

Introduction

Geoffrey Gray, Doug Munro and Christine Winter

So much Australian history is written by intellectuals, so little is written about them.¹

During the twentieth century, intellectuals were mobilised during times of war. They had a number of choices: conscription in the armed forces that compromised their status as intellectuals; contribution to the war effort by adapting their role as intellectuals to a new set of circumstances and needs of the nation;² or opposition to the war. While there 'is copious evidence of intellectuals' desire to contribute to the war effort qua intellectuals, there is not always agreement about the precise role of the intellectual in the wartime order of things'.³ Australian and New Zealand social scientists—our primary focus—were conscripted or volunteered for armed duty, or contributed by adapting their expertise to the war effort. *Scholars at War* explores the use of Australian and New Zealand social scientists, and contextualises their experiences and contributions within wider examinations of the role of intellectuals in war.

Scholars at War links a group of social scientists through geography, transnational, national and personal scholarly networks, and shared intellectual traditions. A collective or group biography involves 'a comparison of several lives or analysis of a number of lives together, linked through a central theme'.⁴ This grouping enables comparisons to be made, similarities and differences to emerge, and connections to be revealed. These connections in the main are disciplinary based, emphasise transnational (in our case, empire) links that predate the war, and are based on shared war service, and shared outlook and desires. *Scholars at War* is structured around historical portraits of individual Australasian social scientists. They are not a tight group; rather a cohort of scholars serendipitously involved in and affected by war who share a point of origin.

1 G. C. Bolton, 'Foreword', in John A. Moses, *Prussian-German Militarism, 1914–18*, in *Australian Perspective: The thought of George Arnold Wood* (Peter Lang/Bern, New York, 1991), p. 5.

2 For example, Robin W. Winks, *Cloak & Gown: Scholars in the secret war, 1939–1961*, 2nd edn (New Haven, Conn., 1996).

3 David Drake and Debra Kelly, 'Editorial: Intellectuals and war', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 2:1 (2009), pp. 5, 6–8.

4 Lois W. Banner, 'History as Biography', *American Historical Review*, 114:3 (2009), p. 583. For historical analysis using collective biography, see Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It* (New York, 1948); and Lois W. Banner, *Intertwined Lives: Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and their circle* (New York, 2003). For transnational history and the importance of biography, see David Lambert and Alan Lester (eds), *Colonial Lives Across the Empire: Imperial careering in the long nineteenth century* (Cambridge, 2006); also William Palmer, *Engagement with the Past: The lives and works of the World War II generation of historians* (Lexington, Ky, 2001).

Analysing practitioners of the social sciences during war brings to the fore specific networks, beliefs and institutions that transcend politically defined spaces. Individual lives, we argue, can help us to make sense of a piece of the historical process. It helps us illuminate particular events and the larger cultural, social and even political processes of a moment in time.⁵ Deacon, Russell and Woollacott remind us that biographies can illustrate that the Antipodes ‘has never existed in isolation from conflicts and crises elsewhere around the globe. Australian [and New Zealand] lives are intricately enmeshed with the world, bound by ties of allegiance and affinity, intellect and imagination.’⁶

When we first conceived of *Scholars at War*—the first scholarly publication to examine the effect World War II had on the careers of social scientists—we did not start with a firm hypothesis; rather we wanted to examine their contribution to World War II, the impact war had on them personally and professionally, and the effect war had on the development of social sciences in Australasia.⁷ In order to explore these themes, the main biographical focus is on early to mid-career academics, though scholars more advanced in their careers and social scientists who came into academia in the postwar period are also discussed. We therefore invited authors working on biographies or with interest in the war work of social scientists to focus on this particular period and these specific issues. With the exception of Aldophus Peter Elkin and Camilla Wedgwood, none of the social scientists portrayed in *Scholars at War* has had a biography written about them that details their war involvement and war experiences, and none has written an autobiography.

World War II was a major turning point of national outlook, patriotism and belonging. Many of the scholars discussed in this volume, however, particularly those from New Zealand, served abroad during the war, and some continued their professional lives outside the nations they had grown up in. *Scholars at War* investigates how World War II impinged on a group of Australian and New Zealand intellectuals—namely, social anthropologists and historians, most of whom were at the beginning of their careers: Derek Freeman, J. W. Davidson, Neville Phillips, Dan Davin, Ronald Berndt, and J. D. Legge (the youngest of our group), and, in the case of W. E. H. Stanner, H. Ian Hogbin and Camilla Wedgwood, midway. There are two exceptions: one was Elkin, who had an

5 Alice Kessler-Harris, ‘Why Biography?’, *American Historical Review*, 114:3 (2009), p. 626.

6 Desley Deacon, Penny Russell and Angela Woollacott (eds), *Transnational Ties: Australian lives in the world* (Canberra, 2008), pp. xiii–xiv.

7 In the literature on war and society, there is no book that we know of that deals with the use of social scientists in the Pacific War, apart from Roy MacLeod (ed.), *Science and the Pacific War: Science and survival in the Pacific, 1939–1945* (Dordrecht, 2000), which is largely a study of the natural sciences. There are nonetheless a large number of articles that touch on aspects of this but focusing on the United States and Britain, on the Atlantic rather than the Pacific. Few scholars have tracked postwar national and social-scientific developments in the Asia-Pacific region.

established career, the other Alfred Austin Joseph Conlon, a mature-age student (often described as a perennial student) who was enrolled in a medical degree and was a student representative on the University of Sydney Senate.

I

Historical geographer Matthew Farish avers that the Pacific War showed that, of all the social sciences,

anthropology's relevance...was singled [out] by the discipline's unusual, lingering treatment of the 'whole man', and the ease with which it could shift to accommodate the rudimentary 'universal cultural patterns' favored by...planners. Even more crucial, however, was the experience anthropologists possessed in contact situations and field methods... [anthropologists] held 'an informant's view of culture', a particularly relevant approach for those soldiers who would be engaging in 'social control at the local level'.⁸

The use of anthropological knowledge in war, as pointed out by Farish, was an extension as well as a continuation of the use of anthropologists by colonial governments in the Pacific in the interwar years.⁹ Colonial governments readily accepted—although did not necessarily embrace fully—the usefulness of anthropology or advice from anthropologists in the control, management and advancement (uplift) of colonised peoples.¹⁰ This is illustrated by the appointment of government anthropologists—initially to the Australian Territory of Papua (F. E. Williams, 1922), and soon after in the League of Nations Mandated Territory of New Guinea (E. W. P. Chinnery, 1924).¹¹ On the Australian mainland, it was a period of incremental growth and steady professionalisation of the discipline, and a move away from museum anthropology that was largely confined to physical anthropology and the collection of material artefacts. The new, modern discipline of social anthropology was established at the University of Sydney. A.

8 Matthew Farish, 'Archiving Areas: The Ethnogeographic Board and the Second World War', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 95:3 (2005), p. 673.

9 Matthew Farish, *The Contours of America's Cold War* (Minneapolis, Minn., 2010), especially pp. 101–46.

10 See various chapters in Naomi McPherson (ed.), *In Colonial New Guinea: Anthropological perspectives* (Pittsburgh, Pa, 2001).

11 See, for example, Geoffrey Gray, 'There Are Many Difficult Problems: Ernest William Pearson Chinnery—government anthropologist', *Journal of Pacific History*, 38:3 (2003), pp. 313–30; I. C. Campbell, 'Anthropology and the Professionalisation of Colonial Administration in Papua and New Guinea', *Journal of Pacific History*, 33:1 (1998), pp. 69–90.

R. Radcliffe-Brown was Foundation Professor (1926–31), followed by Raymond Firth as Acting Professor (1931–32), its third professor, A. P. Elkin (1934–56), and lecturer in Melanesian ethnography, H. Ian Hogbin.¹²

War, nevertheless, brought forth a different set of requirements and specialisations needed by the armed forces.¹³ The Australian Army's use of social scientists (particularly anthropologists) covered a diverse range of tasks from how to best use Australian colonised peoples in support of the war effort to their suitability as soldiers in the service of the defence of Australia—defined at that time to include the territories of Papua and New Guinea.¹⁴ F. E. Williams, E. W. P. Chinnery and the educationalist and anthropologist W. C. Groves were recruited, at varying times, to assist in the production of propaganda for the Far Eastern Liaison Unit (FELO) or to the Allied Geographical Unit or the Education Unit.¹⁵ The closest to frontline fighting was the establishment of the North Australia Observation Unit (NAOU) commanded by the anthropologist Major W. E. H. Stanner and the NT Special Reconnaissance Unit (NTSRU) commanded by the Melbourne University-based anthropologist Squadron Leader Donald F. Thomson. The NAOU was to assist in the protection of Australia's north from

12 The situation in the United States and Britain was different, especially Americanist traditions that were heavily influenced by Boas with their emphasis on culture and personality (behaviour) and concentration on salvage anthropology among dispossessed Native Americans in the south-west of North America. Moreover, the number of practising anthropologists was greater than in Australia and New Zealand, where museum anthropology was taught only at the University of Otago, Dunedin. Regna Darnell, *Invisible Genealogies: A history of Americanist anthropology* (Lincoln, Nebr., 2001); George W. Stocking jr, *After Tylor: British social anthropology 1888–1951* (Madison, Wis., 1995); Geoffrey Gray, *A Cautious Silence: The politics of Australian anthropology* (Canberra, 2007); Caroline Thomas, 'Professional Amateurs and Colonial Academics: Steps towards academic anthropology in New Zealand, 1860–1920', MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1995.

