A unique institution in the world of the humanities (1981-1991)

Abstract for chapter 4

The conference series and the Visiting Fellows programmes continued to demonstrate how successfully the HRC was fulfilling its role as a catalyst for the humanities, nationally and internationally. Donaldson and Clarke set out to discover what areas of significance were not being studied and how new areas of study might develop. Their investigations led to enormously successful themes such as ‘Feminism,’ as well as innovative collaborations to develop the Film Studies Programme and the Fine Arts Programme at ANU.

Donaldson resigned in August 1990 to become Regius Professor at Edinburgh, having fulfilled his vision of the HRC, with some 80 conferences, 260 Visiting Fellows and 400 conference and other visitors over the 17 years of his directorship.
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Words may be cheap, but they can make good reading: the litany of praise lavished on the HRC by former Visiting Fellows made a striking contrast with the decidedly unlavish funding bestowed on it by the University. Charles Fantazzi, Professor of Classical and Modern Languages at the University of Windsor, Ontario, testified that the HRC was, *inter alia*, ‘a unique institution in the world of humanities.’ It was ‘comforting to know that such strongholds of humanistic and humane learning exist and exert their influence in a tangible way.’ The Director and Deputy Director ‘set the tone of excellence and industry, tempered with affability, that characterises the Centre,’ which provided ‘the ideal atmosphere for learning and the sharing of knowledge.’ This testimonial was supported by another foreign academic who declared that no words were ‘adequate to describe the sensitivity, tolerance, kindness and consideration’ with which Donaldson and Clarke treated their Visiting Fellows. Professor J. Goldberg from the Department of English, Temple University ‘found working conditions at the HRC ideal.’ Professor Stephen Orgel, Sir William Osler Professor of English Literature at Johns Hopkins, found them ‘superlative.’ His only regret was ‘the puzzling lack of connection between the HRC and the teaching departments,’ which would indeed be noted by Donaldson as a continuing puzzling aspect. Professor Charles W. Fornara of the Department of Classics at Brown University recalled the Centre as ‘a place of civility and grace.’ His words were echoed by Dr Thomas Wheaton Bestor of the Department of Philosophy at Massey University, New Zealand, who felt similarly
that the most beneficial effect of the Centre ‘was not any “on paper” accomplishment . . . It was more in the nature of being reassured that there do exist places in the world where humanities research is taken for granted as an acceptable form of human endeavour and, indeed, where it is conducted in the most civilized and gracious atmosphere. I felt isolated and embittered upon arrival; I leave encouraged and enlivened.’ Professor F.C. Inglis of the School of Education at the University of Bristol wrote that

the breadth of reference and the catholicity of definition with which the pursuit of humanities is sustained here, have together been the occasion of the most exhilarating three months of my life . . . I hope it will not seem invidious to identify both the Director and Deputy Director as signally ensuring that in their small corner of the universe Newman’s idea of a university is kept splendidly alive.

And Fellow of the National Library of Australia Helen Topliss, recorded that ‘my faith in academic pursuits has been renewed . . . The Centre is a place of true integrity, wit and intellect . . . a model of its kind – it ought to become the original form of places for research . . . such a splendid model of Humanitarian enterprise and discourse.’ She even compared it favourably with academic life in Melbourne. And you can’t say better than that.

It was the ritual morning and afternoon coffee that evoked some of the most poignant recollections for past Visiting Fellows. Professor Guy Fitch Lytle of the Department of History at the University of Texas at Austin, thought that his time as a Visiting Fellow was probably among the most productive three months of my life thus far – and among the most pleasant . . . I have never worked with nicer people . . . When you add to that the quality and congeniality of the Visiting Fellows, it is hard to restrain the utopian adjectives and metaphors . . . I could go on for pages, but it is 10.30 and I think I will go have a cup of coffee alone and hear echoes of Pearl [Moyseyenko]’s bell and all of your voices.

Dr Peter J. Hempenstall of the Department of History at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, had

for the HRC and its system of Fellowships . . . only the warmest feelings, tinged with envy . . . the ritual morning and afternoon tea [and coffee] sessions (which I
found actually did lead on to productive things) so caught my imagination that I have carried a mission home to introduce it among my colleagues here.

Director of the Institute of Advanced Study in the Humanities at Edinburgh Professor Peter Jones judged that the facilities in the HRC were ‘ideal in almost all respects’, and that ‘the daily coffee and tea assemblies’ were ‘central to the happy intellectual atmosphere’. Donaldson recorded that Jones’ visit helped to cement good links between HRC and IASH... There was an IASH Fellowship, tenable each year at Edinburgh, fully funded from Australian sources, the candidate selected by a committee organised through the HRC... I wondered if we couldn’t do a similar thing for the HRC itself in Canberra...¹

Dr Cicely Howell from York University, reported that an ‘ex-fellow once told me that in retrospect he saw the HRC as an “oasis of civilization” and I tend to agree... the regular coffee and tea breaks provided just the right amount of human interaction’. And Professor K.S. Guthke of Harvard found that: ‘My thinking about my project benefited greatly from the informal (and addictive) conversations over tea and coffee (from now on there will be gaps or blanks in my life at 10.30 a.m. and 3.30 p.m.’ It is worth noting that the nostalgia was quite literally for the very economical pleasures of coffee, company and especially conversation. Anything more extensive or expensive would only be provided privately by the Director and Deputy Director: lavish entertainment was not an item in the budget of the HRC. Such a tradition as the coffee and tea and associated opportunities for discussion which evoked such nostalgia among people of such professional eminence was not to be set aside lightly. It was, for a period during the late nineties, after the departure of Donaldson and Clarke. But it came back with the beginning of the new century under Graeme Clarke’s successor as Deputy, augmented by Friday afternoon get-togethers for drinks after seminars, with significant others specifically invited, in line with a welcome and enlightened suggestion by an earlier visitor.

Visiting Fellow in the 1980s John Docker evokes the vision of the ‘urbane cosmopolitan culture of the European Enlightenment’ as described in Jonathan Israel’s Radical Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750 to convey a sense of the HRC scene in the first and second decades of the Centre’s existence. There was during the century
of the Enlightenment, according to Israel, “freedom of conversation between men and women, in a kind of new Epicureanism. In such a libertarian culture and Enlightenment public sphere . . . what mattered was not membership of a particular family or noble group, but a new kind of meritocracy of mind and of attitude, given to philosophical knowledge, irreverent writing and refined pleasure seeking.” Well, I’m not sure about Epicureanism as a specific presence in the HRC “culture”, Docker observed, ‘or refined pleasure-seeking, but at morning and afternoon break times there was excellent coffee served in an urn which added conversational fluency as visitors and scholars sat about the central tables; and after the weekly seminar, wine and cheese would be wheeled in to assist in mulling over issues raised in the seminar that had just ended.’ Perhaps the most significant contribution of all this civility and grace was that it constituted, in Docker’s opinion,

a sophisticated and gently irreverent intervention into an ANU that, as I recall from the 1970s and 80s was formidably gerontocratic and perhaps even openly misogynistic . . . In the archipelago that is ANU, the HRC as it shaped and refined its practices and tone was an island of Humanities cosmopolitanism and interdisciplinarity.

This was all the more important ‘because of the distinction then and still at ANU between Humanities and the Social Sciences, so that one was always made to feel that the Research School of Social Sciences . . . could be clearly distinguished from Humanities . . .’

Canberra itself evoked more modified rapture. Professor Alexander P.D. Mourelatos of the University of Texas at Austin declared that in ‘a world in which cities (including the city of my birth, Athens) have become ugly and oppressive, Canberra is a jewel of beauty and humaneness.’ On the other hand, a visitor from the metropolitan sophistication of Waikiki saw ‘nothing in Canberra to recommend it,’ apart from the HRC. ‘This city is a major disadvantage for the HRC,’ he concluded. Not however a sufficiently major disadvantage to deter overseas academics from pursuing Visiting Fellowships at a rate beyond the capacity of the HRC to sustain. Highly distinguished among such Fellows in 1982 was Richard Rorty, Professor of Humanities at the University of Virginia, acclaimed as one of the most influential philosophers of the late twentieth century. Professor Rorty’s primary academic mission was to continue his work on the intriguing if somewhat equivocal philosopher Martin Heidegger. It
was nonetheless, he reported, ‘an idyllic period for me and my family . . . the nicest sabbatical I’ve ever had’. And it was Rorty’s unreserved and authoritative endorsement of the HRC that might well have carried the most weight at the time of its most critical review thirteen years later. He also provided a major contribution to the mythology of the Centre when he and his wife adopted or were adopted by a forlorn young wombat, which they found in its dead mother’s pouch and named Rainy. Rorty and Rainy became inseparable during the great philosopher’s visit, giving rise to genial academic speculation as to whether the philosopher perceived the wombat as a very small philosopher, or the wombat perceived the philosopher as a very large wombat. Rorty indeed consented to make return visits to the Centre in 1992 and again in 1999 only after he had been assured that he would be able to renew his association with Rainy.

