Cameras, Kinship and Marriage on Groote Eylandt, Australia: Frederick Rose and Peter Worsley's Challenge to Rivers' Genealogical Method

Valerie Munt

Abstract: *To be an anthropological heretic is not in itself unusual, but to critique W. H. R. Rivers, the 'founder of the modern study of social organization', and his 'pupil' A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, who established the science of social anthropology in five continents seems like professional madness, but this is what Frederick Rose did – he attacked the heart of their methodology – the mapping of kinship via the Genealogical Method. This paper explains how Rose's critique of Rivers' methodology began during his fieldwork (1938–41) on Groote Eylandt off Australia's far north coast and how his observations were supported and extended by Peter Worsley's fieldwork among the Wanindiljaugwa in 1953, indicating an entirely new approach to Australian kinship studies. Although these methodological innovations were praised by some contemporary influential anthropologists and followed up by colleagues in the West during the 1970s and later, Cold War tensions and a closed and politically conservative anthropological establishment combined to marginalize Rose and Worsley's valuable contribution to the study of Australian kinship.*

Keywords: *Frederick, G. G. Rose; Peter Worsley; Radcliffe-Brown; The Genealogical Method; W. H. R. Rivers; Australia's Groote-Eylandt Kinship*

Introduction

Since the 1970s, the conceptual foundations of knowledge and the primacy of the western scientific worldview have been subjected to profound questioning, which has had a significant impact on all the social sciences. Social Anthropology – or the 'science of humankind' was at the centre of many debates, and a crucial question was posed: 'How is it possible to form objective concepts and objectively verifiable theory of subjective meaning structures?'[1] Frederick Rose stumbled upon this question years earlier than many of his contemporaries. In his fieldwork on Groote-Eylandt in the years 1938–1941, he came face to face with the problem of the subjectivity and ethnocentricity of the researcher, and he faced the troubling question of whether his chosen profession was indeed a 'science' (Rose, notes 1956, Box 1 Rose Papers). Such epistemological questions later became important for understanding the crisis of authority experienced in both Anthropology and History after the intellectual movements of the1970s and 1980s.[2] However, Rose's methodological innovations were destined to become a casualty of the cloistered academic environment in the West and political and ideological hostilities on both sides of the Iron Curtain, which remained until the fall of the Soviet Union.

Mapping the Empire

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the British imperial endeavor required methodologies which extended 'homogenous mapping' to all parts of the globe 'to record and display [its] worldwide imperial possessions' (Ryan 1996: 5). Such 'mapping' also extended to the social organization of native tribes so that they too could be transformed in an 'objective' depersonalized way and included 'within the scope of [European] vision' (de Certeau 1984: 36). Yet however 'scientific' such representations purported to be, they were inevitably the product of a self-legitimizing European worldview in which marriage and kinship were seen through a particular 'archive of pre-existent images and tropes.' Ryan (1996: 5) has discussed their theoretical deficits and methodological problems.

---

1   Alfred Schutz in D. Emmet and A. Macintyre, eds. 1970. *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis.* New York: Macmillan:15.
2   See: Habermas, Jürgen. 1972. *Knowledge and Human Interests* [translated by Jeremy Shapiro]. USA: Beacon Books; Lyotard, Jean-François. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Manchester: Manchester University Press; Foucault, Michel. 1966, 2002. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences.* UK: Tavistock Publications.

In the early stage of his career, Frederick Rose naturally focused on the standard "structural functionalist" approach to 'kinship mapping' in line with the conventions of his Degree in Anthropology from Cambridge University. When he first arrived at Groote Eylandt in July 1938, he had only recently graduated, but inspired by A.C. Haddon and the writings of Bronislaw Malinowski, he was keen to make his mark on the anthropological world. His education in Natural Science and Mathematics would provide the scientific grounding which laid the foundation for a very different approach through which to view what was then considered a "pristine" traditional Aboriginal society. It was Rose's famous Cambridge predecessor, W. H. R. Rivers (1864–1922), from the 1898 Cambridge expedition to the Torres Strait, and inventor of the Genealogical Method who would provide Rose with his first intellectual challenge.

The Genealogical Method of W.H. R. Rivers

The method Rivers promoted for mapping the kinship and the marriage laws of native societies became known as 'The Genealogical Method of Collecting Social and Vital Statistics' (Rivers 1900).[3] The history of its evolution as a methodological tool has been traced by James Urry (1972). The quest to codify authentic marriage rules had almost totally preoccupied the first generation of Australian anthropologists. In the nineteenth century, J. F. McLennan (1865) had 'laid out a scheme of development from primitive promiscuity, through group marriage and polygamy, and [had]sought to construct by logic and functional reasoning a plausible stepwise course of such a development' (Barth 2005: 8–9). And by the early twentieth century, professors Radcliffe-Brown (1881–1955) and Anglican clergyman A. P. Elkin (1891–1979) had become the accepted academic authorities on Australian kinship and marriage rules (Radcliffe-Brown 1930: 206–246; Elkin 1938). Yet their thinking, according to Rose, was unscientific – it did not match the empirically observed evidence. Nor could their canonical marriage and kinship diagrams adequately explain the fact of Aboriginal survival into the twentieth century (Denham 2013: 2). In the eyes of the missionaries and early anthropologists, marriage had been viewed primarily as a restrictive sexual relationship and the practice of wife-stealing as one driven by sexual jealousy and the 'primitive' male's instinct to dominate as many women as he could. However, Rose's Groote Eylandt kinship research was about to turn what he called this

---

3   George W. Stocking considered this invention as the significant methodological innovation resulting from the Cambridge Expedition of 1898. Stocking, George. W. 1999. *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology,1888–1951*. London: Athlone: 112.

'bourgeois' idea on its head. Rose was not the first to challenge the wisdom of his academic masters. Indeed Thomas (2011: 348) cites the 'great debate between Howitt and Mathews' as an example of the intensity of the internecine warfare within a discipline where much 'canonfire was expended in demolishing Mathews' thesis on 'irregular' or 'alternative' marriages: unions that were taboo according to kinship tables' (Thomas 2011: 11). Yet authentic marriage rules proved elusive for all those who embarked on the quest,' (Thomas 2011: 348) until Rose's and Worsley's fieldwork shone new light on the subject.

British Social Anthropology was established principally as an applied discipline whose aim was to understand the 'otherness' of the non-European inhabitants of its colonies (Stocking 1992: 217). Its 'scientific' methods were deemed unproblematic in that they purported to be 'objective ways of understanding' (Georgeson 1998: 7). These were mainly understood through a biological methodology concerned with constructing anatomical typologies created from a so-called 'cephalic index' (the ratio of the maximum width of the head to its maximum length). This index, invented by the Swedish anatomist Anders Retzius (1796–1860), was used to classify human populations according to a racist pseudo-scientific measure of development. It was employed by Rose's Cambridge professor, Thomas C. Hodson, in his racist classification for the 1931 Census of India (Hodson 1937). Observed through this biological lens, so-called "primitive" societies were positioned within a hierarchical scheme of economic and social progress from the lowest stage to the highest – that of the White European, Christian monogamous civilizations. The Australian Aborigines had been consigned to the lowest rung of the ladder of development by Morgan (1877) and were accordingly considered a "primitive race," thought by some to be doomed to eventual extinction (Kociumbas 2004: 83).

Australian Fieldwork

Fieldwork in Australia had initially been confined to the amateur explorations of adventurers like Ernest Favenc (1845–1908) and the investigations of telegraph station manager Frank Gillen (1855–1920), whose collaboration with Baldwin Spencer (1860–1929) resulted in the classic work on the *Arrernte* desert people of central Australia (1899) which became something of an 'international sensation' when it was first published (Lindquist 2007: 42).

Rose's classic study of Australian kinship (1960) was based on fieldwork carried out on Groote Eylandt from July 1938 to February 1939 and May to September 1941. It constituted an important critique of the reigning contemporary "structural functionalist" orthodoxies and the closed diagrammatic kinship models developed by A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (1930: 51) and mapped by his protégé A. P. Elkin

in the early twentieth century.[4] Radcliffe-Brown's preliminary kinship diagrams of the *Kariera* people imprisoned on Bernier Island in Western Australia in 1911 were presented in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* in 1913 'without a single word' indicating how he had arrived at his conclusions (Lindquist 2007: 120) and in keeping with Rivers' economical method, his work contained no theoretical or historical speculation. Yet Rose realized the importance of publishing *all* his data: or it could 'be held against me that my conclusions were not supported by any data which ultimately was my criticism of what Elkin and Radcliffe-Brown had published. They had published their conclusions in the form of kinship diagrams *but not the data on which their formal organization[s] were based*' (Rose, Memoir: 82) [My italics]. A point also noted by Needham (1971).[5]

The persistent expectation from those who then presided over the discipline was that anthropologists should simply record the 'ethnographic facts' which they gathered on their travels across vast areas (Larson 2011: 76). The diagrammatic mapping of kinship was the essential component of their work and followed the strict methodological procedure developed by W. H. R. Rivers in 1910 (Sillitoe 2005). Rivers' ambition was to create a 'unified science' of anthropology (Slobodin 1978: 232-234; 267), and despite his surprising late adoption of "diffusionism" and the controversy it created (Lawrence 2006), his work was widely revered.

