

SÉRIE ANTROPOLOGIA

144

**FIRST IMPRESSIONS FROM A BRAZILIAN
PERSPECTIVE ON THE STUDY OF
ABORIGINAL POPULATIONS IN SOCIAL
ANTHROPOLOGY IN AUSTRALIA
Stephen Grant Baines**

**Brasília
1993**

FIRST IMPRESSIONS FROM A BRAZILIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE STUDY OF ABORIGINAL POPULATIONS IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN AUSTRALIA [1]

Stephen Grant Baines

I arrived in Sydney in March 1992 to undertake a preliminary survey for my research project about anthropology in Australia. During the days following my arrival, the newspaper headlines announced that the ABC television channel had shown, in a police documentary, an amateur video in which two Australian policemen parody the deaths of two Aboriginal men: Lloyd Boney, found hanged in a police cell in the town of Brewarrina, in the north of New South Wales in 1987, and David Gundy, shot down by the police in Sydney early in 1989. In the video, the two policemen appear with their faces painted black, holding pieces of rope around their necks. It was filmed two years before in a party to collect money for charity, in Eromanga, in the west of Queensland and near the town of Bourke, N.S.W., where the two policemen were stationed.

The showing of the video on TV was followed by a wave of racism in which, a few days later, the house of an Aboriginal leader in Brisbane was burnt. The president of the Police Association of N.S.W. tried to excuse the two policemen, declaring to the press that they "had never intended to offend the Aboriginal community" and that it was nothing more than a joke of bad taste to alleviate the stress of their work (The Sydney Morning Herald, 14/3/92, p.7). From another perspective, Paul Coe, Aborigine of the Aboriginal Legal Service in the suburb of Redfern, Sydney, declared that "To blame one or two policemen who were stupid enough and ignorant enough to be shown up for their racism is to make them scapegoats for the evils and the sickness that is perpetrated in every institution that exists in this country. It's a colonial regime as evil and as racist as the South African regime" (Ibid.).

Besides the attention given to these events by the media, I had already witnessed racial segregation in bars in the outback of W.A. and other manifestations of racism during a previous visit of three months to Australia in 1978-9. The "Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody", established in 1987, which investigated the deaths of 99 Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders [2] which occurred between 1980 and 31st May 1989, revealed that the Australian police arrested 29 Aborigines for each non-Aborigine arrested, and detained 15 Aborigines in prisons for each non-Aboriginal prisoner. In W.A., 86.9% of the persons judged and imprisoned during 1989 were Aborigines, in a country with about 250,000 Aborigines in a total population of approximately 17 million. The

[1] The present paper is the result of a five week preliminary research survey in Australia, for a post-doctoral research proposal. I thank the Brazilian National Research Council for financing my international air fares and part of my research expenses in Australia. In consequence of the fact that this paper was originally written in Portuguese and directed specifically to Brazilian readers, it includes many details about anthropology in Australia, as well as general comments on Australia, which will certainly be very obvious to the Australian reader. I have added a few explanations on anthropology in Brazil for the Australian reader. I would appreciate criticisms and comments.

[2] The two indigenous ethnic groups of the Australian continent.

Royal Commission describes this disproportion as "a national disgrace and one which shames Australia in the eyes of the international community". However, nobody had been judged for the deaths of Aborigines in police custody.

The Research Project

During the two years before undertaking this research survey in Australia, I started my present research project, inspired by reading some recent publications of Prof. Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (1988). My research aims to examine anthropology with Aboriginal populations in Australia, seen through the prism of ethnology with indigenous populations carried out in Brazil, as part of the research project on "Styles of Anthropology", coordinated by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, of which I am a member of the research team, in which the comparative dimension of investigation was brought into effect through the study of what it was decided to call "peripheral anthropologies" (Cardoso de Oliveira, 1988:143-159). That is, those anthropologies situated in the periphery of the metropolitan centres of the discipline (the scientific and academic centres where anthropology originated - England, France and the U.S.A.). As Cardoso de Oliveira stresses, "The greater justification for a stylistic focus on peripheral anthropologies lies in the fact that the discipline in the non-metropolitan countries has not lost its universal character". Instead of studying ethnology with indigenous populations as a secondary task relative to anthropological research, in the project the aim is to attempt to construct its object, anthropology with indigenous populations, within a problematic created at the interface of the discipline itself with epistemology.

The present study can be justified by the fact that Australia and Brazil are both "new nations" (Cardoso de Oliveira, 1988:143-159), ex-colonies of European countries, despite having histories which are obviously very different. However, in both countries research about the "Other" is conducted in the form of studies of native populations (although in both countries it is not restricted exclusively to this) over whose territories the nations have expanded. Australia, different from Brazil, was a colony of a "central country" of anthropology - Great Britain - and had overseas territories (Papua-New Guinea, up to 1973), as well as playing a neo-colonial role in Southeast Asia. Despite these differences, there has been a great dynamic and development in anthropology with native populations in both countries, especially since the late 1960's.

In Brazil, several recent publications reflect on anthropology with indigenous populations: bibliographical works by Julio Cezar Melatti (1982; 1984), and by Anthony Seeger and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (1980); numerous publications about government indigenist policy by Alcida Ramos and a reflection about the Brazilian style of doing ethnology (Ramos, 1990), a survey of ethnology with indigenous populations (Laraia, 1987) and studies of kinship (Laraia, 1986), publications about indigenist policy by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, João Pacheco de Oliveira, Roque de Barros Laraia and many other anthropologists which have been written within the tradition established in Brazilian ethnology with indigenous populations that focuses on interethnic relations, tradition begun by Darcy Ribeiro and finding its principal theoretical mentor in Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira in his publications about "interethnic friction" since the early 1960's [3]. As

[3] His theoretical proposals are very clearly expounded, among many other publications, in his

Mariza Peirano (1991:183-84) emphasizes, "the concept of `inter-ethnic friction' was itself the theoretical result of the difficulty and/or the impossibility to live the distinction (between `anthropology with native populations' and `anthropology of the national society') by Brazilian anthropologists, establishing itself, perhaps as the most genuinely `native' concept which anthropology has yet produced in Brazil". Peirano notes, in a comparison of the anthropology that is practised in Brazil with that practised in India:

"In Brazil a theory with political engagement led to the development of the concept of `interethnic friction', while in India a religious context makes an interpretative analysis of hinduism a possible symbol of nationality. The concept of interethnic friction... had as its objective an evaluation of the integration potential of indigenous groups in the national society together with a theoretical preoccupation, the political engagement of the anthropologist being undeniable" (1992:247-248).

It can be asserted that this concept became a "founding event" (Ricoeur, 1978) in the development of the style of anthropology with indigenous populations that is practised in Brazil, deeply influencing nearly all the later work in this area. It was my interest in studying the situation of Indian populations, after having read some publications by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira and Julio Cezar Melatti about interethnic relations, which led me to come to Brasília to study for my doctorate in 1980.

I arrived in Australia, in 1992, with only a preliminary reading of anthropology with indigenous populations in that country, directed toward obtaining some general ideas about its history and a basic outline of current tendencies. In this paper, I aim to comment on my first impressions, taking as a starting point the considerations of Mariza Peirano (1992:237) to open a discussion about their possible application to the Australian case:

"1) that the anthropologist's thinking is part of the very sociocultural configuration in which it emerges; 2) that the ideologically predominant sociocultural contexts in the modern world are the nation states; 3) that the social representations of the nation are not uniform; 4) that, given that the development of anthropology coincided with and was linked to the formation of the European nation states, the ideology of *nation-building* is a parameter and an important symptom for the characterization of the social sciences wherever they emerge".

Different from my proposal in the case of Australia, Peirano's work is not restricted exclusively to anthropology with native populations, considering that she interviewed some anthropologists who do not work in this area. As Melatti points out (personal communication), a comparison with Brasil, following the parameters of the work of Peirano, would have to examine Australian literature and intellectual life in broader terms, including physical anthropology, as well as the studies of black populations in Brazil which focused on the concept of "race". However, this is beyond the aims of this paper. Another important question to be taken into consideration is the fact that Australia did not have a population of African origin transplanted by force, its colonization beginning with

book, O Índio e o Mundo dos Brancos (1981 [1964]), and a collection of essays written between 1960 and 1975 entitled A Sociologia do Brasil Indígena (1978).

the establishment of British penal colonies. However, it is worth bearing in mind, as Kapferer states, in an article about nationalist ideology and comparative anthropology, that "the subjectivity of the anthropologist, like that of any other person, is rooted in the historic and ideological worlds in which he is positioned" (1989:166).

The research survey

In this paper I aim to outline some of my first impressions obtained through interviews with anthropologists, especially those who work in the area of Aboriginal studies in the Australian continent, during my brief stay in three of the largest centres of studies with Aboriginal populations in Australia - Sydney, Canberra and Perth [4], leaving for future papers the development of some of the themes mentioned here. In this research

[4] Some of the interviews were of very short duration (30 minutes), while others were of one or two hours and more, carried out over several encounters. The academics interviewed were - University of Sydney: Prof. Jeremy Beckett, Assoc. Prof. Diane Austen-Broos, Dr. Francesca Merlan, Dr. Gillian Cowlshaw, and Dr. Marie De Lepervanche (Dept. of Anthropology); Dr. Tony Swain (School of Studies in Religion); Dr. Jan Larbalestier (Dept. of Sociology). Macquarie University, Sydney: Prof. Annette Hamilton, Prof. Kenneth Maddock, Dr. Andrew Lattas (School of Behavioural Sciences). The barrister Dr. Marc Gumbert (Sydney). Australian National University, Canberra: Dr. Nicolas Peterson, Dr. Deborah Bird Rose, and the PhD student Robert Levitus (Dept. of Pre-History & Anthropology); Prof. D.J. Mulvaney (Hon. fellow, Dept. of History, Australian Academy of the Humanities); Dr Rolf Gerritsen (Dept. of Public Policies); Dr. Jon Altman and Diane Smith (Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research). Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), Canberra: Dr. Stephen Wild, Dr. Graham Henderson, Dr. Alice Moyle and Maggie Brady. University of Western Australia, Perth: Prof Basil Sansom, Dr. Greg Acciaioli, Prof. Robert Tonkinson, Dr. Myrna Tonkinson, Dr. Sandy Toussaint, Dr. David Trigger, and the PhD student Kim Barber (Dept. of Anthropology); Dr. John Stanton, Anthropology Museum, University of Western Australia. Curtin University of Technology, Perth: Phillip Moore (School of Social Sciences). Dr. Patricia Baines, consultant (Perth). The Aboriginal leaders Kevin Gilbert, Robert Bropho, Brian Wyatt, and Ralph Winmar. I also had the opportunity to meet Dr. Alan Rumsey, Dr. Michael Allen and some undergraduate and graduate students (Dept. of Anthropology, University of Sydney), Marcia Langton (Dept. of Behavioural Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney), Dr. Luke Taylor (Australian Museum, Canberra), Dr. Kingsley Palmer, Dr. Tamsin Donaldson, Penny Taylor (AIATSIS), the consultants Gil Hardwick, Dr. Edward M. MacDonald, and Dr. Barrie Machin (Perth) and Robert Reynolds, Dept. of Aboriginal Sites, and Dr. Wil Christenson and Dr. Chris Birdsell (School of Social Sciences, Curtin University of Technology, Perth). The president of AIATSIS and Aboriginal leader Ken Colbung, and some Aboriginal students of the University of Western Australia, Perth. I express my thanks to all the people who participated in my research survey, many of whom dedicated long hours of their time. My special thanks to Dr. Patricia Baines, Prof. Jeremy Beckett, Drs. Francesca Merlan and Alan Rumsey, Dr. Nicolas Peterson, Prof. Basil Sansom, and Dr. Stephen Wild, who helped arrange accommodation and/or facilities to study, and in other ways. I stress that there are many other anthropologists who have played a fundamental role in the recent history of anthropology with Aboriginal populations, who, for motives of time limitations in this survey, I was unable to interview.

survey, I also interviewed some Aborigines who define themselves as spokespeople for Aboriginal politics. I shall also refer to some newspaper articles published during the period in which I was carrying out the research survey and some publications recommended by the anthropologists interviewed, many of whom requested that I do not cite their names without first consulting them. As well as carrying out interviews, I was invited to present seminars at the University of Sydney, the AIATSIS, the University of Western Australia, and the Anthropological Society of Western Australia, and to attend seminars at these institutions.