13 Jan van Bremen, 'Wartime Anthropology: A global perspective', in Akitoshi Shimizu and Jan van Bremen (eds), *Wartime Japanese Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific* (Osaka, 2003), pp. 13–48; David Price, 'Lessons from Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, persuasive and ignored contributions', *Anthropology Today*, 18:3 (2002), pp. 14–20; Glenn Petersen, 'Politics in Postwar Micronesia', in Robert C. Kiste and Mac Marshall (eds), *American Anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment* (Honolulu, 1999), pp. 145–96. American anthropologists were sent into Japanese internment camps during World War II. See Peter Suzuki, 'Lessons from WWII', [Letter], *Anthropology Today*, 18:6 (2002), p. 26; Murray Wax, 'Rosalie H. Wax (nee Rosalie Amelia Hankey), 1911–1998', *Anthropology Today*, 19:1 (2003), p. 25. Further sources on the wartime mobilisation of anthropologists include: Margaret Mead, 'Anthropological Contributions to National Policies During and Immediately After World War II', in Walter Goldschmidt (ed.), *The Uses of Anthropology. A special publication of the American Anthropological Association*, no. 11 (1979), pp. 145–57; also Geoffrey Gray, 'Managing the Impact of War: Australian anthropology and the South West Pacific', in Roy MacLeod (ed.), *Science and the Pacific War: Science and survival in the Pacific, 1939–1945* (Dordrecht, 2000), pp. 187–210; 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; Geoffrey Gray, 'Australian Anthropologists and WWII', *Anthropology Today*, 21:3 (2005), pp. 18–21; Geoffrey Gray, "'The army requires anthropologists": Australian anthropologists at war, 1939–1946', *Australian Historical Studies*, 37:127 (2006), pp. 156–80; Noah J. Riseman, 'Colonising Yolngu Defence: Arnhem Land in the Second World War and transnational uses of indigenous people in the Second World War', PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, 2008; Brian Jinks, 'A. A. Conlon, the Directorate of Research and New Guinea', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 12 (1983), pp. 21–33.

14 Robert Hall, *The Black Diggers: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the Second World War* (Sydney, 1989).

15 Alan Powell, *War By Stealth: Australians and the Allied Intelligence Bureau 1942–1945* (Melbourne, 1996), pp. 343–44 (re FELO), 315–64.

invasion by the Japanese. Stanner was chosen to command the unit in part because of his anthropological expertise and a belief by the military commanders that he had the ability to lead Aboriginal people and command their loyalty. Thomson established a guerilla force (NTSRU) of some 50 Yolgnu (Arnhem Land) warriors who were armed with spears (he did not provide them with guns) to work behind the lines should the Japanese invade. Thomson also advised, early in the war, the British Solomon Islands Protectorate (BSIP) Defence Force but had returned to Australia by the time Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. The biggest think tank of social scientists advising the Army and planning for the postwar period—particularly in Australia's colonies and the wider South-West Pacific region—was, however, the Directorate of Research and, from October 1944, the Directorate of Research and Civil Affairs (DORCA). The directorate advised the Commander-in-Chief, Thomas Blamey, on matters to do with, for example, future policy and constitutional problems associated with a postwar military and civilian government in Papua and New Guinea.¹⁶

In New Zealand the situation for social scientists was somewhat different to that in Australia. In 1944, mapping out the central role of social scientists for a postwar Pacific—particularly applied anthropology—the New Zealand scholar Ernest Beaglehole contrasted British and Australian prewar and war developments with those of New Zealand:

The British Colonial service has in the past been able to make use of anthropologists in the service of colonial administration, notably in Africa. Administrators have also often profited by training in anthropology at one of the English universities. Australia again, has had its government anthropologist in Papua and in New Guinea. It has been able to make use of additional skilled anthropological surveys in various sections of both mandate and territory. The New Zealand government and its island administrations have remained consistently and continuously unaware of the benefits that would accrue to Pacific administration by the use of a government anthropological service.

Beaglehole sarcastically suggested that the reason for this lack of interest in New Zealand to utilise social scientists was either 'an already incredibly efficient island administration, or, a certain myopic insensitiveness to the skills of the modern anthropological and socio-psychological field worker'.¹⁷ In New Zealand there were, for example, no war-born institutions similar to the Australian Army's Directorate of Research to provide a haven for intellectuals.

¹⁶ Brian Jinks, 'Policy, Planning and Administration in Papua New Guinea 1942–52, with Special Reference to the Role of Colonel J. K. Murray', PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1976; Gray, 'Managing the Impact of War', pp. 187–210. See chapter by Pybus in this volume.

¹⁷ Ernest Beaglehole, 'The South Seas Regional Commission', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 53:2 (1944), pp. 69–70.

Nonetheless, the experiences of New Zealand social scientists during World War II were profound, and even though they had less opportunities than their Australian colleagues to work in specialised units together with other intellectuals, clusters and group formation also eventuated. They served at home, in Britain, and to some degree in the region, especially in the Solomon Islands and Fiji. In particular, there was a young cohort (born in the early 1920s), which enlisted in the New Zealand Territorial Army and went on to distinguished academic careers. The New Zealand historian Keith Sinclair wrote that ‘few of us doubted the importance of winning the war or that we would soon need to serve’.¹⁸ He also points out that New Zealand did not send young men aged under twenty-one overseas. This meant that some of the cohort remained in New Zealand until quite late in the war. Sinclair and Bruce Biggs, an old friend from school and inaugural lecturer in Maori language at Auckland University College, organised an informal reading group while they were at Army School. When Sinclair turned twenty-one, he volunteered to go abroad with the Navy’s Scheme B—an officers’ training course in the United Kingdom. In this, he was joined by the anthropologist J. Derek Freeman.¹⁹ Biggs was sent to Fiji. New Zealand looked to Fiji as its first line of defence against invasion and attack. Other members of this cohort include Cyril Belshaw and William Geddes. Cyril Belshaw (b. 1921) commented recently that ‘volunteering to join the British Solomon Islands Defence Force...was probably the best career decision I have ever made’. It enabled him to accept an offer from the Institute of Pacific Relations to take a survey of colonial government and reconstruction in New Caledonia, New Hebrides and the British Solomon Islands, which resulted in *Island Administration in the South West Pacific* (1950). His father, an economics professor in New Zealand, was a friend of W. L. Holland, Director of the Institute of Pacific Relations in New York, and this association was to Cyril’s benefit. When Belshaw arrived at the London School of Economics (LSE) to undertake doctoral studies, Raymond Firth ‘was of the opinion that my life in the Solomons gave me a sense of the reality in the field’. His wartime work acted as a substitute of sorts for fieldwork, and Belshaw completed a library thesis.²⁰

Similarly, deployment turned into fieldwork opportunity for W. R. Geddes (1916–89) who put H. D. Skinner’s one-year anthropology course at Otago University to good use during his service (1941–45) in the 2nd New Zealand Expeditionary Force. Rising to staff sergeant, he spent most of his time in Fiji. This experience was the basis for his Polynesian Society memoir, *Deuba: A study of a Fijian village* (1945), written during the Bougainville campaign,

18 Keith Sinclair, *Halfway Round the Harbour: An autobiography* (Auckland, 1993), p. 54.

19 Ibid., pp. 84–5; see also Hempenstall this volume.

20 Cyril Belshaw, *Bumps on a Long Road* (Self-published: <www.lulu.com>, 2009), pp. 31, 54–8. The thesis was published as ‘The Great Village: The economic and social welfare of Hanubada, an urban community in Papua’ (London, 1957).

and his University of London (PhD, 1948) thesis, 'An Analysis of Cultural Change in Fiji', written at the LSE. In 1947–48, he lectured in psychology at Birkbeck College, University of London, and returned to Auckland in 1951 as a lecturer in anthropology at Auckland University College, rising to Professor of Anthropology at the University of Sydney in 1958. The work of women scientists and social scientists, as in Australia, was marginalised and elided, and it is to this we now turn.

II

While war opened up new home-front opportunities and work environments for women of all ages and classes, in the world of the sciences and social sciences war exacerbated a pre-existing gendered divide. A scarcity of trained and experienced female social scientists in Australia and New Zealand and a lack of units and deployments open to women had the consequence that the number of female scholars at war this volume portrays is small indeed. The opportunities for education during the war, which were enhanced through an absence of men, and the academic postwar environment of unusual students—namely, returned soldiers enrolling as mature-age students—opened new avenues for female social scientists, particularly in the new discipline of sociology. The main cohort of female social scientists came into professional careers in the postwar period, and is therefore not part of the biographical chapters. In order to understand the impact of war on a gendered development of social sciences, the main directions and research agendas undertaken by these postwar women scholars are set out and contextualised here.