One of the most interesting HRC policies was the ‘Open Door’, reiterated in HRC Bulletins from the mid-seventies until the mid-nineties:

> The HRC does not wish to become merely a small and closed society of privileged scholars. Many of its Visiting Fellows will quite properly be looking for one thing only from the Centre: a period of uninterrupted time which allows them to get on with their own work in peace.
This they will be able to find. Nevertheless the Centre hopes that its activities will have some impact upon the Australian National University as a whole, and upon Australian universities generally, and that they may also be of interest to a wider public. Members of the University and the general public are welcome to attend HRC conferences, lectures, readings, and work-in-progress seminars. Information about such activities is available from the HRC Secretary.3 (and later from an electronic mailing list and the web). The HRC maintains its open door and attendees at HRC events range from undergraduate students to retired members of the public.

It was naturally the conferences which achieved the most éclat and demonstrated most vividly the degree to which the HRC was fulfilling its mandate as a catalyst for the study of the humanities, both nationally and internationally. The HRC style of conferences was set very early and consisted of an emphasis on new and critical research presented in an atmosphere of collegial debate and within a programme which was constructed to allow plenty of time for discussion and which eschewed parallel sessions then becoming the bane of academic life. Conference participants were carefully selected and conference conveners were expected to apply rigorous selection and develop an overall intellectual conception which broke new ground. Fellows participated in the conferences, but the fact that they stayed at the Centre before and after meant that intellectual exchange and ‘conversations’ began before and continued well after the conferences ended. The extent of scholarly collaborations begun at the Centre cannot be estimated, but without question many major research projects and books resulted. And many younger Australian academics owed much to the Centre in terms of opportunities provided by the HRC to participate in and even convene conferences and saw their careers benefit substantially from the contacts made in those conferences.

There were three conferences in 1982 on the general theme of ‘Insight and Interpretation’, two of them convened by the invaluable Peter Herbst, attracting an impressive 175 people, including ‘sociologists, anthropologists, textual scholars, political scientists and philosophers, as well as the linguistic and literary scholars’ whom the Annual Report that year considered to be ‘the mainstay of the HRC’.4 The spread of the scholars had become considerable: eminent historian Professor Lawrence Stone gave 17 papers while an HRC Visiting Fellow in
1983 in Canberra at ANU and at the Universities of Sydney, NSW, Queensland, Adelaide, La Trobe and New England.

The 1983 series on the theme of the ‘Renaissance’ had set a benchmark which could not have been dreamt of even in the optimistic days when the Centre was first conceived. In selecting this theme, Donaldson reported, ‘the HRC Steering Committee was aware of the existence of several small but flourishing Renaissance groups and societies in Australian universities, and of the particular international distinction of a number of Australian Renaissance scholars.’ It had been resolved that the first of the three conferences should take place at the University of Melbourne, the first time that an HRC conference had been held outside Canberra, while a display on the Renaissance garden was held at Monash University, all of which Donaldson considered ‘benefited the three Melbourne universities.’ The second and third conferences were held in Canberra, convened by Dr William Ramson of the Department of English at ANU and formerly President of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies (and who played a major role in HRC Steering Committees over the years); by Dr Sasha Grishin of the Department of Fine Arts at ANU; and by Mr W. G. Craven of the Department of History in The Faculties. Concerts of appropriate music were held in University House; Visiting Fellows gave special lectures
at the University of Sydney, the University of Western Australia, the University of Adelaide and the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand; 50 papers were given and over 400 participated, including in the words of the Annual Report ‘economic, social, historical and musical historians as well as the linguistic and literary scholars who are the mainstay of the HRC’, as distinct presumably from the other scholars listed among the ‘usual denizens’ of the Centre in the previous year’s report.

But nobody needed to feel left out. In 1983 the Centre hosted sociologist Professor Zygmunt Bauman, in 1989 political scientist Professor Quentin Skinner, in 1985 anthropologist Professor Michael Herzfeld, in 1987 anthropologists Professor James Boon and Professor Clifford Geertz, in 1989 anthropologists and ethnographers such as Professor Faye Ginsburg, Professor George Marcus and ethnographic film makers David McDougall as well as Mihály Hoppál from Budapest, the latter an expert on Hungarian ethnographic film, and in future years would host many anthropologists such as Dr Deborah Bird Rose or Professors Margaret Jolly and Howard Morphy. Writers on Indigenous issues like Professor Peter Read and on new media and philosophy like Brian Massumi all had a continuing association with HRC conferences and events. Later years would also see scientists, medical experts and lawyers as HRC Visiting Fellows as the Centre took on even broader interpretations of the humanities and interactions within society. Scholars in older fields of study which were sadly starting to disappear from Australian universities, such as classical languages, Russian, Scandinavian and Slavonic studies and even more sadly by the nineties Modern European languages, continued to come and keep the flame alive in Australia. Scholars were also coming in new fields such as Dr Stephen Bann (1984) from Modern Cultural Studies at Kent working on contemporary landscape theorists or Professor Mary Jacobus from English at Cornell (1985) who while at the Centre completed a book on feminist literary criticism and psychoanalysis and began one on Wordsworth’s Prelude and De Quincey’s Confessions and managed in a very busy lecture schedule to lecture at most Australian universities and two in New Zealand. There were independent scholars, artists and writers such as Dr Ursula Hoff, Humphrey McQueen and Robin Wallace-Crabbe. Art scholars like Dr John House, Dr John Gage and Dr Marilyn McCully came as conference visitors in association with new links developed in the 1980s with the National Gallery of Australia and later Asian art historians such as Professor Michael Sullivan, Helen Jessup and
Professor John Hay in association with Asian Studies and film theorist and writer on women’s film E. Ann Kaplan, Director of SUNY Stony Brook Humanities Centre, a Visitor in 1989 and 2000 who was doing critical work in feminist film and literary studies and was much in demand from other universities on both occasions.

The fact was that the Centre was welcoming scholars in well-nigh every conceivable field of the humanities, while the scope of its conferences was evidently extending beyond the Eurocentric confines contemplated at its outset. An example was the work of Gayatri Spivak, then Andrew W. Mellon Professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh and still one of the foremost figures in the study of world literature and its cultural consequences. She came to the Centre in 1987 to work on a major manuscript on master discourse and native informant and interacted with the English Department scholars at ANU as well as lecturing at Deakin, Monash, Melbourne and Adelaide and was interviewed on multiculturalism on the ABC. In her report she noted: ‘I found my stay at the Centre most enjoyable and, indeed, quite seriously wish I was there now’. Eminent scholars in new fields like Spivak and those in ‘subaltern’ studies and multiculturalism made a major impact through their lectures and teaching as would Professor Dipesh Chakrabarty in future years.

However, all this record of achievement and all this continuing applause from distinguished visitors might even have added to the financial problems of the HRC by providing support for the argument that the Centre was doing so well with so little of everything that there was no point in giving it anything more. The Centre of Excellence submission was not favoured because ANU was ‘uncertain whether the HRC was strictly eligible to apply for additional funding under this scheme, or whether it would be considered, like the ANU Research Schools, as already constituting a centre of excellence’. This would, the Advisory Committee considered, be ‘a flattering judgment that might nevertheless work to the Centre’s financial disadvantage’, because this could result in the Centre’s ‘being grouped with The Faculties for the purpose of budgetary cuts in 1982, and with the Institute of Advanced Studies for ineligibility under this scheme, thereby losing on both the swings and the roundabouts’. The Committee felt that this would leave the HRC ‘in an unfortunate and anomalous position’. That could only be taken as a superlative example of scholarly understatement. And in the meantime there was the persisting problem of just what the position of the HRC was, in terms of its location within the structure of ANU, in other words whether it was
“associated with” or “part of” the Faculty of Arts, as William Ramson queried. Donaldson recognised in statements to the HRC Committees that the HRC was entering its tenth year and had not grown very much apart from acquiring a Deputy Director. Visiting Fellows were ‘now coming for three to four months on average or for even shorter periods’. The problem was very simply that ‘At the time of the Centre’s establishment, universities had begun to contract financially, and the Centre had really never reached its full projected growth, now operating with a staff consisting of Director, Deputy Director, Research Officer’, and of course as Donaldson recorded graciously in his Annual Report, a supporting secretarial staff now consisting of Miss Mary Theo, Mrs Pearl Moyseyenko and Mrs Jodi Parvey which cheerfully accepts periodic overwork and the difficulties inherent in an enterprise such as ours. Under the efficient direction of the Secretary, Miss M. Theo, they are used to serving not only as typists, stenographers and clerical assistants but as tea and coffee-makers, travel agents, errand runners and at times as chauffeurs for a large and changing population of visitors (some

*Left to right:* Graeme Clarke, Mary Theo, Ian Donaldson, Pearl Moyseyenko, Chris Eade, Jodi Parvey, in the late 1980s.
with dependants) whose demands can be numerous and unforeseeable.\textsuperscript{8}

Donaldson would testify later that it was the secretaries who ‘really do hold the place together and help make it what it is’; and Graeme Clarke observed that ‘the academic staff relied heavily on the goodwill and dedication of the secretarial and administrative staff; without them the Centre simply could not have functioned’. Clarke mentioned in particular how Jodi Parvey mastered the growing technicalities of the computing world – as well as getting at the same time a first-class degree part-time in the Faculty of Arts, specialising in Mediaeval Studies and Art History. Her competence proved invaluable in producing our quarterly Bulletins and the series of HRC monographs . . . Jodi edited through the entire process from typescript to published form.

