

3. H. Ian Hogbin: ‘Official adviser on native affairs’¹

Geoffrey Gray

Herbert Ian Priestley Hogbin² was born in England in 1904 and emigrated with his family to Australia in February 1914. He attended school in Leeton, in country New South Wales, and then Fort Street High School in Sydney. He attended the University of Sydney, on an education bursary, where he completed, in 1926, a Bachelor of Arts and a Diploma in Education.³ Hogbin attended Radcliffe-Brown’s lectures on social anthropology—Anthropology I and Anthropology II—in the newly formed Department of Anthropology.⁴ Faced with a shortage of fieldworkers, Radcliffe-Brown persuaded—as Hogbin remarked later—a scarcely prepared twenty-two-year-old to join an expedition to Rennell Island and Ontong Java in 1927. Hogbin’s fieldwork was the first research conducted under the auspices of the Australian National Research Council (ANRC). Those scholars considered for fellowships ‘should be men of unusual promise [who] should be assured of either a definite University post or of a connection with teaching, research or scientific work having a direct bearing on some biological aspect of human welfare’.⁵ He was awarded his MA in Anthropology (for his work on Ontong Java) on 12 August 1929, the same year he left for the London School of Economics (LSE) to write his doctoral dissertation under Bronislaw Malinowski—later published as *Law and Order in Polynesia* (1934).

Hogbin considered himself a Malinowskian functionalist, although he owed his interest and development in social anthropology to Radcliffe-Brown. In

1 H. Ian Hogbin to Camilla Wedgwood, 20 April 1944, Wedgwood Papers, National Library of Australia [hereinafter NLA], MS 483, box 1.

2 Hogbin changed his name by deed poll. He informed the Registrar: ‘I recently discovered that my name is not what I had thought it was. Would you therefore have it altered in future editions of the [University] Calender. I am entered as “Herbert William Hogbin”: my name is really “Herbert Ian Hogbin”.’ H. Hogbin to Registrar, University of Sydney, 18 March 1929, University Administration, File G3/187, University of Sydney Archives. He inexplicably added ‘Priestley’. His birth certificate names him Herbert William Hogbin, b. 17 December 1904. Against how the rest of the family pronounced their name Hogbin, he pronounced it ‘Hobben’. Personal communication, Rosemary Stanley (Hogbin), 1 April 1994.

3 He thanked Dorothy Griffith Taylor: ‘You know quite well that if it had not been for you I could not have been an anthropologist, don’t you? If you had not come to my rescue with a loan when Radcliffe Brown first made me the offer I might now be teaching! (awful thought).’ Hogbin to Taylor, 10 September 1934, Hogbin Papers [hereinafter HP], University of Sydney Archives.

4 Hogbin took his lecture notes with him to Rennell and Ontong Java, where they fell overboard, but he successfully retrieved them. They are deposited in the Hogbin Papers, University of Sydney Archives.

5 Edwin E. Embree to Orme Masson, 27 May 1926, Elkin Papers [hereinafter EP], University of Sydney Archives, 155/4/1/1.

September 1934, soon after *Law and Order* was published, he wrote to Dorothy Griffith Taylor, younger sister of Thomas Griffith Taylor, associate professor and foundation head of geography in the University of Sydney:

I do not know if I have told you before...I have completely lost respect for Radcliffe Brown's scientific theories and with that tumbled all regard for his person. He is a vain silly man—also I fear a very unhappy one. At the same time...I have a regard for him in that he made me an anthropologist. The book [*Law and Order*] of course *ought* to have been dedicated to Malinowski, only that would not have been right—I owe too much to Radcliffe Brown. Also naturally it was impossible when he wrote the Introduction, I wrote and told [Malinowski] how sorry I was that I could not at least group his name with Radcliffe Brown, and he very kindly wrote back to say that he would like to have me dedicate my next book to him, and he was sure that it would be a better one anyway.⁶

Hogbin returned to Sydney in 1931. He spent most of 1932 and 1934 first in Guadalcanal and Malaita in the British Solomon Islands Protectorate (BSIP) and then in Wogeo (Schoutten Islands) in the Australian-administered Territory of New Guinea (TNG), a League of Nations mandate. On his return, he was appointed temporary lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Sydney to teach Melanesian ethnography—a position made permanent in 1936. Hogbin made the University of Sydney his academic base for the rest of his career, while regularly visiting London on sabbatical leave. He used these visits to develop his love for Italian Renaissance painting in the galleries of Europe, Baroque architecture, the theatre and opera.⁷

Notwithstanding Sydney being close to his geographical areas of interest, he was on the lookout for other academic positions. In 1937 he applied unsuccessfully for the Chair at Johannesburg, and was undecided about an opening at Aberdeen; he asked Raymond Firth to keep him in mind should there be 'any [other] suitable openings'.⁸ He also applied for a position at Cambridge in early 1938.⁹ It indicates that not all was well with Sydney, particularly Hogbin's professional and personal relationship with his Professor, A. P. Elkin.

Like anthropologists of the time, he spent long periods in the field, rarely returning, however, to conduct follow-up research, which is a feature of

6 Hogbin to Taylor, 10 September 1934, HP.

7 Jeremy Beckett and Geoffrey Gray, 'Hogbin, Herbert Ian Priestley (1904–1989)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography. Volume 17* (Melbourne, 2007), p. 539.

8 Hogbin to Firth, 16 July 1937, Archive of Sir Raymond Firth, British Library of Political and Economic Science, London School of Economics, London School of Economics and Political Science [hereinafter FIRTH], 8/1/52.

9 Hogbin to Firth, 3 May 1938, Reference for H. I. Hogbin (application to University of Johannesburg), 18 March 1937, FIRTH8/2/2.

present-day anthropology. His primary anthropological interests were social and cultural change, depopulation and colonial administration, which shifted after the war into a more orthodox ethnography, illustrated by his publications in the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁰ He published widely on many of these topics and his Malaita study was published as *Experiments in Civilisation: The effects of European culture on a native community of the Solomon Islands*, published in the same year as World War II was declared.¹¹ *Experiments in Civilisation* was a 'pioneer study of a society in the process of change'.¹² It was, in his own estimation, of

theoretical importance, in that the process of culture change is a phenomenon of great sociological significance; but it has in addition practical relevance, since the analysis of the actual results of attempts by European agents to transform native societies along lines they consider desirable shows whether they are in fact achieving what they seek and whether there are any unsuspecting developments of their activities.

He drew on African colonial policy and practice, which 'for the most part [were] more progressive than in the South Seas, with the object not only of indicating possible lines of development, but also furnishing...practical assistance to administrators and missionaries'.¹³ We see this suite of interests appear in his war research in the BSIP and in his advice to the Australian New Guinea Administrative Unit (ANGAU), which carried out all the functions of the prewar government as well as providing assistance and advice to the civilian postwar PNG Government.

At the outbreak of war with Germany, Hogbin was teaching, his career seemingly secure and promising. Hogbin enlisted on 17 April 1942 several months after war with Japan was declared. Before the war, Hogbin had developed a loose association with a literary coterie at the university that included A. A. 'Alf' Conlon, Ian Maxwell from the English Department, the poets Alec Hope, Harold Stewart and James McAuley and a young Donald Horne; it seemed to Horne that 'everyone in this circle adopted a pose of contempt for everything that was happening in the intellectual wasteland it was their misfortune to find themselves in'.¹⁴ Hogbin fell into the category of people Elkin 'disapproved of strongly: the "anti-personality"—people who questioned the system'. The relationship between Elkin and Hogbin was, not surprisingly, fraught. Elkin was

10 See list of publications in Fisher Library card catalogue, University of Sydney.

11 He had not returned to the Solomon Islands after 1943 and was 'therefore in no position to prepare a major revision...and bring it up to date'. H. Ian Hogbin, *Experiments in Civilization: The effects of European culture on a native community of the Solomon Islands* (London, 1939), p. xiv.

