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Introduction

Derek Tribe created The Crawford Fund – an Australian institution serving an international need. The two themes of being Australian while being international recur throughout Tribe’s formation and his story. His loyalty to his adopted Australia was obvious. Less well known was his link to the beginnings of the modern international agricultural research system and Lord Boyd Orr. In fact, Australia and Orr may be considered to have been progenitors of international agricultural development. It was Stanley Bruce as the Australian High Commissioner in 1934 who proposed the League of Nations Assembly act to ameliorate the rise of famine in poor countries while surplus food remained unsold elsewhere. And it was Orr, a British nutritional physiologist who served on the first committee for the League and promulgated visionary nutritional objectives. Through informed rationing systems, Orr’s ideas then allowed the British public to be better nourished than would otherwise have been possible through WWII. Spurred by this success, Orr visited the USA in 1942 to promote his global ideals of equitable nutrition, which in turn led to the creation of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) with Orr as inaugural Director-General.

It was this Nobel Peace Laureate, Orr, whom the 21 year-old Tribe met in 1947. Tribe undertook his PhD at the Rowett Research Institute in Aberdeen Scotland where Orr was Director, although he left around the time of Tribe’s arrival. As Tribe was to do when he approached a similar
age, Orr retired from the academy to raise awareness of international food issues. So perhaps we should not be surprised that a description of Orr by one of his FAO successors might well be applied to Tribe’s life. ‘Almost everything he said carried his unique stamp of global vision combined with a keen practical sense of real human needs and an impatience with the kind of reverence for details that gets in the way of action’.7

Orr’s own words to the 1945 conference that launched FAO claimed that governments could together remove what even then was seen as the major global security issue, food shortages. ‘In the years between the wars there were intergovernmental agreements for limiting the production and distribution of goods. If nations were willing to yield part of their sovereignty to perpetual scarcity in the interests of trade, they should be willing to yield at least as much sovereignty to create a world of plenty in the interests of people.’

However, Orr was ahead of his time. Member governments vetoed his vision for global action and he resigned after three years. The FAO Director-General of 1975 A. H. Boerma would later reflect that, ‘as a result [of Orr’s vision being rejected], FAO has never again felt itself able to put forward any great practical scheme at the same high level of bold, global vision which might have made a major impact on a world food situation that is still a disgrace to the twentieth century’.8 Boerma ends his presentation hopeful of intergovernmental cooperation in the late 1970s. Indeed there were great agricultural research advances at that time. And while such words of hope have now re-echoed too often, they served as a constant reminder to the
maturing Tribe as he acquired skills unusual among his peers through his career.

But Orr maintained his personal vision and hope privately. He wrote in his autobiography, “The most important question today is whether man has attained the wisdom to adjust the old systems to suit the new powers of science and to realize that we are now one world in which all nations will ultimately share the same fate.” Tribe came to understand this in his own way and with an appreciation of human behaviour was often a man for his times.

New times meant a new means of engaging government was needed, and that was Tribe’s vision. It was a vision that led him to found an awareness-raising and lobby body for international agricultural research and development – The Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research. It is not hyperbole to say that Stanley Bruce and Boyd Orr would have been proud, for had they been around in the 1990s, they would certainly have known of Tribe and his actions – Tribe would have seen to that himself. So we may consider Tribe as the legacy of the vision of these two great men, and as a legacy informed by realism through his own interpretation of ‘enlightened self-interest’. More than a philosophy, ‘enlightened self-interest’ seemed at times to be Tribe’s mantra. This is the story of how that man from an ordinary background made an impact beyond his fellows in agricultural science, internationally.
Chapter 1

Formative Decades

If a prophet is not welcomed in his homeland, then neither is any man universally appreciated. The views of those who found aspects of Tribe unsuited to their own natures are represented in the pages that follow. But more consistent are generous memories of a kind charmer who placed being effective and accommodating people ahead of being pedantic. Curiously, such traits are less related to the accomplishments he is remembered for, and we do well to keep them in mind throughout our exploration of his energetic career to contextualize some of his unusual interactions. For behind the relaxed and accomplished façade was a character that demanded of himself detailed preparation and continuous learning.

The First 12 Years

How did this character arise? To answer, we must follow a series of conditioning factors, beginning conventionally with his family history and the place and times of his early life. A scion of a line of soldiers, sailors, tradesmen and schoolteachers, Tribe built on the last vocation. The line had also been devout, following austere Protestant literalism. Drinking alcohol was a sin to the grandparent’s generation, which found that even ‘the Methodists were too flexible’.\(^{10}\) In that era, such were good people – industrious,
earnest in helping the less fortunate, frugal and sober, although their puritanical brothers in early freewheeling Australia became the wowsers. But by Tribe’s generation, the family had settled into a comfortable liberal Protestantism that found its expression in the English Baptist church.

Apart from the church, the environment into which Tribe was born was characterized by memories of war, schoolteacher middle-class values of the 1920s and austerity. Compared to the Australia to which he was to migrate some 30 years later, this was probably a lower standard of living than might have been the case for such a family in Melbourne, and the gap was only to grow through his years in England through the next war. These factors are important, but more important to the characteristics that led to Tribe’s accomplishments were his parents and his place as the youngest of three brothers.

Named Derek by his mother Olive after a character in a novel and Edward after his father Harry’s brother, Derek Edward Tribe was raised in Portsmouth, just as his father had been. His father had begun training as a schoolteacher during the initial years of WW1 before enlisting, eventually rising to Second Lieutenant posted to France. Affected by gas and post-combat trauma, he nevertheless continued his courtship of Olive through letters and leave visits. After the war he rapidly completed the minimum certification to qualify as a teacher, just as his own father had done. Employed and with savings from his wartime pay and the Army’s demobilization gratuity, Harry and Olive bought a small run-down house which they renovated until they eventually married. Harry regularly took additional part-
time teaching jobs for extra income to assist with home building and support of sick parents.

Falling close to the Tribe tree, Derek’s life has many parallels with his father’s. Both were attracted to careers in education, engaged in tertiary studies during wartime, took compressed courses and thereby qualified quickly and engaged in additional professional tasks to supplement family incomes. His father’s advancement through the school system as a result of his standing was also to be a pattern of Derek Tribe’s adult development.

But there is one more parallel worthy of mention. When Harry’s own father – Derek’s grandfather – lay dying and unable to return to school, he wrote to his pupils in an endearing yet instructive style that clearly displayed a love of both them and his vocation. As Derek himself noted of his two paternal antecedents, 'like his father, Harry was an outstanding teacher ... always [taking] a keen personal interest in his pupils and they returned the cooperation and loyalty which he inevitably gave them.'¹¹ The words might well have been taken from observations made by Derek’s past students. His personal interest in them and their lives was a component of their learning environment.

Derek was born on 23 September 1926 in the family home at 71 Hollam Road Milton, the third of three. Two older brothers had preceded him, Donald (b.1922) and Geoffrey (b.1924). He describes early life as harmonious as a result of his parents’ mature and caring relationship. While the third or later children are said to be more rebellious, open and agreeable, genetic effects are known to exceed those of birth order;¹² and common sense leads us to look at the reactions to changes in external circumstances. In Derek’s
case, his birth order proved fortuitous as his family was more comfortable when it came time for his further studies, which exempted him from the WWII military service. His brothers served in the war and Derek’s own stories imply the somewhat protected life he enjoyed at that time.

From parents’ ‘unchanging, steady balance of dependable security, affection and firm, fair discipline’ implemented through maternal biblical lore to ‘let not the sun go down upon your wrath’, the young Derry enjoyed a contented childhood busy with obligations and visitors. His recollections of his first 12 years are remarkably ordinary for an aspiring middle class family and are replete with descriptions of food delivery and itinerant handymen, fireworks, football and church activities. His father’s extracurricular industriousness included night-class teaching at local colleges and the prison. With the extra income and teetotal family habits, his mother managed the finances to allow an almost annual family holiday at a time when neighbouring Portsmouth families remained in the poverty that characterized so many in the 1930s.

His parents encouraged wide and wholesome reading. A gift of a leather-bound diary for his eleventh birthday (1937) was witness to his early commitment to writing, although ambitions seem often to have been constrained by the family’s relatively small world. His diary yields among mundane descriptions of church, ablutions and cricket, such notes as on February 20th that ‘Mr. Hitler made a speech’. Perhaps even more revealing of the atmosphere of the times, and a possible emerging awareness of politics in the young Derek is his entry of September 28, which reads ‘went school morning and afternoon. Played football afternoon. We are on the verge of war.’ One wonders if
this is less a prodigy’s insight than a reflection of adult talk of the time, for as Tribe noted himself, this was the same time that the British Prime Minister (Chamberlain) visited Hitler in Munich returning to claim ‘peace in our time’.15

Church features frequently in these years of Tribe’s life. Rather than reflecting a predilection to religion, we may better interpret it as normal activity of the era. Both parents were engaged in Sunday observances, fundraising activities, weeknight meetings and his father was a deacon in the local Baptist church. It was simply a matter of course that Tribe and his brothers were part of the so-called junior church in which each child played a part in the service. It was here that Tribe first gained confidence in public speaking, conducting meetings and sitting on committees. While it may appear unlikely today, the church of that era in the UK, as in Australia into the 1950s, was less a religious influence than a social and educative one providing a local meeting place, an entertainment and social hub within sound civic values.

Apart from parental and church influences on the personality and values of the young Tribe, the city of Portsmouth itself offers some suggestions for facets of his future character. Having been a major naval port for centuries, the site of the world’s first dry-dock and continuing as a major British naval home, Portsmouth was influenced by the sea and the navy. As with other boys of the time, Tribe would have enjoyed Navy Week and thought naught of the seamless association of navy and church. Such an environment was well suited to missionaries returning to tell ‘enthralling stories of their experiences in darkest Africa where they were bringing Christianity, health and education to deprived natives.’ There is no hint of sarcasm
here in Tribe’s words – it was just a matter of fact for the time and place. But one may speculate that such contacts played their part in his future views, work and travels, as might well have the ‘many people we knew [who] served overseas in the forces, the police or the Colonial Services, or had relatives serving in the Empire.’

Such was the environment in which Tribe’s early attitudes were formed. It was a solid foundation built with a sound family environment, such as produces confident and outgoing young men. At 12, he was ready to sit the exam that decided whether he would continue on to secondary school and perhaps beyond to enter a trade in the local dockyards. Notwithstanding such scholastic props as pens in his blazer pocket, his results were less than outstanding, perhaps because his father fell ill at the time. But his father’s contacts in education ensured that Tribe gained a special place and a small bursary to attend the locally elite Portsmouth Grammar School.

Apart from his father’s ill health, Tribe’s first 12 years seem to have been smooth, supportive and succouring; however, the external environment was poised to bring great change.
**War and Evacuation**

The period 1939 to 1946 provides a specific time in which to gauge influences on the character of the young Tribe. His first twelve years of stability and support had produced a confident teenager able to negotiate the disruptive years that followed. In 1939, as for others, the Tribe family was scattered by the British response to war which required evacuation of school children with their teachers from high-risk bomb targets such as the Portsmouth naval docks. Tribe's two brothers followed their teachers to New Forest while his parents went with his father's school to the Isle of Wight. So it was that three weeks before his thirteenth birthday, Tribe found himself issued with a gas mask and whisked off with the Grammar School to Sparsholt in Hampshire and later Southbourne near Bournemouth.

Such an atmosphere of dormitory life, air-raid drills and watching bombers fly over must have been exciting for a 13 year-old. But having enjoyed a close family environment, the separation must also have had its psychological impact. His later life, while maintaining a sound image of the resident academic and father, also included that pattern common to school borders of readily accepting new travels and adventures through their lives.

 Tribe records such droll wartime events as his class communicating with Moroccan troops evacuated from Dunkirk with schoolboy French and a game of cricket, interspersed with more serious shifts watching for fire-bombs at night. But the war does not seem to have touched these boys personally except through homesickness, and Tribe recorded his recollection of the ominous summer of
1940 ‘as an enjoyable season of warm days, blue skies and interesting events.’

Notwithstanding relative insularity from the war, it had its effect in the formation of the influential adult that Tribe was to become. By 1941, his parents having returned to Portsmouth were once again evacuated, this time to a rural community near Newbury in Berkshire where they spent about two years. Tribe was able to spend his school holidays with them and to experience life on the farm. He assisted with farm jobs including rabbiting to supplement family meals. Working with horse-drawn rakes and ploughs, steam threshing machines and mucking out pigsties was his holiday life, by choice even more than necessity. He collected and pressed plant specimens out of interest, and watched the behaviour of farm and wild animals alike. It was of this experience that his father recalled in the notebooks that Tribe provided to the old man that ‘whilst on holidays, [Derek] discovered his great interest in agriculture which decided him later to take a degree course in agriculture at the University of Reading.’

It seems that it was more than just the farm experience that set the teenage Tribe on this path, for his memoirs also reveal the wonder of the city boy who discovers bucolic nature. And he offered the self-revealing observation that such wonder remained with him throughout his life – a mark of the natural scientist. These two otherwise minor points assume importance when we focus on the continued formation of the man who was to inspire many into the science of agriculture and the benefits of rural communities.
By contrast, school does not seem to have engaged Tribe. He found it to be ‘a dull routine of unimaginative teachings and old-fashioned discipline.’\(^{19}\) His school’s evacuation location had no laboratories, which meant no practical science was taught. Nevertheless, with another student, Tribe received direct tutoring in biology from the headmaster who was respected in the field having co-authored a biology text.

The next stage of his secondary education required a move back to Portsmouth Municipal College where the sciences were taught up to university entrance level. During his time at the college, Tribe was introduced to other formative factors, including older and serious students, the theatrical arts and to moral and religious questions.

His early religious life in the liberal Baptist tradition, the norms of the era and his conditioning to attend church-related groups broadened while at the college such that he and some friends sampled different denominations each Sunday. Concluding that the common-sense morality of his parents was ‘as good an answer as any’,\(^{20}\) overt religion seems to fade from Tribe’s life from this time. But the values of a benign English version of Protestantism continued to pervade his value system for the rest of his life.

The family while emotionally close remained scattered by wartime imperatives, coming together during the holidays. Tribe’s brothers being older completed secondary studies, entered university and enlisted in the services before completing their degrees. Tribe’s age spared him some of the pressures of enlisting although having passed his Intermediate examination in 1944 and approaching 18
years of age, he sought to enlist in the Royal Navy. Normal though this was for this time and place, Tribe was to be spared an active commission by his colour-blindness. While accommodating himself to the possibility of a less glamorous administrative naval posting, the University of Reading accepted him as a second-year agricultural student. Urged by both his father and the Naval Recruiting Officer, Tribe thus settled into his future direction of agricultural science at Reading.
Chapter 2

Entering the Profession

The University of Reading

Tribe spent from October 1944 to 1946 as a student of the newly established University of Reading. He recalled those two years as ‘among the most enjoyable and important periods’ of his life. A redbrick university in a small city, its some 700 students mostly lived on campus, although Tribe boarded with an elderly widow for his first twelve months. The University had evolved from a training college known for its agricultural courses, and in 1944 more than half of the student profile took agriculturally oriented studies. These first steps into agricultural science are of interest in terms of the image sometimes later projected onto Tribe in some Australian circles where it was assumed he was a product of a grander background.

But Reading was an active campus, and what Tribe missed by living off site he compensated for in his energetic club and sporting activities. It is as if he had suddenly happened onto a new world of stimulation, learning and opportunity, and he absorbed it all with enthusiasm. His engagements were diverse, including; President of the Students’ Union, Company Quartermaster Sergeant in the Senior Training Corps, Editor of the student newspaper ‘Shell’, Secretary of the Music Club, Captain of the Badminton Team, as well as being a member of the University athletics and hockey
teams and of the Berkshire and English University teams. He was proud of his sporting image, ensuring that a photograph of the time captured the ‘shell’ on his University blazer. Add to this extracurricular load, four dances each term and the travel involved for inter-varsity sports, and a picture emerges of a socially active and well-organized person, as he remained for the rest of his life. At the same time, Tribe also claimed that he spent more time studying than his fellow students, but such claims are always difficult to validate. Building on his firm home foundation and adequate although hasty science education, natural intelligence allowed him to test his talents in diverse fields, and to thus develop further confidence in his actions.

Becoming President of the Students’ Union in 1945 brought with it a coveted room in Wantage Hall, one of the student residences. This brought even more possibilities into Tribe’s life, although the antics of students at that time appear tame compared to both earlier and later times, possibly in response to wartime privations and respect for the national mood. Tribe’s institutional link to that mood was limited to engagement with the Senior Training Corps and its regular camps during vacations as well as his routine schedule with other students watching for fire
bombs. Nevertheless, these roles made real the threat of being conscripted if one failed in examinations.

While the non-academic atmosphere may today seem like a consuming mélange of culture, sport, study and fraternity, the times were different and somewhat formal. Socializing between young men and women fuelled by young hormones found their vehicles in such forms as the Agricultural Club, a Student Christian Movement meeting and political unions. Regular speakers presented to such meetings and musicians entertained at concerts. Through this establishment period for the University of Reading in wartime, an official history confirms that such formal gatherings and clubs characterized student and staff social life. This was fertile ground for the spirit of a young man who was emerging from a rather sober upbringing. One of the consequences was a fascination with politics, as one instance tellingly indicates.

As President of the Students’ Union, Tribe was to host the right-wing University Chancellor, a Conservative Member of Parliament, to speak to the left-wing student conference. His committee recommended that Tribe discuss with the Vice Chancellor the risk of student confrontation, who in turn suggested that Tribe draft a letter to the Chancellor. The letter was apparently a diplomatic introduction of the likely emergence of strong views at the meeting and was worded in such carefully unstated implications as to be clear to initiates of British English. Of the hours of drafting, as Tribe later recalled, ‘what a waste of time it turned out to be!’ He received no reply except a note two days before the date of the conference in which the Chancellor stated that he must remain in bed under doctor’s orders. The Times, however, recorded his speaking in the House of Lords a day
after the letter was written. The hitherto trusting Tribe shed some naivety, noting that ‘this was my first valuable lesson on the nature of political behaviour’.23

With the ending of the European war, British politics returned to its usual oppositional operation and an election was called in mid 1945. As it was ten years since the previous election, Tribe knew little about political campaigns, but this did not restrain him from putting his left-wing student political awareness into practice. Impressed by the Labour Party more than the Conservatives or the Communists, Tribe assisted the local candidate’s campaign through the university summer break. One of his tasks was to ask difficult questions at the Conservative’s candidate functions in an attempt to spoil his public image. Thus we see the young stager honing the public debating skills for which he was decades later and in another country to earn the appellation of ‘the silver tongued fox’.

During this period Tribe was significantly influenced by Victor Gollanz founder and gifted publicist of the Left Book Club, which seductively described the benefits of democratic socialism. Such exposure to socialist ideals as well as his involvement in the political campaign led Tribe to the Reading Town Hall to celebrate Labour’s electoral victory. That event moved him, according to his own testimony, and may well have further shown him the power of emotive rhetoric and crowd engagement.

Such emotional moments were punctuated with other developmental events, including student debates about the morality of the atom bombs dropped in Japan. All this was part of Tribe’s first year at university, which was Year 2 of
the agricultural science course since he had been exempted from the first.

It was around this time, in the middle of the summer vacation, that Tribe spent a day wandering about in central London savouring the celebrative atmosphere that surrounded the end of the war. He seems to have been motivated by the general mood and the prospect of participating in an historical moment. He was enthralled to see the prominent men of the era, and the theme of his memoir is of putting himself close to power, a characteristic that became more evident as his career developed. But most of the summer, he was engaged in the essential vacation work of the agriculture student, which is always especially critical to a city boy such as Tribe.

His second and final year at Reading followed a similar pattern to the first with the addition of meeting and courting Elizabeth, a fellow agricultural student. Upon completing their degrees, Elizabeth accepted a post as Demonstrator in the Dairy Department at the University while Tribe applied for and was offered a post as Tea Planter in Kerala, India. The choice was not out of character as the family was of the class that is sprinkled with colonial civil servants. Before he accepted the post, Tribe’s direction was refocused on the family tradition of education when his future mother-in-law drew his attention to an advertisement for Post-Graduate Scholarships at British research institutes. He duly applied and was offered a scholarship in animal nutrition research at the Rowett Institute in Scotland. He accepted the scholarship, partly at least to continue his courtship of Elizabeth, and at the age of 19 set off for Aberdeen.
This two years at Reading had been formative. He had arrived as a keen, studious, social and not so worldly-wise young man, and now left with political, social and intellectual skills of an order above his peers. As Tribe later recalled, in Reading ‘lessons of every sort were there to be learnt and I absorbed them like a sponge.’24 He was well equipped to continue his development in Scotland.

The Rowett Institute

Tribe was to spend the years from 1946 at the Rowett. For his first two years he lived in Strathcona House, the residential and social centre of the Institute. This was the Institute of which the recently appointed Foundation Director-General of the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) had been Director. Sir (later Lord) John Boyd Orr was famous for his 1937 book – ‘Food, Health and Income’,25 which applied nutritional science to Britain’s wartime food rationing and had remained a basic reference for decades. As discussed earlier, this was a formative if fleeting association, and Tribe remained impressed by the reputation and image of Orr. He admitted that, ‘although I only met him a couple of times ... his views on the importance of increasing world food production were strongly supported by the Institute staff and made a strong and lasting impression on me.’26 We may see this
influence culminating in Tribe’s later roles with the CGIAR, The World Bank, and ultimately The Crawford Fund.

Arriving at the Rowett, a stable and unpretentious upbringing supplemented by the wider experiences of his two Reading years, had primed the 20 year-old Tribe for a worldview beyond British farming. From home and church he was conditioned to responsibility for those less fortunate, to middle class morality including frugality and work, to study for personal advancement, to accepting leadership and to indulge his curiosity. In this emerging environment of expanding science and a wider world a focus developed that would later be seen as international agricultural science. Hindsight might tempt one to see this as a direct link, but that would be to deny the opportunistic streak that often led Tribe into roles that others declined, even at the Rowett.

Tribe came to the Rowett enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate in the University of Aberdeen to work on ‘The Grazing Habits of Sheep’ with a specific focus on factors that determined sheep’s preferential selection of plants. While this involved some laboratory trials with caged rats and sheep, much of the work was conducted outdoors recording the habits of grazing sheep in the windswept heather lands of northern Scotland. In the tradition of field research, Tribe took delight in inventing his own equipment to make life easier. His modest invention was a waterproof outfit replete with a helmet with a windshield wiper above a wearable tent that housed note pads, a battery lamp and a thermos.

Such dedication and ingenuity was noticed, and in the natural pattern of things, led to other opportunities. Such
opportunities were to include the chance to conduct studies on phosphorous-deficient cattle of the Isle of Skye, and on the seaweed-eating sheep of the Orkney Islands. Similar ingenuity was also evident in his not infrequent visits to London and Cambridge, ostensibly to discuss animal behaviour and attend scientific meetings, for these trips happened to allow visits with Elizabeth.

Between sporting interests, research and domestic travel, he was also funded under the scholarship to make one overseas trip. Tribe used this opportunity to familiarize himself with Danish agriculture and to attend the International Congress on Microbiology with a special interest in rumen microbes. And here we see Tribe working opportunity to advantage – and making it appear serendipitous. He found himself en route to Denmark among such world microbiological leaders as Nobel Laureate Sir Alexander Fleming of penicillin fame. Rather than shyly retire from their company, the absorbent young sponge imbibed their talk for the length of the voyage.

Denmark was the next landmark on Tribe’s ever broadening horizon – ‘an excellent place for the uninitiated to start learning about the world’. Post war gratitude to Britain embellished his visit and Tribe wrote glowingly of his experience and observations in the journal of the Agricultural Education Association, ‘Agricultural Progress’. It is from around this time that we can see Tribe’s emerging love affair with words, and in particular clear communication. Surely this was inspired by his departmental head, James Howie’s article, later published in The Lancet, praising the use of plain and interesting English. Howie motivated Tribe to take a correspondence course through the London School of Journalism, which led
to him preparing articles for criticism and later publication. Success was rewarded with article fees that supplemented his scholarship, incidentally mimicking his father’s energy in finding extracurricular income from professional sources.

Tribe was further motivated to augment his means in the second year of his Ph.D. scholarship when he and Elizabeth become engaged. As had his father, Tribe gave evening classes in three towns, in his case to the non-academic Workers’ Education Association. These evenings seem to have been somewhat akin to adult education classes and they placed a speaker on his mettle to retain sufficient audience to justify a course. Thus Tribe sharpened his abilities in public speaking and pursued his penchant for preparation. In the same vein, he summarized scientific articles for Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews, earning cash as well as knowledge from papers he would not have otherwise read, and incidentally perfecting his skills in précis.

Continuing to work on his Ph.D. while teaching elsewhere, writing abstracts and playing sport, Tribe was also preparing a run-down house for after the 1948 wedding. Elizabeth found work at the nearby College of Agriculture and so introduced what would become other lifelong friends. This is an early indication of the Tribes described by many acquaintances as – ‘people who like people’. It was a trait that defined personal approaches across Tribe’s career, even among some with whom he crossed swords. The young couple joined in diverse activities ranging from Scottish dancing to cricket with its village green ambiance of tea and socializing. One Aberdeenshire village of their cricket afternoons, Monymusk, left such an impression on
the two that they honoured it in the name of three of their subsequent homes.

Tribe’s invitation to observe the seaweed-eating sheep of the Orkney Islands allowed Elizabeth to join him, and as they collaborated in the work the resulting two articles were authored by Tribe and Tribe. Tribe was proud of such matters, and often insinuated them into conversations across his life, although it seems he did not always reveal that this was their first holiday together and only a few months after their honeymoon. The energy for writing displayed by the ambitious young doctoral candidate was opening up one more forum for the skills that he was accumulating – skills that would make his subsequent accomplishments appear easy. In this instance, it also provides an early illustration of his reliance on Elizabeth for professional and personal support.

Through 1949, Tribe attended the International Grasslands Congress in the Netherlands with Elizabeth, added rats to his Ph.D. behavioural research interests, abstracted and wrote for magazine and journals, continued his interest in politics and spoke at various farmer gatherings. The latter was an unpopular duty among the Rowett scientists, but Tribe the public speaker was ever willing. He also took his turn showing visitors around the Institute, and this appears to be one of his first contacts with Australians – whom he later claimed to have liked from the beginning. The attraction of Australia may have grown from these early meetings, though colonial ties made it closer than today in some ways.

One Australian was to be especially influential. Ian Johnstone from the Pastoral Research Laboratory of CSIRO
in Armidale NSW was at that time seconded to be Scientific Liaison Officer at the Australian High Commission in London. Tribe’s sheep research attracted his interest and when visiting Tribe he made a casual suggestion in the manner of countrymen that Tribe visit Australia. It seems to have been nothing more than an entertaining idea to Tribe at the time. But it is easy to gloss over such details and thus miss another aspect of Tribe’s modus operandi. Surely Johnstone knew of much other sheep research in Britain, visited many other sites where relevant research was being conducted and tested the mettle of other young researchers. It was Tribe who was to shape the opportunity as his own.

Once he had completed his Ph.D., Tribe was appointed as a Research Scientist of the Rowett with a graduate salary. Nevertheless, as he noted ‘I continued to earn a welcome supplementary income through my abstracting, adult education classes, and occasional articles for the farming press.’ The extra money was welcome since they were to begin a family in 1950, when Jonathan was born as the first of their three children; the others were to be Andrew (born Bristol 1953) and Jane (born Melbourne 1957).

In the same year Tribe’s political interests flared up again. He had joined the Labour Party while at the Rowett although he remained largely inactive. But the 1950 campaign engaged Tribe as a supporting speaker to the local candidate. Here we see Tribe entering into his public element, charming an audience and balancing the political nuances of differing wills behind the scenes. His candidate lost and we may suspect significant understatement in Tribe’s recollection that it was ‘great fun and a valuable learning experience’. The upshot was that he was asked to
be a Labour candidate for the 1951 election. However, Tribe with firm advice from Elizabeth decided that such a life was not for them. None who knew Tribe later in his career doubted his political acumen, some even claiming that he was a master. The truth may be that Tribe knew his own political strengths and limitations and decided to apply this acumen in parallel with his other strengths. Thus he eschewed public office in 1950 just as he was to later avoid the higher levels of the nuanced politics of large universities. Notwithstanding this observation, it is clear that even from this early time, Tribe was possessed of a sophisticated understanding of human nature and its political application uncommon among his peer agricultural scientists.

With such political awareness, Tribe was more broadly based than other young researchers. And the Rowett continued to figure in Tribe’s decisions long after he left, as he sent postdoctoral and postgraduates to work there. Sir Kenneth Blaxter, Director from 1965-82 is one example. Blaxter had argued that cereals grown in certain parts of England were net energy sinks in terms of fertilizer, fuel and other inputs when compared to the calorific value of the crop. Tribe interpreted this as a sign of unsustainability, although he was much more of the Bosrupian school that technology would continue to deliver the food that was needed – if only research was funded adequately. We should not be surprised that this became the theme of his last great venture, The Crawford Fund.

His political acumen certainly helped with that later creation. But even at this tender moment of transition in moving from Aberdeen, his open attitude to learning and skills in public speaking, diplomatic dealings, writing,
researching, teaching and engaging with people of all walks of life, had already marked him as one who would go far. Now 25, he had published nearly 20 papers and had been published in Nature and was soon to be again. He was also married and a father. This was indeed a young man in a hurry. These responsibilities and skills combined with an ambition to widen his scientific base from animal behaviour to general animal production merged within the family tradition in education to lead him into a lectureship in animal nutrition in the School of Veterinary Science at the University of Bristol.

**Bristol and Australian Contact**

Tribe moved to become a foundation member of staff of the new vet school at Bristol where he taught from 1952 to 1955. On reaching the site, he quickly decided on a rental house on the research station some 25 km south of the main university campus. This time spent at Bristol is curiously brief in his memoirs, perhaps suggesting some disappointment with the experience – or perhaps it was the prospect of something more exciting emerging at this time. We have some indication that Tribe found it comfortable to be able to receive more guests in this more accessible part of Britain, which was also closer to parents. It also seems that he enjoyed establishing a research laboratory and preparing lectures. One student of the time recalls Tribe as a young lecturer settling in to a new school and who was thus the target of some clever if routine pranks.
A member of the final year class recalled that Tribe’s first university teaching post revealed a nervous lecturer and the students thought that they ‘taught him as much as he taught them’. His theatrical style of presentation enhanced his image, and overall they felt that he was ‘one of us’, particularly given the similarity of ages – final year Veterinary students were perhaps 22 years of age and Tribe was 26. And in the manner of the curious circles that pervade Tribe’s history, one of these students on migrating to Melbourne three decades later was surprised to meet Tribe as a favoured raconteur of the Beefsteak Club at University House.37

The Bristol years were to be foreshortened as a result of a defining event, which occurred early in his tenure. This was an invitation from the Nuffield Foundation in association with CSIRO to visit Australia for two months as a Visiting Lecturer. Officially, this was simply a direct result from the throwaway comments of Johnstone on his visit to the Rowett. But we may also see this as the fruit of Tribe’s gregarious grace and eagerness to meet people; for it was Tribe who showed the visitors around the Rowett when others found that duty boring. And his discussions of his research were made the more interesting by his theatrical enthusiasm. We may also suspect, on the basis of actions in other events, that Tribe had not allowed any node of his emerging network to atrophy through lack of contact.

So we may dismiss the proposition that the Australian invitation arrived ‘out of the blue’ even though Tribe liked to characterize it that way. Tribe’s skills in dealing with people, his delight in meeting strangers, his interlocutory persuasiveness in explaining science and his sense of duty
had jelled into an opportunity that he would grasp with both hands. We can also see the influences of relatives, including colonial links through Elizabeth’s second cousin Connie in Melbourne, Tribe’s brother Geoff being with the British Council in India and Elizabeth’s brother who was on a Sudan cotton scheme. And in any case, Melbourne was in the news as the site for the coming Olympic Games. But most of this is circumstantial – what is more certain was Tribe’s curiosity and desire to expand his horizons ever further.

The Australian odyssey introduced Tribe to Professor (later Sir) Samuel Wadham, who apart from being the great Dean of Agriculture at the University of Melbourne, was the Nuffield Foundation representative in Australia. He was also to meet Dr Lionel Bull, Chief of CSIRO Animal Health and Production who introduced him to two others destined to influence his future, A.J. Vasey and Norman Tulloh.

Tulloh recalls that ‘in early 1952, we had a visit from Dr Derek E. Tribe ... for about two months. We organized his itinerary from Parkville and it included CSIRO laboratories and field stations, together with universities in Eastern Australia. He gave lectures at most places he visited, including the Ag School in Melbourne. I got to know him well and kept in touch with him after his return to England.’38 Indeed they did keep in touch. For during the next year, when Norman was based in London for CSIRO, they met and Tribe invited him home to spend the weekend. Thus began a lifetime friendship and a mutually supportive professional association.

Tribe visited research sites in Adelaide, Canberra, Deniliquin, Gilruth Plains, Griffith, Melbourne, Perth,
Sydney and Trangie observing new flora and fauna, including unusual people. As he later observed, ‘this exhilarating experience opened my eyes to so much that I had never previously known’ and in his trip report he recorded that ‘every person I met in Australia was most kind and hospitable’. This was a grand adventure for a young man of Tribe’s staid background, and was to have far-reaching effects.