Pearl Moyseyenko had initially been assigned as Clarke’s secretary when he arrived at the Centre at the beginning of 1982, but ‘had other duties especially with organising conferences and looking after the domestic sort of details with the Visiting Fellows’ and dealing with ‘the entertainment side of the job . . . which helped greatly to oil the HRC machine’. Jennifer Kelly had been ‘the first of the HRC secretaries in 1974–75. She was there from the very beginning in Childers Street . . . [and] oversaw the Centre’s move to the A D Hope Building’. She was married to a British diplomat and ‘had many of the diplomatic skills and graces herself’, which would indeed have been a significant asset in her role at the HRC. And Mary Theo had ‘a big laugh and immense energy, always at the centre of things’,’\textsuperscript{9} which are significant assets in any role at all.

An additional problem had to be faced immediately: the new political philosophy that university units had to be self-funding meant that by 1985 the Centre could not afford to allow Visiting Fellows more than a stay of six months. Donaldson and Clarke put up three proposals to the Vice-Chancellor to try to relieve the pressure on the Visiting Fellows programme, which was of course the main reason for the existence of the HRC in the first place. They were

(1) for a topping up of the existing Visiting Fellowship (short-term) vote to enable Visitors to come for slightly longer periods of time; (2) for the creation of Research Fellowships (with support staff) of 3-4 years’ duration,
to enable the Centre to operate on a continuing project . . . and (3) for the establishment of 2 senior Research Fellowships and 2 junior post-doctoral Fellowships with tenure of 1-3 years in undesignated fields.10

These approaches achieved some marginal relief: Donaldson reported to the Steering Committee ‘the good news that the submission to the Vice-Chancellor for additional funds, although not approved in toto, had realised a budget supplementation for 1985 and subsequent years of $50 000 per annum’. This meant that two people ‘on the reserve list for 1985 Visiting Fellowships . . . had been written to in the hope that they would be able to accept late offers for 1985’.11

The Centre would, however, henceforth only be able to provide a stipend to cover basic costs to assist self-funded scholars to survive, rather than financing accommodation. There was no question that the Visiting Fellowships programme had been a spectacular success: the Centre had received ‘152 Visiting Fellows, 44 Conference Visitors and 27 Summer Fellows’ by the end of 1984, as well as holding 45 conferences. Donaldson expected that ‘more than 250 visitors would have been through the Centre and 50 conferences would have been held’ by the end of 1985. These had been marvellously varied, and sustained at an average strike rate of between three and five annually. There had been six in 1981, on the general theme of ‘Australia and the European Imagination’, which had seen conferences on The Roman Family, Transmission in Oral and Written Traditions and Speculative Fiction: the Australian Context, as well as a workshop in honour of the illustrious Marxist historian of the English Revolution Christopher Hill, who assured Donaldson and Clarke that he found it ‘difficult to imagine a more friendly, tolerant and luxuriously appointed environment for working in’. Donaldson reflected that it had been ‘quite a catch to bring to Canberra simultaneously the three leading historians of seventeenth-century England, Christopher Hill, Keith Thomas and Lawlenee Stone’. And the summer school organised in relation to Hill’s visit was the precursor of the summer school for teachers of history organised in 2001 in conjunction with the Emeritus Faculty of ANU and the ACT History Teachers Association.

There were three conferences in 1982: Understanding Texts, Interpreting and Understanding, and Creativity and the Idea of a Culture. It had always been Donaldson’s concern that the new research presented in HRC conferences and seminars should be published and accordingly the HRC began its own monograph series in 1983 and also had a publications agreement with Macmillan begun in the same year which
Visiting Fellow office, A.D. Hope Building, 1980s.

The HRC Reading Room, A.D. Hope Building, 1980s.
resulted in several books. (See Appendix F: Publications.) Donaldson reported in 1984 that the joint series of publications with Macmillan had been terminated, but ‘it was expected a new contract with OUP would be signed quite soon’. Short runs of fewer than 1000 copies were planned, with the HRC ‘to do all copy editing in-house, wordprocess the material, and deliver hard copy or disc to OUP for compositing and printing’. Doing so much with so few inevitably took its toll, here as elsewhere: the Committee ‘showed concern that the Centre’s wordprocessor operator had contracted RSI’. This would not have been surprising if the wordprocessor in question were still the second-hand one acquired on hire in 1981. However, the RSI outbreak was not in fact ‘confined to the HRC but was a pan-ANU epidemic accompanying the introduction of computers in the early eighties’, as Donaldson observed, and was ‘a major source of industrial and medical anxiety within the University’.

A contract was in fact signed late in 1984 initiating a new publishing series with Oxford University Press. The new series was designed for monographs prepared by members of the Centre and for composite volumes deriving from the HRC conferences. Thus the first volume in the series was to be a book of essays from the 1983 conference on Patronage, Art and Society in the Renaissance, and a volume deriving from the 1984 Landscape conferences was being prepared by Helen Topliss and Eade. ‘We tried to get a permanent record of HRC achievements by encouraging and facilitating publication’, Clarke told the authors.

We strongly felt that the publication programme chalked up research achievements for the Centre apart from those of the individual Visiting Fellows & would constitute one of the academic measures by which the HRC might be judged internationally. A great deal of effort, accordingly, went into this aspect of the life of the HRC & many of the conferences were actually planned around the books that were intended to follow.

It was remarkable that Donaldson and Clarke could find the time and energy to put a great deal of extra effort into anything, given the heroic demands of the record of achievement listed above. It was certainly difficult to imagine how such a level of performance could possibly be sustained without significant support in terms of both finance and personnel. But that depended to a degree on the still unresolved issue of where the HRC best fitted into the University.
structure in the interests of both ANU and itself. A renewed proposal for the HRC to be affiliated with the Faculty of Arts was not perceived as being likely to be productive of practical benefits to either: the Faculty Working Party on Relations with Other Areas and Institutions had complained in December 1983 that Visitors to the HRC ‘often establish closer links with relevant departments in other Australian universities than they do with departments in the ANU Faculty of Arts, perhaps because they have no alternative base of support within other universities’. Furthermore, the HRC budget was

part of The Faculties budget, but the Director of the HRC is virtually autonomous with respect to its allocation and in responsibility for HRC staff and visitors. This on the one hand insulates the HRC from scrutiny and the need to co-ordinate with the Faculty but also deprives it of direct access to forums such as the Resources Committee.\(^{15}\)

However, the situation was that the HRC was still being regarded officially by the University as a component of the Faculty of Arts, as indicated by the Registrar’s letter to Ralph Elliott on 29 September 1986, expressing pleasure that he had ‘accepted the appointment as Visiting Fellow in the Humanities Research Centre, Faculty of Arts, for the 1987 calendar year’.\(^{16}\)

The University duly resolved to undertake a full review of the HRC in 1987. Donaldson set himself to prepare a full submission, so the University would be in no doubt as to what it was reviewing. His position was enhanced substantially by the fact that the Centre had staged a series of conferences over the past four years that had both been spectacularly successful in terms of numbers participating and had also demonstrated the will and capacity of the Centre to go boldly where no Research School had gone before. They were both blockbusters and forays at the cutting edge of academe. Helen Topliss had convened two conferences on the theme of ‘Landscape and the Arts’ in 1984 with the support of the National Gallery of Australia, which had drawn nearly 300 participants. There had also been a seminar to discuss the work of the vastly honoured Adams University Professor of American History at Harvard and Pulitzer Prize-winner Bernard Bailyn who was a Visiting Fellow that year. Bailyn gave a public lecture at ANU and lectured at five other Australian universities. He wrote that he had enjoyed his stay at the HRC ‘enormously’ and had begun an involvement with Australian history and historians he hoped to pursue. There were four conferences on the theme of
‘Hellenism’ in 1985, *Byzantium and Hellenism* convened by Elizabeth Jeffreys, now Bywater Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek at Oxford and by Dr Ann Moffat of the Department of Classics at ANU and *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, convened by Dr Jean-Paul Descoeudres from the University of Sydney, now Professor of Classical Archaeology at Geneva, constituting the first Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology, appropriately honouring Dale Trendall. Then in 1986 came the first of what would be a whole series of ‘Great Leaps Forward’, when the Centre would provide a forum for the examination of topics of major contemporary interest and concern not so far strictly within the purview of the Research Schools.

Over 600 participants crowded three conferences on Feminism and the Humanities, convened by Dr Susan Sheridan of the Department of the Humanities at Deakin University and Dr Susan Magarey of the Department of Women’s Studies at the University of Adelaide. Donaldson described the event moderately as ‘a record in the history of the Centre’. It was indeed a resounding *démarche* in terms of scholarly examination of a critical contemporary issue. And it remained a record
in the history of the Centre 25 years later in terms of the number of participants it attracted. The first conference, *Feminist Criticism and Cultural Production*, encompassed feminist work on film, theatre, dance, literature and urban architecture, exploring connections and discontinuities in feminist criticism in all these areas of cultural production. It also involved two sessions of readings, one by the Canberra Women Writers Group organised by the National Library, and one by visiting Canadian poets Nicole Brossard, Daphne Marlatt and Betsy Warland and translator/critic Barbara Godard; a film and video programme arranged by Helen Grace; and an exhibition of works by women artists from the National Gallery, ‘Picturing the Difference’, through images of body and mothering. Well over 300 participants attended these various functions.

