



The Australian Anthropological Society Newsletter

Number 91, September 2003

REGISTRATION NO. Y02862.32 ABN 27 776 118 160 INCORPORATED IN NSW 1988

AAS Newsletter Contributions

Please submit contributions for the next Newsletter by Monday 1 December by contacting one or other of the co-editors:

Rosita.Henry@jcu.edu.au

Phone (07) 47814966

m.patterson@anthropology.unimelb.edu.au

Phone (03) 83447572

Back issues of the Newsletter are available on the AAS website: <http://www.aas.asn.au>

Is there a future for anthropological consultants in Australia?

Julie Finlayson

Introduction

Over the past few months Cape York Aboriginal leader Noel Pearson has referred to anthropologists working in native title as part of a 'B grade industry'. His criticism has at times included anthropologists working more generally in Australian Aboriginal affairs and encompassed centres within at least one university where academic anthropologists and other social scientists also contribute to policy research in matters of Indigenous affairs.

This paper makes no comment on the accuracy of Pearson's remarks but it does argue that consultant and other applied anthropologists need to be more broadly aware of what is happening in their field, and that the profession must collectively respond to the issues confronting it. My focus is largely on the native title area, although I suggest that the matters I raise are not confined to it.

While my own contact with many Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs) has provided some insight into the working conditions and expectations new recruits face, it has certainly not provided confidence about the available professional development and career opportunities new graduates can expect. For example, as a

general operating principle, little, if any, professional development training is provided to NTRB staff. At the level of the professional association, the AAS Clearing House is one step to providing a forum for consideration and attention to professionalism. It also recognises that without collective professional action the specificity of many aspects of the practitioner's employment conditions in the Australian field at least will result in the anthropologist developing a professional 'use-by' date. This may not yet be apparent to those still working in the Aboriginal field; nevertheless it will be a pertinent concern if the practitioner attempts to reposition their career outside that sector.

In view of the challenges to our professionalism generally, the AAS Clearing House sub-committee has organised a special forum for independent consulting anthropologists on the afternoon immediately prior to the annual conference in Sydney. One highlight is a workshop planned with guest speaker Dr Barbara Woodward, a workplace consultant and career coach, as well as an opportunity for sole practitioners to exchange professional experiences and to meet socially. Invitations to participate in the Clearing House forum were widely and repeatedly publicised on AASNET over some period. The forum is not, however, restricted to Clearing House members only, but can be attended by any interested anthropologists, including students, for a fee of \$50.00 (tax deductible).

However, the limited response surprised me. Why should this be the case in times of falling academic employment opportunities but an over-demand in applied work opportunities? Are anthropologists sufficiently secure in their professional opportunities to be justifiably complacent about their future employment options? Or are there other factors at play, for example, aspects of an apparently entrenched disciplinary culture identified by Annette Hamilton in her address to the 2002 annual AAS conference?¹

In her keynote address, Hamilton initially addressed the future of anthropology as a continuing academic practice by asking how well it reproduced itself in the academy. On the basis of her knowledge and observations, she

¹ See Hamilton, A. 2003. 'Beyond Anthropology, Towards Actuality', *TAJA*, 14:2, 160-170.

argued that unlike other social sciences, anthropology has failed to retain a significant position within academic teaching and research. In her view anthropology's demise has come from a failure to apply its methodology and tools to the broad concerns of the human experience and to effectively engage with other disciplines equally focused on these concerns. Such failure might be attributable to the failure of anthropologists to act collectively.

Hamilton surveyed the 2002 AAS current membership list of anthropologists who are employed in Australian universities. She states that

This gives a total of around 113 identifiable anthropologists working in Australian academic environments. Of these, slightly more than 50% appear to be members of AAS, ranging from 12.5% in one department to 70% in another. However, there are many more members of AAS, totalling around 293... ..Notably, only two members specifically identified as 'consultants' even though many do undertake consultancy work either on a full-time basis or from time to time. The 'consultancy' activities however are invisible on the membership database. (Hamilton 2003: 162)

She found that the available AAS membership data makes it impossible to numerically quantify this sector or to capture the varied membership. In fact, while membership of the Clearing House is the only source of AAS figures on independent consultants, not all Clearing House members are primarily independent practitioners nor are all applied anthropologists members of either AAS or the Clearing House. In fact, very few AAS members are also Clearing House members.

Anthropology outside the academy

As Dean of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of New South Wales, Hamilton has the advantage of observing contemporary trends and suggestive future directions of the discipline within the academy. One of her concerns is that the teaching of anthropology should continue to operate from a secure base within the academy. However, achieving even this goal can be difficult in conditions of intra- and inter-institutional and disciplinary competition for students and resources. By contrast, applied anthropology can flourish outside institutional contexts.

While this may be the case, the challenge for consultant anthropologists in applied work is the individual and collective need to think strategically about future work - not least because there may be a kernel of truth in Pearson's opinion that anthropology provides a less than professional source of accessible and cogent analysis and advice on important issues.

Moreover, the nature of contemporary applied practice in Aboriginal Australia may limit the scope for professionalism, since all too often applied anthropological practice flourishes in particular niches through a covert system of personal/professional

patronage. The capacity of such a 'system' to flourish does so at the expense of employing bodies developing merit-based performance indicators in their relationship with consultants.²

The need for better data

Yet the capacity of the Clearing House to engage either its membership or that of the Society more generally on such issues has been limited. Quite rightly, Hamilton has drawn attention to the importance of the Society more accurately reflecting the professional circumstances of members in its data collection. There are several good reasons to support such advice.

First, the Society needs information to argue for the necessary resources for post-graduate students to conduct credible field work. Second, the Society needs to open and lead debate on anthropological employment before this is conducted by those who, based on their dealings with our discipline in legal and legislative process, are less than sympathetic. A third immediate reason for data collection is that the AAS executive receives requests from both its membership and external parties on a range of key professional issues such as;

- The nature and areas of specialised anthropological expertise and practice;
- The nature of individual professional qualifications for industry specific applied work (for example, in native title work or cultural heritage work) since this is not widely known outside specialised groups within the anthropological profession;
- Fee scales and how these related to qualifications, experience and tasks, and market forces;
- How and where to seek appropriate referees.

Detailed content on the nature of any of these issues in relation to the individual and collective practice of academic anthropologists, full time anthropological consultants, or salaried applied anthropologists could not be readily provided by AAS at present. Of course, a database capable of dealing with such descriptive detail is only a beginning. Nevertheless, the wider point stands, namely, the need for the Society to develop strategic options to advance and protect the interests of members and indeed, to enhance the future options for the profession inside and outside the academy.

Many applied anthropologists work from home offices in social and professional isolation from one another, the wider profession, and potential employers. This isolation was confirmed by a recent request on AASNET for

² Indeed, based on extensive experience with many native title representative bodies I would suggest that even within these organisations which heavily rely on external anthropological consultants, the established academic tradition and quality control mechanism of peer review is not widely applied.

information about consultancy remuneration rates, the scope of fees, and what related duties could be expected for various services based on qualifications and experience.³

In considering how to address these matters the fundamental question is whether it is possible to make a viable career in applied anthropology given observation of current trends and practices in the applied field in Aboriginal Australia. In my view, the question is of importance to all applied anthropologists working in Aboriginal Australia particularly.

Transference of skills and further skill development in applied organisational contexts

For new anthropology graduates employment opportunities in applied work in native title, heritage and land rights are currently plentiful. But I wonder what professional career options linked to these fields the graduate will be able to realise.