Tribe was a gift to the Nuffield Foundation. He was gregarious, intelligent, scientifically educated and full of energy. He was also organized in a sense that would shame modern social networkers, as was evident from the records he kept of Australians and others he had met at the Rowett. And after following the polite protocols of the age, he visited these contacts in their research sites and homes. He lectured – not just to fulfil an obligation to Nuffield – but because he enjoyed it and used it as a means to further widen his networks and knowledge. Lectures were given to local branches of the Institute of Agricultural Science in most locations, as well as to farmer and community organizations.

And on the trip back to Britain via the USA, Tribe shared the slow flights and frequent landings and meals with Nobel Laureate Sir MacFarlane Burnet, leaving the mark of his 26 year-old skill and potential on the great man. After the trip Tribe kept in touch with Australians he had met, some of whom then visited him in Bristol.

After his Australian adventure, Tribe continued his paid extra curricular work in Bristol writing for the farming press, conducting short courses for farmers, giving short radio broadcasts on farming and examining occasional
graduate theses. By now, party politics had lost their appeal to Tribe and were replaced by family and domestic activities such as gardening – or so Tribe would have us believe. Teaching and research activities continued apace, but the vet school itself proved to be less open-minded than Tribe had assumed. The old veterinarian versus the animal scientist snobbery seems to have arisen in this new institution – a confrontation that pervades the English-speaking world to the detriment of both professions. At its worst it has seen veterinarians claim that animal scientists lack medical prestige and public acceptance, and animal scientists claim that veterinarians are narrowly-trained technicians. While not a primary reason, such rivalry must be considered one cause for an obviously able and ambitious young animal scientist to consider that better opportunities lay elsewhere.

In this frame of mind in 1955, Tribe received a letter from Vasey of CSIRO stating that Wadham had asked that a forthcoming vacancy at the University of Melbourne be made known to Tribe. Such academic foreplay is often code for ‘if invited, might you accept such a position’ and Tribe was indeed interested. Tribe liked to suggest that the invitation arrived of its own accord, but we again may assume this is part of his gift of making things seem easy and his life one of much luck. In fact, such luck through his career seems proportional to his effort, and many of his accomplishments were not easy at all, requiring much preparation and hard work. In this case, we know that Tribe and Tulloh had often discussed ‘the opportunities for Poms in Australia’. In fact their communication already reflected their close friendship having ‘reached that stage of [British] intimacy where we dropped the prenominals [Dr.
or Mr.] and affectionately called one another “Tulloh” and “Tribe”.

With such experience and personal contacts, it might seem an easy step for Tribe to apply for the post in Melbourne. But this was not the Australia of today, and British attitudes had not kept pace with the decline of colonial glory. So Tribe sought advice. In Britain, the advice seems to have taken the form of it not being ‘exceptionally risky’ to spend a few years in Australia provided one focused on matters of specific interest to British rather than Australian agriculture. Advice from the Australian friends at the time was that Australia offered more opportunity, more interesting work and a superior lifestyle to Britain and that the decision was clearly to be weighted in that direction by any thinking person. Nevertheless the Australian sentiments were couched in the anglophilic language of the times, with the assumption of continuing close relations to Britain. The decision was difficult enough and we may assume that the balanced scales were tipped toward Australia by the two added weights of adventure in escaping from the parochialism of old Britain and the burden of the post war period on the British psyche. After due deliberation, Tribe replied according to the measured manners of the time that he was interested in principle, subject to further information.

Once further information arrived, Tribe began negotiating conditions with an amenable Wadham. It all culminated in a letter offering Tribe appointment ‘as a Reader in the Physiology of Domestic Animals’ with a generous salary plus allowances. He accepted immediately and in early January the family boarded the S.S. Orcades to Australia. The unusual combination of skills that Tribe’s formation to
this time had raised to a near art form was about to be exposed to a new environment to which they would be adapted and applied.
Chapter 3

Australia: The First Decade

Migrating

Sailing to Australia in 1956 keeping two young boys seen but not heard hardly dampened Tribe’s competitive spirit. It found expression in a Mad Hatter competition for his ‘Captain’s Table’, an academic’s mortar-board set with plate, glass and cutlery. And then as if planned, he set foot on what was to gradually become his adopted country on Australia Day. Landfall was Perth where the Tribes were welcomed by one of Tribe’s many Australian agricultural friends, Reg Moir. When they later arrived in Melbourne they were in turn greeted by Elizabeth’s aunt and uncle, friends from Elizabeth’s work and cricket in Aberdeen – Olive and Jack Lawson, and Sir Samuel and Lady Wadham. Tribe’s reflection on the ensuing months reveal a period of adjustment expressed in the somewhat clichéd terms of having ‘come from a small, old, self-satisfied nation to a large, new country which was still finding its self-confidence’.43

With characteristic generosity Tribe described the Australians he first lived among, who were incidentally Elizabeth’s relatives, as ‘sensible, kind, down-to-earth, blunt, good-humoured, egalitarian, and straight laced’. The last comment seems quaint from what we can glean of
Tribe’s rather protected upbringing, and his later prudish image. Perhaps it was a projection, but in any case it was a comment on the cultural divergence between Britain and Australia where old modes of manners long abandoned in Britain had been retained. These working colonials smoothed the immigration settlement experience while conforming to Tribe’s idealized and perhaps even socialist worldview.

It is easy to underestimate the effects of immigration from Britain – a country with apparently the same language and culture. An academic field addressing the subject has deemed such persons ‘the invisible migrants’. While the Tribes were not part of the subsidized migration scheme, they must have been subject to a similar experience – ‘invisible’ because they blended in more easily with the locals, or at least were expected to do so. Yet unsupported by the local social fabric, they were susceptible to various neuroses.44 By contrast, he and Elizabeth settled into Melbourne with a support structure of friends and family and their outward going and egalitarian natures ensured that they made more friends quickly. But both Tribes remembered their initial experience and the lack of information about Australia from the perspective of migrant professionals rather than worker-migrants, and they soon addressed that need in a popular book. Meanwhile they settled into suburbia.

**Assimilating**

Initially living in the somewhat distant eastern suburb of Burwood as arranged by Elizabeth’s relatives, they soon bought a house closer to the city in Surrey Hills. Tribe’s
Australian university life began routinely, but he made sure that changed quickly. How would this young Englishman, depicted as if posing for a knitting magazine cover, settle into the waning pioneering era of southern Australia? Rather well as it turned out. As with so much in his life, opportunities were created by his outward going nature.

So he was soon attending an International Grasslands Congress in New Zealand where he befriended a young farmer from the Mornington Peninsula near Melbourne. The farmer was travelling to study more about sheep, and later back in Australia, Tribe was to find that his new friend and some fellow progressive farmers had formed the Peninsula Prime Lamb Producers’ Association and were seeking someone to conduct research on their land. Never one to let a bird escape the hand, Tribe parlayed the opportunity into a research program over the following years, as is described later. We are tempted to ask, ‘was it just a coincidence that this young farmer was the son of businessman philanthropist Sir George James Coles’?

There are no answers to many of the unlikely coincidences in Tribe’s story. Some are buried in witty anecdotes that have the polished feel of invention laid over fact. Others may be confirmed as fact, and reflect Tribe simply building
on a fortunate moment, such as with the farmer Coles. One way of interpreting Tribe’s approach is to imagine that he consider every need, deficiency, conversation and meeting as an opportunity to help, and to meet multiple objectives. Of course, by overstating his ability, we can easily fall into the trap of implying unwarranted manipulation, as did some of his later detractors.

Yet the approach is useful as a comparison with other academics for whom the same opportunities must have been present. One example is found in Tribe’s reaction to his ignorance of Victorian farmers, and local perceptions of a Pom pretending to know about Australian agriculture. His response was to engage with all whom his path crossed while at the same time ‘going to the top’. In this case, the top was initially his Dean Sam Wadham, whose own experience as an immigrant mistreated by an unfeeling university was relevant. Sam as he was widely called, rose from such insecure employment to eventually best his academic foes and become a major force in advancing Australian agriculture. Wadham – the Cambridge man who was criticized as flippant by fellow academics and lionized by all who knew agriculture – had fought the parochial battles for which the University was famous and knew who was at the ‘top’ of agriculture, which at that time was still the top of most things in Australia.

As had been the case with the impact of Orr on the fresh doctoral candidate, so Tribe was to overlap with Wadham for only one year, yet was destined to inherit his oversized mantle. The bland documentation of the time suggests that we might see Tribe as continuing Wadham’s legacy within and on behalf of the University and agriculture. Wadham knew that ‘the days when universities could live in a world
apart, if they truly existed, [were] long since over’. And he knew that an open-minded and down-to-earth young man with potential to lead was needed. We may assume that Wadham saw this some years earlier when Tribe arrived in his office on a Nuffield Fellowship – and perhaps thought, here was the young man to succeed him. Tribe maintained close contact with Wadham for the rest of his life. In his first year at the University, Tribe was introduced by Wadham to the local agricultural establishment, ‘those who mattered’ as Tribe would have called them as he did others in later situations when he was working an opening.

The similarities between Wadham and Tribe are worthy of note in understanding the character of the man who inherited a legacy that had influenced agricultural science more than any of his contemporaries. Wadham was a no nonsense man of more than academic intelligence who respected farmers and others alike. He was an agricultural scientist with the emphasis on agriculture more than science though accepted by both fields – an unusual combination that was seldom later seen. Tribe on the other hand had science – credible science – for though still a young man he had published more than 30 papers. Yet he like Wadham was not married to the detail of ‘hard’ science or technology as the core of agricultural science. They shared a practical interest in agriculture and helping its continuous improvement.

They were also both English by formation, and this allowed a level of assumed knowledge and connection with which their Australian colleagues were not credited. And in any case Wadham had nominated Tribe as the preferred choice for the Reader in Animal Science appointment. These two factors made them natural allies, and Tribe’s penchant for
maintaining close relations ensured that he learned more of local politics and personalities than his more solitary academic colleagues. This was a huge advantage for Tribe, which he nurtured while offering support and friendship to Wadham right through his retirement and old age. But of course, this did not compensate for Tribe’s lack of local knowledge.

Tribe had his own idea for gaining the experience and credibility that he lacked. He decided to spend his first Christmas vacation working on a farm. In typical form, for both Wadham and Tribe, the mechanism was a dinner at the prestigious Melbourne Club with Wadham and the Western District grazier A.B. Ritchie. Tribe made his pitch and was offered a cottage, rations of milk and lamb, and wages. Declining the wages since he remained on university salary, he made the cottage the family’s holiday house for the season and conducted both farm and research work. We see the beginnings of Tribe’s ‘two-birds-with-one-stone’ management in his enticing a post-graduate student and a technician to also come and live in the nearby shearers’ quarters. And so with the addition of friends invited to visit, work became fun and Tribe gained experience, credibility and research material. In addition, he was socializing with the local Victorian establishment. Seen from this perspective, it seems like a well-executed plan.

Already in his new country Tribe was applying his knack for working and socializing with people to everyone’s benefit. His nominal employer in this vacation of fieldwork and research remained a friend, and years later commented on a talk Tribe gave on international development. We can glean something of Tribe’s pride in speaking well and clearly in the extract he kept from that comment. ‘Dear
Tribe, Congratulations on your talk. I can’t remember ever hearing a better one. But I have to say that I disagreed with all the points you made ... ’49 Tribe loved such inverted praise.

The relationships that Tribe made were genuine and their fruit came to him in many ways. In this case Ritchie offered seats for the tennis and occasional dinners, including another one at the Melbourne Club with two other guests worthy of mention. Lord Casey was Minister for External Affairs and had held other Australian and British portfolios and was to become Governor General of Australia. Neville Fraser was a wealthy grazier whose son Malcolm later became Prime Minister. Throughout dinner the young Reader from Britain imbibed a conversation about the education of one’s sons. The attitudes of the local gentry, which centred on Oxford, Cambridge and classical education, assumed that privilege led to leadership. Coming from another class, Tribe had never before encountered people like this, and while recognizing their altruistic sincerity, he found the born-to-rule attitudes ‘out-dated and verging on the arrogant’.50 This is an instructive and curious contrast with the image that Tribe was assuming, which was as one of the well-connected influential class of Australian agriculture.

Nevertheless, Tribe liked these people, as he liked almost everyone, and the anecdote perhaps confirms some of the anomalies in the views of his later peers about Tribe. It is no coincidence that, some four decades later when Tribe spoke at the Melbourne Club, he relayed another telling anecdote about himself and the younger Fraser. Tribe’s ‘Englishness’ never left him in the eyes of many Australians and so they loved him for his generous egalitarianism, but
they often assumed that he would automatically identify with the vestigial British attitudes retained by what was then known as the Western District aristocracy. But in fact, it seems more likely that Tribe just accepted each person and group as they were, within reason. He did not indulge the ‘battler’ farmers if they did not help themselves, nor did he take all student pranks lightly. But in other ways he showed remarkable flexibility. For example, in the 1980s he became an adviser to a consulting company, a mercenary role to which he quickly adjusted as a means of meeting humanitarian values. Many of his university colleagues of the time continued to insist that all business except family farms was grubby commercialism.

And so Tribe’s capabilities grew as they were applied to new situations. He mixed with his fellow academics, small farmers and captains of business, while living a conventional suburban existence. Reliance on the stability of home life to accept risky opportunities defined this and most periods of his life. Thus he was able to retain confidence in being ever open and prepared when meeting influential persons. And Wadham continued to initiate him into the local elite. Local luminaries who became Tribe’s associates courtesy of Wadham included Sirs Raymond Priestley and Edward ‘Weary’ Dunlop. The Englishman Priestley was famous as part of the Shackleton and Scott Antarctic expeditions, and for being the first salaried Vice Chancellor of the University of Melbourne. He had taken science and agriculture at Cambridge as a Fellow of Clare College. Weary was a local boy from rural Victoria who had shone as a selfless surgeon in WWII and subsequently inspired a compassionate approach to Australia’s outlook on Asia. There is a poetic symmetry between Tribe’s developing interests and skills and those of these two – the
accomplished Englishman who contributed greatly to
Australia and the local rural lad with a gift for inspiring
maturity in Australia’s relations to Asia.

Such are the legacies of Wadham in Tribe’s life, which made
him one of Tribe’s acknowledged mentors – for in addition
to introductions, Wadham thrust Tribe into key positions.
For example, it was Wadham who nominated Tribe to a
joint CSIRO-Victorian Government committee on livestock
research with the Chairman of CSIRO Sir Ian Clunies-Ross
and the Director of Agriculture Pat Ryan. These
introductions and positions were exceptional for an
academic in his first year at the University of Melbourne;
such positions are usually filled by the senior Professor.
Here is a clue to Tribe’s advancement, he was initiated into
the fraternity by the most senior Professor of Agriculture in
the country. We may interpret this as both a tribute to
Wadham’s generosity and to Tribe’s own personality and
skills.

Developing Influence

With such an introduction, Tribe’s influence in the
University was established and it continued to grow as he
read the politics of the institution. Universities in that
period were elite, catering for a far smaller proportion of
the population than they do today. The Faculty of
Agriculture comprised some 30 to 40 students in each of
the four years, of which second year was spent at Dookie
Agricultural College. The resulting close friendships
included the staff in what many continue to characterize as
the golden era of agricultural science education. The staff of
the Faculty was three; Sam Wadham, Yvonne Aitken and
Tribe, with a strong reliance on related science departments and the State Department of Agriculture for specialist teaching. It was from this base that Tribe became the source of the Faculty’s subsequent growth through increased in-faculty teaching and rising post-graduate numbers. This in turn generated demand for additional staff positions, such as one for teaching and research related to livestock.

Such posts are not created lightly in universities. We may glimpse Tribe’s deft political hand and emerging understanding of university machinations in the creation of the livestock position – and its subsequent appointee. Tribe noted that ‘to my delight they offered the position to Norman Tulloh’, but the facts belie such surprise and passivity. Tulloh, in his own autobiography, implies there may have been more to the process in the tradition of university scholarship. Their friendship went back to Tribe’s Nuffield visit to Australia in 1952 and Norman’s subsequent CSIRO posting to the UK, where they had become close. They had been professional colleagues from the day Tribe arrived in Melbourne. We may better see this as both Tribe recognizing compatible talent for the work at the University and loyalty to a colleague. Loyalty is indeed a hallmark of Tribe’s career, which partially explains the reappearance of many names throughout his story. Rather than a random appointment, we may see this cycle closing under Tribe’s gentle guidance of solidarity to colleagues and his institution.

Meanwhile Tribe was initiating research from the virtually non-existent Faculty resources through his natural networking skills. Jim Coles, the young farmer whom he had met in New Zealand, and his fellow farmers wanted to test
new sheep breeding and nutrition strategies. Tribe saw this as a gift, especially when Coles offered the land, the farmers provided the labour and postgraduate students became the research assistants. Once again, Tribe found a cottage on the property to be a fine holiday house for the family vacation while he was gathering data, weighing sheep and measuring pastures. And never missing an opportunity to help someone in need and to advance a good cause, Tribe came up with a joint writing task when Coles was incapacitated. Thus was published the practical book, ‘Prime Lamb Production’. Resourceful, kind and energetic are descriptions of Tribe’s style offered by commentators who shared such experiences.

This period also provides other indications of Tribe’s style, which might be characterized as a true professional living his vocation. The group that had gathered around Tribe and Coles’ farmers now engaged all of his Faculty colleagues in research that was promoted through annual field days on Coles’ farm. They attracted crowds of up to 300 farmers by road and air, which made local Department of Agriculture field days seem parochial by comparison. How did he do it? Tribe’s own answer is again insufficient; he simply observed that, ‘we [would] invite an Eminent Person to give an opening address, and, at different times, we were privileged to have talks from people like Sir Samuel Wadham, Sir John Hammond (University of Cambridge), and Mr Bert Kelly (a well-known farmer and politician who held several ministerial portfolios).

More likely, based on Tribe’s mode of operation in other circumstances throughout his university and international careers, he would have worked hard at making such events a success. And this would have included determining what
had to be done and how, what should be said, and who could co-opt an influential speaker. His networks, preparation and guidance ensured that status was given to speakers for he well knew that such status led to deeper impressions in an audience – even an Australian field day audience. And in such situations, Tribe was ever helpful in suggesting points that might be included in a speech, even to the extent of writing the speech and helpfully adding emphases for key messages. And he sharpened these skills when he himself was the speaker. Such skills could not escape notice and led to Tribe being in demand for other field days around Victoria and beyond. But it went further, as a vocation must.

In addition to the research, field days and integration of family holidays, an annual tennis match between the farmers’ and the Faculty staff’s families evolved. It may not be that Tribe stimulated every occurrence but we must accept that his presence allowed good ideas to blossom. And in this case, some evidence of Tribe’s humour remains in the engraved trophy modelling a sheep capped by a mortarboard playing tennis. The trophy was dubbed PLUTO, for these Prime Lamb University Tennis Occasions. So once again family, faculty, friends and farmers were integrated in a manner that enhanced each and all. It was such integrated activities that caused a contemporary to remark that ‘work was pleasure for Tribe’.

Yet despite his widespread engagement in farmer gatherings, some locals claim that Tribe was never really totally at ease with the ordinary farmer. Perhaps this related to the Australian peasant’s preference for his own accent and for a speaker to establish his credentials in local
terms. In this sense, Tribe was not to attain the local status of his fellow English predecessor Wadham, although he transcended Wadham in many other ways. But it could also be that, in the changing nature of Australian agriculture, Tribe did not see the battler farmer as either the focus for the future or the patron of University science.

Through this period of assimilation and personal growth, Tribe was loyal to his supporter and to his own vision, such as in opposing the vet school. ‘Wadham and Tribe have been criticized by some veterinarians for allegedly attempting to scuttle the reopening of the Veterinary School’.59 It appears that Tribe did the leg work and Wadham added clout. While they were ultimately out-politicked, their financial arguments were soon vindicated,60 resulting in a tentative relationship between animal and veterinary science in the University until today.

With two animal scientists in the Faculty and a mandate to increase post-graduate research, facilities were needed. Tribe converted an on-campus insectarium into an animal house for sheep work, thereby paving the way for the inner-city sheep research that continues today in an underground research facility below Old Agriculture. Cattle work began under Tulloh on a 24 hectare site at the Werribee sewage farm. Real field testing from such work required larger experimental sites and Tribe approached the task characteristically by writing an article for the Victorian Graziers’ Association journal, the Pastoral Review, inviting cooperation.61 We may well think that this had been done multiple times by others and is therefore nothing special. But we would be wrong, for this was an article calculated to attract attention, wordsmithed by a
scientist who had trained in journalism and practiced clear and convincing writing.

The article was duly published, and introduces a telling anecdote. ‘Shortly afterwards [1959] there was a knock on my door and in walked a tall young man who explained that he was a Western District grazier who would like to make his farm and livestock available to us for our research. We discussed what would be involved and finally arranged that I should make a reconnaissance visit to the property. Because I had not caught his name when he introduced himself upon arrival, I now grabbed a pen and paper and asked for his name and address. Because I was still new and ignorant of things Australian, I failed to show any particular reaction when he replied “My name is Malcolm Fraser, and the property is called Nareen.” After a pause, he said, “I happen to be a politician as well as a grazier.” Of course, I should have known this. I then proceeded to make matters worse, first by jokingly offering my sympathy, and then by asking “Commonwealth or State?” I felt ashamed of my ignorance, but I would have felt a lot more embarrassed had I known that I was talking to a future Prime Minister of Australia!’

This is vintage Tribe. Creating a good story against himself, whittling off unnecessary details yet retaining enough substance for the astute ear to recognize that this will lead to something significant. We know that there were many other replies to his journalistic request, and his particular story omits to mention that he had previously met Fraser senior. We may even suspect that he knew to whom he was speaking. This is why we should be on guard to select which of the many apparent coincidences that populate Tribe’s life
might in fact be the result of his quiet diligent preparatory hand guiding serendipity.

Tribe subsequently visited Nareen frequently, often with post-graduate students, sometimes staying over to enjoy both the older and younger Frasers’ hospitality. Malcolm recalls Tribe from this time and in their subsequent interactions when he was Minister for Education as someone he ‘respected and thought was good value’. The anecdote also reminds us of Tribe’s interests in politics and his eye for influence and self-restraint in such relations. It made sense to Tribe to speak to whoever had power, and his whole career involved politics in various guises as he developed ever-wider links.

And the links developed ever more widely from the article in the Pastoral Review, leading to field experiments being carried out from Winton to Bundaberg in Queensland and to Deniliquin in New South Wales. Describing this half decade as ‘good years because they were happy years’, Tribe worked closely in a team with post-graduate students who later nostalgically recalled those years in similar words. It was the busy and enjoyable life of academia as it once was in the 1950s and early 1960s, with teaching, post-graduate research, scholarship, community engagement, leadership and team building all being interrelated and combining to create a new and sound base for the future of agricultural science.

His appreciation of Australian agriculture was that of an alert immigrant, and it allowed a balance to the pioneering approach that was already waning in Australia of the 1960s while retained a respect for the serious farmer. In one of his later entertaining speeches, looking back on his early
Australian days, he observed, that ‘coming originally from England, I can’t help remembering that, long before Australia, the old country [i.e. the UK] was for centuries carried on the sheep’s back.’ He described the century-old UK production of the finest wools for Flemish and Italian looms – and the gradual demise as other countries entered production and as new products such as cotton were developed. ‘Then along came innovators ... who introduced new crops, improved livestock, better methods of drainage and revolutionary systems of farm management based on rotations.’ Field days became famous across Europe, attracting as many as 7,000 farmers to Holkham – ‘all the innovations were farmer driven.’

Tribe went on to say that he was reminded of this history in a cold Geelong paddock where he encountered two local wool producers whom he called ‘Dad and Dave’ for the sake of a good story. Dad and Dave lamented the falling price of wool, the invasion of serrated tussock in pastures while incidentally noting the rising demand for foods from an emerging Asia. ‘Do you think’, Tribe has Dave asking, ‘that we should ... give up being graziers and become farmers ... !?’ ‘At this’, Tribe said, ‘a heart rending sob and a horrified cry of protest escaped Dad’s lips’. But after Tribe had answered diplomatically, Dave said ‘Dad, I think it’s time we showed him’.

Thus Tribe represented his introduction to the farmer-initiated “Southern Farming Systems” that tested new winter wheat technologies on the Vizards’ property. Farmers were an essential component of the research, education and extension view that came naturally to an intelligent agricultural scientist of that era. And the story is again typical of Tribe’s style of naming names, giving credit
to those who had done the work and those who had gone before. And in this case, it is touchingly fitting that he rounded off his anecdote and the speech with a quote from ‘Sir Samuel Wadham of blessed memory’ to the effect that food crops might well replace wool as world demand for food increases. Tribe was lauding his mentor as a visionary.

As usual, Tribe was also engaged in multiple activities at the same time. One of these was writing an agricultural science text\(^{66}\) for secondary schools with Yvonne Aitken, Norman Tulloh and new Faculty arrival Jack Wilson. The text was to service those regional and other schools that offered some aspect of agriculture in their curriculum. It was a bold initiative and became a testing experience for all concerned who found it challenging to explain scientific concepts in clear and simple terms. The book was to be reprinted several times including as a second edition, with respectable royalties. Coincidentally, a similar task – a book for secondary students about food production in the international context – was occupying Tribe in his final years, and represents one of his uncompleted legacies.

By now, Tribe was near to qualifying for that generous employment condition of Australian universities, sabbatical leave. Belying the separation of universities from religious influence, such leave was available every seven years to enable Australian academics to form and maintain international scholastic networks and to remain up-to-date. Subsidized by the University and minor tax breaks, the scheme served to advance Australian universities and their staff in a period before communication and transport innovations reduced intellectual isolation. However, from the individual academic’s perspective, Tribe’s recites the shibboleth that an ‘academic with a family who regularly
took sabbatical leave would spend six years scrimping and saving in order to pay for the travel costs and expenses for the seventh year. As anyone who has known employment both inside and out of major universities like Melbourne knows, the academic’s position is seldom one of want.

Of course Tribe chose to spend his sabbatical year in Britain. By following his father’s habit of accepting external professional income, he had saved funds for the sabbatical year; these came from book royalties, journal articles, radio broadcasts, external examinations and so on. Thus the whole family could travel to the UK. Straddling the 12 months over two teaching years, Tribe was able to meet his teaching commitments within their correct years as they headed off to his and Elizabeth’s alma mater in Reading. He aimed to revise his animal production lectures and write-up unpublished research for publication, but in what may now be seen to be usual form, he loaded other tasks into the same period. Thus he also planned to visit research stations, to attend the World Conference on Animal Production in Hamburg and to accept an invitation of a South African chemical group to discuss his work on urea supplementation of ruminants.

Through such a busy six years since arriving in Australia, with the additional learning imposed by a new country and new roles, he and Elizabeth maintained the weekly letter-writing rituals of the era. They seem to have been content in Australia while maintaining one eye looking back to England. If this is a form of homesickness, it was at least partly assuaged by Elizabeth’s parents visiting for a year through 1957-58, their third child Jane’s arrival and by Tribe’s parents spending eight months of 1959 in Melbourne. After that Tribe recorded what might be
interpreted as some feelings of homesickness or at least isolation, but notes that the generous sabbatical leave entitlements would soon allow him to visit Britain. The entry is made noteworthy by its inconsistency with the bulk of his autobiography, and is a reminder of the difficulty of the family-oriented migrant settling into a new life.

**Sabbatical**

The Tribe that left Australia looking forward to a sabbatical year in the UK was a different person to that who had arrived in Australia to take up the University of Melbourne post six years earlier. He had found his feet in Australia and his suave skills in making hard work seem easy, appealed to most with whom he associated. Yet in his heart, we may surmise that he still looked to Britain. In some ways he always would, but this trip ‘home’ was to define the separation that eventually left him committed to Australia.

The slow flights to London in 1961 allowed the family to travel via Asia and to visit Tribe’s brother and friends en route. The latter is noteworthy as it is a further indication of the networks that Tribe maintained by his assiduous letter-writing. Professional contacts from his first university years onwards were grist for Tribe’s ever-turning mill of networks and ideas, lubricated by genuine interest in people. Such a contrast to the networking approaches promoted today by business schools for aspiring managers and their ‘LinkedIn’ ‘friends’. Tribe’s were more like real friends.

Catching up with family in England was one objective, but seems to have been overshadowed by scientific meetings.
The World Animal Conference in Hamburg refreshed interactions with global animal scientists and introduced Tribe to others. Such meetings were Tribe’s milieu. One surviving anecdote, tinted by Tribe’s creative eye for a story, concerns a dinner in a colourful local establishment where he was discussing with colleagues protein catabolism in pregnant sows. When a striptease artiste set her bubble-bath adjacent to their table, the serious scientists were offended, not for reasons of propriety but because it disturbed the metabolic discussion.

We may take one aspect of the anecdote, the intensity of interaction, as a lead to the impact of such meetings. Tribe met new colleagues and rekindled old relations with the great and emerging leaders of the field and maintained friendly contacts. Seen from this perspective Tribe’s ability to ‘pull in a good speaker’ or ‘get a message through to those that mattered’ was a researched and practiced art – far from the silver spoon privilege of background with which some less informed Australians labelled him at times. In fact, Tribe’s social background was not much different to the majority of the students he was teaching in Australia with the expansion of university places in the 1960s.

To place Tribe’s diligence in such gatherings in context, he made his contributions matter in terms of whom he could meet and what he could add to the profession. And from these times, his interests were becoming more internationalized than those of his university peers. By contrast, the usual response by others at such meetings was to meet a few close colleagues, attend sessions of papers of mixed quality and generally be content to correspond later, if at all, on scientific details. Tribe did this and much more, forming relations with the range of scientists and science
managers from diverse countries, although we must note a predilection for Western acquaintances at this stage of his development.

In Reading he worked on his lectures – having some task to work on in otherwise idle moments was a habit well learned from his upbringing – until the next trip. Tribe’s visit to South Africa took him to the Onderstepoort Veterinary Research Institute to inspect ruminant nutrition work, from which he gained ideas for research in Melbourne while also squeezing in some big game watching. But he also found his values challenged by the strong apartheid views of some he visited, both Boer and British. Returning via Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Tanganyika (Tanzania) and Sudan, Tribe followed up friends from undergraduate days who were working there. These included the Professors of Agriculture at the Universities of Salisbury and Khartoum and the Director of Agriculture in Tanganyika. The colonial era was crepusculing into aid and in some ways we may see Tribe’s attitudes as representative of that transition. He naturally gravitated to those with similar Western values, was appalled at the practices of apartheid, took his family to mix with hospitable poor Indians and indulged his boyhood admiration of Cecil Rhodes by making a pilgrimage to his grave. Such a mélange of meaning was gradually being resorted as he saw more of life in the world, and a later marginal comment indicates his rejection of Rhodes’ methods.

 Tribe’s education into what is now termed north-south dialogue seems to have begun with this African odyssey. His natural tendency to egalitarianism facilitated learning as he did the veterinary rounds encountering natives, wildlife,
and sites of historical and natural importance. Unsurprisingly, Tribe records that he had been asked to offer lectures in some of these places, and by now we might imagine a pattern of diplomatically worded offers over previous months suggesting such possibilities. While these networks were comprised mainly of British and Australian expatriates, his host in Egypt was a local who had been a graduate student contemporary at the Rowett. But this too links back to Empire as one of the sites his local friends in north Africa helped him find was that of his maternal grandparents’ marriage.

Today it is easy to forget the diverse British global presence of previous generations. Coming from a background where one path to improved status was a colonial career, we might speculate that subsequent generations like Tribe’s may have imbibed a predilection for foreign lands. This might be one reason that when writing about this sabbatical leave he indicates that most of his time was spent in Reading, yet the bulk of his memoir relates to Africa. Whether or not this was a legacy of a past generation, it was a portent of what was soon to come in Tribe’s professional life.

Of at least equal importance, this year away from Australia convinced Tribe of the country’s virtues. His and the family had viewed their initial relocation to Australia as temporary, an experiment perhaps although it of course became permanent. While the specific decision point for remaining in Australia was yet to come, this sabbatical year helped to tip the scales in that direction. Perhaps his encounters with British attitudes to the ‘colonials’ stimulated a defence for his adopted home and caused him to think objectively of his future.
This is well illustrated by Tribe having created another opportunity for himself before he left on sabbatical – to accompanying Major General Sir Kingsley Norris around the UK to interest British graduates in careers in Australia. Wadham had introduced Tribe to Norris at the Beefsteak Club at the University of Melbourne. The idea was that the young Englishman from Australia would be more convincing than the older Australian, and Tribe was going to be ‘over there’ in any case. Tribe, in his inimitable style, combined these expenses-paid trips with his intended sabbatical visits to British universities. Finding the audiences generally friendly, he was often left with feelings of frustration and even anger at the smugly condescending questions about life and conditions in Australia. Whether they knew it or not, this feeling may be seen in retrospect as an indicator that he and Elizabeth were subconsciously accepting Australia as their home.

**Postmark Australia**

As a direct result of this experience, they decided to write the book ‘Postmark Australia’ – a delightful collection of fictional replies to letters from English friends considering migration to Australia. They had time to write as Tribe had converted their air tickets into a boat passage for the return to Australia. ‘Postmark Australia’ was published in 1963 when The Age newspaper described it as ‘a shrewd, friendly view of Australia, designed to answer the questions intending migrants ask about life in Australia at professional and executive levels. An ideal gift for the intending migrant and thought-provoking for Australians.’

The book was a hit – exceeding what any
academic dreams of. The Cheshire publication priced at 22s/6d, was reprinted, and then the Department of Immigration asked to purchase 100,000 copies. Not only had a need and means of meeting it been defined, the Tribes had cemented their place as pro-Australia. And they incidentally created a celebrity author status for themselves among professional and academic migrants they were to meet over subsequent years.