This was only the beginning: the second conference, *Feminism and the Humanities: Enrichment, Expansion or Challenge*, examined the impact of feminist thought on the Humanities and the manner in which feminist thought was itself being shaped by its critical function. It was accompanied by another exhibition of Australian women artists, this time held at the National Library. Speakers included Professor Joan Scott from Princeton, Professor Alice Jardine from Harvard, Dr Lenore Davidoff from the University of Essex and Professor Marilyn Butler from Cambridge. The HRC third conference on *Feminist Enquiry as a Transdisciplinary Enterprise* was held at the University of Adelaide and included scholars in anthropology, art history, education, English literature, geography, history, philosophy and sociology. Overseas speakers included Professor Catherine Stimpson from Rutgers, Dr Rosi Braidotti from Paris and Dr Anthea Callen from the University of Warwick. At the same time, 60 people attended a seminar held with the collaboration of the Canadian Government and the University of Sydney in honour of the Canadian scholar Northrop Frye, Professor of English at the University of Toronto, hailed in his *Festschrift* as a father figure to the present generation of literary theorists and esteemed widely himself as the most systematic and brilliant of literary theorists and as the proponent of symbolist literary criticism in English.

Feminism and Northrop Frye were hard acts to follow. But the 1987 activities on the theme of ‘Europe and the Orient’ were also highly successful in terms of popularity as well as brilliantly successful in illuminating new areas of scholarship by endeavouring to reverse the conventional Eurocentric and Orientalist view of Asia. The timing was singularly opportune: postwar Japanese economic triumphalism was at its height, with the Ministry of International Trade and Industry
(MITI) more or less seriously floating projects for constructing a second Panama Canal, cutting a new one across the Kra Isthmus, damming the Congo, greening the Sahara, Sahel and Arabian deserts and colonising outer space; the Australian economy was lurching into the recession we had to have, with Australian trade representatives plaintively asking their Japanese counterparts for economic advice, which a Queensland official suggested was in that context like a lamb asking a lion if it knew a good use for mint sauce; and Japanese Ministers in Canberra had proposed in January establishing in Australia a Japanese enclave in the form of a ‘Multi-Function Polis’, a ‘city of the 21st century’. It never happened, of course, any more than any of the other grandiose visions of MITI; its most aggressive exponents went bankrupt or became invisible shortly after; and it was Japan that was to enter a prolonged economic twilight. But it was without question a most appropriate time for Australians to essay the salutary experiment of trying to view the world outside through Asian eyes, or at least trying to appreciate what Asians saw through their own eyes.

The two main conferences convened jointly by Dr Tony Milner of the Department of History at ANU, later Professor and Dean of
the Faculty of Asian Studies and by Dr Andrew Gerstle of the Japan Centre at ANU, drew over 400 registrations. It had been intended that Edward Said would be a guest but alas at the last minute he was prevented from travelling, due to the illness of his mother. However, there were many eminent participants in many disciplines including Professors Clifford Geertz from Princeton, John Hay from New York University and Michael Sullivan from Oxford. The first, on *Europe and the Exotic*, brought together Europeanists and Asianists from various disciplines, engaging with the central theme of Asian influence on European artists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the contrasting ways in which the exotic was perceived and depicted by artists and scholars. The second conference, *The Occident and the Orient*, continued the debates initiated in the previous conference, shifting the focus from European artists to contemporary scholars of Asia. An extensive exhibition ‘Europe and the Orient’ was organised by the National Library; the National Gallery hosted exhibitions of Chinese woodcuts of the 1930s and 1940s, Indonesian textiles and Buddhist sculpture; the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade sponsored a concert of Indonesian music at the National Gallery Theatre; the Japanese Consulate in Melbourne loaned a small collection of Japanese woodblock prints; the School of Music arranged a concert of Asian influenced music; the Altenburg Gallery at Braidwood presented an exhibition of Japanese-influenced Australian pottery; there was an exhibition of Asian films at the University Library (R.G. Menzies Building); the Faculty of Asian Studies arranged another exhibition on E. Kaempfer, a seventeenth century German physician who wrote extensively of his experiences in Thailand and Japan; the Nolan Gallery at Lanyon Homestead arranged a special viewing of Nolan’s ‘Chinese’ paintings; and the Japanese Embassy sponsored a traditional bamboo shakuhachi flute recital by Mr Riley Lee. Milner still speaks warmly of the impact of this series of interdisciplinary events on Asian Studies and scholars at ANU. There were also two non-thematic conferences, to add something more to this wonderful year, so to speak: one on the *History of Books*, and another on *Literary Journals*; and a Seminar in October convened for the HRC by Director of RSSS Professor Paul Bourke in honour of the very highly distinguished Sterling Professor Emeritus of History at Yale Edmund S. Morgan, the historian of popular sovereignty in England and America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who declared that his three months at the Centre had ‘been among the most memorable and rewarding of a lifetime. Never before have
I been subjected to such a variety of stimulating experiences, while at the same time being made to feel completely at home’.

There was no doubt that the year’s activities of the HRC had ‘reached far outside the ANU campus’ as Milner and Gerstle observed with moderation. Nor was there any doubt that the Centre was functioning admirably as a clearing house of information about current work and conferences in the Humanities in Australasia, as Donaldson noted in the Annual Report for 1987. Donaldson could thus afford to continue to approach the Committee of Review with his customary blend of confidence and realism. The basic situation, he reminded the Committee, was that the HRC had been ‘originally established in 1973-4 as an unaffiliated Centre within the ANU’. The Director was a member of the Board of the Institute of Advanced Studies and also of the Board of the School of General Studies. This meant that ‘proposals relevant to the Centre would be discussed by both Boards or . . . dealt with summarily by their Chairmen’. The arrangement had worked well as a whole, he thought, and ‘allowed the Centre . . . to play something of a bridging role between the Institute and the SGS’. However, it had the very serious drawback for the HRC that it ‘had no direct representation on the Resources Committee, and was correspondingly disadvantaged when bidding for funds’. In addition, the Joint Committee of the IAS and the SGS had concluded in 1976 that ‘the ANU’s Centres and Units collectively suffered from, inter alia, ‘a lack of identification with the main sections of the University’, ‘a sense of isolation’, ‘absence of clear lines of communication with the academic board and other bodies’, ‘lack of understanding and appreciation . . . by the main sections of the University’, and so on. Donaldson however thought that the Review Committee had ‘failed to perceive or to acknowledge the full extent of co-operation between the Faculty and the HRC’. Nor was any lack of co-operation solely the fault of the HRC in any event: the Centre informed Faculty members and Department heads in detail of visitors coming each year and encouraged them to make contact with these visitors. But on the whole, he noted, the Faculty response was disappointing: it was ‘as if many members of the Faculty have not perceived the existence of a resource that is available to them, or are too busy with their own teaching to take advantage of it’.

This, Donaldson noted, was ‘a long-standing problem, which has so far defied solution’. It would continue to defy solution because of the very simple factor of endemic and increasing burden of overwork on academic personnel, especially in the teaching departments: the
advent of the wordprocessor meant in capitalist logic the departure of typists; the ratio of teaching staff to students continued to deteriorate, so academics found themselves with progressively more to do and less time to do it in; and attendance at seminars tended ever more and more to be viewed as something beyond the call of duty, even when there was time to attend.

Isolation had never really been an issue for the HRC, however. Relations with RSPacS had been ‘on the whole fairly casual and ad hoc’, but there had been some important formal links; the Faculty of Asian Studies had been working closely with the Centre during 1987; ‘a good working relationship’ had been developed with the Canberra Schools of Art and Music; and ‘a close and cordial relationship’ had grown with the National Library and the National Gallery. And the range of services performed by the Centre extended far beyond Canberra itself. It was still ‘the only institution of its kind in Australia (and indeed in the Southern Hemisphere).’ Some more specialised humanities centres had been established at other Australian universities, but many of these had to ‘function on minimal (or zero) funding’. It was therefore appropriate that ‘several have looked to the HRC . . . for co-operation and support. The HRC’s potential sphere of activity and influence’, Donaldson continued, ‘is in one sense greater than that of, say, the National Humanities Center at North Carolina: for that large and handsomely-funded institution exists in a country that already has about fifty humanities research centres of varying sizes and specialisations’. The HRC had attempted to fulfil this national role in a number of ways: by encouraging Visiting Fellows to travel to other universities in Australia and New Zealand; by organising conferences both in and outside Canberra in conjunction with other institutions; by acting as a clearing-house for information about current research in the humanities in Australia and New Zealand; by establishing links with other humanities centres and national bodies throughout Australia; and by helping to initiate new projects of national importance.

The year also saw the publication of the first in the new monograph series with OUP, Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy, edited by F.W. Kent and Patricia Simons, with J.C. Eade. Eade in addition edited the fourth in the Centre’s own series of monographs, Projecting the Landscape, derived as Donaldson and Clarke had planned from the 1984 conferences on Landscape and the Arts.

The main role of the HRC was however necessarily as a conference centre and a haven for research: the Centre was ‘now known internationally, and Visiting Fellowships are keenly competed for by
applicants from many parts of the world. Since 1974, it has appointed 230 Visiting Fellows, 65 Conference Visitors, and 51 Summer Fellows, Visiting Scholars and Short-term Visitors’. Of the Visiting Fellows 92 were from the United Kingdom, 53 from Australia, 48 from the United States, 15 from Continental Europe, 12 from Canada, three from New Zealand, two from Hong Kong and one each from Korea, Japan, Israel, China and Ireland. Something might be said about the distribution, and indeed would be said; but there was no denying the global reach of the Centre or the monumental amount of sheer work that it was accomplishing.

