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Introduction
The South Australian Museum’s Foreign Ethnology Collection is housed in part of what used to be the State Government printing complex at Netley. The storage room is surrounded on three sides by State Records, the Maritime Museum storage room and the new facilities for the Museum’s Aboriginal collections. Half of the store is divided horizontally by a mezzanine floor. About two-thirds of the space under the mezzanine is taken up by boxes housing the Aboriginal archaeological collection. On the mezzanine level over half of the space is taken up by archaeological material and paper records, mostly related to the Roonka excavations. The Foreign Ethnology Collection occupies the remaining space.

The Collection is dominated by material from the South Pacific, although a particularly nasty looking array of Asian and African swords, spears and other weaponry catches the eye upon first ascending the stairs to the mezzanine level. Most of the material from the South Pacific is Melanesian and, understandably, the largest part comes from Papua New Guinea.

The Foreign Ethnology specimens are stored according to location and object type. Thus it is not possible to locate all of the material from one collector in one place. Each collection has been distributed to shelves housing particular types of artefacts from particular geographic regions. All of the arrows, for instance, are laid out on several shelves, all of the clubs on other shelves, all of the spears on others and, since most of the Papua New Guinea collections each contain many arrows, clubs and spears, locating one particular collector’s set can be maddeningly frustrating. Although the Collection is well documented on a database, which includes an accession number, a brief description and a shelf location, it is sometimes necessary to rummage around on the actual shelves to find items. The taxonomic organisation of artefacts in this way has a distinctly Victorian feel about it.

Many of the Foreign Ethnology collections appear to have been assembled at random. The material came to the Museum through donations or was purchased opportunistically. The artefacts in each collection vary in number from only one or two items to well over a hundred. Very few of the collections are representative of the full range of material items produced by the groups of people from whom they were acquired, instead they reflect the interests and itineraries of the collectors, usually missionaries, government officials or traders. These people were usually male and weapons are heavily represented. Amongst the missionaries the Lutherans from the Barossa Valley are well represented but the Anglicans, Presbyterians and Baptists also make a good showing.

Attempts by Museum staff to make organised collections in the Pacific were frustrated by insufficient funds; what resources were available were used to support collecting among Australian Aboriginal groups. Nevertheless, Edgar Waite visited the Bismarck Archipelago in 1918 and made a collection, which occupied six shipping containers of cargo space. In the late 1940s and early 1950s Norman Tindale tried to talk the Museum Board into financing an expedition to the newly opened New Guinea Central Highlands but was unsuccessful. In 1968 Museum curator Graeme Pretty, assisted by Tony Crawford, make a large collection in the Southern Highlands and Western District. After independence, museum collecting expeditions became passe in Papua New Guinea, where the practice was perceived as imperialistic and distinctly colonial in nature. If the National Museum in Port Moresby, which is under-funded, in poor repair and visited only by the odd hapless tourist, is any indication, this belief persists.

Apart from the excellent computer database, which is concerned more with managing the physicality of the collections than their contents, the information related to most collections is scant. In some cases, if information exists it is hidden away in the Anthropology Archives in notebooks and letters. Often it is tucked away in the records of individual curators; Tindale’s Pacific Islands Journal is a good source but real effort is needed to glean relevant information. The primary source is the Anthropology collections register and the associated specimen documentation files. Each incoming item is allocated an accession number and briefly described. In many cases this description represents the entire documentation for an artefact. Occasionally the information is incorrect; sometimes it seems like guesswork after the fact. Other misinformation is perpetuated; a collection described in the literature as having been made by an eminent District Commissioner turns out, on closer inspection, to have been made by a hotelsier with a similar name.

This dearth of information is not peculiar to the South Australian Museum - a similar problem exists in every other museum in Australia. Most museums accepted collections before they commenced the practice of keeping a register. Labels were inevitably lost for many items and most museums now have an ‘Old Collection’. As one curator remarked, ‘This Mr. Old certainly distributed his collections widely!’ The situation presents some unique and interesting problems for anyone attempting to research and document particular collections. In essence it is detective work, the starting point begins at scratch. Usually there is a name, an accession date and, if you’re lucky, a letter or two tucked away in old correspondence or Specimen Documentation files. A good case in point is the Len Howie Collection.

