'Studying man and man's nature': the history of the institutionalisation of Aboriginal anthropology

Nicolas Peterson

Nicolas Peterson currently lectures in anthropology in the Department of Prehistory and Anthropology at the Australian National University. He has a long-standing interest in territorial organisation and land rights issues arising from his fieldwork in Arnhem Land and Central Australia.

On the 5 March of this year the new Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Act came into force restructuring the governing body and membership of the old Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, established in 1964. The chief purpose of this restructuring is to ensure greater Aboriginal control over the Institute's activities now that the production and distribution of objectified knowledge about Aboriginal cultures and societies is of so much greater interest and significance to Aboriginal people than it has been in the past.

In the past the production and use of knowledge about Australian Aboriginal societies and cultures has been of principal, although not exclusive concern, to anthropologists and at certain periods it has played a central role in the creation of social theory. The restructuring of the Institute is an explicit recognition that institutional structures have an influence on the kinds of knowledge produced and the ways in which it is organised, used and distributed. Of course such institutional structures and arrangements are themselves shaped in complex ways by historically specific conjunctures of intellectual interests, personal and public agendas, and institutional histories.

It is these issues of history that I will address here. Specifically I want to consider why there was support for the establishment of the Institute given that anthropology had existed as an independent university discipline since 1926. In providing an answer to this question I will also answer some other related questions raised, but not dealt with, in the existing partial histories of the discipline.[1] In particular why the first chair of anthropology was established in Sydney rather than Melbourne, the home of the most distinguished anthropologist in the country at that time; why the older generation of scholars in Adelaide believe the chair was really meant for them (Jones 1987, 72-73); and why American philanthropists should have played such a key role in funding Australian anthropological research and publication prior to the war.

These four interrelated questions raise issues not only of institutional history but also of intellectual history. In particular, the extreme fascination that Aboriginal societies and cultures have exercised over the European imagination from the moment of first encounter; and the perception of each generation of scholars interested in them that they were the last ones to have the opportunity to secure authentic information about these cultures and societies for posterity.

Studying Aboriginal societies and cultures has long been seen not simply as studying another regional type of small-scale society but as confronting the primordial, 'studying man and man's nature' as Mr Wentworth put it in his original proposal for an Institute of Aboriginal Studies (1959). Aboriginal ways of life were seen as providing a privileged window onto the origins of religion, marriage and social life in a way that

other societies did not. This interest drew much of its inspiration from the social evolutionary paradigm that dominated anthropology at the turn of the century. With the rejection of this paradigm such views were no longer academically respectable although they are still a flourishing part of popular culture. Academically they have been transformed into a more sophisticated view which sees Aboriginal ways of life as a paradigm of the relations between people and nature and Aboriginal societies as the sociological, ecological and evolutionary prototype of the hunting and gathering existence.

The significance of research on Aboriginal cultures and societies has continually been fuelled either by the belief that Aboriginal people were doomed to extinction by the operation of natural laws or by the belief that access to the authentic pre-colonial practices was about to disappear. The former view was clearly stated by Baldwin Spencer in the preface to *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* where he comments:

> The time in which it will be possible to investigate the Australian native tribes is rapidly drawing to a close, and though we know more of them than we do of the lost Tasmanians, yet our knowledge is very incomplete, and unless some special effort be made, many tribes will practically die out without our gaining any knowledge of the details of their organisation, or of their sacred customs and beliefs (Spencer and Gillen 1899, vii).

Such views, as will be seen, were echoed throughout the first three decades of this century and again in the 1960s.

I will argue that although the history of the push to institutionalise Australian anthropology was driven by the intellectual fascination with Aboriginal societies and cultures, the only way government support for the discipline could be gained was by emphasising anthropology's uses to colonial administration in New Guinea and the Pacific. Thus from the outset Aboriginal anthropology was always in incipient danger of being overshadowed by research outside Australia, despite the real intellectual interest of the discipline's founders being within the country. This marginalisation did not come about until after World War II when research in New Guinea and Asia came to dominate academic anthropology and Australia was no longer seen as capable of providing a privileged source of understanding about the human condition. It was in this climate of the academic neglect of Aboriginal anthropological research that the move to establish the Institute arose.

In tracing this history I will follow a modified version of Elkin's original periodisation of the discipline's development.[2] I shall by-pass the initial phase of unsystematic research between 1606–c1870, when the interest in Aboriginal life first manifested itself and turn to the period when it blossomed in a period of systematic research c1870–1925. The period from 1925–46 saw the establishment of professional anthropology and from after the war in 1946 to 1974 the rise of academic anthropology.
Plates 1 to 8 wherever they fit in order of numbers throughout this paper.

Plate 1
AC Haddon 1855–1940
Haddon is seated with the other members of the 1898 Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait standing behind him. From left to right are WHR Rivers, CG Seligman, SH Ray and A Wilkin. In 1900 he was appointed lecturer in ethnology in Cambridge and then reader in 1909. Although never appointed professor he played an important role in the establishment of academic anthropology in South Africa and Australia.
Credit: Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Haddon Collection.

Systematic research c1870–1925

Aboriginal societies and cultures started to gain wide international interest with the re-emergence of evolutionary theory in the 1870s. The first 50 years of the nineteenth century had been dominated by the

christian-inspired degenerativist views that for the most part eclipsed the social evolutionary framework. Darwin's ideas fuelled the revival of social evolutionary interest but his particular views posed problems since they did not entail the idea of progress.

Lewis Henry Morgan summed up contemporary opinion as to the significance for theory of Aboriginal societies in 1880 when he commented that, 'They now represent the condition of mankind in savagery better than it is elsewhere represented on the earth—a condition now rapidly passing away' (Fison and Howitt 1880, 2). He made this comment in the prefatory note to the first book-length theoretical study of any Aboriginal societies, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* by Lorimer Fison and Alfred Howitt which sought to fit them into Morgan's theoretical scheme. The case studies of the two tribes, whose names provide the title of the book, are used to argue against the degeneracy theories and for the evolutionary view.

The first researchers to spend prolonged periods with Aboriginal people in a spirit of inquiry were natural scientists whose primary interests, at least initially, were in the collection and study of flora and fauna and who were to be found in the State museums and universities or came from abroad. Pre-eminent among these Australian researchers and a founding father of academic anthropology was Baldwin Spencer, Professor of Biology at the University of Melbourne. The three major volumes of ethnography he produced, two in collaboration with FJ Gillen, Alice Springs postmaster and Protector of Aborigines, excelled in the detailed observation and recording of Aboriginal social and religious life.

