

**MATHEMATICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND CULTURAL THEORY:
AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
BOOK REVIEW OCTOBER 2015**

**REVIEW OF
RED PROFESSOR: THE COLD WAR LIFE OF FRED ROSE
BY PETER MONTEATH AND VALERIE MUNT
MILE END, SOUTH AUSTRALIA: WAKEFIELD PRESS, 2015
373 PP, BIBLIOGRAPHY, NOTES, INDEX, PHOTOGRAPHS**

**WOODROW W. DENHAM, PH. D
RETIRED INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR
WWDENHAM@GMAIL.COM**

**COPYRIGHT 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED BY AUTHOR**

SUBMITTED: SEPTEMBER 18, 2015 ACCEPTED: OCTOBER 5, 2015

**MATHEMATICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND CULTURAL THEORY:
AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
ISSN 1544-5879**

**DENHAM: REVIEW OF *RED PROFESSOR*
WWW.MATHEMATICALANTHROPOLOGY.ORG**

REVIEW OF
RED PROFESSOR: THE COLD WAR LIFE OF FRED ROSE
BY PETER MONTEATH AND VALERIE MUNT

SUBMITTED BY: WOODROW W. DENHAM, PHD

RETIRED INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR

FRANCONIA, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03580, USA

[WWDENHAM@GMAIL.COM](mailto:wwdenham@gmail.com)

In keeping with the objectives of the MACT journal, this review focuses on Monteath and Munt's account of Frederick G.G. Rose's life as a brilliant but failed Marxist anthropologist during the quarter-century before Marxist theory became fashionable in Western social sciences. My comments deal primarily with Rose's efforts to enhance data, methods and theory in the study of kinship. Some might consider it presumptuous of me to call Rose a mathematical anthropologist, but I have not found a better label since his work did in fact utilize numerical, quantitative and statistical methods albeit of an unsophisticated nature. I am especially eager to address Marxists and mathematicians among MACT's global readership, but am painfully aware of my limitations since I have never been a card-carrying Marxist or a card-carrying mathematician.

From this valuable new book I have learned a great deal about Rose and Australia in the years shortly before and after my fieldwork with the Alyawarra speaking people of Central Australia in 1971-72. Most importantly I have realized that, during my year as a postgraduate student at Sydney University, NOBODY ever mentioned the political hazards associated with my use of a modified version of Rose's data collection methods. Did they assume that I as a newly arrived American student somehow instinctively knew everything I needed to know about this difficult matter? Was it a "public secret", a self-evident truth to them but utterly unknown to me? Were they ashamed to air their dirty linen in my presence? Or maybe they just stood back, waiting for me to hang myself. At the risk of mixing my metaphors, I blindly stumbled through a mine field in Australia, and miraculously didn't blow myself to bits. I wish I had read the book in 1969.

Legacy. Rose addressed a paradox at the heart of kinship research: namely, that the anthropology of kinship began as an analysis of terminology and developed into a science of rules and norms, while marriage choices, which are basic to kinship systems and should be important objects of concern, historically were neglected, especially in empirical research. He attempted to reduce or solve this problem.

Shortly after Rose's death, Kinsources, a genealogical data archive, was created to address the same paradox.¹ Kinsources now makes available in one place a large percentage of the empirical genealogical and kinship data used in international scientific research, much of it collected by methods that somewhat resemble those developed by Rose. In conjunction with the PUCK software platform that powers it, Kinsources constitutes an important and innovative research instrument providing kinship studies with a solid empirical basis and an integrated analytical framework. Currently Kinources hosts 98 datasets from societies around the world, and the use of PUCK is available free of charge to anyone who wants to access the software and the datasets. Kinsources hosts Rose's (1960) genealogical, demographic and census data, but not his kinship term applications, in two datasets available online at <https://www.kinsources.net/>. I coded his wanindiljaugwa dataset directly from his book at <https://www.kinsources.net/kidarep/dataset-48-wanindiljaugwa-1941-au05.xhtml>. Douglas R. White also coded an expansion of Rose's dataset updated by Peter Worsley at: <https://www.kinsources.net/kidarep/dataset-57-wanindiljaugwa-1941-w-boys.xhtml> .

Background. Monteath and Munt provide basic information about Rose's life which began with his birth in England in 1915. He studied physics, chemistry, geology and anthropology at Cambridge where he was strongly influenced by A.C. Haddon, graduated with a degree in anthropology in 1936, and promptly immigrated to Australia where he married a German citizen and a pacifist whom he had met in England shortly before WWII began. As his family developed, his life branched in at least three directions. Occupationally, in keeping with his studies in science and mathematics at Cambridge, Rose obtained technical training in meteorology in Australia and worked as a full-time government meteorologist from 1938 until the end of WWII, then as a higher level civil servant in various Australian Ministries until 1956. Politically, he favored the "underdog" and expressed his support by intervening personally when he saw economic or racial abuse happening, writing forceful letters to newspaper editors, harshly criticizing Christian missionaries and European colonizers, joining the Communist Party of Australia, and becoming embroiled in a highly disruptive Cold War spy scandal. Scientifically, he conducted ethnographic research during his free time with Aboriginal people on Australia's north coast. Having survived this mid-century turmoil, he immigrated to the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in 1956 and became Professor of Anthropology at Humboldt University where he remained on the faculty from 1959 until his death in 1991. It is customary for a critical review of a biography to present a more detailed life history than the one you have just read, but Nic Klaassen (2015) at <http://www.southeastaustralianhistory.com.au/home.htm> provides an excellent online summary to which I refer you.

A superficial view of Rose's life as a scientist and scholar shows him collecting a large body of genealogical, demographic and kinship data with the Wanindiljaugwa-speaking people on

¹ Started by Michael Fischer, Center for Social Anthropology and Computing, University of Kent; funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR); supported by an international consortium of universities; housed at ANR Kinsources, Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie Comparative, Nanterre, France; PUCK developed by a team led by Klaus Hamberger.

Groote Eylandt, adjacent to the northeastern coast of Arnhem Land, during four and a half months of fieldwork in 1941, and publishing his findings in the GDR in 1960. He did a great deal of other research, but his Groote Eylandt study, abbreviated here as *Classification of kin* (Rose 1960), was a significant experiment in anthropological theory and methods, and was his major project. Monteath and Munt fleshed out this central thread of his life by embedding it in a meticulously assembled collection of fine details; I present this thread as fully as I can while omitting details that may obscure it. Furthermore, I expand upon their chronology by examining certain key paragraphs and references that appear in Rose's *Classification of kin*.

Rose's Groote Eylandt experiment. Shortly after arriving in Sydney, Australia, Rose talked with A.P. Elkin about doing field research with Aboriginal Australians. Elkin, who was Chairman of the Anthropology Department at Sydney University, an Anglican clergyman, the successor to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and arguably the most powerful figure in mid-20th century Australian anthropology (Wise 1996), sent Rose to La Perouse, a Sydney suburb with Aboriginal residents. That setting was incompatible with Rose's plan to work with a traditional society in a remote region, so he sought other alternatives thereby tacitly rejecting Elkin's advice, probably not an auspicious move by a 22 year old graduate student.

After completing his training in meteorology, Rose's first assignment took him to Darwin, then onward to Groote Eylandt, both at the top end of the Northern Territory. While at Groote Eylandt, he conducted the first phase of his work on kinship in a traditional Aboriginal society between July 1938 and February 1939.

To get acquainted with the Wanindiljaugwa, Rose began by collecting genealogies, demographic data and kinship terms from several informants using Rivers' (1900/1910) genealogical method. But when he performed preliminary analyses and interpretations in keeping with recommendations by Rivers and precedents by Radcliffe-Brown (1930) and Elkin (1938/1954), he was unable to extract clear diagrammatic patterns or models such as those that others had reported elsewhere in Australia."It was only by neglecting anomalous data that the ideal pattern was obtained." (Rose 1960:5).

Rivers (1910:53) warned of data errors due to postmortem name taboos, adoptions, irregular marriages, double relations based on both consanguinity and affinity, and so on. He recommended recording examples of each kind of relationship from three different key informants to facilitate cross-checking for errors, but provided no instructions for correcting or disregarding them. Yet his message was clear: one must correct problems with the **data**.

But Rose called them anomalies rather than errors, and that was significant. An anomaly is something that deviates from what is standard, normal, or expected. Kuhn (1970:52-53) said, "Discovery commences with the awareness of anomaly; i.e., with the recognition that nature has somehow violated the paradigm-induced expectations that govern normal science." An anomaly may be a data error as Rivers said, but it also may be an indication that the model from which it deviates is defective, in which case one must correct the problem with the **model**.

In addressing the matters in question, Rose (1960:6) realized that Rivers' "method of collection of the data prevented any check being made on any relationship term used, nor was it possible to estimate in quantitative terms the frequency of appearance of these anomalies." In other words, he realized that Rivers, Radcliffe-Brown and Elkin had done a good job of eliciting kinship data by means of key informant interviews, but had done little or nothing to ascertain how people used their kinship terminology and rules outside of the interview situation. As he saw it, "the only relationship data that could be checked was that between living aborigines, and accordingly the problem resolved itself in to endeavoring to have all living aborigines identify every other living aborigine."

Rose had failed to find neat kinship patterns during his first taste of fieldwork, but in the process he had identified the problem that would dominate his research for a quarter of a century.

Before he could proceed with his study, Rose was transferred to Broome on the northwestern coast of Western Australia where he conducted the second phase of the project from 1939 until 1941. There, he and Alec Jolly, a physician and a member of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA), co-authored a paper based on genetics and mathematics relying largely on their joint knowledge of Morgan (1877), and on Jolly's knowledge of Engels (1884) whose work was unknown to Rose at the time. Their speculative paper concerning the emergence of subsection systems in Aboriginal Australia (Jolly and Rose 1943) was published by a reputable British journal, but subsequently damaged Rose's standing with the CPA due to its inclusion of biological factors where Stalin admitted only of sociological factors. Rose's relationship with Alec Jolly and the CPA became increasingly important at this time.

Also, during this period Jolly and Rose developed new data collection methods for Rose to use when he returned to Groote Eylandt.

Rose returned to Groote Eylandt to conduct the third phase of his project while on holiday from his government job in Broome between May and September 1941. There he engaged in intensive fieldwork using his new methods that integrated the recording of numerically coded demographics, genealogies and kinship term applications with the use of photography.

Rose's use of numerical, quantitative or mathematical methods at Groote Eylandt was not complex but was highly labor intensive and had four major components. First, he used Rivers' method to elicit kinship terms and rules, made his best interpretation of the data despite the anomalies that he found, and assigned an alphabetical code to each term. Second, perhaps influenced by Haddon's (1912) photography in the Torres Strait in 1898-99, Rose made and stored photographs of 221 of the 325 Aboriginal people living on the island so he could show the photographs as flash cards, one at a time, to elicit the kinship reference term that each person applied to every other person in the population. Third, he prepared a data form for each person and used it to record a person's identification number, demographic data and genealogical data. Also the card held a matrix to record the kinship reference terms Rose

elicited using the photographs. Finally, he used the kinship codes, the photographs and the recording forms to collect his data. After using this methodology for over 4 months, the end product (Monteath and Munt 2015:66) was a massive dataset containing more than 25,000 cross-checkable alphanumerically coded data points in a field of research in which “data point” was an alien concept.

In comparison with more sophisticated applications of advanced mathematics to kinship research later in the 20th century, Rose’s data collection methods were primitive; but in comparison with methods used to collect kinship data during the century preceding his recognition of the anomalies, his methods were highly innovative.

While assigned to Broome and Perth in 1942 and 1943, Rose began his data analysis. His analytical methods in the pre-computer era entailed using simple statistics to detect previously unknown patterns in his wealth of coded data. Here I briefly sketch only two examples of the many findings that he reported.

First, the default assumption that his predecessors used in preparing their ideal kinship models was that generations should be represented in traditional European style by an endless series of horizontal, discrete, parallel strata that disregarded age relationships. Rose’s (1960:64) data revealed a mean age difference between wives (younger) and husbands (older) of about 17.75 years which imparted a systematic age bias to the generations that ramified throughout the society and was much too large to be interpreted as an error that could be ignored. A systematic $W < H$ mean age difference of about 14 years has been confirmed as characteristic of Australian Aboriginal societies continent wide, and has major structural implications (Binford 2001, Fenner 2005).

Second, the default assumption, based strictly on kinship term reciprocals without regard to age, was that bilateral sibling exchange marriages were diagnostic of many Australian Aboriginal societies. Rose’s data showed that the 17.75 year $W < H$ age bias at Groote Eylandt precluded systematic bilateral sibling exchange marriages. If a man’s MBD was on average 17.75 years younger than the man, then his FZD was on average 17.75 years older than the man, and the mean age difference between MBD and FZD was 35.5 years. Systematic exchange of sisters whose mean ages are 35.5 years apart is not viable. Spencer and Gillen’s (1899) reports for the Aranda that showed bilateral sibling exchange marriages in the diagrams but always emphasized MBD and MMBDD marriages in the texts make more sense now.

As steps toward confirming the value of Rose’s methods and findings, these two examples and many others are now known to characterize the Alyawarra of Central Australia (Denham 2012) as well as the Wanindiljaugwa of Arnhem Land.

Rose’s simple statistical methods and findings constituted a challenge to earlier kinship theorists who were highly literate but far less numerate. Basically, his message was that his predecessors had spent their careers in futile attempts to explain data that were collected on the basis of 19th century assumptions and methods that were fatally flawed. Since the data were

wrong, attempts to explain them were doomed. That was an unpopular message even when he said it politely.

Rose conducted the fifth phase of his project while working at the Central Weather Bureau in Melbourne in November 1944. There he completed a 400-page paper on Groote Eylandt kinship and submitted it to the Minister of the Interior with a letter asking the Commonwealth to consider publishing his outcomes. The Minister referred the paper and the request to A. P. Elkin for advice, and in 1945 Elkin emphatically rejected it. I discuss this matter in greater detail below.

With his major work having been rejected by Elkin, Rose never attempted to obtain his doctorate in Australia, thereby becoming disqualified from seeking senior academic appointments there.

In 1948 Rose briefly re-visited Groote Eylandt with the Mountford Expedition to Arnhem Land and saw the social disruption that had occurred during the decade since he began his project. Later he attempted to do additional research at Groote Eylandt but was prohibited from doing so by the Australian government. However, he shared all of his data with Peter Worsley, a British graduate student whose dissertation at Australian National University dealt with the changing social structure of the Groote Eylandt people (Worsley 1954).

Rose's knowledge of communism developed slowly but ultimately became a major factor in his life. It began amidst his awakening to political, religious, racial and economic injustices during his years at Cambridge and accelerated during his years in Darwin, Groote Eylandt and Broome. When he met Jolly in 1940, he was angry at the abuse of Aboriginal people that he witnessed daily, but claimed to be quite ignorant of Engels (1884) as a way to understand it and the CPA as a way to deal with it. Probably in December 1942 he joined the CPA, apparently based more on frustration than knowledge. During the decade following Elkin's rejection of his Groote Eylandt work, Rose became an increasingly active and visible member of the CPA.

The Petrov Affair followed the defection in Canberra by a high ranking Soviet diplomat, Vladimir Petrov, and his wife in 1954. An intensive spy hunt was conducted by the Royal Commission on Espionage but failed to prosecute any witnesses. Rose was suspected of being an agent of the USSR and the Australian government did everything it could do to substantiate that suspicion, but nothing was ever proven. Nevertheless the event effectively ended Rose's employability by the Australian government.

So by the mid-1950s, Rose was disqualified from seeking senior academic appointments in Australian universities because of Elkin's rejection, unemployable by the Australian government because of the Petrov Affair, and in trouble with the CPA because of the political mistake that he made in his 1943 paper written with Jolly.

Thus Rose immigrated to the German Democratic Republic in 1956 with his wife and children, joined the faculty at Humboldt University, and edited the 400-page paper that Elkin had rejected. He added a dedication to the Australian working class, a preface that he omitted from the published book, two new appendices (12 and 13) and multiple contributions by Peter Worsley. Rose (1960:2) says, "Not only has the philosophical outlook of the writer changed during the past nineteen years ... [but also] my views ... have been modified by a wider experience and more mature consideration. Where the modifications ... are relevant to the subject of this paper they will be indicated and where necessary discussed in the text." Therefore, the published book is not simply a printing of his 1944 manuscript, and without seeing a copy of the earlier version it is impossible to know what references to Marxist theory appeared in the copy that Elkin read. The sixth phase of Rose's Groote Eylandt project ended in 1959-60 when he received his doctorate, was appointed Professor of Anthropology at Humboldt University, and published *Classification of kin* with Akademie-Verlag, the prestigious East German publisher.

With the publication of his book, his Groote Eylandt project entered its seventh phase in which it was received by various anthropological communities. In the GDR, it was welcomed as a major contribution to knowledge and Rose was praised accordingly, but that occurred at the peak of the Cold War and was not an asset – indeed it may have been a liability - outside the GDR.

In Western Europe and the USA, a handful of kinship specialists recognized it as a classic in Aboriginal kinship research and published favorable reviews. Josselin de Jong (1962) extolled *Classification of kin* as a remarkable book with far-reaching implications. It was "not only a new contribution to kinship studies, but also marks a new approach to them." Fortes (1962) said that Rose's study had described institutions and practices "that are more authentically traditional than is the case with most studies of Australian aboriginal societies in the past half century." Lévi-Strauss (1958) sent a personal note to Rose in which he said "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." Goodale (1962) "was strongly disposed to view Rose's book as a major contribution to the theory of Australian social structure and kinship." Others including Lee (1962), Murdock (1958) and Montagu (1964) wrote letters of praise to Rose but never published them. A few others published strongly negative reviews such as Needham (1961) who panned the book as "defective" and "eccentric".

In the USSR his work was never reviewed in print and was vigorously rejected for purely political reasons. Similarly the book was not reviewed in Australia during Rose's lifetime, even though Hiatt (1985), Maddock (1991), Worsley (1991, 2008), and a few others published positive responses to his work in later years.

The Western anthropologists who praised his work did not significantly change the direction of their own work because of Rose's book for at least two reasons. First, he advocated and demonstrated a radically different kind of kinship research that attempted to understand anomalies rather than dismiss them. His work lay far outside the century old mainstream

tradition based on works by Morgan (1871), Spencer and Gillen (1899), Radcliffe-Brown (1930) and Levi-Strauss (1969), and it was not persuasive enough to overcome the momentum and lethargy of the older style of kinship research. We can be sure that Needham was not alone in thinking it was “eccentric”. Second, Rose’s notoriety as a Communist in the GDR and the taint of spying that followed him after the Petrov Affair may have made him “too hot to handle” during the Cold War.

Not only was Rose’s major work published in 1960, but also the great Marxist fad in Western anthropology commenced in the early 1960s. It is ironic that Rose was not hailed as a great man by the many anthropologists who were enamored of Marxist theory throughout the 1960s and 1970s, but in fact they simply ignored him too. All things considered, *Classification of kin* fell on deaf ears and had little impact on anything except Rose’s own life.

So why read or review the book? Monteath (2009) suggests two good reasons and I add a third. First, it contributes broadly to an understanding of the cultural milieu of WWII, the collapse of the European empires, and the Cold War in 20th century Australia and Europe. Second, by focusing on a committed Marxist anthropologist who was a “bitter critic of the impact of imperialism on indigenous well-being” (Monteath 2009:260), it challenges the stereotype of anthropology as a “handmaiden of empire”. Third, it is a microcosmic case study of the many ways in which scholarly scientific research can be arbitrarily impeded, suppressed or prohibited in a “free” society for political, economic, religious and purely personal reasons by powerful people who abuse their power (Munt 2011).

Trying to solve the puzzle. Monteath and Munt, as historians rather than as anthropologists, present an enormous amount of data about Rose’s life from mainly unpublished sources in Australia, Germany and England, but they never really answer the central question raised by Rose’s misadventures: namely, how do all of the pieces of the puzzle concerning *Classification of kin* fit together to account for Rose’s ultimate failure?

The closest they come to telling us “who dun it” or showing us the “smoking gun” appears in the following paragraph:

“Elkin was familiar with the findings of Rose and Jolly [1943] ... Perhaps it coloured his assessment of Rose’s Groote Eylandt work. In his report for the minister, Elkin decried “the very poor quality” of Rose’s previous published papers, and moreover maintained that Rose did not understand indigenous kinship systems. He advised firmly against publication on the basis it might attract the scorn of genuine specialists in the field” (Monteath and Munt 2015:67).

In a separate letter of the same date, 14 March 1945, Elkin said he deplored “the weakness in Rose’s arguments and methods”, and his “bad articles” (Monteath and Munt 2015:67, fn. 45).

Comments about the poor quality of previously published papers are puzzling since there were only 4 of them (Rose 1941, Rose and Jolly 1942, Rose 1942, Jolly and Rose 1943) and all appeared in reputable publications of the 1940s, one in *Man* (now the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* in London), one in *Annals of Eugenics* (now *Annals of Human*

Genetics at University College London), one in Elkin's own journal *Oceania* (in Sydney) and one as a protest against missionaries in a letter to the editor of a newspaper in Western Australia.

Neither the methods that Rose developed in response to what he saw as the failure of Rivers' methods, nor the statistical patterns that he detected in reciprocal kinship term applications, age relations between spouses, and polygynous marriages had any connection with Marxist theory, but they raised difficult questions for currently accepted anthropological theory. His opposition to colonial and missionary abuses of power seems not to have been due to his budding communist awareness. Rather it seems to have happened the other way around: he ultimately became a Communist because he rejected the abuses that he saw earlier in England, Germany and Australia. Finally Elkin's assertion that "Rose did not understand indigenous kinship systems" was incomplete. It should have said that "Rose did not understand indigenous kinship systems in accordance with currently accepted anthropological theory." Rose would have agreed, saying that currently accepted anthropological theory was simply wrong.

Indeed the paragraph quoted above, and its footnote, make no reference to communism. But Rose's kinship research and his simultaneous engagement with communism have been conflated retrospectively, either deliberately or accidentally. Even calling this book *Red Professor* contributes to the conflation. That name could have been inspired by early-20th century newspaper reports about *Red Emma* the anarchist. At least *Red Professor* works better than *Red Fred* or *Red Rose*, but the allusion to violence is misleading.

The authors argue that Rose's experiment was stifled in large part by Elkin in his role as a self styled "gate guard" for his way of life, wherein he confronted challenges to European colonialism, capitalism, Christian missions, assimilationist policies and the implications of these and related factors for his own legacy as an anthropologist. Regardless of any theoretical leanings, when Rose measured what people actually did with their kinship, his statistical findings were radically different from - and incompatible with - the idealized kinship models that his predecessors had reported and attempted to explain for nearly a century. Rejecting Rivers' methodology in 1938 was politically risky, but I suggest that the larger problem from Elkin's perspective may have been Rose's advocacy of mathematical methods in a domain traditionally reserved for the humanities. Thus another irony is that *Classification of kin* was published in Berlin concurrently with the publication in England of C.P. Snow's (1956/1959) *Two Cultures*, a book that stimulated a fierce debate concerning damage done by erecting intellectual barriers between the sciences and the humanities.

I suggest that Elkin's rejection of Rose's manuscript was a major failure for the discipline of anthropology, but others may argue that it was a victory for the necessarily skeptical, conservative forces that prevent scientific disciplines from running amok; i.e., that Rose got what he deserved. Kuhn (1962) argues that an important function of "normal science" is to ward off innovations that threaten the *status quo*. Such defensive actions have happened repeatedly in the sciences, with endless variations in form and substance. Some important

innovations have risen from the ashes after a generation or two of neglect, while others simply have been lost to history. Maybe we should not be concerned about such matters.

But there is a global pattern here. Three notable 20th century anthropologists, V. Gordon Childe (1892-1957) (Allen 1979), Fred Rose (1915-1991) and Peter Worsley (1924-2013), were seriously impacted by pro-colonial, anti-communist attitudes and policies in Australia. For example, Worsley (2008:77) says, "... Evans-Pritchard, the professor at Oxford whose work I deeply admired, had said that he would do his best to ensure that I, as a Marxist, never got a post in anthropology". Subsequently Worsley was prohibited from working in Africa and later was denied an entry permit to work in New Guinea in the early 1950s when "MI5 ... struck again" (Worsley 2008:83). Similar things happened concurrently in the United States at the hands of Senator Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee. And the Soviet Union was notorious for its suppression of scientific research (Graham 1994). Perhaps the concatenation of scientific, political and occupational issues in the Rose affair was not a tempest in a teapot.

In light of research opportunities lost during decades of rapid culture change in Aboriginal Australia and among hunter-gatherer societies worldwide, suppression of Rose's monograph for fifteen years and its subsequent publication out of sight behind the Iron Curtain are distressing. Likewise Rose's failure to persuade his colleagues around the world of the importance of dealing with anomalies that have a long tradition of being ignored or suppressed is equally distressing. Certainly my own efforts to deal with the same or similar kinship anomalies among the Alyawarra have not been notably successful, and I cannot blame it on MI5, CPA, FBI, CIA or any other set of initials. Perhaps the times are inauspicious.

Any book that deals with 20th century communism in academia may be suspected of political rhetoric, but I think that concern does not apply here. The book is a well researched examination of important aspects of 20th century intellectual history that focuses on the suppression of innovations in anthropological method and theory by people who seem to have abused their personal and political power in the service of a particular worldview. Although the book deals at considerable length with Rose's adoption of Marxist theory, it focuses ultimately on Elkin's rejection of Rose's methodological innovations that owed nothing to Marxism. The book takes a position that makes it worth reading, but that fact does not make it political rhetoric.

Without delving deeply into either mathematics or communism, the authors have dealt effectively with a problem in the history of mathematical anthropology and cultural theory. Their book probably will be attacked by anti-Marxists and pro-Marxists, by those who consider Rose's mathematics to be insufficient or excessive, and by those who defend or oppose gate guards in academia. Perhaps publication of the book will make a significant contribution toward rescuing Rose and his legacy from oblivion.

References:

- Allen, Jim 1979. Childe, Vere Gordon (1892–1957). *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/childe-vere-gordon-5580/text9521>, published first in hardcopy 1979, accessed online 17 September 2015.
- Binford, L. R. 2001. *Constructing Frames of Reference: An Analytical Method for Archaeological Theory Building Using Hunter-Gatherer and Environmental Data Sets*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Denham, Woodrow W. 2012. Kinship, marriage and age in Aboriginal Australia. *Mathematical Anthropology and Cultural Theory*. May 2012:4(1):1-79. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6xm8s89k#page-1>.
- Elkin, A. P. 1964. *The Australian Aborigines*. New York: Doubleday Natural History Library.
- Engels, Friedrich 1884/1972. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. With an Introduction by Evelyn Reed. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- Fenner, Jack N. 2005. Cross-cultural estimation of the human generation interval for use in genetics-based population divergence studies. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 128(2):415-423.
- Fortes, M. 1962. Review of *The classification of kin, age structure and marriage amongst the Groote Eylandt Aborigines: A study in method and a theory of Australian kinship*, by F. G. G. Rose. *British Journal of Sociology* 13 (1): 81–2.
- Goodale, J. 1962. Review of *The classification of kin, age structure and marriage amongst the Groote Eylandt Aborigines: A study in method and a theory of Australian kinship*, by F. G. G. Rose. *American Anthropologist* 64 (3): 664–67.
- Graham, Loren R. 1994. *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union: A Short History*. Cambridge: Cambridge Studies in the History of Science.
- Haddon, A.C. editor, 1912. *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hiatt, L. R. 1985. Maidens, males and Marx: Some contrasts in the work of Frederick Rose and Claude Meillassoux. *Oceania* 56 (1): 34–6.
- Josselin de Jong, P. E. de. 1962. A new approach to kinship studies: Being a discussion of F. G. G. Rose, Kin, age structure and marriage. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land-en Volkenkunde* 118:42–67.
- Jolly, A.T.H and F.G.G. Rose 1943. The place of the Australian Aboriginal in the evolution of society. *Annals of Eugenics*, 12(1):44-87.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Enlarged (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Richard B. 1962. Letter to F.G.G. Rose, February 26, 1962. Rose Papers Box 26, uncatalogued mss. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Australia.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude 1949/1969. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude 1958. Letter to F.G.G. Rose, March 31, 1958. Rose Papers, Box 34, uncatalogued mss. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Australia.
- Maddock, Kenneth 1991. Frederick Rose 1915-1991. An appreciation. *Oceania* 62(1):66-69.
- Malinowski, B. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

- Montagu, Ashley 1964. Letter to F.G.G. Rose, February 1, 1964. Rose Papers, Box 21, uncatalogued mss. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Australia.
- Monteath, Peter 2009. The anthropologist as Cold Warrior: The interesting times of Frederick Rose. In Evan Smith, ed., *Europe's Expansions and Contractions*. Adelaide: Proceedings of the VXIIth Biennial Conference of the Australian Association of European Historians.
- Monteath, Peter and Valerie Munt 2015. *Red Professor: The Cold War Life of Fred Rose*. Mile End, SA: Wakefield Press.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry 1870/1997. Systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family. Washington: *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, vol. 218. Reprinted: Elisabeth Tooker, ed. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Munt, V. 2009. "Back to the USSR": Frederick Rose, the "Stalin Criticism" and anthropological theory during the Cold War. In Evan Smith, ed., *Europe's Expansions and Contractions*. Adelaide: Proceedings of the VXIIth Biennial Conference of the Australian Association of European Historians.
- Munt, V. 2011. Australian anthropology, ideology and political repression: the Cold War experience of Frederick G. G. Rose", *Anthropological Forum*, 21(2):109-29.
- Murdock, G. P. 1958. Letter to F.G.G. Rose, April 2, 1958. Rose Papers, Box 34, uncatalogued mss. Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Australia.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1931. The social organization of Australian tribes. *Oceania* 1.
- Rivers, W.H.R. 1900. A genealogical method of collecting social and vital statistics. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 30(1900):74-82.
- Rivers, W.H.R. 1910. The genealogical method. *Sociological Review* 3:1-11. Reprinted in Nelson Graburn ed., *Readings in Kinship and Social Structure* (1971, pp. 51-59). New York: Harper and Row.
- Rose, F.G.G. 1941. Tribal custom: marriage law infringed. Story behind mission murder. Letter to the editor. *Western Australian*, 23 April 1941, page 11.
- Rose, F.G.G. 1942. Paintings of the Groote Eylandt Aborigines. *Oceania* 13:170-176.
- Rose, F.G.G. 1960. *Classification of Kin, Age Structure and Marriage amongst the Groote Eylandt Aborigines: A Study in Method and a Theory of Australian Kinship*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Rose, F.G.G. and A.T.H. Jolly 1942. An interpretation of the taboo between mother and son in law. *Man* 42(5):15-16.
- Spencer, Baldwin, and F. J. Gillen 1899. *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*. London: Macmillan.
- Wise, Tigger 1996. Elkin, Adolphus Peter (1891–1979). *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/elkin-adolphus-peter-10109/text17845> published first in hardcopy 1996, accessed online 17 September 2015.
- Worsley, Peter 1954. The changing social structure of the Wanindiljaugwa. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Australian National University, June 1954.
- Worsley, Peter 1991. Iconoclast of the Outback: obituary for Professor Rose. *Guardian*, 18 February 1991, 35.
- Worsley, Peter 2008. *An Academic Skating on Thin Ice*. New York: Berghen Books.