual and personal – from their stay at the University.”

In response to all this, the editors commented that “as far as we are concerned, religious organisations are open to examination in the same way as any other social phenomena … The attitude of Opus Dei to discussion is as we claimed in our article, contrary to the best interests of free enquiry.” While agreeing that religious organisations should be open to examination, Bruce Wilson and seven others nevertheless asserted that, contrary to the views expressed by the editors about Christian believers, “rationality and truth is the only honest basis for religious belief … We are believers because we are convinced as to the historicity and accuracy of the New Testament account of the life and resurrection of Jesus.” They were clearly concerned that the particular issues relating to Warrane College and its administration were not used as a means of condemning “the serious search for religious truth.” That in itself would not

75 Ibid
76 Ibid
77 Ibid
78 Ibid 9th June 1970. Others were: Stephen Smith, Elizabeth Cook, Doug Hynd, Susan Nugent, Alison Grant, Ian Crook, and Bob Hannah.
79 Ibid
have been in the best interests of free enquiry, and, indeed, “contrary to the interests of the University generally.”

**The Committee of Enquiry:**

The Committee of Enquiry into the management of Warrane College, set up in July 1974, comprised Mr Justice Gordon Samuels (later Chancellor of the University and Governor of NSW), Miss Therese Delanty, Mr Harry Heath (Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee), Mr John Green (President of the Students’ Union), Professor Doug McCallum (President of the Professorial Board), and Professor Myers. The Committee met on eleven occasions prior to the completion of its report; it inspected the College; it received one hundred and forty-nine written submissions; and it interviewed eighteen of those who had made written submissions.\(^80\) The Committee noted that, while contrary to the view of some supporters of Warrane, it was relevant to examine the aims and philosophy of *Opus Dei*, though it strongly declared that it was not interested in investigating its political aspirations overseas, nor any influence it may have exerted on the government of Spain.\(^81\) It reported that it had received many letters of support for the College and its administration, and that a large number of those attributed the opposition on campus to Warrane and *Opus Dei* to “a vocal group of student members of the radical left who had deliberately fomented
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action designed to destroy the threat of a competing ideology.”82 The Committee did not entirely agree with this view, acknowledging that much of the criticism had been stimulated by “plain distaste for the doctrines of religious conservatism.”83 It further noted that the protests earlier in 1974 seemed to come from more moderate students who were reacting against what they regarded as an unacceptably rigid and authoritarian style of College administration.84

A letter to the Committee from a student who had recently been asked to leave the College noted that “troublemakers” were those who didn’t conform to the principles of Opus Dei, and who openly expressed that they wanted nothing to do with meditation evenings or friendly get-togethers.85 The Chairman of the Educational Development Association, Mr Michael Steuart, wrote to Justice Samuels, critical of the lack of direct contact between the Committee and the EDA Board in the setting up of the Enquiry. He also criticised the inclusion on the Committee of John Green, who had participated in public exhibitions that “must be described as blasphemous, offensive and generally abhorrent. You must appreciate the indignity to which the University is submitting the College … by requiring the College management to bare its soul, as it were, to the likes of Master Green.”86 Mr Steuart expressed his belief that the Committee had no authority to interfere internally in the management of the College, and believed
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that, following his and others’ appearances before the Committee, the Committee had “failed to grasp the Christian values and principles on which Warrane’s mode of management is based.”

When asked by the Committee Chairman about the reason for the rule that women were only permitted in certain areas on the ground floor, Dr Joseph Martins replied that they wanted an environment free from distraction and they wanted to maximise social interaction and the “wholesome life there.” Asked if the views of Opus Dei about celibacy had anything to do with the regulations about women visitors, Dr Martins stated that celibacy was not intended for people in general and that it should not be taken into consideration in making such regulations. He was not aware of anyone being pressured to join Opus Dei, nor was he aware of anything that would have been a violation of a person’s rights. He believed the College’s philosophy was borne out in the residents’ good academic results. Cardinal Gilroy’s successor as Archbishop of Sydney in 1971, James Freeman, expressed to Professor Myers that he hoped that the Committee “will not be minded to come up with any finding or recommendation that will in any way reflect upon Warrane College or its present management and that other just and acceptable ways of containing student pressures and agitation against this institution will be found.”
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87 Ibid
88 Dr J. Martins _op. cit._
89 Ibid
90 Ibid
Dr Stuart Barton Babbage of New College, wrote to the Committee in support of the pluralistic nature of the modern university, and stated that affiliated colleges were part of the tradition of cultural and religious pluralism: “What needs to be said is that fruitful argument and debate is only possible in an atmosphere of mutual toleration and respect, whether within a College or without … The University has … an inescapable responsibility to maintain inviolate the freedom and independence of the colleges and to protect them from partisan regimentation and repression.”91 Dr Babbage nevertheless recognised the impact of Warrane’s internal policies when he reported to the New College Board: “Warrane, I’m afraid, is not a happy College; we have several former students from Warrane in New, and others on the waiting list.”92

Findings of the Committee:

The Committee found that there was no evidence to suggest that beyond Warrane College Opus Dei had used its presence on campus as a means of attempting deliberately to stifle or to prevent the enjoyment of intellectual freedom or the pursuit of liberal inquiry in the University.93 It did express a degree of concern about the methods, reported by some, of winning recruits for Opus Dei in the College. This might involve friendly discussion between a tutor and a freshman, leading to invitations for the freshman to attend meetings for prayer and

91 Dr Stuart Babbage to the Committee of Enquiry, 28th August 1974, UNSW Archives, FN.29367B CN.461/1
92 Master’s Report, Minutes of the New College Board 11th June 1974, New College Archives
93 Report, Committee of Enquiry, p.8
meditation: “The invitations and the visits are maintained with persistence and effusive cordiality. Reluctance to participate is ignored. Ultimately, if the student rejects these overtures, the apparent friendship is abruptly terminated, and cordiality is replaced by coldness.”\textsuperscript{94} The Committee felt that while it was not improper to gather recruits, care needed to be exercised with the manner of doing so: “Individual zeal should not be permitted to outrun discretion or respect for the privacy of others.”\textsuperscript{95}

Much of the Committee’s report dealt with issues concerning the College’s rules, especially related to visiting hours and, more particularly, to the presence of women in the College. The Committee was “surprised to find that those involved in the management of the College were unable or unwilling to perceive that there were any reasonable grounds for any criticism of these rules.”\textsuperscript{96} It found that the rules were more restrictive than those which applied in other colleges\textsuperscript{97}; and that arguments stating that the rules allowed for significantly better study conditions were unfounded\textsuperscript{98}; “We know of no evidence which leads us to suppose that the presence of women is likely to produce an atmosphere inimical to study.”\textsuperscript{99}

In its conclusions, the Committee noted that it had kept in mind the argument that the College possesses special aims and a special character, and that “an

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid p.10  
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid pp.10-11  
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid p.11  
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid p.13  
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid p.16  
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid pp.16-17
independent College administration, acting bona fide, must be allowed discretion to formulate for itself the manner in which its purposes are best attained.” 100 At the same time, however, the Committee emphasised that moral or religious doctrine should not deny the right of choice of competing styles or attitudes: “It is here that regard can reasonably be had to contemporary opinion without any compromise of integrity; and here that the defence of integrity should not be permitted to become intransigence.” 101 Having in mind that many felt that the notion of freedom of enquiry was foreclosed by certain aspects of Warrane’s organisation and, indeed, of Opus Dei doctrine102, and taking the view that “the interests of the University”, in the context of the Enquiry, involved “encouraging scholarship and the pursuit of knowledge, and in stimulating and protecting free debate and enquiry”, the Committee concluded:

“We are of the opinion that a University has a duty to tolerate intellectual pluralism, and the expression of disparate views. It may be that there are limits beyond which the principle of pluralism does not apply, but we can see nothing in the material before us which should deprive Opus Dei or the College of the benefits of the tolerance which the principle requires. This is a principle which ought equally to be observed by the College in its dealings with its residents. In our opinion there are not any grounds for the assertion that the present mode of management of Warrane College is contrary to the interests of the University generally.”103

100 Ibid pp.20-21
101 Ibid p.21
102 Interview with the Hon. Gordon Samuels op.cit.
103 Report, Committee of Enquiry op.cit. pp.21-22
Conclusion:

This conclusion went further than that in relation to Robert Menzies College at Macquarie University just over a year before. Though the Macquarie University Council had found that, on the evidence presented, there had been no breach of the ‘religious tests’ By-Law, and that the College was within its rights to exercise its administration as it saw fit in the best interests of the College community, its committee had been somewhat frustrated by the unwillingness of the College authorities to be interviewed. The Macquarie conclusion was qualified; it was seen by some as too narrow in its focus and interpretation, inadequate and unsatisfactory. There had been, on the other hand, no refusal on the part of the Warrane College authorities to participate in the University of New South Wales enquiry, albeit that they regarded it as unwarranted and potentially fraught with “unforeseeable consequences”.104 The broader principle of freedom of enquiry and expression – what the committee had in mind as “the interests of the University generally”105 - was seen to encompass within the pluralist University context the right of the College, and for that matter any affiliated organisation, to express within its area of responsibility and authority its own practices and beliefs. Provided they did not contravene the law or the terms of affiliation, such practices and beliefs were seen in the context of “the expression of disparate views”106 - whether people accepted them or not.

104 Archbishop James Freeman to Professor R.H.Myers, 16th October 1974, UNSW Archives op.cit.
105 Interview with the Hon.Gordon Samuels op.cit.
106 Committee of Enquiry Report op.cit. p.21
In relation to both Enquiries, at Macquarie University in 1973 and at the University of New South Wales in 1974, there were those who loudly echoed the view of the ‘Select Committee on the Sydney University’ of 1859 that “a grievous mistake has been made in the establishment of affiliated colleges.” On the other hand, the colleges helped to satisfy a pressing need within the universities for accommodation and care, as well as, indeed, for the establishment and maintenance of appropriate links with significant interests in the wider community. Robert Menzies, New and Warrane Colleges had been ‘conceived’ in the late 1950s and early to mid 1960s when the churches had experienced significant growth and when the Commonwealth government especially was providing every encouragement for their foundation. They were ‘born’, however, at a time of significant change in society at large and in the universities in particular; a period of student liberation and activism, provocation and protest. Any signs of restriction, prohibition, and imposed codes of conduct were fair game. It was as if the colleges had arrived at the wrong party! Challenge and conflict were perhaps inevitable.

The Warrane and the Robert Menzies Enquiries were reminders, however, that the growth of relationship between church, college and campus in Australia’s secular universities had been fostered by those who saw a place for religion to be represented in the life of the academic community and for the provision of spiritual welfare for those who wanted it, but who saw “clericalism, rigidity and conservatism in matters doctrinal and moral” and any “pressures of militant
evangelism” as “potentially alienating of university respect and trust.” 107 Though the Enquiries found no breach of the respective Colleges’ terms of affiliation with their universities, the essential atmosphere, as described by Stuart Babbage in his submission to the Committee of Enquiry into Warrane College, of “mutual toleration and respect” had nevertheless been sorely tried.

107 Patrick O’Farrell UNSW – A Portrait pp.162-165
CONCLUSION

Reclaiming the Temple:

Another Very Difficult Experiment for Church, College and Campus?

"We live in the age of business and it is plain to everyone that the money-changers have long since mortgaged the temple."

- Simon Marginson & Mark Considine, 2000

Former Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, the Right Reverend Donald Robinson, recalls that in 1966 the then Principal of the Baptist Theological College in Sydney, G. H. Morling, commented that "institutions tend to strangle the ideas that gave them birth". The denominational colleges founded in Australia since St. Paul’s College at Sydney University, however, neither fulfilled all the purposes for which they were originally intended, but nor did they realise the fears and concerns expressed by Professor Woolley in 1859 when he referred to the “very difficult” experiment and scheme of uniting them with the secular universities. They were neither places, on the whole, of “systematic religious instruction”, nor did they “completely sectarianise” their respective universities. The college idea was certainly not strangled.