History of the Collection
Prior to looking at the Howie Collection I had researched part of a collection made by A.P.H. Freund in what is now the Enga Province. Freund was a pioneering Lutheran missionary, most notable for his establishment of a mission...
station at Menyamya in the Morobe Province amongst the Kukukuku or Anga people in the early 1950s. Before this, however, he had taken a large mission patrol from the Lutheran base at Ogelbeng, outside Mount Hagen, into the Wabag area and set up a new mission station at Yaramanda amongst the Ena people. At Yaramanda, Freund, being of a naturally inquisitive nature, became interested in Enga traditions and culture and began to collect the odd artefact. In April 1950 he sent an interesting wig cover to the South Australian Museum.

The Museum’s Ethnologist, Norman Tindale, had followed the discoveries in the New Guinea Highlands with increasing interest ever since his visits to the Wau area during the Second World War. He seized upon Freund as a useful contact and arranged for him to send more artefacts and to provide logistical advice for a collecting expedition he hoped to organise into the Highlands. The two men met later when Freund returned to South Australia on furlough from Menyamya and a relationship which lasted for several years was established.

With Freund’s move from Yaramanda to Menyamya, Tindale lost a good source of Enga artefacts, which had become important to him as a key part of a New Guinea Highlands exhibit he planned to establish in the Pacific Gallery. Howie stepped directly into this breach. In June 1950 he visited Tindale and sold the Museum a number of artefacts from the Oroko area in Papua. He also told Tindale he was returning to New Guinea to take up a post at the new Catholic Mission station at Pomipus, near Wabag in the Western Highlands. Possibly inspired by Tindale, he wrote to him in December of the same year providing a list of artefact types he ‘was in a position to procure - if you so desire’.

Tindale, never one to miss an opportunity, wrote to the Museum Director, Herbert Hale, straight away asking for funds to send to Howie for the purchase of the artefacts. The bureaucratic wheels churned along slowly and it wasn’t until July 1951 that Hale replied to Howie’s offer and despatched a cheque for £10.

On 1 October 1951 Howie wrote back to Hale:

Today I am despatching to you per Parcel Post 6 packages containing native articles of this area - the LAI VALLEY.

I am enclosing a list of items plus cost of same and postage costs. Two 9 foot spears had to be cut into 3 sections, and 4 arrows into 2 sections each for postage. I am sorry about this but am sure you have facilities at the museum for joining.

I still have £2 on hand and will forward further items at the earliest.

The letter is formal and to the point; the handwriting is very neat and legible; he signed it ‘yours etc’. The impression created is of a person with better than average literacy but desirous of keeping his distance. Only the list of each item in package number one survives in the Anthropology Archives but Howie had obviously attached lists with descriptions of each item in each package. Accession numbers in Tindale’s handwriting have been written against each description. Item nine is a typical example:

- About 6 feet rope.
- Native name: MENA PUNK
- Use: rope like this is used to fasten pigs.
- Material: flax from the ‘jakar’ tree.
- COST:- 5/-.

Apart from the arrows and spears the rest of the items included stone axes, ‘loin clothes’, grass skirts, net bags, ropes, mats and body ornaments.

The next piece of correspondence is a letter from Tindale to Howie, dated 10 November 1951, saying the parcels had not been received by the Museum. Tindale notes that the contents of the parcels ‘looks to be of considerable interest to us’ but is obviously becoming anxious about their whereabouts. Howie’s reply on November 30 is somewhat peevish and he points out that two to three months is not an unusual time for mail travelling by ship from Papua New Guinea. He included a ‘snap’ of a ‘Native of Lai Valley, Central Highlands, New Guinea’ in the letter.

