

AUSTRALIA - PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

Rita Helling

"The Personal Is Political"

Everything combined to make 1973 a good year to start Women's Studies at Flinders University. We'd had some success in the anti-Vietnam movement and many of us were feeling that we *could* exercise some power in society. The Women's Movement had been around long enough for "progressive men" to pay lip service to it, though few of them thought it had much application to their own lives. The long boom of the sixties had resulted in many sections of the Australian community being relatively well-off. An expansion of the student body was achieved by the abandonment of fees, then the introduction of freely-available loans, and finally by payment of student allowances. The range of courses was expanded also, and in this atmosphere of liberality, some educational innovations were possible.

When it was rumoured, late in 1972, that Adelaide University was setting up a Women's Studies course, those of us at Flinders involved in the women's group and with the Philosophy Department, felt we shouldn't be left behind. Because of the mainly Marxist Philosophy Department (as well as some other radicals in other departments), and because of that department's involvement in the group assessment struggle, the anti-Vietnam movement, and other student issues, Flinders had a reputation as the more radical University in South Australia, and having a Women's Studies course would enhance that reputation. With the encouragement of the Professor of Philosophy, and after approval by the Philosophy Consultative Committee (the decision-making body in the department, consisting of all staff and students) a committee of women was set up. This included women from the University, students intending to enrol, members of the Women's Movement, and other women from the community. This committee's function was to initiate the course, make suggestions on all aspects of the course, and to prepare a submission and attend the Humanities Board meeting, the body which would either pass or reject the course.

The course outline we drew up was "issue-based". We were to look at women in the media, in history, in the workforce, in the education system, and the position of women in various societies. We also saw the course as having an important consciousness-raising aspect. Right from the start, we had a strong commitment to having non-University women participate in the course.

None of the committee members were employed by the University so none of us were members of the Humanities School Board. This meant that we couldn't fight for the course ourselves - so the Philosophy Department had to do it for us. Our first attempt at getting it through the Board failed - it wasn't academic enough. Some of the male members of the Board were unco-operative. For example, a professor of Spanish submitted a parody of the Women's Studies course, entitled, "The Philosophical, Social, Sexual and Artistic Transcendency of Tauromachy" (i.e., bull-fighting) suggesting that members of the Hispanists Association teach the course. He thought that "Their lack of academic qualifications

should not, we consider, be a serious impediment to our proposals. We have it on the best authority that the majority of them can both read and write".¹

Our second attempt at the Humanities Board was successful, and we were jubilant. Women's Studies was now part of the Philosophy offerings, at second or third year level. It was generally recognized that many of the topics we were interested in were interdisciplinary, but as the Philosophy Department had for some time been expanding its view of what philosophy was because of its political orientation, women's studies topics were felt to be legitimate philosophical concerns.

I was the general course convenor, and I got \$13 a week extra for the work in Women's Studies. I was already doing a Ph.D. and tutoring in first-year Philosophy, but I didn't mind. The committee expected about 20 people to turn up to the first meeting, but there were nearly 80. We were delighted, and organized the students into groups led by a convenor (a member of the committee with some academic qualification). Group assessment fitted the general idea that we had of the course being democratic (i.e., leaderless), of equality in status (no lectures) and all of us learning from each other.

The emphasis was on being supportive rather than critical. As Yvonne Allen said of that year:

Many of us also found the responsibility of self-management, of participatory democracy, difficult to cope with. It is hard to overcome all the notions of passivity and subjection that we have grown up with.²

Adelaide University feminists started their course in the Politics Department. They also had a commitment to non-university participation, and to self-assessment and group assessment (though checked by academics). It was organized on the basis of seminars, and its aims were:

- a) To examine the oppression of women as we experience it, and investigate the possibilities for change.
- b) To examine the positive role of women as a force in history.
- c) To define the nature of women's studies, e.g. in correcting male bias in history, opening up new areas of research, charting the personal experience of political oppression.³

Unfortunately, the course lasted only one year. A course entitled "Philosophical Aspects of Feminist Thought" at Sydney University began in 1973 in the Philosophy Department.⁴

The University of Tasmania offered a course entitled "Women in English Society 1791-1928," in the History Department, again started in 1973,⁵ and there was a Women's Studies course at Monash University in Victoria.⁶ Two feminists in the Department of Government at the University of Sydney, Liz Fell and Anne Summers, gave a course in 1973, which was a study of family structure, and they concluded that:

... the kind of approach outlined by Juliet Mitchell, that blending of three strands of radical thought - Marxism, Laing's radical humanism, and feminism - is one that is worth exploring further.⁷

And at the Canberra Centre for Continuing Education there was a course on "Women in Society," from 1972 onwards, where the participants were so enthusiastic they continued to meet over the holidays.⁸ In brief, we enjoyed a general sense of euphoria and optimism in several places around the same time.