My observations of anthropologists in native title representative bodies are that professional development opportunities are limited to the particularities of the daily work experience. Unfortunately, some organisations are also dismissive of the anthropologist's need to participate in disciplinary workshops and conferences. In the native title arena ATSIC (now ATSIIS) has consistently funded opportunities for NTRB staff to attend the annual national native title conference and in some cases the NTRB technical working group meetings; although too often it is legal staff who benefit from the technical workshops. Embracing these opportunities, however, is not sufficient for professional and organisational capacity building. Anecdotal observation suggests that in many NTRB's the organisational development and application of anthropological knowledge is poorly understood and (with limited exceptions) randomly addressed.

The new graduate is usually unaware of the environment they are entering or how to handle high workloads, negotiate intense political pressures, and competently perform in an often hostile, volatile and technically complex operating environment. Such contexts require support to develop competency in one's own discipline together with knowledge of the wider policy environment, the legal and legislative processes involved and a capacity to work productively with colleagues from other technical and professional backgrounds for common goals and organisational outcomes. In such environments is it any wonder that staff turnover is high, or as many organisations are now finding, that it is increasingly difficult to find and retain competent staff?

Informal operational models initially developed to manage logistical issues are now proving to be sources of

additional problems. For example, a number of NTRBs locate legal staff in a capital city while other professionals, including anthropologists, remain at the 'coal face' in the remote or regional centre. Inequities in working conditions between professionals are emerging as a potential disincentive to new graduates and experienced professionals alike. A further example of the sedimentation of an informal employment strategy has been for many NTRBs to out-source anthropological research. Again, the practice has often been an appropriate strategy for particular circumstances. However, over time this 'model' for research is denying in-house anthropologists the opportunity to expand or apply their professional skills and in the worst cases, the staff anthropologist is reduced to the role of an administrative officer (pers.com).

For those anthropologists who complete their three-year contract with an NTRB and are now ready to move on the question is... to what and where?

What future in applied anthropology outside the NTRB?

There is some potential for recycling through employment with native title sister organisations, and possibly a crossover to the land rights arena in the Northern Territory and in Queensland (although applied work under the Queensland Land Rights legislation has dwindled over the past few years). Lawyers have managed to cross sectors successfully, often leveraging their skills into other institutions in the native title field such as the National Native Title Tribunal. But there is less evidence of the capacity of anthropologists to make such career transitions.

Similarly, anthropologists with a background in native title who seek work in broader community development and other applied anthropological contexts will often find that many of their research tools, skills and experience are too specific. The specificities of the native title environment are not always sufficiently generic for eligibility in other applied anthropological or social science research.

Certainly, applied anthropologists are sought for AUSAID positions in South East Asia and the Pacific. However, many of these opportunities require experience in project management, financial management, policy development, team work, and a capacity to supervise others. However, few NTRBs offer staff training courses or formalised experience in these areas or ancillary fields such as IT, management, or broad-based social science methodologies. Without access to on-going professional development and skills enhancement the potential for skills transference and employment mobility for applied anthropologists is limited.

Based on this evidence I suggest that the person seeking a career in applied anthropology needs to ensure that they take responsibility for pro-actively developing their own career strategy including,

³ I would add that anthropologists employed in native title representative organisations are often working in ignorance of any industry-wide comparative fee scales, working conditions and duty statements. Without such information they are basically guessing what appropriate salaries and conditions can be negotiated in work place/enterprise bargain agreements.

- Constantly upgrade their professional skills, (often by adding additional skills such as in IT, management or mediation, for example);
- Seeking a range of work opportunities to expand their career options, and resisting the call to over-specialise;
- Developing a career plan, by seeking professional advice, or at the very least, participating in informed discussions with appropriately experienced peers;
- Undertaking short-term accredited training courses (such as in project or contract management)⁴;
- Developing business skills, including a business and marketing plan for consultancy growth.

The difficulty for many anthropologists new to the consultancy field is that they cannot foresee the destination at the end of the route on which they have unwittingly embarked. Some portents of the destination as I see it are described above. Given such assessment of the current situation, the underlying issue is whether it is possible to develop a professional career path for applied anthropologists and simultaneously avoid the 'B-grade industry' syndrome.

Consultancy in the career life cycle

Many of my remarks above are relevant to applied salaried employment. However, the consultant applied anthropologist also confronts major career challenges. A key issue for anyone embarking on a consultancy career in applied work, for example, is the financial aspects of running a small business. Some consultants may have partners able to support the business by providing a 'bread-and-butter' wage for daily living costs and to support the cash flow shortfalls in consultancy. On the basis of the evidence, such support may be essential. Recently published research conducted by credit rating firm Dun and Bradstreet with Australian and New Zealand small businesses and published in *The Australian* showed that,

...the average payment period (to small business consultants) was 65 days past the due date (*The Australian*, June 19th 2003).

On the other hand for consultants enjoying applied work as a second career following retirement from the academy, the financial issues may be less serious. Individuals in this situation are more likely to have some form of financial support underpinning their consultancy work. These observations suggest that consultancy employment may be more feasible at some points in a

career lifecycle than at other points. However, the thrust of this paper is directed primarily at new, and often junior, applied anthropologists by arguing for the importance of strategic management of their career paths.

The applied working environment in Aboriginal Australia involves a small field of players most of whom are known to each other. The patronage system of employment provides opportunities and security for some, but not for others. Knowledge of employment opportunities often comes from word-of-mouth contacts, networks and personal recommendations. Advertised tenders are regarded with some ambivalence, not only because of the preparation time involved, but also because they are often a 'fishing expedition' by an agency to canvass the potential field. There may not be a 'real' job behind the tender.

One of the more disturbing emerging employment practices is recruitment based largely on e-mail contact and circulation of a CV alone. No interview occurs, either by telephone or face-to-face contact and, once a decision is made, no feedback is provided as to why a candidate is unsuccessful. This is a poor method of recruiting staff to say the least. However, it is also extremely deleterious to consultants who need information and feedback to gauge their position and to improve their marketability in a competitive field. It denies them the necessary opportunity for improving or addressing issues compromising their capacity to win employment. Indeed, the capacity for organisations to operate with such practises raises again the importance of establishing formalised, transparent, equitable and accountable recruitment methods based on merit and performance.

Conclusions

I have adopted a 'warts and all' approach to exposing critical pitfalls to negotiating a viable career as an applied anthropologist. Research on career cycles in the Western world suggests that individuals are likely to have several careers during their working life. For individuals who want continuing employment in anthropology, the challenge is to think carefully and strategically about how to achieve this. As the professional body, AAS has a role to play in reversing the trends Hamilton observed regarding anthropology's role and status in the academy. I believe the Society also has a responsibility to support the possibility for a broad range of anthropological careers. This paper is an invitation for professional discussion of such matters.

Julie Finlayson,
 Anthropos Consulting Services,
 Canberra.
 E-mail: Julie.Finlayson@anthropos.com.au

⁴ Many Universities and TAFE colleges have professional development arms who offer short-term intensive skills orientated courses, for example a two day course in the fundamentals of project management.

Mentoring Pilot Program for Junior Anthropologists in Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs)

Background

A pilot project for mentoring anthropologists new to native title work is currently being conducted with support from the National Native Title Tribunal and the Native Title and Land Rights Branch of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services (ATSIS). The idea developed from informal discussions amongst concerned senior anthropologists in the Australian Anthropological Society about difficulties encountered by graduate anthropologists working in native title for the first time, who are frequently employed in native title representative bodies without senior anthropological staff.