Tindale acknowledged receipt of five of the parcels in a letter to Howie on 11 December 1951. He was particularly enthusiastic about a ‘working axe with its heavy blade’ which he said was ‘one of the best that we have seen up to the present time’. Parcel number six arrived in the New Year and Tindale advised Howie in a letter dated 13 March 1952. He added:

Doubtless its appearance has puzzled the customs inspectors for it had evidently been very carefully through their hands.

Earlier, on 21 January 1952, Howie wrote to Tindale again advising him that he was forwarding a further item and advising him that, ‘This cuts out the £10 entirely’. The item was a real prize for the Museum. Howie’s accompanying description was typically concise:

Hat - made of human hair. Worn on days of feasts by men, boys and girls. This wig is made from plucks of curly hair, which through constant tapping with a thin pin, grips into each other. It takes a few hours before a wig has its final shape. To give it a dark purple shine a purple stem of a flower is chewed and the juice is spray-spat over the wig. Gay feathers and leaves finish the festive head dress.

Howie’s information was not entirely accurate - hair wigs were only worn by Enga men after they had been initiated, the wig itself being a sign of their passage to manhood.

Tindale advised Hale of the receipt of the collection formally by letter on 13 March 1952, the same day that he wrote to Howie. His summary of the transaction with Howie is interesting:
For the sum of £10 he has sent us 29 specimens (A43 124 - A43 153) and has paid the postage on them. The postages on them amounts to approximately £1/12/6, so that the specimens themselves have cost us little more than 5/- each.

Included in the series are specimens worth many times this amount. I propose to exhibit them before the Board at its coming meeting.

One can imagine Tindale exhibiting the artefacts at a meeting of the Museum Board and explaining that if the Board funded a Museum expedition to the Central Highlands the value of artefacts collected would alone make the trip worthwhile.

Tindale wrote to Howie on 14 March 1952 advising him that the exhibition of his artefacts before the Museum Board had been a great success and thanked him for ‘adding these specimens to the National collection, where they will be preserved for posterity’. A press release followed on 18 March, obviously part of Tindale’s campaign for his proposed expedition. On 24 March Tindale wrote to Howie again and told him that he was sending him another £10, adding that the Museum collections ‘can only be as good as the devoted efforts of those who are in a position to help us in the field make it’. Tindale was particularly interested in stone tools and asked Howie, ‘Have they stone tools of the nature of chisels, drills, gougers, or scrapers?’ At this time Tindale was developing his theories about the occupation of Australia and he considered the development of stone tools an important adaptive element in this process.

In his reply of 5 April 1952, Howie was obviously pleased with the impact his collection had had on the Museum Board. He advised Tindale that the Enga didn’t use the types of stone tools described and that bone implements were used instead. He added:

- If you desire you may forward the £10 (in cash as we had trouble cashing the previous cheque) and we will endeavour to purchase more stone axes (if desirable to you), bone scrapers, and a few other items which may be available.

- It is interesting to note that Howie used the term ‘we’ in his letter. Perhaps collecting had become part of the mission’s activities to raise funds? Howie also noted that he had a camera and could take photographs if Tindale supplied the film.

Tindale sent Howie four rolls of film on 22 April 1952 and suggested that if he used his own money to purchase the artefacts he could be reimbursed when he came to Adelaide on leave in the near future. He also asked, ‘Are there by any chance native pots of any kind being made in your district?’

Howie wrote back to Tindale on 3 May 1952 saying the film had arrived but that he was going on leave on May 7. He advised that Father G.A.M. Bus would collect the required artefacts. He also advised Tindale that the Enga did not make pots. Father Bus wrote from Wapenamanda, near Wabag, on 10 November saying he had despatched two parcels with two stone axes in each. He also added:

- With these four axes, and the material you have received formerly through Mr. Howie, I think the material of any interest is finished. If I should come across something really worthwhile, I will try to acquire it and send it on to the museum.