The impact of their first work, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899), both here and abroad was immense. Sir James Frazer declared its authors to be 'immortal, surpassing Tacitus in their ethnographic virtues' (see Mulvaney 1981, 61), an admiration that was mutual (see Spencer and Gillen 1927, 1:vii). But it was not only natural scientists that were publishing major ethnographic studies in this period up until World War I. Other writers less involved with evolutionary theory were WE Roth a medical practitioner and Aboriginal Protector in Queensland; Erhard Eylmann a German ethnographer who worked in South Australia; Mrs Parker a station owner's wife in western New South Wales; the Rev Mathew on the Kabi of southern Queensland; Daisy Bates on the peoples of Western Australia; Carl Strehlow on the Aranda; and RH Mathews on eastern Australia generally. It was in this period also that specifically anthropological expeditions began. The first was The Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Strait led by Alfred Haddon in 1898, who shortly afterwards took up a lectureship in ethnology at Cambridge. This was followed by Spencer and Gillen's second year-long expedition in 1901, financed by a Melbourne newspaper and assisted by the State Governments of Victoria and South Australia, after impressive lobbying from the British academic establishment (see Mulvaney and Calaby 1985, 189–90, 442). The third expedition was the Oxford and Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Western Australia, 1910–11, headed by Radcliffe-Brown who was to become the first professor of anthropology in Australia.[3]

This spate of research stimulated a huge interest in Europe, particularly among British anthropologists. For a short period there was an active export industry in Aboriginal ethnography, in return for intellectual guidance. Howitt and Fison had early on been communicating with Morgan. Following Morgan's death, Howitt joined Spencer in corresponding with Tylor, and Spencer also maintained close contact with Frazer; Mrs Parker corresponded with Andrew Lang who prepared her work for publication; Daisy Bates sent her manuscript to Radcliffe-Brown (White 1981); and RH Mathews corresponded very widely (Elkin 1975–76).

The impact of the Australian ethnography is evident in the role it played in the production of anthropological theory: twelve major theoretical books drawing either entirely or extensively on the Australian ethnography appeared in the first 14 years of the twentieth century, with a highly influential set of authors: among them van Gennep (1905), Lang (1905), Marett (1909), Frazer (1910), Durkheim (1912 see 1915), Freud (1913) and a future influential figure, Malinowski (1913 see 1963).

British anthropological interest in Australia reached its peak in 1914 when Haddon, Rivers and Marett, all key figures in the British anthropological establishment, came from England to attend the first British Association for the Advancement of Science Meeting held in Australia. Marett brought Malinowski with him as his secretary. Grafton Elliot Smith, an Australian by birth but then Professor of Anatomy at the University of Manchester, also attended as did Radcliffe-Brown, while Spencer was one of the organisers of the anthropology section.

It was at this time that the first formal attempts to establish anthropology as a university discipline were taken. A research committee was set up to advance the teaching of anthropology (RBAAS 1915, lxiii) but the timing was unfortunate, news of the outbreak of war reaching the Association during its meetings in Adelaide.

Immediately after the war in 1919 Haddon, now reader in anthropology in the University of Cambridge, tried to reactivate the proposal to establish some form of anthropological teaching by writing to David Orme Masson at the

University of Melbourne and Chairman of the interim Australian National Research Council. Masson showed the letter to Spencer who wrote back to Haddon saying that coincidentally he had been discussing the self-same question with the Chancellor of Melbourne University within the last few weeks and made an offer which might enable the University to start a small Department of Anthropology. Spencer had decided to resign his chair of biology and devote himself to museum and anthropological work. His proposal was that he would act as Honorary Reader in Anthropology if the University would give him an assistant who could undertake the anthropometric side of research while he devoted himself to the social and technological side.[4]

Haddon, whose research interests were in the Torres Strait, had expressed a preference for the establishment of a chair in Sydney because of the Australian Museum and its holdings of Pacific Island material. Spencer pointed out, however, that, 'Melbourne, with Howitt and Fison, Rev J. Mathew, Gillen and myself and not a few others has been the home of real ethnological work in Australia' and though the Melbourne Museum was not so rich in Island material it was vastly superior to Sydney in Australian material and the University taught all the collateral subjects. 'It is true,' he continued, 'that Sydney is and always must be the main port of the Pacific but after all this does not seriously affect the question of the teaching of ethnology'.[5]

Two years later Spencer wrote to Haddon again saying he had heard nothing more from the Chancellor of the University of Melbourne about his proposal and that if anything were to happen it would be in Sydney as they had the funds lacking in Victoria.[6] Although this switch to a Sydney focus for the establishment of a Department of Anthropology can be seen with hindsight to have had long-term consequences for the nature of Australian anthropology it was not at this period, a simple switch from a focus on Australia to a focus on the Pacific. At this period the University of Sydney was a flourishing centre for research on Australian topics significantly, however, this research was carried out in the Department of Anatomy.

While the social evolutionary paradigm which had fuelled the huge interest in Aborigines had run out of steam by the outbreak of the war, Darwinian evolutionary theory was alive and flourishing among the biological anthropologists. In the first

Plate 2
Sir Baldwin Spencer 1860–1929
It was the two volumes of Central Australian ethnography Spencer published jointly with FJ Gillen in 1899 and 1904 that drew the attention of the world to Australian anthropology and fuelled the drive to establish the discipline within an Australian university.

30 years of the twentieth century, however, a rather simplistic scientific naturalism was sometimes combined with an over-enthusiastic view of the importance of heredity's role in the human make-up and civilisation, giving rise to the eugenics movement (see Pickens 1968). It was the evolutionary biological interest and the eugenics movement that were to play a crucial role in the establishment of institutionalised anthropology.

While the demand for the support of anthropology in Australia up to World War I had been almost exclusively in terms of the importance of knowledge about Aborigines for science, there was a dramatic shift in the basis of justification in the subsequent years although it was still the same set of natural scientists pushing for it. As a result of the war, Australia received a mandate from the League of Nations for the government of New Guinea in 1920, and in 1921 the New Guinea Act of the Australian Commonwealth Government came into force establishing a civil administration throughout the Territory thus bringing the whole eastern half of the island of New Guinea under Australian control. It seems more than merely coincidental that when the Australian Branch of the Association for the Advancement of Science held its first post-war Congress in 1921 the terms in which the Anthropology Section forwarded its resolution about the need for the teaching of anthropology made reference to the practical uses of the discipline for the first time.

The resolution supported by the Congress Council recommended:

> That there be urged upon the Federal Government the need for endowment of a chair in Anthropology, especially in view of its value in the government of subject races (AAAS 1921, xxxiii).

It was at this same meeting that the Australian National Research Council (ANRC), which was to play such an important role in the promotion of anthropology, was officially formed. Seeking to advance the anthropology section's proposal, the ANRC wrote to Malinowski and Seligman at the LSE, Frazer and Haddon at Cambridge and Elliot Smith at the University of London for advice on the need for a chair, to bolster their cause prior to the 1923 Pan Pacific science congress which was to be held in Australia. Their replies display a diversity of opinion on specifics although all were uniformly enthusiatic about the general project.[7]

Malinowski (see fn 7) wrote back a six-page statement urging the creation of a central institute in Sydney where the Mitchell Library would provide an excellent reading room and library but attached to Sydney University and with close connections to the Australian Museum. He strongly advocated that all efforts should be concentrated on the study of cultural anthropology as the culture, customs, beliefs and organisation of the 'South Sea Islanders will disappear within decades' while the people will remain physically pure for centuries. Physical anthropology, which he stated was quite independent of cultural study, required a different training and ability and could be carried out later.

Haddon (see fn 7) felt there should be a concentration on Australia and New Guinea. Of the Australian situation he felt that opportunities were rapidly diminishing because of acculturation but that there was 'greater hope for more extensive and precise information from the study of the natives in the unsettled areas, but even here the old conditions seem to be passing away very rapidly'. Interestingly, in the light of the correspondence with Spencer, he suggested that the University of Melbourne would seem to be the most natural centre for research

Plate 3
G Elliot Smith 1871–1937
An Australian by birth, Elliot Smith was to spend most of his academic life in England first at Cambridge then holding the chairs of anatomy in Manchester and London. He was a forceful proponent of diffusionist views and a major figure in the study of anatomy, particularly the central nervous system. He was extremely well-connected and played an important role in the establishment of academic anthropology in Australia.
Credit: University College London Library.

among Aboriginal people although this should not, he said, preclude other centres from making local or general studies, especially Adelaide, Perth and Brisbane. Sydney would also continue to do so, he thought but, 'it has another sphere of action which seems to be more pressing' (Haddon, see fn 7). This, of course, was New Guinea and the Pacific. To the reasons advanced by Malinowski he added the fact that Sydney is the port of departure and arrival for people interested in this area. It scarcely needs emphasising that both Haddon and Malinowski had their field experience outside Australia.

Elliot Smith did not travel to the meetings but sent the lecturer in his department, W Perry. They authored a joint submission, in which they concentrated on general principles. They emphasised that researchers should be free to decide what type of inquiry they would carry out, although they should also be prepared to offer information and advice to the government on every question affecting the welfare of the populations they are studying; they should be independent inquirers not officials; and that the work should be overseen by somebody who was not a narrow specialist but capable of taking a wide view covering physical and cultural anthropology and archaeology. 'At present this could only be done, so far as the British dominions are concerned, by someone in England' (Smith and Perry, see fn 7). Only Frazer (see fn 7) felt that:

> a foremost place should be given to what remains of the Australian Aborigines who have as yet been little influenced by contact with civilization, and that on two grounds, first, on the surpassing interest of these natives as representing the lowest type of culture now accessible to us on the globe; and second, on the ground of the rapidity with which these people seem hastening to extinction.

Haddon who had travelled from England for the Congress, was appointed Chairman of a committee of the Anthropology Section to develop the proposals for the establishment of a chair. The Secretary to the Committee was a bureaucrat from the Prime Minister's Department in Melbourne, underlining the good connections to the Federal Government, then based in Melbourne, that the promoters of anthropology such as Spencer and Masson had. The Committee brought forward two resolutions:

> Recognising the necessity for the immediate prosecution of anthropological research in Australia and Oceania, this Congress calls the attention of governments, Universities, patrons of research, and research foundations to the pressing and important need for this investigation.
>
> The Congress urges that provision be made for the teaching of Anthropology in the Universities of Australia (PPPSC 1923, 35).

The language of the detailed supporting statement is significant since it clearly reveals the underlying concern with the collection of 'valuable scientific material' rationalised in terms of humanitarian concern and confidence in anthropology's usefulness to colonial administrations. Further, while it articulates the usefulness of anthropological research in New Guinea, no such mention is made with respect to Aboriginal people in Australia.[8]

Thus it is clear that as early as 1919 the academic power brokers, in this case particularly Haddon, who also played a key role in establishing the chair of anthropology in Cape Town in 1920 (Firth 1956), had already settled on Sydney as the centre for the establishment of anthropology specifically because of its significance for work in New Guinea and the Pacific. Only Frazer, of the people consulted, felt research in Australia to be of the first importance, the others by clear implication focussing on the new opportunites in the Pacific where the impact of Europeans was so much less significant. Within Australia only Sir Baldwin Spencer had the authority to advance the cause of Aboriginal anthropology but he was ailing and ineffective at this period.[9]

It is interesting in the light of this that the folklore of the Adelaide academic establishment that the chair of anthropology should properly have been established in Adelaide, and nearly was, is so persistent, being reproduced again in a recent account (Jones 1987, 73). Certainly if it had been, Australian anthropology would have taken a substantially different course since the interest in Adelaide was not only firmly in Aboriginal anthropology but especially in biological anthropology. The Adelaide views arise from the conflict of intentions surrounding a crucial but neglected aspect of the founding of professional anthropology in Australia.

Establishment of professional anthropology 1925–46

In 1925 the University of Sydney established the first chair of anthropology in Australia but the 18 months between the 1923 Congress and the establishment of the chair were not smooth sailing.

Following the Congress an ANRC delegation went to see the Acting Prime Minister to seek the Commonwealth funding of a chair of anthropology at the University of Sydney. Cabinet approved the concept the same day. However, a British colonial administrator from the African Civil Service later contracted by the government as a consultant on the proposal, advised against university-trained administrative officials (Mulvaney 1988, 207). The ANRC was unable to counter this set back and in early March 1924 Senator Pearce, the Minister for Home and Territories, wrote to the Council reversing its support for a chair.

As is well-known, the day was saved by the American Rockefeller Foundation. However the reasons for their willingness to fund anthropology in Australia have not been well-understood nor the somewhat fortuitous timing of their intervention. In late December 1923 the Rockefeller Foundation received a letter from the Galton Society of New York proposing a major study of so-called primitive peoples (Jonas 1989, 133).[10] The Galton Society members were eugenicists devoted to the science of human well-being. Their central concern was with the threat that modern medicine posed to racial fitness because of the way it thwarted natural selection and allowed 'bad' genes to be reproduced. A study of contemporary small-scale societies, they argued, was a last chance to look at the human biology of people living in societies where natural selection was working uncorrupted.

The Society had among its Charter Fellows two of the leading eugenicists of the day, Charles Davenport, Director of the Station for Experimental Evolution run by the Carnegie Institution and Madison Grant, Vice President of the New York Zoological Society and author of *The Passing of the Great Race*. Among its ordinary fellows was Clark Wissler, Curator at the American Museum of Natural History and among its corresponding fellows, Elliot Smith, by then holding the chair of anatomy at University College, London.[11] The proposal was taken up by Edwin Embree, secretary of one of the funding divisions within the Foundation, who was casting about for new projects to support, as his previous humanities-based proposal had recently been rejected by the Foundation's Board of Trustees (see Jonas 1989, 138–39).

Embree took up the suggestion expeditiously but the Board quickly narrowed it down to a single regional study. It will come as no suprise that Australia, the home of the 'natural society' was the region chosen. The Galton Society proposed that the research be organised by the establishment of a field hospital which would offer treatment as a means of attracting Aboriginal people for study. It would be staffed by five Americans and two Englishmen the latter

Plate 4
Edwin Embree was Secretary of the Division of Studies of the Rockefeller Foundation. It was largely due to his sponsorship of the Galton Society's proposal for a major human biological study of unacculturated peoples that the Rockefeller Foundation came to fund anthropological research in Australia up until World War II.
Credit: Courtesy of the Rockefeller Archive Center.

being thought desirable because 'Great Britain controls so much of the territory occupied by primitive peoples'. Somewhat suprisingly Sir Arthur Keith and Sir James Frazer were suggested as suitable people.[12]

The Galton Society quite quickly lost direct input into the course of the proposal, however, partly because Embree started making the project his own but also because the Foundation's policy was to work through the institutions and scholars of the countries concerned. On the 19 March 1924 Embree wrote to Elliot Smith, seeking advice about the project and to ask if he might be available to visit Australia with a representative of the Foundation to make preliminary investigations about the feasibility of the project. Elliot Smith wrote back immediately saying he was 'keenly interested in the Australian scheme' and already had plans to visit New York within three weeks. He also endorsed a suggestion that had been made in the letter to him that Dr Hunter of the Anatomy Department at the University of Sydney would be a good Australian-based person to direct the investigation.[13]