The pilot provides short-term focused professional development and support of anthropological skills in native title research. A second outcome has been the opportunity to assess the feasibility and capacity of such mentoring to enhance skill transference and professional development. The pilot programme operates with five mentors and five mentored and runs for twelve months. The participating mentors were invited to take on the role and those mentored were selected by their organisation. However, the selection principle for organisational participation was to offer placements to those with the greatest need for mentoring support. The pilot will conclude, following evaluation, in April 2004.

The Project objectives are:

- To explore the potential to mentor inexperienced junior staff anthropologists in identified NTRBs Australia-wide
- To boost the immediate performance of representative body employees and to assist ATSIS to direct funds to obtain long-lasting future benefit in this area
- To promote a generic mentoring practice across all native title expert practitioners, and to promote the efficacy of this approach to the professional associations that service these disciplines, thereby assisting mediation processes for native title determinations.

Preliminary findings

Ideally, mentoring benefits all those involved. Some advantages of being mentored are stated in the literature as being support for setting and achieving goals, increased confidence and self-esteem, personal growth and extended networks and development of support systems. Mentors benefit too, through increased self-awareness, access to different perspectives on issues and by making a professional contribution. Organisations gain from improved employee commitment, attracting and retaining staff, and building organisational capacity.

However, as project coordinator it will be my task to assess how far these benefits are achievable. At this stage however, some preliminary remarks can be made.

First, it is already clear that communication between mentors and mentored without face-to-face contact has difficulties in terms of sustaining momentum. All communication during the pilot occurs through distance methods (largely e-mail or telephone contact).⁵

Second, the capacity of the mentor and the person mentored to sustain a regular relationship can be compromised by the busy field schedules and work demands of both parties. This can make communication on a regular basis a challenge. Pleasingly, most partnerships have managed to recognise the challenge and have devised solutions to deal with it.

The pilot is also exposing wider professional issues of interest to AAS and other institutions relying on the professional skills and expertise of anthropologists. Some examples are identified below.

Negotiating Employment

Many of the anthropologists being mentored are in the early stages of their employment careers. A serious concern for them is lack of direct access to information about professional employment and development. AAS has not been able to meet such needs and indeed has no mechanisms at present for doing so. New graduates therefore face negotiating the terms and conditions of their salary and other employment conditions under workplace agreements without any coherent professional advice or assistance, apart from that provided by a union where it is involved.

There is clearly a need for an agency such as the professional body to circulate information about job descriptions, employment terms and remuneration. This is especially the case in the applied field because recruitment, employment terms and salary levels are not pegged to any particular awards unlike the universities.⁶ At present, knowledge of employment options, terms and conditions tends to circulate informally amongst peers. In addition, without direct access to a reliable source of comparative data it is difficult for all anthropologists, to negotiate a work place agreement with an informed view.

5 Although some mentors and mentored have had the opportunity to meet briefly

6 Some NTRBs/Land Councils operate on Commonwealth employment terms and rankings while others may be linked to State Government scales and classifications, and others again operate with what seems to be more 'informal' arrangements .ATSIS has in the past provided notional advice on pay scales and job descriptions, but these do not appear to be mandatory not are they monitored for consistency.

Career issues

All those mentored are employed in NTRBs. Elsewhere in this Newsletter I have raised concerns about what career paths are available to applied anthropologists working in indigenous Australia. This is also an emerging concern for many of the mentored, not least because for staff anthropologists of NTRBs claims research is frequently out-sourced to more senior consulting anthropologists and correspondingly, desk top research—and often mundane administrative and logistical support—is relegated to in-house anthropologists.

The corollary of this practice is the essential deskilling of the in-house staff, failure to develop professional capacity and little if any professional knowledge and skill transference from the external professional to the organisation.

Moreover, all parties in the mentoring pilot have argued that NTRB workloads negatively impact on the capacity of the mentoring relationship to operate fully. Some participants have experienced less than full support or interest from their management for participation in the scheme.

Conclusions

This is an early preview of some key issues to date from my management of the mentoring pilot. They are of course therefore only preliminary and will be subject to change. They are also my views and not necessarily shared collectively by either the mentors or the mentored.

What is clear however is that for the pilot study we have had a remarkable group of mentors to work with! These individuals have taken to the task with dedication and engaged with the responsibilities involved with a high level of professionalism. Indicators to date suggest that the experiences of the mentored confirm this.

Inquiries about the program can be directed to:

The Facilitator
Mentoring Pilot Program
Dr Julie Finlayson
0419 994 708
email Julie.Finlayson@anthropos.com.au

Revised Code of Ethics

A revised Ethics Code was circulated in June to the AAS membership. The Ethics Code has now been amended further after the incorporation of AAS members' comments. This is the final opportunity for members to raise any issues relating to the Code of Ethics before the AGM in Sydney in October when we would like to propose acceptance of this revised Code. The deadline for final comments is 30 September.

Please send any comments to:

mandy.thomas@anu.edu.au

The two key concerns of those who have commented have been dealt with in the following way:

1. Whether the Code can be enforceable and members expelled if they do not behave ethically.

In the AAS constitution we have no procedures for disciplining members or adjudicating accusations of unethical behaviour. If we decide that we can reject members or expel them for unethical behaviour we need clearly defined procedures and there will be legal ramifications - people may appeal and sue the Society for example. For these reasons the Ethics Sub-Committee decided not to focus on enforcement of the Code. Rather, the Code will reflect best practice and make the statement that it is assumed that all members share values embodied by the Code of Ethics.

2. Informed consent and who are the 'research participants' to be informed

Because of the varied nature of anthropological research, and the many situations in which it occurs the Code has had to provide general principles of informed consent but mentions also the difficulties in obtaining consent in certain situations (such as conflict situations, repressive regimes etc.). It is also made clear that 'research participants' is a broad term and that it is not always possible or desirable to obtain consent from all participants.

DRAFT only

17 September 2003

**AUSTRALIAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL
SOCIETY
Code of Ethics**

1. Introduction

1.1 This Code for ethical practice recognises that anthropological work is broad in scope and includes academic research, teaching, consultancies and public commentary. In a field of such complex involvements and obligations, it is inevitable that misunderstandings, conflicts, and the need to make choices among apparently incompatible values will arise. Anthropologists are responsible for grappling with such difficulties and struggling to resolve them in ways compatible with the principles stated here. The Code aims to exemplify the best standards of ethical practice and human rights. For biological anthropologists it additionally aims to embody the best standards of practice in humane dealings with non-human animals involved in research. The Code also sets out practical recommendations for anthropologists undertaking research and aims to foster discussion and education within the profession about ethical obligations and challenges involved in the generation, dissemination, and utilization of anthropological knowledge. The

objectives of the Code are to provide the consensus view of ethical practice among members of the Australian Anthropological Society, to elaborate on the standards we share, to aid members in making informed decisions about their own practices, and to help them communicate their professional positions more clearly to other parties. The Australian Anthropological Society cannot investigate or adjudicate allegations about unethical behaviour.

1.2 All members of the Society are assumed to share this Code of Ethics. In applying for new membership or renewal of membership, applicants are also assumed to share this Code of Ethics.

1.3 In this document, 'anthropologist' refers to anyone eligible for membership of the Society; 'sponsor' refers to an employer, granting body or client which engages the services of an anthropologist; 'research participants' are the persons (or non human-animals) who in some aspect or other, are the subject of anthropological investigation; and 'representatives' are those persons and organizations which play a role in representing research participants. Anthropologists have the responsibility for ethical dealing in each of these sets of relationships.