‘Postmark Australia’ tells us much about their experiences in Australia. It opens with the affirmation, ‘We came to live in Australia in 1956. We like it here.’ They describe how, after meeting professional persons interested in and who had applied for positions in Australia, they felt that the current official information was inadequate. Existing documents about life for the professional migrating to Australia were ‘too general to suit the largely graduate population with whom we are dealing’. Written as serial letters replying to imaginary letters from English friends contemplating the move, they painted a picture of a proud and dynamic nation discovering its geographical location near Asia and gradually severing its links to England.

The book’s impact has perhaps been even wider than previously claimed, as the volume maintained by the Baillieu Library of the University of Melbourne indicates. It is well annotated by past readers with such testimonial comments as ‘considerable helpful’[sic], ‘realistic view’, ‘not only professional but also good for all migrants’. And perhaps such readers have not just been English migrants, as the Japanese marginal notes suggest. The book typifies the Tribe approach of seeing a need and an opportunity to address it.
Writing Postmark Australia may also have cathartically resolved feelings about being Australian, for once back into the family home and domestic routines, schools and so forth, a more settled aura is represented in Tribe’s memoirs. His research work led to hand-rearing of young lambs and kangaroos in their suburban backyard. Once again holidays were based around house-swaps with country friends who wanted a break in the city, sounding remarkably similar to an Australian-born family with relatives and friends around the country. Increasingly becoming ‘an Australian of English descent’, he appears to have accepted that social status, which he came to enjoy and play exceptionally well in the University environment. He was also becoming the wise counsellor of undecided students.

One graduating student, not from Tribe’s discipline, is typical of many. He attributes his distinguished career in the CGIAR international research to being confronted by
Tribe asking him directly – ‘so what are you going to do about feeding the world?’ It was the first time the young agricultural scientist had considered the question. From that moment, he became interested, and when an opportunity arose in 1965 to travel and then work in Mexico, he keenly did so – a couple of years later playing host to Tribe in the then famous Zona Rosa of Mexico City. Here is one of the sources of Tribe’s international network – by doing good, Tribe came to do well in his expanding careers internationally and at the University of Melbourne.

Another student relayed the events that led to his own career in international agriculture, ‘I went to see Derek in late January/early February after fourth year to seek advice after being offered some pretty boring jobs by the Victorian Department [of Agriculture] and a seed company. He asked what scholarships I had applied for, with the answer being "None". "Why not?" was the obvious response. "I reckon that research is only for clever buggers ... ” was my poorly thought through initial response. After more conversation that led to a decision that post-graduate training might be worth a try, he lifted the phone. "Hello Mary, its Derek here. Yes, I'm fine, and how is Frank and those charming daughters? I see that they did really well this year." A bit more chatting, then "Mary, I've got this silly boy sitting with me who did not apply for any postgraduate scholarships and has belatedly seen the light. If you haven't already decided on offers, would it be possible for him to slip in a late application for your consideration?" A few Hmmms, Hmmms later I heard "Yes, I'll send him over straight away" while he stared intently at me with a half-smile. "Mary, thank you for your help, give my regards to Frank, and let’s hope that we have made the right decision." I ran across the campus, met the lovely blue-rinse Mary who adored Derek,
filled out the forms, was awarded a University Postgraduate Scholarship a few days later, and changed my life.’\textsuperscript{73} Such interest in research and people underpinned Tribe’s expanding network of influence.

At the University, Tribe had built a research program for post-graduates, a lecture series, a community profile and had increased the size of the animal science group. His jointly authored ‘Animal Health, Production and Pasture’,\textsuperscript{74} which was to earn him a solid reputation as successor to names in the field, had now been published. In the terms of academic performance of the day, he was already a success. But he was still a young man in a hurry – full of energy, passion and ideas, and with an ever-widening worldview. Then the Murray Report on the state of universities was accepted for implementation in the 1960s.

That report had concluded that Australian post-graduate education was generally weak and that ‘university research in the sciences and technologies must be the door through which must come, in an increasing stream, those men and women of enthusiasm and high capacity, of whom Australia has need, if it is to exploit the potential of its environment ... and render some measure of service to its less fortunate neighbours in South-East Asia.’\textsuperscript{75} Like a tree beside a spring, Tribe’s post-graduate research and links to Asia blossomed. Tribe saw it as ‘ ... once more, [finding] myself in the right place at the right time.’\textsuperscript{76} We cannot know what other opportunities crossed his path in these decades, but this was one that his conditioning, training and skills suited.

Increased numbers of post-graduates widened Tribe’s influence further, and proved to be a key part of widening his international reputation. His open-minded acceptance
of unusual thesis topics endeared him to intelligent students and opened further opportunities. And he was on the lookout for such students wherever he roamed. Tribe’s past students recall his energy and support, and his pride in their successes in CSIRO, government departments and international organizations. The Asian links that were to be implied in new university charters engaged the imagination that had been awakened in Africa during his sabbatical year.

So it followed that when asked to look after Dr Keith (‘K’) Kesterven, the Head of Animal Health and Production in FAO, during his visit to the University of Melbourne, Tribe was in his element. To Tribe it was the completion of a circle from his interest in FAO in Aberdeen days when Orr had left the Rowett to become its inaugural head. K knew Africa well and was sufficiently impressed with Tribe’s observations from his African visit that he invited Tribe to join an African mission. The task was to be a member of an East African Livestock Survey, which would take one year. In those days, the University justified such absences as budgetary savings, and so the Tribes readied themselves for the next family adventure.
Chapter 4

Africa

Into Africa

The ‘East African Livestock Development Survey’ hardly sounded world shattering, and even in 1965 it had more of a colonial ring to it than an heraldic cry of development. There is no indication that Tribe foresaw its far-reaching potential, and even years afterwards Tribe was to comment that the family embarked ‘without the slightest appreciation that [...] it] would change the course of our lives, in my case quite drastically.’

It was a consulting task, and thus new to Tribe whose life had been bound up within academic institutions as a student or employee. But as we should expect, Tribe proved adaptable and convincingly extended his knowledge across fields in which he had little experience. His openness led him to quiz specialists as they crossed his path. While the task was diverse, including domestic livestock, wildlife and international market linkages, the team included five others, and occasional specialist consultants – all of whom were part of the wider Anglo-Saxon family. Sir Donald MacGillivray, an Oxford man who had distinguished himself in the British Colonial Service, and had retired in Kenya, led them. MacGillivray was to become Tribe’s African Wadham, an older respected mentor.
Living in the Muguga estate shared by the East African Agricultural and Forestry and the Veterinary Research organizations, the family settled into the local expatriate life in this second year of the newly independent nation of Kenya. Meanwhile Tribe travelled East Africa; the team’s vehicles covering more than 165,000 kilometres, excluding air travel. Tribe willingly acknowledged his debt to MacGillivray, as well to other team members and consultants, African leaders and practitioners. Read with today’s eyes, their Mission Reports back to HQ sound more like a colonial patrol than development consulting, with notes about shared tents, tiring travel, evening ‘sundowner’ aperitifs and local staff for pitching camp and cooking. Tribe shared a tent with MacGillivray and encouraged him in his story telling.

Wives and sometimes families of team members joined safaris that formed part of the wildlife component of the Terms of Reference. Tribe even included a visit to his brother who was by then British Council Director in Mwanza on Lake Victoria. Only a hundred years after Stanley’s outstanding treks through Africa,79 a similar element of white discovery and adventure is evident in Tribe’s enthusiastic reminiscences. The year in Africa also saw him renewing old friendships from UK days, including one of the mission’s consultants who had lectured to both he and Elizabeth at Reading.

But what is even more fascinating in this period is Tribe’s slowly emerging awareness that others may not see things his way. It is sometimes said the culturally kind and tolerant can often be the last to appreciate another’s Weltanschauung. And we may see some softening of Tribe’s views that technology, good government and kindly
attitudes lead directly to development, but not in all cases. For example, Tribe recorded his efforts to convince Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere of the benefits of land reform as a basis for livestock development. Tribe believed in the mainstream development thought of the time that land reform was a universal good and retained his position for decades despite contrary indications relating to nomadic livestock owners. In this case, the President disagreed displaying the wisdom of a leader – ‘we are the experts on the people, you are the experts on livestock development’. Here is a moment when we may compare the 39 year-old Tribe to that of a few decades later when, if he had not been lost to the University system, he may well have conjured up a philosophical doctoral program from the President’s pronouncement.

Tribe carried his beliefs in Western approaches into his next decade, notwithstanding the revelations of sociological research. It is in such instances that we see Tribe revealed as the bridge between the fading colonial era and the faltering emergence of development assistance, between his fascination with colonial lifestyles and his egalitarianism, and between his sensitivity to human values and encouragement of local education and leadership. In the Tanzanian case, a proposal for nationalized land reform, which may have suited the gestalt of development agencies and hence Tribe’s creed, was to be firmly repudiated by the President in 1985.

We catch another glimpse of the loneliness that comes from being a bridge between eras in Tribe’s expressed regret that establishing close friendships with Africans proved difficult. He notes Herbert Nsubuga as an exception, possibly because he had excelled in the colonial education
system in Kenya and was more at ease in the white world. Tribe also appears to have been genuinely touched by the response of their house staff when leaving Kenya, which he attributed to the routine kindnesses that the family had extended as simple good manners. Yet Tribe’s reminiscences of four decades later are dated by their nostalgic wish that those cross-cultural relationships had been deeper. But even by 1965 he had come a very long way from his roots.

A year in the remote developing world is fertile soil for flowery anecdotes, but such war stories of consultants can appear tedious to the uninitiated. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to elaborate the myriad deadly dangers, serendipitous meetings and visits to forgotten historical sites. But perhaps we may indulge in a one-liner related to tribal Africa. When halted at a border crossing Tribe was routinely asked ‘your name please’. He replied ‘Tribe’ drawing the clarification, ‘no, no. I asked your name’. He patiently explained, the realization leading to raucous laughter, ‘what, your name is Tribe!’ He was to make further mileage from his name in later polemics such as ‘Tribe on the Warpath’ when he was leading the AIAS’ Policy Group in support of his creation, The Crawford Fund.

Before completing the African contract, FAO required a debriefing in Rome. Here was Tribe’s first exposure to the inefficiencies of an international agency in the form of ‘rivalries between different parts of this unwieldy organization’. FAO had only been born when Orr left the Rowett about the time Tribe arrived there. And as Tribe well knew, Orr had left earlier than expected, disenchanted with the directions of the institution within the United Nations’ modus operandi. Tribe’s milder language reflected
something of the same concern that is commonplace among international agriculturists. With a little more distance, Tribe probably came to recognize, as have a few others, the special nature of those who can work effectively within such bureaucracies. In any case, it was consultants such as Tribe who, despite these heartbreaking realities, made a genuine contribution through skilled fieldwork and diplomatic reports. That is when the system worked well. The downside was that Tribe was now an advisor or consultant – a ranking subservient to the real international civil servants regardless of qualifications, experience and commitment. It is worthy of note that Tribe fell into this category when his background and predilections seemed more likely to have led him into the privileged life of the bureaucracies with their colonial legacies. But when an opportunity to join the system arose later, he declined, by then having found the power of independence fuelled by his political and diplomatic skills.

FAO asked Tribe to return to Rome to edit the East African Livestock Development Survey report – a suggestion clearly made by the Team Leader MacGillivray. This meant more time away from Australia while continuing to meet responsibilities, through colleagues, at the University of Melbourne. Comments from this and later periods are still rehearsed by some disgruntled colleagues in such words as ‘he was seldom here’. But if the proof is in the pudding, we may judge Tribe’s contributions by his outputs, which by university yardsticks of postgraduate students, research papers, books, community involvement and university committees, exceeded those of most of his colleagues through the period. He managed this through efficient correspondence, as recipients of his distinctive scrawl across hundreds of blue aerograms recall.
Tribe enjoyed the conviviality of Rome on this second more leisurely assignment, meeting many of the interesting entourage that passes through such a well-located organization. This extended well beyond agricultural science as one anecdote reveals. The author Morris West was passing through and Tribe met him over dinner, and through that detail we learn that Tribe had long been a member of the Australian Society of Authors. While he may perhaps have known that he shared his birthplace Portsmouth with Charles Dickens and Arthur Conan Doyle, and even the colonial Rudyard Kipling and the Australian novelist Nevil Shute, Tribe had a sense of himself as an author. More likely, he was simply continuing the appreciation he had learned at the Rowett Institute of the power of clear writing. Membership of the Society reflected his lifelong interest in the power of words. Tribe recorded that this meeting with West afforded him advice on planning and management of writing, and on accepting editorial change without argument. He even went so far as to record that ‘I have tried to follow his advice, even when writing these memoirs.’ And for that, at least one other author is grateful.

**Into the World**

Despite a protracted absence, Tribe did not rush home. FAO had agreed to his visiting a dairy project in the Philippines where the expert, we should not be surprised to learn, was a Reading graduate who had also worked in Kenya and was known to Tribe. Such examples provide us with further insight into Tribe’s calculated preparation to create opportunities from the possibilities that daily passed by.
Throughout 1966 Tribe had of course been engaged in countless other activities, including myriad University obligations as introduced in Chapters 3 and 5, as well as corrections to the East African report as it worked its way through the FAO and national bureaucracies. By March the following year, the report was ready for official presentational fanfare in Kenya. But Tribe’s African mentor, MacGillivray had died in the interim. Tribe was the obvious choice to step into the lead role, and having practiced for the occasion, he shone. Thus he introduced himself to a wider and higher network in international development. The Kenyan gathering of some 150 included representatives from 18 nations, ten private companies and diverse African leaders. It was also an initiation into the major global aid institutions. Tribe found it necessary to call it ‘luck’, but he failed to credit his indispensable role in deputizing for MacGillivray through the year’s fieldwork and the subsequent year of editing, and his ever-readiness to assist whenever asked. The result was that ‘virtually overnight … invitations to accept consultancies in various parts of Africa, India and Asia started to roll in.’

But as every consultant knows, invitations do not roll in unless one does good work, services the needs of client organizations and the egos of its staff, and enjoys the work with all its hardships and unforeseen events. Tribe managed this well; he had been bitten by the consulting bug. He immersed himself in the stimulation of the required intellectual agility and in its romance. He even referred to himself as ‘the tarmac professor’ for the period 1967-72, an appellation less enthusiastically embraced by some in his family though they did not begrudge his absences. The
period also testifies to the indulgence of the University in that epoch.

Tribe’s first consultancy after East Africa was to advise on livestock research and education in Thailand for the Rockefeller Foundation, which proved to be ‘a steep learning curve’. Next was a UNESCO commission to write on animal ecology and management, which took him to Paris. Here we find a curious detail that offers a glimpse of the times and of Tribe himself; he had admitted difficulty with the French language, although he probably meant the culture overall. While he had an interest in other cultures, it was uncommon for persons like Tribe to learn other languages. We may take it as a product of the era being a transition from colonial approaches, for today it would be difficult to claim cultural appreciation without language. But such matters constrained neither development agencies nor their consultants through the sixties. And Tribe was operating increasingly at higher levels.

Interspersing his high profile University role with international consulting seems to have had both symbiotic and competitive effects on his academic work. His period as Dean of the Faculty was generally seen as more effectual than that of his predecessors or successors of that small Faculty, excepting Wadham of course. But his absences offended. His consulting met all requirements and more, but he never had the time to stay on in a country once a job was done.

Tribe’s further consulting assignments included a World Bank appraisal of a livestock development project in a lawless Chad where he slept in an old Foreign Legion fort converted to a prison. The essence of the assignment was to
balance the needs of nomadic livestock and their owners with the development agency mindset of sedentary agriculturists in an era when agencies could hardly see social or environmental issues. This agency blindspot provided his next opportunity when reporting back in Washington. There he happened to run into a wildlife science friend, Les Talbot, whom he had met in Kenya and at the UNESCO conference in Paris. This in turn led to a meeting with concerned environmental specialists for whom Tribe wrote a brief, which their delegation presented to a meeting that led to the formation of the United Nations Environmental Program. Minor points perhaps, but he seems to have grasped every opportunity, and in this case contributed to UN history as he was to do again later.

Other international consultancies included; another mission to Chad for the World Bank, an FAO meeting in Rome, the Steering Committee for the Second World Food Congress in The Hague, and assignments in India and Rome for the World Bank in conjunction with FAO. The themes of the consultancies by now represented a balance between university upgrading and livestock development. Like many successful international consultants, Tribe had created the two-stringed reputation that ensured frequent invitations to join interesting missions. Of course, these approximately bi-annual trips also allowed him to visit parents in England.

And also like successful international consultants, Tribe shared his good fortune with those whom he respected, as Australia’s first commercial international consultant recalls. ‘I have always been grateful to [Tribe] for giving me a start in my international career.’ As a result of his East African work, Tribe was asked if he knew of a Farm Management Consultant and ‘Derek asked me if I was interested’. This
led to ten years involvement in the Middle East, which was incidentally an important part of initiating Australia’s international professional consulting. It also may be seen as the foundation for the major Australia presence in the Middle East today, and now of that region’s trust in investing in agriculture in Australia. The story is worthy of note, not only as it indicates Tribe’s mechanism of networking and sharing, but as an unusual figure who was in discussion with academia, international consulting and the private sector farm consultants.

The energy necessary to sustain the dual roles of a senior academic and international consultant is symptomatic of Tribe. We can but be impressed that he could do all this in an age when travel was less reliable and much slower than today. As is clear from his own memoirs, he relied psychologically on Elizabeth’s organization and responsibility at home. With that base and his growing international reputation, it seems unsurprising that what had passed up until 1971 was to be but a prelude to one of his great international contributions, the creation of an international research centre – a unique member of the Green Revolution Centres of the CGIAR. And like many great projects, it initially appeared to be just another innocuous assignment.

**A Global Centre**

It began in 1972 with the World Bank asking Tribe to lead an International Task Force to consider the need for an international livestock research centre in Africa. This was Tribe’s entrée into the newly created Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), an elite
gathering of international agricultural scientists intent on continuing the successes of the Green Revolution. We may take with some salt Tribe’s suggestion that the request was unsolicited. He had no doubt impressed many of the international players and corresponded with them. He was an energetic, accomplished and respected middle-aged full professor in animal science with international experience and he came from Australia. Such a gift would not have escaped the attention of that great international Australian, Sir John Crawford. This is the same Crawford whom Tribe was to later honour when naming of The Crawford Fund.

At this time, Crawford was Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University and among other appointments was also Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the CGIAR. The TAC was charged with investigating a range of research centres to build on the wheat and rice successes that had emerged from initiatives of the Rockefeller Foundation. However, a Rockefeller team studying the possibility of a livestock research centre had failed to attract multilateral support. Tribe’s task was to lead a smaller team to repeat the study while negotiating the personalities and national politics that plague international cooperation. A four-man team was to conduct the task, estimated to require six months work spread over one year. One wonders if Tribe was consulted over the team composition as this was not uncommon for such critical tasks, for it seems that he knew the two who came from Canada and the UK and was acquainted with the immediate superior of the French team member. The possibility seems even more probable when it emerges that the three Commonwealth team members all travelled on British passports.
The assignment was exhaustive. It took them to some 400 organizations, 40 research institutes and 26 countries, albeit travelling first class and staying in the best hotels. International development was establishing its own nobility, and the CGIAR saw itself in that rank. Of course Tribe commented on the incongruity between working to assist the world’s poor while enjoying the world’s riches. And he acquiesced to the generous daily allowances of the World Bank and FAO, the main players behind the assignment. Once the sensitive phase of writing up began we again feel Tribe’s influence as Team Leader choosing between the logical sites of Washington DC and Rome where the supporting organizations were headquartered. Tribe chose some World Bank offices in London’s West End, observing perhaps tongue in cheek, that ‘there a couple of efficient secretaries did our typing and booked our theatre tickets’. And of course, he could visit his UK family.

Political rivalries in international development often continue along century-old colonial lines. It was hardly surprising that Tribe found the French and Francophone countries wanted the centre located in Francophone Africa while the Anglophones argued for their ex-colonies. Ethiopia, which was never a colony of either country, was a welcome compromise as it suited the subject of livestock research par excellence. Nevertheless, it required Tribe’s persuasive charm to arrive at that consensus – as it also did for defining the research focus. Tribe’s insistence on the critical role of people in resolving overgrazing and similar conflicts alongside disease control and nutrition research held sway. He had learned from his earlier African experience. Thus an International Livestock Centre for Africa was proposed with integrated social, ecological and
agricultural research objectives. In world nutritional and livelihood terms, this was of major significance.88

Crawford then made an appearance to smooth the dreadful international politics of Washington that could kill any proposal. One of Crawford’s many outstanding traits was to use his great intellect and insistent personality to cut through political obstacles. Thus with Crawford’s help, all parties agreed with the report; the hesitant French team member signing in a shaking hand after receiving the brunt of Crawford’s opinions. Thus the national factional fate of the previous Rockefeller report was forestalled. In some ways, Crawford was an older Tribe, albeit rougher in style and intellectually even more agile. Both had evolved means of getting things done, of dealing with those who count and of producing work of a certain quality. In this case, Crawford’s seniority and reputation accomplished what Tribe may not have been able to do in the face of anti-livestock lobbies and national jealousies. They must have made a formidable team, and we may see Crawford as the third mentor of Tribe’s professional life, after Wadham and MacGillivray.

One surviving anecdote of this period illustrates both Tribe’s character and the Machiavellian nature of international development politics. After Crawford had departed Washington, a World Bank agriculturist advised Tribe that he required changes to the report. Tribe refused, arguing that it was a team consensus, signed off by all, thanks to Crawford’s insistence. The official retorted that if Tribe refused to make the changes, he need not expect to be retained again by the Bank. Such things are more common than outsiders may believe, and less principled consultants often acquiesce. So Tribe left Washington expecting that the
report would go through the usual approval processes, and that he would not work for the Bank again. But neither story ended there.

Somewhere within the already hydra-like CGIAR, an ‘African’ Livestock Subcommittee was called to consider the report at a meeting in Paris. No team members were to attend neither was the TAC, the intellectual hub of the CGIAR that had commissioned the report. Once Crawford heard, via Tribe of course, of this meeting and its rejection of the report, he took action. Tribe’s admiration for Crawford’s bravery and insight is evident in his telling of the saga, which culminated in Crawford advising Tribe to later make a formal presentation of the Report to a meeting of the TAC in Rome, with other team members present. Crawford advised that all memory and records of the Paris meeting were henceforth erased. The Bank’s official position, presented by the same agriculturist who had threatened Tribe, was now laudatory and he asked for no changes in the report. Thus was the International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA) born.

The official history of ILCA relates these events in the more conventional language of international agencies, such that an uninformed reader might mistake the role of Tribe’s team as a follow up mission to clarify a few technical points. But a more careful examination reveals that what they refer to as ‘The Tribe Task Force’ determined the politics, focus and location of the centre. Each had been contentious and unresolved before that mission. Tribe’s team, with Crawford’s back-up, had managed the sensitive Francophone-Anglophone politics, had insisted on a livestock systems approach to research and had proposed the neutral Ethiopia as the headquarters.89 The insoluble
mystery of how to integrate sophisticated disease research into the program was begged by the creation of a separate centre – the International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases in Kenya. The amalgamation of these two centres – ILCA and ILRAD – to form the International Livestock Research Institute was to await another task force in 1995, led this time by a product of Tribe’s PhD programs at Melbourne, John Vercoe.90

The Tribe Task Force had not been just a submission of a routine report, it had taken much political finessing right up to the last stage. In fact, Tribe’s presentation to the final approving meeting of the TAC was considered to be ‘an integral part of the report’, as is minuted in the provisional translation of the Chair.91 As noted by one of his doctoral students who later became Chair of the Board of its successor organization – the International Livestock Research Institute, Tribe ‘conceived it, planned it and captured the interest of the international research community’.92 One would not be exaggerating to claim that Tribe and Crawford were the parents of ILCA.

This was a singular moment in Tribe’s career. The photograph of the signing of the establishment of ILCA places Tribe among his international peers.93 His integrated understanding of livestock research and development had produced a workable focus for ILCA. His personal ability to work across cultures and his respect for others had led to a workable approach for its implementation, and his political acumen had allowed the team to negotiate the minefields of international history and mistruth. And he had seen an even more accomplished player in action. All of these factors were to feed in to his last great creation, The Crawford Fund. It was during this period that another
mentor of Tribe’s – Wadham – died. Tribe shared his view of the men who formed his professional life thus: ‘I feel so lucky that it was men like Donald MacGillivray, John Crawford and Sam Wadham who were my guides and advisers during such important periods in my life.’

Tribe soon found himself engaged by the Canadian International Development Research Center (IDRC) to guide preparation for that country’s investment in ILCA, the
centre Tribe’s team had created a year earlier. This required more travel in and out of Africa, and Tribe negotiated to allow Elizabeth to accompany him. And so began what must have been an enjoyable year. Family visits in the UK and with friends there and in Africa and the USA were interspersed with official meetings. The tentacles of the international development system reach into every corner of the developed world and so Tribe travelled more widely than a consultant to IDRC might normally. Once, when reporting progress on the establishment of ILCA to the World Bank, Tribe was inevitably offered a permanent position with the Bank. Here we gain another insight into the insularity of the development agencies he was serving, for such regimented bureaucracies were by now anathema to the freewheeling academic. But Tribe was more to the point when he noted ‘I had no wish to work in such a formal and hierarchical atmosphere in which spontaneous trust and loyalty were sadly lacking.’

The ILCA process on behalf of IDRC and the Bank took him, with Elizabeth, to Spain and France before returning for travel in the UK where, apparently by chance several ex-postgraduates and friends from Australia, including Norman Tulloh, happened to be visiting or now working. By this stage of Tribe’s story, we are attuned to viewing such rendezvous as having been more planned coincidences than reflections of the small size of Australia’s anglocentric animal science world, but in fact they were both. Tribe was once again combining business and pleasure while gaining feedback for IDRC and ILCA and catching up on some science through visits to research stations. Such indulgence was possible because Tribe was again on sabbatical leave from his generous University of Melbourne. Part of the sabbatical was spent at the National Institute for Dairying
in Reading, which was similarly a reunion, this time with colleagues from undergraduate days, and of course family. Throughout such a social and travel calendar, Tribe was constantly writing up research papers and revising lectures. The mundane work of a university professor went on, but the ILCA dream now motivated Tribe.

He was relieved from the mundane by the ILCA Chair-elect’s request that Tribe accompany him to Addis Ababa to negotiate the conditions for the centre and its staff. Tribe was highly impressed by the imperial majesty of Haile Selassie, his guardian lion and the various behavioural proscriptions. From the Emperor’s side it was a routine meeting meriting a cursory local news reference; ‘During the audience the Emperor discussed with the two veterinary experts the important role the proposed centre will play in the improvement of livestock in Africa.’

Returning to Reading, Tribe was in London within a few days for a final meeting in the local World Bank office with concerned parties to sign the formal establishment documents for ILCA. One has the distinct impression that Tribe’s usually busy life in Australia was doubly busy on sabbatical, yet it appears that he was still able to both update his lectures and draft some research papers.

ILCA had been born. Having miscarried once, there had been much care taken with its subsequent gestation, and Tribe was an attentive midwife. It was therefore logical that he was to be present at the inaugural ILCA Board meeting in Addis. En route he visited with his former post-graduate student John Vercoe who was now with the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency, and who was to later review and then Chair the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) in 1998. John was a typical example of those
whose loyalty and trust had been engendered through Tribe’s approach to working with capable persons.

ILCA was born in a drought. Sub-Saharan Africa, especially Ethiopia, had thousands dying. As distressing as this was to Tribe, who visited outer districts where the effects of drought were worst, he saw ILCA as a longer term hope to avoid these recurrent famines. His was the vision of the Green Revolution, in this case for livestock owners. After Ethiopia, Tribe went on to Kenya where Elizabeth and family were already visiting old friends. Then this second sabbatical was over and Tribe was back in the routine of the University.

**Board Member**

These years in Australia allow a peek at the status that Tribe had now acquired. The stream of visitors through the Tribe households in Surrey Hills and Main Ridge in this period is a testimony to Tribe’s international contacts, reputation and friendliness. Australia not really being on the way anywhere, it attracts those curious about its environment and lifestyle, and in agricultural circles those with an interest in unique approaches to industrial agriculture under extensive conditions. And those visitors with an international livestock exposure all gravitated to Tribe, who in turn invited his post-graduates to also meet such luminaries. Most were from the U.K directly or via the colonies, although one different visitor was Herbert Nsubuga, then Minister for Animal Resources in Idi Amin’s Uganda. Herbert’s sabbatical with Tribe in Melbourne was a Ford Foundation funded initiative that removed him from harm under that regime. We see Tribe’s behind-the-scenes
work in such arrangements, and those that led to Herbert being awarded his Ph.D. from Makerere University after his return.

Tribe’s substantive post was in Melbourne, but he was now also an international consultant. It has been said that trying to get someone to give up international consulting is like trying to remove a cat from a curtain – just when you have three claws unhooked and go to remove the fourth, one of the three suddenly strikes out to grab the curtain again. Tribe had his claws firmly in the international development curtain. So the period from 1973 to 1980 included much travel, mainly for ILCA, of which Tribe was now a Board member and part of the Executive Committee as well as Chair of the Program Committee. This required four board meetings a year in Ethiopia or Washington DC as well as trips to Mali, Nigeria, Kenya and Botswana – at least. The death-cheating experiences that populate international consultants’ memoirs enter Tribe’s here, though his stories are hardly special in the genre. But his leadership under stress was exceptional, such as when he negotiated the release of an ILCA secretary held hostage by the Ethiopian military government that had overthrown the Emperor. Tribe threatened to move ILCA to another country, and instantly achieved release of the hostage.

With family now having grown up, Elizabeth accompanied Tribe as much as possible, sharing adventures in primitive parts and enjoying that intimacy with local women that is forbidden to men. In this way they saw the best of Ethiopia, be it the Hilton Hotel or the Muslim town of Harrar, which with characteristic positivism Tribe diarized as ‘not a good place for a holiday, but a most interesting spot for a short visit.’
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After one ILCA Board meeting, Tribe returned via Saudi Arabia to advise on the expansion of livestock industries. The incident is of minor consequence except that it confirms two aspects of Tribe’s diverse communication. The first is the apparent coincidence that the brother of one of Tribe’s students happened to work in Jeddah and invited him to stay at his house. The second is Tribe’s club tie story of meeting the ornithologist Sir Peter Scott, son of the Antarctic explorer in the Minister’s anteroom. Scott recognizing the tie, introduced himself as a fellow member of the East African Wildlife Society; Tribe was proud of his Life Membership of the society and many colleagues recall him wearing that faded tie. The story is totally in character, for Tribe while not of the Oxbridge set, knew the value of wearing club ties.

The Saudi sojourn stimulated Tribe to propose a University of Melbourne research and development project to that government, which after two years of diplomatic lobbying came to nothing. It is noteworthy only because there are few failures of this type in Tribe’s résumé. Perhaps he had strayed outside the institutional confines that had produced his skills, as is suggested in later days with IDP.

Meanwhile ILCA developed under its first Director-General, albeit with a colonial colour to its senior staffing. Then in 1976 a mutiny resulted in the Director-General taking stress-leave, which forced the Board to appoint a temporary replacement. In recalling the events, Tribe claimed that he was the only one who could be available immediately since it was University vacation and he could therefore fill in until another Board member, David Pratt, could take over temporarily. Negotiating to return home for
Christmas and to bring Elizabeth back with him, Tribe set about smoothing ILCA feathers over dinners at his Addis Ababa Hilton abode. Again, Tribe the networker is evident in his note that this was made easier since ‘the hotel manager was an Australian whose twin brother was one of my old students’. Tribe’s chosen means of bringing discontented staff back into unity was to chair a review of research – the institution’s raison d’être. He then used the outcomes as the basis of a conference involving donors, the Ethiopian government and ILCA staff. It was an inspired approach and the institution moved on under Tribe’s successor.

The absent Director-General eventually resigned and the slow process of appointing a replacement led to the Board asking Tribe to consider the post. He considered it seriously for he had conspicuously been deeply involved in the gestation, birth and early formation of ILCA. Period photographs show him involved in headquarters site planning for example, and his passion for the Debra Zeit research station is still remembered. Ultimately declining the D-G role, Tribe said that he needed the safety net of a post to return to at the end of the appointment. The events tell us more of Tribe’s insecurities, a subject on which his memoirs are not a reliable guide. He argues that other governments provided such guaranteed
posts but that Australia was not experienced in such matters. And so David Pratt with a secure post back in British aid was appointed. The story feels as if there is more to it since Tribe had conducted tens of consultancies secure in the employ of the University, yet there is no hint of his approaching the University with a proposal to return under the provisions of Professorial Fellow or the like. Furthermore, Tribe would have known well that he could source consulting revenues in excess of academic salaries if it was only a matter of financial security. Perhaps the permanent role was not of sufficient status compared to being on the Board. Or perhaps, we gain an inkling of Tribe’s lingering view of the dangers of going native by not having a respectable post at home. And as has often been observed, risk-taking declines with age and status.