---

1 Simon Marginson & Mark Considine The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 2000, p.2

2 Interview with Bishop Robinson, 21st April 1997
The Australian Pattern:

The pattern that emerged from the very difficult experiment and that became established in Australia's first universities was one in which denominational colleges provided residential care and tutorial supervision for a relatively small proportion of the university population, with opportunity in them for presentation, debate and discussion of religious and other ideas, but, with only a few exceptions, no formal theological or religious education. With the early example of the Anglican 'Moore College' in Sydney, many churches established theological colleges separate from any connection with the universities, with this "seminary model" fulfilling the various requirements for systematic religious instruction of candidates for ordained ministry. For the most part, the denominational colleges acknowledged and accepted the requirement that their residents attend the lectures of the university, and certainly that no religious tests be applied to students as a condition of college entry. Collegiate activity in the context of church oversight formed part of the corporate life of the university, but it engaged only a limited - though potentially influential - number of students and staff; while the colleges clearly sought to encourage the "virtue of character", they largely avoided any danger of extolling the virtues of creed.

This is not to say that at certain times in particular colleges no spiritual impact was made upon residents by college leaders or by association with groups such as the SCM At Ormond College, D. K. Picken, for example, was noted as having a
“driving passion” for providing a place “where Christian leaders could be developed.” Nevertheless, while the very difficult experiment was successful in gaining a foothold for the church on campus and providing a means of particular pastoral, moral and academic supervision and influence on students of the colleges, it by no means resulted overall in places on or in association with the campus where, as Sir Charles Nicholson suggested, the “spiritual guardians of each denomination” might seek the “inculcation of religious truth.” This had been intended as the complementary teaching role for the colleges on campus. Religion was not opposed; though marginalised, it was “an adjunct ... a desirable and proper one.” Indeed, the University took to itself a role for “the better advancement of religion” - what Ken Cable refers to as a kind of moral and social “common Christianity” - and deliberately placed “dogmatic Christianity” in the colleges. Overall, the denominational colleges did not meet this expectation of the founders.

A Relationship of Compromise:

The sacred and the secular in the foundation of denominational colleges became a relationship marked by compromise as, in most of the universities, Church, College and Campus sought to coexist if not conjoin. Heads of churches and
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colleges took supportive initiative and leading positions in the first universities - Bishops Perry, Moorehouse and Short, Archbishops Donaldson and Riley, and Sir John Macfarland; and in later universities, people such as Bishop Moyes, Archbishop Woods, and the Reverend Dr Davis McCaughey. Though he considered himself "entirely as a layman", Professor John Woolley was an ordained minister of the Church of England, and Sydney University, though avowedly secular, allowed for the establishment of a Board of Studies in Divinity - in somewhat similar vein to the secular State schools allowing non-denominational scripture lessons to be given by State teachers and denominational religious instruction by visiting clergymen. Vice-Chancellors Robert Wallace of Sydney and Raymond Priestly of Melbourne supported the colleges, the latter very much "because the full academic life could only be lived together."7

In the post-World War II new universities, co-operative support for colleges was received from university leaders such as Sir Philip Baxter, Sir Rupert Myers, Sir Louis Matheson and Professor Alex Mitchell. Sir Zelman Cowen supported and encouraged the college system, denominational and otherwise, at New England and Queensland universities. Practical needs of accommodation and finance, together with often commonly held and largely conservative expectations among the churches, universities and the wider community, meant that denominational colleges were accepted as part of the university scene. They in turn, however,

7 John Poynter and Carolyn Rasmussen op.cit. p.3
accepted a peripheral position that was expected neither to confront nor challenge the "primacy" of the secular university. The colleges served the university in much the same way as a health service or even as a campus catering company. It was a position that tended to reinforce "the conviction of many liberal Australians that Christianity was sacred but private. The colleges strengthened the emphasis on practice over theology, and underlined a decent reluctance to talk about religious beliefs." It was a compromise between the sacred and the secular that represented perhaps a "diffused" kind of Christianity, "doing little to dispel the secularised air." Professor Woolley’s fear, despite the situations well over a century later in relation to Robert Menzies College and Warrane College, that the colleges might "completely sectarianise" the University was certainly not realised.

Bishop Broughton rejected the potential of such a compromise and refused to be associated with what he regarded would be “the great emporium of false and anti-church views”. His successor, Bishop Barker, founded Moore Theological College, with St. Paul’s College essentially being separate from Sydney diocesan influence and control, albeit having representation on the diocesan Synod. It was a view of distance, distrust and perhaps even some disdain of the established denominational colleges that became a mark of many evangelicals of the Sydney
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 Anglican diocese well beyond the Second World War, and helped to form the incentive to establish the New University Colleges Council for the purpose of founding new Anglican colleges. The rather elitist and exclusive nature of the older colleges such as St. Paul's, the 'fresher system', and the association of these colleges with liberal and modernist theology, gave rise to the denominational colleges being seen somewhat like Bishop Broughton had seen the University, as places of false and anti-church views. Rather than the colleges completely sectarianising the University, it seemed, if anything, that the University had secularised the colleges – at least, any distinctive role of representing revealed religion had been neutralised.

The Sydney Anglican diocese, especially following the election of Howard Mowll as Archbishop and the appointment of T. C. Hammond as Principal of Moore College, put far greater store in the support and encouragement of the Evangelical Union and the establishment of chaplaincies to students of the universities; its representation at the Consultation in Melbourne in 1961 sought to ensure that such a distinctive evangelical presence on campus was fostered and maintained. It was in this way that “soul-destroying philosophies” within the universities might be countered. The more ecumenical Council of Churches and SCM approaches, that were commonly associated with universities outside Sydney - especially seen at the Australian National and Monash universities - were opposed.
The confluence of circumstances and motives that occurred in the immediate post World War II decades – the founding of new universities, the vastly increased demand for accommodation, the desire of government to fund and support denominational colleges as well as university halls, the granting of Commonwealth/State aid to independent schools, and a renewed and vigorous interest of the churches in Christian work among students – gave opportunity for both more liberal ecumenists and more conservative evangelicals to take advantage of the accepted position of colleges on campus so that they might be, as agreed at the Melbourne Consultation, centres of Christian intellectual activity and the means of making a strong Christian witness in the academic setting. While this was translated by the ecumenists into the foundation of Burgmann College at the ANU and an attempt, largely thwarted by lack of finance, to establish a Christian Collegiate Community at Monash, their approach was perhaps most significantly represented by the setting up, not of a college, but of the Monash University Religious Centre. The New University Colleges Council and its foundation of New and Robert Menzies Colleges in Sydney represented perhaps the most distinct evangelical attempt to fashion collegiate residence in a way that would provide for the expression of reformed evangelical faith. Catholic initiative was chiefly exercised through the Dominican Order on behalf of the various dioceses, though at the University of New South Wales, through the more controversial and conservative Opus Dei Apostolate (now Prelature).
Testing the Relationship:

The challenge and controversies that arose in relation to Robert Menzies and Warrane Colleges tested the relationship of the sacred and the secular at a time when sensitivities to the place of Church and College on Campus were most volatile. While the Committees of Enquiry affirmed the importance of there being no religious tests applied for entry to the Colleges, and found that neither College had applied such tests of particular faith or belief, they saw the creation of an “atmosphere conducive to the advancement of a particular religion or part of it”, and the governance of religious Colleges “according to certain moral principles which admit of neither compromise or debate”, as able to be in accord with or even to the advantage of “the interests of the College community as a whole” and with the University’s duty “to tolerate intellectual pluralism and the expression of disparate views” – John Woolley’s “spirit of union”. Within the ambit of the secular University’s concern for “encouraging scholarship and the pursuit of knowledge, and in stimulating and protecting free debate and enquiry” there was scope for the Colleges to formulate for themselves the manner in which their purposes might best be attained. The principle of pluralism ought to encompass the profession and practices of any particular faith; at the same time, however, the spirit of toleration ought to be exercised within the Colleges in such a way as to show respect for the beliefs and privacy of others. Clericalism, conservative intransigence, and militant evangelism were seen as potentially alienating of University respect and trust. In essence, the Committees of Enquiry
asserted for the Colleges the right to exercise the role intended for them by the founders of Australia's first University, as places of "religious training and moral superintendence", as well as of residence and tutorial supervision. Just as the early founders did, however, they opposed any sectarian intrusion and influence into the affairs and teaching of the University. Nevertheless, the outcomes of the Enquiries signalled a challenge to any view that necessary compromise in the coexistence of College and Campus must inevitably mean for Church colleges the neutralisation of any distinct religious character.

By 1975 the focus in new residential accommodation for university students had clearly begun to shift to a greater variety of university-managed housing and halls. Very few denominational colleges have been established since then.\footnote{Richard Johnson College is an Anglican College in association with the University of Wollongong, and the Anglican St. Martin's College and Roman Catholic St. Francis College are at the Charles Sturt University in Wagga Wagga.} Funding arrangements became very different from the period of relative largesse up until the early 1970s, and any denominational interest in establishing church colleges significantly declined.\footnote{NUCC continued to discuss plans for colleges in association with Sydney University and Wollongong University well into the 1980s, and concern was also expressed later for a college in association with the University of Western Sydney. Issues of funding were clearly obstacles to the realisation of such aims. In November 1984, NUCC had resolved that its general plans for the future involved “both the continuing policy of strong support for the colleges (New & Robert Menzies) and their future development and the establishing of additional colleges as opportunities arise. Such initiatives may require financial and other assistance being sought from the existing foundations.” The need did not arise.} No doubt the challenge of dealing with secular campuses, the costs and responsibilities involved, and the seemingly inevitable compromise with humanism have been disincentives. As Mark Hutchinson has noted: “Many colleges have begun with firm religious principles, only to have
these whittled away with the colleges becoming either business-oriented places with little room for educational or religious activities; or merely lovely buildings sliding slowly into intellectual, spiritual and physical delapidation ... Universities treat their peripheral institutions as ways around budgetary constraints, and churches treat them as sinecures." All colleges, denominational or otherwise, have claimed significance in their care and support over and above any hall or hostel; they have largely demonstrated Professor Woolley's view that the "great advantage" of the Colleges was in the provision of "tutorial instruction and academic discipline", especially for students from the country.

Distinctive Roles:

Denominational colleges have on the whole, therefore, been successful in their provision of pastoral and academic care and support, and in creating a milieu for the engagement of ideas. Indeed, the relevance of such colleges even now and into the future is arguably enhanced rather than diminished by the increasingly corporate and entrepreneurial focus and character of Australia's campuses. Simon Marginson and Mark Considine use the term "enterprise university" in which "money is a key objective, but ... also the means to a more fundamental mission: to advance the prestige and competitiveness of the university as an end in itself. At the same time, academic identities, in their variations, are subordinated to the mission, marketing and strategic development of the

13 Mark Hutchinson "A Scottish Name ..." pp.80 & 105
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A sense of collegiality, it seems, has gone from the "temple", and concerns expressed by the then Professor (later Sir) Zelman Cowen in the 'Sir John Morris Memorial Lecture' in 1974 take on renewed significance in his quoting Clark Kerr: "It will require the solution of many sub-problems ... How to treat the individual student as a unique human being in the mass student body; how to make the university seem smaller even as it grows larger; how to establish a range of contact between faculty and students broader than the one-way route across the lectern or through the television (or computer) screen ..." Albeit with application to a more residence-oriented pattern in the United Kingdom, there is some relevance to the Australian scene in the words of Joan Brothers and Stephen Hatch in their 'Sociological Inquiry into Residence in Higher Education', published in 1971: "Residence is a tool of higher education. It is a particularly useful tool for humanizing and personalizing the system; for making large institutions feel small enough for the individual to be able to feel identified with them and capable of participating; and for widening the scope of higher education." Colleges, and especially denominational ones with a particular ethos of care, can play a positive role in helping to reclaim something of the university "temple" from the "money-changers".