Thus at the very time the plans for the chair of anthropology at Sydney University were grinding to a halt, Elliot Smith, who less than 12 months before had outlined his proposal for the kind of work that should be carried out in Australia was being approached independently by the Rockefeller Foundation in connection with the kind of anthropological research project in which he was clearly most interested. The decision to approach him must have seemed natural: he was a member of the Galton Society; he was a respected scientist to whom the Rockefeller Foundation had already given two million dollars for his school of anatomy; and he was an Australian.[14]

Although the letter of authorisation Elliot Smith carried with him from the Foundation when he arrived in Australia was quite non-committal, the Foundation had already approved in principle a study in Australia on 27 February 1924 and recorded in its minutes that it awaited a mature definite proposal at a later meeting.[15]

In Australia, Elliot Smith went straight to Adelaide where the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science and the ANRC were holding meetings and enlisted their support for the establishment of the chair of anthropology. On the 30 August 1924 Elliot Smith was received by the Prime Minister and in Bruce's

Plate 5
AR Radcliffe-Brown 1881–1955
Radcliffe-Brown was the foundation professor of anthropology in Australia who took up his chair at the University of Sydney in 1926. His mentors were Haddon, Rivers and Seligman, all of whom had been on the Torres Strait expedition. Unlike most of the proponents for the establishment of anthropology as a university discipline, Radcliffe-Brown was not interested in biological anthropology. He was self-consciously a social anthropologist concerned to establish the scientific study of society.
Credit: Royal Anthropological Institute Photographic Collection.

own words, proceeded to 'interview' him on the need for the chair.[16] Elliot Smith reported on the meeting in the following terms:

> I took advantage of the opportunity provided by this interview to discuss the question of my mission to Australia. I explained to the Prime Minister that my purpose was merely to inquire what the attitude of the Government and the Universities would be if the Rockefeller Foundation should be asked to provide funds to help the Australian Universities, or one of them, to embark upon a comprehensive investigation of the Australian Aborigines. I made it clear to him that I was not authorised to make any offer, or to promise that any such help would be forthcoming, but merely to say that if the universities (or one of them) were to approach the Rockefeller Foundation, the appeal would receive sympathetic consideration.
>
> The Prime Minister authorised me to inform the Rockefeller Foundation that he keenly appreciated this new demonstration of the Foundation's interest in Australia and would gratefully welcome any help the Foundation might give to promote the scientific study of the native population of Australia.[17]

Of course this elaborate denial of commitment simply served to underwrite its existence. Shortly after the visit the Commonwealth Government and with it the State Governments, changed their views back to support for the chair so it could go ahead.[18]

Although Professor Frederick Wood Jones of the Department of Anatomy at the University of Adelaide was seen as a strong ally by Elliot Smith in the establishment of anthropology in Australia because of his biological interests, Sydney University had association with at least five people working in the area of Aboriginal human biological and psychological research at that time (Drs Burkitt, Lightoller, Tebbutt, Bostick and Graham)[19] under the leadership of Professor Hunter of whom many people, including Elliot Smith held a high opinion. The existence of these people gave Elliot Smith the feeling that the choice of the ANRC to establish the chair at Sydney was quite compatible with the Rockefeller Foundation's proposed project but that some way of encouraging and helping Wood Jones and his associates in Adelaide should be found. Significantly he felt that the way to do this should be left to Professor Hunter's discretion, clearly indicating that Hunter was foreseen as having a considerable input into the course of the developments at Sydney and even gaining a lectureship in physical anthropology out of it if the funds turned out to be adequate.[20] Unfortunately for these plans, Professor Hunter died unexpectedly while on a visit to Elliot Smith in England in December 1924.

On the 7 November 1924 the Foundation moved to commit itself to not more than $US100,000 over a five year period in cooperation with Australian universities in anthropological studies.[21] Thus what had started as a proposal for an extended bio-anthropological expedition from the Galton Society ended up as an untied grant to anthropological studies but one in which Aboriginal human biology was clearly assumed to be central. Further, the theoretical interest of the Galton Society in Aboriginal peoples fell firmly within the general intellectual interests in Aboriginal societies and cultures at the time: they were seen as uniquely able to shed light on the human condition because they most closely represented it in its natural form.

With Australian Government and Rockefeller support, Sydney University moved to establish a chair of anthropology in June 1925. Events moved fast. On 14 September 1925 Elliot Smith reported that after preliminary correspondence he had met with JT Wilson, formerly Professsor of Anatomy at Sydney but then holding a position in Cambridge (Mulvaney and Calaby 1985, 147) and Haddon, in Haddon's house in Cambridge, to select an appointee for the chair. The main applicants were Radcliffe-Brown, AM Hocart and Arthur Grimble. Malinowski was considered in the absence of an application but it was felt certain he would not leave the LSE. It was also thought unlikely that Hocart would accept if offered the position and given that Radcliffe-Brown had university teaching experience and fieldwork in Australia he was the unanimous choice.[22]

Although it is clear then that there is no justification for the view that the chair of anthropology narrowly missed going to Adelaide, there were clearly grounds for the Adelaide University group expecting substantial support because of their biological orientation and their knowledge of the original ideas behind the Rockefeller funding. Oral history has in some cases further confused the issue because some members of the Adelaide group have reordered the sequence of events and seen the visit of Edwin Embree and Clark Wissler representing the Foundation in October 1925 as further evidence that Adelaide was in the running for the chair: this visit was, of course, after the chair had been established at Sydney, but the confusion reflects the tension between Australian and biological interests on the one hand and Pacific and social on the other.

Embree and Wissler made visits to the universities and museums in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide in order to gain local knowledge of the state of research in them. Wissler in his report to the Foundation on the visit records that:

> No other university in Australia seems quite so intent upon research in...[the Aboriginal] field. Yet, it is

almost exclusively the medical group that is interested. This does not mean that the biological side is unduly emphasised, for a number of the men engaged are as much interested in archaeology and ethnology as in any other aspect of the subject...[Wood-Jones] is the 'best bet' to lead in anthropological research on the Aboriginal.[23]

Because both universities and Aboriginal affairs were State matters, Wissler saw this as giving a further prominence to Adelaide as a centre of Aboriginal research as it was the gateway to central and western Australia and had the easiest access to substantial populations of traditionally-oriented Aboriginal people in comparison with Sydney and Melbourne. Because Melbourne and Sydney were not in contact with large Aboriginal populations they were seen as being disposed to look towards New Guinea so, he concluded somewhat suprisingly that:

> In general, then, the University of Adelaide has first claim for support in aboriginal research, whereas Melbourne and Sydney are to be considered only in respect to more strictly biological; studies of the aboriginal, if at all.[24]

His final conclusion was that because New Guinea offered one of the few places in the world where there were people as yet uncontacted by Europeans it was a most important area of research, but that research work in Australia should also be strengthened by a specific grant of funds for fieldwork. He proposed $US12,000 annually for research in the Mandated Territories to be administered by the ANRC and $US4,000 annually be made available to the University of Adelaide for research on Aboriginal topics.[25]

In the event the Rockefeller Foundation decided to channel funds exclusively through the ANRC. Embree explained the reasons for this in a letter to Wood Jones:

> Our officers and the Board in considering the matter [of the allocation of funds] felt that we would not be justified in attempting to make allocation to several institutions in Australia. In addition to the important work in Sydney and Adelaide the claims of Melbourne were also being advanced. It seemed to us that the only proper thing for such an outside organization as the Rockefeller Foundation was to carry its contribution through a central scientific body, leaving to that representative body in Australia decisions as to allocation of the funds from time to time...I hope that this decision of ours will not be a disappointment to you. It should in no way result in less resources for Adelaide than might be the case by direct appropriation from the Foundation. It may in fact result in greater resources for South Australia, particularly during these early years when personnel for research is more available at Adelaide than at any other place.[26]

This analysis did not turn out to be correct for two reasons. First the chairman of the Anthropological Committee of the ANRC was always the head of the Sydney Department and it was always more resolutely social anthropological in orientation than biological. Although in later years the Adelaide research workers were to allege that they were not getting their fair share of the funds, figures from their own Board for Anthropological Research show that they received over 75 per cent of the cost of eight expeditions between 1927 and 1935 from the ANRC.[27]

The second reason for the failure of Embree's prediction was that Radcliffe-Brown, who took up the chair in 1926, was active in finding research workers and very keen on getting research work started as soon as possible. Indeed, even on his way to Australia to take up the chair he was on the look out for people and met Lloyd Warner, then a graduate student at Berkeley, whom he immediately recruited.

Under Radcliffe-Brown's (1930, 3) aegis, research in Australia received some priority. The terms in which he rationalised this have a familiar ring:

> These [Australian] investigations are perhaps not of an immediate practical use, for the Australian aborigines, even if not doomed to extinction as a race, seem at any rate doomed to have their cultures destroyed. But they will provide data of the very greatest importance for a comparative science of culture.

It is interesting to reflect on why it was that anthropology was not thought of having practical use to Aboriginal administrators when the New Guinea administration clearly perceived it as useful. Not only did they appoint two government anthropologists in 1921 and 1924 but up until the end of the war, administrative officials were sent to the Department of Anthropology in Sydney for a year of training. The reason for this difference appears to relate to the dominance of functionalist theory. Although functionalism's preoccupation with how things work at the time of study reflects the colonial administrators' interests, they are the interests associated with indirect rule. To the extent that the work of the functionalist anthropologists was perceived to be useful to government in New Guinea, it was because government was concerned with more or less independent functioning societies. In Australia, however, even where there were people whose social and cultural orientation was close to that of pre-colonial times, the demographic and economic situation was always transformed, often radically. The pre-colonial past was close enough, however, for the changes not to challenge the

functionalist paradigm within which the researchers were working, even though elements of land tenure and economy had to be reconstructed. But the situations in which people were actually living, and indeed their social organisation, were not amenable to indirect rule and in consequence the work of anthropologists seems not to have been seen as having great practical relevance.[28]

Thus up until the outbreak of World War II, research in Aboriginal Australia was actively pursued. It was pursued not under the guise of being useful to administration but for the same reason it had always been studied because of the insight it was thought to give into 'man's nature'. An editorial comment in *Nature* during the course of 1930 makes this clear:

> Spencer and Gillen saved from oblivion a vast amount of material which demonstrated the value of the Australian evidence in its bearing upon the early history of society and culture. Even now much further study is needed for which the data still exist, especially among the remoter and less known tribes. A few years more and it will be too late; the evidence will have vanished for ever (*Nature* 13 September 1930, 392. See also BAAS 1931, xxvi; Firth 1932, 6 for expression of the same sentiments).

Although the Rockefeller funds ceased in June 1938 it was not until June 1940 that the last fieldwork sponsored by their funds was completed. In the meantime, AP Elkin who had become professor of anthropology on Radcliffe-Brown's departure, had set about raising more funds for research from abroad, for such funds were not forthcoming from Australian sources. In 1940 the ANRC received $US10,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to continue research work (Elkin 1940, 465) but it was a lean period and the only real research lights on the anthropological horizon were Ronald and Catherine Berndt working out of Sydney under Elkin's direction.

Establishment of academic anthropology 1946–74

Following the war there was a change in perception and a change in institutional structure which had ramifications for the pattern of research in Aboriginal anthropology. The threat of invasion had greatly improved internal communication in Australia, particularly in the Northern Territory where a new surfaced road linked Alice Springs and Darwin and many airstrips had

Plate 6
Clark Wissler
Wissler was curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History and a member of the Galton Society which originated the proposal that led to Rockefeller Funding of Australian anthropology. In 1925 he visited Australia with Edwin Embree to investigate research institutions here and apparently had considerable impact in Adelaide.
Credit: Departmental Library Services, American Museum of Natural History, photographer, Julies Kinschner, Negative No 36896.

been built. Outback Australia started to become much better known and it seems the idea of there being an internal anthropological frontier came to an end. Even though there were perhaps as many as a thousand Aboriginal people who had not seen Europeans it seems there was a widespread academic view, both within and beyond Australia, that Aboriginal societies and cultures could no longer provide a special insight. A consequence of this was that working with Aboriginal people became doing anthropology at home whereas before it had been working in a foreign country, so to speak. The interesting and authentic non-Western ways of life were now to be found exclusively outside Australia and work within Australia became less valued professionally (see Cowlishaw 1986).

Plate 7
AP Elkin 1891–1979
Elkin took up the chair of anthropology in 1933 following Radcliffe-Brown's departure. The survival of anthropology as a university discipline was largely due to Elkin's formidable drive and administrative skills. He not only built up anthropology but encouraged sociology and the study of mainstream Australian society.
Credit: University of Sydney.

At the same time there was a change in institutional arrangements which led to the removal of the training of administrative officers from the Department of Anthropology at Sydney to the Australian School of Pacific Administration. Although Elkin remained vitally interested in the formation of policy for Aborigines and personally played an important part in the development of that policy, the consequence of the shift of training outside the University was that the Department became entirely academic, in a formal sense, and the direct relationship with colonial administration terminated.

Ironically, however, it was the perceived usefulness of anthropology that led to the establishment of the second department of anthropology in the Research School of Pacific Studies at the newly-created Australian National University. The need for such a school had grown out of the wartime awareness of the importance of an understanding of the Pacific Islands and the countries to the north. It is the department that has had by far the greatest impact on the world of anthropological scholarship outside Australia, primarily because of the large number of postgraduate students trained by it. But despite the early appointment of WEH Stanner to the Department, little

work on Aboriginal societies and cultures was sponsored by it: only seven of 56 projects up until 1977 (Anon 1977).

Thus the postwar funds were being put into research outside Australia for the most part and research work within Australia appears to have been seen mainly as a training ground for advanced research: thus five scholars who carried out their first research in Australia all went to the Torres Strait or New Guinea for their PhD research. Only four pieces of PhD research were sponsored in Australia during the 1950s (Barwick, Munn, Hiatt and Worsley) and they were invisible to the wider public at the time the moves for the Institute began, because three were still in process.

The third centre of anthropology grew out of a survey of social sciences in Australia by the American psychological anthropologists, Clyde and Florence Kluckholn in 1952. They recommended Western Australia as the site for a new department of anthropology and with support from the professor of psychology, a senior lecturership was funded and taken up in 1955 by Ronald Berndt who formed a separate Department in 1961 (see Tonkinson and Howard 1990).