Consolidation

The success of the first year at Flinders was continued in various ways over the next few years. The Philosophy Department appointed a woman tutor to be responsible for Women's Studies, which seemed to be convincing proof of the department's genuine commitment to the course. In 1974 there were about 140 participants in the course, only 40 of whom were University-enrolled students, and things continued to be democratically-run. More thought could be given to the basis of the course. As one participant said in 1974:

Now that the course is 'established' and we don't have to go around continually justifying it and guaranteeing that academic standards will be maintained, questions like what is women's studies, why do we want it, who does it serve and what are we hoping to achieve from it are assuming much more importance for us.⁹

There was plenty of part-time teaching money in the Philosophy Department (and elsewhere in the University), and much of it was given to Women's Studies, so that women were appointed to be part-time tutors in the course, as well as the full-time tutor, and they formed a "collective" to run the course. There was an agreement that part-time tutors for the course would not be appointed for more than two years, so the membership of the collectives varied over the years. The course continued to be open to anyone who wanted to take part in it, and in effect, the Philosophy Department, with that part-time teaching money, was supporting the non-enrolled students.

Enormous expansion occurred in the number of Women's Studies courses offered throughout Australia during 1974. Another Sydney University course which was started in that year was Interdepartmental, involving women academics from the departments of economics, economic history, government and fine arts. It was entitled "The Political Economy of Women", and began with 50 students, 30 enrolled and 20 other participants.¹⁰ The University of New South Wales started a course in the Sociology and Philosophy Departments, "Oppression and Liberation,"¹¹ and at the University of New England Miriam Dixon's course in the History Department, which dealt with the "Problems of Women, Family and Identity in Western traditions with special emphasis on the Australian tradition", was more within the academic tradition.¹² Queensland University had a course on women in the Social Work Department.¹³ However, Women's Studies courses were not confined to Universities. By 1974, the Social Science Department of the State College of Victoria (largely a teacher training institution) organized a course which covered "(a) a brief history of the Women's Liberation Movement, and (b) a study of the conditioning of women into their role in society through education."¹⁴

In South Australia, a seminar course on "Sexism in Education" was run at the Sturt College of Advanced Education (also a teacher training institution) in 1974. The aims of the course were to examine explanations with reference to education such as "recent theories ascribe the causes of different behaviour of the sexes to social and cultural conditioning, rather than to innate differences."¹⁵ Similar courses were run at the other teacher training institutions in South Australia - Salisbury, Murray Park and Torrens Colleges of Advanced Education where there was a high level of interest in the issue of sexism in education amongst teachers, partly due to the fact that a number of members of the Women's Movement were, or had been, teachers. This interest was evident for some years.

For example, there had been a conference in Adelaide at Easter of 1973, called "Women in Sexist Education," where the papers ranged from attacks on Bowlby's theories of

maternal deprivation, through sex-role reinforcement in primary and high schools, to sexism in theories of knowledge and in radical education theories.¹⁶

Sylvia Kinder gives details of practical actions which followed these early initiatives against sexism in education:

Plans to establish a Women's Studies Resource Centre staffed by feminists providing materials for running Women's Studies programmes in schools were begun in 1974. A submission for funding was written and together with a course outline, sent to the Schools Commission Innovations Programme in December 1974 . . . The submission to the Education Department's secondary curriculum advisory committee by WEL (Women's Electoral Lobby, similar to NOW in the United States) attendance at the Women in Education conference organized by the Education Department in October 1973 and the compilation of non-sexist children's book lists represented these early initiatives.¹⁷

Communications between the States were improved by more regular conferences and by publications. A conference in Melbourne in May 1974 on "Women in Tertiary Education" was attended by over 200 women and the areas of concern covered women's career choices, women as role models, facilities for women in tertiary institutions, sexism in courses, and work opportunities. Resolutions and proposals for action were passed in relation to all of the above areas, as well as:

That the Students' Union support a campaign to have Women's Studies established as a course at this university, as an inter-disciplinary, self-managing, and open course along the lines of the course at Flinders University.¹⁸