The success of the "sacred" dimension of denominational colleges in relation to
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the secular context of the campus is, however, more open to question. Theological training within the Melbourne Colleges – Trinity, Ormond and Queen’s – and the dominant influence within the University and beyond of their Masters in the latter 1800s and early 1900s, indicated a measure of the success claimed in Belfast on the award in 1891 of a doctorate to Sir John MacFarland, Master of Ormond, when it was declared that the “difficult problem of uniting a University training (free of religion) ... to a system of collegiate residence (with its recognition of religious truths and sanctions) ... has been solved.”

The St. Andrew’s Theological Hall was a place of religious instruction within the physical bounds of the Sydney campus, with noted teachers such as Andrew Harper, Samuel Angus and John McIntyre; and Wardens of St. Paul’s such as Radford, Garnsey and Arnott, were regarded well in the wider University community as well as within the College.

The influence of clergy and other Christian scholars in chapel and collegiate conversation has undoubtedly had a significant bearing upon the lives of untold numbers – in turn, among them people who have exercised leadership in the life of the nation and beyond. Student religious societies such as the SCM and the EU have been represented among and have engaged with college residents. The Newman Society, priests and religious have clearly sought within the older and newer colleges - such as St. John’s and Sancta in Sydney, Newman and St. Mary’s in Melbourne, St. Leo’s and Duchesne at Queensland, St. Thomas More
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at the University of Western Australia, Ursula and John XXIII at the ANU, St. Albert's at UNE, and Mannix at Monash - to integrate the tenets of Catholic faith with the teaching of the secular faculties of the university. The situations that gave rise to the Committees of Enquiry into Robert Menzies and Warrane Colleges were indications, each in its own way, of the Colleges being seen as places of opportunity on campus not only of Christian care, but for commitment and conversion. The NUCC colleges and that of Opus Dei would have no truck with any liberal notion of the "rumour of God", but rather, as each founding body saw them, with the rudiments of the Gospel.

The Sacred Secularised ?:

Nevertheless, Australia's universities have consistently applied the principle of separation of the sacred from the secular; of keeping the teaching of religion in any dogmatic sense well apart from the teaching of secular knowledge; of opposing any sectarian influence on the character and curriculum of the university. Church, College and Campus may co-exist, but in affiliation the sacred has very much remained on the sidelines. Systematic religious teaching has largely been sent to the seminaries. Overall, denominational colleges have tended to accommodate the principle of pluralism by allowing for the secularisation of the sacred - by appearing somewhat neutral in relating faith to scholarship, belief to learning. It is perhaps something akin to what James Burtchaell describes in relation to colleges and universities - albeit teaching
colleges – of “diverse ecclesial origins” in the United States of America in their efforts to avoid the taint of sectarianism: “Gun-shy liberals learned to talk religiously without giving offense, by saying much and affirming little”; the Christian colleges have been characterised by a “slide into liberal indifferentism ... To sidestep embarrassment they must reduce their description of the colleges’ ambitions and the churches’ expectations to secular bafflegab”.19 With an obvious need to establish and maintain a recognised and acceptable association with the university, it may be concluded that, on the whole, denominational colleges have compromised the sacred with the secular to the point where their distinctive religious significance has all but been lost.

A Renewed Purpose for Denominational Colleges?:

In writing about the secularisation of America’s first teaching colleges – essentially reformed, evangelical denominational institutions – George Marsden notes that “college and university leaders were responding to broader cultural forces and many legitimate demands. So rather than finding many culprits, what we typically find are unintended consequences of decisions that in their day seemed largely laudable, or at least unavoidable. The evaluative question is whether the unintended consequences regarding religion are desirable. Particularly, in a just society might there not be more room for the free exercise

of religion in relation to higher learning?" Emeritus Professor Edwin Judge would agree that such room can and ought to be found in the denominational colleges in a way that neither compromises an effective relationship between Church, College and Campus nor the assertion of the particulars of faith. He opposes a retreat into an Australian Christian University, but rather that denominational colleges and Christian institutes within or without them, "where Christian doctrine in one form or another can be taught on Christian standards, not secular standards", might exist "in neighbourliness with the university", contributing "an authentic independent input to university life." In the latter decades of the 1900s such institutes have been formed in connection, for example, with New and Robert Menzies Colleges. Professor Judge argues that, as determined in relation to Australia's first universities, the credal teaching of doctrine cannot be part of the secular curriculum - "universities cannot teach credally." The attempt to marry credal doctrine with the secular curriculum is a mistake, but they can exist in cohabitation - albeit that such cohabitation will represent a dynamic interplay of "the contradiction between classical naturalism and the Biblical conception of the world as an artefact of God." The founders of the first Australian universities saw the denominational colleges as, among other things, places of systematic religious instruction; the university
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"temple" placed its "sanctuary" on the side, in the colleges. Over one hundred years later, the 1970s Committees of Enquiry upheld the distinctive nature of the colleges, provided there were no religious tests for entry and the rights of residents were respected with due regard to the university's spirit of toleration. With that in mind, words of Brian Kelly might well apply in the context of Church, College and Campus in Australia: "The challenge to Christian colleges is therefore to serve the common good of our society by positively valuing our distinctiveness ... by discovering and deepening our identity, not diluting it."²⁵

In the relationship of the sacred with the secular, it might well be a legitimate way forward that, in reclaiming the "temple", the original purposes for which the denominational colleges were established might also be reclaimed. Clearly, the "contradictions" in the cohabitation of the sacred with the secular "need to be explored and to be open to testing from either side."²⁶ This is a worthwhile though rather daunting challenge for the future of Church, College and Campus. It too could be a very difficult experiment.

²⁶ Ibid
## APPENDIX

### Affiliated Denominational Colleges

(Australian Universities, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Men/Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew’s</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancta Sophia</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Clarke Hall</td>
<td>1886/1962</td>
<td>(ind. of Trinity) Anglican</td>
<td>W/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley</td>
<td>1891/1965</td>
<td>(affiliated) Baptist</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley</td>
<td>1910/1965</td>
<td>(affiliated) Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hilda’s</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark’s</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Franklin Hall</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Tas. Council of Churches</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Fisher</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Uniting/Presbyterian</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Leo’s</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Uniting/Presbyterian</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas More</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Columba</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John XXIII</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgmann</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Ang/Uni/Pres/Bap/Ch.of Chr.</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrane</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert’s</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannix</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmore Lang</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Presbyterian (ceased association)</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Menzies</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook</td>
<td>1970 (as a University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Raphael’s</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark’s</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flynn</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Uniting/ Lutheran</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Johnson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sturt (Wagga Wagga) 1989 (as a University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

(Written in response to some points made by the examiners.)

*A Church, A Home, A School:*

The Place of Women and the Nature of Religious Instruction in the Early Colleges of Sydney and Melbourne

“Every day we realise more strongly that our realm is no longer the sole domain of men, so let us extend the warm hand of welcome to our new sister ...”

- The Magazine of the Students of St John’s College within the University of Sydney, 1927

Safeguarding the Faith:

In February 1917, the Reverend Father Dr Maurice O’Reilly, Rector of St John’s College within the University of Sydney, circulated a letter to the Mothers Superior concerning the attendance of “our religious teachers” at lectures of the University. He noted that “in spite of the palpable disadvantages of attending a Secular University, there was much to be gained by securing a University degree … if only for the purpose of showing that our Catholic teachers, both men and women, are capable of making good, even in a field of the enemy’s choosing.”1 While indicating that the Apostolic Delegate and the Bishops of New South Wales were unanimous in their invitation for secondary school teachers to attend Arts and Science courses of the University of Sydney “with a view to graduation in the same”, he added that “in order to neutralise the dangers attendant on such a course of studies at a secular University, special lectures will be available at St John’s College,

---

which, it is hoped, will abundantly safeguard the faith of religious undergraduates of both sexes.”

Dr O’Reilly’s words echoed a great deal of Catholic concern about secular education and, as well, represented much of the purpose, indeed the defense of the role of the Catholic residential college within the University and the wider role of a religious presence on the secular University campus. In May 1874, Archbishop Vaughan on his first official visit to St John’s College, of which he became Rector, spoke of a “battle” for the Christian student against an “ever-growing body of men, massing themselves together from almost every walk of life … (with) their common attitude of menace to Christianity in all its creeds.” The University would not escape “the wave of infidelity which is upheaving, confusing, and … sickening the mind of Europe”, and thus St John’s College was “pre-eminently fitted to become the main fortress amongst us of Catholic Christianity.”

Nearly thirty years later, a pastoral letter from the Archbishop and Bishops of New South Wales, emphasised the role of St John’s College as a “fortress” in the “enemy’s fields” by asserting its purpose as providing a “Catholic atmosphere for its students” in which “they might be preserved from the undeniable dangers of university life, and from the not less certain perils of a big and pleasure-loving metropolis.” The importance of such an atmosphere for the Catholic student entering University from school was stressed by ‘L.M.H.’ in an article in the Magazine of the students of St John’s College in December 1924: “The Catholic student, fresh from the environment of his Alma Mater, enters the

---

2 Ibid p.243  
4 Ibid pp.427-428
University – an entirely secular one, where the Goddess of Reason alone reigns supreme … the University is essentially a Godless place – religion is taboo or spoken of in a jocular manner … A Catholic young man at a University must have a deeper knowledge of Catholic Ethics if he is to remain true to his faith. He must live in a Catholic environment – he must have someone near at hand to whom he can appeal in time of need and be sure of succour. Can he get this if living in a boarding house? Assuredly not … what of the ‘atmosphere’, that intangible, ethereal substance which silently, unobtrusively, and unnoticed, has been moulding his recently acquired ideas? No! He must go to a Catholic College for that ‘atmosphere’.”

Catholic Women:

In line with his letter to the Mothers Superior in 1917 – in seeking to “neutralise the dangers” of secular study - and in seeking to develop a deeper knowledge of “Catholic Ethics” among Catholic students, Dr O’Reilly conducted a series of lectures at St John’s College in 1922, 1923 and 1924, on such topics as ‘The Church and the Bible’, ‘Bigotry and Intolerance’, ‘The Individual and the State’, and ‘Natural Theology’. Perhaps, however, the greater significance of his letter in 1917 was the implication for Catholic women attending the University, in this particular case Catholic religious. While Father O’Reilly and Cardinal Moran had been strong supporters of more academic depth in the

---

5 Pastoral Letter on Catholics and University Education, 21st November 1923, in Patrick O’Farrell op.cit p.245
6 L. M. H. ‘Quo Vadis’ The Magazine of the students of St John’s College No.6, December 1924, p.4 (Fisher Library Rare Books, University of Sydney)
secondary education of girls, they and others remained as strongly concerned for the impact of secular teaching on those who enrolled in University degree courses or undertook the University ‘Diploma of Education’ conducted at the Teachers’ College. A proposal had been put to the University in 1909 that lectures be conducted for Sisters and laywomen by professors of the University at ‘Kincoppal’, Elizabeth Bay, thus avoiding the need to attend the University itself. The Senate was not entirely opposed to the idea, but it was eventually rejected, particularly as it could be seen as a precedent for other groups to argue for such an extension scheme. A University College for nuns was not to be. Clearly, however, following indication of acceptance of religious attending the courses of the University, and with the realisation that Catholic women were attending the University in greater numbers than had been thought, the desire for a Catholic Women’s College gained greater acceptance and support. The Women’s College, opened in 1892, though non-denominational, was regarded as largely a Protestant place and it was time the Catholics assumed their ground in the provision of proper supervision, care and religious and moral instruction for Catholic women.

