

[14 June] to consider the Printing Press position be placed on record. No motions were passed'.⁷² It is not known if Lowry attended that meeting, but his activities were certainly being called to account. At the heart of the matter was the Executive's determination to squeeze Mason out. The Secretary wrote to the *Phoenix* committee seeking confirmation that all its members were *bona fide* students, that is, enrolled in full or part-time study. Only *bona fide* students could hold positions in clubs or societies. By the end of June it had clarified matters sufficiently to state unequivocally to the Literary and Dramatic Club: 'you have an officer, namely the editor of PHOENIX, who does not comply with the *bona fide* student rule. This rule must be enforced.'⁷³ Mason had no choice, but he did have a plan. Although the records are hazy on this point it seems he wanted to continue to publish *Phoenix* independently of the College, and that the Executive was sympathetic. In mid-June he put to them a proposal which they treated with cautious acceptance. Unfortunately the proposal itself is lost, but Mason later made clear reference to this idea.⁷⁴ By this stage any effective support of allies in the Literary and Dramatic Club for the status quo had withered. Early in July the Club met to discuss 'policy in the matter of *Phoenix*'. Sullivan moved:

That it is the opinion of the Club that the *Phoenix* is not carrying out the policy or wishes of the Club, and that, in view of this fact, the Club cease to publish the *Phoenix*, and that recommendation be made that the magazine be published by the formation of an affiliated society.

While this motion was defeated, the alternatives put forward by Mulgan and Lowry, and carried, made little real difference: 'that a recommendation be made to the *Phoenix* committee that no editorial be published, that all articles be signed, that literary matter be not less than half of the contents, and that political articles be written to show differing points of view.'⁷⁵ For events had taken decision-making beyond the confines of the Club.

Lowry's increasingly precarious position worsened as a result of his contribution in yet another freedom of speech issue, this time in the competing claims of candidates for the June election to the College Council. The Reverend Dr H. Ranston's nomination for re-election was supported by many who were, in effect, the ruling clique. Opposing him was W. H. Cocker who claimed that Ranston's attitude to freedom of speech was 'at best a controlled liberty'. The issue was seen as one of academic freedom: 'no more important issue has ever been placed before Convocation since its foundation'.⁷⁶ Broadsheets and leaflets flew, and Lowry was responsible for printing at least one on behalf of Cocker. This was an ill-considered action at best; the use of the College printery to promote one candidate at the expense of the other.

By then too, *Phoenix* v. 2 no. 2, the last issue, was out. Its content was more overtly political than any previous issue, including, for