In October of 1974, there was a much larger conference also in Melbourne. About 700 women registered for the "Feminism and Socialism" conference. Papers were given on "The Origins of the Autonomous Women's Movement," "History and Critique of Campaigns," "Consciousness-Raising and the Political Assumptions behind our methods of Organization," "African Women," "Class and the Women's Movement," and a paper by the "Flinders Marxist-Leninist Women," entitled "Women's Liberation and the Struggle against Imperialism," where it was stated that "Sexism is rampant on the male left," but also that "We are not weak, we are not in danger of being dominated or over-thrown." The Women in Education Coalition was formed at the end of this conference, later becoming the Australian Women's Education Coalition, a vigorous body, still growing and holding annual conferences.

One of the big events of 1974 was the Sydney Philosophy strike, the original purpose of which was to continue the course started in 1973, "Philosophical Aspects of Feminist Thought," but which was taken over by male radicals to promote the issue of democracy and self-government in the Philosophy Department. One of the participants said:

The extent to which sexism became subsumed under other issues, mainly self-management, is clearly indicated in the following comment. A woman, bemoaning the apparent loss of the women's cause and the probability of it not getting accepted for years to come, received from a sympathetic male supporter: "Damn the women's course - this is important. If the professors win on this one, the whole movement for self management will be set back years." It is obvious that most of the men on the left are unable to see the relationship between sexism and self-management - sexism is seen to be a minor issue.²⁰

Even though the strike resulted in self-management for the more 'radical' part of the Philosophy Department, and in keeping the women's course, some of the women felt it might have been better if they'd fought their own fight and lost!

Refractory Girl, subtitled "A Journal of Women's Studies," was first published in 1973, and charted the progress of women's studies through these years, with bibliographies, research notes, theoretical articles, stories and poetry. A typical issue would contain articles such as "A Women's History Workshop," "Women in the Family," "The Women's Weekly: Depression and War Years" and "The Women's Weekly: Today," "Octavius Beale and the Ideology of the Birthrate: The Royal commissions of 1904 and 1905," "The Philosophy Strike: Feminism by-passed at Sydney," and so on. There was a bibliography extending over several issues entitled "Bibliography of Women in Australia," which listed printed works, by subject, of everything that could be found on women in Australia from 1900 to 1972, which proved to be an extremely valuable source for women's studies courses.²¹

It was International Women's Year in 1975, and we had a Labor Government in Federal Parliament. Funding for refuges, information services, and resource centres, was fairly liberally handed out. Flinders University received funding for a Resource Centre, which from that time onwards was an important part of the course. Books were purchased, journal subscriptions taken out, articles gathered from all corners and xeroxed, and students' works kept and filed. A room was allocated for the centre, and a woman employed to do the purchasing, cataloguing and running of the centre. It took some years to build the stocks up to a decent level, but it was desperately needed, and heavily used right from the start.

There was a strong connection between the Women's Studies course and other parts of the Women's Movement. Many, at times, most of the students doing the course took part in Women's Movement activities, worked in shelters, went on marches, worked in resource and other women's services. There was a strong feeling that practice had to go with theory, growing out of the conviction that "The personal is political," so it was no good just talking about feminism, you had to *do* something as well. The tutors in the course were usually committed feminists, some socialist, and some separatist or radical feminist. In those years the divisions between radical feminists, socialist feminists, separatists and liberal feminists were starting to be felt, and at times there were deep divisions between the Philosophy Department and the Women's Studies collectives and where there was a strong separatist commitment the divisions were deepest. The Philosophy Department with its male ethos was sometimes seen as "the enemy," which disapproved of feminism that was not socialist in orientation. A major ideological rift seemed inevitable because of the belief among many feminists that the movement is for *all* women whatever their social class and conditions of life. Moreover, the notion of women *as a class* is related most strongly to a particular view of society that has feminist separatist implications. However, there seemed no question of an open breach, simply ideological disapproval on both sides.

The democratic seminar or discussion group teaching methods that were used in the first year of the course, and which were inherited largely from the Women's Movement were also consolidated, but there was little innovation. The concept of "leaderlessness" faltered because in reality, the stronger personalities dominated. Some teaching kits were assembled which were participatory, but their contents and value varied a great deal with little consistent educational basis. They contained copies of a couple of essential articles (e.g., Lee Comer's "The Motherhood Myth" for the kit on the family) and lists of books to read. The assertiveness kit included *Don't Say 'Yes' when you want to say 'No'*, by H. Fensterheim and J. Baer, and G. Burton's *I'm Running away from Home but I'm not*

allowed to cross the Street, as well as, in later years, Hogie Wyckoff's *Solving Women's Problems*.