Nevertheless, his methodologies appeared to be tethered to a dichotomy between "simple," "backward" societies and those which were modern and civilized.[6] His was a colonial worldview which was both class-bound and Eurocentric. He belonged to a social class that for centuries had invested enormous energy in 'maintaining and developing extensive, reliable, and well-articulated structures of exchange among connected families over many generations' (Sabean and Teuscher 2007: 3). Marriage was the key institution through which property was transmitted down the generations and from an Anglo-Christian perspective, marriage "rules" were clearly outlined in the *The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England* in 'A Table of Kindred and Affinity' (1662 Edition: 384). The table listed thirty categories of kin (for both men and women) who were forbidden

---

[4] Elkin began questioning Radcliffe-Brown's 'generalizations' in 1953 (See: Hiatt 2006: 119).

[5] Rodney Needham stated that 'Radcliffe-Brown never published a single scholarly, technically exact, and comprehensive analysis of any kinship system.' See: Wilder's, Review of *The Culture of Kinship Studies* (Wilder 1973: 129).

[6] Meyer Fortes' 1945 research on the Tallensi, according to Allman and Parker (2005:16), suffered a similar limitation with the result that they too 'were enshrined in ethnographic discourse as the archetypal stateless society, marooned on the margins of a distant hinterland in a timeless ethnographic present' (cited in Insoll 2010). See also Worsley's critique of Fortes' Tallensi ethnography in Worsley 1956.

'in scripture and our laws as marriage partners.' Both Rivers' clergyman father and his mother had a strong Church of England, naval and Cambridge lineage (Slobodin 1997), so would have been well-schooled in biblical references and family "trees." The sociological underpinnings of their colonial world were only just beginning to be swept away by the First World War in Rivers' adulthood, yet the vast British Empire had been ruled for almost a century by the "Grandmother of Europe" Queen Victoria. The historical power of a dynastic European lineage had promulgated the virtues of the prosperous middle-class family: '[M]edallions of [Victoria's] progeny hanging like fruit from the branches, were published in newspapers and magazines all over the Empire for her Jubilees' (Warner 1979, 303). Along with the biblical exhortation to: 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moved upon the earth' (Genesis 1-28). Such publications endorsed both the nineteenth-century Christian family and the British imperial project.

Even English grammar had its colonizing role, for, however 'abstract' the British notational system may have seemed, it was 'concretely tied to the possessional logic of the English language' (Bouquet 1993: 166; Foucault [1966] 2002). Yet the connection between words and culture, was largely unexamined by early British/ Australian social anthropologists. More recently, Rademaker (2014) has explored reinforcement of the imperialist project through the English language by both the CMS (Church Missionary Society of Australia) missionaries and the government project of assimilation. Yet 'what could the English language say about [Aboriginal] ceremonies, places and relationships?' (Rademaker 2014: 227–229). Typically for his era, Rivers did not acquire any native languages (Slobodin 1978: 42). Neither did Elkin, Radcliffe-Brown or Rose. Yet Rose at least raised the problem of communication in 'pidgin' and Worsley acknowledged the challenge of trying to understand 'one of the worst languages in Australia to learn' (Worsley interviewed by Martin Thomas, 2010).

Curiously, for one studying marriage and kinship, Langham claims that Rivers arguably 'held puritanical views with regard to sex' – surprisingly, he concluded from his analysis of Melanesian society that, in the earliest state … 'there could have been no question of general promiscuity' (Langham 1981: 143). Raymond Firth suggests that in Rivers' 'use of the concept of marriage in his theoretical constructions he focused almost entirely on its legalization of sex relations' (Firth cited in Langham 1981: 327), an illusion that Rose's work would shatter. Rivers' naive social viewpoint is supported by Layard's (1998) experience of Rivers as a mentor: 'It now seems unbelievable to me that neither Haddon nor Rivers … studying the problems of race mixture, never so much as mentioned sex,

whether by way of jokes or serious talk. Shades of Victorian humbug and fear and secrecy … [Rivers' *History of Melanesian Society*] left out so many basic facts of life … [it] was an intellectual structure lacking in basic reality … I went out to Melanesia not even knowing the elements of social anthropology, or even of primitive kinship which Rivers thought himself an expert on' (Layard 1998:15). As Mulvaney and Calaby explain, the problem of 'Victorian prudery' had also bedeviled the work of Tylor, Spencer and Gillen (Mulvaney and Calaby 1985: 179). Even though certain well-known anthropologists had 'irregular' marriages themselves, it did not seem to occur to them that 'the gulf between what people do and what they say can be fabulously wide' (Thomas 2011: 352). Frederick Rose, separated from Rivers by time, class and ideology, looked at the changing world through a very different lens.

"Primitive" marriage rules and the classification of kin

Colonial anthropologists had, by and large, looked at Aboriginal social institutions as "primitive". The mere existence of a 'classificatory' system of relationships,[7] rather than a simple 'descriptive' kinship system as used by Europeans was, as Sir James Frazer opined, the 'hallmark of savagery' (Frazer 1890, cited in Langham 1981: 8). It clearly signified that: '[Europeans] were Christian monogamists [who] knew who our begetters were, whereas the poor benighted savages living in a state of promiscuity did not' (Fox cited in Langham 1981: 8). 'Primitive marriage' (McLennan 1865) had attracted the interest of earlier ethnographers, but for Rivers, marriage and kinship could easily be documented as 'bodies of dry fact' that could be singled out from other 'low forms of culture' and studied in 'relative isolation' (Rivers cited in Slobodin 1978: 41). He held the firm belief that marriage rules were the key to understanding any system of classificatory kinship, for marriage assigned a definite place to every individual in society (Slobodin 1978: 112). Moreover typically, for the nineteenth-century students of various forms of Aboriginal kinship, the task 'was not just to classify [kinship systems] … but to fit these types into a *succession:* to transform taxonomy into a sequential typology … each type must represent a stage in an evolutionary progression' towards civilization (Worsley 1992:25).

The theoretical underpinnings of European monogamous marriage had been endorsed and sanctioned by Biblical scriptures since the Middle Ages: '[It] should

---

7 A 'classificatory' system recognizes kinship terms such as mother, brother, uncle and aunt as 'non-specific category terms which include large numbers of individuals rather than specific categories of blood-related relatives (Leach 1982: 228).

be hierarchical, taking its place in the universal hierarchy; men had to keep a tight reign on the women entrusted to them, but they also had to cherish them, and women owed respect to the men who had power over them. This exchange … established order within the domestic group, starting with its nucleus the married couple …' (Duby 1994: 97).

This Western European Christian model of marriage outlined in the sacramental religious vows remained fundamentally intact until the social upheavals of the twentieth century. However, the variation in forms of conjugal union among indigenous societies indicates its relative nature.[8] Many societies traditionally accepted polygamous marriages, but the polygamous marriage was considered characteristic of the 'savage' stage of 'barbarism' according to Lewis Henry Morgan (1877). It was, therefore, considered uncivilized by western theorists, destined to die out and make way for a higher stage of civilization. Indeed, the highest stage represented the monogamous Christian marriage, and a legal system constituted to protect patriarchal rights and private property inheritance (cf. Radcliffe-Brown 1935: 286–303).

Although relationship and marriage 'mapping' initially seemed orthodox enough to the young Cambridge-trained scientist Frederick Rose, he soon began to suspect that it bore the cultural imprint of its inventor and Christian Anglocentric orientation. Rivers' Genealogical Method (1900) was succinctly outlined in the Fifth Edition of *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* (1929) which Rose used as his fieldwork manual (Rose to White 7th Feb. 1950).[9] The manual advised that it would be 'practicable to collect the most extensive pedigrees, using only five terms of relationship, father, *mother, child, husband*, and *wife; …* Terms such as brother and sister, and still more cousin, uncle, or aunt [however] must be altogether avoided' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 45). 'Practical Hints on the method of recording the pedigrees' were as follows: 'It is a convenient practice to write the names of the males in capital letters, and those of the females in ordinary writing … In recording a marriage, the name of the husband may be put to the left of that of the wife, and in cases of polygyny and polyandry, the names of the associated spouses may be enclosed in square brackets if they are contemporary' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 45–47). Kinship Grouping (the Relationship System), for

---

8   There were some societies where marriage could occur between people of the same sex: the Nuer, for example, studied by Evans-Pritchard (1951), maintained the institution of "woman-marriage." In this case, a woman could give bridewealth to the relatives of another woman and "marry her" (See diagram in Bodley 2011: 110). Indeed, same-sex marriage has a long history.