Father Bus sent the four axes to Father Daniel Driscoll in Wewak for despatch. Father Driscoll had them ‘fumigated’ by the Public Health Department in Wewak before sending them on and enclosed a certificate to that effect. From Father Driscoll’s letters one gets the impression that he was used to regularly shipping artefacts to various parts of the world.

Whether Father Bus meant that there were no other artefacts worth collecting for the Museum in the Wabag area or that he wished to terminate Howie’s collecting activities altogether is not clear. When I asked an elderly Father Gerry Bus about this a year or so ago in Mount Hagen he said he couldn’t really remember but noted that the Catholic Mission received frequent requests for artefacts from other institutions at that time and that the inconvenience was bothersome. In any event, the correspondence between Tindale and Howie ended and there were no more collections made on behalf of the Museum from an area they had been a great success and thanked him for ‘adding these specimens to the National collection, where they will be preserved for posterity’. A press release followed on 18 March, obviously part of Tindale’s campaign for his proposed expedition. On 24 March Tindale wrote to Howie again and told him that he was sending him another £10, adding that the Museum collections ‘can only be as good as the devoted efforts of those who are in a position to help us in the field make it’. Tindale was particularly interested in stone tools and asked Howie, ‘Have they stone tools of the nature of chisels, drills, gougers, or scrapers?’ At this time Tindale was developing his theories about the occupation of Australia and he considered the development of stone tools an important adaptive element in this process.

In his reply of 5 April 1952, Howie was obviously pleased with the impact his collection had had on the Museum Board. He advised Tindale that the Enga didn’t use the types of stone tools described and that bone implements were used instead. He added:

- If you desire you may forward the £10 (in cash as we had trouble cashing the previous cheque) and we will endeavour to purchase more stone axes (if desirable to you), bone scrapers, and a few other items which may be available.

- It is interesting to note that Howie used the term ‘we’ in his letter. Perhaps collecting had become part of the mission’s activities to raise funds? Howie also noted that he had a camera and could take photographs if Tindale supplied the film.

Tindale sent Howie four rolls of film on 22 April 1952 and suggested that if he used his own money to purchase the artefacts he could be reimbursed when he came to Adelaide on leave in the near future. He also asked, ‘Are there by any chance native pots of any kind being made in your district?’

Howie wrote back to Tindale on 3 May 1952 saying the film had arrived but that he was going on leave on May 7. He advised that Father G.A.M. Bus would collect the required artefacts. He also advised Tindale that the Enga did not make pots. Father Bus wrote from Wapenamanda, near Wabag, on 10 November saying he had despatched two parcels with two stone axes in each. He also added:

- With these four axes, and the material you have received formerly through Mr. Howie, I think the material of any interest is finished. If I should come across something really worthwhile, I will try to acquire it and send it on to the museum.

Father Bus sent the four axes to Father Daniel Driscoll in Wewak for despatch. Father Driscoll had them ‘fumigated’ by the Public Health Department in Wewak before sending them on and enclosed a certificate to that effect. From Father Driscoll’s letters one gets the impression that he was used to regularly shipping artefacts to various parts of the world.

Whether Father Bus meant that there were no other artefacts worth collecting for the Museum in the Wabag area or that he wished to terminate Howie’s collecting activities altogether is not clear. When I asked an elderly Father Gerry Bus about this a year or so ago in Mount Hagen he said he couldn’t really remember but noted that the Catholic Mission received frequent requests for artefacts from other institutions at that time and that the inconvenience was bothersome. In any event, the correspondence between Tindale and Howie ended and there were no more collections made on behalf of the Museum from an area they had been a great success and thanked him for ‘adding these specimens to the National collection, where they will be preserved for posterity’. A press release followed on 18 March, obviously part of Tindale’s campaign for his proposed expedition. On 24 March Tindale wrote to Howie again and told him that he was sending him another £10, adding that the Museum collections ‘can only be as good as the devoted efforts of those who are in a position to help us in the field make it’. Tindale was particularly interested in stone tools and asked Howie, ‘Have they stone tools of the nature of chisels, drills, gougers, or scrapers?’ At this time Tindale was developing his theories about the occupation of Australia and he considered the development of stone tools an important adaptive element in this process.