Which of course raised the obvious issue of who was doing the work. Donaldson’s analysis of how the Centre functioned in practice is a classic prescription for the organisation of all available resources for the achievement of a predetermined goal, such as would have gladdened the hearts of the German General Staff. ‘The Director and Deputy Director’, he explained,

are together responsible for the day-to-day running of the Centre . . . The Deputy Director oversees the HRC budget, whose detailed management is in the hands of The Faculties’ Business Manager. The Deputy Director also looks after the agenda for the Steering and Advisory Committees; HRC liaison committees, travel by Visitors to other Australian and New Zealand universities. The Director handles most of the correspondence and paper work. All incoming mail addressed to the Director or to the Centre is initially read and registered by the Secretary before being passed to the Director, who shows it to the Deputy Director before replying (or asking the Deputy Director or someone else in the Centre to reply). The Secretary places copies of all outgoing mail on a Day File, which the Director, Deputy Director and Research Officer read at regular intervals. The Secretary, the Director and the Deputy Director are thus all theoretically knowledgeable about everything that is happening in the Centre, and are able to deal quickly with enquiries on any matter. The Research Officer and the Deputy Director’s Secretary . . . are also well-informed about the running of the Centre, as is the Word Processor typist . . . Everyone knows their way around the files, and knows how to set about answering a problem . . . The six members of (academic and general staff) work essentially as a team.
This was the touchstone of the success of the HRC, not to say its survival: an organisation as small as that could do what it did only if all members did indeed work as a team. It was also the essence of Donaldson’s personal contribution: a team does not exist without a captain, and captaincy was a talent that Donaldson possessed in an exemplary degree.

It is also the essence of a team that its members can play different roles as required. And this versatility was called for particularly in the less academic functions of the HRC. ‘The total administrative workload in the Centre is heavy’, Donaldson told the Review Committee. ‘The Director and Deputy Director spend too much of their time arranging furniture for seminars, carrying typewriters from one room to another, waiting at airports, and driving out to University houses in distant parts of Canberra to await the connection of gas or electricity’. They would also in later years be expected to make the coffee, carry out the dishes and operate the dishwasher. But these activities were not what they were actually paid to do: the Centre was, Donaldson pursued,

badly in need of another member of administrative staff who might (for example) look after the HRC’s budget, liaise with University House and the University Housing Office, meet visitors at the airport, be responsible for equipment and furniture in the Centre, arrange for the hire of buses and vehicles and booking of venues, and so on. The social demands in a centre that is host to thirty or forty visitors each year are also considerable, especially as the generosity which Donaldson, Horan and Clarke had always shown to visitors had given rise to the very highest expectations in that area on the part of new arrivals. But the fact was that the Director and Deputy Director were there to do more than carry typewriters and wait at airports. Their jobs are extremely varied, extremely rewarding, and increasingly onerous. For a centre like the HRC to operate efficiently, it is essential that the Director and Deputy Director are able to maintain their own research, keep abreast of new developments in the humanities, talk in some depth to HRC visitors about the research projects which they have come to Canberra to pursue, stay in touch with former HRC visitors (whose number increases yearly) and with the local and overseas institutions mentioned
earlier in this submission. Ironically, the more successful the HRC becomes, the harder it is to do these things, and the greater the demand upon the Director and Deputy Director to act as assessors, reviewers, advisers, etc. on a variety of matters around the country and internationally.20

Just what the Director and Deputy Director had to do beside carry typewriters and wait at airports might be gathered from a record of their academic activities during 1987-89, for example. In brief, Donaldson continued his research on Ben Jonson and his general editorship of the Oxford University Press/HRC monograph series; taught regularly in the Department of English at ANU; lectured for the Department of History and supervised graduate students from the Departments of English and Modern European Languages at ANU; was on the Review Committees for RSPacS and the Canberra School of Arts and of course participated extensively in the HRC’s own review in 1987; lectured and gave papers at the Australian Defence Force Academy, the Universities of Melbourne, Adelaide, Macquarie and Oxford, in Lausanne and at the twentieth anniversary symposium of the Australian Academy of Humanities; served on various ANU committees and committees of the Australian Academy of Humanities; chaired the National Committee of the Arthur Boyd Australian Centre in Italy; was on the Advisory Committee for the National Dictionary Centre, the Australian Encyclopaedia Britannica Committee and the University of Edinburgh’s Australian National Fellowship Committee; was a Visiting Professor at Cornell and lectured extensively in the US in 1988; was elected in 1987 a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy and in 1989 to the Executive Committee of the International Association of University Professors of English. Clarke, in 1987-1989 prepared chapters on early Christianity in the Roman World for Volumes X and XII of the Cambridge Ancient History as well as a translation and commentary of the letters and fragments of Dionysius the Great; taught regularly in the Department of Classics and supervised graduate students for that Department; gave seminars in the Centre and in the Department of Prehistory and Anthropology; served on numerous ANU academic committees; chaired the Library committee; was a member of the Council of the Australian Institute of Archaeology in Athens, Treasurer of the Australian Academy of Humanities (serving on several of its subcommittees – publications, finance, language, library); was a Member of the National Committee for the Arthur Boyd Centre in Italy and advisory boards for Medi-
terranean Archaeology and New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity; co-led archaeological digs in North Syria; provided entries for the Anchor Bible Dictionary; and completed the editing of a volume of papers on Rediscovering Hellenism for Cambridge University Press. The Arthur Boyd Centre, incidentally, had originated in consequence of massive efforts by Donaldson and Clarke to get an Australian Centre established in Rome. Professor William Kent of Monash University finally succeeded in establishing a Centre at Prato, outside Florence, of which he became the Director.

There was one feature of this amazing record of achievement which might be regarded as an anomaly rather than a problem. It was certainly much easier to identify it than to suggest anything effective to do about it. Professor David Roberts of the department of German at Monash University told Donaldson that the composition of visitors was ‘clearly unsatisfactory, e.g. 92 visitors from the U.K. as compared with 3 from France or 4 from Germany. Oxford and Cambridge alone have provided 23 visitors compared with 15 from continental Europe as a whole. You can hardly be surprised if one concludes that the H.R.C. has confined its interest to Anglo-America e.g. 210 of the 230 visitors’, or 91.3%; and ‘has made no serious attempt to attract visitors from elsewhere’. Roberts considered that ‘positive discrimination is clearly indicated’ to break this pattern: the United States and Continental Europe ‘should provide about equal percentages of visitors, the U.K. should drop from over 40% to about 10%, Asia and Latin America should be actively targeted etc. In other words, a spread based on regional percentages should be worked towards’.21

Easy to say, not so easy to do: affirmative action or positive discrimination is always a delicate operation in academe; it was hardly surprising that European scholars might prefer to pursue European studies in Europe itself; it was not exactly a disadvantage that the HRC should be located in an English-speaking country, since probably more academics spoke English than any other language; and there was not much that could be done in the way of targeting scholars who preferred to work among people who spoke languages they were more familiar with. Twenty-five years later, 90.3% of all visitors to the HRC still came from the United States and the United Kingdom, and the proportion coming from Continental Europe had actually fallen. However, the HRC had attempted to redress the balance by devoting special theme years to Africa, Latin America and the Asia-Pacific, with the result that the number coming from Asia had significantly increased; there were far more New Zealanders; and the total
now included eight Latin Americans and seven Africans, the latter
admittedly all from Anglophone Africa.

What really mattered was the report of the Committee of Review
in 1987. This was as satisfactory as could reasonably be hoped for
in an economic and political climate so much more unfavourable to
the humanities than Max Crawford or Richard Johnson could have
contemplated in the comparatively benign sixties. The Committee
described its terms of reference as being ‘(a) to consider and advise the
Vice-Chancellor on future developments of the Humanities Research
Centre on the assumption that the present level of resources devoted
to the HRC continues’; ‘(b) to report on the relationship of the
Centre to the Faculty of Arts and to the Research School of Social
Sciences at the Australian National University’; and ‘(c) to comment
on the international standing of the Centre and its relationships with
universities and other organizations within Australia’. The option of
increasing the present level of resources was not on the agenda. It was
recognised that ‘Evaluation of enterprises such as the HRC pose special
problems . . . it is difficult to know what should count as success in
a venture based substantially on activities such as sponsoring visitors,
conferences and seminars’. A count of participants and publications
might have seemed as good a way as any to start. In any event, the
Committee concluded that in general ‘the HRC has been an outstanding
success. It has fulfilled its stated goals admirably and, in so doing, has
at modest cost brought much credit and visibility to the Australian
National University. The testimony before us from distinguished former
Visiting Fellows of the HRC was quite striking on one central point
viz. That the HRC has become known internationally in a wide range
of fields of the humanities for the distinction of its academic staff
and for the quality of the intellectual environment it has provided
for work at the highest level’. This high standing ‘rested substantially
on the academic leadership of its Director, Professor Donaldson, very
ably assisted since 1982 by Professor Clarke as Deputy Director’. The
conference programme of the HRC, the Committee recorded, ‘has
maintained a high standard of excellence and scholarly relevance . . .
providing a national forum for the exploration of major issues within
its mandate’; had ‘given a notable stimulus to humanities scholarship
within Australia’; and had ‘in general, established itself as a national
resource and the focus of a national network in the humanities’.