It is in this context that the perception of the need for the establishment of an Institute of Aboriginal Studies emerged. Little work was being done. In August 1959, Mr Wentworth circulated a nine page document entitled, 'An Australian Institute for Aboriginal Studies'. Free from the epistemological and theoretical constraints surrounding academic anthropologists which made Aboriginal cultures and societies undergoing rapid transformation problematic for a holistic functional approach, he could freely espouse the view that any knowledge gained from what he described as perhaps the most interesting people in the world, would contribute to a record that would be 'one of the priceless treasures of mankind'. He was fired with a sense of urgency: 'Within ten years there will be nothing but a fraction of a fraction left. It must be recorded now, or it will go unrecorded for ever' (Wentworth 1959, 2–3). Despite good work in the past, he wrote, the field had been inadequately covered, because of too few workers, lack of funds, inadequate equipment and limited publication.

In an obvious and telling reference to the Rockefeller funding he remarked (Wentworth 1959, 6):

> It is significant that Australians until recently did not always play a major part in studies of our aborigines. Funds and scholars came largely from abroad, knowledge and collections tended to flow overseas. Even where Australians themselves did the work, the necessary funds were often provided from abroad.

He went on to argue:

> In view of the desirability of obtaining the whole of the finance from Australian sources for the sake of our national credit it would not be unreasonable to ask the Commonwealth to finance this, which would seem to be the most important academic project facing Australia.

Should we not do so, 'humanity will lose something of permanent value and we Australians, as its custodians will lay ourselves open

Plate 8
WC Wentworth
His drive and vision led to the establishment of the Institute to make up for what he saw as the neglect of Aboriginal studies by the universities. The photo shows him delivering an address at the dedication of the Stanner Room in the Institute Library, 1982.
Credit: Pictorial Collection, AIATSIS.

to perpetual reproach' (Wentworth 1959, 8-9).

In his Second Reading speech he was to make a similar point:

> Somebody will say: 'Why bother? What does it matter? These are only the aborigines; does it matter if this knowledge is lost?' I believe that this is the crux of the matter and here we see the real importance of our study. We are not just studying aborigines although the aborigines are important people in their own right for whom we have a responsibility. We are studying man and man's nature. We are laying up the raw material for future psychologists and sociologists (Wentworth 1964, 2167).

Here then, in this influential document, the feeling that Aboriginal societies and cultures could provide a unique insight into the human condition and the belief that the possibility of gaining this insight was rapidly disappearing emerges yet again.

The conjunction of circumstances that made government receptive to the suggestion for this kind of Institution are complex but the principal reasons seem evident. By the early 1960s Australia was extremely prosperous. The economic assimilation of a continuing stream of migrants, appeared to have made it seem inevitable that the official government policy of assimilation of Aboriginal people would be successful. This policy stated that all Aborigines 'shall attain the same manner of living as other Australians, enjoying the same rights and privileges, accepting the same responsibilities, observing the same customs and being influenced by the same beliefs, hopes and loyalties' (see Lippmann 1981, 38). The success of the policy would end once and for all the chance to secure the insights Aboriginal societies and cultures could provide. With the prosperity also went an increasing interest in Australian history and culture and a loosening of the ties with Britain which was to climax in the cultural and economic nationalism of the early 1970s. The explicit nationalism of Mr Wentworth's statement clearly resonated these feelings and he perceived that Aboriginal people and their cultures were a crucial icon of an independent Australian identity. But there was a firm preference for the schematic authority of normative accounts to the reality of the disorder and the poverty of many Aboriginal people's lives which gave the lie to the success, or even the possibility, of an assimilation policy (Said 1978, 92-93).

In its initial years the AIAS remained a conventional academic research institute as envisaged at its founding. The money it injected into research saw a great surge in linguistic recording and helped develop academic archaeology but was slower to have an effect on the amount of substantive social anthropological research, because, with the exception of Western Australia, the universities did not place it high on their own teaching and research agendas.

At the Institute's 1974 Biennial Conference a group of Aboriginal people circulated a document that has come to be known as the 'Eaglehawk and Crow Letter'.[29] The immediate pretext was the cost of the Conference which the newly-arrived Principal organised as a three week international event, in contrast to the usual two-day regional affair. The authors of the five page letter asked what benefit Aboriginal people would receive from the Conference; attacked the move to relevant research as merely influence-seeking with government to obtain further funds; accused the Institute of conducting research on economic viability as an apologist alternative to land rights; and most significantly, stated their belief that Aboriginal communities should have commissioning rights over research and control of funding for projects carried out among Aboriginal people and on their cultural property (Widders et al 1974). The letter was strong for its time and helped precipitate changes to the way in which the Institute was run, but only gradually. The opportunity for the Institute, and anthropologists more generally, to reposition themselves in respect to research with Aboriginal people was provided by the passing of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act in 1976. This Act enables Aboriginal people in the Territory to lay claim to their traditional lands where they are unalienated crown lands. With the assistance of their newly-established and Aboriginally-controlled Land Councils, most anthropologists have been employed in the preparation of claims initially under the coordination of the Institute.

The reinstatement of a strong commitment to Aboriginal anthropology in the universities has been fuelled by student demands for courses. This demand has stemmed in part from the high profile Aboriginal issues achieved with the Federal Government's commitment to land rights and has been most enthusiastically met by the present and former colleges of advanced education.

Thus nationalism and public interest have put Aboriginal culture and social life firmly back on the agenda of the universities. The public interest now has a dual focus: the original concern with the uniqueness of traditional Aboriginal societies and cultures remains powerful, often coloured by contemporary interests in conservation and rejection of materialism. However, there is also a strong interest in the present situation, its origins and what can be done about it.

The structure laid down in the new Act is for a continuation of the cooperative enterprise that has developed since 1974: an Aboriginally-controlled Council

with a minority elected component and a largely elected Research Advisory Committee. No doubt this combination will emphasise the production of slightly different kinds of knowledge from the previous Council but it should be evident from the foregoing account that although institutional structures and funding sources are important influences on the kind of knowledge produced, they are only one factor in a complex social process which is not easily controlled. Further, while Aboriginal people are increasingly concerned to be involved in the production and control of knowledge about their societies and cultures, their own demands that all Australians learn about them will itself generate increased interest. This is likely to widen the number of non-Aboriginal people producing knowledge about Aboriginal societies and cultures both within and without institutional structures diluting the possibilities for easy increased control.

Conclusions

At many stages in the history of anthropology certain groups of people have had a central place in the production of anthropological theory because of the light their social and cultural practices are thought to throw on universal questions relating to the nature of human sociality. Aboriginal societies and cultures held this place between 1870 and 1914 in the context of an evolutionary paradigm. With the demise of that paradigm international scholarly interest in Aboriginal societies and cultures declined and was further diluted locally as functionalist perceptions made it seem that it was no longer a productive area for research. Yet among the general public the social evolutionary views still had and have a firm grip on the imagination, which is in no way weakened by the claim that Aboriginal culture is 40,000 years old. For myself, and I do not believe I am alone, the sense of physical and intellectual adventure occasioned by time spent with Aboriginal people in remote places still produces a palpable *frisson*. Although this may be enhanced by a romatic impulse it is grounded in sound intellectual reasons. The history of Aboriginal Australia is remarkable: the complete occupation of a continent by people practising a single mode of subsistence for a very long time and intensified by a high degree of isolation has given involution a central place in the historical process. Clifford Geertz (1963, 81-82) has characterised this process as one where cultural and social patterns:

> having reached what would seem to be a definitive form, nonetheless fail either to stablise or transform themselves into a new pattern but rather continue to develop by becoming internally more complicated...[displaying an] increasing tenacity of basic pattern; internal elaboration and ornateness; technical hairsplitting and unending virtuosity.