2. Agreeing to work

2.1 Anthropological work should optimally be carried out only where there is informed consent by research participants, or those providing information, owning or controlling access to material being studied, or otherwise identified as having interests which might be impacted on by the research. At the same time, it is understood that in some circumstances such as in conflict situations or where researchers or participants may be endangered by such a process, it may not be possible to obtain informed consent. In most situations, however, anthropological work should be carried out only where all participating parties are informed and agree upon the terms of work.

3. Relations with research participants

3.1 Where a conflict of views or interests arises among the parties to research, anthropologists should endeavour to ascertain the views of the various research participants, as independently and impartially as possible.

3.2 Where live non-human animals are studied by a biological anthropologist, the anthropologist must do everything in their power to ensure that the research does not harm the safety, psychological well-being or survival of the animals or species with which they work.

3.2 An anthropologist should not reveal personal identities or confidential information except by agreement with those whose identities or knowledge have been recorded by the anthropologist. In the case of deceased persons, anthropologists should have due regard to the interests

and feelings of their surviving kin and fellow community members.

3.3 An anthropologist should explain to the research participants that, despite every effort anthropologists may make to preserve the anonymity or privacy of individuals or the confidential status of information, there may arise legal contexts where those efforts fail.

3.4 Researchers are responsible for identifying and complying with the various informed consent codes, laws and regulations affecting their projects. Informed consent, for the purposes of these guidelines, does not necessarily imply or require a particular written or signed form. It is the quality of the consent, not the format, that is relevant.

The principle of informed consent expresses the belief in the need for truthful and respectful exchanges between social researchers and the research participants.

(a) Negotiating consent entails communicating information likely to be material to a person's willingness to participate, such as: - the purpose(s) of the study, and the anticipated consequences of the research; the identity of funding bodies and sponsors; the anticipated uses of the data; possible benefits of the study and possible harm or discomfort that might affect participants; issues relating to data storage and security; and the degree of anonymity and confidentiality which may be afforded to informants and subjects.

(b) Conditions which constitute an absence of consent made after the research is completed is not meaningful consent at all. Further, the research participants must have the legal capacity to give consent. Where subjects are unwilling to participate in a piece of research but are legally compelled to do so (eg. by their employer or government), consent cannot be said to have been meaningfully given by subjects, and anthropologists are advised not to pursue that piece of work.

(c) Consent in research is a process, not a one-off event, and may require renegotiation over time; it is an issue to which the anthropologist should return periodically.

(d) When technical data-gathering devices such as audio/visual-recorders and photographic records are being used research participants should be made aware of the capacities of such devices and be free to reject their use.

(e) When information is being collected from proxies, care should be taken not to infringe the 'private space' of the subject or the relationship between subject and proxy; and if there are indications that the person concerned would object to certain information being disclosed, such information should not be sought by proxy;

(f) The long period over which anthropologists make use of their data and the possibility that unforeseen uses or theoretical interests may arise in the future may need to be conveyed to participants, as should any likelihood that the data may be shared (in some form) with other colleagues or be made available to sponsors, funding bodies or other interested parties, or deposited in archives.

3.5 Results of research should be communicated back to the research participants, their next of kin or someone in their close social network. Anticipated practical consequences of the research should be properly considered and explained to research participants. Where necessary, interpreters should be used in such consultations to ensure adequate understanding on both sides.

3.6 Anthropologists should be aware of the intrusive potential of some of their enquiries and methods. They should scrutinise their research proposals and activities so as to minimise any intrusion:

(a) Like other social researchers, they have no special entitlement to study all phenomena; and the advancement of knowledge and the pursuit of information are not in themselves sufficient justifications for overriding the values and ignoring the interests of research participants;

(b) Anthropologists should be aware that while it can be a welcome experience for research participants to become the subject of anthropological description and interpretations, it can also be a disturbing one. In many of the social scientific enquiries that have caused controversy this has not arisen because participants have suffered directly or indirectly any actual harm. Rather, the concern has resulted from participants' feelings of having suffered an intrusion into private and personal domains, or of having been wronged, (for example, by having been caused to acquire self-knowledge which they did not seek or want).

3.7 Due acknowledgement of the role of research participants should be made in any reports of research.

It should be recognised that research participants may have contractual and/or legal, interests and rights in data, recordings and publications, although rights will vary according to agreements and legal jurisdiction.

(a) It is the obligation of the interviewer to inform the interviewee of any uses to which the interview is likely to be put (e.g., research, educational use, publication, broadcasting etc).

(b) Under the Australian Copyright Act, researchers making audio or video recordings must obtain 'copyright clearance' from interviewees if recordings are to be publicly broadcast or deposited in public archives. Any restrictions on use (e.g., time period) or other conditions (e.g., preservation of anonymity) which the interviewee requires should be recorded in writing. This is best done at the time of the interview, using a standard form. Retrospective clearance is often time-consuming or impossible where the interviewee is deceased or has moved away.

(c) Interviewers should clarify before interviewing the extent to which the research participants are allowed to see transcripts of interviews and fieldnotes and to alter the

content, withdraw statements, to provide additional information or to add glosses on interpretations.

(d) Clarification must also be given to the research participants regarding the degree to which they will be consulted prior to publication.

3.8 The research participants should receive a fair return for services rendered, or for objects acquired from them by request. Anthropologists should not engage in exploitative relations with the research participants.

3.9 Anthropologists should seek joint status for researcher and the research participants in planning and executing research as far as feasible; notwithstanding 3.8 above, research should involve an essentially collaborative relationship between anthropologist and the research participants.

3.10 Anthropologists should not knowingly or avoidably allow information gained on a basis of the trust and cooperation of the research participants to be used against their legitimate interests by hostile third parties.

3.11 Anthropologists should inform the research participants of the nature of the anthropologist's relations with representatives, representative organisations and sponsors and of their obligations under any contractual arrangement with them.

4. Relations with the profession

4.1 Anthropologists should keep informed of developments in the field of their own anthropological expertise, and be willing to share such knowledge as a means of improving the general standard of anthropological knowledge, theory and practice.

4.2 Anthropologists should maintain integrity in the recording and presentation of anthropological data, and should not discredit the profession of anthropology by knowingly colouring or falsifying observations or interpretations, or making exaggerated or ill-founded assertions, in their professional writings, as expert witnesses, or as authors of any other form of reportage related to their work.

4.3 Anthropologists should not knowingly behave so as to offend research participants in ways which would make future work by other anthropologists unacceptable, unless such action is an unavoidable consequence of a commitment to truthfulness and good conscience.

4.4 Anthropologists should not compete with other anthropologists for employment in a way which may be detrimental to professional standards.

4.5 In agreeing to participate in a research project anthropologists should have regard to whether any aspect of the project is deemed unethical, not simply the part that the anthropologist is directly responsible for.

4.6 Anthropologists should not enter into agreements with sponsors, representatives, representative organizations, research participants or other entities which entail essentially partisan direction of anthropological research, or which confer on those entities powers of partisan censorship over results as distinct from reasonable protection of privacy and confidentiality.

4.7 Members of the Society should not make statements to the media purporting to represent the views of the Society without authorization from the Executive of the Society.

4.8 Anthropologists should support the long-term conservation of the archaeological, fossil, and historical records they deal with in their work.

4.9 Anthropologists should give due consideration to the disposal of their personal effects gained in the course of anthropological work (e.g. field records, ethnological objects) in the event of their incapacitation or death.

4.10 Anthropologists have a duty to be informed about ethical codes relating to their work, and ought periodically to inform themselves of contemporary thought on the relation between research activities and ethical issues.