Tribe’s status was soon to be enhanced when he was made, in 1977, an Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE) for services to education. This was important to him, as a one-word telegram – ‘Snap!’ – to his brother, who had been similarly honoured, implies. Tribe organized his forthcoming travel to Africa, the USA and the UK so that he could be in London on the appointed day to receive his honour directly from the Queen. His expressed regret of the day was being unable to share it with his mother who had died the previous year. Perhaps we see something more here, for if one was describing the successes of a young person today, Tribe might well be classified as a high achiever. And it seems that a common motivator for such persons is pleasing parents. But one can easily read too much into such generalities, even if it is also known to be a reasonably common trait among senior academics.
With one ILCA Board meeting each year taking place during the CGIAR Centres’ Week in the World Bank’s Washington headquarters, Tribe was mixing with those who sought experts, and inevitably he was asked to join an appraisal mission to Sudan. Here Tribe was confronted with the impact of technical successes in livestock projects, for nomadic ruminant populations had swollen with disease controls and inflicted unsustainable grazing pressure on the region’s fragile soils leading to desertification. Foreseeing this eventuality, Tribe had insisted on the social and environmental charter of ILCA to complement technical research. Nomadic lifestyles, disease control and desert encroachment were symptoms of the development dilemmas being faced in parts of Africa, and Tribe was seeing this firsthand in a Bank project. His Team Leader recalls from the Sudan mission that ‘he was an inspiration and role model for all of us’.\textsuperscript{101} With Tribe’s clarity of intellect, energy and reliable networks, it was a great loss when he moved away from African livestock development. Such integrative minds were already becoming scarce in the new agricultural education systems.

These events had all taken place in 1977 when Tribe spent much time in the UK, Africa and the USA, a contrast to the role he may have had as Director-General of ILCA. This diverse activity would have been much more stimulating for someone of Tribe’s disposition. And at the same time, he had the intellectual challenge of lecturing and supervising postgraduate students. Then he added to these by accepting joint-editorship with Professor Neimann-Sørensen of the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Copenhagen for a series of 35 books to be published as ‘World Animal Science’ by Elsevier Science.\textsuperscript{102} As Managing Editors they nominated Volume Editors – Tribe following
form in nominating his friends in Melbourne and the UK, including Norman Tulloh, Lynn Peel, and Tony Dunkin. The whole series was to take 30 years to complete. And of course, this tells us that Tribe was routing his travel for ILCA and others via Amsterdam to coordinate this editorial work with Elsevier. There is no doubt that Tribe worked hard, efficiently and cleverly across these multiple strands of his professional life.

After seven years on the ILCA Board, where the maximum tenure was six, Tribe stepped down. His withdrawal from Africa was softened somewhat by joining a World Bank mission to Tanzania to appraise a national agricultural research project, although the widespread post-colonial decline was by now obvious to Tribe. By contrast, the official opening of the ILCA campus in Addis Ababa in 1980, to which Tribe as Founder was invited, provided some hope of an alternative future for African agricultural research.

With such rich experience in so many countries of Africa, some were surprised that Tribe later became reticent to visit places like Nigeria. Others in international consulting with whom he raised such concerns were sympathetic, knowing that it was not uncommon for fears to manifest over time. But it was a specific case and time expressed as a concern of flying in unsafe conditions mixed with impractical talk of travelling in Africa with supplies of one’s own blood as the AIDS publicity exploded. In any case, Tribe was yet to fly hundreds of thousands more miles.

On this final visit to Africa, Tribe transited in northern Asia where he had Academy of Technological Science business to attend to. This was the early days of Chinese
international cooperation. The Academy in conjunction with Academia Sinica was encouraging scientific cooperation in food production and processing. Here one may see the continuity of a thread from his past to his future lives, for the Academy was to feature strongly in the creation of The Crawford Fund immediately after his interlude of six years in Canberra. As ever with Tribe, such threads intertwine symbiotically. And through it all, while on international assignments he was continuously engaged with his graduate students and in University matters, although his absences were raising barriers to his continued enjoyment of such roles. Even the intrigue of university politics must have lost its sheen among the African exotica.
Chapter 5

Latter University Years

The Balancing Act

Exotic Africa had worked its way on Tribe and led him into a wider experiential and intellectual world than could a prestigious university that considered agriculture to be declining in status. Tribe maintained his position in the University and spent most, but not all, of his non-African time there. And he met his obligations to the University. But Africa and the CGIAR had provided a political and development environment that made the School of Agriculture at the University of Melbourne seem parochial. Throughout his African period, he continued to be engaged in university matters, even when he took leave from the University for these engagements. He maintained contact with the School and his graduate students, and met most of his lecturing commitments while also publishing research papers. He was living two parallel professional lives, and like many engaged internationally, he relied psychologically on the notion of a ‘home’ with family in Australia and a recognized professional position, in his case in a respected university.

From his first major assignment for the East African Livestock Survey, Tribe had developed a taste for the mental and sensual stimulation of international agricultural development. The view may be taken, as it was by his
University colleagues, that Tribe conducted international assignments as sorties from university life. Alternatively, it may be seen that Tribe was committed to international development and entered into it while continuing his identification with the University. By treating his African experiences separately, this biography takes the second viewpoint, for the simple reasons that Tribe progressively involved himself more and more in international work as evidenced by his subsequent activities. The parochial notion that intellectual life is best found in a university was already in the 1970s proving to be uncertain, and we may best see Tribe as part of a small group of academics who walked the line between practice and theory and so gained that intellectual stimulation and knowledge that infuses teaching from research.

The stimulation that Tribe had derived from outside the University continued even in remote places. The natural sorting process that delivers people with compatible interests together in the same places peppers his chance meetings, dinners and airport lounge conversations with influential and interesting personalities. Tribe considered these as serendipitous and seems to have thought little more of it – but he paid tribute to the effects of running into influential persons overseas, just as he had when he first came to Australia. But having seen Tribe’s penchant for influence, it may be too easy to see such encounters as mere chance.

In his university life, the international experience enhanced his already entertaining lectures as real-life case studies. Such inclusions should not be undervalued when the alternative is depersonalized texts with second-hand experience. And in agricultural science it is a particularly
effective means of broadening the perspective of young antipodeans. One student from the late 1960s typifies many comments when he says that Tribe was ‘a lecturer with outstanding communication ability.’\textsuperscript{105} And in other fields, we might even go so far as to say that Tribe’s international activities increased the efficiency of his administration as Dean of the small Faculty. Certainly he introduced more initiatives than others of his era, and proved effective. But it was in this role that his absences became a clear source of friction in the Faculty.

In some ways it seems that, by the time the ILCA process was underway, Tribe was seeing the Faculty and the University itself as a less critical body in his life. He and Elizabeth travelled to Spain, France, the USA and the UK combining business and pleasure while meeting other travelling University staff and colleagues. And it seems that though he usually took leave-without-pay for his consultancies, somehow entitlements for sabbatical leave continued to accrue as if he was full-time at the University. Such were the halcyon days of academia. But what his critics at home forgot to mention in their detractions from his growing international stature was that as he travelled he was constantly writing up post-graduate research papers and revising lectures while making the University’s Faculty of Agriculture known globally.

Tribe’s international stature could have been evident to his University colleagues through the visitors that called at the Faculty. Many passed through the Tribe’s Surrey Hills and Main Ridge homes, and many were introduced socially to others in the Faculty and the wider University. It became a well-worn track for international livestock personalities to ‘call on Derek while in Australia’ – which is what the
University was just beginning to realize was the basis of its reputation. Alas, a university is sometimes but the sum of its staff and if that staff is jealous of each other, then the University is the loser. Thus when international agriculture was the flavour of the Australian aid program, the University of Melbourne was a significant actor, to the extent that it even created a Masters Degree related to tropical animal production.106 And at the same time that such initiatives attracted detractors at home, Tribe’s international reputation grew. Of course, others in the Faculty engaged in international activities, but it was usually opportunities that Tribe had put their way. And when Tribe left the University the Faculty’s international engagement did not reach the same level for another two decades.

A large part of the success that Tribe parlayed from international consulting into University activities centred on post-graduates. They were introduced to the foreign guests, encouraged to look beyond Australia’s shores for answers and careers, and were engaged in the warm family of colleagues that Tribe engendered. But we keep coming back to the nub of his problem – he was less and less present at the University. He could work magic, such as helping Herbert Nsubuga escape a murderous Ugandan regime, and later complete his doctorate at Makerere University. But he could not escape the ire of colleagues who felt that they were left to clean up after his lightning visits home.

In fact, resentments seem to have run even deeper. Tribe’s smooth style and preparation of the ground before proposing an innovation caused the more conservative academics to feel outwitted. In many cases, this may be put
down to routine envy or discomfort with change. But in some cases, there was a real basis for academic differences. Tribe’s innovation of the masters course for overseas students was seen as a compromise of standards by some of his colleagues – yet Tribe saw it as serving a need of the countries concerned. At one stage, an opponent – ‘G.W. Leeper, of the stringent standards and precise pen’\textsuperscript{107} – asked sarcastically, ‘how many extra marks per mile from home do you think this merits’.\textsuperscript{108}

The issue went further with the stickler for standards writing a learned paper in which he described the existing mechanisms in place for marginal students and the tendency for staff to mark them leniently. He therefore saw no need for a second compromise of standards and labelled those within the University who advocated them ‘refined philistines’. ‘Crude philistines’ existed outside the University and only wanted graduates to have practical skills, but the refined versions were within the cloister and more sophisticated. Leeper notes that the argument reached the point of his being asked, ‘is it fair to penalize students for having been badly prepared?’\textsuperscript{109} Here is the essence of the issue that made Tribe unpopular with some of his equally committed colleagues – compromise of standards had limits, and in their mind Tribe was pushing the envelope. The archetypal ‘refined philistine’ of the article was specifically aimed at Tribe.

It was a typical example of a confrontation between the pure and the practical academics with all its understated and unacknowledged origins in another cloistered institution, and its associated zealotry.\textsuperscript{110} Tribe was practical, he mixed with people outside the University who were practical and he added value to both parties in a
manner that is *de rigeur* today. He felt that agricultural science was an applied science. Such tensions continue as they indeed must to fuel the dynamism that makes universities useful to society. In any case, despite such obstacles, Tribe does not seem to have been excessively concerned. He felt he was meeting a genuine development need through innovative education. He also felt that he was doing the right thing and meeting all of his other University obligations, even when travelling frequently.

To Tribe, those obligations were to his postgraduate students and their research, to undergraduate lectures and to enhancing the University’s reputation. This meant that he was doing his University business wherever he was – it did not require a fulltime presence in his opinion, though for others who adopted a more conservative academic lifestyle it did. In his era, Tribe would have known that the prized collegiate atmosphere could not be maintained with frequent absences. But then Tribe had not really spent the long laborious years in cloisters that many of his colleagues had. It was common in that era to hear of seven-year doctorates after four to seven years of masters and bachelors degrees spent engaging in the diverse distractions of university life and the collegiality of long discussions; Tribe had spent two years in undergraduate studies and then energetically completed his doctoral work on a prestigious research station.

We see Tribe’s understanding of this situation when ILCA needed a temporary Director-General and he offered his services on the basis that he was free through the University vacation. By today’s norms this may sound outrageous for most university staff, but it was a different time. It still goes on for senior professors if universities
wish to keep them. And while some of his University colleagues carped, Tribe received an OBE for services to education, and took on joint-editorship of a 35 volume ‘World Animal Science’ series for Elsevier. As an elite academic, Tribe’s Foundation status with the Academy of Technological Science further testified to his star’s continuing rise. But despite all this, negativity characterized factional commentaries in corners of the overly large staff common room of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry. And at that time, as now, many of his colleagues in the Faculty did not know of his international status.

University Politician

It is a particularity of Tribe’s life that those who recall him, for better or ill, usually only knew him in one guise. He was either the Professor from the School of Agriculture, or the international African livestock expert. Of course there was overlap, but few personalities appear on both sides, even in Tribe’s own recollections. In fact, his own reflections indicate some partitioning between these parts of his professional life. Accolades in Australia emphasized his contributions from a local perspective as is usual for this nation, and his international colleagues of later years were yet to enter his life. It is therefore little wonder that Tribe inspired some resentment among some of his university colleagues, and yet it is a wonder that he was able to accomplish so much in both arenas.

To understand more of Tribe’s way of accomplishing his visions, we must return to our knowledge of the unusual skills that he had practiced. He was a skilled writer – he made it seem effortless, but extant draft manuscripts
suggest a continuous revision of his own work until it was acceptable to his high standards. He was a skilled public speaker and he also made this seem easy, yet those who were close to him attest to his detailed preparation and practice before a mirror. And he was a skilled politician to the extent that he had spent some time in the UK system and seen how ambitious individuals function, and this made it seem easy for him to engage others in his ideas. But in the university environment, where highly intelligent academics often apply their gifts to thwarting change that might impact their lives, political skills are a constant trial for one such as Tribe who seeks change. We may appreciate more of Tribe through some case studies of his work in that environment. He put much store in Cornford’s 1908 university satire, parts of which may well have been describing Tribe, such as the apocryphal process of political squaring described in the Box.

Tribe assumed that institutional social interaction was political. This did not mean that he was alienated from others, but the contrary – for he genuinely liked most with whom he associated. But he also saw like Aristotle that ‘man is by nature a political animal’, and having studied both animal behaviour and politics, it had all become second nature. He had much more political experience than his colleagues at the Faculty of Agriculture, but he had also rejected the deliberate deceptions that defined public politicking. Nevertheless, in practicing his gentlemanly craft, Tribe sometimes was so smooth as to make others wary of subsequent interactions. Perhaps one instance was that of recruiting a bright young plant physiologist to the Faculty.
Cornford describes one of the political methods Tribe employed with aplomb when there was a ‘job’ to be done as ‘Squaring’. The process ‘can be carried on at lunch; but it is better that we should meet casually. The proper course to pursue is to walk, between 2 and 4 p.m., up and down [between University House and the Raymond Priestley Building], and more particularly that part of it [known as Professors’ Walk’]. When we have succeeded in meeting accidentally, it is etiquette to talk about indifferent matters for ten minutes and then part. After walking five paces in the opposite direction you should call me back, and begin with the words, “Oh, by the way, if you should happen...”. The nature of Your Job must then be vaguely indicated, without mentioning names; and it should be treated by both parties as a matter of very small importance. You should hint that I am a very influential person, and that the whole thing is a secret between us. Then we shall part as before, and I shall call you back and introduce the subject of My Job, in the same formula. By observing this procedure we shall emphasise the fact that there is no connection whatever between my supporting your Job and your supporting mine. This absence of connection is the essential feature of Squaring.

Remember this: the men who get things done are the men who walk up and down [this route] from two to four, every day of their lives. You can either join them, and become a powerful person; or you can join the great throng of those who spend all their time in preventing them from getting things done, and in the larger task of preventing one another from doing anything whatever. This is the Choice of Hercules, when Hercules takes to politics.’112
Gentlemen’s Agreements

A doctoral candidate in the Faculty of Science, Doug Parbery was allocated to teach plant pathology to students from the Faculty of Agriculture following a tradition of cross-teaching. After some seven years, the change in guard that saw Tribe appointed Dean, allowed him to square away a ‘gentlemen's agreement’ with the Head of Botany ‘that all teaching of plant pathology, for Agriculture and Science, would be taught by the Faculty of Agriculture staff, and that all plant physiology courses for students in each faculty would be taught by Botany staff’.113 Thus the young plant pathology lecturer was faced with a terrible choice between the two faculties for his future career.

Much later he met Tribe in the System Garden, a once elaborate botanical display of plant taxonomy and exotic species that was architecturally designed to link the pure Botany to the applied Agricultural Sciences. In practice across some seven decades, however, the garden proved to be more of a barrier than a meeting place of the sciences. But if the setting was ominous, the meeting was as cordial as all of Tribe’s, and he simply ‘asked me when I was moving across to Agriculture’.114 Having heard nothing of the matter for seven years, this was a surprise to the young plant physiologist, as was Tribe’s suggestion that he ‘move over as soon as possible’ and square it away with the acting Head of Botany. And so erupted a ‘torrent of fury’ that eventually led the soon to be doctoral graduate to opt for agriculture. Thereafter the Botany Head referred to Parbery as the ‘staff member that Agriculture stole from Botany’.115

Tribe had gained a new young staff member, and had made his colleagues in Botany feel that they had been bested. The
story is repeated in various forms, and in all cases demonstrates a studied testing of the winds of change and the whispering of calculated words in the right place at the right time. Tribe was a master at this, surpassing the older academics who thought themselves too smart for university politics, which was often practiced under the euphemism of administration. However, the most consistent results of such instances seem to have been a respect for the skill, an agreement of the inevitability of the outcome and a wariness of future interactions with Tribe. And from Tribe’s viewpoint, each case resulted in an improved situation for the person and subject concerned.

But while the results may have been beneficial overall, the sensitivity of bright academics can be relied upon to entrench positions and so maintain antipathy for decades, even lifetimes. So we find within the staff involved in the small Faculty, polarized views of Tribe and his accomplishments. To some he remains a great Faculty innovator that made ‘wonderful contributions [to] the quality of its teaching’.\textsuperscript{116} This view saw that across the whole university, undergraduate courses had become ossified. Tribe’s response was to lead a 1970 reform of courses, after engaging the support of his two fellow Chairs.

Tribe’s innovations freed up the undergraduate course to allow a choice of subjects in fourth, and to some extent, third year. It was well received and did much to enliven the scholastic life of the School. At the same time a compulsory subject, Resource Use and Conservation, was introduced in response to rising social concern about agriculture and its environmental blindness. This was a time of unfulfilled technical promises in the Little Desert agricultural development, the rise of the environmental movement
around the Lake Pedder issue and direct criticism by the Duke of Edinburgh. ‘Society was beginning to look at the less than romantic side of agriculture and Tribe could see increasing competition and even confrontation between agriculture, conservation and a range of societal interests other than the provision of food and fibre’.\textsuperscript{117} In this conception, Tribe led a reform that introduced the most up to date and socially responsible course in agricultural science in Australia

The new subject of Resource Use and Conservation serves as a further illustration of Tribe’s way of motivating others to join his vision. Selecting the young plant pathologist – the same Doug Parbery he had ‘stolen’ from Botany – to deliver the subject, he provided guidance, support and contacts to make it work. The course integrated informed senior persons from relevant agencies through seminar discussions between opposing groups, and innovatively offered students a choice of a formal examination or written assignment. As a capstone to the course, Tribe organised a five-day excursion visiting farmers, past graduates and others. Thus such diverse issues as fish farming, agricultural impacts on water quality, drought management, bird sanctuaries and trace-element deficient soils were made practical to students as they travelled by train and boat with staff while engaging in formal discussions each evening.

One such excursion demonstrated Tribe’s educational and political interest – he arranged with a past graduate to use his property as an on-site conference facility. ‘The evening discussions were held and greatly helped along by [that particular graduate who] was a bit like Derek. He was into everything and was fully aware of what was going on in
most nooks and crannies’. Knowing there were some 17 different Government agencies involved in coastal salinity issues in the area, they brought their representatives together for a seminar that mischievously showed that many did not even know of the other agencies’ existence or roles. It was an early indication of the maxim of Tribe’s later life – of doing well and doing good at the same time.

**Enthusiastic Innovator**

Tribe also responded creatively to a problem of the senior high school subject Agricultural Science declining in enrolments. He proposed it be renamed Agriculture and Environmental Science and helped to guide its evolution into Environmental Science while retaining lead-ins to subjects of agricultural science. Tribe’s strategy of rewarding loyal willing horses with further challenges again led to the young Parbery becoming the secondary schools’ Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agricultural and Environmental Science as well as Chairman of Examiners from 1974 to 1976. Swapping Environmental Science for Agricultural Science doubled enrolment immediately and numbers continued to build. Students benefitted, the Faculty gained a wider pool of qualified applicants and the continued development of a young academic was fostered. Tribe had done well – at least in the eyes of most involved.

It is often said of Tribe that he liked people. He said it himself. This had its drawbacks as he was trusted with confidences. While politically skilled in guarding information, he sometimes found it difficult to keep secrets. This led him to occasionally remind interlocutors ‘don’t tell
me anything you don’t want repeated’. It was an endearing warning best understood as part of his general liking for people.

In fact, more than liking, it extended to concern, such as for students who felt isolated from staff and home. In that case, Tribe allocated each student to an academic as his pastoral supervisor. Supervisors would host small lunches in their offices or in the garden each term to encourage students to feel more at ease in seeking help if needed. Calls for help might have been few, but some were serious to the student concerned. Such welfare concern was also expressed in terms of the lecturer’s role in guiding young men and women into being responsible members of society. One student of Animal Husbandry in the early 1960s relates how Tribe discussed ‘current research on the contraceptive pill, which was then not readily available. We students listened [with active imaginations … until he] concluded the lecture in his lovely well-modulated voice: "while this research has little relevance to animal husbandry, you should understand it, not only as endocrinologists, but as mature educated gentlemen"'.

Concern for student welfare was matched with concern for the course. The high attrition rate at the end of the first year of Agricultural Science courses was once legendary, and both the personal and educational costs were yet to be seen in today’s light as an indicator of poor management. Leading the issue, Tribe identified the primary question as relating to whether a student could handle subsequent years of the course, rather than the extant issue of passing a specific examination. He thus arranged for the Faculty’s animal geneticist and statistician Rolf Beilharz, to work as an analyst with the Department of Education to develop
predictors of the chance a student who had failed one or more subjects had of succeeding if allowed to proceed to the next year. Past experience and data were used to develop a new view of students’ ability. Thus the lazy criterion of using chemistry, physics and the complex mathematics as proxies for capacity to handle other subjects was informed by a formula based on the margin by which a student failed an exam and the number of subjects failed. Apart from benefitting students, the formula also reduced Faculty tensions between the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ markers that characterized many of the staff arguments of that era. Tribe’s critics supported this innovation, although his parallel proposal of different approaches for overseas students led to deep internal divisions.

Not only was Tribe stating his ideas about special consideration for overseas students in Faculty meetings and the corridors, he made it the subject of at least one seminar to which a fellow academic previously from the University of Melbourne but by then at Latrobe University took umbrage. Tribe had apparently proposed his usual special course for overseas students in the same vein that he was said to have made to the Faculty some ten years earlier. The objective may have been to make education appropriate for international students while also arresting declining enrolments in agriculture, but the approach was seen by his critics as a downward spiral in quality and reputation that would damn the whole Australian system.

It seems that Tribe used a young Australian who was making worthwhile contributions in Asia as an example. But he had also argued that degrees for students should be ‘appropriate’ to their expected workplace. Of course Tribe meant that overseas students would return home to work
and courses should be oriented to that outcome. His critic was deftly able to argue that the successful young Australian, whom he knew through having taught him at Latrobe, had a reputable degree and some relevant experience – yet Tribe had inferred that such a degree would have been ‘inappropriate’ for overseas work. The critique concluded, ‘if we do as Tribe suggests to survive then we don’t deserve to survive. We can do more lasting good by maintaining standards, training people like [the Australian mentioned], and by setting an example of scientific integrity and of how to do research of quality.’

How do we reconcile such views? In fact, we do not have to for both parties may be correct according to their own perspectives. The problem was that Tribe usually got his way, even as such arguments were being aired. And this must have infuriated his critics. Tribe was possibly a softer touch in some cases than his colleagues, but not always, and his own research papers and those with postgraduates indicate the rigor essential for the complexity of animal physiological research. In the final analysis, we must simply accept that while Tribe liked almost all whom he met, not all of those liked him back. To place this in context in the period under discussion, we should also consider the innovations that Tribe dreamt up to promote collegiality.

Staff were brought together perhaps more than would otherwise have been the case by Tribe’s introduction of staff retreats. The idea may have arisen from the need to integrate the Forest Science course with that of Agricultural Science, when Forestry moved from Botany. Such rationalizations often reveal academics worst parochialism, and Tribe saw that continued fruitless discussion might be resolved by a live-in conference of all
concerned. Thus decisions that ‘could be lived with’ were agreed as a by-product of social interaction, and a general greater appreciation of each other’s skills was gained, from music to poetry to table tennis. This was the clubbable Tribe at his best – able to rally the troops around him to go in his direction.

Integrating students into the Faculty and encouraging staff interaction may sound like universal goods, but in that academic setting no emotion was universal. Detractors saw negatives where others saw positives. Some of these emotions continue to this day having outlasted Tribe. One apparent universal good was Tribe’s response to the anticlimactic ending of Graduation Day with its dispiriting mass cup of tea and sweet biscuit gathering of anglophile Australia. A real Graduation Luncheon following a morning graduation ceremony that included all staff and new graduates and their families was the result, with he and Elizabeth graciously welcoming everyone at the door. The innovation continued until recently and was virtually unique in the University. But it was not universally accepted in Tribe’s time as some academics argued against Tribe acting as host, and others could not allow themselves to attend when offended by some recent slight or ongoing dispute. And disputes were rife through his reign.

A contemporary has likened Tribe to Gaius Julius Caesar. He saw beyond the vision of his fellows and that inspired confusion that others can manipulate into distrust. With a fellow Professor in the Faculty acting as his Cato, Tribe was checked at every turn, and was locked into a competitive environment that masqueraded as collegiate. Still a ‘young man in a hurry’ he may have also united ‘the virtues of a Brutus to the passion for lost causes of a Cato’ but he
‘learnt that most of his causes are lost by letting the Cato out of the bag’.\textsuperscript{123} In short, it was the typical faculty of a major university, and Tribe was its master.

Staff and postgraduates were forced to take sides, and the split was along the disciplinary lines of Tribe’s antagonists who saw themselves as the ‘good men’ opposing their corrupt Caesar. The analogy should not be taken too far; Tribe was a leader and visionary, but he was not the academic pedant. He was thus open to criticism of ‘lowering standards’, the mantra of the conservative academic criticism such as described in Cornford’s satire\textsuperscript{124} of which Tribe was most fond, and which he passed to a Dean of the later much enlarged and equally divided Faculty at Melbourne.

But the smoke of such criticism requires us to seek the fire of the fact. And through this time, we may see that while Tribe was the mover and shaker, the one with great ideas that he would pass to others to implement, he was often absent. Here, as indicated earlier, we find Tribe’s Achilles’ heel: international assignments. It counted little that he maintained contact while away, appointed deputies to follow through initiatives and hit the ground running when arriving back. As a fellow Professor of Animal Science in the Melbourne Faculty saw it, Tribe’s ‘charisma carried people with his ideas’\textsuperscript{125} – but, we assume, when his charisma was overseas, his big ideas did not fit into the tiny pool at Melbourne. His absences fomented resentment that he was off doing something glamorous while they ‘were left holding Tribe’s baby’.\textsuperscript{126} This led, by the late 1970s to a growing resistance to Tribe’s initiatives. And as an intra-institutional entrepreneur, this frustrated Tribe.
Within that sentiment in the Faculty, it is difficult to isolate one event as precipitating Tribe’s eventual decision to resign from the University. Nevertheless, we may see the clouds gathering in his opposition to the absorption of the State Government’s School of Forestry at Creswick into the University’s Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry. Tribe opposed the amalgamation partly because the overhead structure of the University would lead to a proportion of the budget for Creswick being retained centrally and thus making it a drain on other Faculty funds. After a couple of years of negotiation between the University and the Victorian Forests Commission during which Tribe campaigned against the merger through meetings and petitions, he was summoned before the Vice Chancellor. An observer of the time noted that Tribe was told in ‘no uncertain terms, that the University wanted the amalgamation and that if it should fail, he would be held personally responsible and goodness knows what else. From then on, I hardly ever saw Derek in the School’.

While Tribe liked to paint his departure from the University as his choice and part of a life plan to not stay in academia throughout his career, it seems that he may also have thought that having overplayed his political hand, he could no longer create the environment of innovation in which he thrived. In any case, he was already casting about for different things to do. He had considered pursuing the Vice Chancellor career track but apparently rejected it as not suiting his worldview. And so he moved on.

Later after his stint with IDP, he did the same as he moved back to greener pastures, for it was in the 1980s that Tribe formed and directed a Policy Committee of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science onto which he invited a
few loyal colleagues. It was another Tribe initiative and one that advanced the profession, yet like his later years at the University, it engendered resentment from those with a different perspective. Like the visionary from whom he derived his early inspiration, Orr of the Rowett and FAO, he was a little too far ahead of his time. And so Tribe eventually resigned from the Institute and severed all contact after some offensive public criticism from those with a different agenda.

A Caesar mindful of his dignitas, or still the ‘young man in a hurry’ who would not bother with fools? Such analogies define Tribe as much as his accomplishments, for in them we see his values as well as his personal desires. Tribe had bold ideas and wanted to win. His methodology may now be seen to have followed the principles of agricultural science – adapt to the environment or change the environment to suit your purpose. In his earlier life he had cultivated new skills in order to suit the environment in which he found himself. Now advanced in his career, he sought to modify the environment to suit his further growth. His years at the University of Melbourne had been very productive.

**All Round Academic**

Throughout his 24 years at the Faculty, Tribe had done what the evolving University thought was the sign of a great university, and he had been acknowledged. He had been awarded a Higher Doctorate – the Doctor of Agricultural Science – by the University as early as 1969 for his research publications and had received numerous professional accolades. These included: the Silver Medal of the
Australian Institute of Agricultural Science (AIAS) for contributions through research in 1969; being a Foundation Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences in 1975; being made an Officer of the British Empire for services to education in 1977, and being elected a Fellow of the AIAS in 1977 and of the Australian Association of Animal Production in 1980.

More honours were to come, but these had accrued while Tribe was a member of the University. His publication record – usually an indicator of academics being distracted by extramural work – was solid, well above the average for full professors of his era. This included four books excluding the voluminous East African Report and the best seller, ‘Postmark Australia’, four book chapters and some 62 papers of which he was sole or lead author for about 30, all published during his tenure at the University. According to the old system of equivalency, this was calculated as about 100 publications, or the equivalent of five papers per year. He had also brought a stream of international visitors to the University as a function of his wide networking, writing and consulting. And he had brought much else, including the international conference of his discipline – The IIIrd World Conference on Animal Production.128

Through these busy university years, Tribe was known by young technical staff as ‘creating an environment where it was pleasant to work’. Students recall him as ‘a good mentor, approachable and who made boring things interesting because he was a storyteller’. He insisted to staff then, as he would two decades later to a new style of Dean in the same words, that ‘the professor should teach first year where the minds are fresh and eager.’ And of particular interest among the middle-aged agricultural
scientists of today is a recognition that Tribe was ahead of his time, such as teaching energy equations for fossil-fuel agriculture as a means of highlighting environmental costs.\textsuperscript{129} As a colleague of 45 years concluded, he was 'as good an academic as you can get'.\textsuperscript{130}

Considering that Tribe was working internationally, speaking widely in Australia and increasingly internationally while also supervising postgraduate students, the University might in today’s era seek to keep such an achiever associated with its name. That this did not occur in Tribe’s case may be seen as a reflection of the University administration of the time, Tribe’s confrontation with the administration, and these years representing the closing decade of a golden era in University life.

Having begun as a ‘young man in a hurry’ in Reading and maintaining his pace through Aberdeen, Bristol and Melbourne, Tribe was now 54 and still full of energy, but that energy was to be allocated to a new purpose – one that he would find a greater challenge than he expected.

**Leaving the University**

On leaving the University, a Minute of Appreciation was recorded by Academic Board. The tradition is not of great import, subsumed as it has been today by exaggerated press releases, but it does provide a summary of what he and his University colleagues considered important parts of his academic life.
The Minute notes that Tribe first visited Australia in 1952 under a Visiting Lectureship supported by the Nuffield Foundation. It goes on to record that he returned four years later as Reader in Animal Production, a section within the Faculty of Agriculture that comprised one post-graduate student and one technical assistant and no research facilities. From this base, he built an Animal Production section within the Faculty that had extensive research facilities, links with industry and government, and albeit poorly understood at the time, respected international linkages.

His research and related activities, together with concurrent additional appointments in Animal Production, led to Tribe’s appointment as Professor of Animal Nutrition in 1966. Across his time at the University, the Animal Production section graduated some 29 Ph.D. and 40 Masters degrees. His four years as Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture is acknowledged in unusually glowing terms, - ‘he showed a flair for administration, tact and diplomacy’. And overall, it is noted that ‘he sees issues clearly, makes decisions easily and he loves a debate. Essentially, a leader, his wisdom and energy are combined with a great personal charm’.131 He left the University in 1980 as an Emeritus Professor, to the relief of some and to the detriment of the Faculty’s international legitimacy, though he was to engage many of his loyal colleagues through his next role as the Executive Director of what became IDP. It was to be yet another transition in his interesting professional life.
Chapter 6

Transitions

UK to Australia

Tribe’s resignation from the University of Melbourne in 1980 is a convenient point at which to consider the changes as distinct from the continuity in his career. Such transitions as indicated in the chart appear to be significant in some cases while in others seem to be but subtle changes in emphases. Tribe’s activities in Africa are an example – are they a subset of his Australian university years, or are they the beginning of his internationalization? There was no apparent momentous decision to shift focus from Australia to Africa, because both occurred simultaneously.

Other transitions were significant however, particularly that of migration from the UK to Australia. So was that of leaving the University to join IDP, here depicted as a transition from Africa to Asia while retaining continuity with Australia. The first has been discussed in Chapter 3 although the commitment to the new country took longer, and the second is considered here and into Chapter 7.

While it may seem that the transition from the UK to Australia was completed with the voyage, the writing of ‘Postmark Australia’ with Elizabeth some seven years later indicates otherwise. And we can see this even more clearly from events that occurred in the final weeks of 1965 when
Tribe was in England with family and friends after one of his African assignments. Friends naturally included fellow agricultural scientists, and it was they who would lead him to a decision about his relationship to Australia. They informally informed Tribe of the forthcoming creation of a Chair in Animal Production at the University of Reading.