Under such conditions cultural and social practices become cryptic and self-referential and the bricoleur central to creative life. Face to face with societies comprised only of people, in which everything is over-determined, one is confronted with the enormous complexity of all human life, even in societies of the smallest scale, and by our capacity and need to generate worlds of meaning.

It has, as WEH Stanner put it, been a long hard intellectual struggle to develop an informed, detached and respectful perspective on Aboriginal society. But in rejecting the unsatisfactory views of the past and in recognising the need to pursue new understandings that directly address issues of the day, there is no need to lose the sense of wonder at, nor the self-knowledge offered by, ways of life with such unusual histories.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have made only minor changes to the form in which the lecture was given. I would like to thank John Barnes, Athol Chase, Koko Clark, Faye Ginsburg, Chris Gregory, Jacquie Lambert and John Mulvaney for assistance and suggestions. This paper utilises unpublished material from the Records of the Australian National Research Council held by the National Library, Canberra, referred to by the prefix NL below; the Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, in the Record Group 1.1 Projects, Series 410 Australia, referred to by the prefix RF below; and the Haddon Collection in the University Library, Cambridge.

NOTES

1. There are a number of partial histories of the discipline but for the most part they are overly dependent on Elkin's writings. See especially Elkin 1938, 1939, 1943, 1954, 1958, 1959, 1963, 1970; Mulvaney 1958, 1966, 1970, 1971, 1981, 1986, 1988; Mulvaney and Calaby 1985; Wise 1985; Hamilton 1982; McCall 1982; Berndt 1967; McCarthy 1946; Jones 1987.

2. Elkin's periodisation was: A phase of incidental anthropology; A compiling and collating phase; A phase of fortuitous, individual field projects; A phase of organised, systematic research (see Elkin 1963). McCall's phases are: Development of social science phase, pre-1788; Casual or incidental phase, 1788 to mid-19th century; Compiling and collating phase, mid-19th century to late 19th century; Systematic research phase, late 19th century to 1925; Professional anthropology phase, 1925 to present (McCall 1982, 2). The final phase in my own sequence is Diversification 1974 ongoing. The beginning of this phase is marked by the Eaglehawk and Crow letter mentioned below which can be taken as more or less the start of negotiated anthropology within Australia. It also saw the beginning of a move away from the dominance of British social anthropology symbolised in a range of new appointments made in the Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University. Between 1973 and 1977 the Department made nine new appointments, six of them American-trained scholars; subsequently two professors and at least a dozen other American academics have taken up anthropology positions elsewhere in

Australia. This marks the weakening of the British intellectual tradition.

3. AR Radcliffe-Brown was known simply as AR Brown until 1926 when he changed his name by deed poll (see Firth 1956).

4. Letter from Spencer to Haddon 21 April 1919 (Haddon Collection 4—letters).

5. See Note 4.

6. Letter from Spencer to Haddon 15 October 1921 (Haddon Collection 4—letters).

7. Copies and/or extracts of their advice are in the Haddon Collection. See Malinowski 1923, 6; Haddon 1923, 1; Smith and Perry 1923, 1–2; Frazer 1923, 1.

8. The statement reads:
(1) Teaching of Anthropology—The preservation, progress, and welfare of the native population of Oceania, which is a charge under the terms of the Mandates granted to the Commonwealth of Australia, can best be carried out by a policy based on the investigation of native conditions, customs, laws, religion, and the like which is a study not merely of academic interest and importance, but points the way to a sympathetic method of dealing with and governing such peoples. The economic development of these countries depends largely upon the adoption of an intelligent native labour policy of recruiting, treatment, protection, and so forth, which can be built up only on a wide and sympathetic knowledge of native life and thought; this knowledge can best be gained on by intensive investigations by trained students.
(2) Study of Australian Aboriginals—In view of the great and peculiar interest of the Australian aboriginals as representing one of the lowest types of culture available for study, of the rapid and inevitable diminution in their numbers, and of the loss of their primitive beliefs and customs when under the influence of a higher culture, the Pan-Pacific Science Congress suggests that steps should be taken, without delay, to organise the study of those tribes that are, as yet, comparatively uninfluenced by contact with civilization.

Research in Australia and Oceania is urgently needed for the following reasons: (1) The undoubted disappearance of the native population in many areas, which not only seriously affects the labour problems, but involves the loss of most valuable scientific material, and in the Territories held under mandate, is itself the most serious obstacle to the duty accepted by the Mandatory Powers of promoting the material and moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants (PPPSC 1923, 40–43).

9. At this time Spencer had a problem with alcohol (see Mulvaney and Calaby 1985, 365–69).

10. There were in fact a number of separate funds within the Foundation which underwent administrative reorganisation at various times; I use Rockefeller Foundation to cover them all for convenience.

11. List of members—RF 1.1/410/3/23.
12. Letter CB Davenport to Embree 3 March 1924—RF 1.1/410/3/24.

13. Letter from Elliot Smith to Embree 31 March 1924—RF 1.1/410/3/23.

14. Elkin's and Mulvaney's views differ on the significance of Elliot Smith's role in this history. Elkin makes a great deal of it (1958, 231 and 235) while Mulvaney (1988, 208) plays it down. Elkin had studied under Elliot Smith.

15. Minutes of Board of Trustees Meeting 5/7/24—1.1/410/3/25.

16. NL 482/61/853B.

17. Letter from Elliot Smith to Embree 30 September 1924—RF 1.1/410/3/24.

18. The reasons why the State Governments were prepared to support the chair need further investigation. If it was because they felt it would help in the administration of Aboriginal affairs it is curious that no officers who worked or were to work in Australia were sent to the Department at Sydney for training. Training seems to have been confined to people who were to work or were working in PNG.

19. Burkitt of the Anatomy Department was working on a comprehensive investigation of the physical characteristics of Aboriginal people; Lightoller, of the same Department, was working on the minute muscular topography of the face in Aboriginal and European people; Tebbutt was investigating the precipitin reactions of Aboriginal people's blood at Royal Prince Alfred Hospital; Bostick, Assistant Superintendent of Callan Park Hospital for the Insane, was working on the incidence of insanity; and Graham, whose precise affiliation is not clear, was working on an epidemiological study of the spread of pneumonic influenza through the Aboriginal population (see Elliot Smith letter of 30 September 1924 to Embree—RF 1.1/410/3/24).

20. Letter from Elliot Smith to Embree 5 November 1924—RF 1.1/410/3/24.

21. Minutes of Board of Trustees 7 November 1924—RF 1.1/410/3/23.
22. Selection report 14 September 1925—RF 1.1/410/3/27.

23. See C Wissler Report of a Visit to Research Institutions in New Zealand and Australia During the Year 1925, pages 41 and 44—RF 1.1/410/4/42.