12 Ibid., p. xiv.

13 Ibid., p. 3.

14 Cassandra Pybus, *The Devil and James McAuley* (St Lucia, Qld, 1999), pp. 9–10; also Alan Barcan, *Radical Students: The old left at Sydney University* (Melbourne, 2002).

the antithesis of the more refined and elegant Hogbin, and Elkins' biographer concedes that Hogbin had advantages of style and substance over his more senior colleague: 'striding up and down in front of the students with a cigarette between his fingers, [Hogbin] was widely read, cultured, liberal, brilliant, a witty lecturer.'¹⁵ Theirs was a mutual dislike that predated the war,¹⁶ and was exacerbated by it.

War

Soon after he enlisted, Hogbin was appointed to the National Morale Committee (NMC), headed by Conlon.¹⁷ Conlon hand-picked its members from among his personal allies: Alan Stout (Sydney University philosopher), Roy ('Pansy') Wright (Professor of Physiology at the University of Melbourne),¹⁸ Hogbin and Julius Stone (Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Sydney). Hogbin and Stone had written the interim report on the need for such a committee. In January 1943, Hogbin and Wright were sent to northern Queensland to investigate morale. They spent three weeks in Cairns, Townsville and Rockhampton, and 'although in that short period a full and complete investigation of the problem was not possible, we feel that we can, with confidence, put forward a number of recommendations'. They delivered their report to Conlon on 1 February.¹⁹ Perhaps the lack of action is explained by the Morale Committee and its members, especially Conlon, being seen as intruders by the traditionalists in the bureaucracy.²⁰ As a first foray into influencing the formulation of policy by Conlon, it was hardly successful. Notwithstanding, it created the beginnings of a network of intellectuals, academics and professional men who would influence government policy during and after the war.²¹

Early in 1943, as Hogbin remembered it, he 'offered his services'—although it is more realistic to say that his services were asked for—to Sir Philip Mitchell, High Commissioner for the Western Pacific.²² As a member of the British Solomon

15 Tigger Wise, *The Self-Made Anthropologist: A life of A. P. Elkin* (Sydney, 1985), p. 138.

16 'I do detest him [Elkin] so.' Hogbin to Mary Turner Shaw, 3 June 1949, HP.

17 For further discussion on morale and the NMC, see John Pomeroy, 'Morale on the Homefront in Australia During the Second World War', PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1995; and Pomeroy's chapter in this volume.

18 Following Wright's biographer, I have used the nickname 'Pansy', but it is also spelt as 'Panzee', 'Panz' or 'Panzy'. Peter McPhee, *'Pansy': A life of Roy Douglas Wright* (Melbourne, 1999), pp. 25–6.

19 *Civilian Morale in North Queensland* (Report by Dr R. D. Wright, Professor of Physiology in the University Melbourne, and Dr Ian Hogbin, Lecturer in Anthropology in the University of Sydney, to Major A. A. Conlon, Chairman of the Prime Minister's Committee on National Morale), 1 February 1943, National Archives of Australia, Canberra [hereinafter NAA], A5954/1, 328/21.

20 Pomeroy, 'Morale on the Homefront in Australia During the Second World War', p. 263.

21 McPhee, *'Pansy'*, pp. 50–71; H. C. Coombs, *Trial Balance: Issues of my working life* (Melbourne, 1983), pp. 197–8; Geoffrey Gray, "'The next focus of power to fall under the spell of this little gang'": Anthropology and Australia's post war policy in Papua New Guinea', *War & Society*, 14:2 (1996), pp. 101–17.

22 High Commissioner from 21 July 1942 to 1 January 1945.

Islands Defence Force, he was set the task, for which he was well qualified, of looking into the question of 'Native courts and Native counsellors', the results of which were published in 1944.²³ All his recommendations were accepted.²⁴ In 1945 a new set of regulations, 'Instructions to natives', was promulgated. Hogbin approved of these changes, adding that indirect rule was 'beginning to take definite shape'. He hoped that the newly established civil administration in Papua and New Guinea 'will be as fully alive to its responsibilities and follow the example of its enlightened neighbour'.²⁵ He wrote a confidential report, *Big Gela and Olevuga-Vatila Sub-districts, Florida. Report to Colonel O. C. Noel, Resident Commissioner, BSIP, October 1943*, which examined a range of matters including the loyalty of Solomon Islanders and reasons for Solomon Islander resentment towards the British. He described the way in which the villagers greeted the incoming Americans and their dissatisfaction with the withdrawal of British officials in the face of imminent Japanese attack. He told Elkin that his main task was to make a month's investigation at the village he worked at in the 1930s (described in *Experiments in Civilization*) and a 'short tour of the more heavily devastated areas where the [British] administration is now experiencing considerable difficulty'.²⁶ These were also matters that he addressed during and after the war with regard to Papuan and New Guinean people who were caught in the competing and often conflicting demands of wartime allegiance and loyalty.

On his return to Sydney, in early November 1943, Hogbin recalled that 'almost immediately' he was appointed to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the AIF. In April that year Conlon had convinced Major-General Victor Stantke, Adjutant-General of Land Headquarters, to form a small research section under his command.²⁷ Most of those who were part of the NMC were appointed, and it expanded and became the Directorate of Research under Sir Thomas Blamey, Commander-in-Chief of Australian forces.²⁸ (It was only in April 1945 that it became the Directorate of Research and Civil Affairs.)²⁹ Hogbin told Jeremy Beckett that he 'went up to New Guinea and did various jobs for Conlon and the administration generally',³⁰ but this downplayed his work and his role. Elsewhere, Hogbin described himself as 'official adviser on native affairs to

23 H. Ian Hogbin, 'Native Councils and Native Courts in the Solomon Islands', *Oceania*, 14:2 (1944), pp. 257–83. Hogbin was awarded the 1944 Royal Anthropological Institute's Wellcome Medal for this essay.

24 Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) Archives, MS 185, item 204.

25 H. Ian Hogbin, 'Notes and Instructions to Native Administrators in the British Solomon Islands', *Oceania*, 16:1 (1945), pp. 61–9.

26 Hogbin to Elkin, 18 September 1943, HP.

27 For Stantke's memory of his meeting with Conlon, see John Thompson (ed.), *Five to Remember* (Melbourne, 1964), pp. 101–2.

28 Pybus, in this volume.

29 I have referred to the Directorate of Research as the directorate; after April 1945, I have used the acronym DORCA.

30 Jeremy Beckett, *Conversations with Ian Hogbin* (Sydney, 1989), p. 26.

the High Command of the Western Pacific'.³¹ In March 1942, the Allied South West Pacific Command was formed and US General Douglas MacArthur was appointed Supreme Allied Commander South West Pacific Area. The South-West Pacific was clearly defined and was one of two theatres of World War II in the Pacific; it included the Philippines, the Netherlands East Indies (excluding Sumatra), British Borneo, Australian-controlled Papua and New Guinea and the British Solomon Islands. Notwithstanding his diverse war work, Hogbin spent most of his time during the war in Papua and New Guinea.