5. Relations with sponsors, employers and representatives

5.1 Anthropologists should apply professional skill, care and expertise in the conduct of anthropological work and should endeavour to carry it out with due promptness and efficiency.

5.2 Anthropologists should not accept anthropological work which they are insufficiently qualified to do, whether by way of training or experience.

5.3 Anthropologists should state clearly the degree of confidentiality of reports and identify restricted material within them so that sponsors are protected from inadvertent misuse or publication of such material.

5.4 Anthropologists should respect the confidence of sponsors.

5.5 Anthropologists should not agree to clandestine employment by sponsors.

5.6 Anthropologists should come to explicitly contractual arrangements with sponsors before commencing work, specifying the tasks to be done, rights and responsibilities, nature of reportage, agreement with research participants, representatives and representative organisations, copyright and access conditions, and rates of remuneration and costs.

5.7 It is the anthropologist's responsibility to clarify the extent to which his or her role as employee or consultant is essentially fact-finding, or acting as negotiator, or playing an advocacy role etc., and therefore to clarify the extent to which their work can be characterised as anthropological and covered by these ethics, or by other ethical considerations.

5.8 Anthropologists should not enter into agreements with sponsors which do not allow them to withdraw their services on ethical grounds.

5.9 Anthropologists should respect the role of corporate bodies operating on behalf of research participants and should include them where relevant in the negotiation of field research agreements.

5.10 Anthropologists should keep representative organisations informed of their activities in the field and, where there is no breach of confidentiality or agreements with research participants, supply them with copies of research results. Establishing a relationship with a representative body does not do away with the need to get informed consent directly from the subjects of study.

5.11 Anthropologists should respect the confidences of corporate bodies.

6. Relations with students

While it is understood that most universities and educational institutions have their own enforceable codes of conduct regarding relations with students, the statements here refer to anthropologists working either inside or outside these institutional settings.

6.1 Anthropologists should conscientiously strive to give students, trainees and interns or junior colleagues in joint projects an excellent anthropological education.

6.2 Anthropologists should select students without regard to sex, race, ethnic group, age, social class or other factors extraneous to their intellectual potential and suitability as scholars of anthropology.

6.3 Anthropologists should be fair and impartial in assessing student performance.

6.4 Anthropologists should properly inform their students of the ethical, scholarly and practical requirements of taking employment in the field of anthropology.

6.5 Anthropologists should do their best to assist their students in securing professional employment in a field relevant and appropriate to their qualifications.

6.6 Anthropologists should not engage in exploitative relationships with their students.

6.7 Anthropologists should not be involved in sexual liaisons with students, trainees or interns for whose education and professional training they are responsible.

6.8 Anthropologists should be receptive and responsive to the needs, problems and aims of students in relation to their education or career in the field of anthropology.

6.9 Anthropologists should encourage the educational departments in which they work to include and require ethical training in their curriculums.

7. Responsibility to the law

7.1 Anthropologists should take care to know of and generally understand the requirements of laws affecting their professional activity.

7.2 Research conducted outside one's own country raises special ethical and political issues, relating to personal and national disparities in wealth, power, the legal status of the researcher, political interest and national political systems:

(a) Anthropologists should make allowances in their research methodologies for the differences between their own and the civil, legal and financial position of national and foreign researchers and scholars where appropriate;

(b) They should be aware that irresponsible actions by a researcher or research team may jeopardise access to a research setting or even to a whole country for other researchers, both anthropologists and non-anthropologists.

7.3 Anthropologists should be aware of national laws or administrative regulations concerning data dissemination and storage, publication, rights of research subjects, of sponsors and employers. They should also remember that, save in a very few exceptional circumstances, social research data are not privileged under law and may be subject to legal subpoena. Such laws vary by jurisdiction. Some which may have consequences for research and publication in Australia. are, for example, anti-

discrimination laws, defamation laws, copyright law, law of contract, and the Official Secrets Act.

8. Responsibility to the wider public

Anthropologists also have responsibilities towards other members of the public and wider society. They depend upon the confidence of the public and they should in their work attempt to promote and preserve such confidence without exaggerating the accuracy or explanatory power of their findings.

8.1 Anthropologists should use the possibilities open to them to extend the scope of social inquiry, and to communicate their findings, for the benefit of the widest possible community. Anthropologists are most likely to avoid restrictions being placed on their work when they are able to stipulate in advance the issues over which they should maintain control; the greatest problems seem to emerge when such issues remain unresolved until the data are collected or the findings emerge.

8.2 Social inquiry is predicated on the belief that greater access to well-founded information will serve rather than threaten the interests of society:

(a) Nonetheless, in planning all phases of an inquiry, from design to presentation of findings, anthropologists should consider the likely consequences of their research practice for the wider society, groups within it, and possible future research, as well as for members of the research population not directly involved in the study and the immediate research participants;

(b) That information can be misconstrued or misused is not in itself a convincing argument against its collection and dissemination. All information is subject to misuse; and no information is devoid of possible harm to one interest or another. Individuals may be harmed by their participation in social inquiries, or group interests may be harmed by certain findings. Researchers are usually not in a position to prevent action based on their findings. They should, however, attempt to pre-empt likely misinterpretations and to counteract them when they occur.

8.3 Research can never be entirely objective - the selection of topics may reflect a bias in favour of certain cultural or personal values; the employment base of the researcher, the source of funding and various other factors may impose certain priorities, obligations and prohibitions - but anthropologists should strive for objectivity and be open about known barriers to its achievement:

(a) Anthropologists should not engage or collude in selecting methods designed to produce misleading results, or in misrepresenting findings by commission or omission;

(b) When it is likely that research findings will bear upon public policy and opinion anthropologists should be

careful to state the significant limitations on their findings and interpretations.

8.4 Anthropological researchers should make the results of their research appropriately available to sponsors, students, decision makers, and other non-anthropologists. In so doing, they must be truthful; and must consider carefully the social and political implications of the information they disseminate. They must attempt to ensure that such information is well understood, properly contextualized, and responsibly utilized. They should make clear the empirical bases upon which their reports stand, be candid about their qualifications and philosophical or political biases, and recognize and make clear the limits of anthropological expertise. At the same time, they must be alert to possible harm their information may cause people with whom they work or colleagues.

Acknowledgments

The first AAS Ethics Committee was formed in 1981 to draw up a Code of Ethics. Over the following four years of debate and discussion Peter Sutton drafted a Code of Ethics which was revised and finally adopted at the 1985 AGM. Since that first Code of Ethics was written, the AVCC and the ARC all require that academic anthropologists seek ethics approval for all research proposals, using forms that satisfy the NHMRC medical model. Each University has set up an Ethics Committee with checklists for research proposals along with new rules and procedures. During the 1990s some dissatisfaction with the Code was mentioned by AAS members and a Sub-Committee to revise the Code was established in 2002. Extensive comments were presented to the AAS Executive by Brian Fegan and John Morton who compared the AAS Code with the AAA and the ASA Codes. The Sub-Committee aimed to revise the Code to better fit the practices of anthropologists working in both the academy and beyond, and in both Australia and overseas.

This revised Code of Ethics was drafted by an AAS Ethics Sub-Committee during the period March 2003-June 2003. The Committee members were Mandy Thomas (Chair), Bob Tonkinson, John Morton, Wendy Asche and Patrick Sullivan. The revised guidelines were sent to the AASNet list in June 2003 for comments, after which a final set of revisions were undertaken. Open hearings on the revised guidelines will be held during the 2003 annual meeting of the Australian Anthropological Society.