Many ethnologists in Australia participate in processes of territorial claims in the Northern Territory and the recognition of sites of significance to Aborigines in various parts of the continent, in situations that almost all of them described as politically very sensitive, a matter which I shall comment further on. Some pointed out that their careers could be damaged by the publication of their statements in contexts which they consider inappropriate and where the content could be subject to manipulation by interests contrary to those of the Aboriginal populations with whom they undertake research. This highly politicized climate in which anthropologists who work with Aboriginal populations carry out research, explains the anthropologists' concern to exercise a control over the presentation of their declarations. Some of the anthropologists interviewed also commented that this was the first time that they had been interviewed about anthropology in Australia, stressing that their observations were of a preliminary nature and worthy of deeper reflection.

Some anthropologists expressed distrust of the intentions of an unknown person, from another country, who had arrived as it were "out of thin air" having what they considered to be the audacity to attempt to comment on a discipline to which they have dedicated many years of their lives. In some cases there was a reluctance to disclose, in an hour or so of interview, details of their professional lives and their ideas about anthropology which resulted from many years of research. Comments such as: "My research reports are simply too politically sensitive to show you", revealed caution that my citing of their comments outside the local political context might have adverse consequences. Clearly, as in my previous research with an Amerindian population, I would have to spend a long period of research with some "native" anthropologists in order to gain a deeper insight into anthropology in Australia. I have to respect, on the one hand, the limits imposed by my own lack of knowledge about anthropology with Aboriginal populations in Australia and lack of familiarity with the ethos of the academic community in that country, and, on the other hand, the limits imposed by those anthropologists interviewed who requested a control over the divulgation of their verbal comments. However, despite an understandable constraint on the part of some of the anthropologists interviewed, almost all of those whom I approached willingly accepted being interviewed.

My situation, while carrying out this research survey was permeated with ambiguities, since, despite having been born in Britain, I am a Brazilian national and my academic formation at doctorate level was in Brazil. I completed the M Phil. in Social Anthropology at Cambridge University (1979-80), England, coming to the Universidade de Brasília in 1980, at first as a special student. I entered the doctorate programme (1981-87), supervised by Prof. Julio Cezar Melatti, where I also completed courses given by Prof. Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, founder of the doctorate programme at the Universidade de Brasília, and other lecturers. Brazilian anthropology, more specifically, ethnology with Indian populations, is the area in which I consolidated my academic formation. I use my

experience over the past twelve years in Brazilian ethnology as a paradigmatic case to examine anthropology with Aboriginal populations in Australia.

Whilst in Brazil I am most commonly classified by anthropologists as "Anglo-Saxon", and by others, including some people who work in indigenist policy, as a "foreigner" or "gringo" [5], since my non-native physical appearance and accent marks me out, in Australia there was more ambiguity as to the identity which was attributed to me. I was seen, in the first place, as a Brazilian, as I had written from the Universidade of Brasília to establish the first contacts and I went to Australia with research funds from the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq). However, several anthropologists in Australia characterized me as not being a "real" Brazilian. I was sometimes presented as Brazilian, sometimes as English living in Brazil, and even as a "pommy". These observations, which may at first seem trivial, reveal an essencialism in the attribution of identity that permeates the common sense and molds styles of anthropology.

Australia: The place of the study of Aborigines in anthropology

I chose anthropology with Aborigines as the focus of my research, firstly because it is my principal area of interest, and I decided to concentrate my attention specifically on the anthropology which studies Aboriginal populations in the Australian continent, ignoring other important geographical areas which are the object of study of anthropology in Australia, such as research with native populations in Papua-New Guinea, Oceania, and other areas like Southeast and South Asia. Anthropology in Australia is divided by the anthropologists who work there into geographical areas at a world level, as in the British and North American traditions, and different from the anthropology practised in Brazil up to a decade ago, which was restricted, with rare exceptions, to Brazil. Only in recent years has anthropology in Brazil started to include research into styles of anthropology. Other publications of Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (1988) - the proposal to study peripheral anthropologies; Mariza Peirano (1981, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1992) - Brazil and India; Mariza Corrêa (1991) - Brazil; Leonardo Fígoli (1989) - Argentine; and Guillermo Ruben (1990) - French-speaking Canada; examine styles of anthropology in peripheral countries, representing attempts, some of a comparative nature, to think about the discipline anthropologically. The choice of anthropology with Australian Aborigines as the object of focus was made to limit the scope of the research in a vast anthropological literature, although, in future stages, I aim to gain more familiarity with the other fields of study within anthropology in Australia, in order to examine their relationship to anthropology with Aborigines.

Another reason why I chose anthropology with Aborigines is the central place given to this field of anthropology by the "native" anthropologists. Ronald Berndt & Robert Tonkinson (1988), examining the developments in social anthropology and Australian Aboriginal studies in the period from 1961 to 1986, assert that "It is probably true that social anthropology in Australia, in spite of the fact that its research interests embrace Australian society at large and a number of neighbouring regions, is still evaluated within and outside this country largely in terms of research and publications on Aboriginal

[5] a word for "foreigner" in popular language, used through most of Latin America, sometimes with a depreciative connotation and sometimes with jocosity, depending on the context.

Australia" (1988:6). Berndt & Tonkinson affirm that, up to 1986, there had not been any rapid and collective embracing of new models from Europe and the U.S.A. by the Australianists in Australia. They divide their book into five topics: gender, kinship, economy, law and religion, which, with the exception of "gender", follow the traditional division of a monography in British anthropology, revealing the strong influence of the British tradition over the way in which anthropology is seen in Australia. Berndt & Tonkinson observe that the "salvage" anthropology, which prevailed up to 1961, had almost disappeared as processes of change and cultural transformation had taken centre stage (1988:4).

John Barnes (in Berndt & Tonkinson, 1988:269-270) relates the focus on "salvage" anthropology of that period (an attempt to get it all down before it disappears), in part, to a strategy to obtain research funds from the Commonwealth government: "By stressing the contrast between the traditional culture of the past and the rapidly changing social and cultural arrangements of the present, it was possible to give the impression that the proposed research program would not impinge in any significant way on the interests of the Aboriginal welfare bureaucracy..." (Ibid.:270). Jeremy Beckett criticizes this affirmation of John Barnes, that anthropology in Australia was cut off from the political problems of the indigenous populations and suggests that Barnes and other anthropologists of his line discouraged any political involvement of their post-graduate students. Beckett adds that, since the 60's, he has written about the consumption of alcoholic beverages among Aborigines as a form of resistance, as well as focalising political movements among the Torres Strait Islanders.

Several anthropologists stressed the close relationship between Aboriginal studies in anthropology in Australia and internal and external political questions, and the way in which anthropology has been molded by policies and legislation. Some anthropological publications focus the question of aboriginality and Australian society (for example, Beckett 1988a, 1988b; Rowse 1988; Morris 1988) and its relationship to the construction of Australian nationalism that has emerged since the end of World War II.

Australia: the ideological and political context

According to the majority of the anthropologists interviewed, up to the 1950's, Australians saw themselves as Europeans[6], and conceptualised Australia as an anglophone European nation state of colonization situated very far from Europe. Trood (1990:89) affirms that "when the Commonwealth of Australia was founded in 1901, its political leaders did not seriously consider the possibility of pursuing an independent foreign policy". Citing the first prime minister of the new nation, Edmund Barton: "(t)here could be no foreign policy of the Commonwealth ... foreign policy belong(s) to the Empire", and according to Trood, the majority of Australians agreed: "For several decades

[6] Despite being conceptualized as a nation state of, above all, British colonization, Annette Hamilton of Macquarie University, Sydney (personal communication) stresses that at the time of Australia's independence in 1901, there was a significant Irish component in the population, which, since the beginning of colonization, distinguished itself from the British. However, in the early 1980's, about 80% of the population was of British descent, a consequence of government policy up to the 1970's to restrict immigration to whites.

they were largely content to define their place in world affairs by reference to their country's status as a dominion within the British Empire rather than as an autonomous independent actor within the wider international system" (Ibid.).

During the first half of this century, anthropology in Australia must be seen within this context. Parting from this political configuration, and taking into consideration the fact that, having easy access to British and North American anthropologists through the English language, and the fact that many anthropologists who work in Australia came from these two countries and/or completed their PhD's or post-doctorate research there, several anthropologists in Australia stated that anthropology in Australia would be best characterized as being "semi-peripheral", in the sense used by Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (1988:143-159) in referring to "peripheral anthropologies".

On a theoretical level, it is aimed to interpret social anthropology with Aborigines in its respective singularities, without, however, separating it from the disciplinary matrix from which it originated. At a practical level, it is hoped to increase contacts between institutes or departments of anthropology in Australia and Brazil. Anthropology in Australia may be considered, following Stocking Jr. (1982:172), an anthropology which, until approximately 30 years ago, emerged and was established within the context of "empire-building" rather than an anthropology which developed in the context of "nation-building", which reinforces even more its characterization as "semi-peripheral". In this aspect, the history of anthropology in Australia up to the 1950's is closely related to world political events and their impact on the Australian continent as seen from a British perspective.

The majority of anthropologists interviewed affirmed, when asked, that nation-building did not present itself as a relevant question in Australian anthropology. In the opinion of a North American anthropologist who works in Australia, the question of nation-building is not present in the anthropologists' conceptualization, the question of the tension between Aborigines and the national society being more in the foreground. The same North American anthropologist mentioned, in contrast, anthropology in Indonesia as an example of a style of anthropology closely related to the question of national integration and the attempt to create a national identity, in which some anthropologists, such as Koentjaraningrat, for example, identify with these questions, examining them through a theory of ethnicity and a focus on the question of an Indonesian identity. A situation, however, very different from that of Brazil, considering that Indonesia is a very much newer nation state than Brazil, made up of an enormous archipelago of many islands and divided by large contingents of ethnic groups with great cultural and linguistic differences. Yet, being an ex-colony in which a majority of colonized peoples were dominated by a minority of European colonizers during the Dutch occupation, different from Australia which was conceptualised as a European nation of colonization, Indonesia faced, and is still facing the problem of attempting to construct a nation state as a political programme (Geertz, 1973).

With the perspective of war in Asia and the Pacific, Menzies government, in 1939, took measures to establish diplomatic contacts with the more important nation states of the region and play a more active role in local affairs, marking a first step toward autonomy. The Japanese invasion of the countries north of the Australian continent was interpreted as a great threat to Australia and the Labour government of John Curtin turned to the U.S.A for help. During World War II, while Australian troops were sent to Europe, The Middle East and North Africa, North American troops were stationed in the extreme

north of Australia, in direct contact with the Aboriginal populations. Some Aborigines had the experience, for the first time, of meeting other people classified as "blacks". The threat of invasion from the north awoke national interests and a consciousness of being localized on the periphery of Asia. From this period, Asia and the Pacific became areas of national interest.

Only from the time of World War II, when Australians felt themselves to have been abandoned by Britain, were there the beginnings of a change, a rethinking of the British cultural and political tradition and Anglocentric perspective, until then, embedded in Australia. The ANZUS Treaty, of 1951, between Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A. was the first attempt to formalize relations with the North American government. With the creation of SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organization), in 1954, against communist expansion, the principal aspects of North American foreign policy were observed by the Australian government. From the moment in which the naval forces of the United Kingdom were withdrawn from "east of Suez", the strict conformity between Australian government policies and the political criteria adopted by the U.S.A. for the region became evident. After World War II, Australia became a client of the U.S.A. and Japan.