One of Hogbin's first tasks with the Directorate of Research was to study the effects on village life following the Army's use of native labour—that is, the removal of men from the village thus disrupting the social and economic life of people. These men were employed to support actual operations as carriers and stretcher-bearers. They were also engaged in tasks such as road making, clearing, construction of storage sheds and camps, and stevedoring. In bald terms, the number of New Guineans who were employed by ANGAU in June 1944 was 35 958—up from 2033 in June 1942.³² Hogbin spent short periods at various places as is indicated in the proposed itinerary: 'Depart...April 26 [1944] for a couple of days at Lae: then Benabena: then Gusap...then Wau to collect records of court cases only: then up the coast from here [Finschhafen] to accompany a patrol making first contact with reconquered villages.' He was unable 'to see the whole of New Guinea, [and] confined [himself], except for Port Moresby, to the former Mandated Territory', and, with the exception of Manus and Bougainville, he 'spent a few weeks in every other Administrative district which had been freed of enemy occupation'.³³ He was confident that he would produce a 'report which ought to be of value—though whether it will be acted upon is another matter. Briefly, the stink is appalling: at one place I was so angry that I couldn't sleep (largely, I suppose, because I felt it wise to remain silent)'.³⁴ Another member of the Directorate of Research and Civil Affairs (DORCA) with experience in New Guinea commented that the 'longer the smell of Angau clings to the POs [patrol officers], the less use they will be in their proper administrative functions'.³⁵ After this survey of labour conditions, Hogbin began, in September, his research at Busama, a village south of Lae, located in an area that was for the better part of 18 months at the 'front line' and

31 Hogbin to Wedgwood, 20 April 1944, Wedgwood Papers, NLA, MS 483, box 1.

32 J. D. Legge, *Australian Colonial Policy: A survey of native administration and European development in Papua* (Sydney, 1956), p. 185.

33 See also Diary, Native Labour Survey, March to June 1944. During this trip, he travelled, at various times, with his colleagues from the directorate Camilla Wedgwood, James McAuley and Conlon, as well as E. J. (Eddie) Ward, the Minister for Territories. He also managed to go on a 'bombing mission' (10 June 1944).

34 Hogbin to Wedgwood, 20 April 1944, Wedgwood Papers, NLA, MS 483, box 1.

35 McAuley to Wedgwood, 10 September 1946, Wedgwood Papers, NLA, MS 483, box 1.

for many months under Japanese occupation'³⁶—where the native people had been 'accused of treachery' by ANGAU officers.³⁷ Hogbin's report was critical of ANGAU's recruitment practices.

In his reports and correspondence, Hogbin was critical of ANGAU's leadership and its staff—unlike his estranged colleague W. E. H. Stanner, who was laudatory, particularly of Morris and the Adjutant-General, Donald Cleland. Stanner, a constant critic-from-within of the directorate and particularly critical of Conlon, Kerr and Hogbin ('the triumvirate'), commended Major-General Basil Morris, Commander-in-Chief of ANGAU, and doubted whether 'any other General Officer could do better'.³⁸ Hogbin thought Morris was not up to the task, later describing him as a 'boofhead'.³⁹ Hogbin's assessment of the situation was contrary to that contained in an internal ANGAU report—*Report on the activities of Angau in respect of native relief and rehabilitation in the Territory of Papua and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea*—which covered the period from February 1942 to September 1944.⁴⁰ It is probable, however, that the ANGAU report was in part a response to Hogbin's *Report of an investigation of native labour in New Guinea*—an investigation conducted between March and mid-June 1944.⁴¹ Hogbin concentrated almost exclusively on the situation in the Territory of New Guinea. He assailed all aspects of ANGAU's labour control and what he saw as the abuse and misuse of New Guinean labour in working for officers in the Army's mess, building and decorating gardens, acting as personal servants and such like and being kept therefore unnecessarily away from their home villages with the effect that village social and economic life was deprived of physically fit men. He was concerned that many New Guineans had suffered 'considerable loss of property and foodstuffs as a result of the war' (p. 4), which would improve once men were returned to their villages. He was also critical of the Native Labour Officers: 'the majority of these men have no real interest in native welfare and [are] chiefly concerned with maintaining or increasing employment figures for the sake of their promotion' (p. 5). Hogbin also produced a report on *The natives of the Salamaua Coast, a preliminary report by Lieutenant-Colonel Ian Hogbin forwarded to Brigadier Cleland for perusal* (7 October 1944), in which he recommended that indentured labourers should be 'freed' to return

36 Camilla Wedgwood to Elkin, 9 February 1946, EP, 160/4/1/80.

37 H. Ian Hogbin, *Transformation Scene: The changing culture of a New Guinea village* (London, 1951), p. 10.

38 Appreciation of Current Situation and Problems of ANGAU by 1943, W. E. H. Stanner, Territories Administration, n.d. [c. November 1943], Australian War Memorial [hereinafter AWM] 54, 80/6/17. See the chapter on Stanner in this volume.

39 Interview of H. Ian Hogbin, 25 April 1971, University of Papua New Guinea Library, AC33/10.

40 *Report on the activities of ANGAU in respect to native relief and rehabilitation in the Territory of Papua and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea February 1942 – September 1944*, NAA, AS 13/35, NN ANGAU.

41 *Report of a investigation of native labour in New Guinea carried out on instructions from the Director of Research by Lieutenant-Colonel Ian Hogbin during the period March to June 1944*, n.d. [22 pp.], copy in HP.

to their villages to produce food.⁴² He also declared that both the Australian and the American Armies made use of New Guinean labour far beyond operational requirements.

Hogbin was of the opinion that the percentage of indentured labourers was too high, pointing out that anthropologists like himself believed 25–30 per cent of adult males removed from the villages had the potential to undermine the whole social structure. He favoured somewhere about 5 per cent.⁴³ Powell, in his history of ANGAU, suggests that Hogbin was overstating the situation and that ANGAU did what it could in the circumstances to ensure indentured labour was properly looked after and repatriation of labour to their home villages could commence once the need for their services abated—that is, when '[m]ilitary demands lessened'.⁴⁴ But the home villages nonetheless continued to suffer and the demands of the Australian Army took precedence.⁴⁵ In fact, patrol reports from the districts visited by Hogbin confirmed the deleterious effects of labour recruitment on village life.

In contrast with Hogbin's harsh assessment—but more in line with that produced by ANGAU—was Stanner's observation of the labour situation. He declared that service with ANGAU had

definitely improved the native. His control has been firm, but just; his physique has improved from the excellent housing and rations he receives; he has learnt the value of discipline and his added responsibilities; he has a far more extensive appreciation of health and hygiene matters; he has been taught how to produce more and better food within his own village.

Stanner believed this would ensure that 'when the European returns, or decides to settle in New Guinea he should be well-served with efficient and contented labour'. If this proved to be the case then 'most of the credit should go to the

42 Copy in HP. Ian Downs comments on these changes in *The Australian Trusteeship in Papua New Guinea, 1945–1975* (Canberra, 1980), pp. 15, 38–9.

43 Hogbin, *Transformation Scene*, p. 9.

44 Alan Powell, *The Third Force. ANGAU's New Guinea war, 1942–1946* (Melbourne, 2003), pp. 194–8; W. E. H. Stanner, *The South Seas in Transition: A study of post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction in three British Pacific dependencies* (Sydney, 1953), p. 82. See also Hank Nelson, 'Payback: Australian compensation to wartime Papua New Guinea', in Yukio Toyoda and Hank Nelson, *The Pacific War in Papua New Guinea* (Tokyo, 2006), pp. 320–48.