The Ethics Committee gratefully acknowledge the use of some language from the codes of ethics of the American Anthropological Association and the Association of Social Anthropologists of UK and the Commonwealth.

Other Relevant Codes of Ethics

The following list of Codes of Ethics may be useful to anthropological researchers, teachers and practitioners:

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies

http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/rsrch/rsrch_grnts/rg_abt.htm

Association of Social Anthropologists of UK and the Commonwealth.

<http://les1.man.ac.uk/asa/Ethics/ethics.htm>

American Anthropological Association

<http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm>

Animal Behavior Society

1991 Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research. *Animal Behavior* 41:183-186.

United Nations

1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

1983 *United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*.

1987 *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

1993 *Draft Declaration, United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples*

<http://www.cwis.org/drft9329.html>

Research Council. National Board of Employment, Education and Training, Canberra

(Commissioned Report 59) (Especially: 'Chapter 4. The Ethics of Research')

http://www.arc.gov.au/publications/arc_pubs/99_05.pdf

Janke, Terri. 1999. *Our Culture: Our future. Report on Australian Indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights*. Prepared for AIATSIS and ATSIC. Michael Frankel & Company, Sydney.

<http://www.icip.lawnet.com.au/>

Langfield, Michele (ed.). 1999. *A Question of Ethics: Personal Perspectives*. The History Institute, Victoria.

National Health and Medical Research Council. 1999. *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans*. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra

<http://www.health.gov.au/nhmrc/publications/pdf/e35.pdf>

Ngalia Heritage Research Council. n.d. *Ethical Research Guidelines for Researchers and Consultants*. Typescript.

2003 Native Title Conference: Reports on Workshops and Sessions

Proving Connection

Patrick Sullivan

On Thursday June 5th the Native Title Conference hosted a workshop on Proving Connection which aimed to arrive at improved procedures for producing and assessing connection reports for native title claims. The workshop was facilitated by Dr. John Litchfield of the Research Section of the National Native Title Tribunal. It was a milestone in a long process of consultation which began with a series of interviews with expert practitioners in April and May, leading to a workshop in Perth on May 23rd, and then the workshop and panel discussion at the conference. A draft report on the project has recently been circulated to participants and it is expected that the final report will be released soon. The conference discussion tended to concentrate on the difficulties that representative bodies have in arriving at agreement with state governments over the appropriate scope of mediation reports and the transparency of their methods of assessment. The workshop revealed that there are considerable differences of practice across the various state jurisdictions.

Social and Cultural Evidence and Legal Process: are they compatible?

Peter Veth

The ethics and independence of researchers and consultants retained by heritage stakeholders have been perennial issues of interest and debate in ATSI studies. They have been brought into even sharper focus by the requirements of the native title process – whether for litigation, negotiation or regional agreement making. Several core themes are raised in the critical examination of the contemporary practice of researchers and consultants in legal process. These include the need for adequate frameworks to ensure professional independence and far greater appreciation (by legal practitioners) of where disciplinary boundaries begin and end. Specifically the issue of how social and cultural evidence is ‘heard’ and accommodated by legal process will be discussed in this session.

The guidelines of the federal court make it clear that expert witnesses are answerable in the first instance to the court and that they must seek agreement wherever possible. The guidelines also state explicitly that experts must not act as advocates for the parties who retain them nor are they to accept instructions that they should not reach agreement with ‘opposing’ experts. Professional independence and ethical conduct with communities are encoded in the AAS and AACAI constitutions, yet there is a perception amongst both ATSI communities and the professions that this is often not the case. Most vulnerable are early career researchers and consultants placed in a

complex mediating environment where much more than their disciplinary-based skills are tested. Arguably, early career co-ordinators in representative bodies and community leaders are also placed in demanding and sometimes compromising situations where they must choose between legal and statutory determinations of significance in possible contradiction to their own cultural value systems.

Seven papers/presentations of approximately 10 minutes duration were presented at the session which addressed different aspects of the foregoing themes. The session was then opened to general discussion – which unfortunately could only extend for half an hour. There were probably many days worth of discussion to be had from points raised during the papers.

The first by David Trigger and David Parsons examined recent decisions of the High Court and how these defined elements of native title that supply new definitions for core concepts such as society and tradition and the implications of these for research and assessment in native title cases. John Morton looked at the continually re-negotiated cultural relationships between anthropologists and lawyers (and possible remedies) – building on a paper by Patrick Sullivan delivered at the Geraldton Native Title Conference. Simon Correy discussed the impact of the Native Title Act in constituting and mediating social relations within native title groups.

The sometimes vexed role of historians in the native title process was then explored by Ann McGrath with particular emphasis on the role of Indigenous historiography. Jane Anderson tackled the important issue of who owns cultural knowledge before and after legal translation and explored whether indigenous intellectual property should be seen as native title right.

Larissa Behrendt then gave a presentation on the ARC project “Researching Law and History in Native Title Cases”. Issues covered by Larissa included how certain kinds of histories are privileged over other forms of historical interpretation (such as in *Yorta Yorta*).

Finally, Patrick Sullivan acted as a discussant bringing together inter-related themes from the various papers.

[David Trigger is Chair of anthropology at UWA; David Parsons is a barrister based in Melbourne; John Morton lectures in anthropology at La Trobe; Simon Correy is an anthropologist based at NSW Native Title Services; Ann McGrath is Chair of a history program at RSSS ANU and Director of the Centre for Indigenous History; Larissa Behrendt is Chair of Law and Indigenous Studies at UTS (amongst other directorships) and Patrick Sullivan is a Visiting Research Fellow at AIATSIS. Peter Veth is Deputy-Director of Research at AIATSIS and Adjunct A/Professor at James Cook University].

AAS Annual Conference 2003

Anthropology and Pragmatism

1 - 3 October 2003

Veterinary Science Conference Centre (VSCC)

University of Sydney

The conference theme addresses the relationship between the current circumstances under which anthropologists work and undertake research, and a dominant pragmatic interpretive trend in anthropological writing itself

Keynote Addresses

Professor Gerald Sider, Professor of Anthropology, College of Staten Island, CUNY

The Walls Came Tumbling Up: Rethinking class, culture and the production of Native American history.

Dr. Martha MacIntyre, Centre for the Study of Health & Society, University of Melbourne

When was postcolonialism? Applying anthropology in Melanesia

Conference Plenary Debate:

Ethnography today, yesterday and tomorrow

Panels

1. The Anthropology of Indonesia Today: Pragmatic approaches to political challenges
2. Mediating the Self, Extending the Citizen: Key Institutions and the Practices of Everyday Life
3. Healing practices in everyday life: local and global issues for a critical cultural and medical anthropology
4. Celebrating sporting contests
5. Nature, culture & social inquiry: perceiving the natural and politicising Nature
6. Managing natural resources through cultural frameworks
7. Negotiated Lives: Conjunctures and Disjunctures in Indigenous Being
8. Critiquing Ideologies of Boundaries and Borderlands
9. Reimagining the State: Discourses and Techniques of Governmentality
10. Gender and Ethnicity in cyberspace: the intersection of the offline with the online
11. Cultural innovation in Indigenous traditions in Australia and the Torres Strait
12. Pacific Island Places
13. Agency and Resistance, Pragmatic Self-interest and What's Possible in Women's Practice
14. Anthropology in Cape York Peninsula: Cultural Particularities, Flows and Regional Connections
15. Anthropological Positions on the Ethical Review Process
16. Urban Pragmatics
17. Anthropological Perspectives on Regional Economies in the Process of Decentralization