Anthropology in Australia is closely related to British and North American - the U.S.A. and also Canada - influences, which constitute the principal sphere of exchange between professionals of the discipline. Up to the 1960's, British models dominated anthropology in Australia. It is worth mentioning that the traditional themes of British anthropology predominated, based on studies of social organization and kinship, treating native populations as autonomous socio-cultural unities. In social anthropology with Aborigines before the 1970's, little was said about interethnic relations and questions such as Aborigines and the police and the violence of the colonial situation in which the Aboriginal populations were situated. Little was said, moreover, about the Aboriginal populations in the densely populated regions of the southeast, east coast and southwest of the Australian continent, which had suffered the first impact of colonization and the greatest violence, anthropology having focused as its object of study those Aborigines in the north and centre of the continent. The Aborigines of "the north" were characterized, in popular language, as "full-blood", a category based on the concept of "race", in contrast to those of "the south", "half-castes", "mixed-blood" from the areas more densely populated by immigrants, despite the fact that all of them had been subjected to biological miscegenation. The former were characterized as being "more authentic", "real" and "traditional", and were thus defined as the privileged object of study in contrast to the "less authentic" (Cowlshaw, 1986:2) of the densely populated regions, especially those living in urban centres.

An Aboriginal anthropologist [7] (Langton, 1981:16), who defines herself as a political activist, comments that "few anthropologists have studied Aboriginal life in urban contexts, and those who have, have failed to challenge the insidious ideology of tribal and detribalized Aborigines - the 'real' Aborigines and the rest of us...". Langton criticizes

[7] One of the few Aboriginal anthropologists. Anthropologists who work in Australia mentioned that there are few Aborigines who work in the discipline, despite noting, during recent years, an increasing interest among Aboriginal University students in anthropology. Some attributed the paucity of Aboriginal anthropologists to the fact that there are opportunities created by the government to absorb Aborigines with higher education into far more highly remunerated jobs.

anthropologists for, according to her, having created this ideology: "As a result the 'full-blood/half-caste' dichotomy and the now famous urban-rural-tribal triangle remains the widely held and largely unfounded model of the 'detrribalizing' or urbanizing Aboriginal population" (Ibid.). According to Langton, through this model, the assimilationist discourse has been appropriated by anthropology.

Despite the rejection by Aborigines of the anthropologist's role as their intermediary or defender, the legislation to claim Aboriginal territories requires the participation of anthropologists. Langton, in the "Wentworth Lecture", 1992, organized by the "Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies" (AIATSIS), spoke about her research into relations between Aborigines and the police in the Northern Territory and solutions found by Aborigines through community projects in which they police their own communities. Projects conceptualised within the ideology of native self-determination, which aim to reduce violence within the communities, at the same time reducing the police violence which leads to even more violence within the communities.

Aboriginal populations in the north of the continent were contrasted with those in the south on the same basis of a dichotomy between "settled Australia" and the north-centre of the continent, despite the fact that all the continent was colonized. This false dichotomy, observes Cowlshaw (1986:2), still embedded in anthropology, is evident in the tendency to privilege research in the north of the continent. Cowlshaw affirms that "no concepts or theories were developed within Australian anthropology which could adequately deal with either relations between the indigenous population and the invaders, or with changes in either" (Ibid.), despite the fact that anthropologists were confronted by these issues during their fieldwork. Anthropologists traditionally denied Aborigines the survival of their culture in the "settled areas", affirming the "destruction" and "loss" of their culture. Only a minority of anthropologists work with Aborigines in urban contexts and/or in the regions of the continent that are densely populated by non-Aboriginal populations and, by different ways, have broken with the search for the "traditional" of an anthropology of cultural continuity (to mention a few examples - Beckett, 1958, 1964, 1991; Sansom, 1980, 1991; P. Baines, 1988, 1991; Cowlshaw, 1987, 1988; Langton, 1991; Morris, 1985, 1991).

One anthropologist interviewed stated that the Aborigines with whom she works interpret the anthropological negation of their cultural identity as yet another expression of the wish of non-Aborigines that they disappear as a people, also seeing this negation as the equivalent of a violation of the places they consider sacred.

Cowlshaw (1986:3) suggests that social anthropologists uncritically equated "traditional Aborigines" with the evolutionist concept, prevalent at the beginning of this century, of "Aboriginal race". An equation which, using categories incorporated by some anthropologists of the Australian academic community, "rendered the study of 'non-traditional', 'southern' or 'mixed race' groups invalid" (Ibid.). Cowlshaw argues that "One 'cultural assumption' of social anthropology in Australia since the rise of structural functionalism concerns the submerged or implied definition of Aborigines as a race, the identification of that race with an unsullied tradition and the protection of this ever narrowing category of Aboriginal studies from any systematic concern with the nature of the wider society or with changes in the object of investigation" (Ibid.:4). The narrow focus of anthropology with Aborigines on the reconstruction of Aboriginal societies "as they were", eliminated the possibility of a concern with the context of the national society and political factors of interethnic relations, which, with rare exceptions, were ignored as central issues of Aboriginal studies in anthropology. This concern came to anthropology

from other disciplines such as political science (for example, Rowley, 1970, 1971). It is worth stressing that this concern came from outside anthropology. Cowlshaw (1986:11) argues that "the view that there is a proper anthropological position on political and ethical issues has tended to stifle debate" on such matters. These categories have permeated anthropology with Aboriginal populations in Australia and, to a great extent, molded the way the discipline has developed, being incorporated into the definition of what is and what is not the discipline's object of study.

Cowlshaw (1986:1) maintains that the ideas about anthropology which underlie this division, between "traditional" and "non-traditional" Aborigines, have largely remained unexamined. The representation of contemporary Aboriginal societies has been inadequate since anthropology did not develop concepts that explain social change. The concepts of culture and social structure were based on a totality and integrated social order, an anthropological concept of "traditional culture", associated with the older concept of "race", which did not explain the total character of interethnic contact. This theoretical bias has made it impossible "to recognise a systematic and consistent ideology among subordinate groups who lack the power to give authoritative expression to their ideas" (Ibid.:8). One consequence has been that many anthropologists have fallen into a dualism which reflects the theoretical impasse of a perspective that does not take into account historical, political and economic factors. Another consequence has been that anthropological research with so-called "non-traditional" Aboriginal populations was accorded low status in the academic community (Ibid.:8).

Research in NSW "was seen as a kind of apprenticeship carried out by those not yet ready for the real anthropological work", either in the north of the continent with the "real" Aborigines or with native populations overseas. Cowlshaw relates that, in dealing with the issue of racism as the object of study, her work has not been recognised as "anthropology" by some anthropologists in Australia, who classify it as "sociology" because it focuses a domain related to the national society. The paucity of research with Aborigines in urban contexts is a delicate issue for some anthropologists of a more traditional orientation.

Anthropology with Aboriginal populations at the end of the XIX century and early XX century - Australia as an arena for ethnographic samples for the emergent anthropology in the "central countries".

I do not intend to enter into details about the history of anthropology in Australia, nor do I have sufficient knowledge to attempt such a task. I shall refer briefly to some historical outlines of the discipline in Australia undertaken by Hamilton (1982), Peterson (1990), and McCall (1982), in an attempt to sketch my first impressions, based on some texts which were indicated by some of the anthropologists interviewed and on the interviews in Australia, looking at the development of anthropology within the historical context of the formation of Australia as a nation state.

During the first half of the last century, the interest in phrenology led to the exportation of Aborigines' skulls to England (Hamilton, 1982:92). The first scientists who spent long periods with Aborigines were natural scientists, interested, above all, in the collection and study of flora and fauna. Peterson describes Baldwin Spencer, professor of zoology at Melbourne University, as "a founding father of academic anthropology"

(1990:5).

In Australia, as in Brazil, anthropology was first established in museums. The Australian Museum in Sydney began functioning in 1829, followed by the Tasmanian Museum in 1843, National Museum of Victoria in 1854, Queensland Museum in 1855, South Australian Museum in 1856 and the Western Australian Museum in 1891 (McCarthy, 1982:23). The end of the last century and beginning of this century was a period marked by several anthropological expeditions to the Australian continent. The Horne Scientific Expedition to Central Australia, in which Baldwin Spencer participated, in 1894, and the Cambridge University Expedition to the Torres Strait in 1898, in which Haddon participated, were followed by a one year expedition undertaken by Spencer and Gillen in 1901, and the Oxford and Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Western Australia in 1910-11, with the participation of A.R. Brown (later, Radcliffe-Brown). Hamilton (1982:95) mentions that in 1911, when Radcliffe-Brown was watching an initiation ceremony in Western Australia, together with Daisy Bates, the camp was raided by police. Radcliffe-Brown abandoned the area and went to Bernier Island, a quarantine hospital for Aborigines, most of whom were suffering from incurable venereal diseases.

This early research in Australia stimulated the interest of anthropologists living in Europe, especially the British. The ethnographic work carried out in Australia at this time offered data for theoretical discussion, in works of Van Gennep (1905), Marett (1909), Frazer (1910), Durkheim (1912), Freud (1913), Malinowski (1913), Radcliffe-Brown (before he took up the first chair in anthropology at the University of Sydney in 1926) and others (cf. Stocking, Jr., 1984). At the end of the last century and beginning of this century, the life of Aborigines came to be considered, in the debates about social evolution, a privileged window onto the origins of religion, marriage, and social life. Australia served as an arena for ethnographic examples of the "Stone Age man" of evolutionist theory, seen as "our contemporary ancestor", the "most primitive" and "most exotic", for the great debates of anthropology in the "central countries", where the discipline was in the process of consolidation. A role analogous to that frequently attributed to Amazonia, in more recent times, as an arena for ethnographic examples for debates about the relationship between man and the environment, especially in North American works of neo-evolutionist inspiration, cultural ecology and sociobiology.

Data about totemism published by B. Spencer and F.J. Gillen (1899) were used to question the premises of the times and they had such a great impact that Malinowski suggested, in 1913, that one half of anthropological theory written since then was based on them (Stocking, Jr., 1983:79). However, according to Stocking Jr. (Ibid.), Baldwin Spencer, carrying out research in a distant colony, neither created a school of anthropology nor left academic successors, being incorporated into a line of Australian ethnologists who supplied ethnographic data for anthropologists in the "central countries". Baldwin Spencer is seen by Stocking Jr. as an ethnographic agent in Australia with whom Frazer corresponded from his armchair in England. Thus, in the interpretation of Stocking Jr., Baldwin Spencer was excluded from the myth-building process of British anthropology, where relations of lineage played a crucial role.

In a similar way, Lorimer Fison and A.W. Howitt corresponded, in the 1870's, with Lewis Henry Morgan in the U.S.A., and, after the latter's death, with E.B. Tylor in England (Mulvaney, 1990:34-42), supplying them with ethnographic data. The case of Baldwin Spencer, like that of Fison and Howitt, can be compared to that of Curt Nimuendajú in Brazil, who corresponded with Robert Lowie in the U.S.A., supplying him

with ethnographic data about indigenous populations in Brazil (Melatti, 1985). The data of Nimuendajú later impressed Lévi-Strauss and George Murdock. None of these ethnographic agents were "trained" as anthropologists.

In 1914, Haddon, Rivers and Marett came from England to attend the first British Association for the Advancement of Science Meeting held in Australia, at Melbourne. Malinowski was also present at the meeting and, with the outbreak of World War I, was threatened with internment as an Austrian Pole, choosing the Trobriand Islands to spend his internment period. It was from this meeting that the first formal attempts were made to establish anthropology as a University discipline, interrupted by the outbreak of World War I. In 1919, Haddon tried to reactivate the proposal.

Before World War I, the interest in establishing anthropology in Australia was expressed in terms of the importance of knowledge about Aborigines for science. Since the 1880's, Britain and Germany had assumed sovereignty over New Guinea. As a result of the War, the League of Nations issued a mandate for Australia to govern New Guinea in 1920, and in 1921 the New Guinea Act of the Australian Commonwealth Government came into force establishing a civil administration and bringing the eastern part of New Guinea under Australian control (Peterson, 1990:7). The same year, in a meeting of the Australian branch of the Association for the Advancement of Science, the anthropology section presented a proposal to establish anthropology as an academic discipline, reference being made to its political use "in the government of subject races" (Elkin, 1970:250). In this meeting the Australian National Research Council (ANRC) was formed, which took initiatives to establish a chair of anthropology before the second Pan Pacific Science Congress, held in Australia in 1923. Peterson (1990:8) reveals that the Congress emphasized the need for teaching anthropology in the Universities, mentioning the usefulness of anthropological research in New Guinea, with no such mention being made with respect to Aboriginal people in Australia.

After the Congress, the ANRC got support from the Australian government to establish a chair of anthropology at the University of Sydney. However, the government withdrew its support and the Rockefeller Foundation offered funds, assuming that human biology would be privileged. With support from the Rockefeller Foundation, which decided to channel funds exclusively through the ANRC, and support from the Australian government, the University of Sydney established a chair in anthropology in 1925, the British Radcliffe-Brown being chosen for the position, and taking up the chair in 1926. Radcliffe-Brown saw anthropology as a scientific discipline, regarding its uses in the administration of native peoples to be of secondary importance. His interest was to delineate the internal structure of the typical Aboriginal social group and trace its variations throughout the continent, which, in the following decades, led to descriptive studies about social organization, kinship, forms of marriage, religion, and traditional aspects. The results of much of this research were published in the journal *Oceania*, created by Radcliffe-Brown in 1930. In 1931, Radcliffe-Brown left the Sydney Department, the New Zealander Raymond Firth substituting him as acting Professor for 18 months, before moving to the London School of Economics with Malinowski. The Australian born anthropologist and Anglican pastor A.P. Elkin relieved Firth in 1933, remaining in the chair until his retirement in 1956. The Rockefeller Foundation continued to provide funds until 1938, although the last research projects it financed were concluded in 1940.

From the beginning, anthropology was not considered to be of any practical use for the administration of Aborigines in Australia, while the New Guinea administration

considered it useful. In 1921 and 1924 two government anthropologists were appointed to work in New Guinea, and administrative officials spent a one year training period at the Sydney Department of Anthropology, after its foundation (Peterson, 1990:12). Firth, in an attempt to save the Department from closing down through lack of funds, wrote that it had trained, in the first six years, 14 cadets for Australian colonial service, a dozen patrol officers, a number of missionary students, and over 300 University students (McCall, 1982:13). Peterson notes how functionalist theory was considered to be adequate for the policy of indirect rule in New Guinea, since, there, "government was concerned with more or less independent functioning societies" (1990:12-13), anthropology being seen as useful for administrative purposes. This observation indicates a strong correlation between functionalist theory and a certain type of colonialism.

Peterson (Ibid.) emphasizes that there were native populations in Australia which, despite having suffered demographic and economic transformations, had a social and cultural orientation similar to that of pre-colonial times. He argues that the pre-colonial past was close enough for the changes not to challenge the functionalist paradigm, admitting a certain reconstruction. Peterson explains, however, that anthropology was not considered to have great practical relevance for the administration of Aborigines in Australia since, according to him, the situations in which the native populations "were actually living, and indeed their social organisation, were not amenable to indirect rule". A situation different from that of the native populations of New Guinea. Another way of interpreting this attitude that anthropology was not relevant for the administration of native populations in the Australian continent, while being considered useful in the case of New Guinea, is that Australia was conceptualised, at this time, as a European nation of colonization, with which the practice of indirect rule within national territory would be incompatible, being reserved for the colonies and countries under mandate. Beckett (1988a:195) mentions that until the late 1960's, Australian historians omitted Aborigines from the history of Australia, given their "preoccupation with the formation of a British colony of settlement and its subsequent transformation into an Anglophone nation state". As Peterson (1990) states, up to the beginning of World War II, research in Aboriginal Australia was carried out to provide insight into "man's nature", and not under the pretext of being useful for administration.

Hamilton (1982:98) describes A.P. Elkin, by the 30's, as paternalistic, proud to be a mediator between Aborigines and Government bodies responsible for the formulation of native policies, and unable to visualise feasible alternatives to paternalistic government intervention. She notes (1982:100), however, that at this time, the involvement of anthropologists with government agencies was seen as a commendable concern with the well-being of indigenous people. By the late 1930's the issue of "social change" had become the theme of debates in all the region. When grants from the ANRC and the Rockefeller Foundation ceased, the Department of Anthropology in Sydney sought financial support, and questions of "native administration" took precedence. Anthropologists started to become the target for criticisms by development interests, when they advocated controls over the activities of non-Aborigines in the Reserves of the Northern Territory, seen as obstacles to economic development. They were accused of wanting to keep Aborigines in "zoos" for the purpose of preserving their objects of study.

Anthropology with Aboriginal populations after World War II

After World War II, Peterson perceives a fundamental transformation in anthropology. The threat of a Japanese invasion from the north induced the government to improve internal communications in Australia and to occupy permanently the north of the continent, especially the Northern Territory. In this period, even though there were around one thousand Aboriginal people who had not had contacts with Europeans "it seems there was a widespread academic view, both within and beyond Australia, that Aboriginal societies and cultures could no longer provide a special insight" (1990:14). With the complete occupation of the north of Australia, Aborigines came to be thought of as "our others" and, therefore, less exotic than the "others" overseas. Peterson points out, citing Cowlshaw, that "a consequence of this was that working with Aboriginal people became doing anthropology at home whereas before it had been working in a foreign country, so to speak. The interesting and authentic non-Western ways of life were now to be found exclusively outside Australia and work within Australia became less valued professionally" (Ibid.).

This provides a clear contrast to anthropology with Indians in Brazil at this time, in which indigenous populations within the national territory were the privileged object of study. Peterson affirms, however, that even before the more intensive occupation of the north and centre of the continent which occurred from World War II, the Aboriginal populations of Australia were not considered adequate for the functionalist approach. In a European nation of colonization, conceptualised as an antipodean extension of Britain, there was no possibility of admitting indirect rule of the native populations, and, consequently, functionalist theory was not thought of as adequate to study them. At this time the native populations were excluded from the history and from the future of the Australian nation, losing their "exotic" quality [8].

It is worth mentioning that several anthropologists, such as Hogbin, Wedgewood and Stanner joined the research section of the Australian Army during World War II. Stanner carried out work for the military in northern and central Australia (Hamilton, 1982:98). During these years, the native populations of northern Australia and Oceania suffered the violent impact of War [9]. After World War II, the non-Western and authentic and therefore privileged objects of study of anthropology were only found outside Australia. The presuppositions included in the theoretical approach privileged the exotic,

[8] Jeremy Beckett (1992) notes that South Africa, until recently, has "imagined out" its (majority) African population from its history and destiny, institutionalizing this exclusion through the fiction of the Bantustan. In Australia, in contrast, the native populations that survived the colonization were so reduced, demographically, that there was no need for such colonialist jugglery. They were ignored, relegated to the past, or conceptualised as being a dying race, which was another way in which the European nation of colonization denied their existence.

[9] After the War, an assessment of its consequences for the populations affected, was made by CIMA - "Co-ordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology". 44 scientists, all but one of them from the U.S. or Hawaii, were transported to many of the 1400 islands and atolls of Micronesia, inaugurating "the presence of the American anthropologist on a mass scale in the Pacific and Melanesia, where the British had largely dominated before" (Hamilton, 1982:99).

which was defined as those societies most susceptible to the functionalist approach, the colonized "others", and not "our" colonized.

It was at this time that the training of administrative officials was transferred from the Department of Anthropology at the University of Sydney to the Australian School of Pacific Administration, ending the direct relationship with colonial administration. The Department of Anthropology at Sydney became exclusively academic, although Elkin continued to have an intense interest in the formulation of native policies in Australia and Oceania and played a decisive role in this area (Wise, 1985:160-1, 210).

The usefulness of anthropology for political purposes led to the establishment, in 1951, of the second Department of Anthropology in Australia - the Research School of Pacific Studies - at the recently constructed Australian National University (ANU), Canberra, headed by the British trained S.F. Nadel, followed by J.A. Barnes from the London School of Economics. The establishment of this Department resulted from a "wartime awareness of the importance of an understanding of the Pacific Islands and the countries to the north" (Peterson, 1990:14). This Department trained many postgraduate students but produced little research on Aboriginal populations in Australia. Up to 1977, only 7 of 56 research projects of the Research School of Pacific Studies were with Aborigines of the Australian continent (Peterson, 1990:15). Funds were allocated for research outside Australia: 5 students who carried out their first research in Australia all did their PhD research in the Torres Strait Islands or in New Guinea. In the 1950's, only 4 PhD research projects with Australian Aborigines were funded. During the following decades the research was directed to New Guinea and Southeast Asia, especially those countries in which the Australian government had diplomatic interests.

A third centre for anthropology was established in Western Australia, the result of a survey of the social sciences in Australia carried out by the American anthropologists Clyde and Florence Kluckhohn in 1952. R. Berndt, who worked under the supervision of Elkin, was appointed senior lecturer of anthropology in the Department of Psychology in 1956, a separate Department of Anthropology being created in 1961.

According to Peterson (1990:15), it was in this context of few research projects with Aboriginal populations that the perception of the need for the establishment of an Institute of Aboriginal Studies emerged. The early 1960's were marked by a loosening of the ties with Britain, which led to the emergence of the cultural and economic nationalism of the early 1970's (Peterson, *Ibid.*:16). W. C. Wentworth, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, perceived that the Aboriginal populations and their cultures constituted an icon for an independent Australian identity. The "Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies" (AIAS) [10], established in Canberra in 1964, was a conventional research institute during the first years of its existence. In 1974, a group of Aboriginal people questioned whether anthropology offered any benefits for Aborigines, and, since that date, they have insisted that the AIATSIS discuss its relationship with Aboriginal populations, and return the results of research to the communities, as well as demanding opportunities to train Aboriginal people as researchers.

While the earlier generation of anthropologists in Australia relegated Aboriginal culture to prehistory, many anthropologists in the 1960's seemed to want to suspend

[10] Renamed, in 1989, "Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies" (AIATSIS), to include the other native ethnic group of the continent.

Aboriginal culture in the timeless vacuum of structural-functionalism (Beckett, 1988a:195). Up to the 60's, anthropologists who worked in Australia engaged in a dialogue almost exclusively with British anthropology.

The consolidation of anthropology in Australia

According to Hamilton (1982:91), "the development of anthropology as a system of knowledge within a University framework, stretched uneasily between the founding British and later American intellectual traditions" and only since the 1970's has the possibility of an authentically Australian anthropology emerged and an effort to adopt a local rather than a colonial viewpoint (Hamilton, 1982:103). Hamilton, characterizing the history of Australia as "British assumption of the land in the name of the Crown, of relentless extermination of the coastal and hinterland Aboriginal peoples, the gathering together of the remnants, the institutional control..." (Ibid.:91) and application of policies of assimilation, emphasizes the question of colonialism, in which the Aboriginal populations were declared to be British citizens from the beginning. Thus, their efforts to oppose the conquest of their territories and to survive were defined as criminal acts rather than the consequences of warfare. They were opposed by the police rather than by armies, as they still are (Ibid.:92).

In 1955, the first PhD programme was established in the Faculty of Arts at Sydney University (Hamilton, 1982:100). Among the first candidates were J.H. Bell, M. Calley and M.J. Meggitt. By the late 1950's, the Department of Anthropology at Sydney University had some lecturers with PhD's from the ANU, among whom were Jeremy Beckett, Les Hiatt and Michael Allen. Hamilton (1982:100) remembers that in the early 1960's, period in which she did her undergraduate studies, there was an influx of fads and fashions, from ecology and neo-evolutionism from the U.S.A. to Lévi-Strauss's structuralism. The influence of the "hunters and gatherers" fashion had its impact in Australia, with the construction of an anthropological image of Aborigines as the sociological, ecological and evolutionary prototype of hunters and gatherers. An image which still persists in the works of some anthropologists.

Jeremy Beckett, one of the first anthropologists to break with the traditional approaches of social organization and kinship, qualifies the colonial nature of the place of Aboriginal people in Australian society as "that of a minority managed through specialised institutional structures" (1988a:192). The academic trajectory of Beckett, born in England, reveals his dissatisfaction with the Aboriginal studies that he found when he came to Australia in the early 50's. His intention to carry out post-graduate research in New Guinea was prohibited by the Australian government, which alleged, as a pretext, his past involvement with left-wing political parties. Facing this impasse, Beckett chose to study Aboriginal populations in the pastoral region of western NSW. He comments that at that time his research was not considered to be serious research as it was in "settled Australia", where it was thought that there were no "traditional" Aborigines that were worth studying. Beckett, dissatisfied with the theoretical lines of his time, approached such questions as the consumption of alcoholic beverages by Aborigines as a form of resistance to European colonisation. He then undertook research with Torres Strait Islanders, inspired by such notions as internal colonialism, and, after a long theoretical trajectory in which he did not find subsidies for his research in the greater part of British anthropology, went to the

U.S.A., where he developed an approach which focused interethnic relations and the question of native policy.

In the words of Beckett: "I read everything (of the British anthropology of that time), I tried to apply their method, I used life histories... but, in the end, the society that I was studying was undergoing constant change. The paradigm of the anthropologists influenced by Gluckman was static ... I became deeply dissatisfied". Beckett relates that, after looking for ideas in the works of Julian Steward, Oscar Lewis, Robert Redfield and others, he found inspiration in the work of Eric Wolf, going to City University in 1968, where his old interest in Marxism was revived, although a soft Marxism. He was inspired also by the works of Rodolfo Stavenhagen and Pablo Casanova.

Also in the 50's, in Brazil, Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, through other ways, was formulating his theory of "interethnic friction". Cardoso de Oliveira, involved in the formulation of Indian policy, and invited to work in the Serviço de Proteção aos Índios (SPI) [11] by Darcy Ribeiro, aimed to take into consideration the national ideology and reality of the Indian populations. Through his concept of "interethnic friction", Cardoso de Oliveira was obliged to confront ideas embedded in the definition of the social sciences, that sociology is the study of the national society while anthropology is the study of "others", which led to his oscillation between sociology and anthropology (Peirano, 1981:160-161). Peirano argues that the fact that Indians are seen as "different" and "oppressed" explains why the "interethnic friction" model never really solved the question of whether this is a matter for anthropology or for sociology (Ibid.).

From the late 60's and 70's, the work of Otávio Velho opened up a new perspective in anthropology in Brazil, with a focus of analysis on the nation state (Peirano, 1981:164) and, "despite all the efforts to incorporate the Indian theme into the discipline, the Indian remained always the 'other' which is 'different'" (Ibid.:167). "The premise of homogeneity, which is one of the basic tenets of Brazilian nation-building, did not catch on in relation to the Indians. Because they could not be incorporated as part of a national 'us', they were excluded, having maintained the role of the 'different other'" (Ibid.:168). Peirano adds that "despite the fact that the Indian is no longer considered by all anthropologists as the discipline's true and genuine object of analysis, the concern with Indians did not disappear" (Ibid.:169), and that "it is in their role as 'intellectuals' that anthropologists are concerned with Indian populations" (Ibid.). Peirano affirms that anthropologists, as Brazilian citizens, "are held responsible for the rights of the populations they study... Brazilian anthropologists studying Indians are looking at part of their own country's population. It is not the case of anthropologists going abroad and later returning to their countries of origin" (Ibid.:173-4) [12].

[11] The SPI (Indian Protection Service) was founded in 1910 by General Cândido Mariano Rondon, being disbanded in 1967, after repeated accusations of corruption and connivence with genocide, and substituted in the same year by the present government Indian agency, the Fundação Nacional do Índio (FUNAI - National Indian Foundation).

[12] Alcida Ramos affirms that "In contemporary Brazilian anthropology, it is the Indian issue that is the main focus of political attention, even though ethnologists dedicated to indigenous studies are but a minority in the profession" (1990:456). Ramos adds that, "Of all the concrete objects of Brazilian anthropological research, indigenous societies are the best representatives of 'Otherness'. ... Yet, Brazilian Indians are our Others, they are part of our country, they constitute an important ingredient in the process of building our nation, they represent one of our

In the 50's, anthropology in both countries was defined largely as the study of native populations, although, in Australia, different from Brazil, this definition included native populations of other countries of Oceania and Southeast Asia, especially the Australian colony of New Guinea. Comparing the academic trajectories of Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira and Jeremy Beckett, both had an important role in the definition of the directions which anthropology with indigenous populations was to take in their respective countries. An observation of Mariza Peirano helps to clarify the immense impact which the work of Cardoso de Oliveira had, not only on Indian studies, but on the whole style of anthropology practised in Brazil, different from the case of Beckett, whose influence was limited more to anthropology with native populations in the Australian continent and Torres Strait Islands. In addition to the historical fact that anthropology in Brazil during the 50's and 60's was defined as the study of Indians in Brazilian territory, while anthropology in Australia encompassed other regions of the world, the study of Aborigines ("our" others) in the Australian continent being considered an area of less prestige, there is yet another explanation.

According to Peirano, "The anthropologist in Brazil is part of an elite which defines itself as the 'intellectual' group of the country" (1981:174-5). Peirano adds that academics are defined as "intellectuals" and "intrinsic to this definition is a critical approach to Brazilian society". Citing Antônio Candido to support her argument, Peirano affirms that in Brazil there is a sense that, by writing, the anthropologist as an intellectual and an engaged citizen, is contributing to the building of the nation. Peirano shows that this idea, which "contrasts with the European intellectual ... for whom the commitment to national issues is not so emphasized" (Ibid.), was part of Brazilian intellectual life, although it may not have always been conscious in the thinking of Brazilian anthropologists. As I mentioned above, in Australia at this time, of a largely British anthropological tradition, there was not a conscious identification of the anthropologist with a role of nation-building, the national question taking a prominent conscious place in Australian intellectual life from the 70's (Peterson, 1990:16), and in a very different way from the ideology of nation-building which Peirano and Ramos draw attention to in the case of Brazil.

Beckett, in recent works, observes that Aboriginal people, despite different legislation in each Australian state and in the Northern Territory, have been subjected to unifying pressures since the 30's, long before the federal government took up Aboriginal affairs as a national question in 1973. When Aborigines started to participate in the process of construction of public Aboriginality, the state incorporated them into its structures or co-opted them. Beckett stresses that the construction of public Aboriginality must "be understood in the context of the formation of a British colony of settlement in an age of European imperialism, and of the building of a small, semi-peripheral nation state in an age of superpower politics, transnational business and a mass culture" (1988a:193). He calls attention to the way in which native administration is managed at a national level, placing the question in a wider political context of movements such as multiculturalism and

ideological mirrors reflecting our frustrations, vanities, ambitions, and power fantasies. We do not regard them as so completely exotic, remote, or arcane, as to make them into literal 'objects'. Their humanity is never lost on us, their predicament is our historical guilt, their destiny is as much theirs as it is ours. ...the Indian question is a particularly privileged field for the exercise of the twofold project of academic work and political action" (1990:456-7).

environmentalism, popular among the electorate and among the new generation of government officials in Aboriginal affairs.

Beckett (1988b) examines the relationship between Aboriginality and the state, using the notion of "welfare colonialism", introduced by Robert Paine to describe the situation of indigenous people in Northern Canada (1977). Juxtaposing terms which connote citizenship (welfare) and its denial (colonialism), Paine considers it a contradictory and unstable policy, in which the colonizers make decisions that control the future of the colonized. "The decisions are made (ambiguously) on behalf of the colonized, and yet in the name of the colonizers' culture (and of their political, administrative and economic priorities)" (Paine apud. Beckett, 1988b:14). Beckett describes it as "part of the political practice of the liberal democratic nation state which is aimed at maintaining a measure of social harmony and equity internally, and an image of moral rectitude in the world at large". According to Beckett, welfare colonialism arises in situations when the nation state finds itself embarrassed at home and abroad by the presence of a small indigenous group which has become a minority as a result of the process of colonization, but which it is unable to dissolve simply by declaring the members citizens. The expropriation and marginalization, consequences of colonialism, have produced a level of poverty that is beyond the capacity of the market or the welfare apparatus to remedy. The required measures demand state resources which are subject to other claims.

The colonizers make the decisions, yet they can no longer impose them arbitrarily. Another contradictory feature of welfare colonialism is the necessity to get the assent of the colonized as evidence of their political enfranchisement. The frequent political fragmentation of the colonized obliges the state to create channels of political expression and articulate native aspirations. An Aboriginal government bureaucrat interviewed, notes a recent tendency toward a passive acceptance of decisions made by federal and state governments, and an ever smaller space for Aboriginal political expression within the government bureaucratic structure.

The question of Australia's image abroad in relation to Aboriginal populations has become a focus of attention over the past two decades and is often mentioned in the press. To cite just a few examples, on 11 March 1992, an article in The West Australian relates that "A United States Government report has attacked the lack of effort in Australia to cut the Aboriginal imprisonment rate - once again putting the issue in the international spot-light". On 4 April 1992, The West Australian published an article stating that the former Department of Foreign Affairs head said that "Australia should not condemn the human rights violations of other countries" when there are similar problems with the treatment of Aborigines in Australia. His declarations were made in an appeal "to build a national consensus that our strategic, economic and political interests now lie less in the countries of our historic and social origins and increasingly with the countries of Asia and the Pacific", some of which, such as Indonesia and the Phillipines, are notorious for their violation of human rights. According to The West Australian of 11 April 1992, the prime minister Paul Keating, before making an official visit to Indonesia, "to strengthen relations" with Australia's closest neighbour, called for Australia to trade "its long-held ambivalence on national identity for a bolder link with Asia", adding that "Australia had only paid lip-service to Asia in its policy decisions while firmly keeping its gaze on London".

From the late 60's, with the rapid spread of anthropology in the Universities, the discipline became diversified, with a great number of theoretical lines and new approaches. This diversification, with the importation of theoretical tendencies from the U.S.A. and

Europe, as well as the development of approaches directed to specifically Australian questions, makes it difficult, according to most of the anthropologists interviewed, to characterize a style of anthropology in Australia in recent years. Several anthropologists interviewed suggested that several different lines have emerged associated with different academic institutions, with a lot of diversity within these institutions. However, most of those interviewed expressed the opinion that social anthropology with Aborigines has been influenced above all by the question of territorial rights and sacred sites. Several are of the opinion that the involvement of anthropologists in these questions has induced them to change their theoretical focus from the traditional themes of social organization and kinship, prevalent up to the 60's, to social change and Aboriginal policies, a change of focus parallel to that which has occurred in Brazilian Indian studies, although through different theoretical paths.

In Australia, these changes which occurred in social anthropology with Aborigines came, above all, from outside the discipline: through influences from other disciplines, through modifications made in the legislation concerning Aboriginal land rights, and through demands made by the Aborigines themselves who obliged anthropologists to rethink their relationship with their object of study. In Brazil, in contrast, the theory about inter-ethnic contact emerged from within the discipline, in a tradition which focused indigenous populations in the context of the national society, especially the works of Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira and his collaborators and students, which led to an enormous transformation in ethnology with Indian populations in Brazil.

Ramos (1990:466) notes that the "profound transformation in the political role of the Indians at the local and national levels" in the indigenous movements in Brazil (where the indigenous populations constitute a minority of approximately 0.2% of the total population), has led to a more and more complex situation, which "none of the well-known theoretical approaches - acculturation studies, interethnic friction, or ethnicity, for instance - seem quite appropriate to unravel..." The inadequacy of an anthropology based on the "subject-object chasm" has led to dialogical approaches, as has also occurred in anthropology with Aborigines in Australia over the past few years. Two examples of recent works in Australia which aim to approach theoretically the question of interethnic relations are those of Barry Morris (1991), who uses the notion of resistance in writing about an Aboriginal population in NSW, in the south of the continent, and David Trigger (1992), who uses the notions of accommodation and resistance in describing the life of Aborigines in a mission in the north of Queensland.

Although there is no consensus of opinion about the definition of a style of anthropology with Aborigines in Australia (nor is there in Brazil), and many affirmations that there is nothing like a coherent school of social anthropology, several anthropologists characterized the greater part of Aboriginal studies in social anthropology by a strong emphasis, following the British tradition, on the empirical study of sociological, economic, political and religious facts. And a strong emphasis on carrying out long periods of fieldwork which result in descriptive style monographs. This contrasts with ethnology with Indian populations in Brazil, with its emphasis on values, reflecting the French influence and a different definition of anthropology itself that "sprang from a tradition common to philosophers, writers, and other humanists, as Peirano points out" (Ramos, 1990:456). While in Brazil, the separation of cultural anthropology from the "sociology" of the period which extends from the 30's to the 60's, equivalent to the present-day "social sciences", occurred over the past decades (Peirano, 1992:52), in Australia, social anthropology was

implanted as an academic discipline by Radcliffe-Brown from 1926. Anthropologists, heirs of the British tradition, directed their attention to the themes of social organisation and kinship. Sociology, in contrast, was introduced much more recently in Australia, as a distinct discipline. However, the diversification of social anthropology in Australia, especially over the past decade, is modifying this style.

A North American anthropologist pointed out that the British system still prevails in the Australian academy, where there are no theoretical courses at PhD level, research being elaborated through a more intensive relationship of personalised supervision between student and supervisor, which results in richer ethnography than in the U.S.

"In the U.S. we are trained to be performers in regard to theory... In Australia there is less theoretical exhibitionism and more down to earth research based on a long fieldwork, with some exceptions... While in Australia the external examiners of a PhD thesis are chosen for having worked in your area, in the U.S. none of the members of the examination committee may have set foot in the area you have worked in. There, a PhD thesis is valued more on innovativeness, theory and criticism. In Australia a different sort of PhD thesis is produced. It has more to do with the structure of the graduate programme than anything Australian".

The graduate systems in both these countries contrast with that of Brazil, where there are obligatory theoretical courses, and great importance is also given to fieldwork, admitting, however, the submission of doctoral theses of a theoretical nature, based exclusively on bibliographical sources. These differences reflect different theoretical definitions of anthropology which emerged in the specific historical contexts in which the discipline developed, as it faced problems specific to these contexts. They constitute the styles of anthropology.

The same North American anthropologist stressed that, in Australia, there is a recent tendency to focus questions such as multiculturalism as a factor of national integration, with more and more people looking close to home, in the Australian continent, despite having many specialists on Papua-New Guinea, Melanesia and Southeast Asia. He added that in anthropology with Australian Aborigines there are recent studies on themes such as mission stations, how the fringe is constituted, how one gets along in contemporary settings, and interethnic relations, and that, currently, approaches which treat enclaved isolated communities as bounded cultural units are more common among Indonesianists who work among native populations in the east of Indonesia than among Aboriginists. The same anthropologist noted, in Aboriginal studies, less concern with theoretical questions than in the U.S.A., attributing this to a practical involvement among anthropologists with the land rights question. He stated that, in Australia, post-modernism has had much less impact than in the U.S.A., attributing this difference to the fact that a style of anthropology that is deeply involved with Aboriginal policy and directed toward the solution of the practical problems of native populations finds few subsidies in post-modern theory. In Brazil, also, post-modern theory has had only a superficial impact on a highly politicized ethnology of action with Indian populations.

An anthropologist who defined himself as being of British formation, emphasized that in recent years the influence of the North American academic system is becoming stronger in the Australian Universities, resulting in the restructuring of some departments. Other anthropologists mentioned a recent tendency to spend sabbatical leaves in the U.S.A., whereas, up to a few decades ago, England was considered the natural choice.

In the political climate of anti-imperialist struggles of the 60's, Hamilton (1982:100) mentions that any collaboration of anthropologists with government agencies began to be automatically suspect. With the Project Camelot scandal, in which some North American anthropologists, funded by the U.S. Defence Department, were involved in research activities the results of which were used by the U.S. espionage service, and another scandal involving some anthropologists from Sydney University in connection with research in Thailand, anthropologists were obliged to consider their ethical position. Another political scandal occurred in the late 60's, when the Australian government refused permission for Professor Fred Rose, of the Humbolt University, East Berlin, to continue his fieldwork on kinship with Aborigines on Groote Eylandt. Fred Rose had been investigated by the Royal Commission into Espionage in 1954-55 Hamilton, (Ibid.), and the then minister for Aboriginal Affairs, W.C. Wentworth, one of the principal figures involved in the founding of the "Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies", announced that permission had been refused because Rose "ha(d) a particularly bad record of treachery and of prostituting his position as an anthropologist for the gains of the Communist Party" (Barnes, 1969:27 apud. Hamilton, 1982:100). Such incidents were hushed up, being considered an embarrassment to the position of scholarly detachment within which anthropology was forced to define itself in the University context at this time. The conservative position on which a huge mass of anthropological production was based omitted the political factors of anthropological practice. This was also reflected in the reluctance to publish politically sensitive issues in the most prestigious journals.

Recently, a line of comparison Between Australia and Canada has enriched the reflections in anthropology with Aboriginal populations, especially in the area of native policy and the relations between the native populations and the nation state in these two countries. Studies in this area have been published by Sally Weaver (1983, 1984, 1985), Bruce Hodgins, John Milloy and Kenneth Maddock (1989), Noel Dyck (1985), B. Morse (1988) and others.

Anthropologists and government indigenist policy

The referendum of 1967 profoundly marked the relationship between anthropologists and Aborigines, giving the federal government the power to pass laws affecting Aborigines throughout Australia, which opened up the possibility of land rights legislation, leading to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act, 1976. After the election of the Labour government, at the end of 1972, on a reform platform, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) was established, setting up nationwide networks of government financed legal, medical and educational services for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. The demand for land rights by an urban Aboriginal leadership, which adopted the rhetoric of the U.S. "Black Power" movement, put pressure on the government, setting up a Tent Embassy on the lawns of Parliament House in Canberra in 1972. The land rights legislation formulated by the Labour government and passed by the following government, obliged many anthropologists who carried out research with Aboriginal populations to participate in land claim processes in the Northern Territory and in the demarcation of sacred sites in the Australian states. As a consequence, a space was also created for professional consultants who did not work in academic jobs. This is a fundamental difference between anthropology with indigenous populations in Australia and

Brazil. Whilst in Brazil, anthropology is restricted mainly to the Universities, with a few exceptions such as some NGO's and the government Indian agency (Fundação Nacional do Índio - FUNAI), in Australia an industry of consultancy has developed.

One consequence of the participation of anthropologists in land claims is that they have been obliged to rethink the relationship between the anthropologist and the indigenous population that he/she studies. I emphasize that the pressures which led to these changes came from outside the academic discipline.

Consultancy work was described as being of an extremely politically sensitive nature, where interests of large mining companies are frequently involved. The anthropologist's role is seen to be that of defender of Aboriginal rights. Those anthropologists who accept contracts as consultants for mining companies, as in the recent case of Ron Brunton in the Coronation Hill land claim, Northern Territory, who later accepted employment at the Institute of Public Affairs [13] in Canberra, are excommunicated from the anthropological community.

Regarding the question of consultancies, I have already mentioned that few people in Australia were willing to go into details about their personal participation. Some government research projects are carried out as contract work through consultancy agencies, which offer a higher remuneration than in government jobs, however without employment benefits. One consultant mentioned that, because of the political sensitivity, the researcher feels him/herself obliged to take out an insurance as a protection against the possibility of being sued (by other Aborigines or non-Aborigines linked to contrary interests), in accepting an invitation from Aborigines to participate in a land claim or sacred site process. I heard that an anthropologist, after talking to me with extreme caution about his research and work as a consultant, commented to a colleague that he thought he had "said too much".

In Australia, the legislation related to Aboriginal lands and sacred sites varies from state to state. Between 1853 and 1856, the four colonies, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania adopted their own constitutions, based on the Australian Colonies Government Act, approved in England in 1850, followed by Queensland in 1859 and Western Australia in 1890. The northern part of the continent remained under the jurisdiction of South Australia until 1911, when it passed to the jurisdiction of the Australian Commonwealth (as the Northern Territory). The constitution of the Australian Commonwealth was elaborated in Sydney in 1891, submitted to two popular referendums in 1898 and 1899, and approved in 1900, Australia becoming an independent nation almost 80 years after the independence of Brazil. The six colonies were transformed into states with notable internal autonomy. The new federal capital, Canberra, ACT, was inaugurated in 1927. Despite several attempts by Aborigines and non-Aborigines to create a single legislation at a national level, Maddock (1983:130) argues that, taking into consideration that the Aboriginal populations in each state share a common history, and taking into account the social and economic differences between states and differences in the condition of their Aboriginal populations, the states provide more manageable arenas in which to resolve Aboriginal issues than the nation.

During the period that I was in Australia, newspaper articles mentioned changes in

[13] "...which in media reports was commonly described as 'a right-wing think tank'" (Merlan, 1991:347).

the legislation regarding Aboriginal patrimony in the state of Western Australia, as well as the impact of anthropological consultations in disputes over Aboriginal sacred sites in the nickel mining project at Yakabindie (W.A.), the iron-ore project at Marandoo (the Karijini National Park, W.A.), and the uranium mining project at Coronation Hill (N.T.). According to The West Australian, of 19 February 1992, the principal motives for "big changes to WA's Aboriginal heritage laws to be introduced in State Parliament" the following month, were "streamlining development approval procedures and improving the protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage". An article in the same newspaper, of 20 February 1992, states that Liberal Aboriginal affairs spokesman Richard Court "said it was crucial that changes to the laws enabled direct consultation between traditional owners and developers", urging that fringe groups trying to act for Aboriginal interests should be given as little emphasis as possible in changes to the Aboriginal heritage laws, in an attempt to disqualify urban Aboriginal activists.

To illustrate the complexity of the question of recognition of Aboriginal lands and sacred sites, I mention, as an example, during the weeks that I was in Australia, a fierce struggle which broke out in the state of Western Australia between two groups over the question of the right to assess Aboriginal sacred sites. The Aboriginal Cultural Material Committee (ACMC) of the Museum of Western Australia announced that, as from 1 March 1992, it would no longer accept Aboriginal site surveys or reports unless the writer belonged to a professional association. Academic anthropologists of the Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists (AACA) were confronted by a group of private consultants made up of anthropologists and people involved with Aboriginal sacred sites, who did not want to be linked to academics, and moved to register at Corporate Affairs the Australian Association of Professional and Consulting Anthropologists and Archaeologists (AAPCAA). Academics from two departments of the University of Western Australia and from one department of Curtin University (also in Perth) lodged several objections at Corporate Affairs, claiming that the AAPCAA should not be registered, on grounds of public interest. Prior to this, some private consultants contracted by Aborigines, had represented the interests of mining companies and real estate developers in places where there are Aboriginal sacred sites. The conflict led Labour's Senator Peter Walsh to publicly defend the private consultants, questioning what he calls the academics' intolerance "of views which may differ from their own".

Some anthropologists in Australia work exclusively in research, as is the case of those of the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR), a small multidisciplinary research unit, established in 1990, in the Faculty of Arts, Australian National University, Canberra, through a contract signed between this University and the DAA (now ATSIC) on behalf of the Commonwealth of Australia. It is directed by the anthropologist Dr. Jon Altman and includes the anthropologist Diane Smith. The Centre is a new initiative which grew out of a recommendation in the Report of the Committee of Review of Aboriginal Employment and Training Programs in 1985, and aims to carry out research to investigate issues relating to Aboriginal employment and unemployment; factors affecting Aboriginal participation in the labour force; and the development of government strategies aimed at increasing Aboriginal employment and economic status generally.

Social anthropology and Aboriginal studies in the Universities

Australian Universities share similar characteristics with other bureaucratic institutions in the sense that there are patronage structures. I got the impression that, similar to Brazil, the definition of what is anthropological knowledge is made by a few anthropologists who have high prestige. The people who have the professorships (equivalent to a "full professor" in the U.S.A.), who until the 70's were few, defined and controlled what is knowledge. This influenced the process of appointment and promotion of professors, on the basis of not threatening the existing academic structures. Lecturers who did not follow the defined lines were ignored by the academy, including many foreign anthropologists who carried out research in Australia, with some exceptions such as Fred Myers. According to several anthropologists interviewed, up to the 80's, and even today, there are some influential anthropologists oriented by a search for the "traditional" and "cultural continuity". Even while accepting approaches which recognise the situation of change in which Aboriginal populations are enmeshed, they still use the concept of "tradition" as a measure which orients their theoretical perspective.

The development of the discipline occurred within patronage structures which only started to widen in recent years with the growth of the academic system, the creation of new departments and the emergence of a much larger anthropological community (in early 1992, according to some of the anthropologists interviewed, around 130 professional anthropologists employed in academic institutions). If in Brazil few anthropologists admit the existence of patronage structures in the Universities, in Australia there is a tendency to deny their existence. They remain concealed at the level of discourse by an egalitarian ideology of "give everyone a fair go", and the embedded idea that Australia is a "society without classes". What Kapferer calls "Australian egalitarian nationalism" (1989:178), related to the concept of "mateship": "that form of friendship, strongly egalitarian in tone... the natural will to sociality... activated between individuals who are alike or share an identity in nature" (Kapferer, 1989:175). The concept of "mateship" stresses the principle of "balanced reciprocity" and "egalitarian individualism" (Ibid.:176). According to Kapferer, "Ultimately, individual and nation are interchangeable. The nation is like a group of 'mates'" (Ibid.:177).

Anthropological interpretation in Australia has depended a lot on borrowed theories and the application of imported models for the analysis of local situations, as well as the influence of academic fashions. To mention a few: the caste model applied to race relations came from the U.S.A. in the early 50's, and, later, studies on the feminist line, followed by gender. There has been a profusion of publications which deal with the question of "hierarchy" in "egalitarian" Aboriginal societies, ethnohistorical works, biographies of Aborigines, works on oral tradition, and experiments in co-authorship between anthropologists and Aborigines. A new direction initiated by Fred Myers, dealing with the question of emotions, has stimulated a series of recent works about Aborigines and emotions, and the vision of ethnic contention of emotions. There has also been a series of confessional style works about fieldwork, and of the type, "How I did (as anthropological consultant) my land claim case", in which the anthropologist justifies his/her representations of the case.

Several anthropologists affirmed that, although the majority of anthropologists who work in Australia attentively accompany the anthropological debates in the "central countries" of the discipline, there is much less interest among their colleagues in these countries in accompanying the works published in Australia. This is so, despite the close links with Britain and the facility of access to publications in the English language. A

situation rather similar to that observed by Mariza Peirano in the case of Brazil: "We dialogue with renowned authors as if we were really read outside Brazil, we reanalyse classics as if our works had worldwide prestige, not knowing the fact that, the moment that national frontiers are crossed, what was here a theoretical discussion is immediately transformed into mere regional ethnography" (1992:229-230).

The expansion of anthropology in Australia came as a consequence of a more general policy of expansion of institutions of tertiary education, especially from the 60's. Hinton & McCall (1982:109-110) show that in 1980 there were 19 Universities and 68 Colleges of Advanced Education in Australia, as well as another 85 post-secondary institutions. The majority of these 172 institutions were established during the 60's and 70's. The enormous increase in institutions of tertiary education resulted in the contracting of many lecturers in this period. Hinton & McCall (1982:113) note that this period is marked by the proliferation of journals. Until 1960, there were only two anthropological journals in Australia - Oceania, founded in 1930, and Mankind, founded in 1931. Between 1961 and 1981, 24 journals relating to anthropology were founded.

Taking into consideration that the first PhD programme in anthropology was implanted only in 1955, at the University of Sydney, Universities were obliged to contract many foreign lecturers with PhD's to fill the vacancies. In 1982 there were 11 institutions with anthropology: 5 departments of anthropology, 1 department of prehistory and anthropology (ANU), and 2 departments of sociology and anthropology (Queensland and Monash Universities), as well as 2 anthropology museums (in 2 Universities) and 1 anthropology department at the Australian Museum (Hinton & McCall, 1982:110). The importation of lecturers with PhD's, especially from Britain and the U.S.A., created a situation, which still persists, in which the anthropology departments have many lecturers of foreign origin and academic training. In addition, many of the older anthropologists, born in Australia, did their PhD's abroad, especially in England. The contracting of British, American and Canadian anthropologists still occurs, although the number of Australian born anthropologists is increasing to the point that the discipline is now reproducing itself with anthropologists who have Australian PhD's.

Several Institutes of Technology, which had a status below that of the Universities, have, over the past few years, been transformed into Universities, although, maintaining the practical intention of training students for government jobs rather than producing academics. In addition, they put more emphasis on teaching than on research, the lecturer being judged by the number of students that he/she attracts to his/her courses, as well as not having, initially, graduate programmes. Despite the fact that they now have academic status equal to the older Universities, several anthropologists who work in the latter emphasized that they are still not comparable, being similar to the popular ("red-brick") Universities established in Britain after World War II. In those Universities established in the 60's and 70's, such as Flinders, Griffith, Murdoch, Monash, and Macquarie, which absorbed the "radical" style of that time, social sciences occupy a central position with the implantation of inter-disciplinary departments.

In recent years, as well as anthropology, other disciplines such as sociology, history, political science, and literature, have focused Aboriginal populations as an object of study. Sociology was implanted as a discipline in the Australian Universities very much later than anthropology. However, the definition of sociology as the study of the national society is still embedded, whereas anthropology is seen as the study of "others". An anthropologist who works on the theme of racism and Aborigines in Australian society and

interethnic relations, commented that she is frequently told by anthropologists that she is not doing anthropology but sociology.

Another lecturer in anthropology, in one of the older Universities, related the following anecdote: When she proposed to include the present-day situation of Aborigines in an Aboriginal studies course, in which it was expected to have some Aboriginal students, she was told by some colleagues that "We don't want any of that trendy race relations stuff here". She added that, with few exceptions, "anthropologists haven't studied racism in Australia. Paul Rabinow asked 'Why haven't Australian anthropologists studied racism?' ... People just don't find it an issue", affirming that one of the biggest problems is the racist implications of the discipline itself, as well as a disinclination to study power relations of any kind. She stressed that, until recently, anthropology with Aborigines was dominated by a search for the exotic and an emphasis on culture which censured the question of interethnic relations. The same person said that, until a few years ago, there were more works in the area of history, than in anthropology, which dealt with the Aboriginal experience of colonization.

Several anthropologists mentioned that there has been a recent incorporation of research workers into the principal Universities when the themes that they study were legitimized by the government. Such as, for example, the recent focus on Aborigines and the police, the imprisonment of Aborigines, and the question of racism. It is worth mentioning that, in Brazil, the question of racism has been examined, in both anthropology and sociology, however, only in studies about blacks and not in Indian studies. As Melatti (personal communication) points out, in Brazil, the study of Indians was associated with the notion of culture in "acculturation studies", while the study of blacks was associated with the notion of race in "race relations".

One anthropologist interviewed interpreted the late implantation of sociology in the Australian Universities as a conservative policy adopted by the government to try to eliminate sociology at a time when social sciences, especially sociology, were associated with socialism, and seen by the government as a potentially dangerous area. According to the same anthropologist, professor at one of the older Universities, the use of anthropology which has had most impact is this negative use to justify the absence of sociology. To illustrate his argument, he affirmed that when Flinders University was established in the early 70's (planned in the late 60's) in South Australia, the University of Adelaide implanted anthropology as a discipline which was seen as "controllable", in contrast to the "radical" sociology at Flinders. In Brazil, during the period of military government, anthropology was seen by the military as a discipline which presented less danger than the other social sciences, perhaps because they saw it as the study of races, human palaeontology and archaeology.

Styles of anthropology in the national context

Some of the anthropologists interviewed who are naturalized Australians mentioned that they are occasionally reminded of their national origins by Australian born non-anthropologists, above all when their comments about the situation of Aborigines in Australia are seen as offensive to Australian nationalist feelings. One anthropologist relates what he sees as a predominantly apolitical position in Aboriginal studies to the fact that many anthropologists were imported and not trained in Australia. Placing himself among the "imported", he affirmed that anthropologists of foreign origin who speak about questions such as race relations are frequently accused of political activism by conservative sectors of Australian society.

In Brazil, also, the anthropologist of foreign origin who carries out research with Indian populations faces nationalist feelings when he/she deals with some bureaucratic officials of FUNAI. In my own fieldwork experience, from the time I applied for permission from FUNAI, in 1981, I was threatened by a colonel of the agency who reminded me that FUNAI would allow me to carry out research (as a foreigner) with "our Indians", but that any "criticisms" would result in the immediate suspension of my authorization. Some high level officials of FUNAI's bureaucracy, revealed that they were against the presence of a "gringo" in an Indian area (in northern Amazonia) seen as being of top national interest. At the local level, many FUNAI workers introduced me to the Indians as a "gringo", "foreigner", "not Brazilian", using extremely negative stereotypes about foreigners, such as the "gringo who has come to rob gold from the Indians' land", in their efforts to try to control my access to information and to impose an identity of "Brazilian Indians" onto the Waimiri-Atroari (Baines, S.G., 1991). My intentions were often questioned by officials of the coordination, and, in a FUNAI Work Group in which I participated in 1985, some members told me that they thought I had come from abroad "only to do research" (insinuating that, being a "foreigner", in itself, was enough to know, a priori, that I did not have any concern with the destiny of the Indians).

My research was banned in 1989, when some top officials of the "Programa Waimiri-Atroari" (the result of an agreement between FUNAI and ELETRONORTE - the government electricity company which constructed the Balbina hydroelectric scheme, flooding part of the Waimiri-Atroari Indians' territory - financed by the World Bank), used calumnious newspaper articles, based on forged documents, published to favour mining company interests, to incite the Waimiri-Atroari Indians to prohibit the continuation of my research. The government officials presented me, in a false nationalist discourse, as a supposed international agent of international mining interests, involved in a conspiracy against national sovereignty. At the same time, the "Programa Waimiri-Atroari" invited an English ethnobotanist together with Brazilian and foreign research workers to carry out an ethnobotanical survey in the same Indian territory, as part of a strategy to obtain academic backing for the "Programa Waimiri-Atroari".