45 Peter Ryan, 'The Australian New Guinea Administrative Unit (ANGAU)', in K. S. Inglis (ed.), *The History of Melanesia: Second Waigani Seminar* (Port Moresby/Canberra, 1969), pp. 531–48; also Geoffrey Gray, 'The coming of the war to the territories: forced labour and broken promises', Unpublished paper presented to Remembering the War in New Guinea, 19–21 October 2000, Australian War Memorial, Canberra.

personnel of ANGAU because of his efforts on behalf of the native during the war period'.⁴⁶ This was not their first disagreement over the conditions of employment and condition of indentured labourers by ANGAU.

Indentured labour had long been criticised particularly by missionaries and humanitarian groups calling for its reform but preferably its abolition. In December 1944, the Minister, E. J. Ward, convened a conference on the future of 'Native Labour' in a postwar Papua New Guinea. Elkin chaired the conference. Hogbin, the only other anthropologist besides Elkin, represented the directorate. It was at this conference that Ward announced that indentured labour would be phased out.⁴⁷ This led to the repatriation of all indentured labour after the war. Downs stated that 'there was no practical alternative that would have stopped the growing unrest of people who had suffered greater privations and disturbance of their lives than any section of the public on the Australian mainland'.⁴⁸

There had been established in February 1942 a War Damage Commission, which covered white residents in the Australian territories of Papua and New Guinea who had been 'unfortunate enough to suffer loss as a result of war operations'.⁴⁹ In October 1944, the Commonwealth Government set up the Native War Damage Compensation Committee to recommend a just and practicable plan for compensating natives in Papua and New Guinea for loss of or damage to land and property, or death or injury, arising from military operations, or 'from causes attributable to the existence of a state of war in the Territories'.⁵⁰ There is little doubt that Hogbin's report contributed significantly to the establishment of such a committee. Hogbin was appointed to the committee headed by J. V. Barry, a Victorian barrister, and which included Major James (Jim) Taylor of ANGAU—an experienced prewar district services field officer. Barry spent only eight days in Papua New Guinea so that most of the work fell onto Hogbin and Taylor.⁵¹ The committee reported to the Government in August 1945.⁵² Hogbin was assisted by K. E. 'Mick' Read⁵³ whom he had had transferred to the directorate from army duty at Mataranka, Northern Territory, where he was a general clerk in the traffic section of the 8th Australian Army Ordnance Division;⁵⁴ he

46 W. E. H. Stanner, 'ANGAU', November 1944, AWM, 54/80/2/1; cf. Lucy Mair, *Australia in New Guinea*, Second edn (Melbourne, 1970), pp. 198–218; Neville Robinson, *Villagers at War: Some Papua New Guinea experiences in World War II* (Canberra, 1979); Yukio Toyoda and Hank Nelson (eds), *The Pacific War in Papua New Guinea: Memories and realities* (Tokyo, 2006); Downs, *The Australian Trusteeship in Papua New Guinea*, pp. 38–9.

47 For a report of the conference, see NAA, MP742/1, 274/1/246.

48 Downs, *The Australian Trusteeship in Papua New Guinea*, p. 39.

49 Hiromitsu Iwamoto, 'Patrol Reports: Sources for assessing war damage in Papua New Guinea', in Toyoda and Nelson, *The Pacific War in Papua New Guinea*, p. 349.

50 'Compensation to Natives', NAA, MP742/1-5/3/167.

51 Legge, *Australian Colonial Policy*, pp. 85–7; also Hogbin, *Transformation Scene*, pp. 19–21.

52 Downs, *The Australian Trusteeship in Papua New Guinea*, pp. 40–1.

53 Hogbin to Patience, 14 May 1944, NAA, MP 742/1, 274/1/245.

54 Hogbin to Grand, 30 March 1944, NAA, MP 742/1, 274/1/245.

arranged for Read's promotion from corporal to sergeant.⁵⁵ The committee was exceptional 'in its comprehensiveness, in the time and effort demanded by government officials, in expenditure, and in the direction of funds and effort to ordinary villagers it was an extraordinary policy and even more extraordinary application of a policy'.⁵⁶ The membership of the committee, especially Taylor and Hogbin, predisposed it to be generous towards Papuan and New Guineans and not make moral judgments about the loyalty or otherwise of Papuans or New Guineans.⁵⁷ As a result of the committee's recommendations, the Australian Government introduced a broad scheme providing compensation for deaths, injury and loss of property that were 'directly or indirectly connected with the war'.⁵⁸

Aside from Hogbin's *Transformation Scene*, Read's resulting report on the Markham Valley is the only anthropological publication dealing with the effects of war on New Guineans. Read studied five villages, but concentrated on one: Ngarawapum. There, as a result of contact with Australian soldiers, the locals had come to see the prewar period as a different time, a time when they were not treated as men. Following the war, they looked towards their own new order. Following this research, Read taught at the School of Civil Affairs, and wrote up the results of his research as an MA thesis, under the supervision of Elkin at Sydney University.⁵⁹ He then left for London, where he completed his doctorate at the LSE in 1948, and returned to the Australian School of Pacific Administration (ASOPA) where he stayed for 18 months before taking up a position at The Australian National University (ANU).⁶⁰ He returned to New Guinea in 1951–52.⁶¹ In 1956, he moved to the University of Washington, Seattle, first as a visiting, then as a permanent, professor. He did not return to Australia.⁶²

55 Conlon to Camp Comdt, LHQ, 1 November 1944, NAA, MP 742/1, 274/1/245. Hogbin 'fitted' Read for work in New Guinea by advising him to study Malinowski's *Coral Gardens and Their Magic* and *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*; Williams' report on the Vialala Madness; and Father J. Murphy's *Book of Pidgin English*. Hogbin to Grand, 30 March 1944, NAA, MP 742/1, 274/1/245.

56 Nelson, 'Payback', p. 341. See also Hogbin, *Transformation Scene*, pp. 19–22.

57 Nelson, 'Payback', p. 342. The recommendations of the committee can be found in Hogbin, *Transformation Scene*, pp. 20–1.

58 Nelson, 'Payback', p. 342.

59 Kenneth E. Read, 'Native Thought and the War in the Pacific: A study of the effects of the Pacific War on a native community of the Markham Valley, Australian Mandated Territory of New Guinea', MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1946; Read, 'Effects of the War in the Markham Valley, New Guinea', *Oceania*, 18:1 (1946), pp. 95–116. There has been subsequent work done on indigenous people and the Pacific War—most notably, a series of essays in Geoffrey M. White and Lamont Lindstrom (eds), *The Pacific Theater: Island representations of World War II* (Melbourne, 1990).

60 Dorothy Shineberg, 'The Early Years of Pacific History', *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 20 (1996), pp. 3, 14 n. 4.

61 He was awarded the first Research Fellowship in Anthropology at The Australian National University. From his research among the Gahuku Gama in the Highlands of New Guinea, he produced what is now considered a classic ethnography, *The High Valley* (London, 1966).