In his reply of 5 April 1952, Howie was obviously pleased with the impact his collection had had on the Museum Board. He advised Tindale that the Enga didn’t use the types of stone tools described and that bone implements were used instead. He added:

- If you desire you may forward the £10 (in cash as we had trouble cashing the previous cheque) and we will endeavour to purchase more stone axes (if desirable to you), bone scrapers, and a few other items which may be available.

- It is interesting to note that Howie used the term ‘we’ in his letter. Perhaps collecting had become part of the mission’s activities to raise funds? Howie also noted that he had a camera and could take photographs if Tindale supplied the film.

Tindale sent Howie four rolls of film on 22 April 1952 and suggested that if he used his own money to purchase the artefacts he could be reimbursed when he came to Adelaide on leave in the near future. He also asked, ‘Are there by any chance native pots of any kind being made in your district?’

Howie wrote back to Tindale on 3 May 1952 saying the film had arrived but that he was going on leave on May 7. He advised that Father G.A.M. Bus would collect the required artefacts. He also advised Tindale that the Enga did not make pots. Father Bus wrote from Wapenamanda, near Wabag, on 10 November saying he had despatched two parcels with two stone axes in each. He also added:

- With these four axes, and the material you have received formerly through Mr. Howie, I think the material of any interest is finished. If I should come across something really worthwhile, I will try to acquire it and send it on to the museum.

Father Bus sent the four axes to Father Daniel Driscoll in Wewak for despatch. Father Driscoll had them ‘fumigated’ by the Public Health Department in Wewak before sending them on and enclosed a certificate to that effect. From Father Driscoll’s letters one gets the impression that he was used to regularly shipping artefacts to various parts of the world.

Whether Father Bus meant that there were no other artefacts worth collecting for the Museum in the Wabag area or that he wished to terminate Howie’s collecting activities altogether is not clear. When I asked an elderly Father Gerry Bus about this a year or so ago in Mount Hagen he said he couldn’t really remember but noted that the Catholic Mission received frequent requests for artefacts from other institutions at that time and that the inconvenience was bothersome. In any event, the correspondence between Tindale and Howie ended and there were no more collections made on behalf of the Museum in the Wabag area. I also cannot find any record of the Museum receiving back any exposed film or photographs from the films Tindale sent to Howie; perhaps they are tucked away in the Tindale archives. It is also unclear whether Howie visited Tindale in Adelaide whilst on leave. In a number of other letters at the time Father Bus insisted that the payment for the axes be sent by money order to Wabag and this was done.

Whatever happened, Tindale nevertheless had acquired a useful small collection for the Museum from an area only recently opened up to Europeans. When added to the Freund material the Museum had a good representation of Enga material culture for a crucial period in their history. In that same year Tindale also received artefacts from Mr. G. Blythe from the Aitape area and from Dr. D. Parkhouse from ‘N.E. New Guinea’.8

Reseaching the Collection
I began my search for Len Howie at the Australian Electoral Office. When I couldn’t find him in any of the current rolls I went to the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages and discovered that he had died only the year before. His Death Certificate gave no indication of his parents or next of kin. I made a tentative enquiry at the office of the Public Trustee, who despite promises, never got back to me. On a hunch, I checked The Advertiser’s funeral notices for the period and discovered a notice inserted by the Scalabrinian Fathers of the Mater Christi Church at Seaton.8 When I spoke to them they were unable to offer much help beyond saying he had been a reclusive bachelor residing in a church-owned apartment at Rosewater. His funeral notice did, however, mention that he had been a member of the 2nd A.I.F. during World War II.
I contacted the National Archives office in Adelaide and they graciously looked up his Army and Veterans Affairs files and provided me with a brief summary of the information they had on him as well as some copies of a few useful documents. From these records I discovered that he had an elder brother named John. I went back to the electoral rolls and through various circuitous routes discovered that his brother had predeceased him but that his sister-in-law was still alive. I spoke to Mrs. Mary Howie and slowly began to piece together a picture of Len. Mrs. Howie also provided me with a small collection of annotated transparencies sent to her husband by Len in the 1960s.

![Len Howie and Engan girl. Judging by the trousers worn by Howie the photograph probably dates from the late 1960s.](image)

Len had been born at Merildin, near Clare, on 10 September 1920. Merildin was the former name of the Mintaro Railway station. His parents were Mary Elizabeth and Ernest Milford Howie. The family later moved to Roseworthy. In 1938 Len commenced an apprenticeship as a tailor’s cutter with Mr. E. L. Wiener of Grenfell Street in Adelaide. On 14 October 1941 he left Mr. Wiener to join the 25th Battalion of the Citizen Military Forces. He was stationed with them in Darwin until December 1942. On December 10 he joined the A.I.F. and served with the Ammunition Ordinance Corps, later transferring to the 4th Australian Advance Ammunition Depot. He was overseas at Balikpapan, near Moratai, in Borneo, from 3 April 1945 to 4 February 1946. He was promoted to the rank of corporal on 11 December 1945.

He was discharged from the Army on 14 March 1946 and resumed his training as a tailor’s cutter with Mr. Wiener on 23 April 1946. He left Mr. Wiener on 29 March 1947 and went to Rockhampton in Queensland to work. Why he left South Australia and what he worked at is unknown. According to Mrs. Howie he met a family in Rockhampton who encouraged him to seek work with the missions in Papua New Guinea. At some stage in 1947 he travelled to Papua to work with the Catholic Mission there.

He must have spent some time at Orokolo because the first artefacts he sold to the South Australian Museum came from there. From Orokolo he transferred to the newly opened mission station at Pompabus near Wabag. At Wabag he worked as a carpenter and built a number of churches. Someone who knew him at Wapenamanda in the 1970s remembered how he made furniture out of natural timber in such a way that no artificial joints were used. Some time
after that he moved to Rabaul and then Port Moresby to work for the Commonwealth Government. A number of Commonwealth Government departments were located in Papua New Guinea at the time and were distinct from the local Australian Administration departments. It is unknown in what capacity he worked.

He returned to Adelaide when he was in his fifties and on 3 December 1973 joined the Department of Agriculture as a Horticultural Inspector. He retired from the Department on 19 September 1980. He was living in Hampden Street, Rosewater, before he died on 3 May 1997. He was buried on May 9 at the Cheltenham Cemetery. He never married but was very active in church affairs. Mrs. Howie attended his funeral as his nearest direct relative but is unable to provide much more information about him. As she said to me when I first contacted her, Len was a very private individual who kept to himself.

Len Howie spent over 20 years amongst the Enga at Pompabus. He was there from their first sustained contact with Europeans right up to the time of self-government. Like many Papua New Guinean expatriates he left the country during that strange period in limbo between self-government in 1972 and independence in 1975. His wealth of knowledge about the Enga would have been great.

The Enga

The Enga are the largest linguistic group in the whole of Papua New Guinea. The population of the Enga Province at the 1980 census was 165,000 people, with a high rate of population growth of approximately 2% per annum. The people live in high valleys varying in altitude between 1500 and 2500 metres above sea level. Frost regularly occurs above the 2200 metre mark. On the fringes of the province, population densities are as low as five people per square kilometre. In the densely populated areas, such as the Upper Lai Valley where Howie worked, the density is as high as 160 people per square kilometre. 9

During Howie’s time, the Enga would have been living in separate patrilineal groups, divided into clans and sub-clans. It is only relatively recently that the clan has achieved dominance. On a day-to-day basis the Enga live in
extended families in small hamlets. As then, the majority of the Enga are still subsistence farmers. Sweet potato and taro form the basis of their diet. Traditional Enga wealth was counted in pigs, shell, salt, stone axes and tree oil before the introduction of Western style currencies. This wealth was regulated through an elaborate ceremonial exchange and debt system called Te’e. The Te’e system still underpins Enga social cohesion. The same system, called Moka, is used further east by the Medipa people of the Western Wahgi Valley.  
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Contact History  

Apart from the Highlands Highway and the ancillary roads snaking into it from the surrounding valleys, and the airstrips, motor vehicles and tin roofs, the Enga province today provokes the same impressions as those recorded by Jim Taylor in 1938 when he led the famous Hagen Sepik Patrol into the area. He mused:  

We were now in the heart of the valley, one of the most beautiful in New Guinea, if not the world. Everywhere were fine, well-laid-out garden plots, mostly sweet potato, and groves of casuarina. Well cut graded roads traversed the countryside and small parks or playgrounds, the ‘bena’ of the Mt. Hagen people or the ‘kama’ as they are called here, dotted the landscape which resembled a huge botanic garden. It may well be called the garden valley of Lai.  

On the Waga River, Taylor noticed that at a place earmarked for the construction of a bridge two young casuarina trees had been planted on either side of the stream in such a way that they could be used as pylons when they matured.  

Europeans first penetrated the Central Highlands of New Guinea in the late 1920s. Those coming up the Sepik and Maramunie or Yuat Rivers almost certainly met populations of outlying Enga. The prospectors, Jack and Tom Fox, explored the country west of Mount Hagen in 1934 but there is no record of their travels. In the same year, however, the gold prospectors, Mick and Danny Leahy, penetrated the area from their base at Kuta, near Mount Hagen. Their visit culminated in violence at a place called Doi, close to Wabag. Fifteen Enga died when they attempted to overrun the Leahy camp. Although the Australian Administration was subjected to international criticism over the incident, when Michael Leahy presented his account of the expedition to the Royal Geographical Society in London the following year, it did draw the attention of other prospectors and missionaries to the area.  
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The Administration resisted the pressure to open up the area until 1938 when the patrol under the leadership of Jim Taylor set out to explore the area. The patrol was in the field for 18 months. On 21 July 1938 Taylor located an airstrip site at present-day Wabag on the banks of the Lai River. On 8 August 1938 the first aircraft landed at Wabag and the Enga found themselves thrust into a curious new world.  

Taylor’s airstrip and campsite was used intermittently by patrols until 1942 when a permanent patrol post was set up there by Australia/New Guinea Administrative Unit (ANGAU) officers. Expatriates fleeing the Japanese from the north coast passed through Wabag on their way to Mount Hagen and Port Moresby. In 1944 there was a serious outbreak of dysentery amongst the Enga as a result of their contact with Europeans. A paramedic with ANGAU who visited Wabag to treat people was a Seventh Day Adventist and he was instrumental in convincing his church to send a mission there. Two pastors visited Wabag and set up the Seventh Day Adventist Mission at Rakamanda in 1947.  
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The Enga soon became a focus in the quest for souls. The Catholics flew into the area in the same year to investigate the new field and in February 1948 the Divine Word missionary, Father G.A.M. Bus, set up a mission station at Pompabus, near Wapenamanda. The Lutherans were the last into the valley that year and had to take up a site at Yaramanda about 50 kilometres south west of Wapenamanda. Howie arrived at Pompabus some time in 1948 amidst a highly competitive mission environment and at a time when the Enga were trying to come to terms with this sudden intrusion in their lives.

Unlike many other Papua New Guinean societies, however, the Enga were familiar with the concept of colonisation. Their oral histories refer to the migrations of their own ancestors into the area from the west and south-west and the displacement of the original inhabitants. Large battles took place about five generations ago when the tribes from the Saka, Lai and Ambum valleys were driven out towards Kompiam in a domino effect. Subsequent population growth caused more expansion outwards to the fringes of the present province.

There were also similarities between the new religion being promulgated by the missionaries and traditional Enga beliefs. The Enga shared their religious life between so-called ‘sky people’ and their ancestors. The ‘sky people’ were created by the sun, Aitawe, and are responsible for major phenomena such as weather, light, darkness and earthquakes. The ancestors deal in earthly concerns. Placating both groups provides harmony in the Engan world, with special ceremonies and feasts frequently held in their honour. The history of both groups is related in colourful myths and legends which now coexist comfortably with the mythologies of the introduced religion.

Discussion

The other major Enga collection in the Museum, the A.P.H. Freund Collection from Yaramanda, contains approximately seventy items. There are multiple examples of specific items in the collection as well as examples of artefacts-in-preparation. Curiously, many of the items Tindale encouraged Howie to collect are duplicates of the Freund collection. Tindale was careful not to mention the existence of another collector in the same area to either man in his letters to them and it is difficult to follow his rationale for collecting some of the artefacts. He was refurbishing the Pacific Gallery at the time and he may have been seeking specific items to illustrate a larger Melanesian theme; perhaps he just wanted a range of similar-type artefacts to choose from for his exhibits.

However, none of the Freund or Howie material ended up in the gallery so one can assume that, if this were the case, the theme failed to be developed. That Tindale seemed happy with Howie’s cutting up of spears and arrows for posting seems to indicate that the display of the items in the gallery was not a high priority. Tindale’s interest in the artefacts collected by both men was definitely scientific and it is difficult to say how much he appreciated their aesthetic value.

The value of the Howie material is related to the historical period and circumstances of its collection as well as its relationship to other Highland collections, particularly those of Harold Freund. Like Freund, Howie also collected samples of the raw materials used to manufacture artefacts. If Freund’s photographs from Yaramanda and his notes on...
the gathering of raw materials, manufacture and uses of the artefacts are added to the one hundred or so artefacts in the combined Howie and Freund collections, the Museum has a reasonably representative resource to tap into if it ever sets up a New Guinea Highlands display in the Pacific Gallery. Such a display is very obviously missing as one wanders around the Gallery. Mounting such an exhibit would surely have pleased Tindale. On the other hand the frustrating gaps in the information about Howie and his collection shows up the past folly of the Museum in not recording primary documentation about both the collection and the collector. It also points to the enormous task required to document the other myriad Foreign Ethnology collections in the Museum.

Figure 5. Headwoman of the village of Sikiro.

Figure 6. A40697. One of the original 'charms' from Oroko brought to the Museum by Howie on his first visit to Tindale in 1950. The charm is a marupai. It is a dwarf coconut that has clan designs incised on it with a shark's tooth. Marupai is personal magic, and it is usually carried under the armpit of a man in a small net bag. Incantations to appeal to the marupai are spoken into its 'mouth'. There are a number of other accessories which accompany the marupai but Howie did not collect these.
Figure 7. A43150. The black palm spear cut into three pieces for posting by Howie. The register notes that the spear was collected 'by arrangement, Howie purchased on our behalf directly from natives'.

Figure 8. A43139. A rope used for tying up pigs. The Enga call it a mena punk. It is made from the bark of the jakar tree according to Howie.
Figure 9. A43128. A cord wound around the waist by men to support their front net covering and rear tangat leaf covering. The cord is made from a bark fibre interwoven with yellow orchid stem fibre and is called a marap.

Figure 10. A43125. The working axe collected by Howie which impressed Tindale. It is called a kundine. The blade is beautifully shaped, with no flaws and a very sharp cutting edge. The type of stone has not been identified by the Museum but it probably comes from a quarry site located at the eastern end of the Lai Valley.
Figure 11. A43153. The large wig made of human hair purchased by Howie.

Tindale was particularly pleased to receive this item.

ENDNOTES

6. All the correspondence quoted in this section is contained in the Anthropology Correspondence Files. South Australian Museum.
8. The Advertiser, 8.5.97.