There were problems, of course; but these could not be said to be
of the HRC’s own making, except in the sense that some were the
price to be paid for its success. It was evident that the Committee
had painstakingly studied Donaldson and Clarke’s submission, and virtually accepted it in toto. The Committee noted that the total administrative workload in the Centre was substantial, and that the Director and the Deputy Director appeared ‘to be obliged to spend an excessive amount of their time in the routine administration of the Centre’. It was considered appropriate to emphasise as part of the success of the Centre, as Donaldson and Clarke had done, ‘the long standing contribution of the support staff’, the ‘bibliographic work of the Research Officer, Dr J.C. Eade’, and especially the efforts of the Secretary, Miss Mary Theo. Indeed, her position was ‘crucial to the efficient running of the Centre’, but was ‘particularly demanding’, and the Committee believed it ‘almost certainly to be under-classified’. The Centre had ‘an acute need for another member of administrative staff’ who might, for example, in Donaldson’s own words, look after the HRC’s budget, liaise with University House and the University Housing Office, meet visitors at the airport, be responsible for equipment and furniture at the Centre, arrange for the hire of buses and vehicles, the booking of venues, etc., etc. The Committee also noted that role of Research Officer had ‘special responsibility for publications’, did the ‘executive editing for the Centre’, and produced the Bulletin and the brochure ‘as well as engaging in in-house editing’. However, the Committee noted the anomaly that ‘Dr Eade seems to have more time for research than either the Director or Deputy Director’; and recommended accordingly that Donaldson, Clarke and Eade ‘should seek to reallocate routine tasks and resubmit their case for an expanded staff only after a period of some revision of the present situation’.

The Committee then addressed the issue of where the HRC should be located within the structure of ANU to the greatest benefit of the Centre itself and the University as a whole. There was no doubt that many of the Centre’s activities related ‘to disciplines housed in the Faculty of Arts and, accordingly the formal affiliation has proved of benefit to both sides’. However, it was also evident that the Centre ‘has its obvious intellectual links with RSSS and, to a lesser extent with RSPaCS’. It was accordingly considered that ‘significant advantages to the HRC may follow its being established as a structure within the IAS [Institute of Advanced Studies] and attached to the Research School of Social Studies’. The logic was compelling, prima facie at least: the HRC was not a teaching institution, although Donaldson had always given time to teaching in The Faculties; and it was conspicuously a forum for advanced study. The Committee accordingly concluded in
its final recommendations that:

1. the HRC, in the light of the quality of its performance, be regarded by the University as a centre of excellence;

2. the HRC be re-located within the Institute of Advanced Studies, attached to the Research School of Social Sciences’; and that:

3. consideration be given to funding the activities of the academic staff of the HRC on the basis of membership of the IAS.

It was also recommended that ‘the HRC should explore external sources of funding’. This could have seemed ominous. But Donaldson would ever strive to find practical solutions to difficulties, present or conjectural. He was certainly getting plenty of practice. He told the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professor R.G. Cushing, that he believed for example, that

named fellowships sponsored by the business community or the governments of other countries whose representatives are in Canberra might be achieved . . . It may also be worth considering launching an appeal for funds among former Fellows and Scholars for the endowment of a special Fellowship or an annual HRC lecture, possibly given by a former Fellow.22

The proposal to relocate the Centre back from The Faculties to the RSSS was in essence an exercise in survival: it was perceived that the rampaging Minister for Education John Dawkins had in mind to amalgamate The Faculties with the University of Canberra. Dawkins’ policy, as described in 2002 by his former fellow-Minister Barry Jones, was that ‘universities were required to adopt corporate governance models, to see themselves as trading corporations, not just communities of scholars. This’, Jones considered, ‘pushed many universities towards courses with strong, rising economic demand . . . Fifteen years down the track humanities were down, business and computer studies up. At Monash University in Victoria only 9 per cent of activity was in the humanities, 30 per cent in computers and Information Technology, marketing, management and accounting.’ Jones decided that all this added up to ‘the greatest mistake of the Hawke/Keating years’.23 What it certainly had done was accelerate a shift in the nature of academic structures which was presumably
irreversible: the number of students grew by 50 per cent between 1980 and 2000, the number of academic staff grew by only six per cent, Commonwealth funding fell by three per cent and the number of senior university managers increased by 300 per cent.

This was in the future, though the implications were clear enough. But the immediate problem was that amalgamation with the University of Canberra was likely to mean that the HRC would lose all independent identity which could mean that the HRC would lose all independence. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts himself supported the move to relocate to the RSSS, advising the Budget Committee of the University that ‘the HRC’s attachment to the Faculty is only nominal’. None of its business went through the Faculty. And this had the effect of inhibiting any possible growth for the Centre through competition for funds. ‘The move to RSSS’, by contrast, ‘would provide the HRC with a potential growth path that probably cannot be provided by Arts’; he could not ‘see the Faculty diverting teaching or research resources to the HRC in a substantial way’.24 It was also the case that HRC staff would be available for ARC grants if affiliated with The Faculties, but not if they were part of the RSSS. Also, there were shared appointments with The Faculties, some members of The Faculties being non-stipendiary visiting Fellows. Clarke told the HRC Steering Committee that the HRC would ‘ideally like to be a Centre having links with both Faculty and the RSSS’, although he realised the administrative difficulties. It was accordingly agreed that ‘the HRC should keep its options open for the time being’.25 Cushing appreciated this expression of preference: he wrote to Donaldson that he understood that the HRC’s preferred option is to stay as it is (in effect an autonomous unit loosely affiliated with the Faculty of Arts), but some mechanism be provided to allow it to compete effectively for funds to foster growth (e.g., to develop longer term projects without winding down existing activities). Strategic Planning may provide the most appropriate route to growth in present circumstances.26

Donaldson was quite prepared to accept that an association with the RSSS ‘could be of considerable benefit to the HRC’; and that ‘the HRC might in turn have something positive to contribute to the RSSS at this transitional time’, as he told Director of the RSSS Professor Paul Bourke. It was true that the Board of the RSSS had decided in
October 1976 against having the HRC affiliated with that School, on the grounds that it seemed too difficult to separate the Centre’s budget from that of the School; and that it was thought, rather improbably, that the Centre’s academic interests were too far removed from those of other Departments in the School for effective peer scrutiny to be achieved. There had also of course been the problem that the HRC might seem to be competing with or at least duplicating some of the operations of the History of Ideas Unit already within the RSSS. The Centre had accordingly been affiliated with the Faculty of Arts in 1977. This had the effect that the budget of the HRC was ‘administered by the Business Manager of The Faculties in consultation with the Centre, but normally without reference to the Dean of Arts’, who ‘nevertheless represents the HRC on the Faculties’ Resources Committee’. The disadvantages of this arrangement flowed mainly from ‘the HRC’s anomalous status as a research-only Centre located within The Faculties’. Bourke himself was however genuinely in sympathy with the role being played by the HRC and could see advantages in its playing this role within the School. The Review Committee accordingly recommended that the HRC be relocated within the IAS, attached to the RSSS, as had been proposed at the very outset. What made it particularly attractive this time around was that the RSSS had at present ‘a number of Departments and Units . . . whose work lies partly within the broad field of the humanities’; and several of the HRC’s recent themes ‘might profitably have been undertaken in close conjunction with the RSSS . . . the HRC’, Donaldson concluded, was ‘especially interested at the present time in the possibility of undertaking joint projects and appointing shared visitors with the RSSS itself’.

Donaldson was at pains to reassure his colleagues that the ‘re-location of the HRC that is envisaged is not geographical but administrative and budgetary’.27 There would be limits to the extent of the administrative and budgetary relocation as well. Bourke explained to the Advisory Committee that it was ‘not proposed that the HRC be fully incorporated as a new department or division within the RSSS with access to the research funds of the School and Institute. Rather, it was proposed that the HRC’s separately identified budget be managed through the Joint School’s Business Manager Office. It was hoped that the HRC and RSSS would thereby come into a closer academic relationship’. But closer to the RSSS would presumably mean further from The Faculties. Concern was expressed that the withdrawal of the HRC from The Faculties ‘would involve, or be
thought to imply, a further weakening of the already-imperilled humanities disciplines within the Faculty of Arts’. Withdrawal might of course never have been an issue if there had not been ‘some indifference towards the HRC by the Faculty of Arts within the ANU’, as Donaldson and Clarke observed. It was conceded in any case that ‘it might still be in the Centre’s own best interests to pursue an RSSS affiliation’; and the Committee ‘agreed that the question of RSSS affiliation should be cautiously but actively explored’.

What made the whole question of affiliation peculiarly urgent for Donaldson and Clarke was the fact that the terms of reference of the Review Committee had seemed to assume that the HRC would ‘continue without any apparent growth’. There was certainly little opportunity under the existing arrangement ‘for the HRC to benefit financially, e.g. by the Faculties coming to the HRC’s financial rescue . . . if there was to be any growth, the HRC had a strong chance to fare well in competing in a bid for funds within the RSSS’. But this ‘would not be possible if the Centre continued with the Faculties owing to competition with teaching enterprises’. Richard Johnson warned gloomily from long and bitter experience that ‘it would not necessarily be that a relationship with the RSSS would be any different’: the Centre ‘should take into account that there was a general suspicion of research for its own sake in the Australian community’. Things had not improved for the Humanities since 1969. They had got much worse.