Back in Australia for just a month, Tribe received official notification of the soon to be advertised Chair at Reading in the coded language of academia that indicated that the Chair was his if he so chose. This was the trial. Was home really in Australia, or was it England? Where were opportunities greater? Tribe’s immediate response was, after discussion with Elizabeth, to apply for the Chair when the time came.

Of course, applying for the Chair made sense. Reading was still home in many senses – aging parents lived nearby and post-war Britain was getting on its feet again. And in such a mood, a Chair in the hand was worth who-knew-what in the Australian bush. But in retrospect Tribe’s application might also be seen as keeping the door open and even as
salting away a negotiating position for possible future use. Coming at a time when Tribe and the family had been based in Africa, the prospect also benefitted from the absence of the frame of mind that comes from the enjoyable habits and daily routine in an established university like Melbourne. And Tribe knew that he was only to be in Melbourne for a month before heading off again.

Tribe returned to Rome where the Chair at Reading remained in his mind. If it wasn’t, it certainly would have been after his Dean from Melbourne, Professor Carl Forster happened through Rome and casually mentioned that a Chair related to animal husbandry had been approved for the Faculty and that Tribe was likely to be invited to fill it. We must suspect the coincidence of Melbourne’s creation of a Chair soon after Reading at the same time as Foster’s visit to Rome, for the English-speaking academic world is a tightly wired network. Whatever the case, Tribe was now in a good negotiating position. And as academic secrets have short half-lives, Tribe immediately knew that a gentleman’s responsibility was to formally inform each party of the other opportunity and of his need to consider the choice from his home base, which was Elizabeth in Melbourne.

By now, Tribe was combining the careers of international consultant and senior academic – and doing both well. He was in Melbourne months at a time, but he had much on his mind. While busy on safari and writing the East African Report, he continued working on research papers and university matters. So it was that when back in Melbourne on one of these trips he was awarded a higher doctorate – a D.Agr.Sc. – on the basis of 50 of his significant papers that he had cobbled together and bound. It may not be a major task to collate one’s written papers and submit them to a
Faculty committee, especially when the process was less formal than today. But the timing indicates that he was organizing this while in another hemisphere, and it confirmed Tribe as the outstanding animal scientist. This was a significant moment – he had the higher doctorate and an offer of a Chair from two universities. The outcome would decide the rest of his professional life.

With Elizabeth, he deliberated the choice between Chairs in Reading and Melbourne. There is no need to imagine too much of the details of such decision factors as family, friends, opportunities and drawbacks that ultimately led to a somewhat reluctant decision for Melbourne. Tribe’s letter to academic friends in Reading is a classic example of his clear style and honesty. ‘For years it has been the height of my ambition to return to Reading as a member of the agricultural staff. It has never occurred to me that I would ever decide against seeking such a position. Now when at last the opportunity has arisen, I have decided to do just that. The decision has not been easy ...’ ¹³²

This is the migrant’s choice par excellence. Two genuine and attractive offers, one representing the peak of ambitions to which Tribe could have returned as the conquering hero to his home territory, and the other, the top post in a new country where Tribe had already proved himself an accomplished player and major contributor. Tribe was now an Australian, if not yet a citizen of the country – this was to be delayed until 1980 after both his parents had died. His transition into an Australian was his accepting of the Melbourne Chair.
Academic to Entrepreneur

This transition also serves as a means of examining Tribe’s accomplishments at the time. While his Australian activities were better known than his international exploits by local colleagues, his contributions were simultaneous. Locally, this was seen in such summaries as: Derek Tribe: Arriving in 1956 as Reader in the Physiology of Domestic Animals to the School of Agriculture at the University of Melbourne, he was raised to the Chair of Professor of Animal Husbandry in 1966 and a new Chair in Animal Nutrition in 1969133 and was Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture from 1969 to 1973. He resigned his Chair in 1980 and was then conferred Emeritus status by the University. He received such honours as: the 1969 Silver Medal of the AIAS; Foundation Fellow of the Academy of Technological Sciences from 1975; Officer of the OBE for services to education in 1977, Fellow of AIAS and ASAP in 1980. By that time, he recorded 72 publications and some 19 international involvements. Publications included six books, four book chapters and 62 papers.134

No appreciation of the energy required for such international work is evident in these descriptions. We may perhaps gain an inkling by listing some of his missions. These included, in addition to the various assignments that led to the establishment and operation of the International Livestock Centre for Africa and the preceding and comprehensive East African Livestock Survey:135 a Rockefeller livestock mission to Thailand in 1976; two World Bank missions to Chad in 1968 and 1969; an FAO Indian mission in 1971; a World Bank mission to Sudan in 1978 and Tanzania in 1979, as well as serving on the Australian Aid Consultative Committee on Research and Development and a range of related committees.
This was much more than the average agricultural academic attempted, indeed much more than most of his peers knew about Tribe. His accomplished ease was a practiced image. Perhaps it was as a counter to some of the envy that he engendered that he later reflected that ‘being an academic is a much more arduous and demanding occupation than is popularly imagined and if one’s specialist interest is community related (like agriculture, medicine, law, veterinary science etc.) the pressures tend to be even greater.’\textsuperscript{136} He might have gone further and termed it a vocation or a calling, for he took it that seriously. He could also have noted that as ‘the Professor’ the demands by diverse groups are so much greater. If he didn’t dwell on such details it was because he loved what he was doing.

For example, after he was confirmed in the Chair of Animal Husbandry on June 30 1966, he set about the further development of animal sciences at the University of Melbourne. He did this by opening and then following through on opportunities, such as when he gave the keynote address to the Pig Industry Conference. His presentation emphasized the need for graduate training and research in the pig sector, including a thinly veiled challenge for increased funding. We can almost hear his targeted challenge in the reported words, ‘at the University of Melbourne we would like nothing better than to train pig specialists and carry out pig research, but we have no resources to finance such developments.’\textsuperscript{137} From this opportunity-opening political appeal we can follow Tribe’s deft hand behind-the-scenes to produce a spectacular outcome.
The story unfolds thus. A notable pig farmer formed a committee to raise funds for pig research and introduced his friend – Victoria’s longest serving Premier Sir Henry Bolte – to Tribe. Bolte promised State support for a University Pig Centre. He then mentioned it to the Federal Minister for Agriculture Doug Anthony who also supported the centre. Next a public appeal was orchestrated and launched in the University of Melbourne Student Union with the University Chancellor, (former Prime Minister) Sir Robert Menzies presiding. The State and Federal contributions were made public and more than $100,000 was raised.

Here was a case study of Tribe’s finesse in dealing with politicians and fundraising. His adventures in politics, open nature in dealing with all persons and passion for worthwhile projects are all in evidence. And as we should expect of such an accomplished diplomat, few traces of the detailed preparations for each step remain for analysis. The Pig Centre was another success for Tribe’s animal sciences group, and Tribe attributed it mostly to the new Pig Centre Director Tony Dunkin, whom we are not surprised to learn had once been a student with both he and Elizabeth at Reading.

But it is worth reviewing this event from another perspective, that of the beneficiaries – the pig industry itself. Australian pig research at this time was a poor cousin to other animal research. It could muster only five scientists in 1969; by 1985 the number had risen to 190. The Australasian Pig Science Association, when looking back from 2007 and evaluating its own history, attributed the change to Tribe’s ‘three masterstrokes’.\footnote{138 They saw them as: 1) coaxing eminent pig producers to convince other pig}
producers of the benefits of research, 2) convincing the Federal Minister for Agriculture to fund it on the same matching-levy-dollar-for-dollar basis as other rural industries for those funds raised from producer levies, and 3) attracting Tony Dunkin to head up the Mount Derrimut Pig Research and Training Centre. APSA asked itself: ‘Why were so many students stimulated towards training opportunities in the pig sciences and why did so many dedicate their professional life to the pig industry?’ Their response was ‘the skilful engineering by two individuals working together, Derek Tribe and Tony Dunkin’.”

The APSA went even further in attributing their success to Tribe by making three further points. First, to assess research proposals, he ensured that a Research Committee was created with a majority of scientists, rather than administrators or farmers. Second, he suggested the founding of many centres rather than one Centre of Excellence to ensure no monopoly over ideas developed. And third, he encouraged post-graduate training as the main means of conducting research and creating researchers. The establishment of other centres in Sydney, Wollongbar, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth ensured that post-graduate training increased pig scientist numbers. This is an independent group charting its own history and attributing its success, not to extant pig scientists of the time, but to Tribe the ruminant physiologist. By contrast, Tribe’s own descriptions of the events seem unduly modest.

Tribe’s practiced skills came together in this and other fundraising and entrepreneurial ventures. From an academic talking to serious farmers, he had delicately managed an opportunity from behind the scenes using his skills of brokerage and political nuance for the benefit of his
institution. All this was accomplished after successive absences from the campus. In other circumstances, we might have expected to see the facility named the Derek Tribe Pig Research Centre. But that was neither Tribe’s style nor the mood of the University and its Faculty at the time.

Tribe’s own telling of his dealings with the Australian power brokers and politicians in such circumstances is similar to his earlier self-deprecating anecdote about meeting Malcolm Fraser. We may assume that the truth was mostly relayed in such anecdotes, but that the background hard work and thoughtful preparation was downplayed, in some cases so much so that it was implied to not have existed. But it always did. Such good luck comes with hard work. Awareness and preparation were Tribe’s bywords, and little happened by accident. So having met Doug Anthony in his role as Federal Minister of Agriculture, Tribe did not simply let the contact lapse after securing funds for the Pig Centre, he cultivated a deep friendship as he did with many he met. And he knew ‘that what goes around comes around’, which is exactly what occurred with Doug decades later in the formative days of The Crawford Fund.

**Busyness to Efficiency**

Meanwhile, apart from routine academic duties, Tribe was continuing to balance consultancies with diverse domestic professional responsibilities such as judging for the Royal Agricultural Society, sitting on committees of the University Professorial Board, the Geelong Grammar Council, the Australian Journal for Agricultural Research, the Australian Society of Animal Production, the Victorian Grasslands
Society and the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science. He also edited five books, continued his generous speaking commitments at field days, dinners, speech nights and community groups such as the Jewish Council and Rotary, and became a regular attendee of the Beefsteak Club. Maintaining stability with demanding work across great distances became even more precarious when at the end of 1968, he found himself the only full professor in the Faculty when the two others retired, and hence he became Dean by default.

But a Dean in 1969 was less a manager of hundreds of staff and more like a benign *primus inter pares* charged to carry out the administration that others eschewed. Tribe even observed that while he continued his consultancies that the Faculty ‘seemed a long, long way away’. But it does not mean that Tribe took the role lightly. His first Decanal step was to change the post from an annually elected one to a three-year tenure, which of course meant three additional years in his case. In this way, he heralded a longer-term perspective for Faculty development, and the need for a trustworthy secretary. Jan (Armitage) Jones proved to be the one, predictably selected for her ability, lack of pretension and eagerness to serve; Jan went on to be secretary to five further Deans, and more importantly became Tribe’s choice for the anchor administrative post when he created The Crawford Fund. Of many examples, Jan is typical of the loyalty that Tribe extended to his colleagues and the loyalty he engendered in them. And typically endearing is the story of how he once advised Jan of her promotion; Tribe called her into his office and dictated a letter on the subject, and watched realization dawn.
So when Tribe was in the Dean’s chair, he was active. His intellectual focus remained mainly on the Animal Production group, which now comprised Norman Tulloh, Tony Dunkin, Rolf Beilharz, Geoff Pearce and some 18 postgraduate candidates. Postgraduate candidates came from various countries including Argentina, Canada, England, Greece, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Korea, Malaysia, Scotland, Thailand, Uganda, the UK and the USA. But as Dean he also created annual academic retreats at Mt Derrimut House, the Forestry Campus at Creswick or the Gippsland Strathfieldsayye run, all of which were or later became property of the Faculty.

Becoming Dean in 1969 may also have made him more conspicuous for other roles in Australia, especially when decision-makers were persons whom Tribe had earlier befriended. This may be part of the explanation for Tribe being invited by Malcolm Fraser as Minister for Education, to be a member of the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education, chaired by Sir Ian Wark. This was to prove an important appointment because it prepared Tribe for his post-academic career as Executive Director of IDP being concerned as it was with the second-tier of higher education, the Colleges of Advanced Education. At the same time, it placed Tribe among senior executives from the industrial elite, such as BHP, BP, AMP and ICI (Orica). Such company gave confidence to the now committed migrant to buy a holiday house on the Mornington Peninsula, an iconic indicator of his local status.

In an ever-expanding world, as Dean and with his ever-agreeable demeanour, Tribe was a darling of the speaker’s platform. He continued to enjoy speaking at farming and
agricultural science functions, and his presentations increasingly included general topics about world food and population. Tribe’s interest in this wider topic, traceable to his impressions of Orr’s critical work in establishing FAO, had spurred him to become Chairman of the Victorian Committee of the Freedom From Hunger Campaign. He had perfected a knack for cultivating ‘those who mattered’, and advised mentees to ‘always go to the top’. But by nature and personal disposition, Tribe never really regarded himself as one of those elite, and remained tickled by the attention he earned through successive accomplishments. One might observe that in many ways, Tribe fitted into Australia because he was like an Australian. He was as egalitarian as most, yet remained somehow enchanted by the nobles. Yet this differs from the inferiority complex used to define the Australian character of that era, for Tribe wanted to appear confident in his opinions and knowledge, and always prepared assiduously to this end.

Cultivation of the elite was worthy of planning in Tribe’s eyes, and equally important, should seem natural and effortless. For example, over lunch after giving the opening speech at a 1969 conference of the NSW Agricultural Bureau, Tribe asked if there was someone with a car going to the airport who could offer him a lift. So it transpired that Governor General Sir Paul Hasluck, who had opened the conference, offered him a lift. Tribe had created the opportunity in the right circumstances and company for such an outcome. All that was then necessary was to accept whatever other opportunities arose, which they soon did as Tribe was told to follow the GG as he inspected assembled troops, to ride in the official car with Sir Paul and to then take tea at Admiralty House while awaiting the delayed flight. In his telling the tale, Tribe’s storytelling persona is
palpable with its energy and power in pauses and emphases, and having heard such rhythm we expect a final contextual comment that brings the story back to earth. In this case, he related a police-escorted ride to the airport, an officer offering to check-in for him – until it was clear that it was only an economy ticket, and ‘I was suddenly back in the real world’.\textsuperscript{143}

But it was not just a matter of being impressed by power or celebrity, Tribe was actually interested in these people with whom he ultimately formed friendships. And he was loyal. This is illustrated in an anecdote about Tribe encouraging the aging Wadham to give up driving. Passenging one day as Wadham negotiated precariously around Parkville, Tribe gently insinuated into the conversation that he had heard that ‘the second-hand car market is up at the moment’. A couple of days later, Wadham appeared in Tribe’s office, to his surprise saying, ‘about your wanting to buy my car’. And so Tribe did buy the car and on-sold it for no benefit to a needy post-graduate in the Faculty.\textsuperscript{144}

\textbf{Local to International}

The ILCA assignment detailed in Chapter 4 began in Tribe’s final year as Dean. Away on international assignments up to twice a year, he maintained an increasing profile of significant lectures including the Sir Richard Stawell Oration to the Australian Medical Association and the Presidential address to the Agricultural Section of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science. His Stawell Oration paper was entitled ‘A Pestilence of People’\textsuperscript{145} reflecting a growing international perspective, and concern for the role of
agricultural scientists in feeding the world. Despite good intentions and visits back to Australia to see family and for such lectures, the role of Dean was not enhanced in this final year. Even his public appearances were oriented more to international matters than local agriculture, and this was not universally understood by parochial interests. Tribe’s interests were now elsewhere. The adventures of international life were in his blood, and perhaps a little in his family who followed Tribe’s movements through letters and pins on a world map.

As a world figure in international livestock, Tribe had successfully led the definitive study for the creation of the single most important initiative in third-world livestock research. So when the World Animal Production Conference was held in Melbourne in 1973, Tribe was a key figure. Of course, he had been engaged in the planning, funding and politics of the meeting and was a pivot around which many parties orbited. We should not be surprised that Tribe’s was the first paper in the hardback tome of proceedings of the conference collated by Bob Reid, another Australian animal scientist with Scottish sheep experience who created the once great agricultural science program at the neighbouring Latrobe University in Melbourne. That paper by Tribe with David Pratt of the UK Overseas Development Administration was entitled ‘Animal Production in Relation to Conservation and Recreation’. This was one of the international topics of the time in the major development agencies and so attracted much attention. With such success, it is curious to note Tribe’s own recollection was of his debacle when speaking without notes to his scientific paper, which no one else seems to recall.
It was at this conference that Tribe is remembered, perhaps apocryphally, as giving the after-dinner speech in the recently completed Great Hall of the National Gallery of Victoria. True or not, it is a tale worth retelling, for it is consistent with so much in this story. Tribe’s mild rhotacism – misarticulation of the sound ‘r’ as ‘w’ – provided him with the perfect subject for this gathering of the world’s animal scientists – rabbits. In an hilarious speech with a serious message populated with a superfluity of words containing the letter ‘r’, he captivated the convivial audience – at least those who were comfortable in the English language.

By 1973 having completed his term as Dean, Tribe was again eligible for sabbatical leave. From today’s perspective this sounds incredible. And even at the time, it was seen as a ‘bit rich’. But, it was argued, Tribe had taken the role of Dean more seriously than many in an era of elected senior roles and had brought international repute to the University. He had fostered and supervised a base of postgraduate candidates. And he had relieved the University of his salary when away, an action not universal among colleagues. On top of all this, the era allowed Faculty decision-making on such matters, and Tribe was the senior Professor. Thus this sabbatical may be seen as a reward more than a need to have contact with international peers. Tribe used it to indulge what was now his passion, starting with two months as an international livestock development consultant for the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Interestingly he also spent five months in Reading, an illustration of his combining social, academic, intellectual and development activities wherever possible. While in Reading, he was also writing up both consulting and scientific reports.
A few years later, around 1978, Tribe made some critical inputs in Thailand. An anecdote from this period is recounted later, but of greater importance is his role in the development of the newly formed Prince of Songkhla University’s Faculty of Natural Resources. An Australian aid project to assist the creation of the new faculty differed from other Australian projects that strengthened existing faculties in older universities. After a young agricultural scientist working in one of those other projects identified the opportunity for AIDAB, Tribe led a mission to design a project for them, and one for IDP. The impact was impressive, benefitting from Tribe’s wide perspective and embracing personality.

One eminent Thai livestock scientist recalls that Tribe’s ‘contribution as the AIDAB Team Leader from the year 2522\textsuperscript{148} is the primary reason for the faculty’s rapid establishment and the University’s international reputation.’\textsuperscript{149} Other similar comments exist, and point to an unusual combination of firmness with politeness in this project and in other development scenarios. The practical academic was felt to be a rarity in the Australian aid program; this may have been a prejudice, but certainly it was one that was to later come back to haunt Tribe in his IDP years when dealing with AIDAB. But at this stage of his career – his final University years – he was seeing himself as part of a world that remained invisible to many of his academic equals. He was gaining confidence in his new role and in his evolving subject of international agricultural research, as may be seen in some of his subsequent papers and presentations.
Tribe thrived on giving presentations, which in his latter University years typically included; opening speeches for farmer organizations, school speech nights, University and College Graduation addresses as well as the Duxbury Memorial Lecture at the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories\textsuperscript{150} and the Meredith Memorial Lecture at La Trobe University.\textsuperscript{151} We can clearly see a strengthening of the theme of international agricultural research and education in these presentations, and in such invitations as that to a panel session on ‘Impacts of the Food Situation on the Environment’ at the 1976 World Food Institute in Iowa State University.

Tribe could not have maintained his pace of activity without strong home support. That he valued this is evident not only in his memoirs, but in advice extended two decades later to a middle-aged executive from a private advisory group who was being courted by the University as a new style of managerial Dean. Tribe’s paraphrased advice was something like, ‘don’t even consider it unless you have the strong home support that includes a willingness to devote most social life to the University and its political machinations’. He had learned this by experience in an era of perhaps less politics, and from practice in the skills that made his efforts appear easy. His practiced clear writing,
diplomatic negotiating skills, public rhetoric and encompassing concern for his charges had been fused together into an approach that allowed him insight into the way such things worked. It had taken time for these skills and characteristics to mature and interact productively, as we see in this Australia-Africa period before he left to head up IDP.

All this suggests that Tribe had ‘hit his straps’ from the late 1960s. He had worked out efficient means of providing entertaining, current and demanding lectures to students, of motivating the malleable hearts and minds of young entrants to agricultural science and to managing university committees efficiently. He was one of many lecturers who motivated a generation of young minds to blend their cultural and science educations with a global responsibility to feed the hungry. That sense stuck with many graduates, as one from the 1960s relates before he later set off to India ... ‘as an agricultural scientist, I had always felt guilty for not doing anything to try to help relieve the problem of “the starving millions”.’152 That sense of the global conscience in those who benefited from the broad and integrated science education in the demanding university agricultural courses of those days stimulated a group with whom Tribe also maintained contact as he passed through various countries.

And in addition to inspiring students, at which of course he was not unique, Tribe developed efficient skills in administration – a rarer trait among academics. His discipline of preparation before meetings and other fora led him to mentally plan the flow of Faculty Board meetings, for example. Sometimes, he discussed tactics with colleagues, and even with those not disposed to his view as a kind of forewarning that he was serious and prepared on
agendas he proposed. He was at his best in such meetings as Chair. We may take his confession that he sometimes drafted minutes before chairing a meeting as more than a repartee; perhaps as an indication of confidence and efficiency.

Within the conservative university milieu, such a dynamo instituted management change. He streamlined Faculty administrative procedures, introduced an annual staff retreat, commissioned a review of the undergraduate degree and introduced specializations into the fourth year of the course. As the Minute of the Academic Board notes on the occasion of his leaving the University, ‘he showed a flair for administration [seeing] issues clearly’.153 And he was thoughtful. One surviving memory is of Tribe as Dean bringing the extra work of marking examinations to young busy postgraduates with families. At first this may have been seen as an extra burden, but they soon came to realize that this was his way of helping them financially as these were tasks that they could do at home.

Competitive to Elite

Tribe was also competitive, and some memories remain of his style of winning. One incident recalls a matter where Tribe did not seem to prevail, but in the end developed a mutually beneficial relationship with all concerned. The case concerned a young Australian researcher based in Asia on a project managed by the University of Queensland. Tribe visited the research site and suggested that the researcher’s work was well suited to a Ph.D. thesis under Tribe’s supervision through the University of Melbourne. The enthusiastic young researcher duly communicated his news to his head in the university concerned, who quickly
suggested to Tribe that this was hardly appropriate given the young man’s engagement as an employee of the University of Queensland.

Undeterred by such a suggestion, Tribe argued that the young man was from Melbourne originally and would probably come back there and that it was in his interests to enrol in the University of Melbourne, adding a hint of Melbourne’s superior status. It didn’t work this time, and the pawn in the game, the young researcher found himself enrolled in the University of Queensland’s doctoral program. But such was Tribe’s networking skills that he repaired the relationship with his opponent from Queensland. He also maintained a close relationship with that young researcher from that 1977 meeting to mutual advantage in such forms as career advice through to consulting and advisory roles. And through these years we can trace Tribe’s activities focusing in elite and international directions, stimulating initiatives in each.

One such initiative of which Tribe was a foundational member occurred through his final years at the University in the form of an energetic Melbourne committee of the informal Australian Industrial Research Group. This committee of six called itself a Steering Committee for the foundation of what became in 1975, the Academy of Technological Sciences (‘and Engineering’ was to added later, hence ATSE). This elite organization filled a need for a learned applied science organization to join the other three learned academies of Australia. We may be tempted to read into this that the ATSE was destined to play a central role in Tribe’s future, but it seems more correct to say that after its establishment, Tribe saw the ATSE as a vehicle for further contributions to international agricultural science. Tribe
later created The Crawford Fund as an innovation of the ATSE.

In being part of its creation, Tribe had practiced his proven approach of bringing influential figures to the table as patrons and supporters. The ATSE history lists Tribe as one of its 64 Foundation Fellows, but his role as a facilitator and maker of relationships was more important than this suggests. And through the ATSE he was in very good company – better than the University was affording him by now. His fellow Fellows included Sir Ian McLennan (President), Dr Keith Farrer (Vice President), Sir John Holland (Treasurer) and Dr Howard Worner (Secretary) – a veritable Who’s Who of the applied sciences, from both intellectual and commercial sectors. Seen in this context, it is quite understandable that Tribe when offered nomination to the Melbourne Club – once seen as the social pinnacle – declined for his own reasons; he disagreed with what he saw as an anti-Semitic entry policy. But in any case, he had no need of such clubs by this time.

Tribe was making his mark as a facilitator of great change and from this point on, the Academy claimed much of his time and in 1987 it was to be his chosen vehicle for his crowning achievement. Over the ensuing 20 years since its creation in 1975, Tribe served variously as an ATSE Council member, Chair of the Symposium Committee and the International Relations Committee and served on the Membership Committee. More about the role of the ATSE in relation to The Crawford Fund appears in Chapter 7. The ATSE may be seen as typical of the mode by which Tribe managed his transitions. In some ways it was similar to the safety net that he claimed was missing when he declined the Director-Generalship of ILCA. The ATSE was a
continuing prestigious component of Tribe’s professional life that bridged his University years to his formation of The Crawford Fund. Through it, he was able to link back from before his IDP interlude to something ultimately more in accordance with Tribe’s worldview. But he could not have realized that without the later realizations that were to be forced on him by the coming years at IDP.

University to Commerce

Tribe said his move to IDP was to do ‘something different’. ‘If I am ever going to change jobs, now is the time.’ IDP (at that time operating under the name of the Australian-Asian Universities’ Cooperation Scheme) was more an NGO serving aid and university development in Asia when Tribe became its first full-time Executive Director, although it was to progressively become more commercial. Tribe tried new things – he considered his appointment of a male personal assistant as avant-garde, and in some ways perhaps it was. But such details tell more of Tribe’s views than of the 1980s in Australia.

Of more significance is the comparison with peers, which while difficult to specify at this point in time still close to the events, follows a general trend. Those who stayed with routine university activities found that they lacked the freedom to accomplish what Tribe went on to do. This seems to have caused some to re-evaluate their views of Tribe and his behind-the-scenes preparation to secure success within the University system and then share its benefits so that all thought they had contributed to the event. Others may have been more intelligent and certainly more academic, but Tribe showed a different brilliance. He
was the brightest agricultural star that the University had seen in his era, and as noted in its own histories about other great figures, the University routinely proved unable to retain such talent in the long term.

Why Tribe accepted the position in IDP remains moot, as it appears to be a somewhat similar circumstance to Tribe’s earlier rejection of the Director-General post at ILCA. We know that he considered the inaugural Directorship of the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), which was closer to his agricultural research interest. Why wasn’t Tribe its inaugural head? One recollection is that Sir John Crawford interviewed not only the best applicants but also any whom he thought should have applied – such as Tribe. Outwardly it seems to many that the IDP had come up first and Tribe had accepted it and thus honoured his commitment. Another recollection observed that, while Tribe had assisted Crawford to bring ACIAR into being, he could not see himself as Director under Crawford’s micro-management style of governance. In the final event, Tribe was probably more effective giving behind-the-scenes support for the organization, its Directors and in lobbying for the removal of the sunset clause from legislation establishing ACIAR.\textsuperscript{156} Jim McWilliam was appointed as the first Director and created the foundations of a very successful organization. Nevertheless, it must not have been easy for Tribe, and file correspondence alludes to ‘the agonizing that went on in connection with this appointment’.\textsuperscript{157} Perhaps, as for ILCA, Tribe may have thought he could have more influence pulling strings than being the puppet.

The post for the Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee (AVCC) as head of the Australia Asia Universities’
Cooperation Scheme (AAUCS), which became IDP may well have conformed with Tribe’s other vision of higher education as a critical part of development. We could also speculate that he wished to complete his work at the University, but we have already seen that he was winding up that chapter of his life, and the narrow strictures of university life clearly chafed the world traveller. It was even suggested at the time that Tribe was an Africa man, and the development profession was replete with debacles that arose from specialists swapping between Africa and Asia, where most of ACIAR’s work was to be. But then, the AAUCS post was also restricted to Asia initially. In the end, we are left with the banal suggestion that Tribe may have seen a better future for IDP than ACIAR.

From one perspective, the transition from the University to IDP was less a leap out of university life than crossing a bridge formed by his international experience and involvement in AAUCS. In fact AAUCS had received a significant input from the Faculty at Melbourne, which continued when AAUCS became AUlDP in 1981. By 1983, three years after Tribe had been appointed Executive Director of AUlDP, the Faculty claimed a decade’s experience in such programs. His Melbourne colleague Norman Tulloh had earlier been part-time Academic Director for two years and continued regular inputs particularly to Indonesia and other Faculty staff were also involved, including Rolf Beilharz, John Cary, John Holmes, Stuart Hawkins, Geoffrey Pearce, Neil Sturgess and Jack Wilson. Around the same time, the Animal Science section of the Faculty again led internationally with the aid-funded Australian-Asian Fibrous Agricultural Residues Network.158
The transition was in fact more significant personally than professionally. For it meant uprooting from the quiet suburban existence supplemented by the stimulation of the University to a somewhat less dynamic small city where he and Elizabeth had few mutual friends. Professionally, Tribe was able to build on the existing program, which was overwhelmingly dominated by his old Faculty as a result of his and colleagues’ previous efforts. From one perspective, joining what became IDP was a demonstration of a personal need for change, to do something of more critical importance. And even if it was to provide certain disappointments, it proved to be a useful interlude before his ultimate achievement, The Crawford Fund.
Chapter 7

The ‘Real’ World

Australian-Asian Universities’ Cooperation Program

Tribe’s move to what became IDP - AAUCS at the time – was a product of the environment in which he had operated in the preceding decade. It was not simply a job offer at a Deputy Vice-Chancellor’s salary or frustration with the processes of the University of Melbourne that made him decide on the change. The move had been heralded by his friendship with Crawford and his previous engagement on the Commission on Advanced Education. This in turn had led to his serving from 1977 to 1983 on the Consultative Committee on Research and Development (CCRD).

CCRD was a creation of Crawford and Jim Ingram who was then Director of the Australian aid program (ADAB). Tribe had maintained regular contact with Crawford on CGIAR matters. Both also had senior educational positions and so Tribe became an obvious choice for Crawford to appoint to the CCRD. While Tribe had met Jim Ingram in other capacities, it was through CCRD that their friendship blossomed. And the accomplished mild-mannered Jim was to feature further in Tribe’s future, both through his IDP years and in the later creation of The Crawford Fund. CCRD involved Tribe in more international travel, mainly to Asia to examine assistance in education, agriculture, engineering and science. And from such activities of CCRD, the
Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) was born. Tribe at this time was a likely appointment to head up either ACIAR or IDP, and of the two ACIAR might have seemed the more suitable.

But it was IDP – under the banner of AAUCS – that attracted Tribe in the end. After 28 years lecturing in universities Tribe felt that ‘enough was enough’. The young man in a hurry who had been married and had a Ph.D. by the age of 21 and published in Nature by 24 was now at 54 respected in both international development and agricultural education. And he recognized the changes within himself. Family recall him saying such things of his university years as ‘I am no longer an “angry young man” and should leave it now for others to carry on’. Besides Tribe felt that he was getting out of date as a result of his international, teaching and administrative activities. And when he found the son of one of his past students enrolled in the Faculty, he really felt that much time had passed. Nevertheless, the decision to cut official ties with the University and join AAUCS remains curious.

An indulgent university may well have allowed sufficient flexibility for an international figure like Tribe to assume the role while retaining his Chair, or at least Professorial Fellow status. But Tribe had a different view of life – something bigger than an academic post, but of course in common with senior scholars, he retained the title and status. Status is a continuing theme in the story, for Tribe knew that it was an essential ingredient for getting things done. So he paid attention to the status of both those whom he co-opted and himself.
Crawford had ultimate status earned through consistent bellicose brilliance. A decade earlier one of his creations was the modest organization that fostered regional university cooperation, the AAUCS. A history of the University of Melbourne indicates that Professors Forster, Tribe, and Tulloh ‘all played leading roles in the AAUCS’,\(^\text{160}\) indeed Forster and Tulloh held part-time positions there. Both are familiar names in Tribe’s history and both were from the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Melbourne. In itself, this substantiates Tribe’s role in the Faculty’s international reputation. It also tells us that Tribe was very familiar with the organization.

The primary role of AAUCS at that time was to foster ‘scientific and socio-economic aspects of food production’,\(^\text{161}\) which it approached through improving agricultural and demography courses in four universities in Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. Australian academics made visits to assist these universities and in turn their staff engaged in Ph.D. studies in Australia. After a decade’s success, Jim Ingram as Director-General of the aid program (ADAB) encouraged the Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee (AVCC) to expand the program with increased allocations from the aid budget.

Tribe was chosen to lead an AAUCS mission to Thailand and the Philippines to discuss an expanded program, and the next step was to appoint a full-time Executive Director. After both Tulloh and he had declined the post, Tribe acquiesced. Having rejected the Director-Generalship of ILCA in Africa and perhaps the post-1982 prospect of being the inaugural Director of ACIAR in Canberra, Tribe had accepted the Executive-Directorship of what would become
IDP, a significant player in higher education in Asia and the Pacific – and later much more.