We saw the traditional teaching methods as patriarchal and elitist particularly lectures and exams. High "academic" standards meant collecting the ideas of others, not making assumptions or generalizations, close argument, impersonal formulation, extensive and "correctly" done bibliographies and footnotes. On the other hand, we were committed to ideas that each woman's experience was valuable and that we all had skills and knowledge that made us equally "expert."

Occasionally there were men who did the course, mostly independently of the women's groups, as it had always been a principle that women should be able to be in groups without men. It's a principle I still support strongly, having taught mixed and segregated groups. What makes our conditioning in this society so powerful is the fact that we don't realize we've got it. Most of us have very little idea of the power or extent of the way we've been formed. Women often thought they'd rather have men in the groups, not realizing what the problems might be. The specific attitudes we have which relate to group behaviour include considering the opinions of men to be more valuable than those of women. This means that women will allow men to talk for a long time without interruption, whereas the opposite is not true.

Because women are more likely to be passive than men, they would be less likely to take the initiative in conversation, in stating their opinions, in interrupting, or in trying to set or change the direction of a conversation. We're all conditioned thoroughly into having an authoritarian personality to react in an automatically submissive way to authority, and that authority is male. Our authority figure is a part of us, it is carried around with us and applied to all our situations - and that's why we take more notice of what men say. We simply cannot leave this aside when we join a Women's Studies group. It's hard enough to try and break down the walls of isolation, competitiveness and passivity, without tackling the male/female power differential at the same time.²² I found that men and women can work reasonably well together after they've been through that process of separation, but I think that's important to have first. But in many places, and many courses, the participation of men was never questioned.

Throughout these years the women's journals, and especially *Refractory Girl* provided valuable resources and forums. *Refractory Girl* never seemed to take up a particular ideological stand, but showed the trends in the Women's Movement as they developed, and illustrated debates. An issue in 1975 (No. 9) contained a review of *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* by Pat Vort-Ronald, a member of the Communist Party of Australia, "Women in Politics," which was subtitled "Reflections on WEL's Third National Conference", and an article by Sue Wills on "The Psychologist and the Lesbian". Other journals had more particular interests - *Scarlet Woman*, a socialist feminist journal, began publication in April of 1975, and *Hecate*, a more literary and theoretical journal, first came out in January of 1975.

Women's Studies courses extended to the Department of Further Education Colleges (mainly concerned with technical vocational courses, but also including General Studies sections). The first of these was a seminar course at Brighton (South Australia) in 1975, and then an Opportunities for Women course which was begun by Liz Hooper in June of 1976 at the Panorama College, and the following year similar courses extended to most of the South Australian D.F.E. Colleges. In Victoria there were dozens of courses in the Universities,

State College, Institutes of Technology and more informal courses for women set up in the Diamond Valley Learning Centre and Working Women's Centre,²³ and there was a similar situation in the Sydney area. Queensland now had courses for women in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology and the English Department.²⁴

Further Developments

After a year in the United Kingdom when I returned to take up a tutorship again in 1978 with the Philosophy Department I found a climate that bristled with deep feelings. There was a collective teaching and running Women's Studies that year (with socialist-oriented and separatist-inclined membership). While I kept close contact with the collective my main assignment was with 1st year Philosophy. I was divided by the tension that existed between the goals of the collective and the department for I felt identification with them both. I could not reconcile myself to the possibility that it was not merely misunderstanding that caused both my alienation and the antagonisms between them but instead a serious ideological conflict. Strained, and in conflict, I felt compelled to write a paper "On the Relationship between Women's Studies and the Philosophy Department" in an attempt to overcome the estrangement between the two areas. In this paper I criticized the lack of sympathy and intellectual support on both academic and ideological grounds. I observed in this paper that:

Apart from [two exceptions] nearly all course descriptions, readings lists, course content, manner of teaching, has remained exactly the same . . . almost nothing has been taken from women's studies to enrich philosophy courses. Most of the courses are still addressed to and are about the male half of humanity. After all these years, the philosophy department should be contributing material relevant to women to the women's studies resource centre, as well as ideas and help, in fact everything they do should be just as relevant to women as to men.²⁵

The general reading list for the Feminism course I taught during 1975-77 included Kollontai's *Communism and the Family*, Engels' *Origin of the Family*, Rowbotham's *Women, Resistance and Revolution*, Rayna Reiter's *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, and Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex*. There were other sections on history, radical feminism, socialism and feminism, Russia, China and Australia. This structure was derived largely from my Ph.D. thesis, "Women's Role in National Liberation."

