PART ONE
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Ok, so I am here to talk about the research behind my book “A Cohort of Pioneers, Australian postgraduate students and American postgraduate degrees, 1949-1964”.

“Pioneers” as I’ll refer to it today is really about the Australian academy,

But it’s also about Australia, Australia’s intellectual culture in the 1950s and 1960s, and it’s about a pre-existing deference to British precedent that limited that culture in Australia.

It’s about the USA after the Second World War, it’s about the Cold War, and it’s about the place of education in the waging of that war.

The Talk
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I plan to divide today’s talk into a few separate parts. I’ll give you a brief rundown of the research method, and I’ll talk about Australia, about the United States, and about Australia when they came back. I also want to talk about some of the challenges that are associated with oral history as a method for this kind of group biographical work and some of the key benefits that I perceive having completed it.

Background to the project.

Letters, parents, Why?

Project involved finding anyone who had studied in the United States during a period that I initially defined quite broadly as being between the end of the Second World War and around about 1970. Finding such people was initially pretty difficult because there was no body of
work on the topic. Though I should point out that the Australian-American Fulbright Commission were involved from early on, providing me with contact information for past Fulbright scholars (“Pioneers” actually relies upon the reflections of one in six of the scholars who left in the time period that it covers), as were people right across a number of schools at La Trobe University within the department of social sciences and particularly the department of politics.

So, once I had a bit of a group of people I began sending out a questionnaire that asked various questions about the American experience generally. In the end I had around about 100 useable questionnaires and with time I had fifty interview transcripts from a selection of people who heralded from a wide and various selection of disciplines, subjects, and universities in Australia.
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In fact by the time the study was completed and the book was written I had actually gathered the views of individuals who came from over 70 different subject areas and nine broadly defined disciplines. The point being was that at first glance few of these participants had any relationship to one another, apart from the fact that they had completed postgraduate studies at a tertiary institution in the United States at around about the same time as each other. So what?

I had imagined that the questionnaire was going to provide me with the answers I needed, and that the interviews were always going to be an adjunct to the questionnaire and other secondary resources. But secondary sources on the American postgraduate experience were actually very scarce, in fact there were none that specifically dealt with the experience of the United States from an Australian perspective, let alone as something unique and perhaps central to wider discussions of Australian social and intellectual history.

As the interviews began to progress I began to see similar narratives emerging from each one, and this lead me to conclude that by identifying individuals I was actually establishing the existence of a discursive community of returning graduates who as a group had similar memories of the way that the US postgraduate experience had impacted upon them personally and professionally, and of the way in which they were able to contribute aspects of that experience to their various professions when they returned to Australia.
Together they shared a narrative about Australia before they left, a narrative about the United States both inside and outside of the Academy while they were there, and there was a narrative about the experience of return to Australia. All of these stories, while not always factually accurate, nevertheless contextualised places and eras in the same way. And therein lay the strength of the study and of the use of interviews as a valid method of investigation (a topic I would like to discuss further at the end of this talk). Despite the great diversity of subjects, disciplines, and people who had agreed to participate in an interview with me, or who had agreed to complete a questionnaire for me, the memories that I was gathering through the interview process concurred with one another.

Members of this cohort contributed in no small way to Australia. Most members of the cohort had reached the pinnacle of their professions by the time that they were interviewed by me. Five had taken up judicial appointments to the Federal, Supreme, and High Courts of Australia, Forty had been appointed professor, up to ten had become senior scientists with senior research bodies like the CSIRO. A number became chief executive officers of large international organisations, one became primate of the Anglican Church, and one became a highly regarded school principal. Out of 100 respondents, at least 48 were awarded an Australian honour, many were appointed to distinguished chairs in Australia and overseas, and many more were awarded scholarly and scientific medals for contributions to their field and to Australia’s intellectual evolution.
PART TWO

A. *5

The first context that was shared by everyone in this group was that of Australia and the kind of place that it was before they left.

