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Introduction.
Carnegie Corporation grants to Australia in the nineteen thirties threw
something of a cultural lifeline to a nation enduring the worst
depression in its history. The grants, although relatively modest, fed
into strategic points where national ideas and values were shaped - in
leadership of school systems, universities and teachers colleges,
centres of cultural heritage and adult education, research and
international affairs. Carnegie initiatives, of course, have been
examined in Connell's history of the Australian Council for Educational
Research (ACER)1 and in the standard histories of Australian libraries
by Horrocks2 and Balnaves3. These accounts, however, have not dealt to
any substantial extent with the range of critical assessments of U.S.
foundation activities, including those of the Carnegie Corporation,
advanced by such writers as Horace Coon4, Lagermann5, Arnove6 and
Berman7. Richard Glotzer has also written extensively on Carnegie
operations, and particularly with respect to South Africa.8
This paper reassesses the impact of Carnegie travel grants to
Australian educators in Australia in the light of these new
perspectives, including American-Australian relations, before the
outbreak of war in the Pacific. That event profoundly altered the
policy environment. The task was partly motivated by the fact that the
critical views concentrate upon domestic North American and third world
(largely African) concerns, and either ignore Australia or New Zealand
completely or view grants to the Antipodes as simply pale reflections
of North American policy, or else as an inconsequential sideshow. The
present appraisal approaches with some caution the more radical views
in the works by Berman and Arnove, which are almost too predictable,
but takes special note of the more ambivalent treatment by Lagermann,
the Corporation's official historian. The upshot was to confirm
aspects of the radical critique, but to question its validity on the
broader front where Australia is concerned.

Andrew Carnegie.
Andrew Carnegie, as most will know, was a wealthy industrialist in the
United States of America who became one of the most prominent
philanthropists of the late C19th and early C20th. From about 1890 he
systematically set about giving away his personal fortune to support a
range of philanthropic ventures. He was a Scot by birth, who migrated
with his parents to the United States. Self taught beyond elementary
education, Carnegie eventually amassed enormous wealth from mining and
iron and steel. When he sold his industrial interests in 1901 they
were worth in excess of $400 million, a huge sum for the time. He
spent the rest of his life not only ridding himself of his fortune, but
in publicising the principle that wealthy people should do likewise. He controlled the process of wealth disbursement personally until 1911, when on advice he formed the Carnegie Corporation of New York for "the advancement and diffusion of knowledge among the people of the United States". Grants in the early years went mainly to North America (USA and Canada), however in 1913 Carnegie placed money aside to form a United Kingdom Trust, for the support of Carnegie activities in Britain. In 1917, again at Carnegie's own insistence, a small amount also was put aside in a British Dominions and Colonies Fund for the support of activities in such places as Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand.

Critiques of Foundation Activity.

Revisionist accounts of philanthropic foundations challenge the classic liberal interpretations by viewing their activities as a form of cultural domination. Lagermann, for example, while acknowledging the important benefits of Carnegie's largess, identifies the naive 19th liberal motivation of his grants to libraries, adult and popular education and even research to alleviate social conditions of his day. The more critical analysts further argue that once the philanthropic foundations became managed by professionals, their control passed to a wealthy, East coast, Ivy League coterie of America's elite sharing a culture far removed from that of the common people. Carnegie grants, in this view, selected an elite among scholars, bureaucrats, politicians, etc. who would lead American society into the next generation. More, that elite was channelled into a cultural vision of the world through university training and research experiences (the positivist-scientific paradigm for example) that would preserve their dominant position in the social order, protect conservative-liberal political systems and perpetuate the capitalist organisation of economic life. Assistance to black American education, in this view, was paternalist and pretty thin. Where assistance to former colonial nations was concerned, this involved imposing the dominant imperial/colonial ideologies of the wealthy western nations under the mask of philanthropy. It was a form of cultural imperialism that blended with foreign policy imperatives of the U.S. government. In the case of the British colonies and dominions, moreover, the patrician backgrounds of the Carnegie bureaucrats facilitated an easy working relationship with Britain's social and political elites in domestic and imperial affairs. The Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, unemployment and political unrest during the depression years, the rise of Nazi and Fascist regimes in Europe, Japanese imperial expansion and the calamity of World War II only served to consolidate this pattern of ideas. Cold War politics after 1945 imparted a special urgency to philanthropic intervention.

Australian-American Relations in the 1920s.
American foreign policy involvement with Australia before 1930 was limited, poorly informed and affected by relations in the League of Nations. Although annexation of the Philippines in 1898 drew America into Pacific affairs, trade and missionary involvement focussed American foreign policy on Japan and China rather than the South Pacific. Relations with Australia were sorely tested at Versailles, moreover, when the then Australian Prime Minister, William Morris Hughes, vigorously opposed President Woodrow Wilson over control of German colonies in the Pacific, particularly New Guinea which became an Australian protectorate under the League of Nations. Hughes further challenged Wilson's idealism when Australia influenced the League's decision not to support the principle of racial equality being championed by Japan (which threatened the White Australia policy). Later in 1921-22, the United States largely ignored Australia at the Washington Conference because American diplomats did not understand the independence Australia enjoyed after Federation in 1901 and later conferred by dominion status. Nor were they impressed by Hughes' belligerence. Indeed, if Americans thought at all about Australia, it was to see it as a thinly populated, white, Anglo-Saxon outpost of the British Empire and hardly worthy of serious consideration in world affairs.10

Australia's similarly limited and poorly informed interest in the United States, meanwhile, was being undermined by antagonism about America's late entry into World War I and the spread of popular American culture. The former issue and America's hard line on British war debts eroded pre-war goodwill from the visit of the American Pacific fleet in 1908, and it attracted resentment among returned servicemen. American culture, meanwhile, infiltrated Australian theatre through the activities of an American entrepreneur, J.C. Williamson, in vaudeville, farces, melodramas and frivolous musical comedies all of which coincided with a decline of domestic drama and literature. American cinema gradually took hold during the war years, when British and European films were in short supply and Williamson and other entrepreneurs opened a string of theatres. Although the union movement had been well informed on American labour developments during the early part of the century, most news highlighted the evils of American capitalism and the weakness of American labour organisations. Newspapers, mostly informed from negative British sources, concentrated on scandals and murders. American literature spread through cheap detective stories, westerns and works that were critical of American culture. Serious Australian art and theatre was focussed solidly on Britain and Europe, not the United States. American material culture - the ubiquitous motor car, household appliances and the humble hamburger - were well established by the nineteen twenties.

In domestic affairs, Australia after the Great War lost the impetus of pre-war nationalism and idealism. The nation concentrated upon economic development from within a framework of imperial preference, protective tariffs shielding local industry, an arbitration system
controlling domestic labour markets and a White Australia policy restricting immigration to people of British extraction. Fear of communism following the Russian revolution of 1917 drew the shutters down upon further social reform. The nation, even at the state level, retreated into a cocoon of stodgy parochialism accentuated by the White Australia policy and growing insecurity once the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was abolished at the Washington Conference of 1921-2. This drove Australia into closer defence ties with Britain, a dependence that was encouraged by the Foreign Office.11

In education and culture, Australia also was conservative. The state education systems were bureaucratic, centralised and monolithic, ruled by aging directors and in the thrall of English ideas. They also lacked any national focus and were intensely jealous of each other. Local communities were little involved in education because of this bureaucratic isolation and a century of dependence upon government initiative. Secondary schooling, in spite of reforms before World War I, was still largely the province of private institutions that catered to the social elite and offered a grammar school curriculum modelled almost slavishly upon that of the English great public schools. State governments were responsible for primary schooling and vocational education for the mass of the population, with a few selective grammar-type schools for the academically talented. The "New Education" had made some inroads into curriculum and teaching, but the early impetus had slackened as the state education bureaucracies lost the reformist edge of pre-war years. Culturally, Australia had done little to promote the arts, music and literature, which failed to maintain the lively progress of earlier decades. Public libraries were dated and poorly resourced, while subscription libraries were the norm in municipalities, mechanics institutes, schools of arts and the Workers' Education Association.

First Contacts with the Carnegie Corporation.
Against this background, the Carnegie Trustees, and in particular Frederick Keppel, the President, initiated the corporation's first contacts with Australia. Keppel was the quintessential foundation manager, having graduated earlier from Columbia University and served the institution for several years before taking up the post of Dean of its undergraduate college in 1917. During the war he served as assistant secretary of war and later joined the Carnegie Corporation as president in 1923.12 His background in Washington and Columbia along with Carnegie's endowments to the British dominions and colonies, brought together a set of interests that coincided with growing US foreign affairs involvement in the Pacific region. Japanese imperial designs on the former German colonies inevitably meant that Australia and New Zealand, though not immediately, would become of some interest to the State Department, if only as outposts of the British naval presence in the Asian region. Keppel's personal interest in the
Antipodes, moreover, included the presence of 'a dozen first and second cousins in New Zealand and Australia'.13 The first Carnegie visitor was James Russell in 1928, immediately following his retirement as Dean of Teachers' College, Columbia University. At the request of his old friend, Keppel, Russell was sent to New Zealand, Australia and South Africa to report on ways in which the Carnegie Corporation could become involved in what Russell and Keppel came to view as an exciting group of countries that might later wield a great deal of influence in the Southern Hemisphere.

It was natural that Teachers College, Columbia University, should become closely involved in the corporation's philanthropic work, and particularly with education in the former British colonies. Its first president, James Earl Russell, recruited faculty that drew educationists from around the world to pursue the new fields of educational research and scholarship. Its alumni by the 1920s included significant leaders in South Africa (Charles T.Loram and E.G.Malherbe) and even Australia (Percival Cole and Kenneth Cunningham). At a personal level, Russell's influence extended beyond his retirement. One son, William, succeeded his father as Dean of Teachers' College while James was en route to New Zealand and Australia, and another, John, later joined the Carnegie Corporation as the secretary responsible for the Dominion and Colonies Fund.

Russell's first impressions of Australia were clouded by the anti-American sentiment he encountered, which he attributed to ignorance, isolation and worship of everything British. A true capitalist, he also was concerned about the state socialism he saw as rampant in Australian society, as well as the dominant position held by big unions. In a letter to Keppel he made a number of points:

'The conditions here are far from satisfactory. I begin to detect a wide gulf between the cordial reception that I get and the undercurrent of feeling towards the USA. When you realise that these people get only a few lines of cable news and these always on some scandal or murder, that they go almost daily to see our movies and hear our jazz, that the popular authors are Sinclair Lewis and Upton Sinclair (everybody proves everything American by reference to them), is it any wonder that they think us next to barbarians, boasters who won the war, or leeches who demand the fast dollar in reparations of war debts?'16

This reception failed to undermine Russell's enthusiasm, however. For Keppel's benefit, he asserted that:

"These countries (Australia and New Zealand) are the experiment stations for all English speaking peoples. What they are experiencing we may expect to meet a few years hence. Hence the value of knowing more about these experiments - political, social, industrial and educational. Some way must be found to gain that end.'
'I am mighty glad you gave me the opportunity to come out here. It has opened my mind to the fact that here is a great continent which is bound to play a great role in world affairs as affecting the Pacific. It is blood brother to us and will always be a "White Man's Country". It is trying out problems in democracy which whether the solution is reached be correct or false must inevitably be an example to us. It is an integral part of the ring around the Pacific beginning with Canada and our West Coast and running on to Hawaii, New Zealand, Australia and the Philippines. We can't ignore it without loss to ourselves. The time is ripe for closer contacts and the safest way is through educational agencies. From this time on I am a missionary - a home missionary at that as distinguished from interest in China, Japan, Continental Europe - Yes, even So, America. The rest of the world may be worth cultivating but this part needs intensive tillage and irrigation.17

Russell's broad appraisal of Australian education, which revealed his own cultural biases, was clearly expounded in a strongly worded commentary, again to Keppel, on educational conditions in New South Wales:

'I am very glad that I came here. I had no idea that any English speaking people could possibly live under conditions imposed by the educational system. The University [of Sydney] is trying to get in touch with life outside but actually does not know how to do so - probably the majority of staff do not want to do so - but the new Vice-Chancellor sees the need and in time will put new life into the old shell. The Department of Education is a wonderful machine that works like a fine watch. No detail is overlooked but it is autocratic to the limit. General criticism is that it is static if not actually on lower gear. I have indicated in my notes the only way that I can see to renew the life that brought the present system into operation. It can be saved but it will require almost superhuman diplomacy and much patience. The political government is in a precarious situation as well. The Labor Party is powerful and has the votes if they can be controlled. It looks just now as if a split may come between the conservatives and the radicals in most labor union groups. If so much good would follow. If the radicals win out something desperate is sure to follow. The whole social system is as nicely calculated to meet their ends as any other and the change could be made within a few months. As it is the thoughtful group is in control but cautious. What might happen if the Communists get control can only be imagined by what is going on in Russia.'18

As for action to assist Australian education, he believed that a first priority was to see established some organisation - perhaps ' an institute independent of universities, school systems, and politics, on the lines of the [U.S.] Council of Science and Industry, to conduct a
bureau of educational reference and research, not to build up operating machine (sic), but to assign jobs, if possible to get government cooperation through assignment of men at full salaries.'19 This institute would sit outside the state systems and use its independence as a "burr under the saddle" where the conservative and complacent education departments were concerned.

Another priority was for the Corporation to widen the vision of Australian educators beyond their British cultural fixations. On his return he engaged Teachers College faculty and library staff to draw up a list of modern American texts and reference books, which the Corporation then offered as a gift to Australian teachers colleges and education departments20. He also responded to persistent complaints about the isolation felt by Australia's state education directors, inspectors and leading teachers. They believed that the chance to see what was happening in the centres of Europe and the United States would be immensely beneficial not only to their own professional development but also to the introduction of new ideas and schemes in Australia's schools. For them, access to travel grants was of critical importance. Russell himself commented:

'It occurs to me that if a few outstanding men in Australia were appointed Carnegie Visiting Professors of International Relations to America it would be a fine stunt'.21

Where university education was concerned, Russell's main concerns lay not so much with academic work, where he concluded the standards were high, but in the management and administration of universities. He was particularly critical of the lack of professional administrators - permanent and full-time vice-chancellors and able registrars - who would ensure the efficient organisation of universities. Travel by leading Australian vice chancellors and registrars, he believed, would help remedy those problems. In 1927, however, the Corporation had given $25,000 towards an endowment fund for the National Research Council of Australia, then centred in Melbourne.22

In pursuing his new "mission", Russell saw chances to engage the services of at least three people who had made a big impression on him. One was Frank Tate, recently retired as director of education for Victoria, whose sharpness of mind, standing with the other Australian directors and state systems, diplomatic skills, political nous, and personal charm fitted the mould of elite bureaucrat with whom the Corporation found it easy to deal. Kenneth Cunningham's credentials were perfect: holding a doctorate from Teachers' College and therefore known personally and held in high academic regard by Russell and other Columbia worthies, he was well-disposed to American ideas and institutions and of proven competence. Percival R. Cole, now Vice-Principal of the Sydney Teachers' College, was one of Russell's earlier doctoral graduates and, like Cunningham, one of the initiated who now held a significant academic post in New South Wales. Russell proffered further advice on adult education which had benefited
before his arrival from small Carnegie grants for library book stocks and administration in Sydney and Melbourne. Modest grants for this purpose were continued on Russell's advice, but the new thrust was to provide travel grants to enable adult education leaders to witness the new approaches being adopted in the United States. Russell thought that Australia should widen its outlook from that typical of the older British institutions - mechanics institutes, schools of art, the tutorial classes and the W.E.A. - and benefit from the more egalitarian United States experience. At the time Russell was President of the American Association for Adult Education and also close to the American Library Association leadership.

President of the University of Minnesota, L.D.Coffman, was a second Carnegie visitor, sent somewhat later, in 1931, to report on grants to New Zealand and Australia, especially to libraries and university administrations. Other important Carnegie visitors included C.O.G.Douie, Ralph Munn and Keppel himself. Douie, an Englishman, visited Australia in 1932 to report on the condition of adult education. Ralph Munn, the Chief Librarian of the Carnegie Public Library, Pittsburgh, came to New Zealand and Australia in 1934 to report on libraries in the two countries. Museums in New Zealand and Australia, meanwhile, gained some coverage in a report in 1932 by Sir Henry Miers and S.F.Markham.23 Keppel visited Australia and New Zealand in 1935 in a tour to acquaint himself with the local situation and review Carnegie policy (not to mention meeting up with his Antipodean cousins).24.

Foundation of the Australian Council for Educational Research.
The key to Carnegie influence in Australia was its financial support for the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). The Corporation provided £50,000 to support the Council for its first ten years, and appointed Tate as Chairman and Cunningham as the Executive Officer. The story of ACER's work has been told by W.F.Connell, and so does not need repeating here. Richard Selleck also has published an excellent biography of Tate, which deals with his work for ACER and the Carnegie Corporation.25 Keppel came to regard Tate as 'one of eight or ten really great men whom I have had the privilege of knowing'26 '[T]he only person,' he concluded, 'was Tate who was both respected and feared'27. About Cunningham, Keppel and Russell were more equivocal, though adamant that the "impersonal" approach he adopted to national educational questions was the only way to avoid damaging conflict with state governments and directors of education. Russell himself spoke out on this matter in 1928 that (with respect to Carnegie financial involvement):

'I have told all and sundry that if they want a hearing they must bury their hatchets and boomerangs and talk in terms of the Commonwealth and professional service without institutional or partisan bias.'28
ACER was the first educational organisation in Australia that served the nation as a whole. Its concerns reached beyond the state borders to break down inter-state jealousies and suspicions and energise the state education bureaucracies. The Council published reports by various grantees, which, although heavily edited, publicised US "progressive" developments as a challenge to Australian policy and practice. ACER also developed as a source of information on Australian education, an agency promoting the collection of national statistics, and a clearing house for information on education in other countries. In 1938 the Council published the first of several five-yearly Reviews of Australian Education, which provided almost the only national overviews available at the time. In another paper attention is focussed on the non-controversial approach adopted by ACER which was epitomised by its promotion of experimental studies of different aspects of education and the development of intelligence and achievement testing for Australian schools. For present purposes, we concentrate on ACER’s role in administering Carnegie grants to Australian educators during the nineteen thirties.

Carnegie Travel Grants for Australian Educators.

One of ACER’s major functions was to consider applications for Carnegie travel grants, with Tate and Cunningham in many cases actually providing direct personal recommendations to Keppel and John Russell in New York. Carnegie policy favoured older and more senior administrators and academic leaders who on their return from overseas were in a position to introduce changes. The grants were intended to "top up" support from official Australian sources rather than replace such assistance. The Corporation on several occasions also advanced small sums to enable Australian academic or bureaucratic leaders to extend overseas trips and include North America in their itineraries. Later, in 1935, The Corporation extended separate grants to the universities of Melbourne and Western Australia to supplement university funds for academic sabbatical leaves 29. For the most part the Corporation avoided grants to enable Australians to complete degrees in the USA or even to remain for too long in one place, preferring that established leaders should travel widely to experience the whole spectrum of current developments in relevant institutions and study fields. The North American tour usually followed the main rail route from West to East, starting at San Francisco and Los Angeles and passing through Denver, Colorado, Chicago, Detroit and New York and including Washington D.C. and possibly Boston, Massachusetts. The librarians invariably visited the Carnegie Library at Pittsburgh. On arrival in New York, the travellers were entertained by Keppel or John Russell. Notes for personal files on impressions gained at this meeting reveal much about the upper class, Yankee backgrounds of Carnegie bureaucrats besides giving perceptive snapshots of each visitor. Russell and Keppel, who both visited Australia in the 1930s, built up an intricate network of contacts in Australian states that,
Corporation to become remarkably well informed on Australian affairs, politically astute in selection of visitors and subtly influential through the programming of itineraries and selection of American institutions and personnel to whom the visitors were introduced. Teachers College, Columbia University, occupied a place high in the itineraries of educational leaders from Australia.

A good appreciation of the Carnegie intentions in extending the travel grants can be obtained from a brief overview of the people who obtained them. In the tables below are listed the people obtaining grants, with their affiliations also mentioned. Many of their reports to the Corporation were published by ACER in its research series, for example those by Cunningham and G.E.Phillips, G.S.Browne, H.S.Wyndham, C.R.McRae, J.G.Cannon, B.H.Molesworth, H.T.Parker, F.G.Sublet and A.Hoy. In the vocational education field, Fenner, Eltham and Drummond capitalised upon overseas visits in preparing substantial reports for, and published by, their respective state governments that directly influenced official policies towards youth unemployment and vocational preparation. Experimental work by H.T.Parker in educational psychology and on mathematical thinking by F.W.Mitchell, which were also published by ACER, attracted particular attention from the Carnegie leadership. Others sent their reports to the Carnegie authorities, who invariably had them read by critical scholars for comment and assessment. John Russell and Keppel himself watched with interest the subsequent careers of those given grants, even to the point of collecting newspaper clippings for personal files.

Another series of grants was introduced in 1936, which in Australian were awarded by the Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee rather than ACER. These were taken up at the University of London's newly formed Institute of Education. The Institute was brought into being by Sir Percy Nunn, who was well known at Teachers College. His personal contacts with William Russell, the son and successor to James as Dean of Teachers College, led to the critical discussions with Keppel and the Carnegie Corporation. One of his most important professors was H.R.Hamley, an Australian whom Nunn persuaded to complete a Ph.D. at Columbia in the early nineteen thirties and who returned to London University as a leading educational researcher.

In 1934 and 1935 the Carnegie Corporation assisted the Institute with funds to expand its overseas department, to which was recruited Professor Fred Clarke (later Sir Fred) as overseas student adviser. Clarke visited Australia in 1936, prior to taking up his post in London, and upon Nunn's retirement and death, he became the Institute's director. His correspondence with Keppel during 1936 and 1937, including his report on his Australian visit, showed them to be of like mind where the travel grants to Australian educators were concerned. Clarke, however, favoured a one-year stay for visitors to Britain, which might include arranged visits and lectures as well as study towards a University of London post-graduate degree.

(1938-39).45 Phillips and Robertson were later to play important roles in the development of education in Western Australia as well as having an impact nationally.46 As at Columbia, there were many Australians who independently travelled to London to complete post-graduate studies, for example Colsell Sanders, later professor of education at the University of Western Australia, and George William Bassett, later principal of the New England Teachers' College and then Professor of Education at the University of Queensland after Schonell resigned to become vice-chancellor of that institution.47

The visitor grants were not all one way. The Carnegie Corporation also funded visits by various foreign experts who each provided stimulating reports on Australian education and culture. We have already mentioned the Munn visit to report on libraries, the Douie report on adult education and the study of museums by Sir Henry Miers and S.F. Markham. A later report by Cramer, an educational 

AUSTRALIA: CARNEGIE TRAVEL GRANTS 1930-1942
NEW SOUTH WALES: VICTORIA

Teacher Education
Mackie, A: Sydney Teachers' College
Browne, G.S.: V Pr, Melb T Coll
Univ. of Sydney, Treasurer of ACER.
Wrigley, L.T.: Pr, Melb Teachers
Phillips, G.E.: Lecturer, Univ. of Sydney.
Coll, Dean, Education, Univ of
McRae, C.R.: Lecturer, Sydney Melb.
Teachers' College (later a professor).

Education Department and Schools
Drummond, D.H.: Minister for Education.
Hicks, S.W.: U/Sec. for Education.
Flynn, Miss Julia: Ass Chief Inspector.
Harkness, B.C.: Ass. U/Sec. for Education.
Wyndham, H.S.: (at Stanford University!).
Ellis, F.: Pr, Melb Tech College.

Harvey, R.F.: H/m Sydney Boys' School.
Eltham, E.P.: Ch Ins, Tech
Hilton, A.R.: Rural and Ag educ Schools.
Schapper, Dr. H.: Sr Technical Inspector Agriculture.
Tompkins, :: Head of Art, Swinburne Tech Coll.
Osborne, G.A. Sr. Inspector

Libraries, Museums Art Galleries:
Bell, F.L.S.: Sydney Municipal Library.
Ifould, W.N.: Pr Librarian, Pitt, E.R.: Pr Lib, Public Library
Public Library of NSW. of Victoria.
Metcalfe, J.W.: Dep Pr Librarian, Foxcroft, A.B.: Ass Lib, Pub Lib
Public Library of NSW. of Victoria.
Technological Museum of NSW.
Kingsely, J.: Preparator,  
Australian Museum, Sydney.
Ashton, W.: Dir, National Art  
Gallery of NSW.
Kinghorn, J.R.: Curator, Herpetology,  
Australian Museum of NSW.
Hendy, R.: Town Clerk/Municipal  
Library, City of Sydney.

University Admin and Academics:
Bland, F.A.: Prof Pub Admin, UnivPriestley, .: Sec, Univ of Melb.  
and Training, Univ of Sydney. Lindsay, E.: Entomology.
Lovell, H.T.: Prof Psych, Univ of Sydney. Splatt, B.: Researcher,  
Waterhouse, E.G.: Prof German, UnivCook, P.H.: Psychol, Travaneure  
of Sydney. Psychological Clinic.
Martin, D.: Prof, Univ of Sydney. White, N. Bur of Soc and Int  
Gray, W.: Bur of Soc and Int  
Sheppard, E.: Bursar, Tutor in English, Affairs (Austral-Asiatic  
Section)  
Women's College, Univ of Sydney.

Other

School Teachers' Federation. and libraries.
Church of England Grammar School. Hospital, Melb.
Stewart, D.: Gen Sec, Workers'  
Educational Association, Sydney. Tate, F.: President, ACER.
Byrne, L.: Org, Women's Section, Cunningham, K.S. (ACER)  
Agricultural Bureau of NSW.
Woodhill, J.: Dietitian, Royal Prince  
Alfred Hospital

SOUTH AUSTRALIA QUEENSLAND
Education and Schools:
Halton, A.R.: H/m, Murray Bridge Boys' H Sch  
Luskey, : Sr Lect, Adelaide Teachers Coll  
Wauchope, M.: Lect, Adelaide Teachers Coll  
Allen, E.: Ch Insp Schools.

Libraries, Art Galleries and Museums:
Hale, H.M.: Dir, Pub Lib, Museum Mayo, D.: Hon Sec Qld Art Fund Board  
and Art Gallery, S Australia.
Tindale, N.: Museum of S Aust
(Aboriginal life and culture).
University Administration and Academics
Stewart, J.M.: Prof Philos, Molesworth, B.H.: Tutorial
Univ of Adelaide Classes Univ of Qld.
Coombe, R.J.: Stip Magistrate, Richards, H.C.: Prof of Geology, Univ of Qld.
Children's Court, Adelaide.
Davidson, J.: Prof Entomology.
Macbeth, A.R.: Prof Chemistry.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA. TASMANIA.
Education:
Cameron, R.G.: Prof Education & Pr
Claremont Teachers College. Fletcher, C.E.: Ch Insp Schools.
Coleman, E.A.: Ch Insp Schools.
Libraries, Art Galleries and Museums:
Boswell, R.: Queen Victoria
Wood, M.: Lib, Univ of WA Museum and Art Gallery,
Scott, E.O.G.: Dir, Queen
Victoria Museum and Art Gallery, Launceston
University Administration and Academics:
Smith, M.: Plant Physiology. Preshaw, A.S.: Registrar, Univ of
Roberts, T.H.: Adult Educ, Univ of WA Tasmania
Whitfeld, H.: Vice Ch, Univ of W A.
Fowler, H.L.: Psychology.
Beazley, J.R.: Prof of Law.
Smith, M.E.: Plant Physiology.

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY.
Libraries:
Binns, K.: Ch Lib, Commonwth Parl Lib
White, H.: Ass Lib, Commonwth Nat Lib

administrator from Oregon who visited Australia in 1936, was highly critical of Australian education.48 So too was I.L. Kandel, the Teachers' College professor who stayed on after the NEF Conference and wrote at least three reports later published as Impressions of Australian Education, The Free Library Movement and Its Implications and Kinds of Administration.49 Spencer from Britain, reported on technical education in Australia.50 Others to visit included Porter Lee, the Director of
the New York School of Social Work whose illness cut short an inquiry into social work training, John Russell51, George E. Barnett52, who made a study of Australian arbitration systems, C.Hartley Grattan, a journalist, and Frank Tose, Chief, Department of Visits, California Academy of Sciences, who visited Australian and New Zealand Museums. Most of the people receiving visitor grants were men, although there were, towards the end of the 'thirties, several women. Four who stand out were Julia Flynn, Assistant Chief Inspector of Schools in Victoria, Elizabeth Sheppard, Bursar at the Women's College, University of Melbourne, Lorna Byrne, Organiser of the Women's Section of the Agricultural Bureau of New South Wales, and Joan Woodhill, a dietitian from Sydney. Most of the others were involved in kindergarten work. One to make an impact in Western Australia was Miss Gladys Pendred, then Principal of the Kindergarten Teachers' College in Perth. Pendred completed a Bachelor of Science in Comparative Education at Teachers' College Columbia. Mary Guttridge, Melbourne, and Mavis Wauchope, Adelaide, were other early childhood specialists, the former completing several degrees at Columbia in the 1930s and publishing her research with ACER after its formation in 1930. Joan Woodhill, already mentioned, became a leader in the training of dietitians53.

Evaluating the Visitor Grants.
The visitor grants attracted criticism from Isaac Kandel in a pungent report to Keppel in 1937. Kandel claimed that the bureaucratic stranglehold on state education and teacher preparation would never be broken unless younger men and women were given the grants as an investment in the future. More extended visits, he averred, were necessary before informed assessments of American education could be made. Older administrators, in his opinion, were so imbued with the public service culture that they were incapable of changing their minds. Longer visits by younger people, Kandel argued, would bring forth people who would change Australian education. Too many of the younger group (which numbered Cunningham and Wyndham amongst them), however, chose:

' ... too much in the direction of intense specialisation and that chiefly in the direction of psychology and measurement. Too often the brief time abroad is devoted to securing an advanced degree, and the time which might be devoted to broadening one's outlook and preparation is consumed in producing an exercise in research ... which is infinitesimally slight as a contribution to education. The degree in turn is sought as a claim to advancement; but too often its recipients sink into minor positions where they engage in a further round of repeating the exercises that led to it; they are not and are not likely to become leaders.

... Under the present arrangements students go to London or New York but come away ignorant of England or of the United States, however skilled they may be at working out coefficients of correlation. The
situation demands breadth, imagination, vision, and a type of scholarship that can view education steadily and view it whole, that is, not as a system of techniques but as the expression of the culture of a people.'54

James Russell, asked for comment by Keppel, countered by emphasising how much the situation had improved from that he had encountered in the nineteen twenties.

'His [Kandel's] criticism is due in the first instance to his disappointment in finding N.Z. and Australia so ignorant of what has been taking place back "home". He counts them 20 years behind. My comment, I recall, was 40 years. Surely a gain of 20 years in a ten year period is most encouraging!!'55

Keppel stressed the powerful positions held by those selected for grants, and the change they could implement upon their return. Russell pointedly asked also:

'Would Shelley (NZ), Harkness, Rae, Edwards, Cannon, Brooks, Adey, Cameron, Browne and others be better off now without the travel experience we gave them? (You can lead a horse to water -!). One advantage not mentioned - they get some understanding of what and why they do things the way they do. It's how much better they understand their own system'.56

Russell believed Kandel weakened his case by mentioning names of people achieving reforms who, unbeknown to Kandel, had been travel grant beneficiaries. Further, he believed that Kandel was too wedded to the American system of education to see Australian institutions in a favourable light. Kandel was not convinced.

"I rather strengthened it [my case] by the small numbers that I could mention. Of those listed, I would say that half of them have not been seriously affected by their visits abroad and are confirmed in their prior faith in their own systems; the other half were au fait with what is going on and are first rank men anyhow, and happen to be in teacher training work with all the limitations that I mentioned."57

In further defending the grants, Russell and Keppel reflected on publicity attending the grants and reports by recipients, which gained remarkable coverage in local media because of the very absence of virtually any other foundation money available to Australians at the time. Russell asked Keppel the rhetorical question: 'Read the press. How much 'education' was front page news [in Australia] ten years ago?' A review of files tends to confirm this viewpoint, and there is no doubt that library reform owed a great deal to public controversy following the Munn-Pitt report. A comment made by Joan Woodhill in
1939, after receiving a travel grant to further her work in dietetics, typifies the public impact. She wrote that 'prior to the announcement of her Carnegie grant, interest in Sydney in dietetics as a career was about nil. When it became known she had [the] grant, her hospital received a flood of applications from girls who wanted to become dietitians.'58

Fred Clarke confirmed the views of Russell and Keppel in his report on his own tour in 1936. His assessment was that:

>'Even from my own necessarily hurried observation it was clear that the policy [regarding travel grants] was having a most beneficial effect. And it has come into operation at just the right time, just when the phase of development which these communities have reached, and the insistent demands of a changed and much more exacting world, are forcing them to realise the need for strengthening their cultural resources, and broadening the range over which new inspiration is to be sought'59

There nevertheless was considerable merit in Kandel's observations. Russell, Keppel and also Clarke would naturally defend the grants. But reports, even some that were published by ACER, submitted by those on grants do tend to defend the status quo in Australian education, especially academic standards embedded in "conservative" curricula and examinations and also the egalitarian purposes and geographical dilemmas behind centralised administration. Departmental officials were inclined to rate their systems among "the best in the world" although showing themselves to be open to aspects of the progressive message coming out of North America at the time.

Russell summed up his views on the visitor's grants, when observing that:

>'True, they [the visitors' grants] may not be revolutionary and yet most valuable. He [Kandel] does not have the administrative slant and may not appreciate the quiet workings of a ferment that ultimately fits the loaf for baking.'60

He suggested, however, that his son John, who was planning a private trip in mid-1938 to Australia, should quietly contact grant recipients and evaluate their impressions for reference to the Corporation. Russell also expressed some regret that visitors other than Kandel, whose report he thought extremely valuable, 'could not have spent their time in learning about another type of education instead of exposing their own nakedness. Strangers to our way of doing things do not always understand that we tolerate radicals in order to keep conservatives on their toes!'61 In that context, crisis conditions of the nineteen thirties depression had kindled lively debates about education in Australia, though much of it home-grown. These combined with the critiques from overseas experts to ginger up the local educational reform agendas.
Travel Grants for Australia's Librarians.
It is not intended in this paper to detail the climactic influence on Australia's public library system of Ralph Munn's report with Ernest Pitt in 1934. The first survey of the nation's libraries by an overseas expert, this report was the catalyst behind major improvements that followed after World War II. For present purposes, however, what was particularly significant was the formation, on advice from the Munn-Pitt report, of a professional librarians' institute and the allocation of Carnegie money to enable the best library personnel from Australia to visit the USA. All the key state and Commonwealth library leaders benefited: W.H.Ifould, John Metcalfe (Sydney), Ernest Pitt and A.B.Foxcroft (Melbourne), Kenneth Binns and Harold White (National Library, Canberra) and H.M.Hale (Adelaide) were prominent, and their travel grant reports were influential in the development of post-war policy. Librarians from Western Australia and Queensland were conspicuous by their absence, however, reflecting local antagonism towards change and the influence of particular personalities (J.S.Battye for example). Most of the librarians also visited Britain and Europe, and so were exposed for the first time to the best practice available around the world. Money to support training courses also was allocated in 1939.62 The Corporation also extended travel grants to the most prominent museum curators and art gallery directors63. They, like the librarians, benefited from seeing the best practice available overseas, although Carnegie leaders described most of the galleries and museums as rather shabby and pathetic, and realised that talent in the field was very thin by the time, in 1939, when a visitor's grant was extended to Glauert from Western Australia..64

The New Education Fellowship Conferences 1937.
Whatever the truth might be regarding the travel grants, one observation is fully justified: the holding of the New Education Fellowship Conferences in Australia during 1937 proved to be a major catalyst for change. Cunningham, Russell's "agent" in Australia, attended the NEF conference in South Africa during 1935, and won support for a later conference to be held in Australia during 1937. The Carnegie Corporation agreed to help ACER with travel and expenses for a number of the visiting specialists who would be invited to address the conference meetings in each state. The library group, meanwhile, formed an Australian Institute of Librarians in Canberra during 1937 and joined the educationists to run their own state meetings alongside the NEF meetings. This joining of forces was the well-spring from which came growing community agitation for state involvement in children's libraries, including those in schools.65 A number of the visitors were radicals whose perhaps unduly harsh criticisms of Australian education clashed strongly with ACER's policy
of avoiding open confrontation with state education directors. Others were more circumspect, but none the less stimulating. The proceedings of the conference, published under the editorship of Cunningham as Education for Complete Living (1937), were extremely influential in opening up a free flow of new ideas, changing the "culture' of Australian education in preparation for many of the reforms that followed during and after World War II.

Kandel was not so convinced about the conference. He believed that the more radical speakers alienated support in Australia. He believed this was reflected in the fact that newspaper publicity, although widespread during the conferences, virtually disappeared within weeks. From a European background himself, Kandel was an educational conservative in many ways, certainly no rabid progressive although he saw merit in decentralised administration and a more liberal approach to curriculum, examinations and teacher training. Keppel and Russell were more positive, although anxious to distance themselves from the more radical people engaged as conference speakers since the Carnegie Corporation had nothing to do with their selection.

International Relations and Pacific Affairs.
Carnegie Corporation initiatives extended beyond education and libraries to foster an emerging national interest in international relations, Pacific affairs and American foreign policy. In the broader frame of foreign relations, Carnegie assistance to the Australian Institute of Political Science and the Institute for International Affairs during the 1930s marked something of a watershed in American-Australian relations. Before the State Department became formally involved, with an exchange of commissioners with Australia in 1940, Carnegie played a small yet influential role in at least three directions: the dissemination of knowledge about Australia and New Zealand in the United States; the promotion of knowledge about America in the Antipodes; and the development of Asian-Pacific studies with links to American institutions involved in the field. Recipients of Carnegie travel included William Macmahon Ball and William Gray whose work on international and Pacific affairs was seminal in Australian university circles. Carnegie visitors to Australia - Charles Hartley Grattan and Dr. Tyler Dennett - exercised a remarkably powerful influence on international studies in Australia and also interpreted Australian life and culture for American consumption.

A Review.

Even though the amounts of money expended in Australia were modest by standards of Carnegie money spent elsewhere during the 1930s - the Australian grants were something of a sideshow to the main thrust of the Corporation's work - their impact on Australian education was impressive. A whole generation of educational, library and adult
education leaders was given rare insights into overseas developments at a time when the nation was reeling from the depression. Institutions involved, which are the backbone of cultural formation, received a much needed injection of new ideas that eventually percolated to the surface of the nation's cultural life. The NEF Conference was a high point in Australian education. Cunningham later described it and ACER's role in library reform as the most memorable events in his professional life with ACER66. As for ACER, it achieved notable success in promoting a research culture in Australian education despite very tight budgets and facing a sometimes hostile environment in the state education departments. Its influence on Australian education was profound. The significance of the Munn-Pitt report on Australian libraries needs no further emphasis here.

Given the enormously beneficial effects of Carnegie operations in Australia, what credence can be given the more radical critique of corporation activities? One can certainly identify the elitism depicted in revisionist accounts, and the clubbie nature of this leadership is also borne out from a close acquaintance with the filed correspondence in the Carnegie records. The correspondence of Russell, Keppel and others also reveals them to have been remarkably well informed about intricacies of Australian politics and regional jealousies. Along with Tate, they were respectably conservative in their views on Australian political life67. There is little evidence from the archival record, however, of excluding from grants people of a more radical temper. Indeed, Keppel and Russell frequently broke away from stated policy towards the travel grants. Even so, their preference for older men in powerful positions was declared policy, and the subject of some conflict between Kandel, Russell and Keppel. But it is difficult to imagine another line of action that would not have subjected the whole reform effort to impossible political and inter-state jealousies.

There is a related question as to whether this Australian elite warrants the significance implied in the radical critique drawn from domestic and African experience. The Australian librarians certainly fit this description, as borne out in the literature on Australian library development. As for Australia's educators in the nineteen thirties, their political and social standing was probably constrained by their connections with the lower status fields of primary and vocational education. The private school heads were more involved in elite cultural circles, but only two of them - Robson and Buntine - were selected, and they could stomach none of the American progressive ideas. State secondary education policy after the war, however, was strongly affected by two state directors, Wyndham and Robertson - who both benefited from Carnegie travel grants. Rather than from the ranks of older, more senior bureaucrats, they were from among the middle level of state educators whom Kandel had championed. Their later careers, however, were greatly enhanced by exposure during and after the war to national developments of major consequence. American ideas on secondary education were but one of many competing pressures for educational reform at the time.
Carnegie grants to university professors and administrators and to American academic visitors went to a more typical cultural elite as described in the radical literature. However, the benefits to Australian academic research were incontestable, as was the widening of Australian understanding of American and Pacific affairs. To paint people involved as unwitting dupes of American cultural imperialism is to ignore the pre-Carnegie void in Australian university research and the vital importance of better understanding of Pacific relations at the time. Keppel was not entirely dissembling, moreover, when asserting that the Corporation relied mainly on dominion initiatives in deciding which programs and people it should support.

What of the wish to insinuate American ideas and institutions into Australian education and culture? The Carnegie activities certainly helped to nudge the attention of Australia's educational leadership away from Britain, or at least to balance the previously rather supine acceptance of everything British as superior to anything else! One has only to see the tentacles of Columbia University reaching out to accept that the Carnegie policy was quite effective, at least in the long term. Pearl Harbour and the fall of Singapore, however, were infinitely more important in turning Australian attentions towards American political, economic and cultural ideas.

As for the observation that foundations like Carnegie fostered acceptance of research paradigms that preserved conservative political, social and economic systems, the evidence needs prudent assessment that is beyond the scope of the present paper. At one level, Cunningham and ACER were certainly instrumental in bringing to Australia the patterns of standardised achievement and intelligence testing and the "hard" statistical, social science, approach to educational research that swept America during the 1920s and 1930s. This has been painted by radicals as confirming the status quo in social class divisions through selection and selective provision for post-elementary education. Even so, historical works and descriptive surveys by local and overseas experts stirred the pot on educational reform, and the "progressive" education movement in Australia was given an enormous "leg up" through the tours undertaken by Australians and especially the NEF Conference of 1937. These influences were hardly conservative; and indeed scandalised the more traditionalist bureaucrats in Australian education during the decade.

The Carnegie Corporation activities, whatever else they might represent, stand out as perhaps the most remarkable phenomenon in Australian education between the two world wars. Along with home-grown educational ferment in the depression years, the Carnegie influences are crucial to understanding the sea-change that occurred in Australian education during the nineteen thirties. Financial stringency delayed implementation of many ideas originating in the lively 'thirties. But reforms flowed quickly towards the end of the war and afterwards. Keppel in 1937 recorded his own and James Russell's view:
'Last week I was talking with Dean Russell, who has been telling the history of the early days at Teachers College in the Dodge lectures, and we agreed that what had happened in Australia since his visit nine years ago is a real (sic) historic event; and we are certainly proud of our connection with it; and do realise it would have been quite impossible to achieve it had it not been for the part played by Russell, Tate and last, but not least, Cunningham.'68
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