Meanwhile, The Women's Studies people at Flinders were involved in helping to run or giving advice in several courses in community groups, some in country areas and The Salisbury College of Advanced Education (also in South Australia) started a Women's Studies programme in July of 1979, which led to a Graduate Diploma in Teaching, Women's Studies.²⁶

In January of 1980 we arranged to have a four day residential course, which was called a "Trainer Training course". We didn't have much idea what it was about; we knew it included assertiveness, and communication skills, but apart from that my ideas about it were vague. We'd been led to it partly because of our knowledge that assertiveness was important, but we realised that we had only scratched the surface. The people running the training course were two feminists from the Training and Development Branch of the Department of Further Education, Yve Repin and Miranda Roe. These two, and others at Training and Development, have contributed a great deal to many organizations and individuals in South Australia, especially in the Department of Further Education, because they have made it possible for women who have done their courses to organize teaching for themselves and get their objectives much clearer.

During the first term of 1980 we covered assertiveness, communication skills, adult learning, media images, work and women, and problem solving. The students set their own objectives for the course, and while encouraging them to take responsibility for their own learning the structured program meant that the tutor had a more important but basically non-authoritarian role. The next two terms including health and psychology, transactional analysis and major projects subjected to group assessment methods.

Even before the year ended, I felt I had to write it all down - what we'd done as well as why we'd done it. The whole year, and especially that four-day course, had expanded my ideological framework, and in working out the political implications of what I'd been learning, I rejected Leninism as an appropriate strategy for changing society to a less sexist and exploitative form. I'd seen how the authoritarian personality functions in the teaching situation, and extended this analysis. The authoritarian personality is not only expressed in people's personality, and in teaching, but in the way things are organized. Leninist (and Trotskyist) organizations are organized in the pattern of male power relationships in capitalist society. There is a strong sense of competition amongst the individuals, and between the group and the rest of society, and in particular, the rest of the Left. And if Leninist groups see themselves as a vanguard, which really knows what the revolution is all about, and we (the masses) don't know, then it's not at all likely that Leninists are going to take feminism seriously. Leninism fits in very well with the authoritarian personality developed in capitalist societies. It reproduces very easily the power relationships between men and women, and its very structure makes it impervious to change through new ideas.²⁷

In the Department of Further Education Colleges in South Australia alone, there were 57 different offerings listed in the 1980 Handbook "Women's Studies in Further Education." These ranged from "Opportunities for Women" courses extending over twelve weeks to "Women and Transactional Analysis" and "New Technology and Careers for Women" at the Training and Development Branch. In addition, National Conferences were frequent and well-attended. The Women and Labor Conference was held every two years, and in 1980, 1,500 people attended. However, the relations between the Philosophy Department and The Women's Studies people had not improved.

Dispersal

The department viewed my ideas about assertiveness and communication with suspicion and at times, hostility, to what were perceived of as being "con tricks." I began to realize that my faith in rationality was dubious and that there were serious ideological issues at stake which militated against persuasion. What bothered me most was that there seemed to be an end to discussion. There was an *impasse* regarding assessment systems and ideas about "education," and methodology.

Financial problems were becoming much more serious for the Philosophy Department and the university and for all universities throughout Australia. Financial problems, however, were only one side of it. It's not only a matter of scarce resources, but of priorities - of distribution of those resources. Women's studies courses and tutors were either the first to go or as at Flinders having a reduced level. Economic tensions increased the distrust between myself and the Philosophy department particularly after I described it as "patriarchal" in the notes for my Feminist course.²⁸

It is disappointing to note that in many other courses there was even less challenge to patriarchal teaching methods. Most courses, then and still, remain within the traditional,

therefore, patriarchal, academic mode. These include lectures, tutorials, examinations, textbooks, and the demand for "high academic standards." I cannot see any way out of this dilemma for courses merely reflect the institutional structures and the nature of formal institutionalized learning itself. On the other hand, to combine both the "academic" mode and informal and anti-patriarchal modes, while giving students the benefit of research, the use of transmitted bodies of knowledge and scientific approaches in a relationship would combine personal experience with the system of oppression.