Naturally that included the institutional developments that were occurring through the 1930’s, 40’s, and 1950’s and that continued to occur through the 1960’s. And certainly research was growing at least outside of universities up into the 1950s as a result of initiatives prior to the Second World War like the CSIR and the ACER, and then after the war as a direct response to the success of scientific work completed for the war effort (that’s not to say that PhD programs weren’t beginning in universities but rather that they were immature).
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As everyone here will know, the university sector was growing as well, initially within the undergraduate sector in response to funding for returned servicemen and then through the Commonwealth Scholarships Scheme, and then later across postgraduate sectors too. And then from the mid-1960s in particular there was a wave of entirely new universities being established as well.
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The contextualisation of Australia also included a depiction of the small and tight communities that made up the postgraduate student body at universities in Australia,
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it conveyed the vast distances and intense rivalries that existed between universities here, and that limited not only interaction between campuses, but also the potential to fertilise ideas across subjects and disciplines.
it described the kind of place that Australia was beyond the campus,

And, it included a larger narrative about the deference that existed toward British precedent within educational contexts in the immediate post Second World War period and right into the 1970s. Further investigation supported the view that that deference presented a number of limitations and also a number of possibilities to those Australians who sought higher degrees at the time.

1. Most teaching and research staff in Australia had studied in the UK and so their inclination was to recommend that their students do the same. Naturally, they had firsthand knowledge of the different levels of sophistication between research in the UK and the fledgling Australian system so it made sense that they do so, particularly as British scholarships provided talented Australians with options at the time that were otherwise unavailable.

However, the British curriculum that was used in Australian educational settings also assigned cultural distinctions that regulated upward mobility and status. The prevailing culture on Australian university campuses together with the private schools that in general fed the universities reinforced the presumed superiority of the British degree. And the departure of PhD students stifled the development of vigorous local schools. The following points make it pretty clear why that was.

2. The British option required that they complete a second undergraduate degree, which meant that they were absent from Australia for up to ten years and unable to contribute to the ongoing development of a vigorous graduate system here.

3. The best and brightest were often poached by universities in the UK, the option to work and teach there being attractive to the Australian student but again it kept them away from Australia.

4. The more senior posts in Australian universities were often given to British graduates from UK universities than to Australians from the same universities.
“...in the years between [1951-1960] 28 professors [in all subjects] have voluntarily withdrawn from academic life in Australia, 17 of them to accept chairs overseas, (almost all of them in the United Kingdom). In the same period, Australia has attracted only six men who held overseas chairs, and of these four came to the Australian National University. Of the two recruited by the five state universities, both came from minor universities in the UK and one was offered an attractive clinical salary. Out of the 153 professorial appointments to state universities in the last ten years, 48 came from overseas. Of the 48, ten were previously non-academic, and 34 came from junior posts (less than Reader of Associate Professor). One third of the appointments were made by internal promotion, and in more than one third there was noticed definite evidence of poor field.”

5. Wages in the UK were higher.
6. Scholarship opportunities to the UK for women were severely limited, often not offered from year to year and in some cases they were not non-existent.

   Employment opportunities for women were predetermined as much by “Britishness” as they were by biology.

Jacqueline Goodnow, now at Macquarie University in Sydney told a similar story when I talked to her in Mosman in 2004. She said "I went to the head of the department and I said that I had been advised to start thinking ahead of what sort of chance I would have if a tenured job comes up and he said, "Well how many women have tenured jobs?" and I said "Well I have no idea." And he said, "There are two, one in philosophy and one in mathematics...by the time a tenured job comes up the war will be over and all the men will be coming back and it's impossible for you to be competing with returned soldiers."

After returning to Australia in the late 1950s, nothing much had changed for June Halliday. June was the only PhD in her field at the University of Queensland but university regulations stopped her from working because she was married. She said:

7. And of course there was a distinct lack of PhD programs in Australia, Science PhDs preceding Arts. For example, Sydney University introduced a PhD for science in 1947, but for Economics it wasn’t available until 1955, for Arts it was 1957.

Together these smaller narratives not only contextualised Australia and more particularly Australian university research schools, but they pinpointed a number of issues that were obstructing the creation of an independent, vibrant, and confident culture of inquiry in Australia.
THE USA.

Ok, so the second narrative I was hearing about was the one about the USA. Firstly it was clear from the interviews that it was considered very unusual for Australians to not only accept but to be in a position to receive a scholarship to attend a university in the USA. It was also clear that a postgraduate qualification from the UK was by far the first preference of those who went to the USA, and who took part in my study, for all of the reasons that I have just outlined, if not more.