62 Personal communication, Kenneth E. Read, 15 August 1993.

Post war, Hogbin concentrated his research on one village, Busama, located on the upper part of the west coast of the Huon Gulf, north-eastern New Guinea. Initially, he was asked by the Army to investigate the village of Busama 'to see whether the people had been guilty of treachery'.⁶³ He argued that such conceptions were irrelevant, no doubt taking his cue from legal advice provided to the Compensation Committee by Justice F. B. Phillips (previously Chief Judge in New Guinea), who 'pointed out that it was impossible for Papuans and New Guineans in war to distinguish between a *de facto* and a *de jure* government, and acts such as leading Japanese soldiers along tracks did not make them collaborators'. His work for the Army enabled Hogbin to pursue his ethnographic interests: culture contact, changing society and enlightened, anthropologically informed colonial administration (already evident in the earlier *Experiments in Civilisation*). Camilla Wedgwood commented on the value of Hogbin's research: 'with his long stay at Busama...[he] has collected invaluable material on pretty well all aspects of the effects of the war on native life in an area which was for a long time in the "front line" and for many months under Japanese occupation'.⁶⁴

At war's end, Hogbin remained attached to DORCA as a member of the School for Civil Affairs (later the ASOPA when it moved its location from Duntroon in Canberra to Mosman in Sydney) and the Pacific Territories Research Council, which, Conlon and his colleagues anticipated, would oversee all research in Papua New Guinea and the South-West Pacific. Hogbin and Wedgwood were consulted extensively during the framing of the Papua New Guinea Provisional Administration Bill, which was adopted in July 1945.⁶⁵ Two other members of DORCA, Julius Stone and J. R. Kerr, were directly concerned with its drafting.⁶⁶ In a letter to Elkin, Hogbin gloated that he had written Ward's speech—often called a 'New Deal for Papua New Guinea'. He informed Elkin that Ward 'spoke very well indeed, adapting the material he had...from me to the needs of the occasion'.⁶⁷ Ward referred to the failure of past governments and invoked the theme of indebtedness and promised New Guinean advancement. In fact, much of this argument can be found in the pamphlet *Development and Welfare in the Western Pacific* (1943) as well as Julius Stone's *Colonial Trusteeship in Transition* (1944).⁶⁸ The common element, and one shared by most of the DORCA members who were interested in the colonial question, was that development—economic,

63 Beckett, *Conversations with Ian Hogbin*, pp. 32–5. Neville Robinson has produced an oral history of Busama during the war. Robinson, *Villagers at War*, pp. 128–64.

64 Camilla Wedgwood to Elkin, [?] 9 February 1946, EP, 160/4/1/80.

65 Geoffrey Gray, 'The passing of the Papua New Guinea Provisional Administration Bill 1945', in Hank Nelson, Nancy Lutton and Sue Robertson (eds), *Select Topics in the History of Papua and New Guinea* (Boroko, PNG, 1969), pp. 37–42.

66 David Wetherell and Charlotte Carr-Gregg, *Camilla: C. H. Wedgwood, 1901–1955: a life* (Sydney, 1990), p. 181; McPhee, 'Pansy', p. 65.

67 Hogbin to Elkin, 22 July 1945, EP, 197/4/2/573.

68 H. Ian Hogbin and Camilla Wedgwood, *Development and Welfare in the Western Pacific* (Sydney, 1943), pp. 1–31; Julius Stone, *Colonial Trusteeship in Transition* (Sydney, 1944), pp. 1–32.

social and political—was an imperative but that it should occur at a pace to which New Guineans (and colonised peoples generally) could readily adapt. In fact, it could be said that they did anticipate independence movements as had occurred in some African colonies, and possibly might never concern Papua and New Guinea.⁶⁹

In some ways, it can be concluded that Hogbin's career reached an apogee: he was the applied anthropologist *par excellence*, conducting research, providing what we now call evidence-based research informing policy; he provided not only policy advice but also made recommendations on how policy should be implemented.⁷⁰ He was an adviser to the minister (Ward) and to the Administrator, J. K. Murray; his opinion was sought on a range of government policies. His optimism and enthusiasm were fired by the appointment of Murray, whom he considered 'first class', to the position of Administrator. With Murray's appointment, of which Hogbin told Firth he 'can claim a big share' as he 'first suggested his name to the Minister and lobbied like hell in Canberra on his behalf', there was the possibility 'we'll get somewhere' in reforming colonial policy and practice.⁷¹ It was, in retrospect, Hogbin's Indian summer.

Hogbin, Wedgwood and Stone were not the only ones who wrote on the need to change and reform colonial policy and practice. A number of interested individuals and groups including missionaries outlined their ideas for a new order in the colonial governance of 'Native Peoples' in Melanesia and the South-West Pacific in general. Included in this is the debate occurring in San Francisco on the matter of colonial governance and the problem of trusteeship.⁷² The Australian Institute of International Affairs hosted a small study group that published a number of discussion papers: *Culture contact in the Pacific* by J. W. Burton, *France and the Pacific*, by R. F. Jackson and *Self-determination in Burma*. Elkin published *Wanted—A charter for the native peoples of the South West Pacific* in 1943; the Anglicans George Cranswick and Ian Shevill published *A New Deal for Papua* (1945). Many stressed the sense of indebtedness and moral duty to assist in the development of Papua New Guinea. But it was the group formed by Conlon that had the greatest influence on the development and formulation of colonial policy in Papua New Guinea in the immediate postwar period—a

69 It placed colonised people—forever in a state of transition—'in the waiting room of history'. See Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference* (Princeton, NJ, 2000); also Amit Chaudhuri, 'In the Waiting Room of History', *London Review of Books*, 24 June 2004, pp. 3–8.

70 H. I. Hogbin, 'Our Native Policy', *Australian Quarterly*, 15 (1943), pp. 100–8; H. I. Hogbin, 'Developing New Guinea and the Future of the Natives', *Australian Journal of Science*, 5:5 (1953), pp. 133–5.

71 Hogbin to Firth, 22 September 1945, FIRTH, 8/1/52.

72 See, for example, Huntington Gilchrist, 'Trusteeship and the Colonial System', *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 22:2 (1947), pp. 95–109. See also [H. E. Hurst], *The Pacific Islanders: After the war what?* (Geelong, Vic, 1944); Cyril Belshaw, *Island Administration in the South West Pacific: Government and reconstruction in New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, and the British Solomon Islands* (London, 1950); W. E. H. Stanner, *The South Seas in Transition: A study of post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction in three British Pacific dependencies* (Sydney, 1953).

position well recognised by W. E. H. Stanner. He was critical of the 'new deal', declaring that 'the policy adumbrated was inherently almost unadministrable in the concrete circumstances of application, and there was undoubtedly an initial misconception of the scale, the intricacy and the phasing of the "new deal" task'.⁷³ Notwithstanding, many commentators and historians observe that there was no formal policy as such; rather it was a policy developed, Downs explains, by J. K. Murray, taking his 'guidelines from Ministerial statements to Parliament and the press'.⁷⁴ As indicated in the introduction to this book, this is an area requiring further investigation.