But perhaps something could even be done about that. Graeme Clarke thought that ‘it seemed timely for the HRC now to consider adopting a slightly different style of life . . . organising, alongside its annual themes and short-term fellowships, a project of slightly longer duration (three/five years), which might attract a few additional appointments at Research Fellow/Senior Fellow level’. Such a project might be ‘some quite current topic in the humanities (e.g. defence of research funding)’. He and Donaldson were concerned at the disjunctions which were emerging in the seventies and eighties between what was being done by the staff of the Research Schools and what students were doing or rather wanted to be doing. They accordingly set out to visit other universities, attend lectures by other academics and in general attempt to discover for themselves what students were really interested in. Their aim was ever to discern the wave of the future, in order to keep the HRC at the cutting edge of academic investigations. This could mean investigating topics such as, for example, sex or religion, which were not regarded as areas
of appropriate investigation by the Research Schools, and which also could not be encompassed within the Eurocentric boundaries within which the HRC was still supposed to be confined.

Their first spectacular success in this provocative as well as proactive role was the resounding conferences on Feminism in 1986, which had attracted over 600 participants. But extending the activities of the HRC in this manner would inevitably mean more work, and more work had to mean more appointments, given the conditions of overstretch which the Centre was already enduring. Donaldson told the Review Committee that he ‘felt that the administrative work-load for all staff of the Centre had grown remarkably in recent years. He himself had explored (unsuccessfully) the possibility of a two-year respite from administrative duties in order to begin a large research project. There seemed a growing tension between administrative and research expectations for the staff of the Centre’. All this dedicated effort was however still bearing superb fruit, especially with regard to one of the prime objectives of the Centre, its interaction with other national institutions: ‘1987 had been a very successful year with regard to co-ordination with the [National] Gallery; the National Library had ‘diverted sums of money to various exhibitions in connection with the Centre’s conferences’; the Centre had also ‘enjoyed a close relationship with the School of Art and Music . . . often sharing speakers’; and relations with the Australian Academy of the Humanities were ‘quite close’.28

The year 1988 proved another excellent one for the Centre, although the Director was able to spend the first six months in the United States as Visiting Professor at Cornell and directing a seminar on Ben Jonson for the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington. He also lectured at the Universities of Chicago, Stanford and Princeton and campuses of the University of California (Los Angeles, Irvine, Santa Barbara and Berkeley) and at the California Institute of Technology.

The year 1988 had been the first year without a set conference theme since 1976. It was however naturally dominated by the bicentenary celebrations, and the Centre was fully involved in the planning and running of the Academy of the Humanities’ bicentennial conference in Sydney Terra Australis which was designed as a sequel to the 1981 conference series Australia and the European Imagination. It also provided however a further example of the facility of the HRC to interact with other universities: the Terra Australis conference was held in both Sydney and Canberra, a seminar was devoted to The Use of the Past which attracted 70 participants, and a second conference
on *The Roman Family* drew 65, which was twice as many as had attended the previous airing of that topic in 1981. Participants noted the developments in the field since the first conference and even since the important book resulting from that conference had been produced by Professor Beryl Rawson. There was in addition a seminar held in honour of the distinguished literary critic and Fellow of King’s College Cambridge Professor Frank Kermode, later Sir (John) Frank Kermode.

More new contacts and advances were made in 1989. The theme was ‘Film and the Humanities’, convened by Dr Roger Hillman of the Department of Art History and Film Studies at the School of Humanities, ANU, who considered later that the HRC had been ‘indirectly responsible for launching the current Film Studies Program at the ANU’, as Sasha Grishin had said of Donaldson’s support for the Fine Arts Programme in 1977. ‘Ian Donaldson and Graeme Clarke’, Hillman recalled, ‘boldly enlisted local, but largely inexperienced convenors, Leslie Devereux and myself, rather than going with

Professor Beryl Rawson.
established figures from outside. The dramatically steep learning curve ultimately generated momentum. New courses were established in the Arts Faculty building up to a major available as of 1995 . . .

I for one, but I’m sure many others too, will remain grateful for the wonderful start made possible by the HRC’.29 The documentary film festival associated with the conference drew 100 viewers over four days, while the conference itself extended the field of interaction of the Centre by drawing on the National Film and Sound Archive and AIATSIS, as well as the National Library and the National Gallery. The named seminar was in honour of Professor of Political Science at the University of Cambridge Quentin Skinner, as a tribute to Skinner’s very considerable impact on the study of political theory of the whole early modern period. In 1990 Skinner was to write: ‘You really did me proud, I at once reflected in inviting me to the Centre last year. I had a wonderful time, and I also learnt a lot. In fact it sent my work off in a new and I think very fruitful way’. And Graeme Clarke triumphantly recorded the appearance in print of the fourth volume of his monumental study of The Letters of St Cyprian, as well as editing Rediscovering Hellenism: the Hellenic Inheritance and the English Imagination, deriving from the 1985 conference series on Hellenism: Rediscovering the Past.

Professor Kermode had given the Centre what would surely have been to his mind the ultimate accolade, assuring Donaldson and Clarke that he did not think that he had ‘encountered higher standards anywhere on my travels, or for that matter in Cambridge’.30 There were of course still administrative matters to be tidied up, as always, of which the most pressing was the vital issue of funding, also as always. Advice was sought from Professor Don Aitkin, Chairman of the Australian Research Council. Aitkin was told that it was ‘not proposed that the HRC move from its present physical location within the A.D. Hope Building. Nor is it proposed that the HRC be fully incorporated as a new department or division within RSSS with access to the research funds of the School and Institute’, though this might have seemed almost the whole purpose of the suggested arrangement. Apparently what was in contemplation was merely that ‘the HRC’s separately identified budget henceforth be managed through the Business Manager’s Office in the Joint Schools’. It was hoped that ‘a re-location of the HRC on these terms would carry a number of administrative and academic advantages, and encourage a closer collaboration between the HRC and the RSSS’. The critical issue was whether it would carry any financial disadvantages. Aitkin was asked
to rule on ‘how such a re-location would affect the eligibility of HRC staff for ARC funding’. His response was that staff of the Centre would remain eligible to receive ARC grants ‘if their salaries come from that pool of funds within the University subject to the diversion of funds to the Australian Research Council for competitive re-allocation’. However, they would not be eligible to receive ARC grants if their salaries came from ‘that pool of funds which goes to support the activities at the Institute of Advanced Studies’.

It looked as if any advantages accruing from relocation were going to be mainly administrative and academic. However, Donaldson had meanwhile been ‘giving a good deal of thought recently to the possibility of obtaining additional outside funding for the Humanities Research Centre’, as the Review Committee had advised. He told the University Treasurer that he was ‘attracted by the possibility of establishing a few Visiting Fellowships endowed through private or foreign national funds, and of creating perhaps an annual “named” lecture, similar to the annual Esso lecture of the Academy of the Humanities . . . Fund-raising of course’, he pointed out, ‘takes time, skill and energy; and the reason we have not pursued these possibilities before is that the HRC is extremely short-staffed: neither Graeme nor I have felt that we could take on the job single-handed’. However, Ralph Elliott had been appointed Chair of the HRC Finance Committee, and Donaldson wondered if he ‘might now have time and inclination to act as the HRC’s chief negotiator in these matters’.

Ralph Elliott would seemingly always have time and inclination to further the interests of the HRC, and not just by serving on committees: he had served as Acting Director while Donaldson had been overseas briefly in 1981 and 1983; he had regaled the Centre with talks on the English of Thomas Hardy and on runic writing and mythology; he had been a most welcome Visiting Fellow in 1987; he performed effortlessly the role of Acting Director again when Clarke was absent on his annual two-monthly archaeological researches in Syria in May-June 1988; and he would assume the responsibilities of Librarian at the Centre in 1990, when that post was filled at last. His managerial style was also eminently suited to the Donaldson-Clarke regime: courteous, charming, prompt and unambiguous in defining priorities for the Centre. The human resources available to the HRC were limited in the extreme but they could not have been better suited to their mission.

The University Council had meanwhile resolved that ‘the Humanities Research Centre be affiliated with the Research School
of Social Sciences and that for administrative purposes the Centre be regarded as an entity within the Institute of Advanced studies’. However, the Centre was also to ‘take steps to strengthen its important relationship with The Faculties and in particular with the Faculty of Arts and to operate more effectively within the University as a whole’. It might have seemed that any steps in that direction would have to be taken by the University as a whole rather than the Centre. And there were other recommendations, perhaps easier to conceive than to implement: the Steering Committee agreed that ‘it seemed additionally important not to invite visitors exclusively from North America and the United Kingdom’, which indeed had never been the practice of the Centre, ‘and not to forget the question of gender balance’. How much the latter needed to be addressed was indicated by the fact that women accounted for just under 28% of some 608 visiting academics over the first 30 years of the Centre’s operations. Perhaps the only real solution was for universities worldwide to employ more women. Certain processes of evolution were however in train in academe: the Advisory Committee decided to vary the wording of the brochure of the Centre to read that the HRC interprets “the humanities” generously, recognizing that new methods of theoretical enquiry have done much in recent years to break down the traditional distinction between the humanities and the social sciences; recognizing, too, the importance of establishing dialogue between the humanities and the natural and technological sciences, and the creative arts. The Centre encourages interdisciplinary and comparative work, and seeks to take a provocative as well as supportive role in relation to existing humanities studies in Australia. It aims to give special attention to topics and disciplines which stand in need of particular stimulus in Australia at any given time.