So why was it that scholarships were now available to Australian students for postgraduate study in the USA? And why were Australians accepting them when they would rather go to the UK?

Prior to the Second World War politics and education were clearly separated. American universities were essentially unitary organisations that specialised (and became famous for those specialisations) in specific areas as a method for attracting philanthropic support.

But the Second World War created an atmosphere that demanded both collaboration between research schools and academics in similar fields across the USA to support the war effort, and it demanded that the federal government pay for such collaboration.

So after the war when the pursuit of Cold War became heavily reliant on advances in research, as did the reconstruction and strengthening of post war economies, as did the behavioural and health sciences for that matter, all three interests; the philanthropists, the university research schools, and the federal government became intertwined in a system that was highly congenial to academics, and that supported and expanded graduate programs to an unprecedented degree.

Amidst these developments, not only had Senator William Fulbright created the Fulbright program that included travel grants for student exchange,

but his "altruistic brain child" was taken on and manipulated by US Federal government senators for the waging of the ideological Cold War. And as a result the Smith-Mundt Bill was passed in 1948.
That meant that foreign student scholarships and graduate student programs were now funded not just by independent philanthropists, or by large corporate bodies like Rockefeller, Carnegie, or eventually Ford (which, incidentally, tripled the combined contributions of the previous two in the 1950s), but by the US federal government as well on two fronts, the latter commitment having been made on the basis that education was considered to be a powerful tool for waging war.

Subsequently, the launch of Sputnik in 1957 by the Soviet Union caused a second, and a much larger wave of federal commitment to US research. Sputnik was seen by scholars, scientists, and politicians alike as evidence of complacency within the American research community and it shook the United States into an era of Cold War spending on research that was impossible to match anywhere else in the world.

Australian students went to the United States for different reasons:

Most would still have preferred to go to the UK when they applied for the US scholarship. The British degree was a known quantity. It’s acceptance upon return to Australia and its relevance for future promotion were established. In the immediate post war era the US was still considered to be foreign. Most were unfamiliar with its postgraduate or research programs and recalled an element of surprise on arriving to find the depth of scholarship and research that was available to them. A number changed the chosen direction of their research as a result.
Some Australians chose the United States. Sir Zelman Cowen, for example, recommended that his best law students accept opportunities that he had cultivated at Yale University in preference to Oxford, at a time and in a field that was for obvious reasons biased toward the United Kingdom.

While for most women, the United States was the only option. (Though as Beryl Rawson assured me that was not the case for her. She rejected an opportunity to study at the University of London because they had expected that she complete a second undergraduate degree first.) The US had a long history of creating courses to suit women’s needs, and a number of women’s colleges and universities had specifically been established for women’s education. These also extended generous offers to foreign female students, yet another source of fully funded scholarships.

The American academic experience was remembered as an awakening:

American postgraduate schools attracted many students; many of them were highly talented.

Those who arrived as big fish from the small pond of Australia were quickly cut down to size by the weight of competition surrounding them.

The American work ethic was equally daunting, and the structure of the American degree presented its own challenges.

There was a substantial foreign student body, many of whom spoke English as a second language, itself a new experience for young Australians who had never left Australian shores.
And there was a culture of informality that supported and encouraged student-teacher interaction.

Australian students also shared vivid recollections of the internationally recognised scholars and students who worked within individual research centres alongside postgraduate students.

Ross King’s principal supervisor was Louis Kahn, one of the seminal architects of the twentieth century. But he also had direct exposure to Charles-Edouard Le Corbusier, and Frank Lloyd Wright.

Within the sciences some Australians worked alongside Nobel Laureates and others who were critical to the research being done in their fields.

Ian Martin attended weekly review meetings with a Nobel Prize winner.

Paul Grimwood found himself working alongside Hans Bethe and Carl Sagan both world renowned for their work in theoretical physics and astronomy.

Barry Ninham studied under Elliot Montrol, one of the team who designed the atom bomb.

For Don McMichael, there were three internationally renowned evolutionary biologists on the staff of the Museum of Contemporary Zoology at Harvard when he arrived.

Similarly important were the links between research schools and research centres that enabled people with intersecting fields to gather together to share and stimulate new ideas.