The war work of women scientists and social scientists, despite the war work of eminent American anthropologists such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, is frequently overlooked, undervalued and under-researched. It reflects a perceived maleness of war and a desire to domesticate women; men went overseas, and women, with few exceptions, stayed at the home front.²¹ It also mirrors the lack of suitably qualified university-educated women. The naval historian Kathleen Broome Williams has written on women scientists who worked for the US Navy during the war. In her group biography, she singles out four women who went on to distinguished careers. Nonetheless, there were few women with scientific qualifications, and those who were qualified found

21 Libby Connors, Lynette Finch, Kay Saunders and Helen Taylor, *Australia's Frontline: Remembering the 1939–45 war* (St Lucia, Qld, 1992); Marilyn Lake, 'Female Desires: The meaning of World War Two', in Joy Damousi and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Gender and War: Australians at war in the twentieth century* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 60–80.

work in laboratories—a space largely denied women before the war.²² A further restriction was the refusal of the Navy to enable women to enlist like the men; rather they were attached to auxiliary units, such as Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES).

The situation in Australia was no better—if anything, worse. For example, in Australia, women—educated or not—were encouraged to join the Australian Women's Land Army to provide labour to rural areas. Nevertheless, historian Marilyn Lake has judged World War II to be one of the high points of feminist mobilisation—that is, women entered public life as men conventionally conceived it.²³ Despite such a judgment, there were few opportunities for women scientists during the war,²⁴ and the rules against the employment of married women created great difficulty in obtaining tenured positions in universities, which lasted into the 1960s, at least.²⁵ Cambridge-educated physicist Rachel Makinson, for example, who later had a distinguished career in wool research at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Division of Textile Physics, came to the University of Sydney in 1939. She commented in an interview with Anne Sarzin:

The prejudice in Australia against married women working was colossal... But apart from that, I wasn't allowed to have a decent position in the University because my husband was already there. They had fathers and sons in the same department but not husbands and wives. It was an unwritten but definite policy.²⁶

Women social scientists were few in number in Australia and New Zealand. Camilla Wedgwood is the most well known of the small number of women social scientists in Australia and New Zealand at the outset of the war.²⁷ The Australian anthropologist Phyllis Kaberry, the most senior and best qualified of all the Australian women social scientists, carried out fieldwork (1939–40) in

22 Williams notes that, in contrast, the Manhattan Project actively recruited and employed a number of women scientists. Kathleen Broome Williams, *Improbable Warriors: Women scientists and the U.S. Navy in World War II* (Annapolis, Md, 2001). See, for example, Jane S. Wilson and Charlotte Serber (eds), *Standing By and Making Do: Women of wartime Los Alamos* (Los Alamos, NM, 2008 [1988]).

23 Lake, 'Female Desires', p. 75.

24 See, however, Nessy Allen, 'Test Tubes and White Jackets: The careers of two Australian women scientists', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 52 (1997), pp. 126–34. See also interviews with Australian scientists: viewed 22 April 2011, <<http://www.science.org.au/scientists/interviews/w/gw.html>> There are seven women interviewed who were active during the war; only two—Dorothy Hill and Jean Laby—were employed for their scientific expertise.

25 Patricia Crawford and Myrna Tonkinson, *The Missing Chapters: Women staff at the University of Western Australia, 1963–1987* (Perth, 1988).

26 Anne Sarzin, 'Review [of *Profiles: Australian women scientists*, by Ragbir Bhatthal]', viewed 22 April 2011, <<http://www.wisenet-australia.org/issue52/bookrev.htm>> A similar situation confronted Catherine Berndt when her husband, Ronald, obtained a position at the University of Western Australia in 1956. In a more general sense, Roy MacLeod's volume *Science and the Pacific War* is silent on the work of individual women scientists, with the exception of passing references in individual chapters.

27 See Wetherell this volume.

the Sepik district of the League of Nations Mandated Territory of New Guinea. The need for an eye operation forced her to return to Sydney, where she spent 1940–41 writing up field reports and working for the university's Department of Anthropology as an honorary assistant lecturer. War precluded her return to the Sepik. While successively holding Sterling and Carnegie Fellowships (1941–43) at Yale University, USA, she gave lectures and edited *The Dynamics of Culture Change* (New Haven, Conn., 1945)—a posthumous collection of Malinowski's unpublished papers. Despite attempts by Elkin to lure her back to Sydney (in late 1947, he offered her a senior research fellowship to establish 'a sociological department'),²⁸ she travelled to London where she became a research associate (1943–44) at the Royal Institute of International Affairs. She then worked in the Office for Colonial Affairs and conducted fieldwork in the Cameroons. After a short period as a lecturer, she was appointed, in 1951, Reader in Anthropology at University College, London—a position she retained until her retirement in 1976. And despite a solid record of achievement, the English anthropologist Audrey Richards' claims to consideration for the vacant Chair of Anthropology at The Australian National University (ANU) were summarily dismissed by the Vice-Chancellor, L. G. Melville: 'Do you not think that Audrey Richards, especially in view of her sex, might be a little old to take over a young department in an area where she is unfamiliar?'²⁹ She was, however, under consideration for the ANU Foundation Chair of Anthropology, supported by Raymond Firth and Keith Hancock, advisors to the Interim Council, who saw no problems in appointing Richards.³⁰

Or else, women academics took a subservient role. A young New Zealander, Catherine Helen Webb, was enrolled in the Diploma in Anthropology at the University of Sydney. She had completed a Certificate of Proficiency in Anthropology at the University of Otago, Dunedin, under H. D. Skinner and had a BA from Victoria University College, Wellington.³¹ She married fellow anthropology student Ronald Murray Berndt in April 1941; he was twenty-four, Catherine twenty-two. They became Elkin's long-desired husband-and-wife combination: 'I realized that this field-work combination of man and wife was an ideal one, for their particular gifts were complementary, just as their opportunities for working respectively with native men and women were also complementary.'³² Catherine, like Ronald, completed her Diploma in

28 Kaberry to Elkin, 11 January 1948, Papers of A. P. Elkin, University of Sydney Archives [hereinafter EP], 197/4/2/373.

29 L. G. Melville to W. K. Hancock, 19 March 1956, Hancock Papers, Australian National University Archives [hereinafter ANUA], 19/18.

30 School of Pacific Studies, Notes on discussion between the Vice-Chancellor [Douglas Copland] and Professor Firth, Monday, 23 May 1949, FIRTH7/5/8.

31 Victoria University Calendar, 1936, pp. 121, 123, 125; 1937, pp. 129, 134; 1938, pp. 134, 136, 141; University of Otago Registry and Administration Records, MS-1632/024.

32 A. P. Elkin, 'Foreword', in Ronald M. Berndt and Catherine H. Berndt, *Sexual Behaviour in Western Arnhem Land* (New York, 1958 [1951]), pp. 9–10.

Anthropology in April 1942; her anthropological research was only marginally linked to the war effort, and is one of the few cases of a female—or male—social scientist being able to conduct non-war-related research unhindered by the war.³³ As their careers took shape, Catherine, perhaps putting aside her ambitions, increasingly devoted herself to actively developing and making Ronald's career. Ronald acknowledged his debt often—for example, by dedicating *Love Songs of Arnhem Land* to her: she 'has been and continues to be my constant companion on all our fieldwork'.³⁴ In 1956, Ronald accepted a position as senior lecturer at the University of Western Australia; Catherine and he remained there for the rest of their lives. Their nearly 50-year partnership was one of the most industrious ever encountered in anthropology.³⁵

Elkin gathered together the largest group of women social scientists. During the war, he developed an interest in the assimilation of recent European immigrants to Australia. It reflected Elkin's long-held desire to include sociology as integral to the department's functions.³⁶ Elkin's sociological research program during the war examined 'problems connected with the assimilation of alien groups'; it was supported, and in part funded, by the Commonwealth Department of Post-War Reconstruction. In spite of his long-held interest in sociological problems, it was also a force of circumstance brought about by wartime exigencies and a shortage of research funds; most of the Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie funds had dried up. The Department of Post-War Reconstruction headed by H. C. Coombs identified three commissions of inquiry: into housing, rural reconstruction and secondary industry.³⁷ Elkin's students were able to provide information on the first two. This sociological research was conducted by recent—mostly women—graduates in the department: Jean Craig (later Martin), Caroline Tennant Kelly, Mona Ravenscroft, Florence Harding, Vere Hole, John McDonald

33 Geoffrey Gray, "'You are...my anthropological children': A. P. Elkin, Ronald Berndt and Catherine Berndt, 1940–1956', *Aboriginal History*, 29 (2005), pp. 77–106; also Gray on Berndt, this volume.

34 Ronald M. Berndt, *Love Songs of Arnhem Land* (Chicago, 1978), p. xx.

35 For a list of their publications, see Robert Tonkinson and Michael Howard (eds), *Going It Alone? Prospects for Aboriginal autonomy* (Canberra, 1990), pp. 45–63.

36 *Our Opinions and the National Effort* (Sydney, 1941) was Elkin's first attempt at non-Aboriginal sociology. It was 'based on a survey and analysis of opinions of individuals of the typical and various sections and ages of the community in which the author was assisted by twenty observers mostly graduates in anthropology. The results of the survey were sent in the first instance to the Commonwealth authorities. Amongst other things the book shows the necessity for basing all appeals and calls to the nation on a knowledge of the various divisions of opinion and the types of reaction which exist.' 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 12:2 (1941), p. 187. See also A. P. Elkin, 'The Need for Sociological Research in Australia', *Social Horizons*, (July 1943), pp. 5–15. *Social Horizons* was the journal of the Australian Institute of Sociology, of which Elkin was President.

37 H. C. Coombs, *Trial Balance: Issues of my working life* (Melbourne, 1983 [1981]), pp. 26–32.

and Jim Bell.³⁸ Craig also researched problems associated with rural housing,³⁹ as did Ravenscroft.⁴⁰ In early 1945, Craig was appointed Teaching Fellow at the University of Sydney so she could continue aspects of her rural research.⁴¹ Since 1942, Kelly had researched 'into problems connected with the assimilation of alien groups, which has been of high standard and national importance'.⁴² This research was under the auspices of the Department of Post-War Reconstruction with the assistance of the Department of the Interior. After the war Kelly did field research on migrants in Victoria and Queensland.⁴³ Elkin's support of research into 'alien groups' did not cease with the abandonment of the Department of Post-War Reconstruction. Hole and Harding, both MA graduates, spent the academic year 1947–48 in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Chicago, as did Jean Craig: 'in particular they are studying the method of social science research which have [sic] developed in these schools.'⁴⁴

Craig was lured into identity and migration studies. Other sociological investigations supported by the Sydney Anthropology Department included John McDonald's 'research in Italy in districts from which immigrants come to Australia', and that of Jim Bell, who was 'engaged in a sociological study of an old township near Sydney'.⁴⁵ The sociology of recent immigrant groups faded from Elkin's view but not from that of the Foundation Professor of Anthropology at the ANU: the Vienna and Berlin trained ethnomusicologist and London trained anthropologist S. F. Nadel. He had developed a detailed research program that included investigating the process of assimilation of recent migrant groups. Soon after his arrival, the department in Canberra was renamed to embrace both anthropology and sociology so such research as assimilation of migrant groups could be studied. Soon after, Craig enrolled to do her doctoral research on 'role assumption and fulfillment among European migrants in Australia'.⁴⁶ She was awarded her PhD in 1954.

38 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 14:2 (1943), p. 182; 15:3 (1945), p. 276; 16:4 (1946), p. 353. Kelly was awarded the Diploma in Anthropology in 1945—her first and only formal qualification in anthropology. 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 15:3 (1945), p. 276. Kelly was a friend of Margaret Mead, who stayed with her when she came to Australia; she had also worked for Elkin, as a research assistant, since the early 1930s.

39 Elkin noted that she 'has specialised in the social-anthropological (sociological) study of rural communities'. 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 15:3 (1945), p. 276.

40 Mona Ravenscroft, 'The Housing Problem', *Social Horizons* (July 1943), pp. 48–53. She was for several years a tutor and research assistant in the Department of Anthropology.

41 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 15:3 (1945), p. 276. See Jean Craig, 'Some Aspects of Life in Selected Areas of Rural New South Wales', MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1945.

42 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 15:3 (1945), p. 276.

43 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 16:4 (1946), p. 353.

44 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 18:2 (1947), p. 176; 18:4 (1948), p. 358.

45 'Notes and News', *Oceania*, 24:1 (1953), p. 78.

46 S. F. Nadel, *Report on Activities in 1952, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, ANU*, Copy in authors' possession; Jean Craig, 'Assimilation of European Immigrants: A study in role assumption and fulfilment', PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1954.

Others worked in Indigenous studies during the war. Elkin pursued an interest in Aboriginal people of mixed descent, which he regarded as sociological rather than anthropological. Ronald and Catherine Berndt and Marie Reay, a recently graduated student, mainly undertook this research. Certainly, it was not considered orthodox social anthropology and those who conducted this type of research were not thought of as ‘real’ anthropologists.⁴⁷ Post war, there were only meagre funds available for anthropological research and Elkin believed that the best use of these funds was pursuing research on Aboriginal people of mixed descent living in rural and urban New South Wales, especially north-western New South Wales. Most of this work was associated with the NSW Aborigines’ Welfare Board (AWB), of which Elkin was Vice-Chairman, and focused on problems specific to the implementation of the assimilation policy of the NSW Government. Funding for research therefore came mainly from the University of Sydney, the AWB and what limited funds were available from the Australian National Research Council (ANRC). A case in point is Pamela Nixon’s 1947 MA thesis, which dealt with the history of the community, family and kinship, economics, religion, authority and leadership, and recreational activities at La Perouse.⁴⁸ The impact of war opened up opportunities for female scholars in the postwar period, particularly in the new and growing discipline of sociology and related fields in social anthropology. This development, however, is not at the core of *Scholars at War*, which examines social-science professionals during World War II.

III

The New Zealanders discussed in *Scholars at War* were in Britain before the war, or, in Freeman’s case, arrived during the war, and remained there (as did some Australians, such as Keith Hancock). The Australians who found themselves in Britain at the beginning of the war, by and large, endeavoured to return to Australia, which reflects, in part, a desire to help defend Australia and a new nationalism that developed during the war; this nationalism was reflected by an optimism that as the war ended Australia and the world generally would provide new opportunities. A number of organisations were established during the war that recruited social scientists, besides DORCA; the Department of Post-War Reconstruction mapped out new structures and directions for peacetime Australia. As H. C. Coombs noted: the task of the Department of Post-War

47 Geoffrey Gray, “[The Sydney school] seem[s] to view the Aborigines as forever unchanging”: Southeastern Australia and Australian Anthropology’, *Aboriginal History*, 24 (2000), pp. 176–200.

48 Pamela Nixon, ‘The Integration of a Half-caste Community at La Perouse, NSW’, MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1947.

Reconstruction, established soon after John Curtin was elected Prime Minister, 'was to ensure an economic and social context in which positive opportunities were present rather than merely an absence of constraints'.⁴⁹

The Pacific War therefore provided an opportunity for intellectual talent to play a role in running and shaping Australia. 'The growth of services, the expansion of government...gave the younger generation chances which it would never have had in the stagnant society between the wars.' In the Public Service, the Department of External Affairs, for example, 'was picking up bright young men... there was a spirit of optimism about Australia's future. The new generation was confident that past mistakes would be avoided.'⁵⁰ This new generation perceived themselves as progressive and able to direct a postwar agenda in the development of the nation.⁵¹ Notwithstanding, the intellectual, cultural, social and political networks linking Australia to Britain and the Empire were not loosened. The Empire remained—as it had before the war—a large conglomerate of nations interlocked through intellectual, social and cultural networks that bound the British world together, beyond the 'mother country'.⁵² Consideration, for instance, of empire (transnational) networks of scholarly patronage indicates less difference between New Zealand and Australia than Belich suggests and perhaps more than Mein Smith's work would allow, especially when early to mid-twentieth-century academic appointments in Australia and New Zealand are considered.⁵³ *Scholars at War* shows the intellectual and scholarly links not just across the Tasman but also the transnational networks in which all our subjects were in some way intertwined and interweaved. It links two neighbouring countries through a network of scholars based in Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, whose histories are seldom reflected in the

49 Coombs, *Trial Balance*, p. 26 ff. See also papers from the conference on 'The Seven Dwarfs and the Age of the Mandarins, 1940s–1960s', 4–5 November 2010, Old Parliament House, Canberra.

50 Richard Hall, *The Real John Kerr: His brilliant career* (Sydney, 1978), pp. 43–5, 53.

51 John Pomeroy, 'Morale on the Homefront in Australia During the Second World War', PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1995, p. 231; see also Paul Hasluck, *Diplomatic Witness: Australian foreign affairs, 1941–1947* (Melbourne, 1980).

52 Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31:2 (2003), pp. 1–15; Keith Jeffery, 'The Second World War', in Judith M. Brown and Wm. Roger Louis (eds), *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Volume 4: The twentieth century* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 306–28; Simon Potter, 'What Did You Do in the War, Professor? Imperial history and propaganda, 1939–45', in Robert Blyth and Keith Jeffery (eds), *The British Empire and its Contested Pasts* (Dublin/Portland, 2009), pp. 24–42; cf. Jim Davidson, *A Three-Cornered Life: The historian WK Hancock* (Sydney, 2010), pp. 186–227.

53 James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A history of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000* (Auckland, 2001); Philippa Mein Smith, Peter Hempenstall and Shaun Goldfinch, with Stuart McMillan and Rosemary Baird, *Remaking the Tasman World* (Christchurch, 2008); Peter Hempenstall, 'Overcoming Separate Histories: Historians as "ideas traders" in a trans-Tasman world', *History Australia*, 4:1 (2007), pp. 4.1–4.16; Geoffrey Gray and Doug Munro, 'Australian Aboriginal Anthropology at the Crossroads: Finding a successor to A. P. Elkin, 1955', *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 22:3 (2011, forthcoming); see also Belshaw to Gray, Emails, 2010, re University of British Columbia anthropological appointments.

historiographies.⁵⁴ Even at a personal level, young scholars such as Sinclair and Freeman, in their brief stopover in Melbourne, established intellectual and social links with the Melbourne academy, which were carried into postwar relations.

These networks stretched far and wide, within a small circle of anthropologists and historians in Australia and New Zealand, to the ‘mother’ country. They were often inclusive but were equally often fractious due in part to personal, intellectual and political tensions.⁵⁵ London committees routinely did the work of selecting suitable candidates for senior postings in Australian and New Zealand universities. The appointment in 1925 of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown to the Foundation Chair of Anthropology at the University of Sydney was decided by a London-based committee that included an Australian, Elliot Grafton Smith (the other members were the Cambridge anthropologist A. C. Haddon and J. T. Wilson, Professor of Anatomy, Cambridge). Haddon was consulted over most empire appointments, including the Chair in South Africa, and the government anthropologist positions in Papua and New Guinea. Elkin’s appointment to the Sydney Anthropology Chair in 1933 was an exception, with a local selection committee making the appointment, although his referees were British (including Radcliffe-Brown) as were those of the other applicants, who were part of the international cohort of anthropologists. The then Vice-Chancellor, Sir Mungo MacCallum, was determined to have Australians appointed when possible. These empire networks were not diminished by war but rather were strengthened and invigorated by war. The ANU Interim Council sought advice over academic appointments from London-based advisers, namely the New Zealander Raymond Firth and the Australians Howard Florey, Mark Oliphant and Keith Hancock. The appointment, in 1949, of Ralph Piddington as Foundation Chair at Auckland University College is a case in point. The governing council sought advice from the Association of the Universities of the Commonwealth, which was asked to convene a committee to advise on the appointment of the professor. The committee was London based and consisted of Raymond Firth as Chairman, E. Evans-Pritchard and Darryll Forde.

The key figures in these empire (transnational) networks of scholarly patronage and appointment were Haddon, Bronislaw Malinowski and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown before the war, and, after the war, Raymond Firth and to a lesser degree Keith Hancock.⁵⁶ Elkin was a central figure, too, as all the anthropologists in *Scholars at War* other than Freeman either were taught by Elkin or worked in the Sydney department under Elkin. He was the dominant figure in prewar

54 Hempenstall, ‘Overcoming Separate Histories’.

55 Gray, *A Cautious Silence*, pp. 13–76.

56 See Geoffrey Gray and Doug Munro, ‘Your own position is not being overlooked’: The politics of choosing a successor to S. F. Nadel, 1957, Unpublished manuscript; and generally Davidson, *A Three-Cornered Life*; S. G. Foster and Margaret M. Varghese, *The Making of The Australian National University, 1946–1996* (Sydney, 1996).

and postwar Australian anthropology, exercising his authority over funding, choice of field site, patronage, academic positions, even controlling the material published in the journal *Oceania*, which he edited from 1933 to his death in 1979. He was consulted over the establishment of the Chair in Auckland, and the University of Western Australia developing anthropology there.⁵⁷ Elkin is the oldest of the social scientists discussed in *Scholars at War*—born a decade before the end of the nineteenth century—while there is a generation gap between Elkin and the other Australian and New Zealand social scientists who were by and large of the same cohort. The youngest was born in 1926. In the terminology of the academy in the early 2000s, they were early to mid-career scholars. With the exception of Elkin, the anthropologists are second generation. The Australian anthropologists were trained under Radcliffe-Brown, Firth and/or Elkin at Sydney, furthering their studies under Malinowski and Firth at the LSE. With the exception of Hogbin, who returned to a position in Australia, the Australian anthropologists found African-oriented work through the British Colonial Office, which supported anthropological research through the universities, or, in the case of Piddington, appointed to the University of Aberdeen. Hogbin, when he was an undergraduate at Sydney, was taught by, and later became a colleague of, Wedgwood. Hogbin was the first Australian scholar to attend the LSE under Malinowski. The Australian anthropologists were Durkheimian in theoretical outlook when they left for London. When they returned, they had taken a Malinowskian functionalist turn. Piddington remained a devout Malinowskian functionalist all his life.

Attendance at the LSE created other networks by bringing the Australians and New Zealanders into contact with anthropologists such as Lucy Mair, Audrey Richards and S. F. Nadel—scholars of considerable eminence before the war; or establishing connections with Hancock, who was to play a key role in the appointment of J. W. Davidson to the ANU. Towards the end of the war, Mair, an expert on colonial administration, was brought out to Australia to conduct a survey of Papua and New Guinea as well as to advise on the courses at the Army's School of Civil Affairs.⁵⁸ It is most likely that Hogbin suggested her; Hogbin and Mair's friendship dated to their time at the LSE in the early 1930s. Certainly, it was Hogbin who enabled Piddington to be appointed Deputy Principal of the Army's School of Civil Affairs; he arrived in 1944 after spending the war working for the British Army. Ronald and Catherine Berndt—the youngest of the anthropologists—were heavily influenced by Elkin, were

57 Geoffrey Gray and Doug Munro, 'Establishing Anthropology and Maori Language (Studies), Auckland University College: The appointment of Ralph Piddington, 1949', in Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach (eds), *Histories of Anthropology Annual*, volume 7 (Lincoln, Nebr., forthcoming); Geoffrey Gray, "'You are... my anthropological children'", pp. 77–106.

58 Lucy Mair, *Australia in New Guinea* (London/Melbourne, 1948).

awarded doctorates from the LSE and were supervised by Firth and Kaberry. (Elkin encouraged them to make as many contacts as possible, as this was in his opinion more important than a doctorate from the LSE.)⁵⁹

New Zealand, in contrast with Australia, was characterised by dispersal and expatriation. Similarly to the Australians, New Zealand social scientists went to London to pursue their education—most notably, to obtain postgraduate qualifications; other factors were the cultural cringe and a yearning to see a wider world, particularly to visit the ‘mother country’. Davin, Davidson and Phillips were all in London at the outbreak of war and were caught up in the war mobilisation. Freeman, as alluded to earlier, was in Samoa at the outbreak of war. He shared Davidson’s distaste for war. Nonetheless, he enlisted in the Navy and arrived in England for an officers’ training course. It enabled him, in retrospect, to pursue a career in anthropology at the LSE.

These intellectual and academic networks were further enhanced post war. Stanner, Davidson and Freeman were all appointed to the newly established ANU; Stanner and Freeman were appointed largely on the recommendation of their old teacher and mentor Firth with some input from Hancock. Hogbin turned down a readership at the ANU to remain at Sydney—a strange decision considering he had such an appalling relationship with Elkin, which was a matter he frequently commented on in his personal correspondence.⁶⁰ The Berndts expanded their empire network, spending six months on a Carnegie Travelling Grant investigating anthropology teaching in the United States. While opportunities for social scientists in Australia were limited, they were even more so in New Zealand. Davin lived in England. Davidson and Freeman moved to the ANU where they remained all their academic lives. Only Neville Phillips returned to New Zealand.

IV

The experience of individual anthropologists during the Pacific War accelerated and consolidated the emergence of anthropology as an applied discipline. Australia had long had an interest in Papua (an Australian territory from 1906; until then it had been administered by Britain) and New Guinea (a German territory until 1914 when Australia occupied it on the declaration of war, and then, from 1921, a League of Nations ‘C’ Mandate under Australian administration). The appointments of government anthropologists in Papua

59 Elkin to R. M. Berndt and C. H. Berndt, 3 August 1954; also R. M. Berndt to Elkin, 2 May 1954, EP, 41/4/2/375.

60 There is a belief he turned the position down because he would not have been able to hide his homosexuality in such a small city as Canberra.

and New Guinea reflect a growing acceptance by colonial governments of anthropology as a helpful discipline useful in governing colonised peoples. Anthropology, as a way of justifying its scholarly and practical credentials, presented itself to colonial administrations and metropolitan governments—Britain, the United States and Australia—as a discipline that was able to help in the control, management and advancement of colonised peoples in the African colonies and indigenous people in settler nations such as Australia, Canada and the United States.

It is during the interwar period that Australian anthropology, slowly but surely, became a recognised academic discipline with the accoutrements of professionalisation: specialised and specific qualifications and training, specific funding for research problems, a growing body of specialists, a journal devoted to publishing the results of research, and various attempts to ‘control a market for their expertise’.⁶¹ The interwar years saw also the demise of the amateur ethnographer, usually associated with museum anthropology.

War therefore opened up spaces in which a new academic and professional elite was established. It gave a younger generation chances it would never have had in the stagnant societies of New Zealand and Australia between the wars.⁶² War enhanced the developing professionalisation of anthropology and an increasing interest in regional and national histories. Post war saw anthropology expanding its academic and disciplinary authority, knowledge and power. The Pacific War thus created an unprecedented opportunity for Australia’s anthropologists. David Price has noted that World War II provided American anthropology with an impetus for its expansion not only in the academy but also within the military and government. Before the war American universities and museums were few in number and funds for research were scarce, especially for overseas research. It was localised, inward rather than outward looking, with most socio-cultural research as salvage ethnography on American Indians. War also placed an emphasis on the practical applications of anthropology and ethnographic knowledge, which saw an increase in applied anthropology after the war—a shift that by the end of the 1950s had given way to sociological ethnographic research on culture and what were perceived as people with minimal European contact.⁶³ This is so for Australia, which combined both an applied interest in

61 Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A sociological analysis* (Berkeley, Calif., 1977), p. xvi; Donald Wright, *The Professionalization of History in English Canada* (Toronto, 2005), pp. 4–5. Also Legge in this volume.

62 Hall, *The Real John Kerr*, pp. 43–5. Such stagnation included Australian universities—described as ‘small and extremely parochial institutions where men of strong personality could build up excessive power bases for the implementation of their views’. Leonie Star, *Julius Stone: An intellectual life* (Sydney/Melbourne, 1992), p. 67.

63 Robert C. Kiste and Mac Marshall, ‘Introduction’, in Kiste and Marshall, *American Anthropology in Micronesia*, p. 2.

governing colonised peoples in mainland and external territories and pursuing what might be thought of as major questions concerning people with minimal European contact—found in the Highlands of New Guinea.⁶⁴

Some observers expected that in the wake of the war the hour of social sciences had come. Ernest Beaglehole in 1944 saw a trend developing in Europe and South-East Asia that he hoped would extend to the Pacific region:

It is already clear that the reconstruction of the post-war world is likely to demand the solution of an enormous number of extremely complex problems. These problems are of all kinds: some of them economic, some political, some educational, some health problems—but all of them, in their fundamentals, human problems...Statesmen will hopefully use the advice, the knowledge and the skilled techniques of the scientist in solving this world-wide human problem. The social sciences, in particular psychology, anthropology, economics and medicine, will thus have to meet large scale responsibilities in this post-war world.⁶⁵

The extended use of the social sciences, and anthropology in particular, as occurred in America, in the service of government and the military, however, did not occur in Australia and New Zealand. Certainly, post war, there was an expansion in the social sciences and increased student numbers.

Australian universities experienced a remarkable renaissance in 1946, 1947 and 1948, resuming the flowering of academic and student life interrupted in early 1942 by national mobilisation...The Universities were bulging. At Sydney a record 3,600 first year students enrolled in 1946, 1200 of them ex-servicemen and women. The largest group was in the Arts, with 790 first year enrolments.

By 1948, enrolments were 10 450.⁶⁶ Anthropology was a popular subject; the Anthropology Department was overflowing with students and its small staff was overloaded. To be sure, some of the younger scholars, such as Ronald and Catherine Berndt, Mona Ravenscroft and Jean Craig, were given teaching opportunities as a consequence. During these years, Hogbin dithered over his future, teaching part-time at the Australian School of Pacific Administration (ASOPA) to the detriment of his teaching duties at the university. Elkin was furious with him for not pulling his weight.

Opportunities for social scientists—economists, historians, sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists—were limited. Nevertheless, in the first

64 See Terence Hays (ed.), *Ethnographic Presents: Pioneering anthropologists in the Papua New Guinea Highlands* (Berkeley, Calif., 1992).

65 Beaglehole, 'The South Pacific Commission', p. 59.

66 Alan Barcan, *Radical Students: The Old Left at Sydney University* (Melbourne, 2002), p. 174.

decade after the end of the war, anthropology in particular was courted by the PNG Administration even to the extent of contemplating (and arranging for) a husband-and-wife team as government anthropologists. There appeared to be a defined role and future for anthropology and its usefulness and practical application in the governance of colonised peoples. Elkin, who, in 1949–50, had undertaken a survey of anthropological research in Melanesia, recommended not only that colonial administrations appoint permanent anthropologists to research positions but also that mission societies appoint ‘mission anthropologists’ to help in their ‘approach, in their difficulties, and to evaluate functionally the effects of their activities’.⁶⁷ He advocated—as he had before the war—that colonial officials and mission staff be trained in anthropology and associated subjects before embarking on their work. This represented some continuity with prewar colonial governments and the place of anthropology but there was an added dimension: an interest in social change.

The establishment of an Army School of Civil Affairs at Duntroon in December 1944 illustrated the success of the DORCA in convincing military authorities of the wisdom of such a training school; it provided further opportunities for social scientists and was part of the expansion of the social sciences in Australia. The School of Civil Affairs was, however, short lived and, after a rather prolonged negotiation over the future of the school post war, it was placed under the control of the Department of External Territories, renamed the Australian School of Pacific Administration (ASOPA) and located at Mosman on Sydney Harbour. The school trained officers, especially cadets and patrol officers for service in Papua and New Guinea.⁶⁸ Various members of the ASOPA hoped the school would be incorporated into the ANU as a centre for colonial studies and training along the lines of that offered at Oxford. This did not occur.

The new Administrator of Papua New Guinea, J. K. (Jack) Murray, who had been a member of DORCA, was keen to get a set-up that would allow ‘routine anthropological work being done in the territory, research work directed to the answers to specific questions such as those related to depopulation, health and the status of women’; there was, he opined, ‘practically [an] open field being presented to any research workers in anthropology who wish to undertake work here’.⁶⁹ In these circumstances, Elkin recommended a husband-and-wife team, Ronald and Catherine Berndt, who were eminently suitable to undertake such research. A formal appointment for the Berndts was in the air. The upshot was that the Berndts were not considered. Rather, Charles Julius, who had done his MA under Elkin before the war, was appointed in 1950 to a position often described as government anthropologist. Rather than making it an administration-wide

67 A. P. Elkin, *Social Anthropology in Melanesia: A review of research* (Melbourne, 1953), p. x.

68 A history of ASOPA awaits its historian.

69 J. K. Murray to Elkin, 10 July 1951, EP, 183/4/2/338.

one, the position was confined to the Department of District Services and Native Affairs and 'limited to District Services' requirements, which emphasises the point that no GA [Government Anthropologist] being available for the purposes of other departments such as Health and Education'. The terms of Julius's appointment cut across the plans of the Director of Education, W. C. Groves, who envisaged a research section in the Education Department in which Julius would have represented anthropology, the Viennese-educated Stephen Wurm linguistics, and a 'third person specialised in Applied or Educational Psychology'.⁷⁰ Julius retained his position as anthropologist in the Department of District Services until his death in 1965. Unlike his predecessors, Chinnery and Williams, he acted as neither gatekeeper nor active researcher; he appears not to have engaged in any serious long-term anthropological research.⁷¹ Groves pointed out to Elkin that as far as he could determine the newly appointed Minister for Territories, Paul Hasluck, squashed the proposal: 'anthropology has no place in his administration.'⁷²

There had been calls in New Zealand before the war to provide training for colonial officials but until the establishment of the Department of Anthropology at Auckland University College, in 1949, there was no facility available. Even then, despite lip-service, the department did not provide such specialised training. Certainly, the usefulness of anthropology in the administration of New Zealand's colonial territories was prominent in the thinking of Auckland's University College Council when they discussed the creation of the Chair of Anthropology and its functions. Before the war various scholars such as Ernest Beaglehole, psychologist and anthropologist at Wellington, had argued that training in anthropology was important for all officials dealing with indigenous peoples; added to this was a discussion on the role of anthropology in preserving Maori culture⁷³ and more generally as part of the armoury of colonial administration.⁷⁴ That is, anthropology could enable a sympathetic and wise governance of colonised peoples under New Zealand rule. These ideas were taken up by Auckland, which also added the need for teaching Maori language.⁷⁵ The 1950s and 1960s saw growth in social anthropology and national histories in both Australia and New Zealand.

70 W. C. Groves to Elkin, 28 August 1951, EP, 182/4/2/325.

71 See the file from PNG National Archives that contains most of his lectures to the School of Civil Affairs, ASOPA and local induction courses for patrol officers, plus notes from research he conducted in Busama in 1947. Government Officers, Mr Charles Julius (Government Anthropologist), Papua New Guinea National Archives, Port Moresby.

72 Groves to Elkin, 28 August 1951, EP, 182/4/2/325.

73 Steven Webster, *Patrons of Maori Culture: Power, theory and ideology in the Maori renaissance* (Dunedin, 1998), pp. 73–102; A. T. Ngata, 'Anthropology and the Government of the Native Races in the Pacific', *Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy*, 6:1 (1928), pp. 1–14.

74 M. P. K. Sorrenson, 'Polynesian Corpuscles and Pacific Anthropology: The home-made anthropology of Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 91:1 (1992), pp. 17–23.

75 See Gray and Munro, 'Establishing Anthropology and Maori Language (Studies), Auckland University College'.

V

The Pacific was the last part of the world to be colonised and the last to be decolonised.⁷⁶ At the start of the war in the Pacific there were six colonial nations occupying the islands in the Pacific: those under the British flag (including Australia and New Zealand); France; Japan; the United States; the Netherlands and Portugal.⁷⁷ Yet, at the time, decolonisation was seen as a predominantly British problem, focused primarily on its African colonies, India and parts of South-East Asia such as Burma. Australia and New Zealand, however, had gained additional territories—New Guinea and Samoa—to administer only two decades earlier after World War I, and did not see the same urgency to deal with issues of decolonisation or even consider self-government for their colonies, despite mounting discontent, particularly in the mandated territory of Samoa.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, they were drawn into a wider debate on political change and future policy for the various South-West Pacific colonies under their administration, which was fuelled by a crisis of legitimacy of the League of Nations during the 1930s and gained further momentum once war was declared in 1941.⁷⁹ At the end of the war, Japan lost her Micronesian colonies, the French remained entrenched in their territories that were portrayed as being part of metropolitan France, the United States had extended the size of its empire with the acquisition of Micronesia, and Portugal remained in Timor (now Timor Leste). The Netherlands, while granting independence to Indonesia in 1948, held onto the western half of New Guinea (West Papua).

A crisis of colonialism was a consequence of World War II. War had destabilised the prewar order as well as enabling colonised peoples to see the weakness and frailties of colonial governance and its rulers in the South-West Pacific.⁸⁰ Assisting the return of the colonial governments, anthropology had a critical role to play. Anthropologists believed (a belief accepted by military and civilian authorities) they were best situated to provide advice on controlling and managing colonised populations disrupted and dislocated by the impact of war. War—cataclysmic event—offered an opportunity for regeneration, renewal

76 Roger C. Thomson, *Australia and the Pacific Islands in the 20th Century* (Melbourne, 1998), p. 189 ff.; Donald Denoon (ed.), *Emerging from Empire? Decolonisation in the Pacific* (Canberra, 1997); Stewart Firth, 'The War in the Pacific', in Donald Denoon et al. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Pacific Islanders* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 291–323; Hugh Laracy, 'World War Two', in K. R. Howe, Robert C. Kiste and Brij V. Lal (eds), *Tides of History: The Pacific Islands in the twentieth century* (Honolulu, 1994), pp. 149–69.

77 See Dorothy Woodman, *An A. B. C. of the Pacific* (Harmondsworth, UK, 1942), pp. 79–107.

78 I. C. Campbell, 'Resistance and Colonial Government: A comparative study of Samoa', *Journal of Pacific History*, 40:1 (2005), pp. 45–69.

79 Michael D. Callahan, *A Sacred Trust: The League of Nations and Africa, 1929–1946* (Sussex, UK, 2004), especially pp. 63–96.

80 Geoffrey M. White and Lamont Lindstrom (eds), *The Pacific Theatre: Island representations of World War II* (Melbourne, 1990).

and reform.⁸¹ It is not surprising therefore that there developed a tension between re-establishing colonial rule and an international push for the reform of colonialism with the eventual aim of decolonisation. Anthropology, of all the social sciences, was able to bridge both by mapping out reforms and supporting the strength (the good bits) of the old order. This brought about a further expansion and professionalisation of social anthropology—the dominant social science on colonised peoples and colonial rule. At war's end, most Australian social scientists—especially those connected with DORCA and ASOPA—were confident that their voice had acceptance and authority over matters to do with Papua and New Guinea (albeit over Aboriginal Australia Elkin retained his authority). Australian anthropology, however, rarely examined colonial legitimacy and its own place in colonialism; rather there was an acceptance that enlightened colonial rule was beneficial for indigenous peoples.⁸²

Notwithstanding, there is no historical consensus on the position of DORCA regarding independence for Melanesian colonies, particularly Papua and New Guinea. Certainly, members of the directorate such as Hogbin and Wedgwood in particular, and Julius Stone to a lesser degree, argued for increasing indigenous control, and possibly some form of self-government. We do not think they envisaged that these colonies could be independent nations, rather some form of self-government and association with the colonial nation. Throughout the war discussion and debate, muted as they might have been, continued on the future of colonies and this debate occurred particularly within the Directorate of Research.⁸³ Certainly, the members of DORCA argued for an enlightened postwar colonial policy and practice.

Anthropologists had a particular interest in examining what was variously described as a clash of cultures, culture contact and the consequence of these events: cultural or social change—that is, the modification of cultural practices to make them compatible with modernity. Understanding these events and the processes associated with them assisted colonial administrators to advance the

81 Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A history of humanitarianism* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 2011), p. 28.

82 Gray, *A Cautious Silence*, *passim*. See also Max Pinkowski, 'American Colonialism at the Dawn of the Cold War' (pp. 62–88), and Frank A. Salamone, 'In the Name of Science: The Cold War and the direction of scientific pursuits' (pp. 89–107), both in Dustin M. Wax (ed.), *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War* (London/Ann Arbor, Mich., 2008).

83 See especially Gray on Hogbin and Stanner, and Pybus on Conlon, in this volume. Also Gray, "'The next focus of power to fall under the spell of this little gang'", pp. 101–17. Geoffrey Bolton, Dr Evatt and Mr Hasluck at the United Nations, Unpublished paper. Bolton comments: 'I think it possible that Coombs because of his subsequent eminence has been a little over-rated and Hogbin a little under-rated as influences on the early shaping of post war policy for PNG.' Email, 15 November 2010. Cf. Tim Rowse, *Nugget Coombs: A reforming life* (Melbourne, 2003), pp. 178–81, who ascribes some unwarranted importance to the role of Coombs vis-a-vis the directorate and its work.

‘native’ down the road of civilisation. It was not merely a matter of pacification. The Australian-born political scientist Linden Mander believed that past colonial policy had

been...administered without a realisation that...the impact of Western life upon native life has unleashed forces which cut far deeper than can be effectively dealt with through the traditional methods of Western law and order. Today the Western powers are paying the penalty for this lack of imagination and insight. Those who studied colonial policy years ago within the dimension of the political and legal are now confronted with situations which these methods are relatively powerless to control.⁸⁴

This was a plea for social science and its practitioners to help identify the problems of colonial administration and the advancement and welfare of the colonised peoples.

A number of monographs, booklets and pamphlets were published during the war and in the period immediately after the war extending until the mid-1950s. Imbued with optimism and idealism, Australian and New Zealand social scientists, writers, intellectuals and church leaders with interest in the Pacific set out arguments and put out moral calls for a new future and a ‘new deal’ for Pacific Islanders. Among some writers was a belief that the colonial powers were indebted to the indigenous populations who had assisted and sacrificed for the Allied war effort.

The New Zealand-born and American-based anthropologist Felix M. Keesing, for some years on the staff of the Institute of Pacific Relations,⁸⁵ was one of the first into this field with his *The South Seas in the Modern World* in 1941. Keesing attempted to ‘define comprehensively the political, strategic, and economic role these Oceanic islands play in the world today, and especially the modern experience and problems of the peoples native to them’.⁸⁶ During the war,

84 Linder [sic] A. Mander, ‘Review [of *Island Administration in the South West Pacific*, by Cyril S. Belshaw]’, *Pacific Historical Review*, 19:3 (1950), pp. 315–16. Linden A. Mander, a South Australian, was Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington (Seattle) and authored *Some Dependent Peoples of the South Pacific* (Leiden/New York, 1954). At a Pacific History Workshop—‘1945 to 1965: The Defining Years’—held at the ANU in December 2003, three views were expressed about Eddie Ward, the Minister for External Territories in the Labor Government (1941–49), and implicitly postwar policy in Papua and New Guinea. Donald Denoon made reference largely by omission in arguing that Paul Hasluck, Minister for External Territories in the second Menzies Government (1951–66), was the best of all postwar Ministers for Territories. He did not think Ward was up to Hasluck. The New Guinean historian August Kituai started and finished his paper with Ward’s 1945 policy statement and its inherent promise to Papua New Guineans that things would change for the better. It was a moral statement about the failure of the Australian Government rather than a statement about Ward. This was implicit also in the story about Tom Kabu—promises made during the war and the failure to implement these promises on the ground. Outside these views, the period 1945–49 was not discussed, and no paper addressed the immediate postwar policy in Papua New Guinea.

85 Woodman, *An A. B. C. of the Pacific*, p. 86.

86 Felix M. Keesing, *The South Seas in the Modern World* (New York, 1941), p. xiii.

he worked as an analyst in the Research and Analysis Branch's Pacific Island section, where he 'directed the compilation of information...on "all phases of psychological warfare, morale, politics, diplomacy, public administration, law personnel and social affairs in the area"', which was designated the South-West Pacific during the war.⁸⁷

The Institute of Pacific Relations sponsored research into identifying problems of colonial administration and had a number of publications that focused on the impact of the Pacific War on colonial administration, which were part of a wider push for long-term change. Social anthropologists such as Stanner, Elkin, Hogbin and Wedgwood, the New Zealand-born Cyril Belshaw and the British expert on colonial administration Lucy Mair, and a number of missionaries including J. W. Burton and the Anglican Bishop of Sydney George Cranswick all addressed political and social change in the South-West Pacific in some detail, with differing motives and outcomes.⁸⁸

An analysis of the similarities and differences between the models developed by individual scholars, missionaries and public intellectuals would give us a more nuanced understanding of the contribution of social scientists to this short but intense debate surrounding a 'new deal', which was soon overshadowed by different concerns and political necessities.

A direct result of the war was the shift of power in the Pacific: an increasing dependency on America coinciding with the demise of British military power, and, as the 1940s ended, the onset of the Cold War. The difficulty for Australia and New Zealand during and after the war was balancing American power and influence in the Pacific with an attachment to Britain. That is, the US Navy and American troops in the streets of Australia and New Zealand were 'a constant reminder that New Zealanders lived in a Pacific country'. Australia and New Zealand faced a common dilemma:

[H]ow to pay their dues in this new, dangerous American sphere of dominance while remaining members of the British Commonwealth.

87 David H. Price, *Anthropological Intelligence: The deployment and neglect of American anthropology in the Second World War* (Durham, NC, 2008), pp. 222–3.

88 A. P. Elkin, *Wanted—A charter for the native peoples of the South-West Pacific* (Sydney, 1943); H. Ian Hogbin and C. V. Wedgwood, *Development and Welfare in the Western Pacific* (Sydney, 1943); J. W. Burton, *The Atlantic Charter and the Pacific Races* (Sydney, 1943); [H. E. Hurst], *The Pacific Islander: After the war what?* (Geelong, Vic., 1944); Julius Stone, *Colonial Trusteeship in Transition* (Sydney, 1944); Lucy Mair, *Australia in New Guinea* (London, 1948); G. H. Cranswick and I. W. A. Shevill, *A New Deal for Papua* (Melbourne, [1949]); H. Ian Hogbin, *Transformation Scene: The changing culture of a New Guinea village* (London, 1951); 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 the Pacific territories* (Sydney, 1953). Of course, various articles appeared in the journal *Pacific Affairs*. This is by no means a comprehensive listing of works dealing with postwar colonial policy and practice in the South-West Pacific or Oceania generally. There were also a number of pamphlets on the postwar future of Aboriginal people in Australia.

Added was the sense of Britishness inhabiting New Zealanders, their direct economic interests, and the need to cling in self-defence to the power of the Royal Navy [that all] kept New Zealand comfortably under direct British control longer than other settler Dominions.⁸⁹

How the Cold War impacted on Australian and New Zealand anthropologists and social scientists generally is under-researched, although some individual cases have been addressed in the scholarly literature.⁹⁰ As one writer so succinctly put it: 'Western countries underwent a period of anti-communist hysteria.'⁹¹ Nevertheless, intellectual suppression during the Cold War in Australia and New Zealand was relatively benign compared with the often public humiliation American social scientists were frequently subjected to in the 1950s.⁹² To be sure, some scientists and social scientists were publicly accused of being communists and their careers were curtailed and hindered.⁹³ It is well known that the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) engaged in covert investigation of social scientists and scientists. Some of the social scientists in *Scholars at War* were subjected to such investigations but the impact these investigations had on the careers we have so far been unable to ascertain.⁹⁴

VI

American social scientists, particularly anthropologists, have been reluctant to discuss and analyse their involvement in war. David Price finds this attitude confusing: 'The silence surrounding American anthropology in the Second World War is especially curious, given widely held feelings of honor and support for those American men and women who contributed to the fight against tyranny.'⁹⁵ Despite a large body of anthropological literature analysing conflict and war, there is a 'surprising lack of scholarly documentation and analysis of anthropology's contribution to the wars of the twentieth century'.⁹⁶ Australian and New Zealand anthropologists are similarly reticent. We are reminded of

89 See Hempenstall, 'Overcoming Separate Histories'.

90 See, for example, Jean Buckley-Moran, 'Australian Scientists and the Cold War', in Brain Martin, C. M. Ann Baker, Clyde Manwell and Cedric Pugh (eds), *Intellectual Suppression: Australian case histories—analysis and responses* (Sydney, 1986), p. 11; Phillip Deery, 'Scientific Freedom and Postwar Politics: Australia, 1945–55', *Historical Records of Australian Science*, 13:1 (1986), pp. 1–18; Geoffrey Gray, '(This Often) Sympathetic Collaboration: Anthropologists, academic freedom and government', *Humanities Research*, 2 (1998), pp. 37–61.

91 Buckley-Moran, 'Australian Scientists and the Cold War', p. 11.

92 See David H. Price, *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's surveillance of activist anthropologists* (Durham, NC, 2004); Wax, *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War*.

93 Intellectual/academic suppression might involve the blocking of funds, the denial of promotion or publication, outright harassment, the subtle undermining of reputation or, in extreme cases, dismissal.

94 Lachlan Clohesy, 'Australian Cold Warrior: The anti-communism of W. C. Wentworth', PhD thesis, Victoria University (Melbourne), 2010.

95 Price, *Anthropological Intelligence*, p. xii.

96 Ibid., p. xii.

Roy MacLeod's observation that 'for many of the men and women caught up in war work it was an aberration, a regrettable interruption to the normal flow of scientific and academic work'.⁹⁷ Australian and New Zealand social scientists have downplayed any role they had during World War II. When Jeremy Beckett, a younger colleague, asked Hogbin about his war work, he quickly passed over it.⁹⁸ Some of the experiences examined in this volume might also lead to the answer that a practical use of expertise by the armed forces—and in war propaganda, despite the high esteem applied social science developed—was seen as undermining scholarly standing. Hogbin's reluctance to answer might be found there, and his association with DORCA and its political ideals seen by conservative elites during the Cold War period as radical and left-wing.

Besides the central question of how war affected the careers of a selected group of social scientists, there are five thematic matters that are addressed in the contributions to *Scholars at War*: the way in which some Australian and New Zealand social scientists sought to involve themselves in war and the war effort both at home and abroad; the role of Australian and New Zealand social scientists in World War II and the way in which they were used by the military authorities; the way anthropologists in particular assisted Australian (and Allied) military forces in the effective use of indigenous peoples during war; the way in which war enlarged anthropology's role as an informing and advising discipline and some of the consequences war had on the institutional structures of the discipline, including transnational ties and networks; and the influence war had on the individual scholar, their scholarship and the wider discipline.

We take a biographical approach to allow a nuanced appraisal of individual experiences and wider trends. No-one was left unaffected. No given person's war experience was the same as another's. Certain generalisations, however, emerge. Those caught up in frontline duties usually have far more negative memories of their wartime experience than those who served in non-combat roles.⁹⁹ Apart from Phillips and Davin, none of the scholars in this book had to confront the physicality of war and they tended to look back more benignly on their wartime years.

The war often enhanced careers, providing opportunities and preferment that would not otherwise have arisen. The social scientists in this book were able to continue as anthropologists or historians because the state needed their expertise and scholarship. Accordingly, they were drafted into duties that were closely related to their callings, creating continuity rather than disruption or disjunction. The youthful J. D. Legge used his experiences in DORCA as the

97 MacLeod, *Science and the Pacific War*, pp. 1–3.

98 Personal communication, Jeremy Beckett, 3 February 1993.

99 This point emerges unmistakably in Jeremy D. Popkin, *History, Historians, & Autobiography* (Chicago/London, 2005), pp. 187–204.

springboard to a successful academic career first in Pacific history before moving onto South-East Asian history. Ian Hogbin, Camilla Wedgwood and Bill Stanner did not have to make up on lost time after the war, because they were able to continue their callings—if in a different guise and under different circumstances. Indeed, they achieved a great deal during the war. Stanner, it is true, bemoaned his wasted war years but he was prone to blaming others for his setbacks and for allowing circumstances to get the better of him. Elkin—at the peak of his power both within the academy and with government before the outbreak of war—saw his importance and influence diminish. He was disappointed at being unable to influence events to any extent, although his patronage did help Ronald Berndt—who was lucky enough not to be called up—to engage in fieldwork during and after the war. The one whose career unravelled in the postwar period was also the one whose star was most on the ascendancy in wartime Australia. Conlon preferred working outside established hierarchies and structures; as Peter Ryan states, Conlon ‘drew perverse enjoyment from the deliberate pursuit of the winding ways instead of the straight path. He would use the back stairs even when the grand front door had been opened for him.’¹⁰⁰ Conlon cultivated personal support and loyalties both with his superiors and with members of the directorate; he failed, however, to establish a broader support base from which he could launch an organisational structure that would survive in postwar Australia. He had limited success, nonetheless, with the creation of the Pacific Territories Research Council and the School of Civil Affairs, both of which excluded him when taken over by the Department of External Territories.

Finally, we hope that *Scholars at War* stimulates further debate and research into the development of the social sciences in Australasia and the Pacific and the work of Australasian social scientists.

100 Peter Ryan, *Brief Lives* (Sydney, 2004), p. 61.