Relations with Elkin

Relations between Hogbin and Elkin worsened during the war and continued to deteriorate thereafter. The appointment to the directorate of Hogbin, Wedgwood and later the British colonial affairs expert Lucy Mair, to advise on colonial policy and teach at the School of Civil Affairs, meant Elkin was bypassed on all matters to do with the South-West Pacific.⁷⁵ Elkin's biographer comments that he 'ground his teeth with rage at this reversal of roles'.⁷⁶ Elkin wrote 'reprimanding pieces into addresses', which were most likely directed at colleagues such as Hogbin and Wedgwood. He wrote such things as 'some personalities become objectionable when placed suddenly in a position of authority which enables them to put other people in their place. They will have to construct themselves afresh to fit into a team.'⁷⁷

Hogbin's relationship with Elkin, although professional, was often uncomfortable, tense, at times bitchy and vengeful. Hogbin nonetheless could be quick to take offence, as is illustrated in the following exchange between Hogbin and Wedgwood: he wrote to Wedgwood that in the course of the letter he had sent to Elkin he mentioned that the job of investigating the labour situation in Papua and New Guinea was 'so gigantic' that he 'despaired of doing anything at all'. What he expected from Elkin is unclear but he was disappointed. He went on: 'You'd have thought he'd have given a little encouragement in his reply. Not a bit of it. "I realise the job is gigantic", he said, "but you can't really do anything at all unless you sit tight in one place and make a detailed study"'.⁷⁸

73 Stanner, *The South Seas in Transition*, p. 118.

74 Downs, *The Australian Trusteeship in Papua New Guinea*, p. 37.

75 See Geoffrey Gray, "'I was not consulted": A. P. Elkin, Papua New Guinea and the politics of anthropology', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 40:2 (1994), pp. 195–213.

76 Wise, *The Self-Made Anthropologist*, p. 151.

77 Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 151.

78 Hogbin to Wedgwood, 20 April 1944, Wedgwood Papers, NLA, MS 483, box 1.

Part of Hogbin's postwar work was lecturing in anthropology at the ASOPA when it moved to Mosman. This created administrative problems for Elkin. Elkin had noted the establishment of the School of Civil Affairs, stressing that '[s]everal anthropologists who have trained in, and/or have been on the staff of, the Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney, and have done research under the auspices of the Australian National Research Council, will be assisting the school'.⁷⁹ The school, as has been stated previously, was to train candidates for military and postwar civilian government in Papua and New Guinea and other Allied-occupied territories, including Borneo and Morotai, in law, anthropology, government and geography, in courses of three months' duration.⁸⁰ Conlon and his advisers intended that the school continue after the war as a civil institution to fill 'the serious gaps in the training of field staff for Papua and New Guinea'.⁸¹ It was a direct challenge to Elkin's department and its prewar function of training officials for the colonial service. The School of Civil Affairs therefore represented an ever-present threat to the authority and hegemony of Elkin and the future of the Sydney University Anthropology Department. It was a contest not only over the training of colonial officials but at its heart also over who would be best positioned to influence the formulation of colonial policy and the research agenda.⁸² Elkin did all he could to retain the importance of the Sydney department and his own standing as Australia's sole expert on Aboriginal Australia. It was exacerbated by a lack of funding, as well as being understaffed in a university that was struggling financially.⁸³ Stanner had already commented on the danger to the survival of the department as result of the ASOPA and the planned national university in Canberra and the possibility of the withdrawal of the Commonwealth Government subsidy for the training of cadets. Camilla Wedgwood offered a more pessimistic prognosis for Elkin's department:

[T]he condition...of Anthropology at the University...is a tragedy when one remembers that it is the only Anthropology Dept in Australia. But I doubt whether anything can be done to improve things so long as Elkin is in the Chair...It looks at present as though the Dept. might die out during the next five [years], its place being taken by the anthropological section of the planned School of Pacific Studies in the National University of Canberra, but even the success of that section depends upon finding the right man to run it. Hogbin is the obvious person but I don't think

79 Elkin, 'Notes on Anthropology and the Future of Australian Territories', *Oceania*, 15:2 (1944), p. 87.

80 McAuley to Wedgwood, 10 September 1946, Wedgwood Papers, NLA, MS 483, box 1.

81 This reflects Murray's assessment. Brian Jinks, Policy, 'Planning and Administration in Papua New Guinea, 1942–52', PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1976, p. 152.

82 See Geoffrey Gray, *A Cautious Silence: The politics of Australian anthropology* (Canberra, 2007), pp. 173–202.

83 J. A. Barnes, *Humping My Drum: A memoir* (Self-published: <www.lulu.com>, 2006), pp. 249–363; also Gray, "'I was not consulted'"; Gray, *A Cautious Silence*, pp. 203–16.

he would be the right man; he has no qualities or experience as an administrator, and I do not think he has the qualities to inspire younger workers, and encourage them to reach out and think for themselves. His own ideas are so clear cut that he finds it hard to make due allowance for different points of view. We are certainly short of anthropologists of experience and sound training over here [Australia].⁸⁴

Elkin was not due to retire for almost another decade and until then little would change.

After the war there was an increase in the number of students attending university (many of them returned servicemen and women), and presenting for anthropology courses at the university put increased pressure on the small staff of the department as well as ensuring its continuance as a teaching department.⁸⁵ As a consequence, Elkin asked Hogbin to resume full-time lecturing duties, but Hogbin resisted, wishing to continue lecturing at the ASOPA. Elkin informed him that it was not possible. Hogbin was undecided as to what he should do. He wrote to Firth:

My own future is completely in the air. The university is clamouring for my return next year (in part I firmly believe because Elkin dislikes me having a finger in so important a pie). But there are three other problems: the continuance of the School of Civil Affairs at Canberra, the New Guinea Government asking me to inaugurate a Department of Anthropology here [University College, Canberra], and the Commonwealth is toying with the idea of getting me to do a study of the number of labourers who can safely be permitted to leave the villages without destroying the native economy. And in addition I have had a request from the Solomon Islands Govt...to do a job for them.⁸⁶

Notwithstanding, he returned to the university in 1946 but continued lecturing part-time at the ASOPA. His workload had increased dramatically:

[L]ecturing here at the University (with 3 times the usual number of students), lecturing at the School of [Pacific] Administration, and spending my vacations in New Guinea as adviser to the Government there—I have just returned from 2 weeks up there—is proving far too strenuous for a permanent diet.⁸⁷

84 Wedgwood to Firth, 24 November 1946, FIRTH8/1/136, part 2.

85 For further discussion on these matters, see Geoffrey Gray, 'Managing the Impact of War: Australian anthropology and the South West Pacific', in Roy M. McLeod (ed.), *Science and the Pacific War: Science and survival in the Pacific, 1939–1945* (Dordrecht, 2000), pp. 187–210.

86 Hogbin to Firth, 22 September 1945, FIRTH8/1/52.

87 Hogbin to Firth, 19 September 1946, FIRTH8/1/52.

In early 1947, Elkin appointed the linguist and Anglican priest Arthur Capell to a readership in the department, overlooking Hogbin's claims for promotion. (Elkin had appointed Capell to a lectureship in 1944, which he confidently 'anticipated...would advance to Senior Lecturer'.)⁸⁸ Hogbin was furious. Hogbin told Firth, one of his confidants, that he needed 'an audience [such as Firth] which knows the fact[s]' about his relations with Elkin. He explained that applications (from Capell and Hogbin) for two readerships were

considered first by a Committee of the Professorial Board. And after the meeting of the Committee Elkin came & told me that the Committee had turned me down & advised therefore that I withdraw the application before it reached the Board. This I did. The Board was to meet at 2p.m. today [Friday 27 June]. And at 12.30 [Professor] John Anderson came down to know why my application had been withdrawn. So I told him. Whereupon he enquired was I aware that Capell had had an application approved by the Committee. I was dumbfounded. However. I then got my spies to work & found that Elkin had come to the Committee stating that he wanted 2 readerships in anthropology. The rest said don't be silly: so he added, well, if I can only have one, it must be Capell: he is a unique linguistics expert. So Capell gets his Readership over my head.