By the 1920s there had been some change in the attitude of the Catholic Church, and in that of the wider community, towards the higher education of women, but moves to affirm and to promote the pursuit of degree courses by women, and particularly to share the seeming advantages and rights of men, were often viewed with the perceptions of the

---

9 *Ibid* pp.31-32
10 *Ibid* p.34
11 Archbishop Kelly, who succeeded Cardinal Moran in 1911, expressed surprise that some 60 Catholic women attended the University (Marie Kennedy *op. cit.* p.30).
previous century – with doubt, suspicion, or outright opposition. Arguments at the time of
the proposal for a Women’s College at the University were still widely held. Nearly ten
years after The Senate of Sydney University agreed “to admit women to all University
privileges, and to place them in all respects as regards University matters on an equal
footing with men”\textsuperscript{12}, \textit{The Bulletin} editorial in May 1890 vehemently opposed the raising
of public money and the granting of Government money for the purpose of establishing
such a College. The Government was well disposed, it seemed, to support “the daughters
of the wealthy in their efforts to attain a ‘higher education’ “, but it refused to recognise
any responsibility “to find work or bread for its starving children.”\textsuperscript{13} Much ‘higher
education’, it was argued, involved “the inculcation of fruitless and valueless knowledge”
which neither benefited the individual nor the community. “Women cannot be too
learned, provided the learning she has helps her to fulfil her varied functions as mother,
nurse, educator and trainer of her children … her education must have the future well in
view … Any education which unfit her for the fulfilment of her maternal responsibilities
is not only useless – it is most emphatically a curse … A girl who has received a ‘higher’
education is generally a prig, or a poser. She cannot help it. It is a characteristic of her
sex.”\textsuperscript{14} There was also the view, as reported in \textit{The Sydney Morning Herald} in June 1892,
that the “brain of the woman is smaller than that of the man … and the supply of blood
therefore relatively smaller, suggesting a corresponding deficiency, of course, in agility,

\textsuperscript{12} 6\textsuperscript{th} April 1881: Clifford Turney, Ursula Bygott & Peter Chippendale \textit{Australia’s First} Volume 1, Hale &
Iremonger, Sydney, 1991, p.183
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{The Bulletin} Saturday 10\textsuperscript{th} May 1890, p.4 (State Library of NSW)
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid}
smartness, and endurance.”15 The article went on to appeal for “sweet reasonableness” in the debate, and noted that the movement in favour of women’s higher education “is in itself too rational, too obviously just, and too much the outcome of the more liberal and progressive views of the age in which we live, ever to be permanently checked now that it has been taken up once for all in a spirit of real earnestness.”16 Interestingly, it was reported in the same paper that “Miss Stawell, of Newnham College” (Cambridge, and formerly of Melbourne University) “has gained first-class honours in the first division of the classical tripos at the University of Cambridge”.17

The view, however, that the most fitting and God-given role for women was in the nurturing and loving support of home and family exercised strong influence on the attitudes of many clergy and religious towards the provision of support for women seeking to gain university degrees. The world needed, declared a Parramatta Sister of Mercy in 1900, “not clever girls … but selfless devoted women”; “the place of woman in Creation’s plan”, stated a delegate to the Catholic Congress in 1904, was that of “queen of the household”; and the true Catholic girl, noted a Dominican nun in 1922, should be “an angel of consolation to her family, and a treasure to society.”18 The need for a residence for Catholic women attending Sydney University was as much promoted by those who recognised the growth and significance of their numbers as by those who wished to ensure their physical and moral protection and to safeguard them in the

---

15 Sir James Crichton Browne, quoted in an article in *The Sydney Morning Herald* Tuesday 21st June 1892, p.4 (State Library of NSW)
16 Ibid
17 Ibid p.5
knowledge of their faith. It must be noted that even the non-denominational Women’s College recognised the need for a context of certain standards in what was regarded by the first Principal, Louisa Macdonald, as an environment, unlike England, in which “there is nothing to remind us of human aspirations after the divine.”

Compulsory attendance at morning prayers was therefore seen as “an excellent means of enforcing punctuality.”

Sancta Sophia – Our Fair Neighbours:

The Religious of the Sacred Heart were asked to conduct the work involved in establishing a Catholic Women’s College, which began as a centre for Catholic women students in 1923 in rather dilapidated premises at No.23 City Road. There were no residents, but space was provided for meetings of the Catholic Women’s Undergraduate Club and the University Catholic Women’s Society, for lectures, and for a library and a chapel. Dr O’Reilly, as chaplain, was keen to have a residential facility established, though he saw such a place as a hostel attached to St John’s College, albeit conducted by the Sacred Heart sisters. They, however, were determined to be independent. On land set aside by St John’s College and still with the view that the women’s residence would be under the aegis of St John’s, the foundation stone of the future Sancta Sophia College was laid on 26th March 1925. The College, or hall of residence as it then was, was officially opened in August 1926 under the Principalship of the Reverend Mother

19 Louisa Macdonald to Eleanor Grove, 4th May 1895, in Jeanette Beaumont and W. Vere Hole Letters from Louisa: A woman’s view of the 1890s, based on the letters of Louisa Macdonald, first principal of the Women’s College, University of Sydney Allen & Unwin, St Leonards NSW, 1996, p.70
20 Ibid pp.69-70
21 Marie Kennedy op.cit. pp.44-46
Margaret MacRory. In 1927, the students’ magazine of St John’s College, re-named in that year *John’s*, reported that the new Catholic Women’s College “although only in its second year of existence … is already filled and a new residential wing is under construction.”²² The “friendly feeling and spirit of co-operation” was noted with “our fair neighbours”, and that it was “indeed a happy thought in the minds of the founders of the new Sancta Sophia when they decided to rear a Women’s College beside the old and picturesque building” of St John’s. The men of St John’s looked forward to a time when both Colleges would be completed and filled, and that it would be “a great day for the future of Catholicity in this State” when Catholic men and women at the University “will be able to live beside each other, enjoying the more or less abstract but invaluable benefits that only College life can give ….”²³ Other comments, though welcoming, were somewhat patronising of the “pretty maidens with gowns untorn, and trenchers nestling daintily over shiny shingles and peeping curls”.²⁴ While it was noted that “the old misogynistic section of our fraternity which tried not to notice this ‘upstart’ colony of femininity, seems to be dwindling”, there was concern about whether the nature of initiation into the “Hall” would merit it true status - with the men, of course: “Rumour hath it that one recalcitrant fresher was introduced to a cold shower, and that another’s room was ‘turned-in’, although without the skill of experienced hands. These vague rumours brought fresh hope to the men of John’s, and one day we hope to see our fair neighbours baptising their freshers (or should I say freshettes?) in the ‘fons sacer’ near the side gate which has enveloped in its icy contents so many generations of Johnsmen,

---

²² *John’s* Volume 1, No.7, December 1927, p.11 (Fisher Library)  
²³ Ibid  
²⁴ B. de B. ‘Over Yonder’ *Ibid* p.18
or executing sylvan dances beneath the midnight stars on our verdant lawns. Then will be justly proud of our little sister, and eagerly welcome her to a shining seat with her brother colleges.” Dr O’Reilly certainly believed in the benefits of a close association between Sancta and St John’s, but despite his continuing insistence that Sancta Sophia would best develop as part of St John’s College, the careful and diplomatic work of leading Catholic citizens such as Sir Mark Sheldon and the Honourable John Mullins secured the independence of the Catholic women’s College under the University Colleges Act in December 1929.

A Hearing in the Seat of Learning:

While in Melbourne there was concern among Catholics for the spiritual welfare and growth of those attending the University, there was not the same degree of defensiveness as there was expressed in Sydney about the impact of secular education on the religious life of the Catholic student. Here was a contrast somewhat similar to that between the Anglican Church in Sydney and the Anglican Church in Melbourne; between Bishop Broughton and Bishop Perry. Melbourne Catholicism was much more open to University involvement and to an intellectual tradition than it was in Sydney, where particularly Cardinal Moran and Archbishop Kelly were both strongly suspicious of secular higher education. It seems that the lack of money was the chief reason for the delay in the Catholics taking advantage of the land set aside for residential colleges at Melbourne.

---

25 Ibid
26 Ibid pp.82-83
University; certainly Archbishop Carr, appointed Archbishop of Melbourne in 1886, was
enthusiastic for such a College to be built. The bishops of Victoria in 1907 expressed
their “earnest desire” for a Catholic College to be established in connection with
Melbourne University, but noted that the financial commitment to the Catholic schools
system had stood in the way of achieving such a goal. A College in association with the
University was seen as part of the tradition of the Catholic Church, and important in
securing the best possible education for “our professional men and our natural leaders in
the various walks of life …”

It was Archbishop Daniel Mannix, soon after arriving in Victoria in 1913, who expressed
strong support for involvement in the life of the University and who brought about the
establishment of both a Catholic College for men and a Hall for women. “You look
forward”, he declared at a public welcome after his arrival, “to the time when the
Catholics of Australia will avail themselves even more fully than they do now of the
culture and learning and other advantages which the Universities place within their reach.
The progress and development of the Commonwealth, and its place and standing among
the nations, is bound up with the work of the Universities.” He, like those in Sydney,
was conscious of “dangers to be guarded against” by Catholics undertaking University
education, but he added that “in a progressive age, and especially in a new and
progressive country … probably the greatest danger of all would be if Catholics were to

28 Geoffrey Blainey A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne Melbourne University Press,
Carlton Vic., 1957, p.172
29 Pastoral Letter from the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Melbourne, 1907, in Patrick
O’Farrell Documents in Australian Catholic History Vol.II, p.83
30 Ibid
31 E. J. Brady Doctor Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne The Library of National Biography (Dominion
Series), Melbourne, 1934, p.41
stand aloof from Universities, to contribute nothing to the atmosphere which the coming men in Australia are breathing in the formative period of their lives – to exercise no influence in shaping the thoughts and ideals of the Universities …”32 His, it seemed, was a much more proactive rather than reactive view; a more positive stance in which the University was seen, not as the enemy, but as an opportunity. Albeit “with all due and sufficient safeguards for their faith and for the practice of their religion”, Catholics should “take their proper place in the Universities” and “obtain a hearing in the seats of learning …”33

Newman and St Mary’s:

When Archbishop Kelly was slow to respond to an offer made by Mr Thomas Donovan of a gift of £30,000, provided it was matched by the Church, it was taken up by Daniel Mannix in 1915 and more than matched by the Catholics of Victoria.34 Walter Burley Griffin was commissioned to design a Catholic men’s College, and on 11th June 1916 the foundation stone of Newman College was laid. The College opened in March 1918. At the same time, and well before the foundation of Sancta Sophia College in Sydney, the bishops of Victoria set up a Hall for Catholic women. Conducted by the Loreto Sisters, who were also in charge of the Teachers’ Training College in Albert Park, and attached to Newman College, St Mary’s Hall was located away from the University campus in Parkville. The separation was at the insistence of Archbishop Mannix who believed the

32 Ibid p.42
33 Ibid pp.42-43
34 D. F. Burke, CM, A History of the Catholic Church in Victoria The Catholic Bishops of Victoria, 1988, p.219
distance between the two colleges was appropriate and safe, and that no harm would come by the women having to walk ten minutes to the University.\textsuperscript{35} Despite the availability of land on the Newman site, the Archbishop maintained his opposition to moving St Mary’s for more than forty years “before conceding that he was wrong”.\textsuperscript{36} The move occurred in 1966, with St Mary’s becoming an independent Catholic College.