9   The First Edition of *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* was published in 1874 during the 19th century push for exploration.

social anthropologists of the day, thus brought 'savage' societies into the ordered field of vision of a modern western man (Foucault 2002: xii–xiii). Moreover, given the urgency of investigating 'vanishing peoples', such mapping seemed to offer anthropologists an efficient 'short-cut route' into the workings of 'pre-literate' societies (Grimshaw 2001: 35). Thus, the 'kinship diagram' soon 'became established as a central motif in modern anthropological analysis' (Grimshaw 2001: 36). It 'would make ethnology the only branch of social sciences able to achieve results with scientific precision to match that of the natural sciences,' as Rivers emphasized in his lectures in 1910 (Lindquist 2007: 111). When Baldwin Spencer undertook his research in Central Australia, he dutifully took along his copy of *Notes & Queries* though he was cautioned by Rivers himself, who had 'expressed doubt as to whether the method was as applicable to extended societies, as to tiny island communities' (Mulvaney 1985: 195).

Rendering the world transparent

Haddon's and Rivers' efforts to place anthropology on a 'scientific' footing had begun as early as September 1899, when they publicized the utility of the new Genealogical Method in a paper read to the Anthropology Section of the British Association (Langham 1981: 69). The Genealogical Method, with its emphasis on 'concrete' facts and physiological data presented 'a concise medical textbook view of the world, one that discouraged the creation of any 'ambiguity' through speculation and theorizing on the part of the investigator' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: ix). It also hinted at the old idea of 'primitive mentalities' (Radcliffe-Brown 1930) 'in the lower culture things are classified in a way very different from that to which we are accustomed; in other words, the savage arranges his universe in categories different from ourselves' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 24). However, such "primitive" categories could only be represented by a western 'scientifically accurate' diagrammatic representation of a family tree, which regrettably avoided 'the representations that men in any [other] civilization may give themselves, of their life' (Foucault 2002: 412).

'Relative' error

Rivers' Genealogical Method asserted that 'nothing gives more insight into the intimate nature of social organization than the mode of naming relatives' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 66). However, Rose soon found that his attempt to employ the Genealogical Method posed more problems than it solved. The 'Method' acknowledged that in 'some communities (as in Australia) kinship terms of this

sort go beyond actual social relations, hence even distant strangers, never met or seen, are regarded as potentially belonging to one group of kindred or another … [and that] Owing to the wide use of terms under the classificatory system everybody may be found to be related in some way to everyone else' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 68).

Yet it did not actually provide any effective solutions to such problems. Also complicating matters were the systems of totems, and rules concerning incest taboos. How could such secret information be aligned with 'the first rule [of The Method] which stated that 'the abstract should be approached through the concrete' (*Notes and Queries* 1929: 31), especially in view of the complexities of Aboriginal languages and the routine necessity for interpreters. As far as Rose was concerned, 'ambiguities' in the Genealogical Method abounded. It became clear to him that: 'an adaptation of the Genealogical Method was necessary in order to sort out the corn of reality from the chaff of half-truth and straight-out fantasy … I was unable to arrange my data or any selected part of it into any formalized pattern which Radcliffe-Brown and his successors have made so popular' (Rose to White, 7th Feb. 1950). As a researcher unconstrained by the academy, Rose brought fresh eyes to the study of marriage, sex and kinship on Groote Eylandt. He soon discovered that Rivers' 'scientific' and 'thoroughly innovative' Genealogical Method, which had become 'a staple of fieldwork, designed to facilitate rapid compilation of fieldwork data' (Kuklick 1998: 162), required much more than a methodological re-appraisal (Rose 1960: 178-184). 'Overthrowing the theories of Radcliffe-Brown points to the need for a radical revision which is most unlikely to come about by patching up the older theories while accepting the assumptions that underlie them. It requires a fundamental attack on the logical and philosophical bases of Radcliffe- Brown's theories of marriage and the family in Australia...' (Notes, Box 36, Rose Papers).

Rose's first attempts to use the classical Genealogical Method had been hampered by his lack of facility with Aboriginal languages[10] – a disadvantage he soon realized that had also constrained Rivers, the Sydney University Professor A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, and his protégé, A. P. Elkin (Rose Memoir: 73). After re-checking answers to his investigations into the classificatory system of relationships of various tribes around Broome in Western Australia, Rose noted that: 'few of these answers confirmed what had been obtained from the genealogical method.[11]

---

[10] Dell Hymes points out that until 'Thirty or forty years ago, linguistics had barely become established as a separate discipline.' See: "Afterword" in Burke and Porter (1991: 330–345).

[11] The preferred Groote Eylandt marriage rule was between persons belonging to clans in the opposite moiety, who stood in the relationship neninja/dadinja (**MMBDS/MMBDD**) to each other. (Worsley 1992: 30).

These discrepancies were at first not taken seriously and were dismissed as being due to exceptional marriages. But this kind of result kept on recurring when individual aborigines were questioned ... the genealogical method as described by Rivers (1900) ... [in] its application to Australian tribes seemed to give anomalous results' (Rose 1960: 22).

The method was: 'Open to criticism on a number of grounds. The memory of individuals is likely to be faulty, and when going back one, two or three generations, it is difficult to get independent checks, although a group of aborigines will usually agree after a discussion – in other words, a consensus of opinion can be arrived at, but less easily an independent check. There is no assurance that when an informant says he called another aborigine, dead some ten or twenty years, by such and such a term, that he is correct ... There is also the important consideration that the classificatory system of relationship of a tribe is always in a state of flux and is constantly changing' (Rose 1960: 23).

Other flaws in the method were – 'difficulties with untrained investigators properly pronouncing Aboriginal names; the fact that Aborigines frequently did not know the name of tabooed relations particularly of the opposite sex; over 13% of the Groote Eylandt Aborigines were strongly taboo to each individual' (Rose 1960: 24).

'Aborigines frequently had several names, some of which were not known to other members of the community; small children often had two names – one used by men, the other by women; Aborigines did not like their names being spoken, so many would only whisper them: A man will never speak a woman's name and vice versa. Names of women consequently had to be obtained from other women in the absence of men.' (Notes, draft of Rose's thesis, Rose papers box 19). Aborigines often refused to speak the name of a deceased Aboriginal person, leading to incomplete data. Rose's data were the first to suggest that the Groote Eylandt relationship system could not 'be given any formalized structure' (Rose to Leslie White 7th February: 1950. Rose Papers, box 20). Crucially, Rose's research revealed that 'the sexual aspect of the "marriage" is quite incidental and occupies second place in the minds of aborigines to the general economic aspect' (Draft of thesis, Rose papers Box 19).

A new technique for kinship research

Rose would no doubt have been familiar with Haddon's photographic record of the famous Cambridge (1898) Expedition. Although much of the agenda of the expedition belonged firmly to the 'salvage' paradigm, the very nature of 'the cutting-edge technology' of the camera was rapidly becoming popular in the

field of anthropology (Edwards 1998: 107)[12]. Rose decided that in view of the complications of accurately researching kinship on Groote Eylandt that he too would employ a camera[13] – thus recording kinship through identifications made by the Aborigines themselves.

A new method had to be found that 'would easily and efficiently identify one aborigine from another … an aborigine can identify one of his relatives by a photograph with as much certainty as a white man can' (Rose 1960: 21).

As each individual Aborigine was encountered: 'he or she would be given a number at the end of the list of those already photographed … during the questioning … there was no attempt to systematize data or divide the Aborigine into locality or totemic groups … The unsystematic numbering of the Aborigines had one advantage in that it was necessary for each Aborigine … to think of each of his relationships … [rather than] repeat it parrot fashion for the others' (Rose 1960: 28).

'For simplicity, letters were used to signify the relationship terms on the tabular record. Out of approximately 300 Aborigines, 219 were photographed, and approximately 25,000 identifications were made by the various Aborigines' (Rose 1960: 30–31). The photographic technique allowed Rose to design tables for each of the Aborigines in the study showing how each one designated their relationship to the others photographed (Rose 1960: 247–267; 513–572). *Ego* was thus displaced as the central motif of the kinship structure.