Draft Programme

Day 1

- 8:30am Registration and coffee
9:00am Session A: Mediating the Self (Panel 2); The State (Panel 9); Ethics (Panel 15); Cyberspace (Panel 10); Sport (Panel 4).
10:30am Morning tea
11:00am Session B: Mediating the Self (Panel 2); The State (Panel 9); Urban Prag (Panel 16); Nature (Panel 5).
12:30pm Lunch
2:00pm Session C: Urban Prag (Panel 16); The State (Panel 9); Natural Res/Cult. Frameworks (Panel 6); Pacific (Panel 12); Mediating the Self (Panel 2).
3:30pm Afternoon tea
4:00pm Plenary 1: Prof. Gerald Sider
6:00 pm Reception (Pfizer Foyer)

Day 2

- 9:00am Plenary 2: Panel discussion led by Prof. Diane Austin-Broos
10:30am Morning tea
11:00am Session D: Cultural Innovations (Panel 11); CYP Connect (Panel 14); Negotiated Lives (Panel 7); Indonesia (Panel 1).
12:30pm Lunch
2:00pm Session E: Cultural Innovations (Panel 11); CYP Connect (Panel 14); Healing (Panel 3); Negotiated Lives (Panel 7); Indonesia (Panel 1).
3:30pm Afternoon tea
4:00pm Session F: Cultural Innovations (Panel 11); Nature (Panel 5); Agency (Panel 13); Negotiated Lives (Panel 7)
7:00pm Dinner (Italian Forum, Leichhardt)

Day 3

- 9:00am AAS Annual General Meeting
10:30am Morning tea
11:00am Plenary 3: Dr Martha MacIntyre
12:30pm Lunch
2:00pm Session G: Healing (Panel 3); Natural Res/Cult. Frameworks (Panel 6); Regional Economies (Panel 17); Borders (Panel 8); Agency (Panel 13)
3:30pm Afternoon tea
4:00pm Session H: Environmental anthropology (Panel 5 & 6); Regional Economies (Panel 17); Borders (Panel 8); Agency (Panel 13); Healing (Panel 3).

Close

Conference program

A full draft conference programme is available, as are panel abstracts at:

<http://www.aas.asn.au/2003conf.htm>

Registration

The conference registration form can be downloaded in rtf or pdf format from the AAS website:

<http://www.aas.asn.au>

Conference organiser:

Dr Cynthia Hunter, Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney, NSW 2006.

Ph: (02) 9351 2931; Fax: (02) 9351 5444

Email:

cynthia.hunter@anthropology.usyd.edu.au

Anthropology Heads of Department Meeting

The 2003 Heads of Department meeting attached to the AAS Conference will be held on Tuesday evening, September 30 at 5pm to 7pm

Place: Seminar Room 148, Mills Building (A26), Main Campus, University of Sydney.

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Australian Anthropological Society

Held at Australian National University, Canberra on Friday 4th October, 2002.

In the Chair: Julie Finlayson

Minute Taker: Sarah Yu for Toni Bauman

In Attendance

Julie Finlayson, Thomas Reuter, Sarah Yu, Klara Hansen, Gillian Cowlshaw, Alison Leitch, Bill Arthur, Maggie Brady, Robert Levitus, Andrew Dawson, Violeta Schubert, Mary Patterson, Kalpana Ram, Michael Young, Shirley Campbell, Susan Powell, Bruce Rigsby, Melinda Hinkson, Benjamin Smith, Nicolas Peterson, Mandy Thomas, Tracey Dilitz, Kingsley Palmer, Laurent Dousset, Mary Hawkins, Helena Onnudottir, John Carty, Cassandra Green, Frances Killaly, Chris Gregory, Anthony Marcus, Andrew McWilliam, Jon Altman, Tony Redmond, Gary Robinson, Nonie Wales, Brett Hough, Grant McCall, Lenore Manderson, Lee Sackett, Mary Edmunds, Diane Smith, Jerry Schwab, David Martin, Michael Allen, Margaret Jolly, Mark Mosko, Rosita Henry, Patrick Sullivan, Neil Maclean, Wendy Asche, Jeremy Beckett, Francesca Merlan.

1. *Apologies.*

Toni Bauman, Nic Petersen, Julia Munster, Kathrine Robinson.

2. *Welcome and introductory business.*

Julie Finlayson informed the meeting that Sarah Yu would be taking the minutes for the Secretary, Toni Bauman. Toni Bauman will be responsible for finalizing the minutes.

Julie Finlayson, as the outgoing President, introduced and welcomed the newly elected president, Thomas Reuter, and vice-president, Mandy Thomas.

Thomas Reuter addressed the meeting, noting his commitment to the AAS and to the future of anthropology and that he was honoured to take up the position of President. He acknowledged the hard work of the previous Executive and broadly outlined a draft strategic plan he had prepared. The Plan will go on the AAS Web site for comment by members.

3. *Confirmation of Minutes of 2001 AGM held at La Trobe University, Bundoora.*

The Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held Friday 28 September 2001 at LaTrobe University, Melbourne, were circulated, taken as read and confirmed.

Moved: Grant McCall Seconded: Jon Altman
Carried

4. *Business arising from the minutes (other items are shown under Point 6 Matters listed for consideration at the AGM).*

Thanks to Executive from the Outgoing President

Julie Finlayson thanked the Executive members for their work over the last 12 months.

5. *Executive Committee Reports.*

(a) ***President's Annual Report (Julie Finlayson)***

The President did not speak to her report. Copies were distributed to the meeting.

(b) ***Treasurer's report (Wendy Asche)***

The financial year June 2001 to 2002 Balance Sheet, profit and loss statement and RC Laurence and Co auditor's statement were presented.

The AAS made a profit of \$7854.87 for the year ended June 2002 compared to 2001 where there was zero profit or debts. Auditing fees will be less than \$600.

The Society is owed \$3532.00 in subscriptions out of a total of \$19,938.80. Almost 18% of subscriptions remain uncollected. Despite this, the Society appears to be in a sound financial position. The Financial Statements are in a different from form last year as they have been

compiled using MYOB and comparatives are not available. The auditor has advised that we will need to alter some of our administrative procedures in view of us now using electronic payments and changes to various legislation. Signed copies of the Auditor's certificate will be forwarded for lodgement with the New South Wales appropriate bodies.

In the past twelve months, the AAS has purchased MYOB, started Internet banking and employed Liz Bell to do the accounts. Subscriptions have increased with 53 new members and clerical costs have decreased thanks to Liz Bell, the new administrative officer.

The Treasurer noted with thanks that ANU and CAEPR had donated a total of \$1500 to support the publications officer of the AAS in 2002.

The President, Julie Finlayson, noted that the host university now has full responsibility for the costs of the annual conference. The Treasurer extended her thanks to La Trobe University for covering all conference costs in 2001, and to ANU for hosting and covering costs for the 2002 conference.

Motion That the AAS endorse RC Laurence and Co as its auditor with an agreed fee of \$600 and with the proviso that this fee be comparable to other auditor's fees.

Moved: Thomas Reuter

Seconded: Mary Edmunds Carried

(c) **TAJA Editor's Report (Michael Allen)**

Copies of a written report were circulated at the meeting. Here the Minutes are confined to a brief summary of Michael's comments.

Publication record

Michael Allen reported that he was pleased to be able to report that over the past 12 months there has been yet a further increase in the amount of material submitted for possible publication. However, despite increasing the number of pages published from 375 to 437, the flow of publishable material is such that the waiting time from submission to publication is now in excess of 12 months. If it gets any longer authors will begin to look elsewhere for publication. Though having to reject worthy papers is not pleasant, TAJA's main response will be to yet further raise the standard of acceptance. TAJA can also continue its recent practice of periodically putting out a bumper issue.