\textbf{Trinity ‘Hostiles’:}

It is perhaps not surprising that Melbourne had a Catholic Women’s residence well before Sydney, as women were involved with the other denominational colleges at Melbourne University even before the establishment of the Women’s College at Sydney in 1892. On 4\textsuperscript{th} April 1883 Lilian Alexander, a student in first year Arts at Melbourne University, was admitted to attend lectures as a non-resident student at Trinity College, the Anglican residential college established in 1872.\textsuperscript{37} Women had been admitted to the University in 1881, but the additional College lectures, tutorial and library facilities were seen as most advantageous to success in examinations. The move was not without opposition, as evidenced in a letter received by the Warden, Alexander Leeper, from J. Warrington-Rogers, a member of the Trinity Council. He noted that, due to a law lecture he was to give at the University, he was unable to attend a meeting of the Council at which the matter was to be discussed. He wished however “to state the extreme regret with which I see the proposal to introduce women as students with the College. I

\textsuperscript{35} Niall Brennan \textit{Dr Mannix} Rigby Limited, Adelaide, 1964, pp.298-299
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid
\textsuperscript{37} Lilian Alexander later changed to Medicine and became a distinguished Melbourne doctor. She was one of the founders of the Queen Victoria Hospital for Women in 1896. She died in 1934.
sincerely trust that no such proposition will be carried. If it happens to be carried it must
of course of necessity terminate the connection with the College of men who entertain
similar views to myself upon this subject. It seems to me to be a most unfortunate move
in a direction which will injure the College.” 38 Only five council members attended the
meeting and it was resolved that the Warden should have discretion in allowing women
to attend the College lectures. 39 Dr Leeper later recalled: “I favoured (the admission)
myself, but it was a matter too important to settle on my own account, so I took it to
Bishop Moorhouse, and was surprised to find that he strongly objected. The reason of his
objection was extraordinary. It seems, indeed, almost incredible at this stage of the
world’s history. He represented that it would prejudice the squatters against the college,
because they would not like to see their sons marry the penniless girls they would meet
there. When a man like Bishop Moorhouse could urge such a reason, can one wonder that
the emancipation of woman was so long delayed?” 40 Following an overseas visit in 1884
that included inspection of women’s university residences, such as Girton College that
had opened at Cambridge in 1869, Alexander Leeper was determined to provide
residence in association with the College – not separate or independent - for the non-
resident women students. The College Council and the Church were not in favour of any
independent arrangements as these would have financial, organisational, and religious
implications. 41 In 1886 two houses were rented in Sydney Road near the College, with a
Trinity tutor, the Reverend T. Jollie Smith, and his wife, appointed to manage the Trinity

38 J. Warrington Rogers to Alexander Leeper, 10th April 1883 (Trinity College Archives, Box 3D)
39 James Grant Perspective of a Century: A volume for the Centenary of Trinity College Melbourne 1872 –
1972 The Council of Trinity College, Melbourne, 1972, p.163
40 Alexander Leeper ‘Memories of College Life’ The Argus Saturday 13th July 1918 (Trinity College
Archives)
41 Farley Kelly Degrees of Liberation: A Short History of Women in the University of Melbourne The
Women Graduates’ Centenary Committee of the University of Melbourne, Parkville Vic.,1985, p.25
Women’s Hostel. Proposals were made in 1888 for a more permanent site, with a particular donation of £5,000 being received from Lady Janet Clarke, who, it is suggested, along with others, was not keen for a movement to build a non-denominational women’s college to succeed.\(^{42}\) The site chosen was adjacent to Trinity, though Dr Leeper and a number of the women residents had wanted a larger site that would allow for expansion of both the men’s and women’s residences.\(^{43}\) The new Trinity College Women’s Hostel (later Janet Clarke Hall) was formally opened in April 1891. The Prospectus noted that in “preparing for University Examinations, Students of the Hostel\(^{44}\) have the assistance of the tutorial staff of Trinity College and the benefit of the College lectures, as well as the use of the libraries and laboratories. Members of all religious denominations are admitted. Prayers from the Anglican Liturgy are read daily by the Principal, which Students are expected to attend either in the morning or the evening … Students of the Hostel attend the Sunday services in the Chapel of Trinity College.”\(^{45}\)

**Ormond Women:**

In these early years there was, in spite of official support and examination success, not a great deal of easy acceptance of the involvement of women in the University and especially in the male-oriented Colleges. Women were usually made to sit apart from

\(^{42}\) James Grant *op.cit.* p.165

\(^{43}\) The Trinity College Archives (Box 3G) holds a letter from some women students to Dr Leeper concerning this matter. The signatories include Melian Stawell, referred to in *The Sydney Morning Herald* 21\(^{st}\) June 1892 as gaining first class honours in classics at Cambridge University.

\(^{44}\) The Hostel students came to be known as “Hostiles”.

\(^{45}\) Trinity College Hostel Prospectus 1894 (Trinity College Archives, Box 11). Attendance at prayers and Chapel services was included among the “House Rules”.

men at the front of the lecture room, and their association at Melbourne from 1888 was much within the confines of the ‘Princess Ida Club’. Non-resident students, and especially women non-resident students, were very much at “arms-length” in their relationship with the Colleges; in the College and wider University context “the woman student, ideally and in reality, inhabited foreign territory …”46 Ormond College admitted its first non-resident woman student, Elizabeth Whyte, in 1885; with increasing numbers, the women non-residents gained kudos for the College by their academic achievements. There was, however, no move to establish a residence for women, though at one point approaches were made for an arrangement with the Trinity Hostel. While “from the first, Ormond College readily accepted women students … their experiences show that acceptance to have been both limited and equivocal. At a time when colleges rivalled the University in academic strength these women were natural and desirable acquisitions, albeit as only non-residents, for an ambitious College … Membership of an unmistakably male college, however, entailed social reticence and compliance … They rarely challenged or entered into the male ethos of the College, and by the early 1900s this path had been institutionalised with the creation of the Ormond Women’s Society.”47 The women were frequently praised, not for their academic success, but for their catering for social functions, “hand-worked replacements” for worn and torn College flags, and their design and make of costumes for the College plays, in which they were “not acting of course”.48

47 Ibid pp.77-78
48 Ibid pp.74-76
Queen’s ‘Outsiders’:

If Trinity College could claim to be the first to associate women students with its lectures, Queen’s College, which opened in 1888, claimed the first female resident. Miriam Merfield was one of ten residents in the College’s first year, and resided in “a study and bedroom … provided in the Master’s house”.49 As much as Dr Sugden, the first Master, favoured and supported the residence of women in the College, the arrangement did not last long, as, following the accommodation in 1889 of a second student, it was considered not to be satisfactory.50 Dr Sugden noted that a reason for this was the likely increasing numbers from the Methodist Ladies College51, though his daughter, May, recorded that he found the two residents troublesome, with the second student being “a perfect idiot” who did “nothing but flirt with the men”! 52 The men, it seemed, were perfectly innocent. Nevertheless, Dr Sugden, with six daughters, was more than supportive of women’s higher education and gained the approval of the Queen’s Council for the setting up of a “Girls Hostel” on the College grounds. Meetings “of Ladies connected with our metropolitan and suburban Churches” were called to raise funds53, with Dr Sugden commenting in a letter to a friend in England: “Hostel scheme going forward. Meeting of ladies last Tuesday. Great enthusiasm.”54 Plans were prepared and approved, but, despite

49 E. H. Sugden The History of Queen’s College within the University of Melbourne Queen’s College, Melbourne, 1933, p.17 (Queen’s College Library)
50 Ibid
51 Ibid p.20
52 Philippa Maddern St Hilda’s College: Forerunners and Foundations St Hilda’s College, University of Melbourne, 1989, p.3
54 22nd March 1888. Letters of E. H. Sugden, donated by Miss May Sugden, 1965 (Queen’s College Archives)
the “great enthusiasm”, financial giving was not strong and there appeared to the Council to be the greater need to provide further accommodation for men – a more “sound proposition”.\textsuperscript{55} As in the Catholic arena, the view was prevalent that women’s education, even at the “higher” level, was best focussed on support for the husband and the home. An uneducated woman “may be no companion for her husband in his higher moods, no help-meet for him to turn to in the storms and stress of life”.\textsuperscript{56} Education for the professions often meant for women, however, a choice not to marry. The association with and involvement of women in the male-dominated colleges gave rise to much ambivalence as to how most appropriately to cater for the needs of an ever-increasing female population in the University. The women in association with Trinity College might well have been “Hostiles”, but the women non-residents of Queen’s were very aptly referred to as the “outsiders” and even as the “outpatients”! Nevertheless, with the pooling of tutorial resources among the colleges, Vera Jennings recalls with warm affection the tutorials in English she attended as a “Hostile” at Queens: “(Dr Sugden) is so funny; but it would take too long to explain his fun (perhaps impossible without a Yorkshire accent). It’s nice that he is lively at 5 o’clock, as we are tired by then. He is going to arrange an evening a week for reading the plays, with a cup of tea to wash it down.”\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{55} Philippa Maddern \textit{op.cit.} pp.4-5
\textsuperscript{56} Mrs H. A. Doudy, c.1914, in \textit{Ibid} p.7
\textsuperscript{57} Hume Dow (Ed.) \textit{Memories of Melbourne University: Undergraduate Life in the Years Since 1917} Hutchinson of Australia, Richmond Vic., 1983, p.7
University Women’s and St Hilda’s:

By 1913 at Queen’s College “the number of women students had steadily increased, and many of them had obtained high places in the University Honour Lists, and were thoroughly deserving of College Scholarships. Something had been done for them by providing lodgings in Parkville … but this was manifestly only a temporary measure.”

In that year the ‘Wyverna Club’ of the Past Women Students was formed, and it took as a particular aim the setting up of a Women’s Hall or Hostel. After the ‘Great War’, the focus was increasingly on the establishment of an independent Women’s College, along the lines of the College at Sydney University. The ‘Wyvernas’ decided that their funds should be directed towards such a College, as well as establishing within Queen’s College a “suitable sitting room and lavatory for the women students in the College”. It was not until 1937 that the non-denominational University Women’s College was opened, but the following two decades saw renewed effort by the ‘Wyvernas’ to build a Hall of Residence for women students at Queen’s. “The necessity”, wrote Ruth Sugden in 1946, “for further accommodation for women students is obvious, since both University Women’s College and Janet Clarke Hall have waiting lists with which they are unable to cope.” As a joint project of Queen’s College and Ormond College, St Hilda’s College for women was opened in April 1964 on Queen’s College land adjacent to Ormond. The College became co-educational in 1973, as are now all the colleges of Melbourne University.

---

58 E. H. Sugden op.cit. p.59
59 Ibid p.61
60 Ruth Sugden ‘The Women’s Hall’ The Wyvern Vol. XXIV November 1946, p.9 (Queen’s College Archives)
Religious Instruction – Widening Horizons:

Dr Davis McCaughey, Master of Ormond College at the time of the opening of St Hilda’s, recalled a comment he made about the appointment of Majorie Smart as first Principal of the College: “Few young women will go in and out of a College over which Majorie Smart presides without having their horizons widened.” He added: “And if that is not what Colleges and Universities are for, I don’t know what they are about.”\textsuperscript{61} No doubt there was a religious perspective in Dr McCaughey’s concept of wider horizons. He expressed it on another occasion, at a Thanksgiving Service for the life of Sir George Paton, Vice-Chancellor of Melbourne University 1951-1968, whose wife was closely involved with the foundation of St Hilda’s College: “George Paton’s life moved out from a family already noteworthy in this community for its service to church and to society. He enormously extended its influence …”\textsuperscript{62} In the outworking of the aim of “systematic religious instruction” expressed in the Affiliated Colleges Act of 1854 and in similar Acts for the establishment of denominational colleges, there was a view that theological instruction and religious teaching and discussion were not to be confined to just the College classroom or the chapel, but expressed as well in wider contexts of intellectual pursuit, in relationships, in care and in community service. The denominational colleges need not just be fortresses to “counteract the poison of agnosticism, which is to be found at all modern Universities.”\textsuperscript{63} The colleges gave opportunity not just for sacred

\textsuperscript{61} Philippa Maddern \textit{op.cit.} p.91. The recollection was made by Dr McCaughey as Governor of Victoria at a Service of Thanksgiving for the life of Marjorie Smart in June 1982.

\textsuperscript{62} Davis McCaughey \textit{Tradition and Dissent} The Miegunyah Press at Melbourne University Press, Carlton Vic.,1997, p.239

\textsuperscript{63} Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of New South Wales, 1923, \textit{op.cit.} p.248
instruction, but for the engagement of the sacred with the secular - for the sharing of beliefs and ideas, for showing by example, and for the sowing of seeds for later leadership and service in various walks of life. This was perhaps also expressed by Justice Higgins, one of the first judges of the High Court of Australia, when he addressed a meeting of the Newman Society at Melbourne University in August 1917: “Men of all creeds reverence Newman; and universities in particular must be grateful to the man who, by his lectures on university education, showed that devoted attachment to a religious creed is not inconsistent with advocacy of full, liberal culture, of freedom for science, for literature, for philosophy.”