It was, as Hogbin pointed out, a preposterous situation 'that an outsider would find...beyond belief'. Firth offered him sympathy:

Not only from what you say in your letter but also from what I gather from Camilla [Wedgwood, a] really scurvy trick has been played upon you. Quite apart from questions of relative seniority and the like. It really is a most unhappy affair, and I understand that the situation in the department has not been too cheerful altogether.⁸⁹

Soon after, the situation with regard to the readership took a new turn but remained unresolved. The Vice-Chancellor appointed a committee to investigate the 'whole question of readerships'. But in Hogbin's mind, Elkin's 'conduct still stands as a monument of duplicity and vindictiveness'.⁹⁰ What Hogbin did not know was that at the end of 1945 Elkin had proposed Stanner as a reader, if he could find the funds.⁹¹ (It is, however, unclear whether Elkin was serious as he held ambivalent views on the ability of Stanner and his work ethic; the motive might simply have been to thwart Hogbin.)⁹² A result of the board's inquiries was that the question of readerships in the department was addressed

88 Elkin to Stanner, 8 December 1944, and Registrar to Elkin, 6 March 1945, EP, 197/4/2/573.

89 Firth to Hogbin, 27 June 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

90 Hogbin to Firth, 5 July 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

91 Stanner to Firth, 10 September 1945, FIRTH7/7/31.

92 Geoffrey Gray and Doug Munro, Australian Aboriginal anthropology at the crossroads: finding a successor to A. P. Elkin, Unpublished manuscript.

again. Hogbin and Capell were appointed readers in 1948. Elkin begrudgingly accepted the decision but the situation between the two men deteriorated even further. Hogbin told Firth that Elkin

grows more impossible daily...and I doubt whether I can stick it much longer. His latest move is to take it on himself to establish night courses in Anthropology 1 next year. The announcement was made to me in these words. 'We are to have night courses in Anthropology I next year. You are the one affected as you will have to do the lectures'.⁹³

Their disagreements did not end there. In late 1948 Hogbin heard from J. W. Burton, President of the Australian Methodist Church, that Elkin 'has had himself and Capell appointed as consulting anthropologists to the S[outh] Seas Commission'. Hogbin saw it as 'a nasty slap in the eye for me...[Douglas] Copland [Vice-Chancellor of the ANU] was furious about it when I told him'.⁹⁴ In recognition of Hogbin's long field experience in Melanesia, Firth had asked him to prepare a report on anthropological research in Melanesia preparatory to outlining a research program for the new Department of Anthropology at the ANU.⁹⁵ Firth, in his capacity as Academic Advisor on Pacific Studies to the ANU Interim Council, had written earlier to the South Seas Commission setting out a desire by Pacific Studies to cooperate 'in any way possible with the work' of the Research Council of the commission. This could take the form of undertaking 'responsibility for one or other of the research projects which your Council has not felt able to undertake at the present time'.⁹⁶ This offer was ignored. It was only after he read the *Progress Report No. 6* of the South Pacific Commission, and Elkin's report on anthropological research, that Firth expressed his dissatisfaction to Harry Maude, Executive Officer for Social Development, who was responsible for such appointments:

May I say to you privately that I think [Elkin] underplayed the possible cooperation of the Research School of Pacific Studies...and...it [is] a great pity that he made so little mention of Hogbin...I know the latter is a matter of personal difference, but I think scientific justice would have given more credit. The omission of Hogbin's name from the acknowledgements in the preface is, of course, very marked.⁹⁷

Hogbin, keen to distance himself from Elkin, successfully applied for an ANU (travelling) scholarship, which enabled him to spend six months in England in 1948. It meant considerable financial sacrifice, but it was a welcome respite from

93 Hogbin to Firth, 3 December 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

94 Hogbin to Firth, 19 August 1949, FIRTH7/1/12.

95 Firth to Elkin, 22 March 1948, EP, 174/4/2/178. See Ian Hogbin, 'Anthropological research in the Pacific', n.d., ANU Archives, Series 19, General files, file 6.1.1.0, H. Ian Hogbin.

96 Firth to Maude, 27 October 1949, FIRTH7/7/22.

97 Firth to Maude, 3 March 1951, FIRTH7/7/22.

Elkin.⁹⁸ Hogbin continued to seek employment overseas. He told Firth he ‘might apply for the advertised’ Oxford lectureship and asked if Firth would act as a referee;⁹⁹ he did not ‘expect to get it as Fortes tells me they don’t want anyone senior’; nor did he ‘really...want to go to Oxford’.¹⁰⁰ His ambivalence and indecision are characteristic of his approach to other possible academic positions. He told M. Turner Shaw, who did the maps and diagrams for *Transformation Scene*, that he had ‘been told I can have the advertised readership to found a dept [department] at Manchester for the asking. I am not asking. Auckland is also advertising for a (new) professorship. But I don’t think I am interested in that either.’¹⁰¹

The future of ASOPA remained uncertain and discussions on its future had reached an impasse of sorts with a showdown between the minister and the Secretary of the Department of External Territories, J. R. Halligan. Notwithstanding, it seemed the ASOPA would most likely go ahead but a decision about its future absorption by the ANU would not be considered for some time, although this seemed unlikely. Despite these reservations, Hogbin entertained the possibility of accepting a position in the ASOPA, but he was not sure whether he wanted to abandon an established academic institution. He was, however, considered for a position at the ANU. Firth was asked by the ANU Interim Council for advice and an assessment of the potential candidates for the anthropology professorship in the School of Pacific Studies.¹⁰² He dismissed the possibility of Elkin, who was ‘an Australian specialist’ and not suitable; ‘someone rather different is needed at Canberra’. Hogbin, on the other hand, deserved

very serious consideration...He has put in years of research in New Guinea and the Solomons and is a first rate field worker. His relations with Government also appear to be very good. I know him very well and have a very great respect for his capacity. However, my feeling is that he would not be the best person to occupy the Chair of Anthropology, and be responsible for the ultimate standard of teaching and research. The test which I apply in my own mind to a Professor of Anthropology in the Pacific Studies School is—how would he get on with my best postgraduate students—could he handle them intellectually? Theoretical anthropology of that order is not Hogbin’s forte; his capacities lie in other types of analysis. My feeling, then, is that while he is most certainly a person who should be offered a Readership in the new School, a

98 Hogbin to Firth, 3 December 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

99 Hogbin to Firth, 11 January 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

100 Hogbin to Firth, 31 March 1947, FIRTH8/1/52.

101 Hogbin to Shaw, 18 January 1949, Hogbin to Shaw, 12 February 1949, HP. Stanner applied unsuccessfully for this position. Max Gluckman was awarded the readership, which he had upgraded to a professorship. David Mills, *Difficult Folk? A political history of social anthropology* (New York, 2008), p. 101.