This atmosphere existed at a time when financial abundance and academic freedom were the norm. Both of these engendered productivity and a sense of possibility that did not exist in Australia (either before the Australians left for the United States, or, in most cases, when they returned to a university setting) and stimulated the initiation and development of new areas of research.
Beyond the Campus
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When the Australian students first began leaving for the USA, Australia was still at the tail end of rationing.

Few women drove a car.

Many essentials were home delivered.

Housewives sewed clothes, baked cakes, ran chooks and grew their own vegies.

The pubs closed by six, you couldn’t bake bread in a bakery on Sundays.

Few students travelled between universities, Australia was huge and empty and the roads were pretty rough.

By comparison the USA was affluent:
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The 1950s US economy was driven forward by cars, chemicals and electric white goods.

The 1960s by housing, aerospace and computers.

By the end of the 1960s Americans had 50% more real and discretionary income than they did at the start of the 1950s.

Wealth nourished idealism. The experience of war propelled it forward.

Prominent intellectuals like Schlesinger, Riesman, Bell, Niebuhr, became active in the ideological struggle of the Cold War, attacking McCarthyism through the Congress for cultural freedom.

A number of members of the cohort remembered McCarthyism and its effect on universities they attended on the East Coast.

Goodnow was depressed by it. "It was a very sad time," she said.
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Dawson saw it as absurd. He chose a course in civil liberties primarily because it had been taught by a man who tended toward communism in his classes. He said,"It was a lure that couldn’t be resisted for any young student"
I give a much more detailed discussion of the impact of McCarthyism on the US academy in “Pioneers”...
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In the main Australians who went in the 1950s were more struck by US materialism and wealth. They described a preoccupation with the liberal virtues of compromise, moderation, and mixed economy, but also tail fins on cars, supermarkets, suburbs, white goods...

Recollections of Australians who arrived in the US after the launch of Sputnik accord with a new mood in the USA.

They commented on Kennedy, the death of Martin Luther King, Brown vs Brown and the Board of education.

Robert Nicholson met Kennedy at the White house, along with Robert Kennedy, Harry Belefonte, and Ed Murrow who was an international television man of the day.

Alan Goldberg sat on the same platform as Martin Luther King to accept his degree in the early 1960s. “I’m was close to history as I could be” he said.

Some, like Gordon Ford, went to Jackson, Mississippi to take part in the freedom rides, protesting against racial segregation in the South.

Tom Healy arrived at Berkeley and found his lab blown up by anti-Vietnam activists,

Greg Dening, Rowan Ireland, and Mary Aitken took part in anti-Vietnam moratoriums in Washington DC.

Others took part in grass roots activism, pamphlet drops, and supermarket dumps that voiced opposition to the use of wetbacks.

Freda Whitlam went and met Ezra Pound in his prison cell.

For many the access that these students had to intellectual and cultural life outside of the university campus was as much, if not more of, a feature of the postgraduate experience that the degree itself.

The point was that the United States politicised them. Going as they did, in the early throes of adult hood, the USA provided not just an awakening but scaffolding upon which many were able to build their subsequent selves both personally and professionally.

And that became very important for those who came back and faced resistance to the new ideas, methods, and work practices that they had absorbed while they were in the USA.
PART THREE

Coming home

Members of the cohort returned to Australia to establish their careers. In so doing their ability to incorporate American models into their field in Australia was shaped by the relevance of the US degree to their field and by timing.

Some students found the professional environment to which they returned too closely aligned with a British system for American models to be easily incorporated. Most of the eight law students who took part in the study felt that their careers were influenced by courses they completed in areas like constitutional law, and by the calibre of the teachers who taught them. Sir Daryl Dawson eventually became an expert in constitutional law, for example, and joined the High Court of Australia. Robert Nicholson and Alan Goldberg were both intrigued by federal politics on the east coast of the United States and after their return became distinguished judges of the Federal Court of Australia.

Federal educational and scientific organisations and private businesses welcomed the American methods and ideas introduced to them by the returning graduates that they employed and they were in a position to fund them.

The ACER, for example, embraced the expertise in educational measurement and statistics brought back by Donald Spearritt, for example, because they were skills that were unavailable to Australian students at the time.

The CSIRO embraced techniques and equipment brought back by Mervyn Hegarty, again similarly unavailable in Australia until he returned.
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Roy Woodall started the nickel boom in western Australia through his position as chief geologist with Western Mining in an area of Western Australia were previous effort (without the benefits of US Science) had failed.
Harold Clough turned a family business into an engineering company of international acclaim on the basis of expertise he learnt in California. His first big project was the Narrows bridge in Perth.