Donaldson himself expressed the true raison d’être of the HRC in what was to be his last public address as Director of the Centre. Graeme Clarke and Dr Sue-Anne Wallace of the National Gallery convened a two-day symposium to coincide with the opening at the Gallery of Civilization: Ancient Treasures from the British Museum, at which National Gallery Director Betty Churcher welcomed Acting Director of the British Museum Jean Rankine. Not surprisingly it attracted 250 registrants. More than 100 others attended a conference
on *Shaping Lives* addressed by Philip Ziegler, and another 72 registered for a symposium on *Working outside the Academy*, described as being presented for a section of the intellectual proletariat, comprising both those who were securely placed inside the academy but wanted to reduce to part-time employment or quit altogether and those who had found an academic career-path closed to them, such as women with children or those who came to university courses relatively late in life.

It was at this symposium that Donaldson told how

In the early 1970s a German friend of mine, deeply troubled by what was happening in universities throughout the Federal Republic and much of the western world, told me with some bitterness that he believed the only “real” work in the humanities would from now on be done outside the academy. . . I wasn’t at all sure that the Humanities Research Centre we were trying to create in Canberra should be seen as lying wholly *outside* the academy, as constituting a kind of bunker within which scholars comfortably nest down and brood, unruffled, upon the eternal issues.

Such certainly never had been the case for the academic staff of the HRC, and in all conceivable likelihood never would be. Donaldson and Clarke had to this end established workshops for scholars working outside the academy, to advise them on how to survive by contract writing and other sources of non-academic income. As for research centres such as the HRC itself, Donaldson continued in words which conveyed everything that the Centre was ever designed to do and the utmost that it could ever aspire to do,

> seem to me vital agencies of change for the universities, a principal avenue through which, even in times of great financial hardship, new people, new ideas, new ways of thinking are constantly introduced into the academy . . . The architecture of such centres carries further symbolic messages about the relationship they seek to maintain with the rest of the world, the heavily fortified Humanities Research Center at Austin, Texas, with its armed security guards representing a kind of ultimate in the art of high-rise scholarly bunkering down (or up, or in, or out) . . . The
Centre here in Canberra is located in a building that has an openness and accessibility to the kind of role that we’ve hoped the HRC would play . . . The A.D. Hope Building stands at what is officially designated the entrance to the Australian National University . . . So here in the HRC we work not outside the academy but inside and alongside.37

It might be hoped that this vision would not be affected excessively by the eventual relocation of the Centre to an equally unfortified and far more gracious and welcoming but also far less open and accessible building at the opposite end of campus to the designated entrance to the University, perhaps alongside the academy but certainly not inside it.

But the time had come at last for handing over the baton. Donaldson and Clarke had agreed that they should alternate positions every five years. The Steering Committee sadly recorded on 31 July 1990 that Donaldson had announced that he would be relinquishing his position as Director on 3 August to take seven months’ Outside Studies Leave. He would then return to the Centre for another seven months before formally resigning in September 1991, to take up the post of Regius Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature at Edinburgh. Meanwhile, Clarke had similarly been granted leave for an Outside Studies Program in Syria from 15 August 1991 through 30 June 1992. Approval had been granted ‘subject to satisfactory arrangements in relation to appointment of an Acting Director of the Centre’ during Clarke’s absence. That of course meant Ralph Elliott, now Emeritus Professor, whom Clarke proposed be given the job ‘as from 15 August 1991 until the end of the calendar year in the first instance, the precise period of appointment being subject to review depending on the successful appointment (or otherwise) of a candidate to the presently vacant second Chair in the Centre’.

Elliott had always been agreeable to acting in Clarke’s stead for brief stints on previous occasions, on the understanding that there would be no remuneration with such appointments. However, this was to be for a term of six months at least; and Clarke accordingly advised Professor Geoffrey Brennan, Director of RSSS, that it ‘would be proper for Professor Elliott to receive an appropriate salary-loading during his period as Acting Director’.38 If only things were so simple. Elliott raised with Brennan

the question of the honorarium to be paid to me as Acting Director of the HRC. It now appears that Deryck
Schreuder will assume duty as Acting Director in early February 1992. This makes my own term a round 26 weeks. At the figure of $2000 which you suggested, this means a gross payment of $77 per week, which is reduced to $53 net after taxation. In other words, the proposed honorarium would be around $1380 net. As I am not in receipt of a professorial salary but of superannuation, Graeme Clarke’s suggestion that I receive “an appropriate salary-loading” during my period as Acting Director hardly applies. In view of the fact that I am carrying out all the duties of the Director, may I suggest that a more appropriate figure be arrived at . . . 39

It is a sound principle of both theology and the Labour Movement that the labourer is worthy of his/her hire. However, Brennan was constrained to explain to Elliott that ‘the University cannot, as I understand it, pay salary to its own retirees’. So a more appropriate figure was not on the board. The official solution was for the University instead to invite Professor W. S. Ramson to ‘act formally as the Acting Director, nevertheless I hope that it will be possible for you to assist him in the day-to-day management of the Centre’.40 That of course meant, as Elliott informed Clarke, that ‘Bill Ramson is de jure, while I am de facto. I do all the work, and I suspect that Bill is getting all the wages! Never mind!’41 Ramson was also able to see the funny side, which indeed he was in a position to see: he told Elliott that he was ‘happy to authorise payment to you to attend the “Histories in Culture” conference, in your capacity as Acting-Acting’.42

Donaldson’s term was coming to an end. It had been a reign of seventeen years as Acting Director and Director, interrupted only by a year’s study leave in 1977-78, six months in 1988 and this seven months’ break. It was also a record of service and achievement that deserved to be celebrated in the most civilised and eloquent terms. And there was no more civilised and eloquent voice in the University than that of Ralph Elliott, that ‘stalwart symbol of continuity’ as Donaldson delightfully termed him. Elliott began by applauding Donaldson’s scholarly achievement, for which the most appropriate term was ‘tireless’ and of which the pinnacle at that moment was his ‘1985 Oxford Authors edition of [Ben] Jonson, all 787 pages of it’. But there was also his record as ‘stimulating, much respected, indeed loved, teacher’; he had ‘given invited lectures at about 40 universities and numerous conferences in Australia, Europe, the People’s Republic of China and the United States of America’; he ‘held
visiting appointments, acted as member of electoral committees for fourteen chairs of English, and served in various editorial capacities from his Oxford days as Co-editor of Essays in Criticism to the present day'; and his ‘involvement as chairman or as member of numerous committees both at Oxford and in Canberra, ranging from the Oxford Experimental Theatre Club to the Australian National Dictionary project’ testified to ‘his willingness to serve in any capacity in which his wisdom and his wide academic experience could be usefully employed’. His achievement in so many and varied fields in the Humanities has been justly recognized by his Fellowships of the Australian Academy of the Humanities and the British Academy. ‘But it is here, at the HRC’, Elliott observed gracefully, that Ian Donaldson will be most affectionately remembered – and missed. There was no model in Australia, and not many overseas, to which he could turn when appointed Foundation Director of the Centre. But he had his vision of a haven where scholars in the Humanities from Australasia and overseas could pursue their work in congenial surroundings, take part in informal discussions as well as in more formal seminars and conferences, and return to their homes or home institutions refreshed and invigorated. His vision never left him – and it was amply fulfilled. Seventeen years and nearly eighty conferences later, some 260 Visiting Fellows as well as almost 400 Conference and other Short-Term Visitors from places as far apart as Warsaw and Wellington, Binghamton and Beijing, have been welcomed to the HRC . . . From all around the world grateful tributes continue to arrive from scholars who have successfully completed projects begun or continued at the Centre . . . The HRC is still the only one of its kind in Australia. Its reputation and that of its Foundation Director have made it, in the words of a former Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University [Professor Peter Karmel], “the Jewel in the University's Crown”.43

It had achieved that distinction because Donaldson and Clarke had made it a place where Visiting Fellows were assured of every encouragement to pursue whatever it pleased them most to pursue: ‘the main thing’, Donaldson had told John Docker, ‘is to enjoy the research you’ll be doing in your time at the HRC’. Such a libertarian
approach could be deployed effectively only in an atmosphere of superlative scholarly standards. It was. Docker recalls that he ‘always felt a little nervous’ talking to Donaldson, to the extent that he wondered at times if he was getting his use of the subjunctive in English right. Anybody who can make Australians feel concerned about getting their subjunctives right would have to project a rare aura of scholarly refinement.

But perhaps what John Henry Newman would have called the real note of Donaldson’s directorship had been that he had made it his aim always to be there: there to hail and farewell visitors, there for the camaraderie of every morning and afternoon coffee break, there to
chair every seminar and to ask the first question; and Ralph Elliott or Graeme Clarke would always be there when he could not be. That was what inspired all the multitude of tributes to the hospitality, civility and grace that had become the identity of the HRC. That was the tradition he had created. That was the legacy he left.
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