**The International Development Program**

IDP is an easier acronym for the organization that began in 1969 as the AAUCS, and became the Australian Universities International Development Program in 1981 and then the International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges in 1984, to arrive at IDP Education Australia by 1994. Its initial governance was by the AVCC and it took until 1984, Tribe’s last year, to appoint its own Board of Directors. The constant changes reflect those occurring in the higher education and aid sectors and the activities that fell to the organization to implement. Thus it moved from its first 15 or so years based on a largely voluntary scheme that aimed to strengthen Southeast Asian universities to its subsequent 15 years of increasingly commercial activity. As the first Executive-Director of IDP, Tribe’s tenure spanned this period of transition in the first half of the 1980s.

For the first 15 years as an instrument of Australian aid, AAUCS was ‘core’ funded in the style of government bodies of the era. Funding rose from $100,000 in 1969 to $8.5 million in 1989, four years after Tribe’s tenure. The parallel contributions of Australian universities in releasing their staff through the 1970s and 80s without seeking replacement costs not only enhanced the scheme, but motivated academics in their contributions. Tribe’s appointment in 1980 may be seen as the point of inflexion in that core funding curve.
The appointment of a full-time Executive-Director had resulted from a Senate Standing Committee enquiry, which had reported that AAUCS was ‘functioning on a shoestring’ and that its success justified more appropriate funding. By 1982, these measures were implemented. AAUCS’s early success had come from the cost-effective base of voluntary inputs by academics in an era when universities, as did Tribe himself, saw this as part of their community responsibility. But soon the worst of both worlds arrived with resistance to direct funding of IDP by aid bureaucrats. And the IDP invented for a disappearing world had few staff resources for the increasingly demanding environment that was dawning.

After extra staff duly arrived as a result of Tribe’s lobbying and Jim Ingram’s support, Tribe found himself travelling extensively, sometimes only for a few days, but enough to disrupt establishment of a home base in Canberra. In addition, Tribe’s penchant for engaging in worthwhile committees took more of his time; committees such as the Advisory Committee of the Development Studies Centre at ANU, the Council of Canberra College of Advanced Education (now the University of Canberra), the Grants Committee of the University of the South Pacific and the Council of the Papua New Guinea University of Technology. Nevertheless, tennis and walking were listed as weekend recreation in his CV during this time, and various diplomatic and official functions were attended. Despite this, Canberra was both socially and intellectually bland compared to Melbourne for both he and Elizabeth, and periodic holidays away pepper the period. But while there he made his mark.
The Tribe Years

Tribe began his period as the inaugural Executive Director of IDP with a mission well honed through knowledge of agriculture and food in the world and through experience in universities and those aspects of international development in which they deigned to dabble. The same message stuck with him and found form in his public presentations – its theme was his motivation. Thus we find that in one of his first public presentations as IDP Executive Director, the 1980 Meredith Memorial Lecture, he linked international needs for enhanced food production to refocusing of university education. The needs he highlighted included shortages of informed administrators, managers and specialists and the failure of scientists to understand how research could serve planning. The solution he said was to develop universities in these countries to suit their own development needs.

‘And who better to assist’, we can imagine his charismatic presence gently prodding the audience rhetorically, ‘than Australia?’ Of course, Australia has many environmental similarities and is geographically close to Asia, but it has few of the historical and cultural constraints of its neighbours to direct adoption of technology. Likening the development relationship to the mistakes of Australian agriculture when based on European models, Tribe cautioned against Australian models being transplanted to Asia. Rather, just as the development of a sound and independent graduate university culture created the expertise now taken for granted in Australia, so strengthening of Asian and other universities might be expected to lead to their enhanced agricultural development. And from this base, Tribe clearly defined the
role of Australian universities as supporting the training of Asian and other university personnel to enable them to return, with ongoing support, to develop their own institutions. And in typical style and without saying it directly, Tribe left an informed listener with the impression that this could well be the successor to the widely lauded project that created both Asian leaders and on-going friendships between Australia and Asia, the Colombo Plan.

The history of IDP defines the ‘Tribe Years’ as ‘institutional development through university cooperation’,\(^{164}\) It is an apt expression of the philosophy that seems to have motivated Tribe in accepting the inaugural role of Executive-Director and sustained him in his negotiations with senior officials in Canberra and diverse Asian and Pacific governments. Tribe’s commitment to people and making good ideas work allowed a visionary Jim Ingram, as Director-General of ADAB, to see merit in allocating regular funding to AAUCS. This amounted to some $2.8 million by 1982, representing about 11 percent of all educational aid. Tribe ensured that the additional funds followed the same core program management approach and extended the program to include Papua New Guinea and the South Pacific, as well as a wider range of Australian academic expertise. As IDP grew its focus on agriculture fell. From initially being the major sector, agriculture was only 12 percent of the program by 1983. Complementing the overall expansion was a program to solicit funds from multilateral organizations as well as other budget lines of the Australian aid program, most notably contracted project management.

Around this time, policy shifts led to the aid program tendering for project management agents, which would have placed AUIDP well for winning contracts related to
higher education. But it turned out to be even better than that when AUIDP was handed higher education components of projects directly by the aid bureau. Tribe was a principal influence in the negotiations that produced this windfall outcome. Such actions did not slip the attention of the commercial sector servicing the aid program. While meetings and conferences debated its fairness, Tribe continued to meet what he understood to be the objectives of aid and government while AUIDP gradually learned some commercial management skills.

Eventually all higher education activities in aid were put to tender and AUIDP became quite commercial by the late 1980s after Tribe had resigned and returned to Melbourne. The post-Tribe organization evolved with an increasing orientation to trade in education to become today the publicly-listed and major global player in student placement, English language testing and project management. Some see the foundations that allowed such growth having been laid during Tribe’s tenure even though he resisted much commercialism. His hand can be detected in AUIDP’s winning of a contract to strengthen Hasanuddin University in Indonesia under Asian Development Bank financing, which in a different form continues today.¹⁶⁵

As Tribe broadened the core program from its agricultural origins to a wider disciplinary base, its multi-faceted activities fuelled demands for colleges to enjoy a share in the international experience through a separate competing organization. The Chair and Deputy Chair of the colleges’ organization ‘were opposed to this proposal and campaigned very strongly against it [and] were greatly assisted by Derek Tribe who argued for the universities and colleges to be a joint body.’¹⁶⁶ Their success led to one more
of the name changes of the organization in 1984, which in turn was soon followed by other competitors’ concern about the capability of IDP to manage large projects. Some sections of the aid bureaucracy also challenged IDP’s capacity. Tribe found himself in new and ever-changing territory, but his techniques for resolving differences remained one of the organization’s greatest assets as it continued to grow.

Ever attentive to differences being fertile ground for opportunity, Tribe sought to address demands for practical training in Asia and in particular the Pacific. The TAFE colleges and Colleges of Advanced Education of that era saw their strengths in practical training – this had fuelled their interest in international contracts. Tribe’s political skills may have won the day in absorbing them into IDP, but he was now mixing with some fast operators who used their institutions’ monopoly positions to advantage and did not always conform to his old-world worldview and its expectation of loyalty.

When universities and colleges began to break ranks and use what we now would call the intellectual property of IDP for their own benefit, private service providers to aid watched in some amusement. Higher education providers clumsily trod on each other’s toes, and critics noted that ‘the unethical shoe was now on the academic foot’. But such a time quickly passed and the external rhetorical environment became one of trade more than aid. And this was decidedly less comfortable for the likes of Tribe and those he respected. For a few years, policy changes fuelled what is now seen by some as immature commercial responses in Australian universities and colleges as long-
held values were compromised in a race for fee-paying students.

Tribe had defined the AUIDP program in 1983 as one that ‘is a people-to-people program, seeking to encourage genuine and lasting academic contacts, exchanges and collaboration through staff development and institutional links.’ That approach bred a loyalty and commitment from Australian academics to work with Asian and Pacific colleagues without special payment or reward beyond knowing that better universities were resulting from their combined activities. Even though the external environment was changing dramatically, Tribe remained committed to his own view that when recruiting international staff, ‘those whose primary interests are pecuniary or “doing good” are best avoided.’ While he regretted the pressures on international higher education, his philosophy on this point was to become more nuanced within a few years of departing IDP when he espoused the benefits of ‘doing well by doing good’ as a call for increased commitments to international agricultural research. He was shifting the emphasis from do-gooders to those who did something useful. And Tribe’s Canute-like stand against the tide of trade and commercialism seems only to have extended to education for he was later to be the Chairman of the trade-based Agritec company of the Department of Trade, and a member of the Consultative Group of the international consulting company, MPW Australia.

**Fish Out of Water**

IDP was from Australia, a small pool now linked to international waters, yet held back by small fish with minds
to match in some bureaucratic functionaries. Resentment about academics within operational levels of the aid program easily found common ground with commercial consulting companies who felt that IDP enjoyed undue favouritism. IDP maintained that it was a ‘transparently competitive program based on value for tax-payers money’. The inevitable confrontations over means of evaluating IDP’s activities deteriorated, according to some observers, to counting numbers of degrees granted and student pass rates.

Tribe was disgusted, and recorded his amazement to hear aid officials describe their aid delivery partners as ‘the enemy’. In this changing world some of this commentary may have reflected junior desk officers’ pent up resentment of Tribe’s penchant for ‘going to the top’ where a more balanced view prevailed. As various bureaucrats struggled to reinvent themselves in the new market paradigm, Tribe gradually came, somewhat ironically, to share the views of consulting companies about the insularity of aid officials. The realization offers an interesting perspective, for at the time the commercial groups were certainly more attuned to international lobbying and negotiation. From many perspectives it appears that IDP was caught between its past world of privilege and the new world of efficiency and marketing. This increasingly commercial world was not Tribe’s element.

Indeed when policy overtly classified higher education as trade rather than aid, Tribe seems to have been taken by surprise. He must have known the possibility was being canvassed in Canberra and beyond. But it is possible that the idea was so foreign to Tribe’s worldview that he never considered such an ideological change could gain support.
Whatever the reason, this is a period where criticisms accrued, such as ‘dropping the ball’ when the Minister of Trade offered IDP management of the expected bonanza of foreign students. Tribe found the charging of full fees for overseas students distasteful, which explains why he missed the opportunity for IDP to take a central role at the time. A later Executive Director observed that Tribe’s rejection of a role in servicing this new initiative on the grounds that Austrade would not fund it, set the organization back two or three years in establishing a central role for itself in the new full fee program.

Through 1984, there was an academic debate about the morality and viability of treating higher education as a commodity ‘like soap powder’. But the debate was academic in both the popular sense of ignoring the reality of the world, and of being largely limited to academics. The fact was that Government had decided, and universities would adapt as they always did in the hope of relief funding lest they be forced to look to their own management efficiencies. Threats of reduced funding to non-complying universities while made unofficially, were unnecessary. And the aid and other programs provided many scholarships.

It was also a fact that, even though ‘trade or aid’ characterized the policy change with an emotive debating tag, it missed the policy’s rather innovative intent. It was a shift that was to benefit many more than the old aid model could ever have hoped to. It raised quotas previously imposed on international students assisted to study in Australia and increased student numbers from the poorer regions of developing countries who received full scholarships. Within the views of the IDP Board at the time, Tribe’s was increasingly seen as ideological stubborn.
So the IDP Board, made up of university Vice Chancellors, set a policy of working within this new policy rubric for Australian clients while maintaining an aid consulting approach for other international organizations. In this new world, immature marketing responses by individual Australian universities led to a curious period of hyperbole and denigration of each other. Tribe found it distasteful. By now he must have felt relieved that he had only given a four-year commitment to head up the organization.

We may gain a feeling for Tribe’s feeling like fish out of water from an anecdote about a 1984 Government trade mission to promote this new era. The mission naturally included Tribe who recorded his being appalled by his fellow team members’ behaviour – ranging from disrespectful dress to dismissal of ambassadorial advice. He went even further relating his disbelief of the leader initiating an affair with another mission member and both absconding mid mission. An undesignated college principal substituted as leader, not Tribe. Such a clash of cultures – old scholarly academic with some paternalism versus brash new managerial ideology – was a confirmation to Tribe that this was no longer his milieu. His time with IDP was rapidly drawing to a close.

Two other contrasting incidents in the Middle East, in 1980 and 1983, also illustrate Tribe’s preferred style. The 1980 mission was led by Doug Anthony, the same Minister who had earlier funded the pig centre for Tribe at the University of Melbourne and who was to be the founding Chairman of The Crawford Fund. All mission members were well mannered, well dressed and well prepared to fit in with local customs and mores. Mrs Anthony also joined the
mission, which while seeming unusual, also suited local mores for Arab leaders who had often enjoyed the Anthony’s barbeque hospitality when visiting Canberra. This was the world of commitment derived from the sense of responsibility that comes with privilege. And it was Tribe’s view of Australian diplomacy, the way both aid and trade should work. It did work, as the mission was trusted and individual members could visit institutions of their choice, which for Tribe were universities that might like to cooperate with Australia. This led to contacts and visits in the routine follow-up processes.

By contrast, the 1983 mission after a change of Government, was controlled by senior bureaucrats whom Tribe claimed engaged in superficial discussions that produced no outputs. Tribe preferred the style of the 1980 mission, where friendships were made that cemented the mortar of government agreements. We cannot escape Tribe’s uneasiness with the change of government and international education policy – and he had missed their point. He felt vindicated when in 1984, the 1980 Middle East mission produced fruit in the form of Tribe being asked by the Oman government to lead a team of elite international educationists to review the first university in the Kingdom. To Tribe, IDP in moving into this new and complex world was becoming less rewarding in terms of what really mattered to him, and he was too busy.

**Busy and Beleaguered**

With the trade winds blowing into Canberra, Tribe saw his own days at the helm of IDP as numbered. When told that education was the same as any other commodity, Tribe
tried to inform the Minister of Trade that a range of academic compromises were implied in such an approach. He claimed he was greeted with the blunt reply that government would reduce the budgets of non-complying institutions. So it was that late in 1984, Tribe tendered his resignation to be effective at the end of 1985, during which time he advised the Board to take a new tack and to seek a new Executive-Director who could smoothly sail the old organization into the new winds.

It has been said that Tribe was one of the two outstanding leaders of IDP through its history.\textsuperscript{168} It was his advocacy that led to the conclusion of the 1984 Hague Conference on developing country universities that "there was agreement that the best type of help known to the group was that provided by Australia's IDP".\textsuperscript{169} However, the Federal Government's policy change impacted heavily on the IDP in which Tribe believed. It ‘was probably a (maybe the) major factor in his decision to resign his position in IDP at the end of 1985’ for ‘it would have been difficult for him to put his heart and soul into achieving an objective in which he did not believe’.\textsuperscript{170}

Some observers interpret this period as Tribe having missed the boat when offered the chance for IDP to lead the management of international higher education students. This may well be so, although IDP later did very well from the changes and continues to dominate the global agency market in education. Another way to see this time is that Tribe realized his own limitations in this new world and was brave enough to hand over to others. The family’s view is that he had said from the outset that he would only go to Canberra for five years. By now it had been four busy years.
As Executive-Director of IDP, Tribe had averaged more than two international or interstate trips each month, and in his final year this rose to 35 trips across a dozen countries. In his 60th year and apparently healthy this was nevertheless tiring and was far from the empty-nest lifestyle that he and Elizabeth had imagined. Some trips enabled them to travel together, but this was not the norm. Although if the trip included Europe, Elizabeth was there – for example, when Tribe was invited by the Netherlands Universities’ Foundation for International Cooperation they included a visit to Italy, Austria and Germany en route. And of course, the 30-volume Elsevier commitment continued whenever passing Amsterdam. On that trip, they returned home via Washington where Tribe had, as usual, arranged some meetings with World Bank officials. But IDP demanded his attention most of the time and such deviations could not be fully indulged.

Tribe saw his four years at the helm of IDP as significant in the terms that he valued. Universities in Asia and the Pacific gained credibility and capability with trained staff and necessary equipment. All levels of personnel in the system were supported, for Tribe knew that technical staff and librarians were as important as academics in a functioning university. And above all, friendships were made across countries that developed into a self-sustaining network. These were the outcomes Tribe valued. He even instituted English language classes, involving friends as one might expect, such as Ailsa Tulloh; for as we have seen the Tullohs and the Tribes lives had been intertwined ever since their early meetings in Melbourne and London in the 1950s. From the history of the organization it may be seen that these were the foundations on which subsequent leaders built to make IDP the large international company that it is
today.\textsuperscript{172} And it is worthy of note that of the many names that recycle through Tribe’s story, one is that of Denis Blight now Executive-Director of The Crawford Fund, and previously in the same post in IDP, and who had earlier served as Secretary for both the earlier CCRD and the committee that led to the creation of ACIAR.

Ever the gentleman, Tribe timed his exit from IDP to suit the organization. He had indicated that he would resign after ensuring a smooth transition to a new Board and company structure during which intervening time a new Executive-Director could be found. Reluctantly agreeing, the Board’s acquiescence ‘was a comfort because I was finding new life in IDP a considerable strain.’ His memoirs note two attacks of dizziness at this time. The transition process took until the end of 1985, which is when Tribe was able to, in his words, ‘return home’\textsuperscript{173} – to Melbourne.

The final year in IDP provides indications of a senior executive succumbing to stress. Neither Tribe nor the work environment of the time would have been alert to the signs, but attacks of dizziness are suggestive symptoms. And earlier in his reign at IDP he had been afflicted by shingles. Such observations as ‘life in Canberra ... was somewhat frustrating and difficult’\textsuperscript{174} and a sadness creeping into his memoirs for this time support this suggestion of stress. Tribe recovered from the dizzy spells and most around him suspected nothing, but he thought they might have. A comment Tribe made a decade later to one whose career he fostered may well have been self-reflective; ‘one can’t go back into management roles after one has been seen to have had difficulty’. He was fortunate to leave the IDP environment, which was now suited to a different style of leader. And Canberra had not been as successful as
expected in a family sense; Elizabeth’s car registration for
the duration began with prefix YMI, to which in the initial
years she would add, ‘here?’ For by now, she had three
grandchildren living in Melbourne.

The period had begun with an expectation of joint travel
and new friends. Eighteen months into his Executive-
Directorship of IDP, Tribe as Chair of the Academy’s
International Relations Committee accompanied a team
including the Academy President and wives, on a mission to
sign a cooperative agreement with the China State Science
and Technology Commission. An IDP mission to the
Philippines was timed to link into the China trip and Tribe
thought that this life mixing personal and professional
matters was a perfect continuation of the best of his African
days. We might imagine that he thought he had created a
lifestyle for this post-children phase of their lives. But the
pace of IDP never allowed this to occur. And in addition to
destruction of such dreams and the strain of this new
world, Tribe was still more focused on agriculture in an
organization that continued to reduce that sector in its
portfolio.

The Call of Agriculture

An invitation in late 1985 to speak at a conference in
Beijing sponsored by the International Minerals and
Chemical Corporation brought together the two strands of
Tribe’s career. There he ran into old friends from the
CGIAR and made new ones, including the Green
Revolution’s Nobel Laureate Norman Borlaug. Tribe was
again hobnobbing with the international agricultural elite.
A month later, Tribe gave an opening address to the Royal
Agricultural Society of the Commonwealth’s (RASC) meeting on ‘Agriculture and Future World Needs’, held in Melbourne. There, true to form, he made new contacts, including the Duke of Edinburgh – and this allowed him to follow-up and lunch with the Duke in 1990 when he spoke at the next RASC meeting in the UK. In the meantime, the Universiti Sains (Science) Malaysia awarded Tribe an honorary doctorate in 1985 and we can see those elements important to Tribe’s life reassembling – international agriculture, Melbourne, international recognition and friends in high places.

At the Beijing conference on world food issues\textsuperscript{176} he spoke of the ‘vital tasks’ of training researchers, extension workers, economists and those who serve farmers, of training those who do that training and of conducting research on urgent issues. Tribe was speaking of developing capacity in the universities of the poor countries, and he noted the attendant difficulties and long lead times. It was a cultural change also, as he said ‘universities are no longer to be regarded as bastions of privilege and affluence but as the essential springs from which flow the streams of well-trained men and women who are needed to sustain the flood of community development.’\textsuperscript{177} And here we can see the poetic language that served his eloquent public expression, referred to in some corridors as the ‘silver tongue’. And Tribe believed it, even as the university world behaved differently and used the vehicle of international student fees to strengthen the preserve of the privileged.

IDP in its new form could not compete with the attractions of international agriculture for Tribe. While it had begun with an agricultural focus, IDP was by now covering most
disciplines, and Tribe had overseen this change. In that
game, agricultural science and its research were often the
losers. At the same time, ACIAR was establishing its
innovative approach to agricultural research partnerships
in Asia. IDP by 1984 was heading in quite a different
direction to Tribe. His earlier fantasy that IDP could be a
vehicle for agricultural development by linking education to
research was now outmoded, and his skills were of less
value in that new environment.

Nevertheless, IDP had been an important training ground
for Tribe as he neared the end of his fifth cycle. He had
learned that the barbarians were not simply at the gates
but in power, and that he was no longer a power broker. Or
had he? In any case, Tribe burned few bridges. He had firm
contacts in parts of government, academia and the private
sector, and these were to be called on as he moved on to his
next adventure. He remained in the place where politics
was done, Canberra, for a few weeks after finishing with
IDP. And he was to return there frequently in a new and
more comfortable guise that would engage the suite of
talents he had refined over decades around issues about
which he was passionate. We should not be surprised that
his next incarnation appears to have begun within 10 days
of finishing with IDP. But as we have learned, the behind-
the-scenes preparation of which Tribe was a devotee paved
the way for his meeting with a World Bank visitor to the
Australian aid agency. And that linked back to the
organization of perhaps Tribe’s greatest accomplishment
(ILCA), the CGIAR. This was to lead into Tribe’s ultimate
creation, The Crawford Fund, as discussed in Chapter 9.

But in addition to creating The Crawford Fund, Tribe
managed this career transition through his usual approach
of conducting diverse activities in parallel. It was a methodology that had served him well through his careers. His time at the Rowett had included meeting diverse international figures, Bristol had included his Nuffield Fellowship to Australia, his University of Melbourne tenure had included a respectable international consulting career and the founding of one of the world’s international research centres. And through different transitions, he was writing short stories – such as an enchanting one now lost about a laundry lady mistaken for another type of lady who knocks at up-country hotel doors in the night. Now, his Crawford Fund years also included a role as Chair of an Australian government company that stimulated private sector activity internationally – Agritec, and a role in an advisory group for an international consulting company – MPW.

Agritec Australia Ltd had been established by Austrade in 1987 to promote member companies and organizations to international agricultural markets. With David Owen of Elders as the inaugural Chair and a Board comprised of major Australian agribusiness houses,\textsuperscript{178} the company’s activities were commercial. Tony Pickett was engaged to identify opportunities in Thailand, India, Turkey and the Middle East. After the Chair retired Tribe was elected, in 1991, primarily as a result of his Crawford Fund initiative in explaining the nexus between training and mutual commercial benefits. ‘Tribe was an enthusiastic chair and generated lively interest from a new range of companies [including] the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories and the Overseas Projects Corporation of Victoria’.\textsuperscript{179}

Project successes during Tribe’s chairmanship included: preparing a dairy processing joint venture between Bonlac
Foods and the Central Department Stores group in Thailand; signing a milk-product supply and grain industrialization agreement with the Dairy Development Board of India; short listing for two World Bank tenders in India and ultimately being awarded one for livestock improvement in Tamil Nadu. However, as Tribe had experienced in IDP in this era, government involvement in commercial arenas riled private sector operators in Australia. Thus ‘Austrade approached Tribe and the Board to desist in these sort of activities’ even though they were clearly in its charter’.\textsuperscript{180} The Board refused to comply and Austrade withdrew its funding; the company was wound-up in 1993. ‘Derek and the Board believed they and Agritec members could not continue in open conflict with Austrade and felt they had been betrayed by senior staff in Austrade.’\textsuperscript{181} This was a frustrating repeat of the governmental changes that challenged Tribe in IDP for he had allocated much time and effort to the Agritec ideal.\textsuperscript{182}

From 1987 To 1993, Tribe was also a member of the MPW Consultative Group, with Sir Frank Espie (right) and Prof John Dillon (left). MPW Australia, a young company experiencing rapid growth, saw the need for older public faces than its youthful directors. In a Foreword to a short history of MPW, Tribe displayed an awareness of the growing role of the private sector. ‘Until recently almost all agricultural consulting … was undertaken … by Governments. It is important for the public sector to retain some activities in this field but, increasingly, advice is also needed from private enterprises that are capable of providing technical advice within a context of sound and confidential economic information and management appraisal. The providing of advice has too long been separated from the cost of providing that advice and the
benefits which accrue from it.’ The Consultative Group ceased to exist after the sale of the company to form Coffey-MPW Pty Ltd as the international arm of a listed vehicle under different management. Such exposure to the ‘real’ world through Agritec and MPW was to feed into Tribe’s approach to the private sector in The Crawford Fund.

In these capacities Tribe contributed at the same time as he learned about the private sector. The association with MPW also led to some new roles, which he eagerly accepted, on one occasion blending his IDP experience with that of the company to provide advice to Warrnambool Institute of Advanced Education when it was seeking to establish its own commercial company. And he used such contacts to ask favours; such as directly asking for a past student in some difficulty to be employed until he got back on his feet. Tribe knew his marks – he knew people and most of the time, such favours produced benefits to all parties. They have been described in general as the feeling of ‘very rewarding interaction’ that Tribe engendered in most with whom he worked.

Throughout his careers after resigning from the University, Tribe continued to follow the fate of his old Faculty. He felt, not without some justification, that it was at least partly his creation, and so as it languished like others under experimental government policies and city-focused
management, he worried. And as his worldview included respect for age and experience, the aging Tribe proffered his advice. While overtly claiming to not interfere as 'no one wants an old Dean who has lost his faculty', he was active behind the scenes giving unsolicited advice to Vice Chancellors on how agricultural science should be enhanced. His advice was mostly ignored, and finally roundly rejected in the style reserved for meddling retirees. Hurt by such an insult, Tribe shook the dust from off his feet and never entered that administrative house again, though he did confide such matters ‘without interfering’ to the Dean. In all these things, Tribe was convinced he was only doing good.
Chapter 8

Good Philosophy

Doing Good

Tribe was not a philosopher in an academic sense. Nevertheless, he had a personal view – a worldview even – that motivated him. And this view, combined with a rare academic personality allowed many of his visions to be accomplished. One contemporary who interacted with him over four decades summed up his strength as ‘a great capacity to bring people together for good causes’.\(^{187}\) He arrived ‘with a broader outlook than the local lads’, and promoted good causes, such as admitting women to the Beefsteak club.\(^{188}\) His philosophy, if we can call it that, was embracing of all as would be expected of an extrovert who loved people. The same trait may have contributed to opponents’ views of him – for he may have been ‘overly sympathetic to overseas students’, as one advocate even mentioned and as has been discussed in Chapter 5.

Likewise, his wider world experience and his political and communication training allowed him to get things done, apparently easily – and this led to charges of being ‘a bit smooth’, which seems to be related to the ‘silver fox’ appellation. Tribe responded by avoiding those who were unconstructive to what he considered to be good causes, and thus his career may appear disjointed to conservative
observers. But ultimately he was as philosophical about opposition as he was about ignorance, even to the extent of seeming to pity some who ‘couldn’t understand’, for he was convinced that he was doing good.

Tribe’s first book on the subject of international agricultural research, ‘Doing Well by Doing Good: Agricultural Research: Feeding and Greening the World’ gives us one perspective of his Weltanschauung. It was a worldview that had crystallized over decades, having been seeded by Orr in Tribe’s early twenties and then growing through his African years and later interactions with the CGIAR. Even his stint in international education with IDP contributed as he discovered more of Asia. It was not a unique worldview. In fact, as it is expressed in the book, it is a product of the CGIAR’s message of the time. What is different in Tribe’s approach is the same as many of his successes – his extrovert personality led to his talking to those outside the self-selected group attuned to a more introverted way of doing business. Thus in ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’, he took the CGIAR message from within meetings of crusty agricultural
scientists and broadcasted it to useful ears. He preached to profane decision-makers rather than a choir of initiates.

Tribe shared these Elysian secrets about world food from the paradisiacal gardens of The Rockefeller Foundation’s Villa Serbelloni on Lake Como where he and Elizabeth were invited Residents for a month. Over the decades, this Bellagio facility had seen most of the world’s distinguished agricultural scientists, especially those associated with the CGIAR – itself a product of early Rockefeller insights into the precarious nature of world food supply.190

Being a Resident was a feather in Tribe’s cap. In typical style, Tribe thanks one of his referees for penning ‘strong imaginative stuff.’191 In the internet-free collegiate environment of that time he made an impact, and a decade later received a highly unusual second invitation; he died before being able to take up the second offer. His passion for ‘clear, concise and convincing’ writing learned from his journalism course back in Aberdeen days, allowed him to produce an unusual book.

Tribe wrote diligently, so that he and Elizabeth had time to indulge in the glorious gardens, lake walks, history and the collegiate atmosphere with other Residents. We may imagine him emerging from his study in his preferred developing-world garb of the light-coloured short-sleeved safari suit for lunchtime gatherings and perhaps even for the more formal drinks, dinner and discussions. His field uniform for at least three decades, he seems to have chosen it for his Resident’s photograph, backed by Italian Alps and lakeside villas.192 Maintained in the Bellagio reading room album Tribe’s photograph stands out from his fellows. As did the book he produced.
Tribe saw his book as a manifesto for The Crawford Fund, which was listed as co-publisher. True to form, Tribe had obtained support for publication costs, in this case from the Fairfax Family, and proceeds from sales of the book went to The Crawford Fund. And many who recall the early nineties have memories of Tribe approaching with a copy of the book in hand, and asking ‘have I given you a copy of my latest?’ To many, it was Tribe returning to agricultural science, but in fact he never really left. Those who saw it as a return tended to have a narrower Australian focus and so were unaware of Tribe’s continuous contact with the international agricultural fraternity. In fact, this was the source of some misunderstandings about Tribe’s energy and accomplishments. We must wonder if he perhaps was thinking personally when he paraphrased a Biblical verse for the title of an early Crawford Fund conference in Parliament House in the form of ‘A Profit in Our Own Country’. In many ways he was a prophet, and in some ways he was misunderstood in his home country.

Tribe spread the good word of Doing Well by Doing Good widely, particularly within the Australian government – his main target. The message was heard, not the least because
of the presentation of the book. A modern cover design, text peppered with illustrative boxes of examples and even a ‘Yes Minister’ sequence made it different from all other serious agricultural documents. Of course, the Foreword drafted by Tribe, over the name of The Right Honourable J. D. Anthony CH, FTS Chairman of The Crawford Fund, was a world-scene setting summary of the book.

The theme of the book may be summarized as follows: agriculture is the engine of economic growth and research assistance to less developed countries that develops their agriculture produces wealth, which in turn generates demand for sophisticated food and other products from more developed countries. Thus Australia would, in return for ‘doing good’ by providing more agricultural research aid, ‘do well’ through increased agricultural and related exports. The argument is still used, and is largely true – though its blind application can lead to some aid recipients doing less than well. At the time with Tribe as its missionary, the message was revolutionary to the aid bureaucrats who bore the brunt of his proselytizing in Canberra.

Doing Well

It is curious to read the book again 20 years after its launch. The message is less dramatic than it was in 1991 for it has been repeated often – itself a tribute to Tribe’s timeliness, leadership and mode of communication. But more conspicuous is Tribe’s clear prose, which remains a treasure among so many other turgid epistles on the same subject. More than his other writings, except perhaps that done with Elizabeth about migrating to Australia, ‘Doing
Well by Doing Good’ reveals a little of Tribe’s inner life. One aspect easily discernable is his choice of the theme of charity to introduce most chapters. A second aspect of his philosophy is evident in his frequent retreat to ‘enlightened self-interest’ as a rational approach to his vocation that allowed donors to also be beneficiaries and thus do well. Both the themes of charity and enlightened self-interest were important to Tribe’s worldview.

He begins the theme of charity with Terence’s194 ‘charity begins at home’ as a convenient evocation by objectors to assisting developing countries to grow commodities that Australia seeks to export. He then counters those arguments. Next he quotes Maimonides advice to ‘anticipate charity by preventing poverty ... ’, which is part of the sage’s insightful ‘golden ladder’ of generosity – perhaps the most enlightened explication of charity ever posited.195 But Tribe is not really concerned with the depths of such insights; he is seeking to relate poverty to hunger. The third chapter is introduced in ‘Tribal’ terms from the Irish playwright Sheridan as a repost to those who believe that charity begins at home – ‘And his, I presume, is that domestic sort which never stirs abroad at all’.196 Tribe uses this to introduce the benefits that accrue to Australia from aid, which he then develops in the subsequent chapter under the question, ‘Does aid help trade?’ Of course it does!

His next chapter tackles the emerging issue of risks to the environment and to food supply and implies a sensible balance. And then his closing chapter addresses the question ‘Can Australia do better?’ – which is introduced by Pope’s lines:

'For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administered is best;
For modes of faith, let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wronged whose life is in the right.
In faith and hope the world will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity’.197

As we have seen, charity to Tribe meant giving. He was generous in his own giving, often anonymously as those close to him knew. So these lines from Pope seem a somewhat incongruous introduction to Tribe’s observations about general ignorance about global food needs and the complexities of agricultural development. Tribe naturally concludes that Australia would ‘do well’ to do better. After these arguments for increased governmental attention, the final page of the book is a bizarre appeal for donations complete with a cut-off slip for posting, an approach that even in 1991 was retreating from fashion.