For a few, Australia was too far behind in their fields to bridge a gap, though for these the contacts that they made as a result of their US experience gave them access to an international world of scholarship through which they developed international reputations.

Students returning after the mid-1960s, when a great number of new tertiary institutions were being established, found themselves with a plethora of career opportunities at their disposal.

The new university schools provided them with a clean slate for them to run courses and postgraduate schools according to the American example.

Many subjects, disciplines, and university schools within the Australian academy were opened up to new fields of knowledge and academic practices by returnees. Social and behavioural sciences, Southern American Studies, Latin American Studies, areas of Classics...these are just some examples.

Existing courses were extended and developed as a result of postgraduate experiences and in response to ongoing exchanges of ideas with US research schools.

Many of the Australians returning during this time frame stepped straight into positions of leadership when they returned, a number being head hunted for positions before they left the United States by those who had returned before them.
For those who came back earlier, in the mid-1950s for example, or else to long established government departments or Oxbridge style universities, the existing cultures frustrated their attempts to incorporate their American experience into the Australian workplace.

They described their environments as traditionally British-centred, hierarchical, racist, and gendered.

For some, existing departments refused to recognise their American PhD.

They clashed with an existing deference to British education.

Some were marginalised by British trained graduates within their departments.

The appointment of returnees to traditionally British centred departments was highly unusual.
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Returning American graduates were pioneers:

They chipped away at conservative expectations in an effort to reveal an alternative but nevertheless plausible view of Australia’s research possibilities.

They were the first to use American models for current disciplines in Australia.

They were the first to employ American trained graduates in preference to those graduating from the UK.

They identified and aligned themselves with those who had chosen the United States over the United Kingdom for postgraduate education.

They paved the way for later returnees to the expanded tertiary sector, often lining them up for senior academic appointments before they had arrived back in Australia.

AND, they ensured a continuing openness of their part of the academy to American academic and intellectual influence.
CRITICISMS: Articulating the place of oral history in this project

One of the obvious criticisms of this work has been the use of memory as a reliable source for the writing of history. As John Still said in *The Jungle Tide*, “The memories of men are too frail a thread to hang history from.”

In this instance, the subjective nature of the narrator’s memories has been seen to overstate the significance of the American degree to changes that were occurring in the Australian context at the time.

As Oral historians we have two responsibilities:

To history, and to narrators and the stories that they tell.

Naturally, there are scholarly risks in relying too much either upon written histories or upon the narrator. But both can and should work together.

How you document their interaction is surely the most important issue. Obviously it is simply question of balance.

Why, we might ask, is oral history different or any less valuable a resource than any other? As historians, we seem content to draw upon, indeed to rely upon contemporaneous writings, memoir, speeches, and newspaper articles to write our books. Yet oral history attracts the suspicion of traditionalist historians (many of whom may secretly define themselves with a capital ‘H’) because it hinges on memory.

In fact, oral history is a powerful tool, particularly when it combines the memories of a wide and discursive selection of players. Rather than detract from historical work because it gathers memories, the inherently subjective nature of the remembered experience actually contextualises the past, and gives it life within the life story of its narrator.

The best oral histories are those done when there is no other method available. In the case of "Pioneers", no other work has been done on the impact of the American postgraduate experience on Australian social and intellectual cultures after the Second World War and the interviews were a crucial resource.

The same language and expression resonated across those who contributed memories, furthermore in some cases the same factual errors were repeated in separate conversations.
The repetition of storytelling motifs across interviews with different narrators provided evidence of a shared construction of the past... Analysing these regularities across the interviews helped to define the boundaries of the discursively defined community that I have called a cohort – that small band of warriors who pioneered a new vision for Australian research.

Clearly it is important that we don’t rely too heavily on what a narrator (with fifty years of hindsight) presents to us as fact. But the patterns and similarities that were evident in the various descriptions of Australia, of the US post graduate experience, and of the kind of place that Australia was when they returned did contextualise the eras that my narrators were speaking of nevertheless.