As Archbishop Polding reminded his Church in 1858: “…the Preamble of the (Sydney) University Bill sets forth the ‘better advancement of religion and morality’ as the grand purpose of all: much more then does it behove all who are concerned for the establishment of Denominational Colleges to manifest the supremacy of this idea by all they do and say”. It seems that on the whole the early colleges, apart from theological teaching in those which also conducted training for ordained ministry, sought to widen the horizons of their students by the conduct of voluntary lectures and talks, compulsory attendance at chapel services, and by the support of meetings of Christian groups such as the Student Christian Movement (SCM) or Christian Union, and the Newman Society. Often the “theologs” were the target of fun for other residents, and compulsory Chapel was subject to much protest, but there was

---

64 The Hon. Justice Higgins ‘In Europe, 1914-15’: a lecture delivered before the Newman Society, University of Melbourne, 3rd August 1917, Advocate Press, Melbourne (The McLaren Collection, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne)
also expressed admiration and affection for College staff, as well as a strong sense of and appreciation for the extra dimension that College life gave to the University experience.

A Pauline or Two in the Bush Brotherhood:

In the first issue of *The Pauline* (1909-1910), the new Warden of St Paul’s College, Lewis Radford, who later became the Anglican Bishop of Goulburn, noted those past students who had entered the full-time ministry, and expressed a wish that the College might “have a Pauline or two in the Bush Brotherhood at Dubbo”. He affirmed the purpose of the College to be “a church, a home, a school; a church to give religious instruction and training, to help men to know and love their Bible and Prayer Book and to give reasons for holding to the faith of their fathers …” Since its opening in 1856, the College had struggled, as had the University, with numbers and “had teetered on the verge of extinction”. The College had not had the official support of the diocese at the time of its opening, and Moore College had been established at Liverpool as the diocese’s theological training school. The first Warden, Henry Hose, had nevertheless established the pattern of delivering a lecture in divinity each week, and chapel services and prayers

---

66 Extract from the Warden’s College Commemoration Address, *The Pauline* No.1, August 1910, p.3. Some 13 clergymen (Old Paulines) are listed, including G. H. (later Bishop) Cranswick. E. H. Burgmann, later Bishop of Canberra-Goulburn, is noted among the first year students. (Fisher Library Rare Books)
67 Ibid
68 Hamish Milne *St Paul’s College: Another Fifty Years 1900-1950* Unpublished MPhil thesis, Department of History, University of Sydney, 1997, p.1
69 Clifford Turney et al *op.cit.* p.128
were very much part of the institutional life of the College. Though numbers were small, the students of the College around the turn of the century undoubtedly would have been influenced by the Warden, the Reverend Canon William Hey Sharp, and clerical tutors, the Reverends Robert Woodthorpe and Henry Jackson.

Building a Man’s Moral Force:

Perhaps along with the activities of chapel and lecture, the role of sport in the Colleges assumed a level of almost religious significance! Certainly sporting competition was seen as a vital part of the College’s role in the development of character: “No man can become really successful, in the widest sense of the word, who sticks to books alone, and only by taking some part in the sporting and social side of College and ‘Varsity life … does a man develop his character along the fullest lines … every sport when gone into thoroughly, and no Pauline should go into a thing unless he means to do it thoroughly, involves considerable self-sacrifice and restraint, which go a long way towards building up a man’s moral force.” Such moral force was sometimes lacking, it seems, when “the cunning Pauline realises that the alarum clock, with its notorious sense of humour and playful habits of inaccuracy, can always be blamed for his absence from chapel!” Dr Radford would not have been as amused, as he saw one of the special functions of College life as “the witness to religion as the centre of a normal human life at a time

---

70 Arthur Feez, in recalling his College days in the late 1870s, noted that the Warden, the Reverend W. Scott, imposed fines for “cutting” Chapel. Attendance was required at least four times a week. *(The Pauline No.23, 1926, p.50)*

71 Clifford Turney et al *op.cit.* p.333

72 *The Pauline* No.1, May 1911, p.5

when students are tempted to think religion a failure or a superfluity."74 Nevertheless, the role of the Chapel was not seen as altogether insignificant, as evidenced in 1915 when, on the suggestion of the Acting Warden, the Festival of St Luke the Physician “found every medical in College communicating at the Chapel Altar at 7.30 – and it was Monday morning too!”75

A range of visiting preachers and lecturers began to visit the College under the Wardenship of the Reverend A. H. Garnsey, including, in 1916, the Bishop of Carpentaria, the Bishop of North Queensland, the Archbishop of Sydney, and the former Warden as Bishop of Goulburn.76 There was also the annual visit by the Dubbo Bush Brothers, “with anecdotes of their varied and interesting experiences in the Bush”.77 The Warden’s weekly Bible Class that year, however, was one morning disrupted when “a horse very conveniently fell into one of the Wesley College pits, thereby creating a diversion … (with members of the class) who sallied forth to a man and nobly assisted in its rescue.” It was strongly suspected “that a member of the class was responsible for the outrage.”78 In 1924 it was noted that “an interesting innovation one Wednesday was made in the substitution for the ordinary chapel service of an address by Mr Tutor Wilson on ‘Religion and Science’. An informal but animated discussion followed, and the experiment warranted a like repetition in the future."79 A debate, however, between St

74 Ibid No.4, November 1912, p.1
75 Ibid No.10, November 1915, p.11
76 Ibid No.12, November 1916, p.10
77 Ibid pp.10-11
Paul’s and St John’s in 1927 on the topic “That the doctrines of Christianity need to be re-stated in the light of modern thought and experience” was recorded as being so badly argued by the Paul’s team “that our guests, far from being impressed with the standard of collegiate intelligence, were reduced to a state of tolerant and benevolent resignation.”

Particularly in winter, Chapel could be of cold comfort as “the cold showers were not numerous enough to accommodate the early morning rush to score an attendance at compulsory chapel. It was thus a common thing to make use of the pump in the stone-flagged yard near the bathrooms where two or three men pumped, one for the other, in turn while the beneficiary squatted under the pump” Facilities improved, as did the attitude of many Paulines towards services in the Chapel and other religious activities. A range of preachers and speakers is chronicled for the 1930s and beyond, very much attributable to the energy and enthusiasm of A. H. Garnsey. They included Archdeacon Davies (Principal of Moore College), the Reverend Dr P. A. Micklem (Rector of St James’ Church, King Street), W. G. Hilliard (later Coadjutor Bishop of Sydney), Professor K. H. Bailey (Professor of Public Law at Melbourne University, for ‘Life and Religion Week’ 1932), the Reverend Dr A. P. Elkin, the Reverend E. H. Burgmann, the Reverend F. T. Perkins (Headmaster of Cranbrook), the Reverend L. E. Bennett (Master of Wesley College), David Garnsey (son of the Warden, a Rhodes Scholar, and travelling Secretary for the Student Christian Movement), Dr R. B. Madgwick (later Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England), Bishop Moyes (Bishop of Armidale), and

78 Ibid p.12  
79 Ibid No.21, November 1924, p.5  
80 Ibid No.24, 1927, p.28  
81 Ibid p.53
the Reverend T. C. Hammond (Principal of Moore College following the death of Archdeacon Davies).82 In 1933, the Council noted the passing of Archbishop Wright and the Rector of St John’s College, Dr Maurice O’Reilly. It also recorded the death of its oldest Fellow, Mr F. B. Wilkinson, who had been in his undergraduate days a non-resident student of the College but who had “attended daily lectures in Divinity and other subjects at the College …”83 The Council also expressed its welcome to Archbishop Howard Mowll84, who, in chairing a meeting in 1938 to consider raising funds for the enlargement and endowment of the College, stated that colleges upon a religious foundation “constitute one of the special enterprises of the Church to safeguard the student from forgetfulness of spiritual values, from neglect of religion …”85 Some students, nevertheless, were no doubt more neglectful than others, with *The Pauline* noting in 1939 that “chapel services and divinity lectures have gone on throughout the year on customary lines, with varying attendances.”86 Certainly there was one very attentive student in that year: “Mr Whitlam has served as Chapel Warden”.87 The following year, E. G. Whitlam continued as Chapel Warden, as well as serving on the Students’ Club Committee as Honorary Secretary, on the Debates, Library and Records Committees, and as being Editor of *The Pauline*.88 In an editorial in 1941, Arthur Garnsey was described – presumably by the future Prime Minister – as “a traditional

82 Ibid 1931-1938
83 Ibid No.31, 1933, p.11
84 Ibid No.32, 1934, p.11
85 Ibid No.36, 1938, p.8
86 Ibid No.37, 1939, p.8
87 Ibid
88 Ibid No.38, 1940, p.2
Anglican clergyman in being a sportsman, a Christian and a gentleman. He is more than the traditional clergyman in being alive to social ills and zealous in solving them.”

Rectors and Recollections:

Like St Paul’s, St John’s College suffered from low numbers into the early 1900s. The routines of chapel and lectures, however, were firmly established and the Rector, the Very Reverend Dr James O’Brien, required all residents to attend morning and evening prayers, Mass, and lectures on Sacred Scriptures, logic and theology, and modern history. Although regarded as strict and aloof, with a former student recalling an evening when the Rector appeared at an “impromptu gathering” – a “supper-party” – at 1am and ordered the gentlemen to “Go to your rooms … This conduct is disgraceful!”

Monsignor O’Brien was nevertheless remembered with affection: “He was a gentleman in the truest sense of the word … He was courteous to everyone.” Warm recollections of College staff included that of the Vice-Rector, Dr M. O’Farrell, who was elected Bishop of Bathurst in 1920. He “won the general esteem and admiration of the students, not only by reason of his great humility and spiritual zeal, but also on account of his deep learning and culture, discerning judgement, keen humour and rich fund of anecdotes … He is a brilliant conversationalist, an eloquent preacher and lecturer …”

---

89 Ibid No.39, 1941, p.4
90 Clifford Turney et al op.cit. pp.334-335
91 Fitz., ‘St John’s in the Nineties’ The Magazine of St John’s College No.5, December 1923, p.9. The writer recalled that in 1896, “John’s … had 15 students in residence. Andrew’s, with 20, had most students.” (p.8)
92 Ibid p.10
93 Ibid No.2, December 1920, p.6
The impact of chapel and preacher, lecturer and lecture, conversation and conversationalists, is of course difficult to assess, but John’s and other Colleges afforded rich opportunities, despite some of the domestic hardships and compulsion, of learning and association that added significantly to the University experience. ‘Si Diem’ expressed it poetically:

“Five years! It seems to me like yesterday
Since through these Gothic portals first I passed.
A wondrous change in us – though fleeting fast –
These years have wrought in some strange subtle way: …
God grant the memory of these happy years,
And of the friends of youth which they begot,
May always in our heart of hearts abide.
And through Life’s journey, in our joys and tears,
Let us remember that, whate’er betide,
Vain is our vigil if the Lord watch not.”

The College magazine in 1924 reported the appointment of Dr F. A. McEvoy as Vice-Rector and student advisor to the Catholic students at the University – “the first Australian to occupy the position (of Vice-Rector)”. In an obituary on the passing of a Fellow of the College, Mr T. J. Purcell, it was noted that he “contended stoutly that a Catholic graduate, without such (systematic religious) instruction, would not only fail to achieve the purpose contemplated by a secular Act of Parliament, but would prove of no advantage to his Church … he (Mr Purcell) attended the weekly lecture-course of the Rector on Apologetics, often at the end of a busy day; and, on the rare occasions when he

---

94 Ibid No.3, December 1921, p.3
95 Ibid No.6, December 1924, p.24
was unable to attend, made sure that the typed notes were sent to him, to be studied before the next lecture … Hence his close friend, Bishop O’Farrell, … described him as ‘the best instructed layman in his religion that I have met in Australia’.”