102 Firth nominated Audrey Richards, Meyer Fortes and S. F. Nadel as the only candidates for the position.

Professor should be looked for elsewhere. This, I think, would be the judgement of colleagues here. He would, I think, be interested in such a post and, if he did well, a Chair of Applied Anthropology might be created for him later.¹⁰³

S. F. Nadel was appointed Foundation Professor. Hogbin and Stanner were offered readerships. Firth advised Hogbin to

write as soon as you can to the Registrar, telling him that you understand from me that a Readership in Anthropology is being established at the University with the title of Readership in Social Anthropology, that you wish to apply for it, and send him if you would a brief indication of your qualifications.¹⁰⁴

Once positive replies from Hogbin and Stanner had been received, the advertisements could be placed in the newspapers. It was unclear how much notice Sydney needed but Hogbin hoped to be 'technically free from Elkin' as quickly as could be managed. After visiting Copland, Vice-Chancellor of the ANU, Hogbin anticipated starting from 1 January 1950.¹⁰⁵

There was considerable discussion over remuneration, with Hogbin wanting more than Stanner and Stanner insisting he receive the same as Hogbin. Firth recommended that both Hogbin and Stanner receive the same amount.¹⁰⁶ It might have been dissatisfaction with this decision that led Hogbin to withdraw his application, although he had stated earlier that he would not want to live in Canberra if he had a choice. Other factors might have been a concern about his superannuation and pension, which were tied to the NSW Public Service and were not transferable to the ANU.¹⁰⁷ A permanent position at Sydney in those circumstances far outweighed what was offered at the ANU. There was also potential conflict with Stanner. It might have been personal, as Firth hinted, which stemmed from their time together at DORCA.¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, he might have decided to wait out Elkin's retirement—due in five years—with the hope he could possibly engineer someone who was more congenial to his interests and demands. Hogbin had little interest in the position, as he disliked the administrative side and the responsibilities that went with a professorship. J. A. Barnes, who replaced Elkin, noted that Hogbin 'held fast to his policy of using his position as Reader to steer clear of administrative tasks as much as

103 Firth to ANU Vice-Chancellor, 25 January 1949, FIRTH7/5/8.

104 Firth to Hogbin, 22 July 1949, FIRTH7/7/12.

105 Hogbin to Firth, 19 August 1949, FIRTH7/1/12.

106 Firth to Copland, 22 October 1949, FIRTH7/1/12.

107 Hogbin to Hohnen (Registrar), 15 November 1949, FIRTH7/1/12.

108 Firth to Nadel, 3 December 1949, FIRTH7/1/12. See Geoffrey Gray, "A chance to be of some use to my country": Stanner during World War II', in Melinda Hinkson and Jeremy Beckett (eds), *An Appreciation of Difference: WEH Stanner and Aboriginal Australia* (Canberra, 2008), pp. 33–41.

possible'.¹⁰⁹ To make matters a little more congenial for himself, he ensured he spent most of 1950 and 1953 in London, well away from Sydney. The immediate problem for Firth, however, was what the ANU should do now that Hogbin had declined the readership. There were two consequential matters, one of which was Hogbin's 'projected visit to New Guinea', which was part of his fellowship with the ANU. The other was Hogbin's offer 'to continue to advise on research matters especially the Melanesian field', which Firth advised Nadel to accept. As to readvertising the position, it was decided to 'hold it over for a period'.¹¹⁰ It was not readvertised.

Thwarting Elkin

When Elkin retired in 1955, Hogbin realised that he would not be offered the chair, if only because of serious opposition from Elkin himself. But neither did Hogbin want the chair and the administrative responsibilities inseparable from a professorship. Rather, his purpose was to prevent a continuation of the Elkin legacy by foiling the appointment of Elkin's chosen successor. Elkin lobbied on behalf of Ronald Berndt, his former student, commending him to the university appointment committee. Hogbin counter-lobbied even more strenuously through backstairs intrigue, sending and receiving a stream of letters to and from friends and associates, pressing his case and fuelling the rumour mill. A sense of urgency was imparted when his old foe Stanner declared his interest, leading Hogbin to urge the youthful Maurice Freedman of the LSE to submit an application.¹¹¹ Happily, another strong candidate, John Barnes, also applied: 'In any case, how much better either [Freedman or Barnes] would be than Berndt!'—or Stanner or Cyril Belshaw, who, if appointed, would 'not only [be] a tragedy for Sydney but for the future of anthropology in Australia'.¹¹²

In the event, Barnes was appointed, which foiled Elkins' best-laid plans. It was a satisfactory outcome for Hogbin but the fact remains that Barnes's appointment had nothing to do with his machinations.¹¹³ It was also an opportunity for renewal and reinvigoration and the setting of a new direction for what had become a moribund, narrow and stagnating department. Barnes worked hard in the interests of change and betterment, but without material assistance from Hogbin, who continued to evade administrative responsibility and refused to develop new undergraduate courses, content to continue delivering the same

109 Barnes, *Humping My Drum*, p. 273.

110 Firth to Nadel, 3 December 1949, FIRTH7/1/12.

111 Hogbin to Firth, 11 April 1955, FIRTH8/1/52.

112 Hogbin to Firth, 20 April 1955, and Hogbin to Firth, 6 June 1955, both in FIRTH8/1/52.

113 See 'Chair of Anthropology 1955', University of Sydney Archives, G3/190; Gray and Munro, *Australian Aboriginal anthropology at the crossroads*.

ageing lectures.¹¹⁴ Dispirited by the under-funding and the general lack of academic achievement at Sydney University, Barnes was appointed to the Chair of Anthropology at the ANU following the sudden and unexpected death of S. F. Nadel in 1956. By then, Berndt was at the University of Western Australia and he decided not to apply on this occasion for the Sydney job. The successful applicant was W. R. (Bill) Geddes, and again Hogbin interfered with the selection process from the sidelines. He opposed the appointment of Geddes and they did not get on.¹¹⁵ But Geddes did usher in a period of stability, which enabled Hogbin to settle down to teaching—something he enjoyed—and writing. He did not return to Papua New Guinea except for short visits in the 1970s.¹¹⁶

Jeremy Beckett, who interviewed Hogbin in the early 1980s, told me that he tried on several occasions to get Hogbin to talk about his war experiences but to little avail. In his interview with Beckett, Hogbin played down his role in the formulation of Ward's 'New Deal' and skirted over his war work including the work of DORCA and his time with them as well as the Barry Compensation Commission. Yet the war can be seen as a high point for an anthropologist who was interested in applied anthropology. He was an advisor to two colonial administrations both during and after the war. It was a time he was most involved at a senior government level in the formulation and implementation of colonial policy—a role he continued after the war: 'for some years I was advising [the Administrator, J. K. Murray] on anthropological matters...after Murray's retirement', he ceased regular trips to Papua New Guinea.¹¹⁷

The multiple opportunities offered during and after the war, particularly the ANU readership—all of which he declined—suggest a stalled career and a man who wanted no further adventure or political involvement. This might have been in part due to the impact the Cold War had on Australian political life and thinking. He might have become disillusioned with the Realpolitik of colonial politics. He remained Reader at the University of Sydney until his retirement in 1970. He was, however, productive, publishing a number of monographs on his research in Wogeo and Guadalcanal.¹¹⁸ On his retirement, he took an adjunct professorial position at Macquarie University, where he taught one day a week.

114 Barnes, *Humping My Drum*, p. 262.

115 Beckett, *Conversations with Ian Hogbin*, p. 31.

116 Personal communication, Jeremy Beckett.

117 Beckett, *Conversations with Ian Hogbin*, p. 31.

118 H. Ian Hogbin, *A Guadalcanal Society: The Kaoka speakers* (New York, 1964); H. Ian Hogbin, *Kinship and Marriage in a New Guinea Village* (London, 1964); H. Ian Hogbin, *The Island of Menstruating Men: Religion in Wogeo, New Guinea* (Scranton, Pa, 1980); H. Ian Hogbin, *The Leaders and the Led: Social control in Wogeo, New Guinea* (Melbourne, 1987). There is also a *Festschrift*: L. R. Hiatt and Chandra Jayawardena (eds), *Anthropology in Oceania: Essays in honour of Ian Hogbin* (Sydney), 1971.