For example, members of the cohort often self-identified themselves as adventurous and different to the prevailing norm within academic departments in Australia. By portraying the US experience as a “choice” (when often it was the only alternative) they brought the US experience into the present discussion such that it justified a preferred self-image as the “ground breaker”, “the revolutionary”, and often “the underdog”.

The way in which they did so often said just as much about adventurousness as it did about the limitations of the Australia that they left behind. It provided clues as to how much an era and an environment in the United States politicised them, how by exposing them to an optimism and to a sense of possibility at a formative time in their lives, it could impact upon their psychological scaffolding at the time, and upon their subsequent achievements and self-construct when they returned to Australia.

New universities in Australia in the 1960s were often peopled by newly politicised graduates such as these. The USA had provided them with a new context with which to identify and against which to measure Australia, Australian universities, and themselves when they returned. They injected a new and different traffic of ideas into their departments or their professional lives when they came home. A traffic that was new and different simply because it did not originate in the United Kingdom. Sabbatical leave provisions and the international connections and friendships continued to direct that traffic. In turn they recommended that their students make use of those connections and travel the same path. The experience came full circle.
In the Oral History review, Alistair Thompson notes that "...oral history as used within the community ... could be a significant resource for making more democratic and transformative histories, and might in turn enable people to tell stories that had been silenced because they did not match the dominant cultural memory." P. 56

In this case, the history of the American postgraduate experience is an important narrative in the establishment of an independent social and intellectual culture in Australia that until now has remained largely untold. It gives balance to that larger intellectual history that until now has given pre-eminence to intellectual traditions derived from the United Kingdom. And it is an important narrative in a larger discussion of Australia's adolescence. An old African that I met whilst visiting my good friend Lisa in Cape Town told me: "until lions have their historians, tales of the hunt shall always glorify the hunters". For my own part, I have to say that I have quite enjoyed listening to the lions talk.
**Cohort: Roman Antiquity.**

“A band of infantry, usually 300 to 600. A tenth part of a legion...

A band of warriors.”
LETTERS
QUESTIONNAIRES
INTERVIEWS
MEMORIES and STORIES
SECONDARY SOURCES
CONTEXTS
CONCLUSIONS
• Australia before they left
• The United States while they were there
• Australia when they returned
1920’s, science and education.

1922, Munitions supply laboratories established to support the armed services.

1924, Commonwealth Solar Observatory

1925, Australian branch of the Institute of Physics

1926, CSIR

1930, ACER

1942, Scientific Liaison Bureau

1942, Radio Physics Laboratory

1941, Reconstruction Research Grants (Curtin)

1949 – Australian Academy of Science, Weapons Research Establishment, Australian Atomic Energy Commission
1946 – ANU

1949 NSW Uni of Tech. to become University of New South Wales in 1958.

1961 – James Cook

1966 – Flinders

1967 – La Trobe

1971 – Griffith

1972 – Macquarie

1974 – Deakin
“Admittedly there aren’t very many of them, and they are of course handpicked”  
*J.D. Medley, 1948.*
“I would never ever have walked inside the doors of the University of New South Wales. It was alien territory!” Ross King, Architecture, University of Pennsylvania.
“In the early 1960s it was still a criminal offence to bake bread in a bakery or drink alcohol in a hotel on Sundays. The pubs in Victoria at least, always closed at 6pm” Justice Alan Goldberg, Federal Court of Australia, Yale, Law.
“Australia in the Empire and the Empire in Australia” Davidson
1. Graduate students “sent” to the UK.

“Australian intellectuals felt frustrated by the feeling that they were inferiors, far from the centre with which they sought to identify”

2. British option meant a second undergraduate degree.

3. Poaching of the “best and brightest”.

“recognition and higher honours on British turf was seen as the pinnacle of academic success in Australia.” *Alomes*

4. Senior posts to British graduates.

“The appointment of a gentleman of high moral purpose to senior positions was regarded as essential if not always achievable.” *Leigh Dale, The English Men.*

5. UK wages higher.

6. Options for women were limited.

“everybody knew that women had been effectively barred from tertiary education...In Australia almost all women married, and almost all married women found their lives homebound.”