The Newman Society:

The 29th International Eucharistic Congress was held in Sydney in 1928, and both St John’s and Sancta Sophia were venues for accommodation as well as for receptions. The occasion was seen as a boost for the position and role of the College in the University and in the wider, especially Catholic, community: “… the final place from which should emerge the educated Catholic man … is this, our Catholic College within the University … the religious stimulus of this historic year should awaken our Catholics to a realisation of the manifold advantages which St John’s alone can offer … Here is the ultimate training ground for the Catholic professional man – the educated Catholic whose positions enables him to bestow real and practical benefits on the community.”

In the same year, on 3rd August, the Newman Society at Sydney University was inaugurated at a meeting in St John’s College Hall. The Eucharistic congress had been a particular impetus for the founding of such a Society in Sydney, already established at Melbourne University, but the existence of the University Catholic Women’s Society and the Student Christian Movement were also factors in its foundation. The Society was open to

---

96 John’s Vol.1, No.7, December 1927, p.13
97 Ibid No.8, December 1928, pp.13-14
98 Ibid p.53
Catholic graduates and undergraduates of the University, or any other university or institution recognised by the Society, and Catholic members of the staff of Sydney University. Its aims, which well suited a close association with St John’s College, were “(1) To foster the spiritual, intellectual, and general interests of Catholic graduates and undergraduates, and to create a spirit of good fellowship amongst Catholic members of the University; (2) To introduce Catholic freshers to University life; (3) To encourage Catholic undergraduates to take part in University activities; and (4) To encourage Catholic members of the University to take part in Catholic affairs.” The Society, together with the Catholic Women’s Society, was involved with the conduct of a Garden Party for the delegates attending the Eucharistic Congress, held at St John’s and Sancta: “The affair was probably unique among the private functions of the period, for there, unbending in gracious friendliness, were gathered together more of the notable figures of the Congress than we could have hoped to meet anywhere else … The (Sancta) visitors’ book … received many famous names that day, place of honour being given, of course, to Cardinal Cerretti, who graced the Garden Party by his presence, and remained for a good part of the afternoon.” Membership of the Newman Society stood at ninety in 1930, and a pattern of study circles and meetings commenced, with many activities centred at St John’s College until the 1950s, when Father Roger Pryke was appointed chaplain to non-resident (college) students and made available part of St Joseph’s Camperdown Presbytery for use as a Newman Centre. The Society moved to City Road in 1963 and

---

100 John’s op.cit. p.54
101 Ibid
102 N.H. ‘The Twenty-Ninth Eucharistic Congress As Seen from Sancta Sophia’ Sancta Sophia within the University of Sydney 1928, pp.9-10 (Mitchell Library, Sydney)
then, in 1965, to the Sydney University Catholic Centre. In 1933 a Retreat was held at St Ignatius College, Riverview, with some three hundred attending. The Society merged with the University Catholic Women’s Society in 1944 and, with the formation in the same year of the Newman Graduate Association, it concentrated on undergraduate activities. The Society sponsored seminars which, for the first time, were held at the NSW University of Technology campus, Kensington, in 1956, with the theme “Technology and Theology”. In following years the themes included “Technology and Human Happiness” (1957), “Freedom” (1958), “The Scientist and Society” (1959), and, in 1960, “The Price of a Profession – a day of lectures and discussions to clarify what is entailed in the formation of the Christian Professional Man and Woman today.” In 1957 a combined committee of “the Newman Movement of the University of Sydney and the NSW University of Technology” sponsored a journal, Manna, whose object was “to be a forum for the expression of Christian thought and to make a contribution towards the development of Christian intellectualism in Australia.” The committee soon included representatives of the Newman Graduate Association and of St John’s and Sancta Sophia Colleges. In somewhat similar terms to the aims of the founders of St John’s and Sancta, Father Des O’Connor expressed in 1977 his view of the impact of the Society over the years since its formation: “I am sure that it saved the faith of many young students who would have been lost in the crowd if they had not that body of Catholics to shelter them

103 Desmond Ryan op.cit. p.77
104 Ibid pp.71-72
105 Ibid pp.76-77
106 Copies of programs are held in the Mitchell Library, Sydney.
107 Manna 1957-58, Sydney, Australia, p.4 (Mitchell Library)
from the awful days of transition from Catholic school to the rationalist and secularist world of the University.”

Delighting the Heart of John Knox:

St Andrew’s College was the only Sydney College to incorporate a Theological Hall, with a Theological Faculty conducting courses in such subjects as Exegetical Theology of the Old Testament, Exegetical Theology of the New Testament, Historical Theology, Systematic Theology, Apologetics and Christian Ethics, and Ecclesiastical Law and Procedure. Theological candidates were required to be, with a few exceptions, “graduates of some recognised University, or have certificates shewing that they have gone through a complete curriculum in Arts in such a University.” Resident College students of the University of Sydney were also, however, “expected to attend Worship daily, which is held in the Lecture Hall, at 7.45am and at 10pm.” Apart from the lectures given in the Theological Hall, the Principal of the College gave regular lectures in Divinity for the benefit of the non-theological students. It was noted that the “courses of instruction within the College are designed to meet the two needs which are expressly mentioned in the Act of Incorporation, namely ‘religious instruction’, and also ‘tutorial assistance’ in University subjects. Religious instruction is given not only by means of the daily assembly, morning and evening, at College Chapel and Roll Call, but also by the courses delivered by the Principal – frequently on subjects suggested by the students

108 Desmond Ryan op. cit. p.78
109 St Andrew’s College Calendar 1908, p.19 (Fisher Library Rare Books)
110 Ibid p.20
111 Ibid p.8
themselves – on Thursday evenings during the year.” The names of John Kinross, Andrew Harper, Ronald MacIntyre, E. E. Anderson, and Samuel Angus were familiar names associated with the College and the University as Principal and/or Theological Lecturer in the latter 1800s and early to mid 1900s. “No one who has passed through college”, wrote a former student in 1920, “can forget the Thursday evening lectures, in which the Doctor (Harper) led us easily through the gardens of his wide reading and knowledge of the world … I always left them feeling diminutively insignificant – an effect badly needed – but hopeful.” The non-compulsory lectures on religion were noted by Dr Harper on the occasion of the College’s Jubilee: “Though attendance has not been compulsory, few of the students who enter themselves as members of any Christian denomination have failed to be present at a number of the lectures given on religion, and all who have attended have had brought within their horizon that great figure the sight of which has done more to moralise humanity and to build up the spiritual fabric of man’s higher life than aught beside.” Whatever the impact on the students, at the College Commemoration in 1928, the Vice-Chancellor, Robert Wallace, stated that the “Churches of Scotland had a great enthusiasm for education. The ideal was holiness through learning. It would delight the heart of John Knox to find that this same enthusiasm prevailed here.” With controversy and debate that soon followed in relation to the ‘Fresher System’, evidence of an enthusiasm for holiness might have seemed difficult to find – though a certain air of ‘sanctity’ seemed to waft around the system’s defence: “The fresher system … enriches each student. But it can do, and does, more than this. A
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rational fresher system teaches youth, and at an impressionable age, that communal life implies communal duty. True public spirit, retailed as ‘college spirit’, is inculcated. The best citizens are thus fostered.” One might have asked whether it was because of good citizenship and an enthusiasm for holiness that the College Golf Club decided to play on Sunday mornings between 5am and 6.30am! In time to return to Chapel? Alas, no. It was to get around “before the course became really crowded”!

**An Unflinching Earnestness to His God:**

The Methodists established a separate theological college, Leigh College; its University College, Wesley, opened in 1917, with the Chapel being a central feature. Of its first eight students, one soon became honoured for the significance of his contribution to the College and to the medical profession, being appointed Challis Professor of Anatomy at Sydney University at the age of twenty-five. John Irvine Hunter, after whom the John Hunter Hospital in Newcastle is named, died in London following a short illness in 1924. At College he was “a member of the Christian Union … and (he was) always ready to show that Science and Religion were not incompatibles … (he) brought his intellect to bear on the development of a spirit that would make Wesley a College worthy of all the best traditions associated with the older Colleges …”

There was established by this a certain benchmark of expectation very early in the life of the College that was, for example, noted by the retiring Vice-Master, Dr W. E. Fisher, in 1937: “ … no reference

---
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to Wesley’s past would be complete without mention of Johnny Hunter … to the present generation he is a name and a figure in bronze … Truly I am grieved when I consider this man’s greatness, and the wondrous parts that were in him.”119 As with the other Colleges, the Chapel was a place for daily prayers and weekly services, as well as for special services such as a Memorial Service or the annual Anzac Day Commemoration. Lectures in Divinity were given for those who wished to attend, but there was also a mood of tolerance extended to those who wished to hold opposing views. The Editorial in the 1937 magazine warned that “in this Journal our contributors have refused to acquiesce to the dictates of accepted standards, and have sought a recognition of the fact that all is not right just because it conforms with current morals and ethics.”120 The magazine included, for example, an article titled ‘A General Outline of the Social Philosophy of Marxian Communism’, which concluded that “communism must not be regarded as a perverse theory to be rejected in toto by all sane, good men, but is more to be regarded as a theory in need of correction and requiring to be made more adequate to fit the facts of life as they are”.121 It took some time, however, before the College Council, “in deference to the wishes of the (Methodist) Conference”, bent to meet “the facts of life as they are” in their opposition to the holding of dances in the College. Permission was refused throughout the 1920s and 1930s until it was finally given in 1947!122 Again, however, with the retirement of the Master, the Reverend Leslie Bennett, in 1943, having been Master for nearly twenty years, expressions of warm appreciation were made by students, with one
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particularly referring to his Christian character and example: “As our knowledge of him deepened we realised that behind that simple, unassuming exterior, there lay within a spirit of like substance. His faith is a child-like one, and his earnestness unflinching to his God … dogma is foreign to him. No philosophy is too obscure, no creed too radical to receive his critical interest; he does not always agree, but he holds that all men are entitled to their own opinions … he is the most approachable of men … a guide for most of us … a friend to all.”

In 1943 it was noted that the Reverend B. R. Wyllie, then a minister in Geelong and a former President of the SCM in Melbourne and Travelling Secretary of the Australian Student Christian Movement, had been appointed the new Master.

Despite the continuing “regularity and uniformity of the Monday-to-Friday quarter-hour in the Chapel” appearing sometimes to be more “an obligation than a privilege”, and the “murder” of “Methodist melodies” being “an inspiration to no one”, there was it seemed some appreciation “for the brief daily pause from the round of work and pleasure, in which, through the ministry of the Church, we can seek to understand and reorientate the purposes of our various activities.”

Of much greater encouragement was a report in 1952 - perhaps to be seen somewhat in the context of the wider Christian “Missions” thrust of the 1950s – which noted that “if Chapel attendances are an indication of the religious life and interest of College men, then College has not failed to fulfil the aim of its founders, that it should set before the men the Christian gospel. Attendances at evening devotions have been the best in years: many were the nights on
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which there was scarcely an empty seat in Chapel … Besides College men, we have had a good sprinkling of students from the Women’s College …”

Queen’s and the Christian Union:

The Chapel and the Christian Union were important aspects of life at Queen’s College, the Methodist College at the University of Melbourne. Founded well before Wesley College in Sydney, it had a Theological Hall and, along with the other early Melbourne Colleges, its reputation and influence in the University and beyond was strong. The Theological Hall joined with those of the other colleges to form a United Faculty of Theology, and teaching was directed towards the gaining of a degree in divinity from the Melbourne College of Divinity, established in 1911. Chapel was not compulsory for student residents of the College, but, with a roll-call conducted in association with the Chapel service, most attended! Prayers were said before dinner on weekdays, and, when the roll-call ceased after World War I, attendance at Chapel and prayers nevertheless continued to be well maintained. The activities of the Christian Union, formed in Melbourne in 1896 and which came to be known as the Student Christian Movement (SCM), were a significant part of the religious activity of the College. There was a “fine attendance” at the first meeting at the College in 1905, and “the address was listened to with great interest.” College Bible classes were noted as going well in 1906, and that the Christian Union was “holding its own among the University Societies”, with

126 Ibid 1952, p.19
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a tenth anniversary service of the foundation of the Australian Student Christian Union being celebrated “by a short service in St George’s Church, Chapel Street, East St Kilda.”