24. See Wissler (endnote 23) 1925, 57.

25. See Wissler (endnote 23) 1925, 59, 60 and 62.

26. See letter from Embree dated 28 May 1926—RF 1.1/410/3/28.

27. The figures are £2615 of £3403 costs (see NL 482/32/498). Mulvaney points out that this was a small proportion of the total funds allocated by the ANRC and is not proportional to their productivity which was higher than Elkin indicated (see Mulvaney 1988, 209–11).

28. Spencer, for instance, had been appointed as a Special Commissioner and Chief Protector of Aborigines in the Northern Territory for a year in 1912, following the Commonwealth Government taking over control of the Territory from South Australia in 1911. Although he did comment in his first report that in the interests of efficient welfare planning a systematic study of traditional life should be undertaken, he also emphasised the need to do this on scientific grounds and made no great issue of the applied side (see Mulvaney and Calaby 1985, 264–65, 273).
29. These two birds are commonly found as moiety totems in southeastern Australia.

REFERENCES

A.A.A.S. 1921 *Report of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science*, A.A.A.S., Sydney.

Anon 1977 Review of Activities from 1952 to 1977, and Some Indications for the Future, unpublished manuscript, Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 1–4[illegible].

B.A.A.S. 1931 *Report of the Ninety-Eighth Meeting: Bristol 1930*, Office of the British Association, London.

Berndt, R.M. 1967 Social Anthropology and the Australian Aborigines, *Oceania* 37, 241–5[illegible].

Cowlishaw, G. 1986 Aborigines and Anthropologists, *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 1, 2–12.

Durkheim, E. 1915 [1912] *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Allen and Unwin, London.

Elkin, A.P. 1938 Anthropological Research in Australia and the Western Pacific, *Oceania* 8, 306–27.

Elkin, A.P. 1939 Anthropology in Australia, *Oceania* 10, 1–29.

Elkin, A.P. 1940 Notes and News, *Oceania* 10 (4), 465.

Elkin, A.P. 1943 The Need for Sociological Research in Australia, *Social Horizons*, 5–15.

Elkin, A.P. 1954 The Australian National Research Council, *Australian Journal of Science* 16, 203–11.

Elkin, A.P. 1958 Anthropology in Australia: One Chapter, *Mankind* 5, 225–42.

Elkin, A.P. 1959 A Darwin Centenary and Highlights of Field-Work in Australia, *Mankind* 5, 321–33.

Elkin, A.P. 1963 The Development of Scientific Knowledge of the Aborigines. In H. Shiels (ed), *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 3–28.

Elkin, A.P. 1970 *The Journal Oceania*, Oceania Monographs No 16, Sydney.

Elkin, A.P. 1975-76 R.H. Mathews: His Contribution to Aboriginal Studies, *Oceania* 46, 1-24, 126-52.

Firth, R. 1932 Anthropology in Australia, *Oceania* 3, 1-12.

Firth, R. 1956 Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown 1881-1955, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 42, 287-302

Fison, L. and A.W. Howitt 1880 *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, Angus and Robertson, Melbourne.

Frazer, J.G. 1910 *Totemism and Exogamy*, Macmillan, London.

Freud, S. [1913] *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances Between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*, Random House, New York.

Geertz, C. 1963 *Agricultural Involution*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Gennep, A. van 1905 *Mythes et Legendes d'Australie*, E. Guilmoto, Paris.

Hamilton, A. 1982 Anthropology in Australia: Some Notes and a Few Queries. In G. McCall (ed), *Anthropology in Australia: Essays to Honour 50 Years of Mankind*, The Anthropological Society of New South Wales, Sydney, 91-106.

Jonas, G. 1989 *The Circuit Riders*, Norton, New York.

Jones, P. 1987 South Australian Anthropological History: The Board for Anthropological Research and Its Early Expeditions, *Records of the South Australian Museum* 20, 71-92.

Lang, A. 1905 *The Secret of the Totem*, Longmans and Green, London.

Lippmann, L. 1981 *Generations of Resistance*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.

McCall, G. (ed) 1982 *Anthropology in Australia: Essays to Honour 50 Years of Mankind*, Anthropological Society of New South Wales, Sydney.

McCarthy, F. 1946 Anthropology in Australian Museums, *Oceania* 17, 26-37.

Malinowski, B. 1963 *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, Schoken Books, New York.

Marett, R.R. 1909 *The Threshold of Religion*, Methuen, London.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1958 The Australian Aborigines 1606-1929: Opinion and Fieldwork, *Historical Studies* 8, 131-51, 297-314.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1966 Fact, Fancy and Aboriginal Australian Ethnic Origins, *Mankind* 6, 299-305.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1970 The Anthropologist as Tribal Elder, *Mankind* 7, 205-17.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1971 The Ascent of Aboriginal Man: Howitt as Anthropologist. In M.H. Walker (ed), *Come Wind, Come Weather*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 285-312, 323-24.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1981 Gum Leaves on the Golden Bough: Australia's Palaeolithic Survivals Discovered. In J.D. Evans et al (ed), *Antiquity and Man*, Thames and Hudson, London, 52-64.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1986 A Sense of Making History: Australian Aboriginal Studies 1961-1986, *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2, 48-56.

Mulvaney, D.J. 1988 Australian Anthropology and ANZASS: Strictly Scientific and Critical. In R. MacLeod (ed), *The Commonwealth of Science*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 196-221.

Mulvaney, D.J. and J.H. Calaby 1985 *'So Much That Is New': Baldwin Spencer 1860-1929, A Biography*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.

Pickens, DK 1968 *Eugenics and the Progressives*, Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville.

PPPSC 1923 *Proceedings of the Pan Pacific Science Congress, Australia 1923*, Government Printer, Melbourne.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1930 Editorial, *Oceania* 1(1), 1-4.

R.B.A.A.S. 1915 *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1914*, John Murray, London.

Said, E.W. 1978 *Orientalism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Spencer, B. and F.J. Gillen 1899 *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, Macmillan, London.

Spencer, B. and F.J. Gillen 1927 *The Arunta*, Volumes 1-2, Macmillan, London.

Tonkinson, R. and M. Howard 1990 The Berndts: A Biographical Sketch. In R. Tonkinson and M. Howard (eds), *Going It Alone*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, 17-42.

Wentworth, W.C. 1959 An Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, unpublished papers. A.I.A.S., Canberra, 1-9.

Wentworth, W.C. 1964 Second Reading Speech, *House of Representatives, Hansard, 20th May 1964*, Government Printer, Canberra.

Wentworth, W.C. 1959 An Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, unpublished paper, A.I.A.S., Canberra, 1-9.

White, I. 1981 Mrs Bates and Mr Brown: An Examination of Rodney Needham's Allegations, *Oceania* 51(3), 193-210.

Widders, J. et al 1974 *Eaglehawk and Crow: Open Letter Concerning the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 29 March*, A.I.A.S, Canberra, 1-5.

Wise, T. 1985 *The Self-Made Anthropologist. A Life of A.P. Elkin*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

Dr Nicholas Peterson, Wentworth Lecture 1990

AIATSIS Library, S06.1/AIAS/10 1990no2,p.3-19

Ref 08.8

“Studying Man and Man’s Nature: The history of institutionalisation of Aboriginal Anthropology”, paper presented at the Wentworth Lecture.

(m0006639_a.pdf)

To cite this file use :

http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/lbry/dig_prgm/wentworth/m0006639_a.pdf

© Dr Nicholas Peterson