

Reflections...

THE EARLY YEARS OF PACIFIC HISTORY

Dorothy Shineberg
Australian National University

*He asked me what I knew about Pacific history.
I said: 'What's Pacific history?' (1947).*

PREAMBLE: I have been told that I am allowed to reminisce about my rambling career as a Pacific history teacher and researcher. Hopefully something on the evolution of thinking about Pacific history will emerge. This paper reflects its origins. An earlier version was presented in December 1991 at the Pacific Islands History Workshop II, held at the Australian National University. The conversational style of the original has been retained.

My connection with Pacific history started about the end of 1947, when I was looking for a job. I saw an advertisement for a tutorship in 'colonial history' at a place called the Australian School of Pacific Administration (ASOPA), of which I'd never heard. The main reason I applied for the job was that it was in Sydney, and Sydney was somewhere else than Melbourne, where I had so far spent all my life.

After a few weeks I got back a scrawled note that said, as nearly as I can remember, 'Can you come up to see me about the job in colonial history. I've booked a plane fare for you', and it was signed 'Alf Conlon'. Probably most people here know of Alf Conlon, who joined the Army when a third-year medical student, and came out of it a colonel on General Thomas Blamey's personal staff. He had sold the idea of a research unit to Blamey, just by going up and talking to him. He was the force behind the School of Civil Affairs, the precursor to ASOPA, which aimed at training the people going to administer what is now Papua New Guinea. He was said to be one of the forces behind the foundation of the Australian National University (ANU) Research Schools, though I doubt that one could either confirm or deny that by consulting the written records of its foundation (see, for instance, Foster and Varghese 1996:3). He operated behind the scenes, through informal personal contacts and through his formidable gift of the gab. People later told me I should have kept that note and framed it, because nobody could remember seeing anything actually *written* by Alf.

At the time, of course, I knew nothing of Alf or his history, and when I rolled up to talk to him in the library of his house I had no qualms. And he soon put me at ease anyway. I think that Alf's greatest gift was that of making one feel important. Although I was very young and very ignorant he made me feel important. He asked me what I knew about Pacific history. I said: 'What's Pacific history?' He said he'd just been reading a very good book by Gregory Bienstock called *The Struggle for the Pacific*, and he talked a bit about it. I said: 'Oh you mean European imperialism in the Pacific.' I explained earnestly that this was just another case of imperialism in a specific area, and that what one had to teach was the nature of imperialism, and its background in the rise of industrialisation and the accumulation and export of capital. (Forgive me: I was not quite 21.) Alf just puffed on his pipe. When I got through the lecture, he took out his pipe and said: 'All right. But at least you have to teach the history of New Guinea, because these blokes are going to be part of it.' He asked me if I could move up to Sydney and start reading in their library. I said yes I could, and I came up and installed myself in one of the army huts of which the School consisted, at the tip of Middle Head, the most beautiful spot I had ever seen. A short time later Alf interviewed another Melbourne history graduate, John Miles, and he hired him too.¹

Alf introduced us to our colleagues at ASOPA. It was an all-star cast. There was Jim McAuley, already a well-known poet, who taught Colonial Administration. Alf thought that if you were a good poet, teaching Colonial Administration would present no problem whatsoever. (And in fact Jim taught it very well mainly from the literature about Africa, about the only thing in print then.) There were two anthropologists: Camilla Wedgwood,² marvellous teacher, and Ian Hogbin,³ whom I'm sure you all know too: during my time he was replaced by Kenneth Read, who wrote *The High Valley*, about the New Guinea Highlands.⁴ There was Hal Wooten⁵ who taught Law. David Fienberg (later Fenbury)⁶ taught Practical Administration. A Sydney philosophy graduate, Helen Shiels,⁷ taught a course in Clear Thinking. The Principal was John Kerr,⁸ whom I admired then for his advanced views on the future of Papua New Guinea.

There were two groups of young men to teach. Most of the bunch doing what we called the Long Course (two years) were army personnel with New Guinea experience who had already done a short course of training. They had been brought down for two years' training, after which, if all went well, they would be sent back to New Guinea as Patrol Officers. The Short Course at ASOPA consisted of rookies, who had joined the service as cadet patrol officers: they came straight to the School to do two or more months' orientation course before going up to New Guinea. After a couple of years' experience in the field, they were to be brought down to do the Long Course. The motley bunch of teachers I talked about were facing the first intake under this scheme.

The ASOPA library was very good, and was run by ex-Mitchell librarian Ida Leeson. There were already several books written on imperialism in the Pacific apart from Bienstock. Probably the earliest one was from New Zealand: G. H. Scholefield's *The Pacific, its Past and Future*, published in 1919. It had a useful chronology of European annexations in the back pages, which I still use. Sydney's Stephen Roberts had done a book on *The History of French Colonial Policy*, in 1929, with chapters on the French Pacific territories. It's a very slapdash and prejudiced account, but it was just about all there was on the French Pacific colonies for the next forty years, in either French or English. There was a series of American books on international rivalry in the Pacific: there was a useful book by Mary Evelyn Townsend called *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*, that appeared in 1930 and followed on from the one she did in 1921 on the origins of German

colonialism. Sylvia Masterman's book, *The Origins of International Rivalry in Samoa, 1845–1884*, appeared in 1934. During the war practically the only publications came out of America. There was Jean Ingram Brookes's work called *International Rivalry in the Pacific Islands*, published in 1941. This was quite a scholarly work, even if you had the feel that it was a PhD student looking for a field of imperialism that hadn't been 'done' yet. And it ends in 1875, which cuts out a lot of Pacific imperialism. Another American, E. H. Bryan, published a book called *American Polynesia*, in 1941, which is really mostly about Micronesia; it's one of those one-damned-thing-after-another books, but it's got some information in it that I've never seen elsewhere that was very useful to me. Felix Keesing⁹ was the only one I can remember who tackled broad themes of so-called 'colonial development'—like education, health and questions of land tenure—across a number of Pacific territories, in a book called *The South Seas in the Modern World*, published in 1941. During the war, two theses were written on the Pacific Islands; one was on European penetration in the South Seas, written at Cambridge University by J. W. (Jim) Davidson, a New Zealander, who was by then the Professor of Pacific History at the ANU; the other by John M. Ward, soon to succeed Roberts as Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney. Ward published his in 1948, the year I went to ASOPA, as *British Policy in the South Pacific*. Jim never got around to publishing his, but chunks of his work appeared in the 'Admiralty Handbooks' (see Ward 1995). All these writers, I noted, seemed to have the devil of a job relating imperialism in the Pacific to the export of capital!

The only academic study of New Guinea I could find was also from America and of wartime vintage. It was Stephen Reed's *The Making of Modern New Guinea*, which came out in 1943. It saved my life. John Miles and I used it and just kept a chapter ahead of the students. It's quite administration oriented, but it does give the impression that there were also indigenous people actually living in New Guinea who were affected in many ways by the policies discussed. I still think it's a good book. There were also the mission books, the Murray books and other memoirs, and the printed *Annual Reports*.

I was at ASOPA for two and a half years. In August 1950 I went to America, on a Teaching Fellowship to Smith College, Massachusetts.¹⁰ My fare was

paid by a Fulbright travel grant; I am told I was the first Australian woman to receive one. To go to America for further study was an unusual thing for a Melbourne graduate to do in those days. The norm was to go to Oxford—or if the worst came to worst, Cambridge—even if it was only to repeat the last two years of an undergraduate degree there. Anything else didn't count.

But in fact I learned a great deal at Smith. Not so much from courses I took, although they were interesting (of course there was no such things as Pacific history there—Southeast Asian was the closest I got). But I have been lucky all my life in meeting interesting people, and I learned an enormous amount from the lecturer I was supposed to assist, Massimo Salvadori, better known as Max. He was an Italian from a well-known Protestant family who had done time in a Fascist prison—not for being a militant Communist but for being a militant liberal! the first and only one I've ever met. He also had a distinguished wartime record.¹¹ It's hard to describe his views briefly without making them sound trite, but I suppose you could say that he was an old-fashioned liberal universalist: he not only thought that human beings were equal but that basically they were similar in their aspirations. Cultural differences were important, but still based on what he thought were fundamental patterns of human behaviour. So he would first look for what he considered the normal human power plays or status-seeking in any society no matter how different from his own, be it ancient Greece, Moslem Arabia or sixteenth century China. He thought that liberal institutions were good for everybody: he didn't think that they brought about a good and just society, but he thought they were essential safeguards within which to work. This of course doesn't do justice to his philosophy nor can I convey a notion of the strength of his feeling or the breadth of his learning.

One might not think that such views would arouse much contention but in fact they were extremely nonconformist at the time, especially in Academe. For example, at this time, around 1950, American intellectuals were paying great attention and respect to nationalism, to the rise of national feeling, especially in the non-European world. Salvadori made himself unpopular by referring to nationalism as a powerful but superficial emotion, one that could be encouraged deliberately, and one that appealed to the ego rather than to the social conscience. It had to be taken into account, but should be regarded with suspicion instead of reverence. It was not

necessarily a liberating force for humanity, and although it might in the short run help achieve liberation from colonial domination, if it had no liberal content it would simply result in new forms of domination. He pointed out that Americans tended to confuse liberalism and nationalism because the two had, by historical accident, gone together in their own history, but that they should not extrapolate from this.

The other highly unpopular point he raised was the romanticism often inherent in the views of intellectuals who championed various underdogs. It was fine to support the rights of the working class, the indigenous Americans, the colonial subjects etc. because they had been the victims of history whose rights needed restoration; but it was not fine to ennoble them. There is nothing noble about being poor, ignorant and dominated. To put one's hopes in the higher political morality of these people when they achieved emancipation was a way of avoiding the more difficult issues of social reconstruction: it was to invite disillusionment, at best, for former underdogs would probably in their new circumstances behave like most human beings, not worse and not better. You could not get away from the necessity of creating liberal institutions to limit the power of the governing, whoever they might be, and to preserve the rights of the governed.

I had differences with Max, but basically I thought he was right and I still do think so. His ideas affected what I later taught and wrote about Pacific history. Something else I learned from him by example rather than precept was the importance of detail in a historical example; that one quality case-study was worth quite a few generalities.

Back at Melbourne University after two years at Smith, nobody even asked me what I had done in America—it was too embarrassing to talk about. However, they were looking for people to teach very specialised fields of history to small groups of fourth year Honours students. The idea was to direct a seminar course in which the students would do their own research papers. Kathleen Fitzpatrick¹² remembered that I had taught something in Sydney about the history of the Pacific Islands, so she asked me to take a fourth year Honours course in Pacific history. I accepted with pleasure. It was 1953 when it began, and I think it was the first of its kind in a university. (I think Stephen Roberts may have had a section of his Australian history course devoted to the Pacific, and John Ward also probably did a Pacific segment—possibly in Roberts's course—I've never really found out about

that. Maybe, also, Mary Boyd was doing something in New Zealand).¹³ My course was a bit odd, it now seems to me. I suppose it followed what there was to read at the time.

We did have a pre-colonial section—we ‘did’ missionaries; we did labour recruiting, at least to Queensland. Traders were very shadowy and sinister figures in the background. We had published mission sources, but not much then in the way of manuscript material. I do remember though that we made good use of Lovett’s 1899 *History of the London Missionary Society*, which had large extracts from missionary letters and journals, and I think that in reading those we had a sense of being close to first-hand experience of at least *their* life in the islands. We also covered the imperialism bit, which now had even more written about it. Then we studied colonial administration. I have found my course outline for second term 1953, in which we did the colonial administration bit. We certainly covered a wide field—including Indonesia and the Philippines. We used J. S. Furnivall for Indonesia, dreadful Roberts for the French territories, Felix Keesing for Samoa, and dear old Reed for New Guinea. Niel Gunson was a student in this course, and he doubtless has his own views about it.

Jim Davidson’s department in Canberra had already been going for three years; Jim was interested in my course in Melbourne, hoping it would provide graduate students for his department, which it did soon after when Niel went to do his PhD there, after first doing an MA with me. (Another student, Ian Grosart, followed in my footsteps as a teacher at ASOPA.) In 1953 Jim came to Melbourne to give a lecture to my students about Samoa, and he came again in 1954. When arranging the second visit, I wrote to him:

It would suit me very nicely if you could talk personally on the subject of indirect rule and alternative forms of colonial govt. Perhaps you could take Samoa to point the distinction between I.R. & simply the attempt to preserve native institutions—on the Samoan side resistance to interference. But I think the general discussion would be the most helpful to them at this stage.

We have merely sketched the problem, in relation to both Indonesia & Fiji and a word or two about the impossibility of its working in New Guinea. About Samoan govt. they know nothing yet. They will only get a chance to look at Keesing before you come. All discussion of the general problem has been quite incidental.

I gave the course at Melbourne for three years. In 1955 I was joined by Jamie Mackie,¹⁴ who was just back from Oxford and his second BA degree; he tended to take over the Asian part leaving me to concentrate on the Pacific Islands. I gradually became more and more focused on the early contact period, which began to fascinate me.

I left at the beginning of 1956 to have a baby—one had no choice then but to resign—and that was the end of Pacific history in Melbourne until Greg Dening went there seventeen years later in 1973. I had two children and was *hors de combat* for five years. When I tried to re-enter Academia in Melbourne—and Melbourne was still the only university in Victoria—I was offered a part-time tutorship in European history but no prospect of a full-time job. John La Nauze was then Head of Department, and he told me quite frankly, in these words, ‘I would never appoint a woman when I could get a man’. He did, however, support me for a research scholarship, since he thought I could do a lot of work at home without interfering too much with my duties as wife and mother.

I began work on a PhD about missionaries in the New Hebrides, since they had left quite a few records, and as I imagined them to have been the first European contacts with the islanders, initial contact being what I wanted to explore. But the missionaries’ journals themselves informed me that they were not the earliest contacts. Everywhere they went they complained about the iniquitous sandalwood traders who had been before them, and, in their account, queered the pitch for them with their infamous behaviour. But traders do not often leave memoirs—how could one find out anything about traders in small ships (see Maude 1968a:233)? Then I read Harry Maude’s piece about the Tahitian pork trade (Maude 1959), and that was the beginning of a long correspondence with Harry—who was then at the ANU in the Pacific History Department¹⁵—and eventually a visit to see him. He emphatically supported the view that the traders played a more important role, and he told me how to look for them. He told me that in the early nineteenth century, Australians were far better informed about the Pacific Islands than they have been at any time since. The Sydney newspapers were full of Pacific Islands news, precisely because very few ships came from Europe. When a ship did arrive from Europe, there was nothing in the paper for days but European news and extracts from the English papers. But there were long gaps in between. So when the small ships came in from the islands, a reporter would always go on board and

pick up all the news he could to fill up the paper. As it happened the marvellous Melbourne Public Library (as it was then) had an almost complete file of the *Shipping Gazette & Sydney General Trade List*. I learnt from Harry how to plot the comings and goings of the ships and how to read the manifests of cargo that always appeared in the shipping columns, so that one could tell exactly what goods were going out to the islands. Gradually I was led to company papers (notably the Towns Papers in the Mitchell Library), with most revealing letters from ships' captains to the owners, never meant to be read by anyone else, about happenings in the islands and about what the Islanders demanded by way of trade goods. The crowning joy was finding a few stray logs and journals of traders' voyages.

The picture was entirely different from the one painted by the missionaries; the letters from traders, for example, often were the letters of tired and frightened men, quite often on the wrong side of the power equation, rather than swashbuckling pirates who always got their way. I was fascinated by this picture of the meeting of very different peoples on a relatively equal basis, for at this time no great Power thought it worth while to back the traders—they were more or less on their own. I thought the quality of the case was unusual, and therefore worth pursuing in detail, and I think it did produce interesting results.

La Nauze was my supervisor, although he frankly admitted that he knew nothing whatsoever about Pacific history. He held the view that if one could not work independently at this level, then one had no business to be seeking a doctorate. I agreed with him; indeed I was very relieved to be left on my own, only seeking help where I needed it from people like Harry Maude. I still find it hard to empathise with PhD students who complain that they don't have enough supervision. La Nauze conscientiously read my draft chapters. His most valued contribution was to point to a particular sentence and say discreetly, 'Do you really think you should say *that* in the context?' I am grateful to him for preventing me from writing, when I referred to the injunction that no women were allowed on Robert Towns's trading ships, that it was 'a rule more honoured in the breach than in the observance'.

I came up to the ANU as a Research Fellow in 1964 and revised my thesis for a book called *They Came for Sandalwood* (1967). Niel Gunson has already written about the Pacific History Department in that era (Gunson

1992:1–13). I have only to mention the obvious thing—that Jim Davidson felt strongly about shifting the focus of research from the many general studies of European empires and rivalries to changes happening in the islands themselves, to what culture contact meant for island societies, and to looking at their active participation in developments (Davidson 1966). We were encouraged to see the European contact period as just an episode in the history of these societies, already a long one since the settlement of the people there until Europeans came upon them. Africanists and Southeast Asianists were oriented to this approach before us. As John Smail (1962) has pointed out, they were trying to move the indigenous people to the centre of the stage, rather than seeing them as bit players in a European drama. I suppose this is the thing by which most commentators have characterised the Davidson regime. The fact that Pacific Islands history was treated as a serious study was, of course, in itself a new thing.

On the ideas level, I don't think that Jim ever got completely away from the idealisation of island societies—at least of the Polynesian communities, with whom he found it much easier to identify than the Melanesian ones. Also he was fascinated by island politics, and didn't have much sympathy for the shipping enthusiasts: he called us the 'Yo-ho-heave-ho' school of history. For both those reasons I don't think he approved very much of *Sandalwood*. But the thing that was good about Davidson's direction was the lack of it. He quite simply believed that people would do better research if they studied what interested *them*, rather than what appealed to him, or the powers-that-be, or the general public. There were people in the department whose work he liked less than mine, and no doubt he would make a crack or two at their expense at morning tea-time, but he never dreamt of interfering. In fact he was always supportive, and intensely loyal should there be interference or ignorant criticism from outside. Personally, so far as method, approach and bibliography went, I learnt more from Harry Maude. But together, Jim Davidson and he were a formidable force for the foundation of research in the subject.

I began teaching again while I was still a Research Fellow, providing a Pacific history course for Honours history students from what was then the ANU School of General Studies, now called The Faculties. Honours students used to come over to the Coombs building for a two-hour seminar each week. Now, with all the marvellous manuscript material that had been collected by the 1960s, under the auspices of the Research School, I could

get the students to do intensive studies of small societies. They really loved this: here they were, undergraduates, who could become the world authority on the evolution of a particular small society. I have never seen such enthusiastic researchers. Some of them did a very good job of it; some had their papers published, others are still having a subsequent Honours thesis quoted in scholars' footnotes. When I went to The Faculties as a full-time teacher I continued this method. Each student studied a different place, with the idea that one pooled one's special knowledge, in tutorials, in a discussion of a particular theme. This general discussion was successful only now and then, but the excitement of finding themselves able to discover new things in their special area was always there.

Something happened around the mid-80s that I don't quite understand, but some students who found that they could get through other courses by studying one or two text books began to complain that they couldn't do the same in Pacific history. But it was only when students asked me to issue a bunch of photocopied articles to each of them so that they didn't have to go the library that I realised it was time for me to quit.

Concerning the assumptions that students brought with them, I had a few initial surprises. I suppose I expected students to come to the course either with no ideas about the Pacific Islands and Pacific Islanders, or some with ideas about ferocious cannibals and perhaps others with notions about noble savages. But all the time I was teaching, almost 100 per cent of the students came to the course with the noble-savage mind-set, expecting to hear about the dismemberment of paradise. You could say that this was because it has remained the prevailing view in popular culture, and that it still pervades journalism and travel literature. But it's more than that, I think, or rather it is what makes this view prevail. It is what Europeans wish to believe, it's a reaction to their alienation from their own society, it is their Other. They have to find paradise elsewhere and if not after death, then in what is to them a remote and unreal part of the world. Anyway, nearly all the students came with this sort of view, and this didn't change right throughout the period I was teaching.

So I found that Pacific history had a lot to teach them not only about real people in the Pacific Islands but about themselves. I found Salvadori's philosophy most apposite in this regard. One had to spend time trying to complicate the mythical constructs the students had set up about the Pacific. These days, I suppose, one would call it a work of deconstruction.

It's a spoil-sport's game, but it made them think more critically about redressing the things they objected to in their own society, instead of seeking a geographical solution.

Pacific history was also a very educative subject in another way; it was ideal for teaching how to go about research, and the importance of detail, and the getting as close as possible to first-hand information. This was made easy by the fact that there was only patchy secondary material and nothing approaching a text-book for most of the time I was teaching, while there was an abundance of source material. And with all the criticism the ANU Pacific History school has had, it's never had the tribute it deserves for the work of actually *assembling* a vast amount of material about the Pacific, collecting manuscripts from everywhere in the world and making them available. This again must be attributed mostly to Harry's vision, for example, the ships' index, the missionary microfilms, the encouragement of the Australian Joint Copying Project and the UNESCO seminar on source materials on the Pacific (Australian National Commission for UNESCO 1973), and of course the establishment of the Pacific Manuscripts Bureau (Maude 1968b), which Bob Langdon so ably managed for many years and which still carries on.

The third reason why it is such an educative subject is the very reason why some denigrate it as insignificant—that is, the very smallness and fragmentation of Pacific Island societies, many of whose forms developed in relative isolation. As Harry Maude wrote:

The anthropologist has, of course, long known this and it would probably be true to say that no other region has contributed so much to the development of anthropological thought and theory. It is not so often realised that it possesses many of the same advantages for the historian, who can attempt to reconstruct and compare the nature of early indigenous societies of many contrasting types . . . and to trace their gradual transformation as pressures from the outside world bring new ideas, techniques, commodities, political systems and economic procedures (Maude 1968a: xvi).

Strangely, he didn't specifically mention religion, although that has been a very important force in most of the Pacific Islands, quite often bringing social, political and cultural change before the arrival of the state on the scene.

Years after I left ASOPA I met Alf Conlon again and he asked me what I was doing. I said that I was teaching Pacific history. He said: 'But you told me there was no such thing. And you convinced me, too.' I wonder whether my new arguments would have convinced him that there was a lot of Pacific history to learn apart from European imperialism, since after almost 50 years I am still studying it.

Postscript on Massimo Salvadori, June 1996

On being asked what Massimo Salvadori wrote, Dr Shineberg responded in a letter to the editor, a slightly amended version of which is reproduced below.

He certainly wrote plenty . . . ¹⁶ I once helped him with research assistance for some grand work on European history of ideas: he was appalled that I knew all the most marginal people in the history of ideas, like Proudhon and Saint Simon, but none of the liberals or constitutionalists. It was just seeing him almost every day for 2 years and listening to his lectures to the young—which he gave without notes—that acquainted me with his views, and also a seminar series of his I took. And we corresponded once a year until he died in August 1992. There was an obituary to his extraordinary life in *The Times*. I've just unearthed his wife's letter to me in January 1993, in which she told me he had died in the August before of a painful cancer, and hadn't read the latest offprint I had sent him. He hadn't told me he was sick. I happened to pull out at the same time another letter from him, of July 1990, in which he thanked me for the offprint about Ballande [Shineberg and Kohler 1990]. He said that although it was probably too late for New Caledonia he hoped that some elements of Melanesian culture would survive to serve 'as a foundation to create something different from what whites created . . . It has always been my principle that the greater the varieties of human experiences, the better, that diversity is preferable to uniformity and that what little mutual respect is required for mutual co-existence is preferable to coercion. That was my belief seventy years ago when involved in the fight against totalitarianism, that

is still my belief.’ I don’t think his books were well reviewed—i.e. didn’t get good ones—for what that’s worth. But I would like two bob for every Smith woman I heard say ‘It was worth coming to Smith just to hear Salvadori’.

Notes

1. John Miles was also innocent of all knowledge of Pacific history at the time. He later became attached to the UN in New York, first as political adviser to the Committee on Decolonization and later holding a more general brief.
2. With wide ranging knowledge, brilliant mind, honest and outspoken, Camilla was a joy to know. She published little, alas, channelling her energies into teaching, at which she was extremely gifted. See her biography (Wetherell and Carr-Gregg 1990).
3. Ian Hogbin studied many societies in the Solomons and New Guinea. He left ASOPA a few months after my arrival for a Readership in Anthropology at the University of Sydney.
4. Kenneth Read later went to the University of Washington. There was not much noble savagery in *The High Valley*. The chief affliction that the people suffered from, in his account, was duodenal ulcers, and in fact he was carried out of the place with the same complaint.
5. Wooten was later an eminent Queen’s Counsel, Supreme Court Judge, and a commissioner on the Inquiry into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody.
6. One of those extraordinary administrative officers in the Australian service who combined good sense and tolerance with an ability to patrol on foot over huge areas of difficult terrain, David was a singular personality who fought unremittingly and fruitlessly against base-wallah bureaucracy. He wrote remarkably well (e.g. Fenbury 1966, 1968) but most of his work—usually aimed either at government policy or popular romanticism about the South Seas—was written under pseudonyms, as behove a public servant.
7. Helen later worked with Harry Maude in the South Pacific Commission. Harry mentions her in his foreword to *Atoll Holiday* by Nancy Phelan. Helen then studied Early Childhood Development in London, and in Port Moresby she lectured at the Papuan Medical College, later joining the South Pacific Commission. She subsequently became David Fenbury’s second wife, after the death of his first.
8. A prominent barrister and later Governor-General of Australia, he was involved in the unfortunate incident of the dismissal of the Whitlam Government.

9. A New Zealand sociologist, Felix was father of Roger who became a Professor of Anthropology at the ANU, and later moved to McGill University.

10. This is one of the so-called Ivy League of women's colleges, with an impressive reputation in America, but little known in Australia at the time, and with an unprepossessing name.

11. For further information see *Faculty Retirements: Smith Alumnae Quarterly*, 64:(4), 1973:10–11. I am grateful to Barbara Trippel Simmons of the Smith College Archives for this reference.

12. Senior Lecturer in British History, and the best lecturer I have ever heard. Her lectures were structured dramatic performances, and we couldn't wait to hear the next one. She was Acting Head of the History Department at the time, in the absence of Max Crawford. She later published a very modest autobiography, called *Solid Bluestone Foundations*.

13. See following article. [Ed.]

14. Later, he also went to America, to Cornell, to study Southeast Asian History, which he taught at Monash University. He subsequently became Professor in the Department of Political and Social Change at the ANU.

15. Harry started as a colonial official in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, later joined the South Pacific Commission, and finally became an academic (Langdon 1978:1–21).

16. As *The Times* obituarist observed (29 August 1992): 'Max Salvadori was author or editor of more than 20 books on modern European political history and politics. Among his most widely read works in English were *American Capitalism*, *A Liberal View* (1954), *Liberal Democracy* (1977) and *The Liberal Heresy* (1977). The recurrence of the word "liberal" was no accident. Max Salvadori was concerned with the significance of liberal-democratic institutions and he was unwavering in his opposition to "the fascination that dictatorialism absolutist and inquisitorial—Nazi—Fascist and Leninist in the 20th century—exercises over sectors of the so-called educated classes". His own memoir of the many years he spent fighting Fascism appeared in English as *The Labour and the Wounds, a personal chronicle of one man's fight for freedom* (1954).'

Minimal bibliography

- AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL COMMISSION for UNESCO, 1973, *Source Materials Related to Research in the Pacific Area*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- DAVIDSON, J. W., 1966, 'Problems of Pacific History', *Journal of Pacific History*, 1:5–21.
- FENBURY, David, 1966, 'The White Cassowary', *New Guinea*, 1(5):48–65.
- FENBURY, David, 1968, 'Those Mokolks: New Guinea's bloody axemen', *New Guinea*, 3(2): 33–50.
- FOSTER, Stephen and Margaret VARGHESE, 1995, *The Making of the Australian National University, 1946–1996*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- GUNSON, Niel, 1992, 'An Introduction to Pacific History', in Brij V. Lal (ed.), *Pacific Islands History: journeys and transformations*, Journal of Pacific History, Canberra.
- LANGDON, Robert, 1978, 'Harry Maude: shy pro-consul, dedicated Pacific historian', in Niel Gunson (ed.), *The Changing Pacific: essays in honour of H.E. Maude*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- MAUDE H.E., 1959, 'The Tahitian Pork Trade, 1800–1830: an episode in Australia's commercial history', *Journal de la Société des Océanistes*, 15(15):55–95 (republished in Maude 1968a:178–232).
- MAUDE, H.E., 1968a, *Of Islands and Men: studies in Pacific History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- MAUDE, H.E., 1968b, 'The Pacific Manuscripts Bureau', *Journal of Pacific History*, 3:191–92.
- SHINEBERG, Dorothy, 1967, *They Came for Sandalwood: a study of the sandalwood trade in the South-west Pacific, 1830–1865*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- SHINEBERG, Dorothy and Jean-Marie KOHLER, 1990, 'Church and Commerce in New Caledonia: Ballande and the bishops', *Journal of Pacific History*, 25(1):3–21.
- SMAIL, John W. R., 1962, 'On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia', *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 2(2):72–102.
- WARD, R. Gerard, 1995, 'Davidson's Contribution to the "Admiralty Handbooks"', *Journal of Pacific History*, 29(2):238–40.
- WETHERELL, David and Charlotte CARR-GREGG, 1990, *Camilla: C. H. Wedgwood, 1901–1955*. New South Wales University Press, Sydney.
-
-