Twenty years later it was noted that Mr B. R. Wyllie, a travelling secretary of the Australian Student Christian Movement, addressed an after-dinner meeting on the aims and work of the Movement. The particular feature of Christian Union activity were the “Study Circles”, each of which usually met for one hour on an evening each week. These small groups engaged in prayer, Bible study, and discussion. Some sixty-five students formed seven groups in 1924, with the Vice-Master noted as one of the Study Circle leaders in 1925. Students attended Summer Conferences in places such as Ballarat (1925), Mittagong (1926) and Adelaide (1927), and frequently there were guest speakers invited to address members at the College. Guest speakers at Queen’s, as at other colleges, were a particular feature of College life that involved issues of faith and discussion of religion, as E. H. Sugden, Master of Queen’s, noted as early as 1888: “I went over to Ormond this afternoon to hear George Clark, evangelist, better known as the ‘Christian Athlete’. He had a good audience of Varsity men and spoke very well. He told us amongst other things that Barabbas was a Home-Ruler!”

The editors of *The Wyvern* in 1928 acknowledged the importance of the Christian Union study circle as “one place where we can think a little about the outside world”, though
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with some reservation, because “even there, unorthodoxy is broached amid a perceptible shudder. What may be a perfectly honest idea is often avoided for fear of its implications. The whole atmosphere lacks spontaneity.”\footnote{The Wyvern Vol.VI, October 1928, p.4} There seemed to be more spontaneity by 1933, when, it was noted, three-quarters of the total number of men in residence formed up into study circles” and “the great subject of religion was freely discussed. Every man had views and opinions, definite or indefinite, orthodox or heretical, concerning religion and its manifold implications in social and individual life. When these were stated and argued under the genial leaderships of various senior men the result was that religion, at any rate for the time being, came into the immediate sphere of interests.”\footnote{Ibid Vol.XI, November 1933, p.36} Ten years later it was reported that “the long standing connection between the College and the Student Christian Movement was maintained” and that “Queen’s College took control of the Evangelical Union … with John Renshaw as President and Ray Outhred as Secretary.”\footnote{Ibid Vol.XXIV, November 1946, p.16} Disappointed with the attendances at Sunday morning Chapel services, the Master, Dr Raynor Johnson, introduced a students’ Sunday evening service open to all, of any denomination or none, followed by a social hour in the Master’s Lodge. A range of preachers took part in the services, which attracted many non-collegians including members of the SCM, who also attended Thursday morning SCM prayers in the Queen’s Chapel.\footnote{Owen Parnaby op.cit. p.192} With the SCM in the University continuing “to centre much of its worship in Queen’s Chapel”, the “Chapel continues to take an important place in the general life of College, and those who have worshipped there have been spiritually enriched … the attendances at week-night Chapel have been somewhat improved … College men have
very readily responded to the reading roster … again, we must convey to the Master and Mrs Johnson our appreciation of their interest in Chapel, and our thanks for the hospitality they have extended to worshippers at Sunday services.”

A Compulsory and Curious Custom:

Christian Union activity was reported at Trinity College in 1913, with numbers “numerous and active … almost the entire College is comprehended”; in 1923 about half the residents formed five study circles. Ten circles were required to meet the demand in 1926, though the following year it was back to five, with the circles described as, for the most part, “hideously dull … but, occasionally, we come upon wisdom unawares, and then we have fireworks!” Perhaps the Wesleyan milieu was more encouraging of study circle activity, but “the increase in undergraduate sophistication” was noted as the reason for the demise of the Christian Union at Trinity by the 1930s.
The Chapel was a central feature in the life of the College as it was seen, apart from the role of the Theological School, to be the means of providing a place where the students might “receive instruction in accordance with the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England”. The first Chaplain was appointed in 1883, though he was non-resident and the Warden was mostly responsible for daily prayers.

139 The Wyvern Vol.XXVII, November 1949, p.11. Dr Johnson was Master from 1934-1964.
140 The Fleur-de-Lys A Magazine of Trinity College in the University of Melbourne Vol.2, No.13, June 1913, p.11
141 Ibid Vol.III, No.23, October 1923, p.10 (Trinity College Library, University of Melbourne)
142 Ibid Vol.III, No.27, October 1927, p.10
143 James Grant op.cit. p.99
144 Ibid College Statutes 1871, p.95
From the early 1900s the students began to take issue with compulsory attendance at Chapel, with a petition addressed to the Warden on 10th June 1901, requesting a meeting to frame an appeal to the Council for reconsideration of the rule. Among the more than thirty-five signatures was that of John C. V. Behan who was later to succeed Alexander Leeper as Warden.\textsuperscript{146} The Chaplain, Reginald Stephen, wrote to the Warden expressing that “it would be a great mistake to substitute a system of voluntary attendance. No doubt compulsion has its drawbacks, but when dealing with undeveloped characters, the disadvantages are far outweighed by the benefits.”\textsuperscript{147} The Council did not relent. The fine of 2s 6d for failing to attend “the requisite number of morning services” was referred to as a “curious custom” by a former collegian\textsuperscript{148}, with ‘Libertas’ complaining in 1913 that “this half-crown does more harm than good … It gets a man’s back up at once. There is no freedom of choice … I plead for freedom – freedom to go to chapel when we want to go.”\textsuperscript{149}

The “evergreen bone of contention, compulsory chapel” was referred to in 1921, with comment that both the 7.20am Sunday service of Holy Communion in winter and the 5.50pm. Evensong during second term were poorly attended and the latter discontinued because of the absence of any form of lighting.\textsuperscript{150} There was a range of preachers, notable and less notable, and certainly some would not have added to the resentment of compulsory attendance:
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“Chas. a Theolog, would be,
Preaching endless sermons;
Three times the measure of his waist,
The length of each determines.”

A Golden Jubilee Service was held in St Paul’s Cathedral in June 1922, at which the preacher was “Bishop Green, the first member of the College to reach episcopal rank”. All present, including those complaining about compulsory attendance at Chapel, were reminded of the purpose for which Trinity was founded, “to supplement the intellectual and moral life of the University by a religious influence, and to provide a training ground for candidates for holy orders.” Despite the purpose, the realities of the Chapel routine urged ‘O. W. K.’ to poetic reflection, “with apologies to Mr. Pope”:

“Now tolls the clanging bell to summon those
Who from their midnight toil have sought repose.
Long since has Sol brought in the freezing dawn;
Alarm-clocks ring, and waking sleepers yawn.
Chill showers freeze the shrinking victim’s bones,
And bathrooms echo loud with shrieks and groans;
And sounds of banging doors and hurrying feet
Betoken those whose toilets are complete.
O hapless wights, who, while the clock strikes eight,
Have lost their shoes, and found their studs too late!
Holes yawn in heels which slippers fail to hide,
And, ‘stead of collars, scarves round necks are tied.
Along the winding path they breathless speed,
And enter, just in time to hear the Creed.”
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Perhaps it was tiredness and the cold that caused one student, as Dr Leeper recalled, to read in Chapel, as part of the Lesson, a verse from Luke 4: “There were many Leepers in Israel in the time of Elisha”!155 In the mid to later 1920s and early 1930s, under the Chaplaincy of T. M. Robinson, a “significant change” was effected “in the students and their attitude towards Chapel Services”, with the raising of the standard of worship, a focus of outreach to the community, and the “custom of inviting men to supper to discuss problems in the relationships of religion, science and philosophy.”156 Protests still occurred from time to time about compulsory attendance at Chapel, until in 1960 a request from a General Meeting of the Trinity College Associated Clubs was put to the Council for “the rescinding of the present rule requiring attendance at Chapel by members of the College”.157 On 24th August, the Warden, R. W. T. Cowan, called a meeting of “all gentlemen in the Junior Common Room” and gave notice that “The College Council has rescinded Rules 18 and 19 of the College Rules relating to Chapel attendance. The Council accepts the assurances given to it – (a) that all members of the College understand that Trinity College is a religious foundation in the life of which corporate worship plays an integral part, and (b) that members of the College (with certain definite exceptions) recognise a moral obligation on them to join regularly and frequently in College services and have a firm intention to fulfil that obligation throughout their College careers.”158
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Conclusion:

In all the early denominational colleges, in Sydney and in Melbourne, and in those that were eventually established in each of the capital cities in Australia, there appears to be a great deal of evidence to indicate that those who led the Colleges were more than conscious of and sought to express in a variety of ways the religious foundation of their institutions. The fuller life and activity of collegiate residence, particularly with all the exuberance and demands of those in undergraduate years, might well have made it difficult for religious activity to be a clear and constant focus – each College was “a church, a school, and a home”, with all that that implied. Particularly in most of the Sydney colleges, where there was little or no presence of theological students, the religious purposes of such residential life in affiliation with the secular University were no doubt more blurred. Nevertheless there was a consistent religious presence in the obligations and/or expectations of Chapel worship, of daily or weekly prayers, of voluntary lectures and special guest speakers, of support and encouragement for the activities of groups such as the SCM and the Newman Society, and in the often caring if not charismatic example of Christian leaders.

Davis McCaughey recalls that when the Nobel laureate Sir Macfarlane Burnet, a resident of Ormond College in his undergraduate years, at his invitation took up residence in the College following the death of his wife, he, “a self-acknowledged agnostic”\textsuperscript{159}, would always come and sit at the back of the Chapel when the Master was preaching. The two

\textsuperscript{159} Davis McCaughey \textit{op.cit.} p.211
were very close and had a great respect for each other. When Sir Macfarlane died in 1985, his son phoned Davis McCaughey to invite him to speak at the funeral, because to his father “you were always there”.

Perhaps the impact of such leadership on untold numbers was best expressed by ‘M. T. B.’ in a letter to Mother Juanita Macrae on her retirement as Principal of Sancta Sophia College in 1957: “I can remember rushing in to talk to you for two minutes on my way to exams to calm my nerves, and, of course, you were always there when I got back, to listen to the triumph or tragedy of it all … You were a great Principal in every way … It is impossible to think of Sancta without your serene and courageous personality, strange to think that from all those new faces that come before you every year you should remember us all so well … To each of us you have been ‘dear Mother’, so I know you’ll remember me even though I have a hundred faces and my name is … Elizabeth and Mary and Ruth and …”

Whether or not, and how much, the early colleges fulfilled the task of providing systematic religious instruction is, of course, debatable. There is no doubt, however, that they provided a steady, albeit at times subtle and at other times strong, religious influence - the full impact of which can never be told.

---
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### INTERVIEWS

Tapes of the following interviews have been lodged with the UNSW Archives.

Ref. No. 01A69 (Noted in *Origins* Newsletter of the UNSW Archives, No. 7, January 2002, p.11)
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<td>New College, UNSW</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Mrs Shirley</td>
<td>Mosman, NSW</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Mosman, NSW</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
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<td>Cowen, Rt.Hon. Sir Zelman, AC</td>
<td>Melbourne, Vic.</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2000</td>
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<td>Hawke, Dr John</td>
<td>Byng, NSW</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
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<td>New College, UNSW</td>
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<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; July 1999</td>
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<td>Warrawee, NSW</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Kenmore, Qld.</td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
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<tr>
<td>Lyons, Emeritus Prof. Lawrence</td>
<td>Kenmore, Qld.</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, Emeritus Prof. Bruce</td>
<td>Gordon, NSW</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sept. 1997</td>
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<tr>
<td>McCaughey, Rev’d Dr J. Davis, AC</td>
<td>Melbourne, Vic.</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 1998</td>
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<td>Longueville, NSW</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
</tr>
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<td>Myers, Emeritus Prof. Sir Rupert</td>
<td>New College, UNSW</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Rev’d Noel</td>
<td>New College, UNSW</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Nov. 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Mrs Alison</td>
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