Tribe’s popular interpretation of charity draws on his formative years in a conservative, responsible and liberal Protestant household. His was not the Latin caritas of theology, though Tribe’s own life contains expressions of such loving-kindness. The difference is illuminating for it helps explain a part of Tribe’s effectiveness that remains misunderstood – Tribe was one of the ordinary people. His background was solid yet ordinary, his education was Redbrick not Oxbridge and his perspective was practical not esoteric. He was just like so many of the Australians that entered agricultural science and became leaders. The confusion among some of those Australians about Tribe seems to have arisen from his mannerisms and retained British accent, even after decades in Australia. And this paradoxically led some Australian natives with remarkably similar backgrounds to view Tribe as one of superior birth.
and education. A few of his Jesuit-trained colleagues in Australia, who knew such words as *caritas*, discerned Tribe’s virtues for what they were; a competent and charitable chap with a first class personality.

**Self-Interest**

The second theme mentioned in ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’ is one to which Tribe returned frequently. He used ‘enlightened self-interest’ as a practical philosophical approach to represent the benefits in international agricultural research and aid. The argument was accepted among the scientifically and technologically trained audiences of agricultural science and was a powerful one within the functionally educated bureaucrats of Canberra. That was sufficient for Tribe, but it does not mean that he chose the philosophy simply as a means of communication. He believed it, as some who engaged him on the topic recall. In fact, he seemed immovable from this belief.

It was this faith that contributed to Tribe being accepted within the circles he sought to influence, yet as out of his area by others. Had he been a more broadly based academic, he may have developed his ‘practical ethics’ further than self-interest. But it served his purpose and for that reason alone was practical to him. Even if it was substantiated in theory as an explanation for Western behaviour, he does not seem to have made the link of Adam Smith to markets. Perhaps this explains his frustrated reaction to policy changes for aid and education a short while earlier. However, Tribe may have simply been reflecting his society’s values, and extending them to other
cultures. Little wonder that most in the donor world agreed with his approach.

What is puzzling perhaps, when compared to Tribe’s personal life and his popular interpretations as in the case of charity, is his preference for the ‘enlightened self-interest’ philosophy rather than other ethical approaches, such as altruism, or even cultural clichés. There were surely some among his colleagues who might rather have invoked the Golden Rule or its equivalent in other great religions. Or at least argued for living from the perspective of the other, with the other being other persons, the universe or indeed anything else. Why did Tribe stick with enlightened self-interest? The most likely answer appears to be because it worked in the ways he understood the world. He had discerned the mood of society and that is where he was targeting; not the intellectuals, not the do-gooders, nor his erstwhile academic colleagues.

Yet Tribe cleverly linked his academic persona to his public face, such as his classic style of opening a speech to net the widest listenership. One memorable presentation, to the Press Club, began by formally and conservatively embracing an academic who had spoken against Tribe’s philosophy and then using such a position to further promote his cause. ‘My opening text today is from the Gospel according to Professor Helen Hughes and comes from her Epistle to the Financial Review, 16 July 1991, Chapter 1, Verse 3: “Every time we congratulate ourselves on balancing the budget by reducing our investment in our neighbours’ development, we once again shoot ourselves in the foot.” Now I have to admit I haven’t always seen eye-to-eye with everything that Helen Hughes has said – but on this occasion I have to say that she’s hit the target smack in
the middle. Let me try to explain why. And thereafter he rehearses the arguments from his book.

So we are left with the view that Tribe was prepared, practical and powerfully persuasive. This relied on both his abilities and on speaking a language that his audience could fathom. But in the absence of any deeper writings or recollections from colleagues or family, we are also left with the view that Tribe did not want to think beyond the practical needs of this world. In this way, he was perhaps typical of the majority of his cohort of applied science colleagues.

More Research Needed!

Tribe published a sequel to ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’ in 1994 using the by-line from the original title, ‘Feeding and Greening the World’. It is a neither-fish-nor-fowl book in terms of discerning Tribe’s personal philosophy, for it goes further than ‘Doing Well By Doing Good’ in argumentation on the need for research yet is limited in terms of breadth of communication. This seems odd since Tribe’s espoused aim at the time was to communicate the message to a wider influential audience and the public, yet the book proved to be neither for the public nor the ordinary civil servant allocating resources.

The book opens with a summary preface in which Tribe tells the reader what is in store for him. ‘Without wishing to minimize the challenges of the present or the dangers of tomorrow, this book argues that the future can be faced with confidence.’ He claims that science, management and understanding have fuelled this confidence and that
progress is already measureable. But characteristically, after presenting the positive, Tribe introduces his main point. ‘The trouble is that progress is far too slow because the present pool of knowledge and understanding is still too limited, and is increasing too slowly. The main reason why mistakes are still being made in managing natural and social environments, and the economy, is that no one knows for sure how to do it better.’\textsuperscript{204} So, Tribe argues, more agricultural research is needed.

More international agricultural research – that is the theme of the book. In Tribe’s mind this is what drives the increased food production necessary for a rising population. Of course an agricultural scientist would argue for this, just as a political scientist looking at the same issue might argue for more international policy dialogue and improved governance. The point may appear trite – yet it explains why those outside the agricultural science sector consider such arguments to be self-serving. Perhaps this explains the lower impact of this book than ‘Doing Well’ even though it is a better compiled and presented piece. Perhaps he meant it as a text for agricultural science students, for its comprehensive arguments and contextual examples provide a better introduction to international agriculture than what was otherwise used at that time, nearly two decades ago.

The chapters of the book indicate Tribe’s interest in literary style and clear communication. Thus the reader is introduced to seeing things from diverse viewpoints through ‘The Eye of the Beholder’, before being confronted with the twin sources of the problem, ‘A Plethora of People’ and ‘Poverty’, which leads to the question as to whether we will be faced with ‘Feast or Famine’. From this alarming
situation, the reader is informed about the environmental fragility of ‘Life Support Systems’ and encouraged to ‘Learn from History’ in order to see that there is a ‘Lifeline to the Future’. The lifeline is through ‘Better Plants and Animals’ including ‘Genetic Engineering’ to reduce the land needed for food production and thus producing ‘A Better Environment’ in an overall system based on such ‘Better Management’. But there are questions about how the world could move to such an ideal situation, such as ‘Who Benefits?’ and ‘Who Pays?’ And to conclude the book, Tribe links to ‘Doing Well By Doing Good’ by indulging in two ‘Dear Minister’ letters, one to the Government of the South and the other to the Government of the North, as a means of summarizing his arguments.

Feeding Before Greening

But just as he could not resist the culturally limited inferences of ‘Yes’ or ‘Dear’ Minister, so Tribe could not hold back from the routine invocation of the apocalypse if his arguments were ignored. We now know, and Tribe probably also knew this would be the case, that the arguments have been largely ignored. Funding to the CGIAR has continually reduced in real terms – currently less than 50 cents per small farmer family member. Governments of wealthy countries – the ‘North’ in the language Tribe adopted for ‘Feeding and Greening’ – have largely curtailed aid to agricultural research. Yet we have not seen continued widespread devastation. We have seen a billion or so people subjected to sub-human lives and hundreds of millions die but the world has hardly counted it a catastrophe, let alone the apocalypse.
Even if we accept some current views that a new hard-heartedness has arisen in the developed world, we are faced with acknowledging something omitted from Tribe’s arguments. It is the corollary of the deficiencies in the arguments of modern day Malthusians when they neglect technological developments and human ingenuity. Tribe was an evangelist for technology, but it was limited to soil-based agriculture – now the world is realizing that other forms of edible foods are part of food supply. He was right for his time, but today his arguments are in the hands of those advocating free trade in food as a solution to food shortages. It would not sit well with Tribe’s worldview that his argument should be used to justify the huge economic experiment of fighting famine by demand-led price rises that might stimulate increased food production. It is more likely that he would have argued that research should be paid for by governments to forestall the possibility of famine. This was part of his ‘enlightened self-interest’, which even if attenuated, contained a moral responsibility that he would find lacking in free food traders’ arguments.

The moral tone of ‘Feeding and Greening’ is also portrayed through quotations from poets, aphorisms that introduce each chapter and text boxes citing relevant authoritative statements. As a masterful collation that unifies arguments known to the initiated, the book enhanced Tribe’s already high popularity in the international agricultural science fraternity – even though it presented no new information. It mainly amplified ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’ and today it is that book which is the better remembered. ‘Feeding and Greening the World’ is recalled mainly by those in the United Nations style of international agricultural research. And because they knew the story by heart, we might be forgiven for observing that not all advocates of the book
have actually read it. Pity, since it is well written and follows a well presented argument on behalf of the CGIAR. Its principle argument that more should be invested in international agricultural research for the benefit of rich and poor alike leads into promoting the CGIAR as the leading light in such research. And in his final paragraph of the book, which is his ‘Dear Minister’ letter to the Government of the North, Tribe praises the examples of Australia and Japan for recently having increased contributions to international agricultural research and CGIAR.

Tribe would regard it as a pity that the message has been subsumed by today’s new disciples of development research as just one of several critical topics – including climate change, biodiversity, illiteracy, employment and housing – such that reliable access to food is seen as having been more successfully addressed than other factors. To rank one billion persons being illiterate as equivalent to one billion without adequate food was a form of logic that might never have occurred to Tribe – for if such argument existed, it was a minor force in development discussions back then. Today, it is not – and we may feel sure that Tribe would have railed against such a distorted hierarchy of needs as being both ignorant and immoral. But he would also have cleverly used such arguments in support of increased international food production research. And he would probably have couched it in a smooth rhetorical question that would not offend protagonists and so allow dialogue and perhaps changes of heart.

We can almost hear Tribe rising to stand in his erect and handsome pose at an international meeting to question a keynote speaker ... ‘First of all, thank you for a stimulating
presentation about the issues confronting humanity. I had never considered the matter from that perspective and you have provided a masterly overview of a very complex situation. It is complex indeed. And hence my question on a matter that I am sure you must have an opinion if not direct experience. When you say that illiteracy is as large a problem as access to food for the poor because it limits their ability to access information, I am curious to know how a mother of a hungry child might react when given a choice of schooling for her child or food for it. Perhaps you could enlighten me on this.’ Of course it is not a question, and such – in this case fictitious – interventions made Tribe’s point. He had learned his technique well on the floor of political rallies in Aberdeen.

As a comprehensive and serious book, ‘Feeding and Greening’ comprises much of Tribe. It represents his omnivorous reading in support of the arguments, his persuasiveness in having it published and promoted through CAB International at the time that CABI was seeking to enhance its own international profile, and it also represents his loyalty to the CGIAR as a body of dedicated agricultural scientists around the developing world. Yet, its message remains better known through his more accessible ‘Doing Well By Doing Good’.

**Parallel Activities**

His books espouse his philosophy in somewhat evangelical terms, and as with all leaders of great causes, Tribe also lived out his convictions. He remained deeply involved with the CGIAR through annual and related meetings in Washington and elsewhere around the globe, though he
never was really on the ‘gravy train’ of rotating from one international centre Board to the next. He was more intent on bringing that the CGIAR organization and aid organizations into the current world. Hence The Crawford Fund’s central focus was to raise awareness. In the case of the CGIAR, he may well have seen it, as some of his younger international colleagues did, as stuck in the time warp of past Western government research organizations from which most of its governance was drawn. But even in his most frustrated moment, Tribe would never have expressed it like that.

Tribe saw the need and sought to promulgate his message locally at home and in the CGIAR headquarters, and he saw the necessity to widen his own exposure to the emerging influence of private sector activities in international agricultural development. His chosen vehicle for widening the message in his home state of Victoria was initially through the local branch of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science. In terms of widening his exposure to other providers of services to international development, he accepted the roles with Agritec and MPW Australia.

The Victorian Branch of the AIAS created a Policy Group in 1987 with the objective of gaining a ‘higher public profile and more say in decisions affecting science in agriculture’. It was comprised of Tribe as Chair and his former Faculty colleague Alan Lloyd plus Bruce Cockroft formerly of the State Department of Agriculture. Initially focusing on the importance of agriculture and agricultural science, its charter was expanded at Tribe’s suggestion to include international agricultural research. Under Tribe’s leadership, the group had articles published in ‘The Age’ and organized public meetings to promote its policy advice.
The message was promoted through, what the rural press called a ‘well organized campaign’\textsuperscript{207} fed by policy topics suggested by AIAS members. They were told, in Tribe’s revolutionary style, ‘you give us the bullets and we will fire them.’\textsuperscript{208} The group was an overdue innovation in a profession that was growing while its professional organization was declining. Its message was prescient – climate change was one of their first policy topics. Its argument, particularly in terms of international agricultural research, was subsumed in Tribe’s simultaneous negotiations that led to his creating The Crawford Fund. Its widely distributed booklet on Australian agricultural research was published, not by the AIAS, but under the imprint of The Crawford Fund.\textsuperscript{209} And his message proved too controversial for the State Government influenced chapters of the AIAS.

Under the surface of the silver-tongued arguments with which his readers readily agreed, may be discerned the realism of an informed political motivator who was still seeking to ‘do good’. To Tribe, the utopian ideal of feeding the world while improving the quality of the natural environment in forms imagined by Western values was indeed a dream – it was a necessary fiction to allow his essential message to be heard. And that essential message was the same as always – research relevant to food production for the hungry poor of the world comes first.

The two books and these policy thoughts were written in the context of Tribe’s new institution, the unregistered organization he deftly created within the Academy of Technological Science, The Crawford Fund.
Chapter 9
The Crawford Fund

Return to Research Politicking

*Nil Tam Difficile Quin Quaerendo Investigari Possit* – nothing is so difficult that it may not be found out by research – might well have been Tribe’s message. But it was not his methodology. He relied equally on knowledge, influence and enthusiasm, which over a professional lifetime he had refined into the ingredients essential to found a successful non-profit support organization for international agricultural research. Beginning within a month of stepping down as Executive-Director of IDP, Tribe investigated and planned the establishment of what he would name The Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research (now known simply as The Crawford Fund) using these skills. But as usual he did not confine himself to one activity.

Tribe’s parallel activities through the late 1980s early 90s included, as noted earlier, a professional policy group, chairing a government company and advising a private firm; he was also a Board Member of the Hermon Slade Foundation – a body supporting environmental harmony through science. Each of these provided the added stimulus, contacts and knowledge, and these motivated Tribe. Each activity in some way supported the other and the fledgling Crawford Fund, though members of one organization usually knew little of the others. Such was Tribe’s ubiquity. The unifying theme across these and other activities was
science, discovery and development to the benefit of humankind.

Tribe had seen the strands of knowledge creation and dissemination across his career and was now convinced that research was central. His agricultural message in IDP was that sound education was essential to produce researchers who would generate the new knowledge critical to meeting rising food demand. Thus Tribe reached the apogee of the agricultural scientist’s applied philosophy. He knew why agricultural research was important. And so after what some saw as a sidetrack into IDP – albeit with significant developments on which others later built – Tribe returned to what he felt was the most important matter facing humankind. Reducing the precariousness of world food through agricultural research became more clearly expressed as his guiding philosophy from this time, as discussed in Chapter 8.

This professional philosophy, which was to define The Crawford Fund, was encapsulated in the abstract of his paper to a farm management congress. ‘When a developing country improves its farming productivity, it at once increases job opportunities, both on-farm and in those rural industries that service farmers and process food. When poor people gain employment and a regular income, they spend most of their money on food, and their health and general standards of living improve. People with an adequate income have smaller families, and also show greater concern for their environments, the welfare of women, and children’s education. Today’s challenge is to find ways of improving farm production throughout the world, while still conserving the natural resources which will be needed for the survival of future generations. If this
is achieved, everyone will benefit – and there is only one way of doing it. The new knowledge that is so urgently needed can only come from increased investments in research." It was a clear vision that others also espoused, but Tribe wanted to spread the message further.

By standing on the shoulders of his giant mentor, the diminutive Sir John Crawford, Tribe saw further than his peers. Crawford and Tribe shared similar values and ideals in this matter and developed practical means of mobilizing the international agricultural research community and funders to alleviate poverty and improve food security. With others, they had worked together on various projects, including the creation of the International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA) and the establishment of the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR). Crawford had died a few years earlier, in 1984, and hence Tribe named his crowning achievement for Sir John, The Crawford Fund.

**CGIAR and The Academy**

As with all successful enterprises, The Crawford Fund has many paternal protagonists, whose claims must be distilled from much unromantic prose. It begins with the CGIAR’s International Centres’ Week in 1984, and a paper discussed at a subsequent follow-up Mid-Term Meeting in May 1986 in Ottawa – ‘Broadening Support for International Agricultural Research’. As the number of CGIAR research centres had grown from four in 1971 supported by 16 donors contributing US$20 million per annum to 13 centres, 40 donors and US$175 million, there was concern about the sustainability of funding. Specifically, it was noted
in the cumbersome insulated language of the institution that ‘it will be important for the system’s accomplishments to become more widely appreciated ... [by] ... expansion of the CGIAR’s public awareness and resource development activities ... the effort to increase understanding of and sympathy for a cause depends on bringing the message to a range of audiences. It is necessary to identify the audiences to be addressed, and to produce materials designed specifically for each audience in each of the countries reached.’

The response was to establish National Support Organizations (NSOs) in member countries, initially in the USA, the UK, Canada, and Australia. While the structure and operation of NSOs would necessarily vary between countries, they would generally aim to: increase understanding of agricultural research and the CGIAR, promote regular government and other support, stimulate private sector interest, provide accessible information on research achievements, conduct seminars, and encourage domestic and international research linkages. Tribe must have known of this development and the opportunity it would present.

The opportunity arrived a fortnight after the IDP chapter of Tribe’s life closed in early 1986. Rodney Hills, a stalwart of the aid program, invited Tribe to breakfast with Peter Greening who was canvassing the viability of a National Support Organization (NSO) in Australia. As Tribe was already involved in the CGIAR system as the Founder, Board Member and one-time interim Director-General of ILCA, and was known throughout the CGIAR in various other roles, he was a logical contact – and he was curious. So within weeks of departing the increasingly stressful IDP
arena, Tribe was back on his turf. By now we know that for Tribe, no door ever closed without him opening another beforehand.

It seems to have begun just like that, with Greening saying that a consultant would be needed to advise on the best means of creating such an organization within the Australian system. By the end of the breakfast, Tribe had accepted the role. He was off again, visiting agricultural research leaders in government and the private sector around Australia, wiring progress reports off to Washington and finding synergies within his intricate networks.

Still Chair of the Policy Group of the Victorian AIAS, he used that forum to preach the virtues of international agricultural research. And he was Chairman of the International Relations Committee of the Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering (ATSE), which he eventually concluded would be the best home for the NSO, as this ‘would give it immediate status among scientists, industry and government, as well as provide automatic rights to tax deductibility for donations.’ Enthusiastic and persuasive, Tribe’s ideas were nevertheless not immediately accepted by his fellow Academicians, which turned out to be a portent of The Crawford Fund’s relationship with the ATSE for much of Tribe’s tenure. To advance the cause, Tribe drafted an outline of an Australian NSO while maintaining speaking engagements with his Policy Group, graduation ceremonies including at the University of New England and other openings where he could promulgate his message.
Elizabeth and he sold their Canberra house and bought an
apartment in Parkville near the University of Melbourne.
Soon Tribe joined another ATSE two-man mission to China
and Japan with Sir Russel Madigan. It was high-level, well
planned and well catered – just what Tribe liked and it
seems to have been cathartic. Life increasingly revolved
around a circle of old friends, grand-parenting, time at the
Main Ridge holiday house and this new creative idea in
support of international agricultural research, and in
particular the CGIAR. What became The Crawford Fund
seemed the ideal retirement interest for an international
agricultural scientist. But as Elizabeth recalls, the intended
three days per week on this new project was to seldom
drop below seven.

This was not all that Tribe was doing. At the same time, he
was under contract to ACIAR as a Research Coordinator and
was active in that role and in at least one project
review with Reg Moir in 1986. He also represented ACIAR
at the Asian-Australian Animal Production Congress in New
Zealand. In this case Tribe wrote on his personal University
of Melbourne letterhead, which shows his office as Barry
Street Carlton. In the same period a handwritten letter to
ACIAR explores the possibility of ACIAR business cards
being issued in his name. With his identification with IDP
fading each day, was Tribe casting around for a new self-
image? Perhaps, and if so, this was a fortuitous motivation
to bring his diverse and now practiced talents to bear on
the creation of the new entity.

Various recitations of the history of The Crawford Fund’s
creation exist. The CGIAR records indicate that in
February, 1987, Greening visited Australia and reported
that a committee had been established by the ATSE to
discuss its housing an Australian NSO. This was fully a year after Tribe had met with Greening – a year in which Tribe had skilfully prepared, cajoled and lobbied the Academy and governments. Having secured AIDAB and ACIAR commitment to the idea, Tribe gained support from ‘a large number of prominent people in the academic, political and business worlds in Australia’. Tribe must have informed Greening that ATSE had agreed in principle and had established a committee to examine the proposal in detail. Greening’s words understate Tribe’s smooth orchestration, ‘It was agreed that the ad hoc committee, under the chairmanship of Sir Rupert Myers, Vice President of [ATSE] would meet on February 3 to consider a detailed proposal submitted by Derek Tribe, and again on February 9 to discuss the matter further with Derek Tribe and myself.’

Rather than duplicate the many existing NGOs and institutions, Tribe aimed to catalyse others’ activities. With the ‘great gift of being able to make his visions become reality’, Tribe brought his political and scientific understanding to bear on the issue as no one else in Australia could. His nomination for the award of the Order of Australia a few years later encapsulated the path that had led him to this point. He had ‘been tireless in ... relation to rural development, education and overseas aid. ... Whatever he tackles, he does so with zest and intelligent thoughtfulness.’ With such intelligence and political nous he was able to bring influential persons to the table.

The details are more revealing, as amplified later. Here it is suffice to note that an Academy colleague recalls that around 1986-87, Tribe had convinced former Deputy Prime Minister Doug Anthony of the virtues of an NSO and set about converting the ATSE Council. Initially unreceptive to
both the idea and the proposed name of the Fund, the Council reluctantly agreed to Tribe’s fallback suggestion to establish an ad hoc group to investigate further, led by ATSE Vice President Sir Rupert Myers. Tribe’s preparation and persuasiveness prevailed and the committee eventually recommended that Council approve The Crawford Fund – which then occurred in June 1987. Tribe saw The Crawford Fund as ‘just the first of many similar initiatives which the Academy should take on and lead’.\textsuperscript{220} We see here that Tribe was influencing both CGIAR’s conception of an NSO and the Academy’s vision of itself as advisory more than practical.

In the gentlemanly language of CGIAR, Greening noted of the decisive Academy gathering\textsuperscript{221} that ‘it was a productive meeting and I was given a most cordial reception’.\textsuperscript{222} In fact it had not only concluded that an NSO be created by the Academy, but that it should be named to honour Sir John Crawford.\textsuperscript{223} Furthermore, it was determined that it should have its own Board of Trustees and a part-time Executive-Director who would be housed in the University’s International House adjacent to the Academy’s offices in Melbourne. The address happened to be just around the corner from the apartment that he and Elizabeth had recently bought. It all sounds so smooth and simple, as do many of Tribe’s ventures, yet the birth of the Fund had required skilled nurture. And it was Tribe who was the common factor between CGIAR and the Academy, just as he was with the Australian aid program.
The Academy and AIDAB

Tribe managed the Fund’s transition from the feasibility stage to design and full implementation. Defining the best legal basis for the NSO, identifying Board members and contributors, appointing part-time staff and planning an official launch were estimated to require some $200,000. It was anticipated that ADAB would provide $100,000 which was to be matched by private companies. The CGIAR report then candidly records in its Old Boy style that ‘Derek Tribe deserves all the credit for the “spade work” that has been done so far. He has been articulate in promoting the concept in ears that matter, diligent in soliciting ideas and support from a wide range of people, and astute in devising a structure and modus operandi for the NSO (which could have application in other countries besides Australia)’.224

As one objective was to spur other countries into similar action, some of the messages may be overly enthusiastic, and certainly they downplay the delicacy and intensity of Tribe’s work. Even such a revealing affirmation of the discrete lobbying in which Tribe was engaged trivializes his actions.

Tribe’s spadework took the form of recalling his political experiences in Aberdeen, which had been honed in the Machiavellian cloisters of academia. So we should not assume that his alternating use of stationery between University of Melbourne and Academy letterheads in dealings with AIDAB was accidental. As a Foundation Fellow and Councillor of the Academy,225 Tribe chose to use his personal University of Melbourne letterhead when writing initially to the President of the Academy, Sir Rupert Myers an eminent academic. In that letter, Tribe emphasized the benefit of the Academy as a parent to the
gestating NSO – ‘The most important single factor, apart from its tax deductibility status, which makes the Academy so attractive as the ‘parent’ organization ... is its strong emphasis on the importance of science and technology in national and international development. Approximately half of its Fellowship of some 250 consists of people drawn from industry, including many of Australia’s most prominent leaders in the food and chemical industries.’

Leaving no sod unturned, Tribe had nursed AIDAB toward financial commitment. With some reticence funding was indicated as possible, provided there was ‘solid evidence’ that government was essential to the process and that it was ‘guaranteed’ that no further government funds would be sought. Tribe’s reply masterfully addresses each demand without making any specific commitments and concludes by politely rehearsing the justifications for The Fund under the phrase. ‘I do not think that I need repeat to you the scientific, humanitarian, developmental and economic justifications for an NSO.’ We might be forgiven for imagining that in such letters he was refining the ‘Yes Minister’ segment for his forthcoming book, ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’. Once The Crawford Fund formally existed, Tribe immediately advised AIDAB in an informative and engaging letter that almost incidentally details The Fund’s bank account number. We may assume that Tribe telephoned before sending the letter as he saw this as good manners, and that he followed up discretely until a written reply was received. In that reply, the Deputy Director-General of AIDAB confirms the contribution of $125,000 over three years in words remarkably similar to Tribe’s.

Matters were moving quickly and the Academy Council was convened to consider the formal paper, ‘Proposal for the
Establishment of The Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research and for a Board of Management of the Fund’. This led to it being duly established on 1 July 1987. Tribe was Executive-Director and Jan Jones Administrative Officer, both part-time, in theory at least. The ‘official’ archives of The Crawford Fund, prepared by Tribe, record that ‘reactions of the Fellowship to the proposal were invited through a brief announcement in the ATS Newsletter. Eleven letters and seven phone calls were received from Fellows who warmly supported the proposal, and the involvement in it of the Academy. No contrary view was received.’

Tribe’s behind the scenes negotiations become evident at this stage. The Minister of Foreign Affairs instructed AIDAB233 to fund the establishment of The Crawford Fund through the Academy to a total of $125,000 over three years (1986-1987, $25,000; 1987-88, $50,000; 1988-89, $50,000). The CGIAR agreed to match these sums. After the Academy Council had established The Crawford Fund from 1 July 1987 and ‘invited’ Tribe to accept appointment as Executive Director of the Board, they invested him with all the powers, functions, duties and responsibilities of the Board. But for the first four months, he was to be advised by M. D. Bridgland, Professor Alec Lazenby and J. C. Nixon.234 Tribe had nursed The Fund through CGIAR, the Academy, private companies and AIDAB, and now was gaining full control of a charter he had written.

**Charter**

The purpose of The Crawford Fund was (a) ‘to make more widely known throughout Australia the benefits that accrue
both internationally and to Australia from international agricultural research (particularly through ... [ADAB, ACIAR and CGIAR]); and (b) to encourage greater support for, and participation in, this research by Australian governmental and non-governmental organizations and in particular in the industrial and scientific communities of Australia.’

Further details are presented in the Box.

‘In pursuance of the purposes for which the Council [of The Academy of Technological Sciences] has established the [Crawford] Fund the Board shall seek particularly to:

- increase understanding of the accomplishments and potential of international agricultural research;
- draw the attention of industry to opportunities for joint research, development and trade;
- promote the exchange of ideas, information and personnel between international research centres and industry, CSIRO, universities and state agencies;
- collect and disseminate information about the international achievements and needs of agricultural research and development, and encourage links and collaborative projects between overseas centres, on the one hand, and institutes and industry in Australia, on the other;
- urge government and non-government agencies to continue their support for international agricultural research;
- undertake such public information activities and commission such studies or research projects as may be desirable in order to achieve these objects; and
- undertake such other activities as are consistent with the purposes for which the Fund has been established.’

Derek Tribe: The Crawford Fund - Falvey
Awareness-raising was the central theme, and this is what Tribe set about with government, the agricultural science fraternity, the concerned public and, until forestalled by his death, schools. While no organization remains the child of its creator once it has developed its own life, The Crawford Fund has remained largely true to this awareness-raising activity in the sense of promoting its cause to government. That this lobbying retains a focus on government and international agencies more than the private sector reflects Tribe’s vision and times.

Somewhat similarly, the management and governance arrangements laid down under Tribe’s guidance served The Crawford Fund well. Tribe, with his ever-loyal Jan Jones, was the management – and when overseas such as in 1993 and 1995, his most longstanding colleague Norman Tulloh acted for him. Tribe maintained the Executive Director role until June 1996 when he handed it to Alex Buchanan, while retaining public relations and newsletter writing responsibilities – as well as the right to assist where he felt it was necessary. Governance was assured by The Fund’s home within the ATSE, an arrangement that continues to serve both parties well in the main. However, the success of The Crawford Fund has curiously led to possible under-emphasis of agriculture by ATSE, since The Fund only concerns itself with agricultural research related to poor nations. And sometimes, ATSE may feel that The Fund undervalues the status and access gained by its ATSE association. Yet the arrangement largely serves both parties’ objectives.

The Academy resolved that a Standing Committee of Council known as the Board of Management of The Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research
would be comprised of up to fifteen appointees with interests in international agricultural research and not necessarily members of the Academy. Other requirements were: three year renewable appointments; the Chairman being appointed by Council; the Board meeting at least twice a year and reporting activities and finance to Council; the Executive-Director being an ex officio member of the Board; that no Academy funds be expended unless the Council should so resolve, and that all moneys received as a result of the activities of the Board shall be paid directly into The Fund.238

This was Tribe’s vision, independence yet association with the Academy. As part of the Academy, The Crawford Fund could receive tax-deductable donations, enjoy status and access to government above that possible from any professional body in the country. It had access to Fellows elected to the Academy who were at the peak of their technological and applied scientific fields. And through separate Board governance, the perhaps conservative and less informed views of the Academy about the complexities of international agricultural research could be balanced by the sometimes colourful personalities of international agriculture.

Thus The Crawford Fund was not born of the CGIAR, the Academy, AIDAB or ACIAR but of Tribe’s determination. It had consumed much effort and time, and should be seen as the culmination of the political balancing, fundraising, vision and intellectual pragmatism that Tribe had accumulated over a professional lifetime. He was in his early 60s at the time, at the peak of his organizational powers and he had learned of his professional vulnerabilities through university wrangling and his IDP
years. The documentation that Tribe himself left as a record of the genesis of The Crawford Fund, as well as a folder he prepared for its first review, present a routine administrative dossier about the formation of The Crawford Fund. Such an approach to history is consistent with the way Tribe represented other chapters of his own history; his detailed preparation and thought before action allowed him to accomplish much more than his colleagues yet to make it appear easy, or even as ‘luck’. And Tribe liked this image. But for Tribe as for most, the harder he worked, the luckier he became. The Crawford Fund was not simply an idea hatched in Ottawa and implemented in Australia, it was an opportunity needing a hero with diverse and unusual skills, and Tribe became that hero with its concomitant trials and work.

He applied the same skill and hard work through the establishment phase. Although the Academy had imposed some constraints on governance and management, Tribe maintained no real Board for these initial years so that everything relied on him and his loyal secretary – Jan Jones once again. Tribe did create a high-level committee of leaders in agricultural science and related fields to flesh out the image of the organization – on paper. But when one senior member commented that ‘you put my name on that committee but I have no recollection of it ever meeting’, Tribe instantly replied ‘and it never will!’

Tribe’s finesse in cultivating Chairs for The Crawford Fund reflect also his independence of action, and his skill with people of influence. In fact as well as his own self description as ‘a people person’, others recall him as a ‘genuine, visionary and timely of action.’ He would say ‘do things while you can’ and so never put off answering letters
and always had minutes of meeting available as soon as meetings were over. His office style was likewise calm and supportive, and he would often say to his secretary that he would make the tea ‘while you type it up’. Family likewise specifically mention his even temperament and ‘can’t ever remember him swearing’. But his eagerness did not enamour all concerned, and a few close associates were privy to Tribe being rankled by the intransigence of particularly mediocre civil servants.

Tribe was most in his element in his masterful approaches for intensifying advocacy, such as during the lead up to the federal budget. He managed seminars, National Press Club speeches by international leaders, book launches and so on. In his passion for what he believed in, ‘he had little patience with bureaucratic niceties if these led to delays’ which led to some ‘ruffled feathers’ that management had later to smooth over. Such passion bubbled over at times, and perhaps provides explains a comment of the current Chair of The Crawford Fund – then Federal Minister for Primary Industry and Energy – about meeting Tribe: ‘When he first visited me asking for support I thought he was just another agricultural fundamentalist!’ But as for many, in Tribe’s capable hands the message won out, not least when he was seeking funds.

**Funding the Fund**

Raising monies was a constant need of The Fund as the seed funding from ADAB was limited. Tribe had experience, as the episode with the Pig Research Centre in 1960s had shown. And he had ensured that some of the political players from that time were now advocates for The
Crawford Fund. But this time, he sought contributions from the corporate sector for an idea that did not seem to offer them direct benefits. He approached a company specializing in fundraising and received confirmation of the difficulty of such an enterprise, and so tailored his cloth appropriately. But the experts had also helpfully suggested that the message be made palatable by using the language of commerce, and so Tribe called together a committee of influential figures, mainly from within the Academy’s captains of industry and elite scientists.