Looking back now it is not surprising that I found myself eventually excluded from contributing anything further to Women's Studies at Flinders.

By 1982 and 1983 the course at Flinders continued but at a reduced level having failed to gain a tutorship or lectureship for the Philosophy department to keep it going. Panorama Community College continues with its support but the present part-time tutors have shifted away from the original model. Relations between them and the department seem to be collaborative rather than confrontative.

Despite the economic climate the Colleges of Advanced Education, the community colleges which represent technical and further education, and community groups continued to expand. In the meantime, Adelaide University has set up a research centre for Women's Studies which is the first of its kind in Australia. In an article in *The Advertiser*, an Adelaide newspaper, it was observed that it was "appropriate that the University of Adelaide has taken the lead in establishing such a centre. In 1881 it had been the first in Australia to allow women students."³⁰

I was encouraged briefly in the August of 1981 when I attended the first Australia-wide Women's Studies conference at Wollongong in New South Wales. There were about three hundred people in attendance; small enough for it to be a warm and friendly conference but big enough for there to be an energetic exchange of ideas. Representatives attended from all kinds of women's studies courses and from all disciplines as well as in community and union groups.²⁹ Despite this optimistic gathering I cannot help but wryly think to myself, "So much for youthful illusions. If I ever see general university courses *that take women into account equally*, I'll be an old, old woman."

What am I to make of these chronologically recalled personal reflections? My experience at Flinders University has taught me one major lesson. It has taught me that it takes more than suppression, hostility, and opposition to prevent such a program from developing. In fact, suppression, hostility, and oppression will make women realize all the more clearly that they *are* oppressed and they will then want to use Women's Studies courses to understand the nature of this oppression and to suggest strategies to overcome it.

Notes

¹ *Refractory Girl*, "Women's Studies Courses," No. 2, Autumn, 1973, p. 39.

² Y. Allen, "The Silence Ends," *Guide to Women's Studies* (Australian Union of Students, 1974), p. 10.

³ P. 38.

⁴ P. 32.

⁵ P. 43.

⁶ P. 44.

⁷ P. 19.

- ⁸ P. 31.
- ⁹ P. 42.
- ¹⁰ "Women's Studies Courses," *Refractory Girl*, No. 5, p. 47.
- ¹¹ *Guide to Women's Studies*, p. 32.
- ¹² P. 33.
- ¹³ P. 34.
- ¹⁴ *Refractory Girl*, p. 47.
- ¹⁵ *Guide*, p. 38.
- ¹⁶ "Conference Papers," *Refractory Girl*, No. 3, Winter 1973, p. 31-2.
- ¹⁷ Sylvia Kinder, *Herstory of Adelaide Women's Liberation 1969-1974*, (Adelaide, 1980), p. 152.
- ¹⁸ *Guide*, p. 21.
- ¹⁹ Conference Papers, *Feminism and Socialism Conference*, (Melbourne 1974).
- ²⁰ *Refractory Girl*, No. 3, Winter, 1973, p. 28.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Rita Helling, *The Politics of Women's Studies*, (Adelaide, 1981), pp. 31-32.
- ²³ Women and College Education, Vol 1, No. 1, Jan 1976.
- ²⁴ *Guide*, p. 34.
- ²⁵ "On the Relationship Between Women's Studies and the Philosophy Department" (unpublished).
- ²⁶ "Salisbury CAE Women's Studies Programme," *Conference Papers*, (Australian Women's Education Coalition; Adelaide, 1979).
- ²⁷ Rita Helling, *The Politics of Women's Studies*, (Adelaide, 1981), pp. 151-2.
- ²⁸ Even one of the members of the Department said "... women ... might be struck by the typically sexist structure of the staff: senior, permanent, highly paid men, junior, temporary, lower-paid women." See *Notes on the Relation between Women's Studies and the Philosophy Discipline*, (Revised, unpublished discussion paper).
- ²⁹ I must apologise for failing to mention Women's Studies courses in Western Australia. That state does tend to be rather isolated from the rest of the country, simply because it's 4,000 kms away from the Eastern States, and transport and communication is expensive. As feminists tend not to be wealthy, few Western Australians are able to come to national conferences, and I found no mention of courses in that state in my research.
- ³⁰ *The Advertiser*, Thursday, 23/10/1982, p. 9.