Aboriginal women were also included by Rose in the process of naming relationships. 'When a man had several wives, they would be arranged in a semi-circle round the husband, and he would describe who the subject was and each of the wives in turn would name their relationship to the Aborigines in the photos' (Rose 1960: 29). Rose discovered that most Groote Eylandt men and women had several marriages during their lives, thus a man might call up to a dozen men "father" or a dozen women "wife." In the words of Peter Worsley: '[C]orrect rules are constantly broken. People marry the "wrong partners. Women changed hands in a dazzling Hollywood confusion, necessitating *the constant readjustment of kinship terms to meet the new situations created*. [He found] no overall 'algebraic', totally interlocking, single system results; rather, the linking together of innumerable separate areas of coherence' [my emphasis] (Worsley 1991)).

Moreover, Groote Eylandt was not a typical gerontocracy; rather, the

---

[12] Haddon used the Newman and Guardia Series B camera with Zeiss lens, which was the finest equipment available. See: Edwards, "Performing Science" 1998, footnote 10, p. 108.

[13] Rose used a Voigtländer camera with Skopar 1: 4.5, F–7.5 cm lens taking 16 photographs on Kodak 120mm film. The majority of the films were developed at the Native Settlement at Umbakumba (Rose 1960: 27).

thirty-to-fifty-year-old males held the most power – necessitating a new definition of gerontocracy. Through this new approach to the classification of kin and by analyzing the data using elementary statistical methods to reveal general trends, Rose made a crucial discovery – that within 'the age range of the wife from approximately fourteen to thirty-nine years, the average age of the husband was almost constant at about forty-two years and did not vary with the age of the female throughout life' (Rose 1960: 475; 491).

The incidence of polygyny amongst women varied considerably with age, however. Although all women aged twenty to twenty-seven years were married polygynously (due to the economic deficits of childbearing in a female gathering group), a minimum occurred in the post-fertile thirty-nine- to the forty-eight-year-old group, after which the percentage rose to 100% in the fifty-nine to sixty-eight years old age group. Rose observed the economic imperative involved – that with advancing years, the woman's economic ability decreased to the point where she relied on the collective help of a group of co-wives (Rose 1960 Tables: 64–65; 86–87).

Rose thus simultaneously revealed the anomalies (Rose 1960: 231; 477; 479) of Groote Eylandt kinship rules due to the age factor and the 'economic as distinct from the sexual aspects of marriage' (Rose 1960: 63; 231). Stability in marriage referred mainly to its *economic* aspects and by no means signified that the wife restricted her sexual relations to her husband (Rose 1960: 74). It was 'impossible to fit the kinship system into symmetrical patterns' illustrated by Radcliffe-Brown, the doyen of Australian kinship studies (Rose 1960: 183). Furthermore, Rose observed that had Rivers repeated his 1899 (published in 1904 and 1908) genealogies of the Torres Strait Islanders in Australia, they 'would clearly be insufficient to indicate the structure of an aboriginal society' (Rose 1960: 182). The 'comprehensive diagrammatic structures depicting Australian kinship organization striven after by ethnographers of the last generation' were 'largely chimeral' according to Rose (1960: 179).

Almost a decade later, Peter Worsley, armed with Rose's 'excellent model for recording the kinship terms people used towards each other – plus all his tables' (Worsley, email to author August 20th, 2011), set off for Groote Eylandt and followed up with genealogies of the deceased, using 'genealogical techniques employed by anthropologists in Africa that recorded descent, patrilateral kinship connections, and affinal relationships' (Worsley 1954). These turned out to be effectively, 'maps of relationships within the clan' and crucially proved to be a record of change over time (Worsley 1992: 29).

'I was therefore deeply grateful to Fred for any model of how to go about studying Aboriginal kinship and followed his excellent model for recording the

kinship terms people used towards each other plus all his tables. He gave me a complete copy of all this to take to the field, which I was then able to replicate and update with my own collection of thousands more kinship terms (see thesis), on Groote in 1953. So, my collaboration with him was very much more than his just "consulting" me about the genealogical material. … Fred's data, however, are NOT 'genealogies', but lists of reciprocally-used kinship terms – a different thing … my genealogies are available at AIATSIS[14] (they are complete, except for one, for a quite small clan)' (Worsley to Monteath and Munt, email: August 20th, 2011).

Marxism and Science

After his conversion to Communism in Perth in 1942, Rose attempted to apply a 'dialectical and historical method' to his study of Groote Eylandt kinship, but he admitted that it was 'more implicit than explicit.' He suspected that a Marxist interpretation of his fieldwork findings would be rejected out of hand as 'polemic' and 'political propaganda' because of his communist leanings. However, only by ignoring the *age* structure of society could one state: 'monogamy is the rule and polygamy the exception.' Exogamy, too, was not always the norm, as Rose discovered on Groote Eylandt. The resulting classificatory relationships established among traditional land-owning groups formed what Rose described as 'an extraordinarily complicated network, linking groups and individuals throughout society' (Rose 1968: 201).

By viewing Groote Eylandt's society through a 'materialist' or economic lens, Rose sought to overcome what he regarded as cultural 'bias' in the previous field studies of Europeans. According to Rose, Aboriginal marriage systems were not fundamentally about sexual exclusivity, and where conflict occurred, it was not usually driven by sexual jealousy, as westerners were inclined to believe. He revealed marriage as essentially a reciprocal *economic relationship*, 'the man primarily providing the meat and the woman the vegetable foodstuffs for themselves and her children' (Rose 1968: 201). His understanding of the economic importance of land use was the most crucial of the insights that he and other anthropologists had gained (Rose 1987: xi). There was no doubt in his mind that 'across Australia, a sophisticated system of land ownership existed well before colonization.' He believed 'it was based on *the land-owning group's economic*

---

[14] ie. *The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies* was established as the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies in 1964. Worsley's 'Groote-Eylandt genealogies, fieldnotes etc., are deposited in the Pitt-Rivers Museum in Oxford' (Worsley to Munt email Aug. 23rd, 2011).

relationship to the land, not as A.P. Elkin (1891-1979) and others had suggested, simply on some kind of religious or totemic connection.' That is not to say that such connections did not exist, but according to Rose they were secondary to the economic relationship and were determined by it. Not surprisingly perhaps, Rose's innovative kinship research on Groote Eylandt was rejected out of hand (Australian Archives CRS A659 item 44/1/4313).

Rose's study is rejected by the academic establishment

By 1945, Rose had finally collated and presented his findings in the publishable form to Professor Elkin of Sydney University. The response was what he had predicted – Elkin returned his manuscript with an extensive critique, advising against printing which would not only 'be a waste of money [but] would bring adverse criticism from those who understand the matter.' Elkin concluded his report with the words, 'I am satisfied Mr Rose does not understand this kinship system nor indeed Australian kinship' (Rose Memoir: 84).

In a letter from Professor Elkin (University of Sydney) to Carrodus (14th March 1945) Elkin deplored: 'the weakness in Rose's arguments and methods' his 'bad articles' – '[Elkin] therefore advise[d] that Mr Rose's thesis be not printed'. A penciled note by the 'secretary' emphasized that 'Mr Chinnery holds similar views to those of Professor Elkin. It is recommended that this department is not prepared to recommend that the Commonwealth undertake the printing and publication of [Rose's] paper on "The Relationship System of The Groote Eylandt Aborigines" (Australian Archives CRS A659 item 44/1/4313).

Under Professor Elkin's regime, there was little room for dissent of any kind. Described as a driven and obsessive character who maintained a stranglehold over the discipline through his critical reviews of the academic articles published in the journal *Oceania* (Wise 1985: 225), Elkin, an Anglican clergyman untrained in the scientific method and impatient with new ideas vigorously opposed any academic competition or opposition:

'The fashion seems to be growing for social anthropologists, in their endeavour to be theorists and masters of abstraction, to use concepts such as epistemology, ontology and cosmology, to cast their lines now here, now there, into the shallows of philosophy and metaphysics… I suggest they launch their nets into the deep' (Elkin cited in Wise 1985: 225).

Frederick Rose, on the other hand, was keen to embrace and test new ideas and theories and a "Marxist" approach to research as promoted by contemporary left-wing scientists of the period, such as John Bernal, J.B.S. Haldane and Albert Einstein, who embraced the idea of a 'new' society founded on rational,

scientific planning and egalitarian principles – a challenging if the somewhat utopian project (Bernal and Cornforth 1949; Einstein 1949). However, it was only after Rose left Australia in 1956 to reside in the German Democratic Republic that his fieldwork and extensive Groote Eylandt data would finally be published.