Dinners with an informed speaker for a clutch of these leaders were hosted by The Fund’s Chairman Doug Anthony at exclusive venues, such as the Melbourne and Australia Clubs. Tribe followed up each attendee emphasizing a threefold message of; research is needed to produce food to stave off hunger and reduce poverty, once the process begins demand for food increases and benefits exporting nations, and hence the benefits of international agricultural research are of ‘enormous direct and indirect advantage to Australian agriculture’.244

Finding funds had been a hallmark of Tribe’s career – even as an academic he had solicited funds in a manner more commercial than the formalized application processes that developed through subsequent decades. Now reliant wholly on donations, Tribe paid attention to such fund inflows, perhaps more than to costs in some cases. Correspondence that would be categorized as begging letters became eloquent masterpieces under Tribe’s pen. In an exchange with ACIAR, Tribe wrote, ‘just a gentle reminder that, according to our records, ACIAR owes a few dollars to The Crawford Fund’ when some 70 percent of an agreed sum remained outstanding. And then in the same letter stating,
‘while dealing with this sordid subject’ as an introduction to seeking expenses for a recent trip since he had heard that some end of financial year surpluses were accessible.245 Such persistence and style funded the fledgling Crawford Fund, but it needed much more.

Having mastered the world of government and institutional funding, Tribe was also aware from his IDP experience that he must approach amenable targets. For third world agricultural research, this had to be the aid budget, even though AIDAB had already noted that it did not wish to be more deeply involved in The Fund. An AIDAB contract with The Crawford Fund, conspicuously signed in 1993, testifies to Tribe’s guile in soliciting funds for his good cause. The contract refers to payments totalling $500,000 over the years 1989-90 to 1993-94, which were to be accounted for simply by showing it had been spent in accordance with the terms of the grant.246 Tribe had managed to obtain at least three years of funds in advance without a formal contract. And soon after he had signed, Tribe set about seeking more. In a carefully worded letter he acknowledges past AIDAB contributions in an invidious comparison with other ‘cash and in-kind’ contributions – the former as $100,000 per year and the latter as a gross $2.1 million. And then over the page proposes the continuation of ‘similar’ funding to that of the past ($500,000), but actually suggests $2 million over five years.247 In that now-past era and with Tribe’s strategically applied charm, such bold expectations were not out of the question.

Tribe had initially been seeking a round million dollars, and as with his other endeavours, he exceeded the target raising some $2.1 million in cash and perhaps up to $2.4 million [1993 dollars] as in-kind contributions such as
discount airfares. And of course, AIDAB contributed more than its initial limit despite having requiring a guarantee that it would never be asked to do that.\textsuperscript{248}

How did this come about? It would seem that, while training was not originally high on Tribe’s agenda, with Bruce Holloway’s leadership, it became an attractive means of raising contributions. Training was tangible, and The Crawford Fund’s ability to attract voluntary and high-level talent ensured that it was seen as excellent value for money. From this point on, around 1993, The Crawford Fund seemed to have become home to two activities, one focused on raising awareness and the other on training.

**Raising Awareness**

Tribe’s primary focus was to raise awareness, especially after a devastating 21 percent cut in Australian funding to the CGIAR in 1991. This was a rallying cry for Tribe. His book ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’\textsuperscript{249} released amidst fanfare in that year was his response. A part-time coordinator was appointed – soon to be voluntarily virtually full time – and a campaign committee was created, and Tribe set about making informed submissions to government. Tribe’s selection of Cathy Reade as head of The Fund’s Public Awareness Program demonstrated again his astute judgement, as Reade is recognized as a major contributor to The Fund’s success. Tribe and Reade’s target audience was defined as government ministers and senior civil servants, the National Farmers’ Federation, NGOs, environmental groups and the wider public. For the tiny Fund, what followed was a blitzkrieg of publicity: 1,500 information kits were distributed; presentations made to the National
Press Club, science groups and other influential groups; some 50 radio interviews; some 50 letters to newspapers; stories specially written for various press outlets; articles in scientific and professional journals; arranging for visiting international scientists to be interviewed on television and radio; using events such as World Food Day to effect, and successive visits to federal ministers with an interest in overseas aid. It was effective, but rather than a one-time offensive, the approach is better understood as a coordinated operation that relates back to the original vision and purpose.

The Crawford Fund’s purpose was to raise awareness about the benefits of international agricultural research. This was done, not through the spectre of mass starvation – though that was always in the minds of those informed – but by working within the machinations of the Australian system. The chosen approach was through an initial explanatory brochure, submissions to government on the subject, regular newsletters, publicized reviews of The Crawford Fund, extracting good messages from ‘master-classes’ for scientists from developing countries, substantial publications and an annual conference.

The initial brochure of The Crawford Fund – titled ‘An Opportunity for Australia’ and featuring Crawford – was the first defining document. It was a manifest of the imperative for international agricultural research. Building on Crawford’s accomplishments and reputation, The Crawford Fund immediately became a force in Australian aid to agricultural research as a 1991 submission to a review of ACIAR indicated.
In a thirty-page submission, prepared mainly by Tribe, reasoned arguments about Australian agricultural expertise, ecologically similar regions of the world and hence benefits to Australia were detailed. It was not only detailed, it was carefully prepared, as was Tribe’s presentation when summoned before the committee. The transcript of the Joint Committee reveals a surprise observation of Tribe’s approach to getting his point across. They recorded that ‘it is remarkable how you have anticipated some of the questions that we thought we would be putting to you’. More than four decades of political and communication experience was now serving international agricultural research very well.

Herein lies the kernel of Tribe’s ‘Doing Well by Doing Good: Feeding and Greening the World’. Following the awareness raising function of The Crawford Fund, Tribe refined his ideas in his later 1994 book using the first’s subtitle as the second’s title. It is in those books and speeches of the period that Tribe tackled an entrenched myth that agricultural assistance to other countries would reduce market opportunities for Australian produce. He relied on the economic argument that demand for agricultural products actually increased as poor countries became wealthier – and went so far as to suggest that food demand increased twice as fast as supply under such circumstances. This was the best theory of the time, and development observations appeared to confirm it. From Australia’s viewpoint Tribe was right, regardless of what we have learned subsequently.

Raising awareness also took the form of the regular ‘Highlights’ newsletter. The three key personalities of The Crawford Fund are introduced by Tribe’s ever careful pen,
as Chairman the Rt. Hon. J.D. Anthony, Executive-Director Derek Tribe and Administrative Officer Jan Jones. The paragraph that Tribe composed to introduce himself is typically understated in a manner entirely appropriate to reinforcing the nationally respected Chairman. It simply notes Tribe’s years at the University, IDP, and his being a Foundation Fellow of the Academy and an international consultant. By now Tribe also knew that in such matters, less can be more.

Curiously he omits direct reference to his pivotal role in creating ILCA, which in many ways is more significant than some of the items mentioned. Perhaps he knew that international accomplishments were not highly valued in the parochial corridors of his adopted country, as elsewhere. Apart from his modesty in this case, his tailoring of words to the task is clear – Tribe saw his previous involvements in agriculture, universities and international aid as the expertise pillars of The Crawford Fund. It is worthy of note that, while it is difficult to span all three areas in one career, the experience of subsequent Executive-Directors of The Crawford Fund have serially represented international development, agricultural research and international universities.
It is through the Highlights newsletters that one may trace the development of The Fund’s training activities, by engaging academics and government scientists on a voluntary basis for collegiate scientific courses offered to mid-career professionals from less developed countries under the rubric of Master Classes. The newsletter also introduces the role of the Federal and other Ministers, such as John Kerin as Minister for Trade and Overseas Development when he announced a significant increase in Australia’s contributions to international agricultural research in 1992. The tightness and commitment of the group that Tribe forged through The Fund is again evident today 19 years later in John Kerin’s appointment as Chairman of The Crawford Fund.

The newsletter continues, increasingly in electronic form under the guidance of Cathy Reade who has overseen the communications and public relations of The Fund since 1989 motivated by the loyalty that Tribe so often engendered from his team-building approach. Even when he had handed over leadership of The Fund, Tribe continued to write Highlights, and his hand may be seen in such subsequent headlines as ‘Good Fortune Strikes Again’, ‘Spreading the Good Word’, ‘Well Said Indeed!! Are You Listening Canberra?’ (noting outcomes of an aid review). Highlights continues to be read around the globe where its low-key style has favoured its retention on waiting room tables, and has perhaps done more to raise awareness of international agricultural research than glossy publications.

Publications of The Crawford Fund are equally impressive – refer to the Box. They comprise Tribe’s writing of the period including his two significant books, ‘Doing Well by
Doing Good”259 and ‘Feeding and Greening the World’,260 as well as seminars coordinated by The Crawford Fund and proceedings of Crawford Fund conferences.

Crawford Fund Publications

Another perspective on Tribe’s approach to raising awareness harks back to his days in Aberdeen when he took a journalism course. He had learned then that there was an art to written communication with the public. And so he wooed a well-known professional journalist to assist in raising awareness about the work of the CGIAR. This was Julian Cribb, who observed that Tribe ‘saw and understood the issue of public awareness much more clearly than anyone before or since’. Tribe understood that the old lobbying style of private meetings with aid agency directors had become outmoded and produced declining dividends for international agricultural research through the CGIAR model. He sought a shift that would promote a more stable funding base, one more in tune with the pressures that drive governmental machinery.\(^{261}\) And he also understood that the whole suite of activities was interrelated.

The CGIAR was a logical wider target for Tribe’s energies. We do well to acknowledge his loyalty to the organization as he was often concerned with its administrative inefficiencies and intransigence. But he saw his role of stimulating it into improved action; he was not part of the group that saw it as an ossified medieval organizational structure.\(^{262}\) Tribe was mainly positive about such things. We see this most clearly when he introduced the 1991 Sir John Crawford Memorial Lecture.

On that occasion of the Crawford Oration, Tribe used his valuable minutes with the power brokers of support for international agricultural research to emphasize the need for public awareness. The Crawford Fund was already established by then and Tribe used its success to effect. It was 19 years since Tribe had first addressed the CGIAR under Crawford’s chairmanship of the TAC and in the
interim he had matured from a competent animal scientist into a convincing visionary with skills in directing agendas. Tribe's perspective on The Crawford Fund was as an organization 'supported by government ... funded mainly by the private sector'. While noting that it engaged in 'practical training for ... developing countries', he emphasized its main purpose by quoting from its constitution, viz. 'to make more widely known the benefits that accrue, both internationally and to Australia, from international agricultural research, and to encourage greater support for this research from Australian governmental and non-governmental organizations.'

Tribe related a public awareness campaign in Australia to a 40 percent increase in Australia's contribution to the CGIAR. In his tongue-in-cheek style, Tribe observed that 'the remarkable achievements of the CGIAR network of centres are still a closely guarded secret as far as most politicians and the community-at-large are concerned'. And then with a preacher's passion, Tribe invoked the vision of his mentor, Crawford of whom W. David Hopper, fourth chairman of the CGIAR, wrote ... “millions of people are being fed because he had the vision to focus national and international efforts on a development strategy that could be implemented with success, and because he threw his powers and talents into ensuring its implementation. We cannot hope to fill his shoes – they are much too large – but we can hope to extend, at least a bit, what he began.” Tribe was by now, the Australian who wore Crawford’s shoes in that international arena.

Completing the list of the awareness raising activities of The Crawford Fund are the conferences, sometimes referred to as seminars in the Box listing publications.
These meetings were planned with Tribe’s deft hand to maximize impact, including all aspects of preparation, execution and follow-up. Tribe would deliberate about the theme, preferring attention-grabbing topics as part of attracting wider publicity – such themes as ‘A Profit in Our Own Country’ revealing his early religious education and its, perhaps unconscious, link to his vocation.

He would set about choosing speakers to attract the widest audience, and to add a controllable level of controversy into the conferences, and would ensure that key international speakers were busy the whole time with press, television and radio interviews and meetings with senior aid and other relevant officials. And soon after the conference was over, the Proceedings would arrive in the mail of each participant and of each person whom Tribe deemed should be aware of the critical role of international agricultural research. It was a masterful package, professionally executed with dedicated support from his loyal assistants, yet with minimal resources. The approach continues today enhanced by electronics and The Crawford Fund’s webpage.

Such details in operation were typical of Tribe’s approach, and we have seen it in evidence in his field days, university conferences and seminars. But he had learned something else through these years – the status that attracts participation with elite personages also works for location. And so Tribe organized for the annual conference to take place inside the new and iconic Parliament House in Canberra. The venue still has impact today, but in the 1990s when the national showpiece was a novelty, its effect was catalytic.
But this was not the only reason for Tribe’s choice of venue. He knew that the task of The Crawford Fund relied on access to the relevant federal ministers, and that as they were generally busy, it was almost impossible to gather two or more in one location – unless that location was their place of gathering, Parliament House. And so, each conference enjoyed opening speeches, duly written to the theme of the day, from Ministers of such portfolios as Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, and Science and Technology. The result was a reinforcement of the messages of the conference to the funding arms of government. Having played a part in the creation of ACIAR, Tribe was well placed to ensure that senior civil servants would reiterate the same essential message.

Tribe’s other activities formed part of his vision of raising awareness, including the overlapping Policy Group of the Victoria AIAS and a particularly successful international conference held in Melbourne in 1996 – Global Agricultural Science Policy for the 21st Century. Tribe formed the organizing committee, squeezed substantial seed monies from the Deans at Melbourne and Latrobe Universities and orchestrated other funding to create a surplus that supported scholarships. It was Tribe’s initiative, together with Australian agricultural economists based in the USA, that attracted the Vice President of the World Bank Ismail Serageldin and host of international research centre figures. By the time of the conference, Tribe had officially handed over management of The Fund, yet its two-year’s preparation had been an added task in which he revelled.

Public awareness was second nature to Tribe. It brought together the stimulus of political involvement and the power of written communication enhanced through his
youthful journalism interests. Apart from the formal mechanisms of books, newsletters, conferences and speaking engagements, Tribe maintained an active correspondence with all whom he felt could advance the cause. Thus his files reveal such trails and solicitous letters to Foreign Minister Downer before and after the 1996 election and interchanges with State Departments of Agriculture, CSIRO, the University of Melbourne and key individuals. He engaged others in the cause as far as they were compatible with his personality; a close relationship with the Minister for Development Cooperation Gordon Bilney being exemplified in the Minister’s newspaper article ‘How Aid Can be a Win-Win Situation’,265 which relies on arguments from Tribe’s ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’.

Raising awareness was Tribe’s primary focus. He saw it as the main role of The Crawford Fund.266 This is confirmed in the outcome of the first review of The Fund – the Ingram Review. ‘The purpose for which the Fund was initially established, namely to promote awareness throughout Australia of the importance and benefits of international agricultural research, should continue to be the principal raison d’être of the Fund.’267 But of course, Tribe also saw reviews as awareness raising opportunities.

Reviews

As the primary communication tool of The Fund, the Highlights newsletter was the obvious means of informing interested parties of a review of The Fund itself, and Tribe in usual style issued a ‘Review Special’ edition. ‘Has it achieved its aims? Should it be continued? What changes would improve its effectiveness? What do you think of The
Crawford Fund?' were the questions posed to readers. A respected international team was assembled comprising senior diplomat and past Executive Director of the World Food Program James Ingram AO, international Thai animal scientist and member of CGIAR Boards and its Technical Advisory Committee, Prof. Dr. Charan Chantalakhana and international economist and senior staff of the Asian Development Bank and other senior government roles, Donald Mentz. Tribe brazenly quotes himself applauding ‘the Academy’s choice of three such distinguished and independent individuals to conduct this Review’.268 Rather than take this at face value, we may see the master communicator and organizer using the review to further the awareness raising functions of The Fund, of engaging politically and academically influential persons as advocates and presenting the review in the language of the wider audience that The Fund was now seeking to attract.

The 1993 review of The Crawford Fund was a fine example of Tribe’s risk-avoidance management.269 The team was hand chosen – after wide public consultation, Tribe said – but Tribe’s form of consultation was to ensure that team members were the right sort of people. And the Team Leader, Jim Ingram had been an advocate of Tribe’s modus operandi from his ADAB and IDP days. The review team duly delivered a succinct report that assisted the further development of the Fund. And they could not help but comment that ‘it is clear that the achievements of the Fund are overwhelmingly due to Professor Tribe’s leadership, drive and persuasive skills.’270

Their 16 recommendations may be paraphrased as follows. Past success may be continued by building on: seeking a successor to Tribe well before he retires; greater private
sector inputs; a focus on research related to Australia’s expertise and interests through increased public awareness, preferably supported by the aid program among a wider diversity of donors. The training program should be expanded ‘only if able to maintain its characteristically un-bureaucratic approach’ with increased emphasis on food policy and developing regions especially Africa, follow-up evaluation of trainees, servicing of aid program needs and avoiding overlap with IDP or other potential training providers. The Academy management committee was to be constituted with new members while relations with the CGIAR was to remain as before, but without support for its public awareness or other programs. The international politics of the day need not concern us here, except to note that Tribe was watching how well the CGIAR was using its public relations funds and was not impressed.

The next review was conducted in 1998 by Professors Alec Lazenby, John Dillon and Emil Javier, at least two of whom were major players in the CGIAR network. By then, Tribe was listed as a Senior Associate of The Crawford Fund, having handed over the Directorship in June 1996. The 17 recommendations follow a similar pattern to the first review with a particular emphasis on The Fund adhering to its national support role for international agricultural research, interpreted to mean public awareness activities. It seems significant in the wider CGIAR world that the reviewers recommended that a phrase linking The Fund to its origins – ‘Australia’s National Support Organization for International Research’ – be included in its letterhead. Tribe’s hand may still be detected in the report, but perhaps less than in the past as he was now, at age 72, genuinely retreating from front-line involvement.
Further reviews of The Fund were undertaken in 2003 and 2008. The most recent review, and probably the most independent, was conducted by Ross Duncan, a market economist with only limited previous exposure to The Fund. In concluding that The Fund is ‘very valuable’ to Australia and that its funding should be increased, Tribe’s legacy may be seen to continue.

**Master Classes**

The second activity of The Fund, which attracted much attention, was The Crawford Fund Master Classes. Training courses offer a multiplier effect by involving many players, and in this case suited those of the retired agricultural science community who wanted to remain active yet were used to a structured working environment. Given the Master Classes profile as an activity of The Fund, it is curious that even though they are mentioned in the founding documents, Tribe did not immediately welcome them.

The idea arose in 1994 when ATSE Fellow Bruce Holloway suggested that the Academy set up a program of Master Classes for scientists and technologists from developing countries in Southeast Asia. This led to the first courses, in agricultural biotechnology, being conducted under the auspices of The Crawford Fund. But ‘Derek at first was not at all enthusiastic to this proposal’, perhaps because ‘Derek’s interactions with the Academy over the years of The Crawford Fund had not all be sweetness and light and it is possible that he thought that this might be the Academy getting at him again.’
Further discussions allayed concerns and from that point on ‘during all my years working with Derek and The Crawford Fund, he was an enthusiastic and unreserved supporter of the Master Class Program’. Establishing a target of three Master Classes each year Tribe set about finding the funds. It was another case of Tribe recognizing talent and assisting its outlet, although this time the idea came with the talent. Likewise his networking approach is evident in the early Master Class programs, which contain names that feature in other parts of Tribe’s story, such as John Vercoe. Funds came in from Holloway’s and Tribe’s actions – more than $2 million over 12 years – even though the Academy failed to contribute to the fruits of its own initiative. One series of communications with the Academy about The Crawford Fund going over budget in a training course might even be read as parsimonious pique.

As it expanded, the Master Class program attracted resources mainly from ACIAR – as well as from CSIRO, Rockefeller Foundation, Asian Development Bank, and consultants managing United Nations and other training courses. In addition to learning, enhanced contacts between Asian and Australian scientists was listed as a principle outcome. But the classes were also effective in terms of The Crawford Fund’s primary awareness raising objective, particularly among officials and the Australian agricultural science community. An incidental benefit was a belated development of some cultural literacy of that community.

Management of the classes also reflected the operational mode of The Crawford Fund with Holloway managing selection of topics, locations, coordinators, funding sources, travel, curriculum, resource personnel and participants.
Under this rubric by 2004, 28 Master Classes for 474 participants from 35 countries had been conducted through classes of 11 to 27 participants, as summarized in the Table.

**CRAWFORD FUND MASTER CLASSES 1992 - 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992, 93, 94</td>
<td>Microbial and Plant Molecular Genetics (Melbourne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Dairy Technology (Melbourne); Beef Cattle Reproductive Technology (Rockhampon); DNA Technologies: Biodiversity &amp; Plant Breeding (Bangkok); Plant Gene Technology: Principles &amp; Applications (Canberra);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Microbial Genetics and Vegetable Diseases (Taiwan); Microbial and Plant Molecular Genetics (Melbourne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>New Technologies for Measuring Biodiversity (Malaysia); New Diagnosis of Tropical Plant Disease (Philippines); Vertebrate Pest Management (Canberra); Microbial and Plant Molecular Genetics (Melbourne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Food Biotechnology (Darwin); New Technologies for Plant Quarantine (Malaysia); Microbial and Plant Molecular Genetics (Melbourne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Rights (Perth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Biodiversity Assessment (Cairns); Rhizobium Technology (Perth); Molecular Plant Breeding (Melbourne); Soil borne Fungal Pathogens (Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Economic Computer Modelling (Indonesia); Research Management in Agriculture (Armidale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Research Management in Agriculture (Armidale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Rodent Biology and Management (Philippines); Soil Borne Diseases of Cereals (Turkey); Agricultural Biosecurity (Canberra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Research Management in Agriculture (Armidale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2011</td>
<td>15 Classes; 11 international and 3 Australian locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Tribe, the Master Classes were an integral part of the public awareness focus of The Crawford Fund. One extract
from Tribe’s reply to a letter from an unnamed Professor in Germany who had queried whether the Highlights Newsletter’s praise of the classes wasn’t ‘a bit over the top’ allowed Tribe to further advertise The Fund while licensing his hyperbole. Tribe wrote – and inserted into Highlights – ‘I am sorry that the high praise for our activities annoys you but we feel that we should not hide the truth! I agree that it is embarrassing for The Crawford Fund to be put on such a pedestal.’

After Tribe

This is The Crawford Fund that Tribe built. It continues with its charter ‘building on the success’ established by Tribe. He had stepped down as Executive Director earlier as he noted with characteristic understatement and humour in Highlights under a distinctly British headline ‘Changing of the Guard’. ‘When nine years ago, the Academy launched the Fund and invited me to be its executive director for the first three years, I had no idea what an absorbing and satisfying time lay ahead.’ The Fund’s history post-Tribe is worthy of further documentation elsewhere. Looking back we may say that The Crawford Fund was: a worthy opportunity presented to the right person and the right time; a masterful application of the amalgamated talents of a gifted agricultural scientist that had been honed over a professional lifetime; and an outstanding success in its raising government, scientist and public awareness of the essential nature and benefits of international agricultural research. Of Tribe’s philosophical drive – often summed up by the title of his popular book ‘Doing Well by Doing Good’, we should delve just a little deeper and perhaps use his own preferred description of
‘enlightened self interest’, for that encapsulated much of his early formation and worldview. While avowedly moderate if religious at all, Tribe’s firm Protestant foundation informed him of life, and found its expression in a country that shared his humanistic view for its science. Without all of these factors, The Crawford Fund would have been stillborn, as were its counterparts in similar nations.
Chapter 10

Tribe’s Legacy

The first page of Tribe’s working notes of reminiscences quotes George Eliot.

‘Our deeds still travel with us from afar.
And what we have been makes us what we are.’²⁷⁹

Whether he saw it in existential, religious or aspirational terms, the outcome is similar – a realization that all things are influenced from conditions of the past since they are all interconnected. Tribe’s work across a professional lifetime showed an intuitive understanding of the interrelationships that govern all life. His interest in politics may be seen as the logical expression of that understanding for one who is engaged widely with others. An extrovert in an older-style university environment, Tribe introduced innovations, motivated others to greater heights than they might have otherwise aspired and yet made his greater contributions outside the university environment. His rough-draft memoir is a symphony of self-expression and in part self-analysis, and although written for family alone, it reveals the insights of one who embraced life to his own and others’ advantage. In agricultural science, Tribe’s was a life well lived.
His deeds travelled with him *from afar* around the world. They continue to travel. Our consideration of his deeds sets a context for his life in agricultural science – a context that joined the sometimes-isolated disciplinary silos that hinder the integrated science of agriculture and animals. It also allows us to view the source of the unifying insight of global food demand and the constant need for appropriate research. He sourced such inspiration from his mentors – Wadham, MacGillivray and Crawford. We can even hear Tribe in the words used by Wadham half a century earlier in postulating the future of Australian agriculture.

‘We should consider the current recession in agriculture as a very temporary situation and that if we look ahead to the next 50 years we are sitting on the edge of an enormous gold mine in Asia. They will need our agriculture. Therefore, the future of the Australian economy will be as much dependent on agriculture as it has ever been and the nonsense talked about by politicians on our dependence on primary industries as being a third world concept should be ignored. We have to keep reminding ourselves and the rest of the world that the highest technology industry in Australia is agriculture.’ — Tribe followed his line and went a step further to become ‘one of the giants of Australian agricultural research’. He worked indefatigably to make his visions become reality’. At the time of his death, his energy contributed to Australia increasing contributions to international agricultural research to $16.5 million through the Global Conservation Trust to conserve agriculturally important plant genes in 1500 global gene banks. These are accolades delivered in eulogies, of which perhaps the most comprehensive was that lovingly prepared by John Vercoe one of his post—
graduate students who followed Tribe into international livestock development and was a Chair of ILRI, ILCA’s successor. Yet they contain elements of understatement. They are delivered by Australians speaking largely to Australians, and so avoid detailed reference to his international accomplishments.

Those familiar with international agriculture and Tribe’s international career make more of his role in creating the International Livestock Centre for Africa (ILCA), which in its heyday – Tribe’s years – was a pinnacle of animal science research oriented to the majority of the world’s livestock holders. Negotiating the unfathomably intransigent politics of international assistance was even more complex than university politics. One close colleague of 50 years, spanning Britain and Australia, including a close working for over 30 years, summed his work up in the words ‘the contribution that Derek Tribe made, both directly and indirectly, to international agricultural research was outstanding ... with the exception of Sir John Crawford, I can think of no other individual who has had such an impact’. And of the two Tribe had charm and a desire to engage with people in greater abundance, though he sometimes seemed to keep up networks for no obvious purpose by just calling in for a chat.

Tribe called himself ‘a gossip’, yet he could keep secrets. Some have emerged in these pages. Others await a later time for constructive discussion. The gossip is easy to trace as it was usually related to some initiative that Tribe was cooking up at the time. But his ability to ‘speak to power’ was less well known and less easy to elicit. We know that he gave advice to international agencies officially and unofficially, that he maintained close contact with decision-
makers to ensure smooth operations of his initiatives, and we know that he regularly gave personal advice to favoured stars whom he mentored throughout their careers.

One instance of his personal advice was to one whom he had adopted and who had been offered a senior role in the University long after Tribe had left. His advice was clear yet even-handed. ‘Don’t accept the position! But if you do, you must do the following ...’. Tribe then assumed he had carte blanche to appear unannounced in his mentee’s office with further advice. His advice included such endearing gems as including library staff as academics, respecting administrative staff as the Faculty’s corporate memory and even recommending ‘an outstanding candidate’ for a senior administrative appointment. On one occasion, he simply proffered his copy of Cornford’s 1908 exposé of academic politics, ‘Microcosmographia Academica’.286 We may suspect that Tribe was reliving part of his own experiences when we recall that the main character of Cornford’s discourse was ‘the young man in a hurry’, as Tribe himself had once been described.

But his life was more than this, for he never really gave up politics, which he had perfected from the outside. Given priority access to politicians of all persuasions, Tribe was seen as an informed advocate more than a lobbyist. A Director of ACIAR in the early 1990s recalls him saying, tongue in cheek, that ‘it was truly remarkable what could be achieved through the powers of persuasion based on his carefully targeted use of a combination of silver hair and a silver tongue’. By now Tribe had grown into his charisma, including the silver tongue appellation that had dogged him for decades, often unflatteringly. At the same time, he is said to have remained modest – by most although not all
past colleagues. With success and experience, he mellowed and was able to create and lead the self-generating voluntary input of agricultural scientists that is today’s Crawford Fund. Yet he retained his delight in being acknowledged, with some degree of modesty in such responses as that to a later reviewer of The Fund ... ‘I have always enjoyed good works of fiction – and I particularly enjoyed your version of my activities with The Crawford Fund’s public awareness campaign!!’

So Tribe’s legacy lives on in institutions – ILCA and The Crawford Fund – and through unspecified advice in the halls of influence and direct advice to many individuals. It is no exaggeration to say that Tribe created The Crawford Fund. Its accomplishments are a further tribute to Tribe, especially as it is the only successful NSO among those sponsored by the CGIAR – although IFAR in the USA has some similar functions. He is specifically remembered every two years through The Crawford Fund Derek Tribe Award. Inaugurated in 2001 to mark ‘the outstanding contributions of [the] Foundation Director of The Crawford Fund to the promotion of international agricultural research’, the award is made to a developing country citizen who has made distinguished contributions to the application of research in agriculture or natural resource management.
His other accomplishments and honours may be seen as a recognition of such contributions. They include: ten books; more than a hundred papers; leadership of missions for the World Bank, United Nations’ agencies and other groups in Africa, Asia, the Pacific and the Middle East; being a preferred expert on various international issues; founding and governing the international livestock centre; stimulating foundation of one of Australia’s four learned Academies; leading what has become the world’s largest education service company; having twice been invited to be a Resident of the prestigious Bellagio Centre of the Rockefeller Foundation, and so much more.\textsuperscript{290} Thus it may be more apt to characterize him as an international scientific entrepreneur than as a leading international researcher.

A fellow agricultural scientist who had known Tribe from his arrival in Australia nominated Tribe to receive an Honorary Doctorate from Macquarie University in the late 1990s. His succinct overview of Tribe was – ‘the complete Agricultural Scientist’.\textsuperscript{291} And as such, we must see his greatest legacy as the hundreds of persons he encouraged to engage in international agriculture over five decades. He appointed key persons in the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Melbourne, though not all were brilliant appointments; he ‘was quite Machiavellian in finding employment for young Australians in ILCA’;\textsuperscript{292} he placed his graduate students in international roles where they appeared to have the right personality traits; he co-opted likeminded younger scientists to his vision in his widespread visits to the developing corners of the agricultural world.
One contemporary retains a vivid image of one who outshone his fellows, with an ‘imposing presence, articulateness, winning smile, courteous manner and personal warmth. He was good at identifying weak spots in an argument which he probed acutely but always with full respect for his interlocutors. He also had a good sense of humour. Though a very serious man he was never stuffy, pompous or self-righteous ... he embodied the best qualities of the highly educated English professional middle class. He was a true gentleman, never snobbish, always courteous and considerate to others irrespective of their origins and concerned to do his best to make the world a little better than he found it. He was a man I admired.293 Another long-term colleague saw a slightly different perspective and noted his distinct combination of the gifts of entrepreneurship, administration, organization and engaging personality.294

But Tribe was human – ‘he was no saint’ as some critics emphasize and then go on to elaborate instances where he might have better eased an ego or even been a little less successful. All the normal spectrum of comment that we might expect. However, if there is one thing that should be clear from the voluminous anecdotes and comments about Tribe’s life that have arrived to inform this book, it is that he was a figure larger than his Australian backyard. So we do better to accept some summary comments from an astutely critical figure of the international agricultural stage. He saw Tribe as one who ‘caught your attention the instant he came in sight ... a name that kindled your interest ... compassionate, humorous and ... on occasion, humble’.295

And that is the overwhelming experience that remains among those with a wide perspective of agricultural science
and global food issues. It is not overstating it to say that his aura, while fading, still pervades some corridors of the informed – though the corridors may be more in halls of retirement homes than of power.

At Crawford Fund annual conferences now after a quarter of a century, Tribe is still present in the atmosphere. The conference venue in Parliament House and the gathering of as many senators, ministers, and elected-representatives as possible are his initiative. And just as the Cheshire cat of Alice in Wonderland vanishes leaving only its smile, so Tribe’s smile hovers over many a shoulder on the platform through to the extended networking breaks. His traits – summarized by one who succeeded him in The Crawford Fund – of ambition, oratory, charm, networking and dropping into an office for no obvious reason just at the right time,296 are embodied in the wider Fund family and its voluntary spirit. And so in that way, The Crawford Fund is his most tangible legacy.

Thus the third son of a conscientious headmaster born on the 23rd of September 1926 in Portsmouth England became a celebrated and occasionally misunderstood visionary of international agricultural science. At the time of his death in his adopted Melbourne on the 19th of April 2003, he was known throughout much of the agricultural science world – from Africa to Asia, from the UK to the USA. And in his home territory was known as someone who got things done, who motivated capable students and who though more tolerant than most, had little time for intransigence whether it was driven by unfounded conservative views, selfish interests or jealousy. His admirers and critics are united in acknowledging his ability to see the direction of the future. They also recognize his enduring legacy in
raising awareness about international agricultural research through his domestic and international legacy, The Crawford Fund.

The Fund began as a support organization to raise awareness of the need for continuous funding for the CGIAR. It is now fitting that in the 25th year of The Crawford Fund for International Agricultural Research – an initiative of the Academy of Technological Science and Engineering – the annual conference held in Parliament House Canberra focuses on producing more food from less land, a continuing objective of the CGIAR. Such is the ongoing legacy of Derek Tribe.
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