Finances

Profit for the year was a healthy \$10,290 and capital has now reached \$119,476. TAJA's long-term financial aim is to continue to build up capital so that the income thus generated will

enable TAJA to steadily reduce the amount of unpaid labour contributed by our management team.

Management and accommodation

Management is once again operating smoothly, thanks to the welcome return of Robyn and Denis Wood. Accommodation has been a real headache for the past few months due to the loss of TAJA's dungeon in the basement of Fisher stacks. After a period of intense lobbying and mostly futile pleading with the university administration *Oceania* took pity on TAJA which is now happily installed in its own room in a terrace house in Camperdown along with *Oceania* and the *Journal of Religious History*. There is a possibility that in a few years time TAJA may be able to combine some administrative tasks with *Oceania*, thereby hopefully reducing costs. In addition, future accommodation needs have been greatly reduced through donating a large amount of archival material to the State Library of New South Wales, and through a mix of pulping and free distribution to students of many hundreds of back issues of *TAJA*.

Motion That the Executive Reports be accepted.

Moved : Rosita Henry

Seconded: Lee Sackett Carried

Matters listed for consideration at the AGM

AAS Clearing House:

David Martin noted that the Clearing House had been established to cater for the needs of members who are applied anthropologists working throughout the world, and not only in Australia. To date, membership of the Clearing House is only 20 and there has been very little activity with members not really getting value for money.

Julie Finlayson noted that, on her resignation as President of the AAS, she wished to devote more time to developing the AAS Clearing house and that there was a need for a sub-committee. Nic Peterson agreed to be on the sub-committee.

Motion That existing memberships of the AAS Clearing house that have been paid for the 1st year be extended for a further 12 months to the next AGM in 2003.

Moved: Bruce White

Seconded: Fiona Powell Carried

7. *AAS Annual Conference 2003 (Venue and Conference Committee) and 2004 (Venue)*

Neil MacLean offered to host AAS 2003 at the University of Sydney, with Jeremy Beckett and Gaynor MacDonald as co-convenors. He asked

to see a break down of the budget for the 2002 conference this year to get an idea of costs, and sought advice as to other procedures.

Julie Finlayson noted that there is a body of documents about planning and costs and that it was desirable to employ a conference organizer as had occurred at the Western Australian hosted conference in 2000. She also noted that the web site is very helpful in organizing the conference.

Thomas Reuter noted that plans to join the AAS 2004 conference with the SfAA offshore conference in the same year requires a commitment to a venue for the AAS conference two years in advance. He reported that the 2002 HODs meeting has approved the bid by The University of Melbourne to host this joint event.

Motion That the AAS Annual Conference 2003 will be hosted by the University of Sydney and that the Conference Committee consists of Jeremy Beckett, Neil McLean and Gaynor MacDonald

Moved: Thomas Reuter

Seconded: Lenore Manderson Carried

8. *General Business*

8.1 *Thanks to outgoing President*

Motion of thanks to Julie Finlayson for her work over the last 2 years.

Moved: Mary Edmunds

Seconded: Diane Smith Carried

8.2 *Thanks to Acting Editor AAS Newsletter and AAS net*

Motion of thanks to David Martin for his contribution to the AAS newsletter, his work on building the AAS Web site, and for facilitating meaningful discussion on the AAS net.

Moved: Jerry Schwab

Seconded: Patrick Sullivan Carried

8.3 *Ethics Committee*

Jeremy Beckett inquired as to the duties of the Ethics Committee.

Julie Finlayson noted that the AAS Ethics document needs upgrading and that it is the most down-loaded document from the AAS web site. She noted that the purpose of the Ethics Committee is to revamp the Code of Ethics and then to put it to the AAS membership for approval. She expressed her concern that she had insufficient time in the previous year to do justice to the issues and had only managed to gather the relevant documents.

Jeremy Beckett noted that many members have to contend with both a University Code of ethics as well as that of the AAS and that procedures should be more liberal.

Julie Finlayson responded that the AAS society is voluntary and that its code has no real power.

Fiona Powell noted that at least one Land Council contract includes a commitment to the AAS code of ethics.

Wendy Asche and Patrick Sullivan expressed willingness to go on the Ethics Committee.

Neil McLean informed the meeting that he will arrange for an additional person.

Mary Edmunds suggested that Brian Fegan who is currently overseas should be co-opted to the committee.

Julie Finlayson suggested that the AAS executive can finalize membership of the subcommittee and that a reminder could be placed on the AAS net to attract additional members. Julie also undertook to contact Martha McIntyre as a highly suitable member of the committee.

8.4 *Subcommittee for AAS newsletter*

David Martin noted that he had been Acting as the Editor of the AAS newsletter in the absence of any other volunteers. He informed the meeting that he is no longer able to continue in this role, though he will be able to assist in technical aspects.

The Newsletter is a vehicle for informing members of interesting books, notices, and conferences, and to provide brief commentary on practice issues relevant to members. It is usually around 8-10 pages long. The Editor's role is to compile the content of the Newsletter 4 times /year, and involves editing and soliciting information from others to contribute and then arranging for its distribution through AAS net and the Web via David Martin.

Rosita Henry offered to take on the Editor's role. Mary Patterson agreed to provide assistance to Rosita in her editorial duties and David Martin agreed to provide technical help in producing the newsletter in electronic form.

Motion that Rosita Henry be the Editor of the AAS to be Newsletter.

Moved: David Martin

Seconded: Jeremy Beckett Carried

8.5 *Thanks to AAS Conference 2002 Convenors*

Julie Finlayson thanked the ANU and graduates who helped in facilitating the AAS 2002 Annual conference.

Meeting closed 4.40pm

2003 AAS Annual General Meeting
9.00am Friday 3rd October 2003

Agenda

1. Apologies: Peter Sutton
2. Confirmation of Minutes of 2002 AGM, held at Australian National University, Canberra, ACT.

Motion: That the minutes of the previous AGM of 4th October 2002 be adopted.

3. Business arising from minutes
4. Executive Committee Reports
 - President's Report [Thomas Reuter]
 - Treasurer's Report [Wendy Asche]
 - TAJA Editor's report [Michael Allen]

Motion: That the executive reports be accepted

Motions foreshadowed:

That the AAS endorse RC Laurence and Co as its auditor.

That there will be an annual AAS thesis prize for Australian honours and another for Research Masters/ PhD graduates, each with a prize money of \$500, commencing in 2004.

5. Matters listed for consideration at the AGM
 - New Code of Ethics
 - Membership Fee Structure
 - Election of Office Bearers (Uncontested nominations for all office bearer positions on the Executive).

Motions foreshadowed:

That the Draft Code of Ethics be adopted by the AAS.

That the subscription fees be increased by \$20 for the forthcoming subscription annual invoice periods which will give AAS members a subscription to TAJA as the AAS anthropological journal.

6. General Business

- AAS Annual Conferences 2004 & 2005 [Venue and Conference Committee]

Motions foreshadowed:

That the following members be appointed to the 2004 Melbourne conference committee: Andrew Dawson (Convenor), Monica Minnegal (Secretary) and Violeta Schubert (Finance Officer), Douglas Lewis (Co-Convenor) and Mary Patterson (Co-Convenor)

Venue of the 2005 AAS conference.

- Clearing House
- TAJA editor replacement procedures
- Welcome to new administrator
- Thanks to outgoing executive and handover to new executive

Meeting Closed