In 1957 Rose submitted his work as a *Habilitationsschrift* to the Faculty of Philosophy at the Humboldt University in East Berlin, where it was accepted and later published in book form there in 1960. He received a formal appointment as Professor mit Lehrauftrag in September 1961 and five years later was appointed Professor mit vollem Lehrauftrag – a professor with full teaching duties (Monteath and Munt 2015: 335). He was director of the *Institut für Völkerkunde und deutsche Volkskunde* at the Humboldt University from 1960-1972 (Noack and Krause 2005: 40). Noack and Krause acknowledge his 'important critique' of 'genealogical kinship principles and gentile organisation' (Noack and Krause 2005: 40; See also Guhr 1991a, b).

Rose's thesis rejected 'the use of kinship organization as a basis for the investigation of the ethnography of a particular tribe. Methodologically [Rose found it] a false approach.' Instead, he insisted that 'the social organization of any people is part of the superstructure raised on and ultimately determined by the mode of production … [that is] the forces of production in conjunction with the relations of production' (Rose 1960: 2). Peter Worsley, banned for his communist affiliation by the Australian government and the Australian National University[15] from pursuing his planned fieldwork in New Guinea (Monteath and Munt 2015: 118–120; Gray 2015; Worsley interview with Martin Thomas 2010: 191; Worsley interview with author 17/4/2012), followed up Rose's fieldwork on Groote Eylandt and using the same method of inquiry, he collected 'a further 11,322 identifications by [himself] in 1952/53 – 61, 88 of these being repeats from 28 individuals who had already made previous identifications in 1940. [He] was thus able to calculate the rate and extent of change in relationships over time' (Worsley 1954: 377). His study included children born since Rose's study who were now old enough to make identifications (Interview with author: 17/4/2012). Although Worsley conceded that: 'the results achieved by Rose's tabulation could equally have been indicated, in a more generalized fashion, by qualitative methods; *it would have been impossible, however, to express these results with the precision achieved by quantification* … Rose's method has importance merely as a technique of recording' [my emphasis] (Worsley 1954: 377–379).

---

[15] David McKnight explains that an informal liaison existed between ASIO and the ANU facilitating the vetting of university staff appointments (McKnight 1994), cited in Monteath and Munt (2015: 119).

Worsley's findings also confirmed Rose's claim that genealogies of polygynous fathers would involve complex 'considerable lateral span' (Worsley 1954: 379). Indeed, he used 'a roll of kitchen paper twenty-three feet long (laterally); for the genealogy of the *Wanindiljauwa* clan, which for reasons of expediency did not include following the mother's line simply for reasons of physical manageability' (Worsley 1954: 383). Worsley inevitably reached the same conclusion as Rose: 'One wonders just what is recorded as a 'genealogy' by [field] workers who follow orthodox methods of recording, and who profess, at least, to include all the relatives of *Ego* in one genealogy. Some arbitrary delimitation must be introduced if this method is followed' (Worsley 1954: 384). Peter Worsley's thesis was passed by his examiners, and he thanked his supervisors, W.E. H. Stanner and Siegfried Nadel (he wisely avoided any acknowledgement of fellow communist Fred Rose). However, blocked from any anthropological post by Evans-Pritchard and others (Worsley 2008: 77), with the support of Max Gluckman, he subsequently became the first Professor of Sociology at Manchester University in 1964 and is noted for introducing the term 'Third World' into the English lexicon (Worsley 1984: 34) in his classic textbook on sociology.

Conclusion

Although Rose promoted the idea of a Marxist materialist approach to kinship studies, it was in fact the use of camera technology and a quantitative methodology which revealed the flaws in Rivers' Genealogical Method. By foregrounding the problem of the cultural and subjective bias of previous researchers who were also handicapped by communication of relationship terms in "pidgin" English rather than the language of the Groote Eylandt people, and by asking his subjects to identify their kin themselves, he highlighted the considerable barriers that had confronted his predecessors in fieldwork. In retrospect, his adoption of a Marxist theoretical lens to view a traditional Australian society, though in some ways an "add-on" to his quantitative methodology, did present an innovative materialist framework for understanding the *economic* basis of Aboriginal marriage and kinship relations as opposed to resorting to myths, magic or comparative religion, which had been foregrounded by influential nineteenth-century "armchair" anthropologists like Sir James Frazer (1854-1941). Indeed, when Rose was later refused research access to Australian reserves by the Commonwealth government in 1962, Professor de Josselin de Jong personally wrote to Sir Paul Hasluck, Minister for Territories: 'Sir, May it please Your Excellency to consider a few suggestions I would like to offer concerning the anthropological studies Dr Frederick Rose proposes to carry out among the Pintubi and Wailbri tribes … [de

Jong discusses FR's achievements in critiquing Radcliffe-Brown's kinship models and their significance] 'for the anthropological study of kinship the world over …' (To the Hon. Paul Hasluck Minister for Territories from Dr P. E de Josselin de Jong' (Josselin de Jong to Paul Hasluck, 18th June 1962, box 31).

Rose had effectively abandoned the Genealogical Method in favor of a new 'model for recording the reciprocally-used kinship terms [that the Groote Eylandt] people used towards each other.' In providing Peter Worsley with 'a complete copy of all this [data] to take to the field [Worsley] was able to replicate and update this with [his] own collection of thousands more kinship terms [Worsley, 1954] on Groote in 1953' (Worsley to author, email 23rd August 2011).

Rose always included his raw data in his studies so his models could be scientifically assessed. Like Malinowski, he advocated a more: 'candid account of such data … [to] ply the full searchlight of methodic sincerity, as [anthropologists] move among their facts but produce them before us out of complete obscurity' (Malinowski [1922] 1966: 3).

The lack of actual data provided in his predecessors' publications was the subject of a pithy rebuke to Professor Leslie White (Rose to White 7th Feb. 1950). After a negative peer review of Rose's Groote Eylandt study, Rose claimed that the reviewer (William E. Lawrence) had 'missed the point of the work' because Rose's data had not been included in the study. Rose then confidently went on to criticize Rivers' famous methodology: 'I do not know how much sociological fieldwork dealing with this question of classificatory kinship systems either you or Lawrence have actually done but the first part of my own experience with tribalised aborigines during 1937–40 led me to the conclusion that the normal application of the genealogical method prejudiced the issue, as it assumed certain [European] categories of thought and association which, as far as the Australian aborigines were concerned were not real. In other words, the fieldworker adopted what I would call a subjective approach. He assumed that there was a formal pattern for a relationship system and found evidence to support it … I do not want it to be inferred that I am suggesting that Elkin was intellectually dishonest when he wrote up the Ngarinyin social structure. What I am suggesting however, is that Elkin fell into an error of over-rationalising his data because *the method* he used made this virtually impossible to avoid … by the genealogical method I understand what is described on page 44 et seq. of "Notes and Queries on Anthropology" Fifth Edition, London 1929 … *I was quite unable to arrange my data or any selected part of it into any formalized pattern which Radcliffe- Brown and his successors have made so popular*' [my emphasis] (Rose to White 7th Feb. 1950). He claimed that the kinship diagrams supporting the "structural-functionalist" paradigm of Radcliffe-Brown merely offered an 'idealistic' understanding

of the workings of primitive society, uncontaminated by history or material culture (Rose Memoir: 55). Kinship terminology – at least 'as far as the Australian aborigines are concerned' was, Rose maintained, an expression of the economic 'rights and obligations between individuals as members of groups and do[es] not express blood relationship (real or fictive) which we social anthropologists in our superior wisdom and *in our categories of thought* have arbitrarily imposed on them' [my emphasis] (Rose, 1968: 201). In his Groote Eylandt study, Rose suggested, … instead of tracing out genealogical paths from informants to their immediate relatives, recording the relationship term E/ego applied to each one in turn, we should instead ask all informants … what terms they actually use in relation to one another' (Turner 1980: 119). By using this more accurate method of identification and recording the relationships within the community and taking polygyny and the 'age-factor' into account, Rose was able to present a much more complex picture of Groote Eylandt society before the irreversible changes wrought by World War Two.