In Australia, I interviewed a Canadian anthropologist who had been subjected to a similar difamatory campaign - published in the press by mining company interests - which resorts to nationalist feelings, questioning the intentions of his PhD research. As Alcida Ramos (1990) shows, reflecting on the case of Brazil, the styles of ethnology result from the particularities of the historical development of the discipline in the national contexts of the respective countries. However, in addition to these factors, the different constructions of the "other" lead the ethnologist of foreign origin to face, in some fieldwork situations, a

hegemony of nationalist feelings among some agents of interethnic contact which makes difficult, or impossible, his/her political involvement in the defence of Indian rights. His/her political engagement is made difficult, for being classified as a "foreigner" seen through stereotypes which represent him/her as an agent of imperialism, or, at least, as an individual who has less legitimacy to express him/herself in an arena seen to be of national prerogative. And this, even before starting fieldwork, determines the directions which his/her research can take and the style of ethnology that results. If he/she persists in focusing questions such as interethnic relations, he/she runs the risk of these stereotypes being used to prevent the continuation of his/her research and remove the possibility of his/her continuing as an actor in an activist-ethnology. When the question of the nation and concepts of the "other" are focused as objects of theoretical reflection, they become epistemological facts of the discipline.

The national born ethnologist or he/she who is seen as "less foreign" (of British origin, in the case of Australia, in opposition to American or of other nationalities; in the case of Brazil, from other Latin American countries or Portugal) is more easily accepted than he/she who is seen as more foreign by the other social agents in a situation of interethnic contact, reflecting the different cultural construction of the "other" in the respective countries. Several anthropologists commented that, in the Universities, the importation of British anthropologists in Australia was easily accepted, whereas the importation of American anthropologists was seen, initially, by some anthropologists, as an invasion of the academic space.

The same anthropologists affirmed that, since the 70's, as a consequence of the growth of the Aboriginal movement in Australia and the introduction of the new legislation regarding land rights, Aborigines demand a political activism from Australian ethnologists who carry out research in their communities. At the same time, they do not make the same demand from anthropologists seen as "foreigners", who come to do fieldwork in Australia. The result is that many of the latter carry out research on the most traditional ethnological themes (an Australian born professor of anthropology cited, as an example, the recent work, based on research with Australian Aborigines, of the French anthropologist Barbara Glowczewski), which is no longer possible for Australian anthropologists.

The consequences are reflected in a style of anthropology with Aboriginal populations which has emerged in Australia during the past two decades, with political involvement, which is less evident in the works of foreign anthropologists who carry out fieldwork with Aborigines in Australia. An analogous situation, in some respects, to that observed by Alcida Ramos in Brazil (1990). Styles of anthropology emerge and continue in a constant dialectic between epistemological facts and sociological facts which molds the product of thought and the very thinking about the product of thought.

A fundamental difference between anthropology with native populations in the two countries is that, in Australia, a large contingent of anthropologists are of British and North American origin, whereas, in Brazil, the majority of anthropologists are Brazilians by birth. It is not surprising that in Australia, as one anthropologist pointed out, in the past five years, period in which anthropology has come to have a voice and in which the Universities are now producing a sufficient number of PhD's in anthropology to perpetuate the discipline without importing academics, the federal government has increased its control over Aboriginal policy, no longer concerning itself with the anthropological legitimation of its decisions. Thus, at the very moment in which the Universities could exercise a greater political force in questions related to Aboriginal populations, they are

being transformed into teaching institutions in which the anthropologist has an ever more reduced space for political expression.

Acknowledgements: My special thanks to Professor Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira, Professor Luíz Fernando D. Duarte, Professor Julio Cezar Melatti and Professor Mariza G. S. Peirano, for reading a preliminary version of this paper and offering their valuable suggestions which I have tried to incorporate in this version. I accept complete responsibility for the content of this version.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- BAINES, Patricia A. 1988 - The Heart of Home: The Intergenerational Transmission of a Nyungar Identity. Doctoral thesis, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, W.A.
- _____ 1991 (1988) - A litany for land. In KEEN, Ian (ed.) Being Black: Aboriginal Cultures in 'settled' Australia. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press. pp.227-249.
- BAINES, Stephen G. 1991 - É A FUNAI QUE SABE: A Frente de Atração Waimiri-Atroari. Belém: Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi/ CNPq/ SCT/ PR. (Coleção Eduardo Galvão).
- BECKETT, Jeremy R. 1958 - Marginal Men: A Study of Two Half Caste Aborigines, Oceania 29, 91-108
- _____ 1964 - Aborigines, Alcohol and Assimilation. In M. Reay (ed.) Aborigines Now: New Perspectives in the Study of Aboriginal Communities. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- _____ 1988a - The past in the present; the present in the past: constructing a national Aboriginality. In BECKETT, Jeremy R. (ed.) Past and Present: The Construction of Aboriginality, Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- _____ 1988b - Aboriginality, Citizenship and the Nation State. In BECKETT, Jeremy. Aborigines and the State in Australia, Social Analysis, No.24, pp.3-18.
- _____ 1992 - Aboriginality and the Nation State: A Comparative Perspective. University of Sydney, ms.
- BERNDT, R.M. & R. TONKINSON (eds.). 1988 - Social Anthropology and Australian Aboriginal Studies: a contemporary overview. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, Roberto. 1981 (1964) - O Índio e o Mundo dos Brancos. Brasília - São Paulo: Editora UnB - Pioneira, 3ª ed.
- _____ 1978 - A Sociologia do Brasil Indígena. Brasília - Rio de Janeiro: Editora UnB - Tempo Brasileiro.
- _____ 1988 - Sobre o Pensamento Antropológico (Biblioteca Tempo Universidade; nº 83). Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro; Brasília: CNPq.

COWLISHAW, Gillian K. 1986 - Aborigines and Anthropologists. Australian Aboriginal Studies, number 1, pp.2-12.

1988 - Black, White or Brindle: Race in rural Australia.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ELKIN, A.P. 1970 - "The Journal Oceania: 1930-1970". Oceania, 40 :245-279.

GEERTZ, Clifford. 1973 - "The Politics of Meaning", in The Interpretation of Cultures.
New York: Basic Books.

HAMILTON, Annette. 1982 - Anthropology in Australia: Some notes and a few queries. In
McCALL, Grant. (ed.) Anthropology in Australia: Essays to Honour 50 Years of
Mankind. The Anthropological Society of New South Wales. pp.91-106.

HINTON, Peter & Grant McCALL - 1982 The Great Australian Anthropological
Periodicals Explosion. In McCALL, Grant. (ed.) Anthropology in Australia:
Essays to Honour 50 Years of **Mankind**. The Anthropological Society of New
South Wales. pp.109-134.

KAPFERER, Bruce. 1989 - Nationalist Ideology and a Comparative Anthropology.
Ethnos, 54 (3-4), pp. 161- 199.

LANGTON, Marcia. 1981 - Urbanizing Aborigines: The Social Scientists' Great Decep-
tion. Social Alternatives, Vol.2, No.2, pp.16-22.

1991 (1988) - Medicine Square. In KEEN, Ian (ed) Being Black:
Aboriginal cultures in 'settled' Australia. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press. pp.
201-225.

LARAIA, Roque de Barros. 1986 - Os Estudos de Parentesco no Brasil. Série Antropologia
nº 55. Brasília: DAN, UnB.

1987 - Etnologia Indígena Brasileira: Um Breve
Levantamento. Série Antropologia nº 60. Brasília: DAN, UnB.

MADDOCK, Kenneth. 1983 - Your Land is Our Land: Aboriginal Land Rights.
Ringwood, Vict.: Penguin Books.

McCALL, Grant. 1982 - Anthropology in Australia: Introductory Remarks. In McCALL,
Grant. (ed.) Anthropology in Australia: Essays to Honour 50 Years of **Mankind**.
The Anthropological Society of New South Wales. pp.1-21.

MCCARTHY, Frederick D. 1982 - Anthropology in the Museums of Australia. In
McCALL, Grant. (ed.) Anthropology in Australia: Essays to Honour 50 Years of
Mankind. The Anthropological Society of New South Wales. pp.22-47.

MELATTI, Julio Cezar 1982 - A Etnologia das Populações Indígenas do Brasil nas Duas Últimas Décadas. Anuário Antropológico/80:253-257. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

_____ 1984 - A Antropologia no Brasil: Um Roteiro. BIB (Boletim Informativo e Bibliográfico de Ciências Sociais) 17:3-52.

_____ 1985 - Curt Nimuendajú e os Jê. Série Antropologia nº 49, Brasília: Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília.

MERLAN, Francesca. 1991 - The Limits of Cultural Constructionism: The Case of Coronation Hill. Oceania, 340-352.

MORRIS, Barry. 1985 - Cultural Domination and Domestic Dependence: The Dhan-Gadi of New South Wales and the Protection of the State. Canberra Anthropology, 8 (1&2) pp.87-115. Special Volume: Minorities and the State.

_____ 1988 - The politics of identity: from Aborigines to the first Australian. In BECKETT, Jeremy (ed.) Past and Present: The Construction of Aboriginality. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, pp.63-85.

_____ 1991 (1988) - Dhan-gadi resistance to assimilation In I.KEEN (ed.) Being Black: Aboriginal cultures in 'settled' Australia. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

MULVANEY, D.J. 1990 - The Australian Aborigines 1606-1929: Opinion and fieldwork. In JANSON, Susan, and Stuart MA CINTYRE (eds.) Through White Eyes. Sydney, Wellington, London, Boston: Allen & Unwin. pp.1-44.

PEIRANO, Mariza G. S. 1981 - The Anthropology of Anthropology: The Brazilian Case. Tese de doutoramento, Harvard University. (Publicada na Série Antropologia N° 110, Brasília: DAN, UnB, 1991).

_____ 1991 - Da lógica à etnografia da ciência. Anuário Antropológico 88. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília; Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro. pp.179-187.

_____ 1992 - Uma Antropologia No Plural: Três Experiências Contemporâneas. Brasília, D.F.: Editora Universidade de Brasília.

PETERSON, Nicolas. 1990 - 'Studying man and man's nature': the history of the institutionalisation of Aboriginal anthropology. Australian Aboriginal Studies 1990/number 2, pp.3-19.

RAMOS, Alcida Rita. 1990 - Ethnology Brazilian Style. Cultural Anthropology, vol 5(4):452-457.

- RICOEUR, Paul. 1978 - O Conflito das Interpretações. Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- ROWSE, Tim. 1988 - Middle Australia and the noble savage: a political romance. In BECKETT, Jeremy (ed.) Past and Present: The Construction of Aboriginality. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, (pp.161-177).
- ROWLEY, C.D. 1970 The Destruction of Aboriginal Society. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- _____ 1971 Outcasts in White Australia. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- SANSOM, Basil L. 1980 - Tha Camp at Wallaby Cross. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- _____ 1991 (1988) A grammar of exchange. In I. KEEN (ed.) Being Black: Aboriginal cultures in 'settled' Australia. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press. pp.159-177.
- SEEGER, Anthony & Eduardo VIVEIROS DE CASTRO. 1980 - "Pontos de Vista sobre os Índios Brasileiros: Um Ensaio Bibliográfico". Capítulo 7, in SEEGER, Anthony (ed.) Os Índios e Nós: Estudos sobre Sociedades Tribais Brasileiras. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
- SPENCER, B. & F.J. GILLEN. 1899 - The Native Tribes of Central Australia, London: Macmillan.
- STOCKING, Jr., George W. 1982 - Afterword: A View from the Center. Ethnos, 47, pp.172-186.
- _____ (ed.) 1983 - Observers Observed. Madison, London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____ (ed.) 1984 - Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology, Madison, London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- TRIGGER, David S. 1992 - Whitefella Comin': Aboriginal responses to colonialism in northern Australia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TROOD, Russell B. 1990 - Australian Diplomatic Practice: Methods and Theory. Journal of Asian and African Studies XXV, 1-2 pp.88-113.
- WISE, Tigger. 1985 - The self-Made Anthropologist: a life of A.P. Elkin. Sydney, London, Boston: George Allen & Unwin.