‘Ian MacFarland who was professor of physiology at the time, said to me, “June, why don’t you get a divorce and you could continue living with your husband and working for me?”’ *June Halliday, University of Wisconsin, Bio-Medicine.*

7. A lack of PhD programs in Australia.

“It wasn’t until 1960 that it became possible for the first time to do professional work in Australia.” *R.M. Crawford, An Australian Perspective.*
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
“EDUCATION CAPITAL OF THE WORLD”

Washington Sunday Star, 11 May 1947
THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM (EST. 1946)

- A SOLUTION TO THE MISUNDERSTANDINGS THAT UNDERMINED WORLD PEACE
- 25-30 AUSTRALIAN POSTGRADUATES EVERY YEAR FOR THE DURATION OF THE 1950s
- ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
- A HEIGHTENED SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
- COMMITMENT TO FAIRNESS
- RACE, COLOUR, OR CREED IRRELEVANT
- NO FIELD OF EDUCATION OR SCHOLARSHIP SPECIFICALLY INCLUDED OR EXCLUDED
- APPLICANTS ACCEPTED FROM NON-UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTRES.
The SMITH-MUNDT PROGRAM (EST. 1948) and

the FIVE YEAR PLAN

“The function of student exchanges is to bulwark the free and democratic areas against totalitarianism” Ninkovich

“Safeguards must be incorporated to prevent the infiltration of long-haired communists” Manchester, The Glory and the Dream.

“The selection of entrants will be reliant upon ideological as well as intellectual screening” Ninkovich

“The important thing is to bring foreigners here and work them over” Congressman John Davis Lodge

“The exchange program must be designed to indoctrinate as well as educate” Ninkovich

“If the destiny of the American people is to be given the opportunity to serve the world through its educational means, then destiny needs a little shove.” Kendrick Marshall
SPUTNIK 1957

1. American university research programs expanded and multiplied.

2. Graduate student programs broadened.

3. Foreign students from across the world flooded into US universities in ever increasing numbers.

“It was the glorious days when there was lots of money for research and there just didn’t seem to be any restriction on what I wanted to do.” Graham Swain, University of Maryland, agronomy.
Why they went.

“It wasn’t a case of this or that…the competition for the English ones was much, much fiercer because that was where everyone thought of going.” Neville Fletcher, Harvard, Physics.
“My intention was to get them better educated in the broader sense.” Sir Zelman Cowen.
“In the mid-1970s, I was a full professor going into committee meetings [at Macquarie University] where there would only be men. Everyone was still addressed as ‘he’ ...to say you found it rude was considered very unBritish...It was like swimming through mud.” Jacqueline Goodnow, Harvard, psychology.
New disciplines

Microbial research

Production engineering,

geography,

biological nitrogen fixation

behavioural sciences.................
“Solid state physics and semiconductor electronics were new post war fields that flourished in the US but had not begun in Australia. I did not know about them until I arrived at Harvard.” Neville Fletcher, Harvard, physics
1961 – James Cook
1966 – Flinders
1967 – La Trobe
1971 – Griffith
1972 - Macquarie
1974 - Deakin
“I was the first person to be appointed to an Australian English Department with an American PhD. This raised some eyebrows.” *Harry Heseltine.*
“I remember one student, a man called Landy at Yale, had been charged with having a known association with a communist, namely his mother...the heights of idiocy!!” Sir Daryl Dawson, Yale, Law
“You could have anything from an ice-cream cone to a new chevy” Murray Kemp, Johns Hopkins, economics, 1951

“American was the land of opportunity” Rolf and Vera Beilharz

“All the supermarkets were new, the freeways were new, things were pretty cheap, you could buy TVs and fridges, and we had a second hand car which was excellent. It was a Plymouth” Graham Swain, University of Maryland, agronomy.
For the US section:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -
EDUCATION CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

Pre-WWII:
US university research schools were:
Unitary organisations,
Philanthropically funded
Specialised in certain departments and fields to attract philanthropic support

During WWII:
Weapons production and research increased
University research schools and departments incorporated into national defence
University scientists relocated to individual laboratories which

- Created a precedent for federal funding
- undermined previous university rivalries
- supported the cross fertilisation of ideas across universities, departments, schools, fields
- made scientists a crucial resource for the government both during and after the war
- created a seller’s market for research after the war.

WWII – 1973,
doctorates awarded increased by a factor of ten – 3,000 to 35,000
Expansion of programs and fields of work across universities increasing opportunities to study anything and everything

Can be broken down into

Post – WWII - 1957
Science fields expand through federal funds
Social, behavioural, medical, health backed mostly by Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford (from 1950 – it tripled combined contributions of the others)

1957 – 1973

Sputnik leads to a second wave of funding. Space and science research, but also graduate education explode. The heyday of American Universities.

THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM (est. 1946)

- A SOLUTION TO THE MISUNDERSTANDINGS THAT UNDERMINED WORLD PEACE PRIOR TO THE SECOND WORLD WAR.
- 25-30 AUSTRALIANS EVERY YEAR FOR THE DURATION OF THE 1950’s (“A Cohort of Pioneers” includes one in every six for that entire decade) went for a postgraduate degree.

- ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
- A HEIGHTENED SENSE OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
- COMMITMENT TO FAIRNESS
- RACE, COLOUR, CREED WERE IRRELEVANT
- NO FIELD OF EDUCATION OR SCHOLARSHIP SPECIFICALLY INCLUDED OR EXCLUDED
- APPLICANTS ACCEPTED FROM LIBRARIES, MUSEUMS, NON-UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTRES (Australians from CSIRO, from the ACER, from the National Library etc. were eligible to apply.)

THE SMITH-MUNDT PROGRAM (est. 1948)

AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

“The five year plan was based on the idea that the function of student exchanges was to bulwark the free and democratic areas against totalitarianism.”

Selection of entrants reliant upon IDEOLOGICAL as well as INTELLECTUAL screening.

It stated: “The exchange program must be designed to indoctrinate as well as educate.”

“Safeguards were incorporated to prevent the infiltration of long-haired communists”

“If the destiny of the American people is to be given the opportunity of serving the world through our educational means, then destiny needs a little shove.” Kendrick Marshall
THE SMITH – MINDT BILL (1948)

- AUTHORISED AN INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM
- WAS PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH THE INTERNATIONAL AND SYSTEMATIC DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES
- WAS ASSOCIATED WITH PROGRAMS LIKE THE VOICE OF AMERICA
- AND THE CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM
- STOCKED INTERNATIONAL LIBRARIES WITH LITERATURE ON THE USA.

WHAT THEY REMEMBERED

McCarthy:

Sir Daryl Dawson;

“The law school at Yale has a very liberal position, I chose a course in civil liberties because it was taught by a man who had been accused of tending toward communism in his classes...it was lure that couldn't be resisted for any young student.”

“I remember one student, a man called Landy at Yale, was charged with having a known association with a known communist, namely his mother! The heights of idiocy!”

Eisenhower:

Wealth and materialism

Conservatism

Kennedy:

Idealism and social conscience.

Assassination

Glamour

Magic

Think tanks
Garden parties

Meeting Harry Belafonte and Robert Kennedy

“I met president Kennedy at the White House!”

“I am a donut”

Television

The south

Brown vs. brown

1. Why was it that scholarships were now available to the USA?
2. Why were Australians accepting them?
3. Why did the Australians feel so good about their postgraduate experience in the USA?
   (because they did and all but one told me that they did) And why was it described as being so incredibly exceptional?

A mere compilation of facts presents only the skeleton of History; we do but little for her if we cannot invest her with life, clothe her in the habiliments of her day, and enable her to call forth the sympathies of succeeding generations. ~Hannah Farnham Lee, *The Huguenots in France and America*

Radical historians now the tell the story of Thanksgiving from the point of view of the turkey. ~Mason Cooley

For the rubble of history, which is undigested and therefore goes on blindly, does not lie so thickly on the ground as in our own consciousness. ~Herbert Lüthy

For me, in fact, the mark of the historic is the nonchalance with which it picks up an individual and deposits him in a trend, like a house playfully moved by a tornado. ~Mary McCarthy, *On the Contrary*

History is the essence of innumerable biographies. ~Thomas Carlyle, *On History*

The memories of men are too frail a thread to hang history from. ~John Still, *The Jungle Tide*

Until lions have their historians, tales of the hunt shall always glorify the hunters. ~African Proverb
Oh, God. The Sixties are coming back. Well I've got a 12-gauge double-barreled duck gun chambered for three-inch Magnum shells. And - speaking strictly for this retired hippie and former pinko beatnik - if the Sixties head my way, they won't get past the porch steps. They will be history. Which, for chrissakes, is what they're supposed to be. ~P.J. O'Rourke