Yet despite his critique of the Genealogical Method and the generally positive reviews his work received in international anthropological journals from distinguished anthropologists such as P. E. de Josselin de Jong (1962: 42–67), Meyer Fortes (1962: 81–82), Peter Worsley (1991), and Les Hiatt (1985), who is now regarded as one of Australia's foremost anthropologists, Rose's classic study of Groote Eylandt kinship was not reviewed in Australia (Maddock 1991). Vladimir Kabo had written a review for the Soviet journal *Sovietskaia Etnografiia* but it was rejected on ideological grounds (Tumarkin 2015: 192; Monteath and Munt 2015: 287). However, it was reviewed positively in Hungary by Tibor Bodrogi (1961). And although some of the most innovative theoretical anthropological work had taken place in the German Democratic Republic, at the end of the socialist era, the process and politics of German re-unification precluded the continuation of 'Ethnographie as a unified anthropological science' (Noack and Krause (2005: 45). Marxist theory was promptly discredited, and the significant academic achievements of the discipline and its academic institutions in the former East Germany were therefore side-lined (Noack and Krause 2005: 45). Nevertheless, as Eriksen and Nielsen (2001) explain, in Britain, France and the USA, Marxian anthropology was about to be revitalized by a 'heady cocktail' of post-structuralism and deconstructionism during the 1980s (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 112–115). Maurice Godelier (1934 -), 'the most famous of the French Marxists' (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 115) who had connected with Rose at the Paris Congress in 1960,[16]

---

[16] This meeting resulted in the publication of Rose's paper - presented to the Paris conference, 1960: "On the Structure of the Australian Family." See letter to Rose from: Le Comité de

was a correspondent of Rose. He too was interested in new theories of kinship (Godelier, Trautmann and Tjon Sie Fat (1998) and though strongly influenced by Althusser's structuralism, his main fieldwork project resulted in 'a comparative study of economic systems' (Eriksen and Nielsen (2001: 115-116). Godelier was also influenced by Lévi-Strauss and even described Marx as 'a structuralist *avant la lettre*' (Godelier 1966, cited in Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 116), but nevertheless, he argued, like Rose, that 'kinship can be a mode of production' (Parkin 2005: 223).

In many ways, Rose's (1960) kinship study was well ahead of its time. Along with Peter Worsley, he revolutionized the way in which Aboriginal kinship systems were perceived (Worsley 1992: 29). It now seemed: 'paradoxical that anything as complex as Australian religion and kinship should ever have been taken as the epitome of the "primitive" … or that Aboriginal kinship could be reduced not merely to a few abstracted, ideal principles but ultimately to one single formula' (Worsley 1992: 30–31). In the words of Professor de Josselin de Jong: Rose had made 'not only a new contribution of kinship studies, but ... a new approach to them' (de Jong 1962: 66–67). As Turner explains, 'while Lévi-Strauss [1949] treated facts at the model level, Rose treated them at the level of observed behaviour.' His achievement was to evaluate the 'actual' against the 'ideal' within the descent framework (Turner 1980: 122), unlike Lévi-Strauss who 'captured a culture through fragments, filling the gaps in his mind, conjuring models as if through thin air' (Wilcken 2010: 75). Despite this difference, however, 'P. E. de Josselin de Jong thought that, considered together, there might result one of those: "chocs des opinions from which proverbially, truth results" ' (Turner 1980: 116).

However, it was not until the end of Radcliffe-Brown's tenure that the methodology of structural-functionalism came under scrutiny regarding its failure to address fluctuations and changes in social relations (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 86–87). New camera technology and the tape recorder enabled superior fieldwork to supplant the simpler observations of an earlier era (Worsley 1992: 40). And ultimately, ideological factors had to be overcome, and these would remain unchallenged until the decline of empires. Later questioning the puzzles posed by classificatory kinship, Fox would maintain that 'Classificatory kinship doesn't operate on [a] myopic scale. Its premises are not those of western competitive individualism … classificatory kinship operates on a grander level – on which

---

Publication, V1ème Congrès International de Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, Paris, 1960. Uncatalogued Rose Papers, box 20 [new box 4] See also:

Letter from Maurice Godelier *Maison des Sciences de L'homme Paris.* February 2nd, 1978, to Rose, informing Rose of: 'a plan for constituting an international group to analyse hunting and gathering societies' Rose Papers, uncatalogued box 30 [catalogued and (re-housed) Rose Papers, box 13].

bonds of sisterhood and brotherhood create networks of interdependence, decisively overriding parochial attachments and aims' (Fox 1967: 84).

And though Peterson (1976: 6) raised the problem of closure in Australian diagrammatic kinship models, there was little change in the research agenda of Australian academia (Barnes 1980). David Turner, the Canadian anthropologist who was also banned by the Australian government and forced to leave Groote Eylandt in 1971 (Turner, email to author, 2nd April 2013), was generously provided with Rose's tabular data for his field research in the 1970s which resulted in new insights into Australian Aboriginal organization, culminating in a computer simulation of *Warnindilyaugwa* kinship systems (Turner 1980; see Rose 1978).

Worsley and Turner not only learned the language of the Groote Eylandt people but immersed themselves in their culture. Turner found Australian Aboriginals, far from being so-called '"primitive" people, were a 'highly sophisticated society' with a worldview that ensured 'social and environmental harmony that runs contrary to conventional Western thinking.' His book *Return to Eden …* (Turner 1996) written 'after years of immersion in the culture' was a significant landmark in which he was able to 'test his insights systematically with Rose's data' (Turner to the author, email April 16th, 2014). His most recent book, *Life to the Power of Nothing* (Turner 2021) explores an Aboriginal worldview which has enabled First Peoples to successfully manage the land and its resources for thousands of years. It 'has much to offer the rest of the human world as it searches for a path to a sustainable and secure future' (Scott Cane: review back cover of Turner's 2021 book).

Woodrow Denham (2012) also records a substantial theoretical debt to Frederick Rose. His paper on Aboriginal kinship not only drew significantly on Rose's Groote Eylandt data but also attempted to place this data in a much broader context (Denham 2012: 79). Its title: *Kinship, Marriage and Age in Aboriginal Australia* 'might be seen as a direct reference to [Rose's early] work' (Denham, email to author, September 14th: 2012). Denham updated this study in 2013, dedicating it to F.G.G Rose; N.B Tindale and J.B Birdsell, and expanded it in a series of seven papers published in *Mathematical Anthropology and Cultural Theory* between 2012 and 2020.[17]

---

[17] Although Rose's work was not welcomed by the anthropological community in the mid-20th century, his meticulously coded data has not been lost. In addition to being available in his 1960 book, it is available now on the web in at least three forms.
Denham's (2016) Group Compositions in Band Societies Database presents detailed numerically coded genealogies, vital statistics, demographics, and census data for co-residing members of 42 hunter-gatherer societies observed and recorded by scientists in Africa (AF), Asia (AS), Australia (AU), Europe (EU), and among North American Indians (ND) and North

Rose's book (1960) revealed that: '… the diagrammatic representation of the kinship structures of some Australian societies of so-called "Kariera" and "Aranda" types with bilateral first and second cousin marriage respectively, could have had reality only in a condition where gerontocracy was completely absent … under gerontocratic conditions the diagrams representing some of these systems are intrinsically impossible' (Rose 1960: 129 cited in Denham 2013: 6). [Rose's] work on Groote Eylandt has been often cited for its great merit (De Josselin de Jong 1962), but his rejection of traditional Kariera and Aranda system models has been consistently forgotten or ignored' (Denham 2013: 6).

In 1958 the French master of kinship studies, author of *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté* (1949), Claude Lévi-Strauss wrote to thank Rose for the 'very interesting paper you were kind enough to send me. As far as I know, your inquiry into the age structure, associated with a set of marriage rules and kinship systems is something quite new' (Lévi-Strauss to Rose, March 31st 1958). Yet he did not review his own work in light of Rose's findings.

Rose's data mapped the kinship connections between some two hundred people and created the same number of tabular matrices along with photographic portraits to delineate the kinship connections. This method yielded approximately 25,000 classificatory connections, which proved a valuable historic data base for younger anthropologists like Peter Worsley, Woodrow Denham, David Turner and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat, who based his doctoral dissertation (1990) and an article (1983) on Rose's Groote Eylandt data (email to author 2017). Yet the use of quantitative methods was unpopular in the Soviet bloc. Rose's colleague in the GDR, Günter Guhr, whose important work on Aranda Kinship was sidelined by those in power with other methodological/ideological agendas, was obliged to give up his position at the Humboldt University and move to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Dresden (Noack and Krause 2005: 40).

Rose's timing was unfortunate in that with the onset of the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s, many western academics who openly expressed any "Red" partialities or Communist leanings found themselves under increasingly fierce attacks and devoid of funding (Wax 2008; Gray 2007; 2015: 28; Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 77–80). Banned by the Australian government from following up his initial

---

American Inuit (NU) spanning two centuries from 1776 to 1979. The Australia (AU) subset includes Rose's (1960) *Wanindiljaugwa* data collected in 1941. The dataset, coded directly from Rose's (1960) book, appears on the web at two locations that are complementary. The ResearchGate version is organized by continents as a coherent and integrated collection of datasets in .pdf format. This collection facilitates visual pattern detection and cross-cultural comparisons using traditional genealogical diagrams in conjunction with Excel and SPSS software.

fieldwork on Groote Eylandt, Rose returned to Australia from the GDR for eight months in 1962 but was refused permission to enter the reserve by the Australian government (Paul Hasluck, 1/8/62 to F. Rose). Peter Worsley 'a card-carrying English Communist … [also] experienced serious difficulties in obtaining research permits and finding employment,' before he finally secured a job in sociology at Manchester University with the support of Max Gluckman (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 112). And even though Gluckman was 'decisively influenced by Marx, references to Marx in his work were all but absent' (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 112).

It was unfortunate that Rose and Worsley's research findings went unacknowledged by the Australian anthropological establishment for reasons which were more ideological and prejudicial than academic (Monteath 2010; Munt 2011). Now that the Cold War is in the distant past – though perhaps a new Cold War is beginning as I write, anthropologists, historians and First Peoples will hopefully be able to dispassionately re-assess the research carried out on Groote Eylandt by Rose and Worsley during the years 1938–1939; 194l and 1953.

References

Allman, Jean, and John Parker. 2005. *Tongnaab: The History of a West African God*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Australian Archives CRS A659, item 44/1/4313.

Barnes, John. A. 1980. Kinship Studies: Some Impressions of the Current State of Play. *Man*, 15 (2): 293–303.

Barth, Fredrik. 2005. "The Golden Age, 1945–1970." In *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology* (Halle Lectures), edited by Fredrik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press: 32–43.

Bernal, John, and Maurice Cornforth. 1949. *Science for Peace and Socialism*. Watford, Great Britain: Farleigh Press.

Bodley, John. H. 2011. *Cultural Anthropology: Tribes, States, and the Global System*. Plymouth, United Kingdom: AltaMira Press.

Bodrogi, Tibor. 1961. Review of Classification of Kin. *Acta Ethnographica* 10 (1–2): 237–239.

Book Of Common Prayer of the Church of England, n. d. [1662 Edition]. London: Oxford University Press.

Bouquet, Mary. 1993. *Reclaiming English Kinship: Portuguese Refractions of British Kinship Theory*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.

Certeau, Michel de. 1984. *On the Practice of Everyday Life*. (trans. Steven F. Rendall). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Denham, Woodrow, W. 2012. Kinship, Marriage and Age in Aboriginal Australia. *Mathematical Anthropology and Cultural Theory: An International Journal* 4 (1), May. 1–79. http://mathematicalanthropology.org/Pdf/MACT_Denham_0512.pdf

————. 2013. Beyond Fictions of Closure. *Mathematical Anthropology and Cultural Theory: An International Journal* 5,1. 1-90. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339944146_Beyond_fictions_of_closure_in_Australian_Aboriginal_kinship

————. 2016. Group Compositions in Band Societies Database.... At Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/project/Group-Compositions-in-Band-Societies-Database At KinSources: kinsources.net. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350788238_Artificial_Intelligence_Machine_Learning_Research_Using_the_Australian_Aboriginal_Alyawarra_Kinship_Dataset_Partial_Bibliography_2004-2020. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

Duby, Georges. 1994. *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages* (trans. Jane Dunnett). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Einstein, Albert. 2009 [1949]. Why Socialism? *Monthly Review. An Independent Socialist Magazine* 61 (1) https://monthlyreview.org/2009/05/01/mr-061-01-2009-05_0/. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

Edwards, Elizabeth. 1998. "Performing Science: Still Photography and the Torres Strait Expedition." In *Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition,* edited by Anita Herle and Sandra Rouse. Cambridge: Cambridge University: 106–135.

Elkin, Adolphus. P. 1938. *The Australian Aborigines: How to Understand Them.* Sydney and London: Angus and Robinson.

Emmet, Dorothy, and Alasdair C. Macintyre eds. 1970. *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis.* New York: Macmillan.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, and Finn Sivert Nielsen. 2001. *A History of Anthropology.* London; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward. E. 1949. *The Sanusi of Cyrenaica.* London, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

————. 1951 *Kinship and Marriage among the Nuer.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Favenc, Ernest. 1896. *The Secret of the Australian Desert.* London: Blackie.

Fortes, Meyer. 1962 [1945]. *The dynamics of clanship among the Tallensi: being the first part of an analysis of the social structure of a Trans-Volta tribe.* Oosterhout: Anthropological Publications.

Foucault, Michel. 2002 [1966]. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences.* London and New York: Routledge.

Fox, Robin. 1967. *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Frazer, James. 1890. *The Golden Bough.* London: Macmillan and Co.

Georgeson, H. 1998. "Part One: Foundation of the Chair of Anthropology at the University of Sydney in 1926." *Newsletter, Australian Anthropological Society*, University of Sydney. 73, 18–21, 5–8.

Godelier, Maurice. Letter to Frederick Rose. February 2nd 1978. Catalogued Rose Papers. Box 13.

Godelier, Maurice, Thomas R. Trautmann, and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat. 1988. *Transformation of Kinship.* Washington D.C. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Gray, Geoffrey, G. 2007. *A Cautious Silence: The Politics of Anthropology.* Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

———. 2015. 'A Great Deal of Mischief Can Be Done:' Peter Worsley, the Australian National University, the Cold War and Academic Freedom, 1952–1954. *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 100, Part 1: 25–44.

Grimshaw, Anna. 2001. *The Ethnographer's Eye: Ways of Seeing in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guhr, Günter. 1963. *Heirat und Verwandtschaftssystem bei den Aranda in Zentralaustralien: Kritik des sogenannten Aranda-Typs von Radcliffe-Brown*. Abhandlungen und Berichte des Staatlichen Museums für Völkerkunde, Dresden Bd 23. Verlag Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963.

———. 1991a. Frederick G.G. Rose (1915 bis 1991) zum Gedenken: Biographisch und Werk. *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 32: 511–519.

———. 1991b. Veröffentlichungen von Frederick, G. G. Rose. Zusammengestellt von Günther Guhr. *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 32: 820–827.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1972. *Knowledge and Human Interests* (translated by Jeremy Shapiro). Boston USA: Beacon Books.

Hasluck, Paul 1962. Letter to Rose, Frederick. (1/8/62) Rose Papers, uncatalogued. Mitchell Library, State Library of NSW. Box 21.

Hiatt, Lester. R. 1985. Maidens, Males and Marx: Some Contrasts in the Work of Frederick Rose and Claude Meillassoux." *Oceania* 56 (1): 34–36.

Hiatt, Lester. R. 2006. Local Organization Among the Australian Aborigines. In *Before it's Too Late: Anthropological Reflections, 1950-1970,* edited by Geoffrey Gray. Australia: University of Sydney: 117–137.

Hodson, Thomas Callan. 1937. *India. Census Ethnography 1901–1931.* In https://archive.org/details/dli.granth.117746. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

Hymes, Dell, H. 1991. "Afterword". In *Language, Self, and Society: A Social History of Language*, edited by Peter Burke and Roy Porter. Cambridge: Polity Press: 330–345.

Insoll, Timothy. 2010. Meyer Fortes and Material Culture: The Published Image and the Unpublished Resource. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 16 (3): 572-587.

Jong de, Josselin to Paul Hasluck.18th June 1962. Box 31 Uncatalogued Rose Papers. SLNSW.

King James Bible, Genesis 1-28. https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Genesis-1-28/. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

Kociumbas, Jan. 2004. "Genocide and modernity in colonial Australia, 1788–1850". In *Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History*, edited by A. Dirk Moses. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books. 77–102.

Kuklick, Henrika. 1998. "Fieldworkers and Physiologists in Cambridge and the Torres Strait." In *Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition*, edited by Anita Herle and Sandra Rouse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 158–180.

Langham, Ian. 1981. *The Building of British Social Anthropology: W. H. R. Rivers and his Cambridge Disciples in the Development of Kinship Studies, 1898-1931*. Dordrecht, Holland / Boston, USA / London, England: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Larson, Frances. 2011. Did He Ever Darn His Stockings? Beatrice Blackwood and the Ethnographic Authority of Bronislaw Malinowski. *History and Anthropology* 22 (1): 75–92.

Lawrence, David. 2006. "Government Anthropologist of New Guinea." Frederick Watson Fellowship Paper, *Public Lecture for the National Archives of Australia*. Presented 23rd March 2006.

Layard, John, W. 1998. "The Story of My Life (the history of a failure)" – extracts from personal diary. Edited and submitted by Michael Allen to the *Newsletter/Australian Anthropological Society,* September issue, 73: 9–18.

Leach, Edmund. 1961. *Pul Eliya, a Village in Ceylon: A study of Land Tenure and Kinship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1982. *Social Anthropology.* Great Britain: Fontana Books.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969 [1949]. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship.* London: Eyre and Spottiswood.

Lindquist, Sven. 2007. *Terra Nullius: A Journey through No One's Land.* London: Granta Publications.

Lyotard, Jean-François.1979. *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir.* Paris: Minuit. English trans. Manchester University Press 1984.

McKnight, David. 1994. *Australia's Spies and their Secrets.* St. Leonards: NSW, Australia.

McLennan, John. F. 1865. *Primitive Marriage, an Inquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies.* London: Reprint.

Maddock, Kenneth, J. 1991. Frederick Rose (1915-1991) an Appreciation. *Oceania* 62 (1), September issue: 66–69.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1966 [1922]. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company Inc.

Monteath, Peter. 2010. "The Anthropologist as Cold War Warrior: The interesting times of Frederick Rose". In *Europe's Expansions and Contractions,* edited by Evan Smith. Adelaide: Humanities Press: 259–280.

Monteath, Peter, and Valerie Munt. 2015. *Red Professor: The Cold War Life of Fred Rose.* Mile End, Adelaide: Wakefield Press.

———. 1877. *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization.* London: MacMillan.

Mulvaney, Derek, John, and John Henry Calaby. 1985. *'So Much That is New' Baldwin Spencer 1860–1929: A Biography.* Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Munt, Valerie. 2011. Australian Anthropology, Ideology and Political Repression: The Cold War Experience of Frederick. G. G. Rose. *Anthropological Forum* 2 (2), July Issue: 109–129.

Needham, Rodney. 1971. *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage.* London: Routledge.

Noack, K. and M. Krause. 2005. "Ethnographie as a united anthropological science in the German Democratic Republic." Hann, C. Sárkány, M. and Skalník P. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe.* Münster: LIT Verlag; New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers: 25–53.

Notes and Queries on Anthropology. 1929. 5th Edition. Edited for the British Association for the Advancement of Science by a Committee of Section H. London: The Royal Anthropological Institute.

Parkin, Robert. 2005. "The French Speaking Countries." In *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology*, edited by Fredrik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman. London: University of Chicago Press: 157–256.

Peterson, Nicolas. 1976. "The natural and cultural areas of Aboriginal Australia." In *Tribes and Boundaries in Australia, edited by* Nicolas Peterson. Canberra: AIAS.

Radcliffe-Brown, Alfred Reginald. 1930. The Social Organization of Australian Tribes. *Oceania*. 1 (2): 206–246.

———. 1935. Patrilineal and Matrilineal Succession. *Iowa Law Review* 20 (2): 286–303.

Rademaker, Laura. 2014. Language and Australian Aboriginal History: Anindilyakwa and English on Groote Eylandt. *History Australia. Journal of the Australian Historical Association* 11 (2), August issue: 222–239.

Rivers, William, Halse, Rivers, Rivers. 1929 [1900]. A Genealogical Method of Collecting Social and Vital Statistics. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. 30 Fifth Edition: 74–82. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2842619

Rose, Frederick, G. G. 1960. *The Classification of Kin, Age Structure and Marriage amongst the Groote Eylandt Aborigines: A Study in Method and a Theory of Kinship*. Berlin: Academie Verlag.

———. 1963. "On the Structure of the Australian Family." *Selected Papers of the Paris International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences* 6 (2): 247–251.

———. [1968] 1987. "Australian Marriage, Land-owning Groups, and Initiations." In *Man the Hunter: the First Intensive Survey of a Single, Crucial Stage of Human Development – Man's Once Universal Hunting Way of Life*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

———. 1978. Die Ethnographie von Groote Eylandt und eine neue Interpretation der sozialen Organization der Australier. *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift*. 4: 613–626.

———. 1987. *The Traditional Mode of Production of the Australian Aborigines*, London: Angus and Robertson.

———. Papers, uncatalogued. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales. Including: unpublished Memoir, "An Un-apologetic Anthropologist" – n.d. Rose Papers, box 1. In 2007 these were uncatalogued. In 2010 part of the collection was re-organized by Dominik Lauer and numbered differently. See: "Listing of General Correspondence Series from Frederick Rose Further papers" (May 1994 and June 1995 consignments). This is abbreviated to "Rose Papers" in this article.

———. Draft of thesis not used in published Preface (n.d) Rose papers, Box 19.

———. Letter to Leslie White. 7th February 1950. Rose Papers. Box 34.

———. Letter to Claude Lévi-Strauss. 31st March 1958. Rose Papers. Box 34.

———. 1943. "Fossil Society." Transcript of Perth radio program. Rose Papers. Box 1.

Ryan, Simon. 1996. *The Cartographic Eye: How Explorers Saw Australia*. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Sabean, David. W., and Simon Teuscher. 2007. "Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-term Development (1300-1900)." In *Kinship in Europe*: *Approaches to Long-term Development (1300-1900)*, edited by David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher, and Jon Mathieu. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books: 1–32.

Sillitoe, Paul. 2005. The Role of Section H at the British Association for the Advancement of Science in the History of Anthropology. *Durham Anthropology Journal* 13 (2): 1–17.

Slobodin, Richard. 1978. *W. H. R. Rivers*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Spencer, Baldwin and Gillen, Frank. J. 1904. *Native tribes of Northern Australia*. London: Macmillan.

Stocking, George. W.. 1992. *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Wisconsin & London: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stocking, George. W. Jr. 1999. *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology,1888–1951*. London: Athlone.

The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, (1571). London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford Amen House, E. C.

Thomas, Martin. E. 2010. *Peter Worsley interviewed by Martin Thomas* [Sound recording]. Canberra: National Library of Australia. https://nla.gov.au/nla.obj-219761211/listen. Accessed 3. 11. 2022.

———. 2011. *The Many Worlds of R. H. Mathews: In Search of an Australian Anthropologist.* Australia. NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Tjon Sie Fat, Franklin. E. 1983. Age metrics and twisted cylinders: predictions from a structural model. *American Ethnologist* 10 (3): 585–604.

———. 1990. *Representing Kinship: Simple Models of Elementary Structures.* [Dissertation]. Leiden: Leiden University.

Tumarkin, Daniil, Davydovich. 2015. Frederik Rouz (1915–1991) zhizn´i trudy na fone epokhi [Frederick Rose 1915–1991). Life and works on the background of the epoch]. *Vestnik antropologii* 32 (4): 179–200.

Turner, David. H. 1980. Leiden anthropology and the reinterpretation of Australian Aboriginal Social Organization. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en Volkenkunde* 136 (1): 116–135.

———. 1996. *Return to Eden: A journey through the promised landscape of the Amagalyuagba*. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2021. *Life to the Power of Nothing*. Oakville, Ontario: Rock Mills Press.

Urry, James. 1972. Notes and Queries on Anthropology and the Development of Field Methods in British Anthropology 1870-1920. Hocart Prize Essay. *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute for 1972*: 45–57.

Warner, Marina. 1979. *Queen Victoria's Sketchbook*. London: Macmillan.

Wax, Dustin, ed. 2008. *Anthropology at the Dawn of the Cold War: The Influence of Foundations, McCarthyism, and the CIA*. New York & London, Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Wilcken, Patrick. 2010. *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Poet in the Laboratory*. New York, USA: The Penguin Group.

Wilder, William, D. 1973. The Culture of Kinship Studies by Rodney Needham [Review]. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en Volkenkunde* 129 (1): 124–143.

Wise, Tigger. 1985. *The Self-made Anthropologist: A Life of A. P. Elkin*. Sydney, London and Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Worsley, Peter. 1954. *The Changing Social Structure of the Wanindiljaugwa*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.

———. 1984. *The Three Worlds: Culture and World Development.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

———. 1991. Iconoclast of the Outback: Obituary for Professor Rose. *The Guardian* 18th February: 35.

———. 1992. "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Australian Kinship." In *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond,* Vol 2, *The Politics of Culture and Creativity,* edited by Christine Ward Gailey. Gainesville, USA: University of Florida.

———. 2008. *Skating on Thin Ice.* NewYork, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Personal Correspondence

Denham, Woodrow. Email correspondence to Valerie Munt (30th June 2012); (14th August 2012); (September 14th, 2021).

Turner, David. Email correspondence to Valerie Munt (February 27th, 2013); (April 16th, 2014); (January 3rd, 2021).

Tjon Sie Fat, Franklin. Email Correspondence to Valerie Munt (October 31st, 2017).

Worsley, Peter. Email correspondence to Valerie Munt (August 20th, 2011) & (August 23rd, 2011).

Worsely, Peter. Email correspondence to Peter Monteath and Valerie Munt (August 20th, 2011).

Worsley, Peter. Personal interview with Valerie Munt, London, April 17th: 2012.

Valerie Munt
valeriemunt74@gmail.com

The Flinders University of South Australia
College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences