UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Horizons of Modernity: British Anthropology and the End of Empire

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/33k7c1q2

Author
Foreman, Grahame

Publication Date
2013

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Horizons of Modernity: British Anthropology and the End of Empire

By

Grahame Philip Foreman

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Martin Jay, Co-Chair
Professor James Vernon, Co-Chair
Professor Xin Liu

Fall 2013

Horizons of Modernity: British Anthropology and the End of Empire

Copyright © 2013 Grahame Philip Foreman

Abstract

Horizons of Modernity: British Anthropology and the End of Empire

By

Grahame Philip Foreman

Doctor of Philosophy in History

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Martin Jay, Co-Chair
Professor James Vernon, Co-Chair

This dissertation charts the ways in which the non-West came to be thought of as part of the modern world in the late British Empire, how that project became politically unfeasible during decolonization, and how colonial social anthropology was brought to bear on Britain itself in the 1950s. I show how in late colonial era social anthropologists began to combine participant-observer fieldwork, and totalistic analysis of a locality, with the understanding of the world's cultures in interaction with each other, rather than in terms of their comparative difference. This colonial anthropology of modernity emerged within a complex matrix of institutional geographies. The branch of that project instigated by Max Gluckman involved circulations not only between metropole and colony, but crucially within the specific regional situation found in South Africa. Through these circulations Gluckman was led to develop new tools for the understanding of the social as globally modern, which were further developed by his colleagues at Manchester, and which became highly influential on new understandings of a global modernity. These tools were imported from the colonial situation to bring a vibrant and productive anthropological dimension to the study of British society in the 1950s: a project which was instigated, funded, and shaped by the demands of social democracy and the construction of a welfare state. However the participant-observation of late colonial modernity, and in particular the processes of decolonization, became impossible under the demands of an emergent security apparatus. Social anthropology's methods were not intrinsically primitivist, but they were dependent on the circulation of anthropologists and their ability to live in fieldsites for extended periods of time, forging intimate links with their subjects. This made the anthropology of modernity both unacceptable and highly vulnerable in the era of impending decolonization, and allowed the discipline's subject matter to be conditioned by political coercion, in particular through restriction of movement. Thus we can see the complex ways in which political circumstances shaped, constrained and channeled the understanding of global modernities at the end of the British Empire.

For my family: Mum, Dad, Serina, Cormac and Ambrose

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

Introduction

Chapter One: *Social Anthropology, South Africa, and the Modern World, 1922-1938*

Chapter Two: *Max Gluckman and the Modern Social Situation*

Chapter Three: *"The Power to Exclude": Political Persecution and the Shaping of Social Anthropology, 1939-1960*

Chapter Four: *Social Anthropology and Social Democracy: The Manchester School and the Anthropology of Britain*

Conclusion

Bibliography

Acknowledgments

I have been incredibly fortunate to have two wonderful advisors as Co-Chairs of my dissertation committee. Martin Jay has been a constant, calm, reassuring presence for many years. It was taking his undergraduate class in intellectual history many years ago which introduced me to the subject. His vast knowledge, experience, patience and attention to detail make him the most perceptive of readers, and master of posing the right question. He has also been the most dependable of advisors when I needed help, and on more than one occasion has gone out of his way to help me out of crises.

It is fair to say that without James Vernon's inspiration and support this dissertation would not exist. His energy and dedication to teaching, and in nurturing a community of British Studies scholars at Berkeley, brought me to the study of British history in the first place. He has been a truly dedicated reader of anything I've given him, from fragments to 120-page chapter drafts. When I reached points where it seemed I would never finish, he found ways to keep me going. His unfailing support, both intellectual and personal, come from a spirit of great generosity. He is the very model of an academic mentor, and much more. Even if he is, as I suspect, a closet Gooner.

My third reader, Xin Liu, introduced me to the history of anthropology. His passion for the topic, and his insistence on its importance, made me realize the rich possibilities it contained. His intellectual energy and dedication to the combination of rigorous theory with empirical research have also been inspiring.

All historians depend on archivists, but I have more than most. When I arrived in London to work on Max Gluckman's papers, newly released from embargo, they were uncatalogued, unsorted and, it seemed, pretty much randomized. The resident archivist at the Royal Anthropological Institute, Sarah Walpole, generously devoted her time to helping me go through scores of boxes (and a few suitcases!) of files, and even began cataloguing it so that I could work on it. I remember our many months working together with great affection. I am very grateful to Sarah and to all at the RAI for providing me a home away from home, a space in which to work, and endless cups of tea. I am also grateful for the support and help of James Peters at the John Rylands University Library at the University of Manchester, and the archivists at Rhodes House, the London School of Economics, the British National Archives and the Wellcome Institute.

I owe a particular debt of gratitude to senior scholars whose work in some way paralleled my own, or who work in similar fields, and who generously gave of their time, expertise, advice and encouragement: Jordanna Bailkin, Peter Mandler, Riki Kuklick, George Stocking, Jonathan Spencer and Dennis Dworkin. I have also benefitted greatly from conversations with, and comments from, Jean Comaroff, Michael Burawoy, Paul Rabinow and Lawrence Cohen. John Gillis and Stanley Brandes were especially enthusiastic readers and supporters, and each gave me a boost at a crucial time. A special mention must go to David Mills, who showed extreme generosity in showing me his unpublished work, in which he blazed the trail through the anthropological archives; David also pointed me to the unopened Gluckman archive, encouraged me along the way, and gave me great comments on my chapters. Another special mention goes to Ronnie Frankenberg, who was a generous host in England, shared his time and knowledge, and oriented me to the intellectual and personal networks of the Manchester School.

Some of the work in this dissertation has been presented at conferences and workshops at the North American Conference on British Studies, the Pacific Coast Conference on British Studies, the University of Chicago's Nicholson Center for British Studies and the Center for

British Studies at UC Berkeley. I am very grateful to the organizers of those conferences and those who commented on the papers. In particular I would like to thank Jordanna Bailkin and Peter Mandler, who chaired panels, and gave invaluable comments, advice, and encouragement, as well as sharing their own work. It was a real pleasure to serve on panels with my conference companion Erik Linstrum, from whom I have learned much. Let's get the band back together soon, man.

Financial and other material support has come from the History Department, UC Berkeley, the Center for British Studies at UC Berkeley, the Mellon Foundation, the Reinhard Bendix Memorial Fellowship, the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Nicholson Center for British Studies. I was also honored to be appointed Visiting Scholar at the Royal Anthropological Institute during my time there.

Three groups of people at UC Berkeley have made this whole thing possible and worthwhile. First, the graduate students. Penny Ismay has been the most faithful, supportive and generous friend a floundering graduate student could have. She is, in fact, the awesomest. Many beers and much laughter with her and David Beecher, our companion and co-sufferer through the dissertation process, have seen all three of us through many tough times. My other close compadre and good friend was Noah Strote, who was hired too early and whisked away to the tenure-track, but he remains the best historian/house-party-DJ I know. The three of them have been huge inspirations and sources of support in the times of direst need. Cheers, guys: you rock. Radhika Natarajan has been another invaluable companion. We have ended up working on topics with close connections, and I am very grateful for her generosity in reading and commenting on my work. She is also always a warm and gracious presence in our British Studies community. John Corbally is an all-round top bloke who stepped up for me in a major crisis—without his help I couldn't have finished this thing. Other fellow students at Berkeley who have read and discussed my work, and helped me understand what it was I was doing include Daniel Ussishkin, Tehila Sasson, Carrie Ritter, Andrew Keating, Jeff Schauer, Daniel Immerwahr, Ryan Acton, Eliah Bures, Keith Woodhouse, Simon Grote, Steven Gross, Joe Bohling, and Mark Sawchuck.

I have benefitted greatly from all my teachers in the History Department at UC Berkeley, with its precious combination of intellectual rigor, dedication to teaching and true sense of collegiality. I have learned—much more than they know—what it means to be a scholar and a teacher from Tom Laqueur, Susanna Barrows, John Connelly and Kerwin Klein. I've never taken a class with Tom Brady but it's been my honor to teach with him twice, and share a glass with him more than once. My very first teacher at UC Berkeley—in an undergraduate summer sessions class—was Felipe Gutterriez, who gave me vital encouragement and advice and set me on the path to graduate study. A final aspect of graduate education at UC Berkeley is the amount of time we spend teaching. This has been the most rewarding and refreshing aspect of my time here, and I would like to thank all my undergraduate students at UC Berkeley. Teaching them has been a great experience.

Finally, and most importantly, my deepest gratitude goes to my long-suffering family, to whom this dissertation is dedicated. My parents have always encouraged me to be adventurous, and have never failed to support me in my various projects, even those (perhaps all of them) which must have seemed largely incomprehensible to them. I am very grateful for their unconditional support and love. My Dad died shortly before I finished this dissertation. I know he would have been as proud of this small achievement as I am of his many big ones. I am just as proud of Mum, who faces life with patience, generosity and a selfless dignity. She is a true inspiration.

More day-to-day support has come from my long-suffering, but fortunately incredibly patient, wife Serina. She is an endless source of strength, companionship and good hum(o)ur. I could not have done this without her help, tolerance and constant hard work. I am very lucky, and very grateful, to have her in my life. In retrospect, starting to raise twins at the same time as beginning dissertation research was a bit over-ambitious. I'm still not sure about the latter project, but the former has turned out to be the best thing I have ever been fortunate enough to do. Cormac and Ambrose are an unending source of joy, amazement, amusement, chaos and extreme silliness, all of which has sustained me through the long years of dissertation writing. Yes, lads, Daddy has finally finished his "book"! Let's play wall-ball!

Abbreviations: People

MG = Max Gluckman
AWH = A. Winifred Hoernlé
RJF = R. J. Frankenberg
ALE = A. L. Epstein
PW = Peter Worsley
TL = Tom Lupton
SC = Sheila Cunnison
WW = William Watson
JCM = J. Clyde Mitchell
JAB = John Barnes
EC = Elizabeth Colson
HK = Hilda Kuper

Abbreviations: Archives

MG RAI = Max Gluckman Papers, Royal Anthropological Institute, London
JCM RH = J. Clyde Mitchell Papers, Rhodes House, Oxford University
RYLANDS = Special Collections, John Rylands Library, Manchester University (*Vice-Chancellor's Archive* and *Gluckman Papers*)
TNA = The National Archive, Kew, London.

Introduction

During the twentieth century the global dimension of the Western social sciences was radically transformed. At the turn of the century, the West's "others" were understood as essentially non-modern, in order, by contrast, to reveal the true nature of Western modernity. By the century's end, the variety of non-Western social and cultural formations had come to be understood as integral to a modern, global society. This radical shift involved seeing the non-West as modern, and Western society itself as saturated with social and cultural difference: in short, the emergence of a global social science.

The history of these developments, however, is not well understood. This dissertation addresses the problem for the case of the British social sciences. While much has been written on the complex relationships between British social thought and the ideology and practice of Empire, the question of what happened at the end of empire has not been clearly addressed. The dominant received narrative is that it was only after decolonization that British social science became capable of understanding the non-European world as modern and contemporary with the West. In particular, it has often claimed (and more often implicitly assumed) that throughout the colonial period British social anthropology—which from the 1920s became the primary mode of understanding non-European people and in particular colonial and ex-colonial subjects—depicted Europe's others as isolated, primitive and timeless social organisms, while connections to the contemporary world were ignored in the interests of colonial ideology.[1] Similarly, it has been assumed that British anthropologists turned to the study of Britain only after decolonization, as study became more difficult in former colonies. The shift from the anthropological study of the primitive to the study of the contemporary is therefore mapped neatly onto the caesura of decolonization.

This dissertation challenges that binary view through an alternative history, tracing the struggles of British social anthropologists to understand non-European peoples as modern political and economic subjects, enmeshed in global flows of capital, power and knowledge, in the middle half of the twentieth century. I show that these developments took place not after decolonization, but within the late British empire, through various intellectual and political projects which involved new imagined imperial futures, and which were themselves enabled and inspired by the circulations of social scientists and categories of knowledge within trans-imperial networks of exchange. Furthermore, I argue that these projects emerged from the very core methods of social anthropology: immersive, long-term participant-observation, totalistic analysis of a delimited social field, and a focus on social structure. However there were limits to this work. Not only their subjects, but they themselves, were subject to the structural limits imposed by the conditions of capitalism, colonialism, and the modern nation-state.

The most striking example of a colonial anthropology of modernity flourished at the University of Manchester in the 1950s, led by the South African Max Gluckman. In the 1950s and 1960s it was one of the most inventive and influential branches of the British social sciences. An intense seminar culture led to the development of common methods and the pursuit of common interests in very different fields in Central Africa, India, Melanesia, the Middle East, and Britain itself. They specialized in the study of African urbanization and industrialization, the

1 For classic expressions of this view see *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*, ed. Talal Asad (New York: Humanities Press, 1973); Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

formation of new indigenous political associations, such as trade unions, and the impact of geopolitical forces on local communities. They also pioneered the application of anthropological methods of research, developed in the colonial situation, to Britain itself. This work became well-known and highly influential not only in social anthropology across the British Empire and Commonwealth, but also in the United States, France and elsewhere. It soon became known as the "Manchester School" within the discipline of anthropology and cognate social science disciplines.

Rather than seeing the study of the primitive as a way by which to understand aspects of modern selves, and humanity in general, Gluckman and his colleagues attempted to understand the interactions between non-Western societies and contemporary national, regional and global forces. Building on the core techniques of social anthropology, involving long-term participant-observation, analysis of a local situation in its totality, and the investigation of agency within social structure, they focused on conflict, process, and the interlocking of various political, social and cultural forms and structures. Their innovations in the conceptualization of the social moved them away from the understanding of "cultures" or "societies" as holistic entities, to the totality of social forces acting within a given concrete situation. This work led eventually to the invention of the British branch of social network theory. Through these methods they brought Europe's others within the horizons of modernity, and brought a new kind of subject into view: the non-European as modern political and economic agent, negotiating a path through a variety of social, economic, cultural and political demands.

It would be easy to see the Manchester School simply as early exponents of an approach which later became more generally prevalent. But looking at the roots of the project shows that it grew from an earlier set of circulations and institutional demands. Although the dialectical exchange of the seminar was important, the core of the Manchester method derived from Gluckman's earlier work on his native South Africa in the 1930s. This work itself emerged from the circulation of personnel and ideas within specific matrices, initially arising in the interchange between British metropolitan concerns and South African liberal politics in the 1930s. Yet neither is this simply a case of moving the origin point backwards. Possibilities which were open in the 1930s became increasingly less plausible in the 1950s under the combined conditions of impending decolonization and Cold War geopolitics. The Manchester School is particularly useful in charting the changing conditions of possibility for academic discourse, because they were the anthropologists who most intently pursued the anthropology of contemporary and—for this very reason—their work was obstructed and re-channeled by state agencies. This story therefore reveals the limits of what could be said about the modern world in the British social sciences in the era of decolonization. By tracing both the genesis and the fate of their project, I offer an alternative history of British anthropology and the intellectual and political engagements with others in the British colonial social sciences.

My story begins in the interwar period. In my first chapter I argue that the new discipline of social anthropology, which was highly successful both institutionally and intellectually, and quickly became the primary mode in British social science for the understanding of colonial subjects, was not, as is commonly asserted, an intrinsically primitivist project. Indeed I argue that the core methods of long-term participant-observation and structural-functional analysis of a specified locality pushed the new discipline toward the understanding of non-Europeans as modern. The early years of social anthropology were highly conflicted, there were multiple ongoing possibilities and actualized projects, and there was change over time. I analyze the ways in which the two founders of the new discipline, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw

Malinowski, struggled to generate an adequate method for the study of the contemporary, and trace the circulations of knowledge and persons between Britain and South Africa which generated this new discourse.

The second chapter shows how Max Gluckman developed a new approach to an anthropology of modernity in the 1930s, and how this work emerged out of his circulation between his native South Africa and British intellectual networks. I argue for the importance of his training at Oxford, and the influence of the structuralist approach being developed by E. E. Evans-Pritchard. It was the synthesis of Oxonian structuralism with the political and intellectual concerns of his liberal South African background which enabled his creation of new methods by which to conceptualize non-Europeans as modern.

Chapter Three shows how attempts to understand colonial subjects as modern were constrained and channeled by the geopolitical conditions of the Cold War and decolonization. The anthropology of modernity became increasingly impossible due to the emergence of another trans-imperial network: that of a global security apparatus, which emerged piecemeal under the combined conditions of impending decolonization and global cold war, and stretched from Central Africa to London to Australia and Melanesia. Work on modern "others," such as the development of African trade unions on the Zambian Copperbelt, had always been politically sensitive, but became much more so as fears grew over the possible outcomes of decolonization. Under these conditions, security concerns made the representation of colonial subjects as modern political actors unfeasible; what was left was an anthropology of the primitive, which was an artifact not of empire, but of impending decolonization. The result was to make the representation of colonial subjects as modern political and economic agents impossible.

Partly as a consequence of the persecution of anthropologists in the colonies, anthropologists at Manchester began to apply techniques developed in the colonies to the study of Britain itself in the 1950s. The fourth and final chapter tells this story, showing how methods of social research and categories of social knowledge were exchanged between disparate parts of the Empire. While they were persecuted in colonial situations, the Manchester School's pioneering anthropological study of Britain was heavily funded and encouraged by the British state, which was anxious to encourage and expand social scientific research in the interests of post-war reconstruction and social planning, and in the absence of a domestic academic sociology. Manchester anthropologists pioneered new modes of social scientific penetration into British everyday life, including the first participant-observation research in British factories and secondary schools. I show how applying ethnographic techniques to Britain reconfigured the understanding of British society, finding strangeness in the everyday, depicting the quest for community in a post-industrial society, and generating a new discourse on the meaning of class and social mobility in post-war Britain.

Historiography

In the broadest terms, my work extends the history of the complex and ongoing dialectic between thought about "others" and about Western modernity, under particular historical conditions.[2] Historians have long explored the relationship between power and knowledge in the

2 See Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1997); Nicholas B. Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

the British Empire.[3] This work itself belongs to a broader category of the longer history of the production of Western knowledge about non-Western others, especially in relation to the colonial encounter.[4] In the British case, this work has often concerned how colonial encounters both structured, and were structured by, concepts of the European metropole as modern and liberal.[5] This work has focused on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; these histories rarely account for the changing conditions of the late empire, particularly after World War I.[6] A recent and rapidly growing literature has begun to elucidate the role of the human and social sciences in the shift to a "development" ideology in the British Empire between the world wars.[7] My work adds to this new literature on the interwar period and extends it into what I call the era of impending decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s. Very little work has been done on what happened to the colonial social sciences in the long period of decolonization.[8] There is also little comparable for the British case to the rich historiography on the Cold War and the social sciences in the United States.[9] Much excellent recent work on the domestic social sciences in

---

3 Key and recent works in this vast literature include Thomas R. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996); J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion: Volume 4: Barbarians, Savages, and Empires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Brett M. Bennett and Joseph Morgan Hodge, *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science Across the British Empire, 1800-1970* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

4 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); William B. Cohen, *The French Encounter with Africans: White Response to Blacks 1530-1880* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980); Todorov, Tzvetan, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984); Anthony Grafton, Nancy Siraisi and April Shelford, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992); Anthony Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993); Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994); Silvia Federici, *Enduring Western Civilization: The Construction of the Concept of Western Civilization and Its "Others"* (Westport: Praeger, 1995); *The Anthropology of the Enlightenment*, ed. Larry Wolff and Marco Cipolloni (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007). The question of the "other" can of course be taken back much further in European history: see Erich S Gruen, *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011).

5 J. W. Burrow, *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1966); George W. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1987); Henrika Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Uday Singh Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-century British Liberal Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Pitts, Jennifer, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Karuna Mantena, *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Origins of Indirect Rule* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Thomas McCarthy, *Race, Empire, and the Idea of Human Development* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); *The Peculiarities of Liberal Modernity in Imperial Britain*, ed. Gunn, Simon and James Vernon, Berkeley Series in British Studies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

6 Exceptions include Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the World Wars* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, ed. Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995).

7 Benoît de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development", *Social Science Information* 36, no. 2 (1997): 343-376; Joanna Lewis, *Empire State-building: War & Welfare in Kenya, 1925-52* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2000); Suke Wolton, *Lord Hailey, the Colonial Office and the Politics of Race and Empire in the Second World War: The Loss of White Prestige* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000); *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge*, ed. Helen Tilley and Robert J Gordon (New York: Palgrave, 2007); Joseph Morgan Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2007); Joseph Morgan Hodge, "British Colonial Expertise, Post-colonial Careering and the Early History of International Development", *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 24-46.; Marc Matera, "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain", *Journal of British Studies* 49, no. 2 (2010): doi:10.1086/649838. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/649838; Helen Tilley, *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Bennett and Hodge, eds, *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science Across the British Empire, 1800-1970*.

8 The one major exception is the work of Frederick Cooper: Frederick Cooper, *Decolonization and African Society: The Labor Question in French and British Africa* (Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Frederick Cooper, "Development, Modernization, and the Social Sciences in the Era of Decolonization: The Examples of British and French Africa", *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines* , no. 1 (2004): 9-38.

9 For the United States, example include Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); S M Amadae, *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Alex Abella, *Soldiers of Reason: The Rand Corporation*

Britain also largely ignores decolonization.[10] My work adds to our understanding of the mid-twentieth century by exploring the relationship between the social sciences, decolonization and Cold War, partly by linking the history of the social sciences to the growing historiography on late imperial security.[11] It is particularly important to understand this history because both the politics of knowledge creation, and the forms of knowledge which were created about global modernity were very different in the British case than the American. Despite the unignorable influence of modernization theory in other of the British social sciences, social anthropology developed a quite different approach to the study of the modern. The history of these developments allows us to rethink the relationship between anthropological research and modernity as a conceptual, practical and political problem.[12]

While my project is not the history of a discipline, it draws from and extends the rich literature on the history of anthropology. The centrality of anthropology in British intellectual life, and the broadness of "anthropology" as a category, means its history has attracted considerable scholarly attention. Again, the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have been well served by complex, nuanced accounts of the intellectual development and its social and political contexts.[13] However, because the accounts which deal with the interwar years end with World War Two, they necessarily de-emphasize the continuities with the postwar, which include the study of the contemporary: they are more concerned with the changing attitudes to the primitive.[14] With some notable exceptions historians have done much less work on the postwar period—and again, in particular on the question of decolonization.[15] Intellectual histories by anthropologists have periodized a "classic" period of British social anthropology from the 1920s

---

and the Rise of the American Empire (Orlando: Harcourt, Inc., 2008); On American anthropology specifically, see David H Price, *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); William J Peace and David H Price, "The Cold War Context of the FBI's Investigation of Leslie A. White:New Series", *American Anthropologist* 103, no. 1 (2001): 164-167; George W. Stocking, "Unfinished Business: Robert Gelston Armstrong, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the History of Anthropology at Chicago and in Nigeria," in *Central Sites, Peripheral Visions*, ed. Richard Handler (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006); Peter Mandler, "One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology", *History Workshop Journal* 68 (2009): 149-172; Peter Mandler, "Margaret Mead Amongst the Natives of Great Britain", *Past & Present* 204, no. 1 (2009): 195-233. See also David H. Price, *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

10 E. g. Michael Savage, *Identities and Social Change in Britain Since 1940: The Politics of Method* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010); David Edgerton, *Warfare State: Britain, 1920-1970* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Dennis Dworkin, *Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left, and the Origins of Cultural Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997). David Mills, *Difficult Folk?: A Political History of Social Anthropology* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008).The major exception is Jordanna Bailkin, *The Afterlife of Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012). See also Jed Esty, *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004).. Another frame in which these issues have been discussed is that of "declinism": see Hall, Ian, *Dilemmas of Decline: British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975* (2012).

11 Christopher Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5* (New York, 2009); Priya Satia, *Spies in Arabia: The Great War and the Cultural Foundations of Britain's Covert Empire in the Middle East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Benjamin John Grob-Fitzgibbon, *Imperial Endgame: Britain's Dirty Wars and the End of Empire* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Thomas, Martin, *Empires of Intelligence: Security Services and Colonial Disorder After 1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

12 Lynn Thomas, "Modernity's Failings, Political Claims, and Intermediate Concepts", *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 3 (2011): 727-740; *African Modernities*, ed. Jan-Georg Deutsh, Peter Probst and Heike Schmidt (Oxford: James Currey, 2002); *The British Intellectual Engagement with Africa in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Douglas Rimmer and Anthony Kirk-Green (New York: St. Martin's Press in association with the Royal African Society, 2000).

13 Burrow, *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*; Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*; James Urry, *Before Social Anthropology: Essays on the History of British Anthropology* (Chur; Philadelphia: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1993).

14 Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*; George W Stocking, *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888-1951* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995).

15 Exceptions are Lyn Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Mills, *Difficult Folk*.

to the 1970s; again, the effects of decolonization have been neglected, while their articulation of continuity has led them to emphasize the generation and adoption of a certain "paradigm."[16]

I add to recent work which complicates our understanding of British anthropology by interleaving intellectual, social and political history through a detailed and fine-grained narrative, paying particular attention to the actual situations in which specific forms of knowledge was produced.[17] I have drawn extensively on existing work on both various aspects of Gluckman and the Manchester School,[18] and particularly that which links Gluckman to anthropology in South Africa.[19] In bringing these strands together with the archival material to show the importance of the anthropology of the contemporary world, I have argued against the prevailing view that social anthropology established a single paradigm in the interwar period, and that the postwar lacks a history because it simply followed that paradigm.[20]

Archives and methods

The central component of my research was the opening up of a previously closed archive. My main set of sources was found in the personal archive of Max Gluckman, now housed at the Royal Anthropological Institute in London. I was the first researcher to work on this archive, which was completely uncatalogued and unsorted when I began. I worked on the archive for ten months, sorting, cataloguing and investigating it, in co-operation with the resident archivist, Sarah Walpole. Ronald Frankenberg, a surviving member of the Manchester School, also helped me to understand this material. I have also consulted archives at Rhodes House, Oxford, the University of Manchester, the British Library (Newspapers Collection), the London School of Economics, and the National Archives of Britain and Australia. I draw on a broad range of sources from these archives, including correspondence within the group and with other social scientists, government agencies, and academic and funding institutions; field-notes and diaries; unpublished drafts and papers; research proposals; newspaper reports; memoirs and interviews; memos from various metropolitan and colonial government agencies, and secret security reports.

I have combined my archival research with an immersive study of the published texts of the Manchester School, and those they drew from and influenced. My general approach has been to begin with the intellectual production, and then, through the archival and other sources, to determine the conditions of its possibility. I have paid close attention to ideas, but also to the institutions and networks in which they were generated. To this end I have traced the work and careers of individual anthropologists in detail, in order to show the structural conditions of possibility under which the intellectual production was carried out. This is particularly important

---

16 Adam Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School* (London: Routledge, 1996); Jack Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

17 Peter Pels and Oscar Salemink, *Colonial Subjects: Essays on the Practical History of Anthropology* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development"; *Empires, Nations, and Natives: Anthropology and State-making*, ed. Benoît de L'Estoile, Federico G Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge*; Tilley, *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950*.

18 Richard Brown, "Passages in the Life of a White Anthropologist: Max Gluckman in Northern Rhodesia", *The Journal of African History* 20, no. 4 (1979): doi:10.2307/181776; Ulf Hannerz, *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward An Urban Anthropology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980); Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology*; Joan Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990); Mills, *Difficult Folk*; T. M S. Evens and Don Handelman, *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006).

19 Paul Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940", *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27, no. 4 (2001): doi:10.2307/823411; Adam Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa: An Inside Job* (African Studies Center, Boston University, 1998); Hugh Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society", *African Affairs* 94, no. 374 (1995): 39-65.

20 Henrika Kuklick, "The British Tradition," in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick (Oxford, 2008).

for social anthropologists because of their insistence on participant-observer method, involving the need to travel and to live in their field-sites for extended periods.

Ultimately, I aim to show how certain kinds of subjects were constructed, and certain imaginings of the social enabled, through tracing specific networks in which modes of knowledge were generated in the late and decolonizing British Empire. In the process I demonstrate how conceptual formations and research practices were shaped by specific political contexts. A detailed understanding of the way in which anthropologists circulated—and were prevented from circulating—through specific networks, institutions and fieldsites shows how anthropological knowledge was generated, constrained and channeled in certain directions. Decentering the metropole by following anthropologists through local situations and regional imperial circuits, shows how social anthropology was constructed in the circulations of anthropologists through concrete situations, and shows how intellectual and political projects were intertwined. Tracing these anthropological work-lives through the complex circuits of a fragmenting empire with multiple centers of power, and across the period of late colonialism and decolonization, disrupts both the metropole/colony and the colonial/postcolonial distinction: two binaries which have structured our understanding of the production of social knowledge in the middle fifty years of the twentieth century.

Chapter One

Social Anthropology, South Africa, and the Modern World, 1922-1938

> There was a time when social anthropology could and did define itself unambiguously as the study of primitive societies. … The anthropologist now is someone who studies societies both 'simple' and 'complex' …
> (Talal Asad, 1973)[1]

> Anthropology, which used to be the study of beings and things retarded, gradual and backward, is now faced with the difficult task of recording how the 'savage' becomes an active participant in modern civilization, how the African and Asiatic are being rapidly drawn into partnership with the European in world-wide co-operation and conflict.
> (Bronislaw Malinowski, 1938)[2]

At the entrance to the Royal Anthropological Institute in London is displayed a well-known quotation by Bronislaw Malinowski: "[t]he anthropologist is now faced with the tragic situation which has often been bewailed in lecture-rooms and in print ... [j]ust as we have reached a certain academic status and developed our methods and theories, our subject-matter threatens to disappear."[3] As presented, the quotation is easily taken simply as another example of the lament to which it refers, made presumably as an argument for the project known as "salvage anthropology," or the urgent need to record rapidly vanishing "primitive" ways of life. But what is less well known is that the original, published text continues, "[i]nstead, however, of lamenting the inevitable, we must face the new, more complex and more difficult task which history has set before us, the task that is of building new methods and new principles of research in order to reclaim the 'anthropological no-man's-land' and take up the 'new branch of anthropology ... the anthropology of the changing native.'"[4] Malinowski had in fact revalorized the perceived rapid disappearance of traditional cultures: far from being the discipline's most urgent task, primitivist salvage anthropology was to be abandoned in favor of the study of contemporary change, which was now to be social anthropology's central project.

At the time of this statement (1938) Malinowski was the single most important figure in British anthropology. Indeed, in the history of anthropological thought Malinowski is regarded as the "mythic" founder of the new discipline of social anthropology, which transformed Western

---

1 Talal Asad, ed., *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*, 11-12.

2 Bronislaw Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures," in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa* (London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), vii.

3 Ibid., xii.

4 Ibid., xii. The direct quotes within the passage are from his own lecture of 1928 as published in 1929, in which he had first argued for the "anthropology of the changing native" as a new branch of anthropological study. He added that these hopes had been "but a pious wish" at that time. Bronislaw Malinowski, "Practical Anthropology", *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 2, no. 1 (1929): doi:10.2307/1155162.

understanding of non-Western societies in the interwar period.[5] His turn to the study of the "changing native" was therefore highly significant. Nor was he alone in his view that anthropology must deal with contemporary global transformations. The other acknowledged founding-figure of social anthropology, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, also advocated the application of anthropological knowledge to contemporary social problems, albeit in a more limited register. This strand of his thought was most evident during his tenure at the University of Cape Town in the early 1920s, and the seeds which Radcliffe-Brown planted there came to fuller fruition in the South Africa of the 1930s, when a cohort of liberal social anthropologists, themselves highly significant in the history of anthropology, took it as given that their anthropological work would be about contemporary developments in various kinds of African societies.

These facts stand in contradistinction to the continued acceptance of a certain received conception of anthropology, that it was essentially primitivist during the colonial period, and unable to conceive of non-Europeans as contemporary to the modern world until after decolonization.[6] To a large extent these claims have become a basic element of the received view of colonial anthropology.[7] This binary colonial/postcolonial conception is exacerbated by a unilinear understanding of the discipline's development: if colonial anthropology was primitivist, then *a fortiori* so must have been its earliest formulations, in the work of its founders Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, who constructed a synchronic structural-functionalism which denied Europe's others "co-evalness" with European civilization.[8]

Against this view, this chapter aims to chart the extent of, and limitations to, the anthropology of the modern or contemporary in the interwar period. I hope to show that the study of the contemporary was much more important to interwar anthropology than has been generally recognized. Furthermore, I argue that it was intrinsic to social anthropology. The urge to understand non-Europeans as modern emerged from the very matrix of imperial circulations and imperial institutions which formed the discipline itself. Furthermore, it arose not in contradiction to, but directly out of, the specific theory and methods of social anthropology: specifically, participant-observer fieldwork and totalistic social analysis.

To a certain extent this is a history hiding in plain sight. Many of the separate elements discussed in this chapter have been discussed under highly varied rubrics. So, historians have debated Malinowski's shift to "practical anthropology," or the attempts of South African anthropologists to critique segregationism, without considering their significance for interwar anthropology as a whole.[9] These developments have therefore been marginalized in both critiques of the discipline, and in disciplinary history. When anti-primitivist tendencies have been noted, they have often been characterized as side-lines or dead-ends, or seen as cynical attempts

---

5 On Malinowski as "mythic" founder see Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. Cf. Stocking, *After Tylor*.

6 See e. g. Jonathan Spencer, "Modernism, Modernity and Modernization," in *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (New York: Routledge, 1996).

7 A significant exception is Joan Vincent, "Functionalism Revisited: An Unsettled Science", *Reviews in Anthropology* 13, no. 4 (1986): doi:10.1080/00988157.1986.9977795. Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends*. For highly nuanced and comprehensive treatments of anthropology in the colonial era, upon which I have drawn extensively, see Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*. Stocking, *After Tylor*. Recently Peter Mandler has discussed American cultural anthropology's shift to "complex" societies in two articles: Mandler, "Margaret Mead Amongst the Natives of Great Britain"; Mandler, "One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology".

8 Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

9 Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*.; Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940"; de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development"; Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*; Tilley, *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950*.

to win funding. Debates about the nature of anthropology's subject matter have been reduced to the question of the nature of "practical" or "applied" anthropology, and its relation to the "pure" intellectual concerns of the discipline, which have been assumed to be primarily primitivist.[10] Furthermore, approached from the point of view of internal disciplinary history, anti-primitivist projects have been seen as failed projects or dead-ends, as by the 1960s social anthropology had indeed become largely primitivist. In the case of Malinowski, his culture contact work has been denigrated, as the specific methods he advocated were ultimately neither as influential nor as intellectually powerful as his ethnographic work on the Trobriands.[11] However this teleological approach does a disservice to the social anthropology of the 1930s. Taking a more historicist approach allows a very different picture to emerge. It may be impossible to escape teleology completely, but I have tried here to present the developments of the 1920s and 1930s in their own terms, in order to understand anthropology as a field of conflicting thought about how to think through the relationship between the West and the rest of the world.

Two points on terminology.

First, I have not defined the terms "modern" and "contemporary" here. Rather I have tried to show the very varied ways in which interwar anthropologists attempted to understand their objects of study as being in any way contemporaneous to Western or European society, or part of a wider modern world. They were not terms used in any technical sense by the subjects of this chapter. Similarly, when I use the term "primitivism," it is meant to indicate the representation in a general sense of non-Europeans as essentially "other" to the modern world, but is not meant to indicate a positive value judgment over such a state, although certainly romanticization of the primitive was sometimes a significant aspect of social anthropology.

Second, I sometimes use the term "discipline" with regard to social anthropology. By this I usually mean a specific cluster of methods, texts and personnel. It does not refer to an academic discipline in any settled sense. Because discipline formation in the highly dynamic interwar period is a crucially formative element of my story, what "academic discipline" means cannot be taken for granted. After World War Two social anthropology became hugely successful as a discipline, both by spreading to universities across Britain and the (ex-)Empire, and in almost completely distancing itself from previously related disciplines such as archaeology and physical anthropology. In the interwar period social anthropology was both less and more than an academic discipline in the postwar sense: less because of its very narrow institutional base, but more because in this period it became the key intellectual space in which various issues could be thought through, including the nature of cultural, racial, or social difference; the meaning of the social and the relationship of the individual to society; and the changing relationship between the primitive and the modern. Nor do I understand interwar social anthropology as a single object, with a single coherent paradigm. Beyond the minimal core methods of participant-observer research and totalistic analysis of some kind—attributes which themselves were subject to significant variation—it is more useful to see it as a field containing many internal contradictions and forces pushing in many possible directions. Indeed, such contradictions can be easily

---

10 See e. g. Nicholas Thomas, *Out of Time: History and Evolution in Anthropological Discourse* (Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 6.

11 Indeed Kuper has suggested that it was Malinowski's intellectual failure which led to the re-primitivization of the discipline: "his theory of culture change was so unsatisfactory that the impetus he gave to the study of colonial realities was gravely impaired" Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 32. On the focus of attention in Malinowski scholarship on his earlier years to the detriment of his later work, see Paul Cocks, "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa", *History of the Human Sciences* 13, no. 4 (2000): doi:10.1177/09526950022120854.

observed within the work of any one of the figures discussed here. Anthropologists were often confused about the nature of their task and the implications of their methods: about whether to emphasize difference or deny it; about whether to attempt to reconstruct pre-contact societies, or focus on the contact situation; about how to contain Western and non-Western elements within a single conceptual field; and about how to analyze social structure and rapid social change. This confusion is an important part of the story.

I

Social anthropology began to coalesce around the time of World War One.[12] 1922 is often taken as a foundational date.[13] In that year the most important living anthropologist, W. H. R. Rivers, died, and the two key founding works of social anthropology were published: A. R. Radcliffe-Brown's *The Andaman Islanders* and Bronislaw Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*.[14] In reality the chronology is of course less clean-cut. The key elements of the new discipline had in fact begun to be developed before World War One: in the reception of Durkheimian social theory, and the early development of lone participant-observer fieldwork.[15] Furthermore earlier evolutionist and diffusionist paradigms continued throughout the interwar period. However there is much to be said for seeing the early 1920s as a marked turning point. A new approach to the study of non-Europeans was being clearly articulated, and through the 1920s and 1930s it continued to grow in both intellectual influence and institutional success, both inside and outside the academic sphere.

A year earlier Radcliffe-Brown had been appointed to the first Chair in Social Anthropology anywhere in the British Empire, at the University of Cape Town, in a new School of African Life and Languages.[16] Having studied at Cambridge, Radcliffe-Brown held a fellowship there from 1908 to 1914, before serving as director of education in Tonga; after Cape Town he held Chairs in Sydney (1926-1931), Chicago (1931-1937) and Oxford (1937-1946), and visiting appointments in Yanjing, São Paolo, Rhodes University and, in the early 1950s, Manchester.[17] This peripatetic career well illustrates that the colonial human sciences were not simply a matter of metropolitan science working on colonial subjects; rather, there was an ongoing and dialectical interaction between metropolitan, trans-imperial, international, and colonial institutions and networks.

South Africa in particular was a key locus for the creation of social anthropology. Radcliffe-Brown's years in Cape Town, 1921 to 1926, were critical for his development of a new

---

12 Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945,* 92. Cf. Stocking, *After Tylor* Chapters Four and Six.

13 See Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*.

14 A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *The Andaman Islanders: A Study in Social Anthropology* (Cambridge: The University press, 1922); Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific; An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea,* (London; New York: G. Routledge & Sons; E.P. Dutton & Co., 1922). On the immediate impact of *The Andaman Islanders,* see Stocking, *After Tylor*.

15 Furthermore both evolutionism and diffusionism continued throughout the interwar period: in particular the diffusionism of Grafton Elliot Smith and William James Perry at University College, London.

16 Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 3. J. G. Frazer, author of *The Golden Bough* (originally published in two volumes in 1890, James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (London: Macmillan, 1890)., had briefly served as honorary Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Liverpool 1907-1908, but "social anthropology" did not then have the connotation of a radical disciplinary break. See M. N. Srinivas, Introduction to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), xii.

17 Kenneth Maddock, 'Brown, Alfred Reginald Radcliffe- (1881–1955)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37877, accessed 26 May 2012].

paradigm. He published a seminal series of papers, which first presented what one eminent anthropologist later called "some of his most fertile contributions to social anthropology."[18] These included several major statements of both his methods and their political implications. Radcliffe-Brown's time at Cape Town firmly established a social anthropological tradition in South Africa, which would be further developed by his students A. W. Hoernlé and Isaac Schapera.

It was no coincidence that the nascent discipline attained its first Chair in South Africa, which provided a broad array of African societies as fields of study, established academic institutions and infrastructures, and funding and practical support for research. It was also a politically autonomous, yet still internally colonial, society which increasingly demanded scientific expertise in the service of its particular political and economic challenges. *De facto* independence in 1910, as an autonomous Dominion of the British Commonwealth, had created a new, supposedly liberal and democratic polity, faced with difficult questions about the universality of liberal subjectivity. These problems were exacerbated after World War One with accelerating industrialization and concomitant labor migration, urbanization and politicization of Black workers. Increasingly the key political question was no longer the relationship between "Boer" and "Briton," but between "White" and "Black."[19] The crisis in the "Native question" was brought to a head with Prime Minister Jan Smuts' Native Affairs Act of 1920, which established a certain degree of autonomy for the reserves, under a Native Affairs Commission, but also instituted political segregation.[20] The early 1920s saw increasingly racialized violent clashes between labor and police.[21]

Radcliffe-Brown's appointment was partly the result of this growing crisis. For decades there had been calls for the application of anthropological knowledge to problems of governance,[22] but under the conditions of early 1920s, and allied to an expanding university system, there was a growing urge to approach the "Native Question" as a scientific or technical question rather than a political one.[23] Liberal academics and politicians lobbied for the establishment of African Studies within the expanding university system. This lobbying was ultimately successful after the Cambridge anthropologist A. C. Haddon,[24] leader of the famous Torres Straits expedition of 1898-9, wrote to Prime Minister Jan Smuts at Radcliffe-Brown's urging, to advocate social research both in the interests of science and for "the advantage which would accrue to the Government for the purpose of administration in having authoritative

---

18 Meyer Fortes called them "a series of papers embodying some of his most fertile contributions to social anthropology." Meyer Fortes, Preface, in Fortes, ed., *Social Structure: Studies presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), x.

19 See Saul Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), 4.

20 See Kuper, *Anthropology in South Afric,* 3. The crisis in Native policy occurred within a broader context of destabilization and radicalization of South African politics after the War: see Leonard Monteath Thompson, *A History of South Africa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 159.

21 Including the massacre of Africans by police at Bulhoek in 1921, and strikes by White miners in 1922. See Stocking, *After Tylor,* 325. Cf. Robert Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa", *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 15-48.

22 Ibid.

23 On the differing political ends of the claim to be scientific, see W. D. Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1997), 20-21; Adam Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-century South Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). Paul Rich, *Hope and Despair: English-speaking Intellectuals and South African Politics, 1896-1976* (New York: British Academic Press, 1993); Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36*. Cocks, for example, argues that while at first politicians sought a scientific justification for segregation, later liberal social anthropologists adopted scientism in order to refute segregation. Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940", 742-3.

24 Haddon, leader of the famous Torres Straits expedition of 1898-9, a key moment in the re-orientation of anthropology towards fieldwork, was then Reader in Ethnology in the University of Cambridge.

information concerning the sociology, manners and customs, and religion of the various tribes."[25]

In several respects Radcliffe-Brown was to fulfill these demands for useful expertise, as we shall see below. However his own primary concern was not to generate expertise in the service of governance, but to establish social anthropology as a radical break with anthropology's past. The tension between these two goals is evident in the first programmatic statement of the new discipline, delivered in 1923 as the Presidential Address to Section E of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science.[26] This paper, "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology," has been called the "charter … of modern British social anthropology."[27] In it, Radcliffe-Brown walked a fine line between advocating the usefulness of anthropological knowledge and distancing the academic subject from its applications, a strategic positioning which signals a deep ambivalence about whether native populations should be understood as essentially modern or primitive.

The claim to be scientific was fundamental to Radcliffe-Brown's rejection of extant modes of anthropological thought, which he termed "conjectural history." Radcliffe-Brown distanced social anthropology from existing approaches, including the German "'geographical' school," British diffusionists such as Perry and Elliot-Smith, and American cultural anthropology.[28] His most sustained attack was on social evolutionism, the dominant post-Darwinian paradigm, which explained cultural difference in terms of unilinear progress. Radcliffe-Brown argued that the Darwinian revolution had transformed anthropological thought, but in an incomplete and distorted fashion. Rather than understanding the diversity of social and cultural phenomena in terms of adaptation to specific ecologies following "specific principles or laws," anthropologists had instead interpreted evolution as stadial development, based perhaps on evolutionary science's use of the stratified evidence of geology.[29] Social evolutionists had therefore mistakenly aimed "not to discover fundamental laws operating in the development of culture, but to show that their development had been a process by which human society passed through a number of stages or phases."[30] Furthermore, this development was assumed to be unilinear, "so that any culture high up in the series may be assumed to have passed through stages which are represented by those lower in the series."[31] He argued against this conception both deductively from his understanding of Darwinism, and empirically, as unilinear social evolution had "become more and more difficult to defend as our knowledge of the peoples of the earth and the diversity of their culture has increased."[32]

Ultimately, the social evolutionists had erred in "seeking, not for laws, but for origins."[33] Social anthropology was defined, in opposition to this "conjectural history," as "the purely inductive study of the phenomena of culture, aiming at the discovery of general laws, and

---

25 Haddon to Smuts, April 16th, 1920, quoted in Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa*. The extent to which Smuts then influenced the appointment of Radcliffe-Brown himself has been debated but seems refuted by Isaac Schapera: Isaac Schapera, "The Appointment of Radcliffe-Brown to the Chair of Social Anthropology at the University of Cape Town", *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 1-14. Smuts himself was an intellectual and interested in ethnological problems, albeit in the service of his own evolutionary philosophy. See Peder Anker, *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945* (Harvard University Press, 2001).

26 Reprinted in Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays*.

27 "If any single essay can be called the charter--to use a favorite word of Malinowski--of modern British social anthropology, it is undoubtedly 'The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology.' It was a charter of revolt when it first made its appearance." M. N. Srinivas, "Introduction" to Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology,* xii.

28 Ibid., 11-16.

29 Ibid., 9-10.

30 Ibid., 9.

31 Ibid., 10.

32 Ibid., 10.

33 Ibid., 19.

adapting to its special subject matter the ordinary logical methods of the natural sciences."[34] Radcliffe-Brown defined social anthropology as a nomothetic science of social and cultural phenomena, following a method modeled on that of the natural sciences, yet with a distinct content irreducible to biological, or indeed psychological foundations.[35] Following Durkheim, he argued that it was inappropriate to explain social phenomena in terms of either biological or psychological causes: they were a separate sphere of natural reality and required their own laws.[36] The social was therefore marked out from other spheres of reality, and was to be understood holistically: "[t]he object of our study is the process as a whole and the individuals do not concern us except in so far as they necessarily enter into that process."[37] Social anthropology was to deal with "the behaviour of groups or collective bodies of individuals in its relation to the group,"[38] and social phenomena were to be explained not in terms of their origins, but in terms of their "meaning" or "function" for the contemporary social life of the group.[39]

Radcliffe-Brown combined these elements of Durkheimian social theory with the distinctive empiricism of the British anthropological fieldwork tradition, as it had developed and culminated with Radcliffe-Brown's mentor at Cambridge, and most famous anthropologist of his generation, W. H. R. Rivers.[40] The team-based Torres Straits expedition of 1899 had methodologically aligned anthropology with the developing field sciences, a move which undermined the authority of Victorian "armchair anthropologists," who synthesized the contributions of overseas informants such as missionaries, colonial officers and settlers. Radcliffe-Brown fully endorsed the centrality of fieldwork to anthropology, "as an inductive science must rely solely on facts, and on well-authenticated observations of the facts."[41] Such observations could no longer be left to amateurs. He also agreed with Rivers that research was best undertaken by a lone anthropologist-fieldworker, rather than an interdisciplinary team. Social phenomena were even harder to observe properly than physical phenomena: therefore research should be conducted by specially trained ethnographers. Furthermore, in order for working hypotheses to be tested and modified, a combined process of observation and hypothesis was necessary, which could only take place in the field.[42] The social anthropologist must therefore be "trained not only in the scientific methods of ethnographical observation that have been worked out in the last quarter of a century by the late Dr. Rivers and others, but also in the whole theory of social anthropology" and "must be prepared to spend some years of his life living in as intimate a contact as possible with the people or peoples whom he is to study."[43]

This epistemological break would lead to radical transformations in anthropology's understanding of its subjects of research, and their relationship to the anthropologist's own society. The question of the relationship between the modern and the primitive—indeed, why Britain was modern when most of the world was not—was a central aspect of anthropology for

---

34 Ibid., 25.
35 Ibid., 7.
36 Ibid., 16. On Radcliffe-Brown's debt to Durkheim, and his status as one of the first to introduce Durkheim into British social thought, see Stocking, "Dr. Durkheim and Mr. Brown" in George W Stocking, *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology* (University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).
37 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays,* 17.
38 Ibid., 17.
39 Ibid., 31.
40 For a detailed analysis of the development of fieldwork methods with specific attention to anthropology, see Henrika Kuklick, "Personal Equations: Reflections on the History of Fieldwork, with Special Reference to Sociocultural Anthropology", *Isis* 102, no. 1 (2011): 1-33.
41 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays*, 26.
42 Ibid., 34.
43 Ibid., 34f.

social evolutionists, such as Herbert Spencer.[44] The fundamental principles of evolutionism, the "psychic unity of mankind" and "independent invention," held that mankind everywhere possessed the same creative capacities, which meant that, conditions being equal, social development would follow a single line, the *telos* of which was the modern European industrial nation-state. Furthermore, irrational elements in modern society could be explained as anachronistic survivals from a less rational stage of society. As all societies would therefore progress along the same line, comparison could then be made not only between current societies (civilized and primitive) but also between contemporary and historic civilizations. By conflating spatial, temporal and cultural distance, social evolutionism therefore allowed anthropologists to fit heterogeneous cultural data into a single framework, and fit societies at different stages of progress into a universal history.

Social anthropology rejected this conflation of temporal and cultural distance. Radcliffe-Brown presented social anthropology as the scientific study of present-day conditions rather than primitive origins.[45] Empirical fieldwork focused on the contemporary everyday, and social institutions were explained in terms of contemporary function rather than historical origin. The marking out of the study of the social as an autonomous sphere also undermined certain possibilities for the radical "othering" of non-Europeans. The disciplinary break with physical anthropology led to the complete rejection of biological race as a category for understanding human behavior, while the rejection of psychologistic explanations of social phenomena precluded the construction of difference in terms of "primitive mentality."[46] Sociocultural difference was to be understood primarily in terms of social structure, the varieties of which were brought about by adaptation to particular circumstances.[47] An understanding of the laws of social change, and the ways in which societies adapt to specific conditions, meant that each society had to be understood in terms of its own specific development, rather than following a predetermined stadial progression towards the condition of modernity.[48]

The scientism which was central to the epistemological break also allowed him to position anthropology as useful in the generation of expertise applicable to contemporary political problems. Just as the discovery of physical and chemical laws had led to technological advances, and just as psychology's apparent success in discovering "laws of the human mind" held the promise of advances in education, so "the discovery of the fundamental laws that govern the behaviour of human societies and the development of social institutions —law, morals, religion, art, language, etc. —will have great and wide-reaching results on the future of mankind."[49] This would enable something like social engineering in the face of the crisis of civilization, through the rational understanding of "the laws of social development ... and a control over ... social forces."[50] Such engineering was justified by an appeal to a shared sense of dissatisfaction with

---

44 See Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology,* 1-6. For a concise explanation of social evolutionism's main concepts see Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945* 78-89. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* Chapter Five, gives a detailed exposition of the development of anthropology after Darwin, including a discussion of the problems of locating a coherent "paradigm" among social evolutionists.

45 Adam Kuper has therefore described this lecture as distinguishing anthropology as a "sociology of the present" from "the speculative history of the evolutionists and diffusionists." Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 4.

46 In all of these aspects, Radcliffe-Brown was rejecting the approach of his mentor, W. H. R. Rivers. As Srinivas points out, Rivers, who died in 1922, was still the most important figure in British anthropology.

47 This is not to suggest that "society," "culture" or "civilization" could not come to be essentialized as categories of difference. Q.v. Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940", 741-2. Cf. Richard King, *Race, Culture and the Intellectuals*.

48 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays,* 10.

49 Ibid., 25.

50 Ibid., 30.

contemporary society.[51] Meanwhile, more immediate benefits would accrue in terms of the contemporary problem of "the adjustment of the native civilization to the new conditions that have resulted from our occupation of the country."[52] The understanding of social institutions in terms of their contemporary meaning or function, rather than their origins, would help administrators to predict the likely impact of proposed reforms.[53]

Thus in "The Mother's Brother in South Africa"—a seminal demonstration of the "scientific" analysis of atemporal kinship structure as a radical break with evolutionism—Radcliffe-Brown claimed his problem had been selected because it was "not only of theoretical but also of practical interest."[54] The functional analysis of kinship structure was "of considerable practical importance at the present time to missionaries and magistrates, and to the natives themselves"[55]: in this particular case, it was necessary in order to interpret *lobola* marriage payments, which had recently become the subject of a case at the Native Appeal Court. Science could lead to more enlightened policy, and current political concerns could influence the choice of research subject.

In these ways Radcliffe-Brown's presentism therefore aimed to satisfy the demand for anthropology as scientific expertise. This expertise was disseminated in various ways: in his teaching, in his role as a public intellectual, and in his theoretical statements on the discipline. According to Lucy Mair, a student of Malinowski in the 1930s and a leading proponent of "applied" anthropology, Radcliffe-Brown's South African teaching was "the first academic couse of lectures in which the modern phenomena of change in small-scale societies formed the central theme."[56] He also taught a summer school for officials and missionaries.[57] A broader audience was reached through frequent public lectures and speeches, disseminated through newspaper reports, which discussed broad anthropological questions in a popular mode.[58] He also gave talks to educational and social welfare organizations,[59] and served as vice-chairman of the Cape Peninsula Native Welfare Society. According to Meyer Fortes, Radcliffe-Brown deemed it necessary to persuade the "educated public" of the value of social anthropology, partly in order to gain support and funding for research, but also as part of "a personal crusade," corresponding to his "long-term" hope for a socially transformative science of society.[60]

In these forays he repeatedly drew on his status as an anthropological expert to comment critically on contemporary political and cultural issues. Radcliffe-Brown repeatedly criticized both the proselytizing universalism of Christian missions, and the legalistic universalism of the

---

51 "Who of us is there at the present time who does not feel that there are many things in the civilization of to-day that would be better changed or abolished? ... Let us first recognize our own ignorance and the need of knowledge more than empirical, and let us set to work to accumulate that knowledge by patient study, in the faith that future generations will be able to apply it in the building of a civilization nearer to our heart's desire.": Ibid., 30-31. On the pervasive sense of crisis between wars see R. J. Overy, *The Morbid Age: Britain Between the Wars* (New York: Allen Lane, 2009).

52 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays* 32.

53 Ibid., 31-32.

54 "The Mother's Brother in South Africa," reprinted in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society, Essays and Addresses* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952), 30.

55 Ibid., 30.

56 Lucy Mair, "Anthropology As a Public Service and Malinowski's Contribution to It," in *Man and Culture; An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski*, ed. Raymond Firth (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1957), 230. Robert Gordon claims his courses were not very popular, only fify-nine students completing his first year course, and only five going on to the second year: Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa", 22-3.

57 Apparently the latter were much more enthusiastic about coming than the former. Indeed, "South Africa was the only modern colonial power which did not require some form of specialist training for its Native Affairs bureaucrats": Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa", 20. Apparently, officials who completed the diploma course were actually discriminated against. Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa", 20, citing Schapera.

58 See Stocking, *After Tylor* 326.

59 *Social Structure: Studies Presented to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown*, ed. Meyer Fortes (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1949), x.

60 Ibid., x.

administration.[61] This was evident as early as his inaugural lecture at Cape Town. Taking the example of infanticide of twins, he pointed out the mother who failed to kill her twins would be ostracized by her tribe; therefore white law was incapable of acting as a deterrent and only put her in an impossible position.[62] This kind of ethical relativism has been taken as evidence of social anthropology's ideological compatibility with indirect rule; as we shall see, a similar cultural relativism was later used by Afrikaner anthropologists to justify segregation. But for Radcliffe-Brown there were two checks to a strong, and therefore potentially separatist, cultural relativism. First, functional analysis offered an objective way to judge the value of social institutions, in terms of whether or not they contributed to social equilibrium, or the health of the social organism. Second, he recognized that native societies were in fact being radically transformed by the presence of European political economy. Again, this was explained in functional terms: because one aspect of native life (the economic) was being changed, all other aspects must necessarily follow: "no social system could remain the same in this country ... the social system of a people could not be altered in one respect without altering it as a whole."[63] The functional approach to the social was therefore compatible with the study of African cultures as contemporary with "modern" European society, and could be used to acknowledge the centrality of change in African societies.[64] The strongest indication of this came in Radcliffe-Brown's use of functional theory to claim that South Africa formed "one whole society,"[65] and that "[s]egregation was impossible"[66]: statements which would form foundational truths for the next generation of South African social anthropologists.

However Radcliffe-Brown's scientism also cut in another direction, through his insistence on a clear distinction between "pure" and "applied" science. The anthropologist should engage in the former, through which he would generate a body of knowledge and theory which would then be useful to the missionary, educator, administrator and magistrate.[67] This strategic move allowed him to negotiate the dual goals of discipline formation and public utility without becoming embroiled in specific political controversies.[68] However, several factors led Radcliffe-Brown to conflate "pure" anthropological research with a focus on the most exotic and "primitive" aspects of African societies, and his substantive work in South Africa developed a primitivist structuralism which constructed atemporal discrete tribal societies.[69] Partly this was a legacy of the holism derived from the French sociology of the *Année Sociologique*. His highly influential monograph, *The Andaman Islanders*, was based around a functional problem typical of the thought of Henri Hubert and Émile Durkheim: "the problem of the nature of social integration."[70] This functional analysis tended to reify societies as organic wholes, as did the comparative nature of Radcliffe-Brown's project, which depended on discrete social entities for its basic material. As Meyer Fortes later put it, "general laws can only be discovered by the

---

61 Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa".

62 Radcliffe-Brown, "Anthropology as a Science," 1921 lecture, reported in *Cape Times*, 23 August 1921, reprinted as A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "Anthropology As a Science", *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 35-39.

63 Ibid., 36.

64 Cf. Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990,* 32: "If the focus is switched to social change ... the model becomes a radical one."

65 See Adam Kuper, "'Today We Have Naming of Parts': The Work of Anthropologists in Southern Africa," in *Empires, Nations and Natives: Anthropology and State-Making*, ed. Benoît de L'Estoile, Federico Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2005) for the history of the idea of South Africa as a single society.

66 Radcliffe-Brown, "Anthropology As a Science".

67 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays,* 32.

68 Stocking, *After Tylor,* 328.

69 As indicated by the very title of his best-known collection of articles: Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society.*

70 Radcliffe-Brown, *The Andaman Islanders: A Study in Social Anthropology,* ix.

comparative study of diverse types of society, or of variant 'species' of one social type."[71] This comparativist functionalism tended to focus on the most exotic and seemingly primitive aspects of non-Western societies. This tendency was ironically exacerbated by the recognition that African societies were undergoing rapid change, and often total destruction, with "the spread of the white race and of European civilization over the world."[72] The most urgent task was to focus on what was being lost, rather than what was being brought into being.

As we have seen, Radcliffe-Brown presented the break with "conjectural history" as a reorientation towards the empirical and scientific study of existing conditions. Yet this presentism was highly ambiguous. The definition of social anthropology as explanation in terms of social function rather than historical origins did not necessarily mean only the study of present-day conditions. Ultimately Radcliffe-Brown was advocating a certain kind of explanation, rather than the study of a particular epoch. The door was therefore open to the invention of the atemporal "ethnographic present," a term which signifies the writing of ethnographies in a continuous present tense, as if the society described was timeless and unchanging, and usually based on a reconstruction of the recent past rather than the actual contemporary situation.[73] Radcliffe-Brown did not claim that indigenous societies were, should be, or even could be, isolated from "European civilization" in practice. Yet his theoretical work contributed to the construction of African societies as reified, isolated, timeless and primitive.

Radcliffe-Brown's Durkheimian functionalism was not well-suited to dealing with a situation of complex social and racial conflict, nor one of rapid social and economic change. Despite gestures towards the idea that South Africa as a whole might be considered a functioning society, the assumption was that African or Bantu societies would be studied as functioning units in themselves. The value of social anthropology was in its ability to identify the likely impact of making specific reforms to aspects of a native society, through understanding the meaning or function of specific customs or beliefs in its social system.[74] Although contemporary problems were framed in a way which acknowledged that the source of the problems was imperialism— "the practical problems of the adjustment of the native civilization to the new conditions that have resulted from our occupation of the country"— these problems were understood primarily as problems of governance, rather than generating a radical critique of exploitation.

This resolutely Eurocentric viewpoint persisted in both the consideration of the single society, and in his treatment of change, as Radcliffe-Brown on occasion expressed himself in terms of an alarmism which combined the supremacist language of evolutionism with fears of race corruption, and a general crisis of Western civilization following World War One. He invoked "the danger there existed in South Africa for the future of our white civilisation—that civilisation which we valued above everything else in the world, and for which men had lately been prepared to give their lives."[75] Not only were whites tranforming African societies, but "native problems and the presence of natives were changing our own types": for example, through the availability of "a vast body of cheap labour."[76] To a certain extent such statements

---

71 See Fortes in *Social Structure: Studies Presented to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown* vii. Fortes also rather cryptically added that although the idea of social anthropology as comparative sociology was similar to the approach of Durkheim and his followers, "the original stimulus to take up the study of comparative sociology and to pay special attention to the simpler societies came from an acquaintance with Kropotkin," with whom Radcliffe-Brown became friendly while studying in Cambridge in the early 1900s.

72 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays,* 37-38.

73 Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*; Cf. John Burton, "Shadows at Twilight: A Note on History and the Ethnographic Present", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132, no. 4 (1988): 420-433.; João de Pina-Cabral, "The Ethnographic Present Revisited", *Social Anthropology* 8, no. 3 (2000): 341-348.

74 Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays* 31-32.

75 Ibid., 39.

76 Ibid.

should perhaps be interpreted in the context of a discipline competing for funds and attention: he immediately followed this warning with the claim that only a scientific study of society could help us generate the politics to navigate through these dangers. However, whatever the motivations, such claims also expressed a radical primitivism, as he referred to natives as "people of a lower type"[77] and to anthropology as the study of "uncivilized peoples,"[78] "underdeveloped peoples,"[79] and "backward peoples."[80] In this regard, stadial evolutionism had been replaced by a hardening of "modern" and "primitive" into a binary distinction.

In Radcliffe-Brown's work in South Africa we see some of the major tensions which were to define the discipline in the interwar years: tensions between the claim of expertise and the need to establish social anthropology as an academic discipline; tensions between his public theoretical pronouncements and the practice of primitivist salvage structuralism and functionalism; and tensions within his "inductive method" which stressed both the need for trans-social comparison, and the immersive study of a local situation by a theorist-fieldworker. Such tensions resulted in a profound ambiguity about the nature of anthropology's subject matter. Both the study of the contemporary and a new form of primitivism grew from the particularities of Radcliffe-Brown's epistemological break with diachronic modes of explanation, and from the political and institutional milieu which produced social anthropology itself.

II

There is no more important figure in the history of social anthropology than Bronislaw Malinowski. While he and Radcliffe-Brown are considered co-founders of a new theoretical and methodological approach, later termed structural-functionalism, it is Malinowski who is considered the "mythic culture hero of anthropological method,"[81] as prototypical lone fieldworker, author of seminal ethnographies, and charismatic leader.[82] Malinowski was largely responsible for establishing the discipline in British academia, from his base at the London School of Economics (LSE): through his training of the next cadre of ethnographers, his institutional and political initiatives, and his fund-raising. He campaigned for the support of anthropology by both governments and non-governmental research organizations, and promoted the discipline in the public sphere, for example giving popular talks on BBC radio.

Malinowski's seminar was the crucible in which social anthropology as an academic discipline was forged. All the major figures in the postwar institutionalisation of the discipline across the British Empire trained there, including Raymond Firth, Audrey Richards, Edmund Leach, Isaac Schapera, Meyer Fortes, Siegfried Nadel, Ian Hogbin, Monica Hunter (later Wilson), Godfrey Wilson and Max Gluckman.[83] It was the only location in Britain for a purely social anthropology, characterized by the participant-observer fieldwork-theorist, analysis of the functional inter-relationships between the institutions of a given society, and detachment from other other potential and erstwhile branches of the discipline, such as physical anthropology,

---

77 Ibid., 39.
78 Ibid., 3.
79 Ibid., 33.
80 Ibid., 37.
81 Stocking, "The Ethnographer's Magic" in *Functionalism Historicized*, 71; cf. Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 9f.
82 On Radcliffe-Brown's failure to emulate Malinowski's institution-building at Oxford in the 1930s, see Mills, *Difficult Folk*.
83 The one great exception was Evans-Pritchard, who came to the LSE to study with Malinowski but soon went in his own direction. See Ibid., 34-35. Regarding the seminar method of teaching, Mills emphasizes the influence of Malinowski's training at Cracow and Leipzig, in the "Humboldtian idea of a research-led model of academic practice," Ibid., 32.

archaeology, and folklore, all of which survived in the only other British universities where anthropology was taught: Oxford, Cambridge and University College, London.

Radcliffe-Brown's emphasis on social structure eventually came to be preferred over Malinowski's institutional, and later biological, versions of functionalism. But while others, including Radcliffe-Brown and Winifred Hoernlé, had carried out single fieldworker research before the War, it was Malinowski who became the archetype of the new social anthropologist: the lone fieldworker-theorist engaged in long-term immersion in the language and culture of a specific alien society.[84] He published prolifically, and his ethnographies of the Trobriand islands became founding documents of the new discipline: the most well-known being *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* in 1922, *The Sexual Life of Savages* in 1929, and *Coral Gardens and their Magic* in 1935.[85]

These books were mostly written in the ethnographic present, making only passing reference to the colonial situation and contemporary change.[86] The combination of immersive fieldwork and functional analysis led to the reconstruction of a pre-colonial past, in order to understand the functioning relationships between social institutions in a well-integrated local community. In Malinowski's case the disciplinary break with evolutionism also involved a highly personal struggle to establish social anthropology at the LSE, over the claims of his erswhile mentor, the ethnologist Charles Seligman[87]. Yet the social evolutionist tradition survived at the LSE under Maurice Ginsberg, Professor of Sociology, who continued to advocate an idealistic, expansive and synthetic overview of all civilizational development, incorporating both modern and primitive societies. In this institutional context, social anthropology then became the branch of "sociology" which dealt specifically with the primitive.[88]

But by the late 1920s Malinowski's vision of the nature and goals of social anthropology had begun to change radically, with a turn towards an anthropology of contemporary global change. This turn gathered pace in the 1930s and continued until his death in 1942. What began in 1928 as a plea and program for an additional "new branch of anthropology ... the anthropology of the changing Native"[89] had, by the 1930s, become Malinowski's central concern. By 1935, he had come to admit—in his final Trobriand ethnography *Coral Gardens*—that the failure to study "the changing native as he really is" was "perhaps the most serious shortcoming" of his Melanesian work.[90] The "totality" which the anthropologist was to study was no longer a locally delimited social or cultural field, but the entry of native societies into the arena of world politics and

---

84 See Kuklick, "Personal Equations: Reflections on the History of Fieldwork, with Special Reference to Sociocultural Anthropology", 17ff.

85 Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific; An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*; Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-western Melanesia: An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage and Family Life Among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea* (New York; London: H. Liveright ; G. Routledge & Sons, 1929); Bronislaw Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands* (New York: American Book Co., 1935).

86 For one example of the many instances in which the colonial situation nevertheless crept into his descriptions see Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-western Melanesia: An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage and Family Life Among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea,* 154.

87 For further evidence of the personal nature of the break with regard to kinship theory, see B Malinowski, "Kinship", *Man* 30 (1930): 19-29, discussed in Adam Kuper, *The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth* (London; New York: Routledge, 2005), 159.

88 Cf. Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 2-4.

89 Malinowski, "Practical Anthropology", 36. In this paper, originally given in 1928, Malinowski advocated study of change as one new branch of anthropology. However even the study of the primitive would have to abstract from the reality of the contemporary: "In fact, the real practice of a modern field worker should become to study the savage as he is, that is, influenced by European culture, and then to eliminate those new influences and reconstruct the pre-European status." Ibid., 28.

90 Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands,* 480-481.

economics."[91] Nor was this a case of merely acknowledging the dynamic elements in native cultures in contact with "Western civilization"; rather, a new "phase of world history" demanded the study of "processes of culture change in their own right."[92]

Like Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski was concerned with the future as well as the present, "with problems of whither as well as of whence,"[93] and understood the ultimate value of anthropology in its contribution to "social engineering," which was "simply the empirical aspect of social theory."[94] He also understood anthropology to be a science. However two major differences with Radcliffe-Brown enabled and encouraged the turn to the study of change rather than difference. Rather than a comparative science of society, Malinowski advocated a "Science of Man,"[95] which integrated scientism with a humanistic dimension,[96] and which now led him to advocate instead the urgent chronicling of the "human interests and values" involved in "one of the most dramatic and far-reaching crises in the evolution of mankind."[97] Second, Malinowski did not endorse Radcliffe-Brown's distinction between "pure" and "applied" anthropology.[98] Anthropology was instead an inherently "practical" concern, it must therefore also be about change,[99] which in turn meant that it was "impossible to keep apart the theoretical and practical issues involved."[100] Theoretical work was to be directly motivated by practical concerns. Indeed, theoretical anthropology could learn "as much from practical issues as it can teach in return."[101]

This turn to the study of contemporary change was integral to Malinowski's success in winning institutional support for the new discipline. While anthropologists had long sought funding and other forms of support through the claim to be useful, Malinowski was uniquely successful in this regard.[102] He integrated anthropology into a broader shift towards the redefinition of, and anticipated solutions to, the problems of contemporary Africa and its colonial governance, through the burgeoning human sciences.[103] This movement involved a network of interconnected institutions such as the International Institute for African Languages and Culture (IIALC), the Rockefeller Foundation, and Lord Hailey's African Survey, among many other governmental, non-governmental and quasi-governmental organizations and projects.[104] Malinowski, for example, won money from the Rockefeller Foundation for the IIALC, and then had those research fellowships assigned to his own students at the LSE.[105] This broad movement combined the shift in imperial ideology towards a development Empire, a rethinking and rebirth

---

91 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", x.

92 Ibid., xi.

93 Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa*, ed. Phyllis Mary Kaberry (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945).

94 Ibid., 6. On the history of the idea of social engineering see Rebecca Lemov, *World As Laboratory: Experiments with Mice, Mazes, and Men* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2005).

95 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xxxiii.

96 On Malinowski's humanism, see Stocking, *After Tylor,* 292. Malinowski's "New Humanist" project had originally involved a similar "preservationist" impulse (see Ibid., 396), but ultimately proved more flexible than Radcliffe-Brown's scientism.

97 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xii.

98 Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* 5.

99 Ibid., 6.

100 Ibid., 6.

101 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xxxiii.

102 Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*. See also Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 33.

103 See for example de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development"; Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism,* Chapter Four.

104 Hodge lists eleven of "the most prominent" groups working in London at the time, Ibid., 321, fn. 100.

105 Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 33-34. On the close and synergistic links between Malinowski and the IAI, see also Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism,* 140-1.; Tilley, *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950*. de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development"; Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*.

of the social sciences, and a reorientation of imperial energies towards Africa. The academic study of the "tropical empire" and the "rationalization" of the colonial service were intertwined and in dialectical relationship.[106]

However the fact that funding and support for anthropology came from such sources should not imply either that "applied" work was a sideline, nor that it was a cynical way of winning funding which was then used for other purposes.[107] Certainly institutional contexts partly shaped the discipline, for example in helping to make Africa its central object of inquiry.[108] But IIALC and Rockefeller funding should not be seen as external factors influencing an otherwise primitivist social anthropology.[109] Rather, the development of social anthropology took place within a complex interplay of resonances between the various institutions involved.[110] Certainly the interests of the IIALC and Rockefeller encouraged the contemporary rather than primitivist aspects of social anthropology, but this is not to say that their goals differed from those of the discipline itself; indeed it is misleading to see them as separate objects at all. Social anthropology developed within a matrix of particular concerns, and should not be separated from that matrix.

Far from being corrupted by external forces, Malinowski himself was a prime mover in the broader movement, and in particular at the IIALC from its very inception in 1926. Indeed, he was the principal formulator of IIALC policy. His program, which was endorsed by the Institute in December 1928, argued for the significance of social anthropology for social problems in the colonies. He advocated both the necessity of theory conjoined to participant-observer fieldwork, and the study of change in the present as opposed to the reconstruction of the past.[111] It was in order to fulfil his own program that he called for "a re-definition of the boundaries and of the very subject matter of anthropology."[112] He repudiated his own earlier failure to address questions of contemporary social change, announcing in *Coral Gardens and their Magic,* his final Trobriand ethnography and which provided the basis of the seminar at the time, that "I want emphatically to state that my attitude, both in theory and practice, on this point was false. … This perhaps is the most serious shortcoming of my whole anthropological research in Melanesia."[113] Such an admission seems evidence of intellectual courage and confidence rather than cynicism.

Neither was it necessary for Malinowski to have advocated this specific strategy in order to win funding. At the IIALC he had to argue against an alternative ethnological program of purely

---

106 This is the de L'Estoile's central argument in de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development". See also Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*; Tilley, *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950*; Matera, "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain", 391.

107 This is a common implicit or explicit claim in the literature. See, for example, Stocking, *After Tylor,* 410, on Malinowski's students as strategically repositioning themselves. As Kuklick has pointed out, this was more characteristic of work funded by the CSSRC after the war, Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*. I am less concerned with the motivations of individuals than with the shape of the discipline as a whole, on which point I agree with L'Estoile that the "autonomization" of the discipline emerged from the same matrix as the demands and hopes for useful human and social sciences, see de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development". Cf. a recent re-iteration of the "handmaiden" claim in Matera, "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain", 388: "The intellectual mapping of Africa was the handmaiden of the new imperative toward welfare and development by the end of the 1930s."

108 See Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970*.

109 See de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development".

110 See for example Jack Goody's detailed account of the interplay between, and compatibility of, Malinowski's methods and Rockefeller goals: Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970*.

111 de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development".

112 Cited in Benoît de L'Estoile, "Internationalization and Scientific Nationalism: The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures (IIALC) Between the Wars," in *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge*, ed. Helen Tilley and Robert J Gordon (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 102-5.

113 Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands* 480-1.

empirical fact-gathering.[114] Meanwhile, Radcliffe-Brown also benefitted from Rockefeller money in Australia and in the USA, while suggesting that the Institute's investigations should be "purely scientific," "confining themselves to the precise observation of what is taking place and not concerning themselves with what is good and bad in the original society or in the changes that it is undergoing, nor with the practical problems."[115] Malinowski then competed for Rockefeller funding for his "culture contact" approach against Radcliffe-Brown's continued claims for a nomothetic, comparative salvage anthropology.[116]

If anything, rather than social anthropology conforming to the expectations of funding organizations, it was the nature of the former which attracted the latter. Social anthropology's institutional success over other paradigms was partly due to the support of institutions such as the IIALC and the Rockefeller Foundation, and precisely because it seemed more capable of dealing with the contemporary. The Rockefeller Foundation saw Malinowski's functional approach as ideally suited to the study of contemporary colonial social and governmental problems, with which it became particularly concerned under Dean Day, head of the Social Science Division from 1929, and under Day "[s]upport grew for the anthropology of the contemporary world."[117] Malinowski's approach was seen as perfectly suited to the study of the contemporary precisely because of its localism and its functionalism, as opposed for example to Grafton Elliot Smith's diffusionist program at University College, London, from which the Rockefeller Foundation withdrew its funding in 1927.[118]

Nor was it a coincidence that Malinowski should find his academic home at the LSE, with which the Rockefeller Foundation already had strong links, while Oxford and Cambridge resisted the social anthropological revolution.[119] Founded in 1895 by the Fabian Society, the LSE was dedicated to "those sciences needed to train good government administrators and statesmen."[120] Originally this meant political economy, but by the 1920s the School had expanded under William Beveridge, Director from 1919 to 1938,[121] who appointed renowned figures such as R. H. Tawney, H. J. Laski, L. T. Hobhouse, L. C. Robbins, F. A. Hayek, and Karl Mannheim, as well as Malinowski himself. These figures brought European social theory to Britain and were also notable for their social and political engagement. In the ethos of the LSE, if anthropology had not had some "practical" bent it would have been exceptional. It is no coincidence that the sole institution which provided the disciplinary space for social anthropology to flourish was also the institution which most closely tied social research to practical outcomes. The LSE was also a preferred destination for black intellectuals, who preferred it to Oxbridge.[122] The West African Student Union recommended Malinowski's seminar in particular, but also the LSE in general, for its "sympathy, humanitarianism and

---

114 de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development".

115 A. R. Radcliffe-Brown to Oldham, 5 September 1931, quoted in Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970,* 21. Malinowski responded that "the Institute's investigators should be as fully aware of practical problems and of the 'good' and 'bad' in the original society and in the changes, as is possible." B. Malinowski, 12 September 1931, quoted in Ibid.

116 Stocking, *After Tylor* 405ff..

117 Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970*.

118 Kuklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*.

119 Ibid.

120 Albert Cherns and Norman Perry in *Demands for Social Knowledge: The Role of Research Organisations*, ed. Elisabeth T. Crawford and Norman Perry (London; Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, 1976), 63. Cf. Martin Bulmer, "The Development of sociology and of empirical social research in Britain" in *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*, ed. Martin Bulmer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

121 Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 32. Willliam Beveridge, later to become the architect of the British welfare state after World War Two, was a prominent social reformer, protegé of the Webbs, and had been a highly influential civil servant during World War One.

122 Matera, "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain", 399.

understanding among the various member States of the British Empire."[123]

The development of social anthropology as a discipline in the 1930s was therefore integrally bound up with its suitability for the study of the contemporary. Malinowski himself saw the turn to the contemporary as a natural stage in the development of the discipline, which grew out of the discipline's core methods. The empiricism of scientific fieldwork, which lay at the core of the rejection of conjectural history, made it "almost physically impossible to neglect the full reality" of the drastic changes taking place in indigenous societies, whether in Africa or Melanesia.[124] It had been his own failure to break fully with the primitivist concerns of evolutionist and diffusionist approaches which had led him to focus on reconstructing pre-contact native society. It was only gradually that he had realized that "the real subject matter for field-work … is the changing Melanesian or African."[125] His student Audrey Richards argued that the rejection of the reconstructions of evolutionist or diffusionist anthropology led not to atemporality but to understanding other cultures as "living, functioning, realities, of interest in their own right."[126] Furthermore, this empiricism was directed at the present-day functioning of the social—rather than those elements such as ritual and belief which may have been easier to portray as unchanging. For Richards, this was a hallmark of the functional method: "[t]he facts that had to be recorded were those of present-day life."

Malinowski implemented this new project both in his own work and in his teaching. He re-oriented the LSE seminar towards conceptualizing the problems of change, and in the first instance to the problem of developing appropriate methods for its study. This led to the publication of a series of papers from seminar members in the IIALC's journal *Africa*,[127] several of which which were collected as *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa* in 1938.[128] The volume included chapters by Lucy Mair, Audrey Richards, and the South Africans Isaac Schapera, Meyer Fortes and Monica Hunter, as well as a long introduction by Malinowski, offering a critical evaluation of his students' contributions. After leaving the the LSE in 1939, he taught the subject in seminars at Yale.[129] He intended to then write a book on the subject but died before he could do so, in 1942.[130] His seminar notes and draftings on the subject were eventually published posthumously as *The Dynamics of Culture Change*.[131] Towards the end of his life he increasingly wrote and lectured on contemporary global issues, drawing on anthropology to make his arguments, as for example in a lecture tour in the USA on the danger of Nazism.[132] He also advocated the anthropology of Britain itself, to which end he became

---

123 "Editorial," Wāsù 2, no. 2 (April–June 1933): 1–2. Quoted in Ibid., 399.

124 Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands* 480. On Malinowski's empiricism see Leach in *Man and Culture; An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski*, ed. Raymond Firth (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1957).

125 Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands,* 480.

126 Audrey Richards, "The Village Census in the Study of Culture Contact," in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 46.

127 *Africa,* Volumes VII, VIII and IX (1934-6).

128 Lucy Mair's Preface to the collection made it clear that the impetus for "the study of culture change in modern times" had come from the IIALC's Five Year Plan (itself largely Malinowski's work), and specfically this had led to the LSE, "attended by the Institute's Fellows as part of their training," becoming "a centre for the discussion of this subject." Lucy Mair, "Preface" to Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", v.

129 Kaberry, "Introduction" to Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* xii.

130 Kaberry, "Introduction" to Ibid., vi.

131 Ibid.

132 See Dan Stone, "Nazism As Modern Magic: Bronislaw Malinowski's Political Anthropology", *History and Anthropology* 14, no. 3 (2010): doi:10.1080/0275720032000143356. Cf. Cocks, "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa". See also Overy, *The Morbid Age: Britain Between the Wars*.

involved with the Mass Observation movement, writing an afterword to the publication *First Year's Work*.[133]

Malinowski's term for contemporary global change was "culture contact." His broad programmatic statements for its study contain much that could be considered progressive and critical, at least in contradistinction to a stereotypical primitivist, atemporal functionalism. Drawing on Meyer Fortes, he insisted that contemporary Africa was a new, dynamic reality, "a process *sui generis*,"[134] rather than a modernity imposed from Europe onto Africa, or a "mechanical mixture" of elements taken from European and African traditions. He advocated a global perspective, as "the African and Asiatic are being rapidly drawn into partnership with the European in world-wide co-operation and conflict."[135] External forces, were an important factor in new local realities: "the changing Melanesian or African … has become already a citizen of the world, is affected by contacts with the world-wide civilisation, and his reality consists in the fact that he lives under the sway of more than one culture."[136] He was also attentive to the presence of "aggressive or conquering" White settler communities, quite different from their "mother communities," as well as "third parties, such as Indians, Syrians, and Arabs in Africa."[137]

Analysis would have to proceed from the inescapable fact of "the large scale exploitation of African resources by Europeans, for Western ends, and by means of African labour."[138] Close attention would have to be paid to racial repression, such as color-bar legislation, and economic exploitation, such as the peculiarities of African labour as organized for the profit of mining corporations, including "recruiting on reserves," "the method of unemployment insurance by throwing back superfluous labour on to the tribal areas in times of slump" and the "remuneration of labour, based on differential discrimination between the races."[139] African labor differed from European labour "legally, economically, and socially," yet neither could it be understood in terms of "African tribal economics."[140]

The asymmetry between Europeans and Africans was economic but also military, political, racial, social and even religious. Europeans had withheld salient elements of their own culture--weapons, votes, capital, social equality, while taking land and labor.[141] To be sure, they had been "given" education, administration and a certain amount of infrastructure, but as he put it, it was easier to part with "spiritual gifts" than material ones, "[y]et it is just the spiritual gifts with which we are most generous, while we withold wealth, power, independence, and social equality."[142] However he also rejected the "plausible and tempting" view of change as "maladjustment, deterioration ... an aberration, a fall from grace."[143] While in many cases Africans were indeed victims of culture contact, the African must be understood as "active participant in modern civilization"[144] rather than simply victim.[145]

---

133 Charles Madge, Tom Harrisson and Bronislaw Malinowski, *First Year's Work, 1937-38* (London: L. Drummond, 1938). I discuss the relationship between social anthropology and Mass Observation in a later chapter on the anthropology of Britain.
134 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xix.
135 Ibid., vii.
136 Malinowski, *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands,* 480.
137 Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* 17-18.
138 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xxi.
139 Ibid., xx.
140 Ibid., xx-xxi.
141 Ibid., xxii-xxiii.
142 Ibid., xxiii-xxiv.
143 Ibid., xxv.
144 Ibid., vii.
145 Ibid., ix.

However Malinowski struggled and—in the eyes of his fellow anthropologists and students—failed to develop a method appropriate to this new task. He recognized the complications of studying change in Africa, yet remained trapped in certain functionalist assumptions about what it meant to consider a situation as a whole: assumptions which had been originally developed in order to reconstruct pre-contact societies, as in his Trobriand ethnographies. Against the suggestions of his South African students Fortes and Schapera, he refused to consider the "contact situation" as an "integral whole," on the grounds that "the concept of a well-integrated community" would ignore the color bar and other forms of conflict between Europeans and Africans.[146] In doing so he confused the totalistic analysis of the situation with the claim that such a situation formed an organic whole, with a single integrated culture.[147] Indeed, he defined "an integral whole" as mututally incompatible with any kind of change, since "[c]hange as a rule means at least temporary maladjustment."[148] Malinowski therefore saw the study of change as a radical challenge to the "main presuppositions" of functionalism: that its object was a single culture, which was in "a state of well-balanced equilibrium."[149]

Malinowski instead conceptualized situations of rapid contemporary change in terms of the clash of two "cultures" (in a grand sense akin to "civilizations"), producing a third: "the two cultural orders, African and European, in their original state entirely independent, and still largely retaining their cultural determinism, meet, impinge on each other, a produce a third cultural reality." Functionalism would have to be adapted in order to "deal not with one culture alone, but with two cultures and a *tertium quid*."[150] Malinowski developed this tripartite cultural ontology into a recommended method for the study of contact situations, in which the three cultures—"old Africa, imported Europe, and the New Composite Culture,"[151]—were represented by three columns in a synoptic table (later supplemented with an additional two to make five.) A given "problem," such as "African warfare" was then analyzed by parsing out the elements into the columns.

Malinowski's general approach found favor among British-educated African intellectuals, due to its anti-racism and apparent emphasis on African dynamism.[152] The "three-column method" itself was endorsed by the Oxford-educated Ghanaian A. Y. Keyerematen over the alternatives proposed by Malinowski's students, because it uniquely acknowledged the existence of a new cultural reality, while preserving the sense of radical difference, and conflict, between European and African cultures, and allowed the simultaneous representation of integration and conflict.[153] But Malinowski's anthropological peers were much less enthusiastic, and found the three-column approach simplistic and hopelessly inadequate as a research method. As his student Max Gluckman put it, "the chart might serve at best as a check on the comprehensiveness of field-work, but not as a tool of analysis." Even supporters such as Lucy Mair and Phyllis Kaberry

---

146 Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* 14-15.

147 In the broad Malinowskian sense of "culture" which as Kaberry puts it, which "[i]ncluded all social phenomena; moreover, it was an 'organic unity' with the four dimensions of social organization, belief, material outfit, and language." Kaberry in Ibid., vii.

148 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xxxvi.

149 Ibid., xxxvi.

150 Ibid., xxxvi.

151 Ibid., ix. Or, as he put it elsewhere, "White hinterland, Black hinterland, and the column of culture contact." Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa* 18.

152 Matera, "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain", 399f.

153 See Ibid., 400.

acknowledged its inadequacies.[154]

Malinowski was also unable to develop a satisfactory new language for the study of change. The tripartite ontology hardened into an unworkable reification of the three cultures, which relied on an implicitly social evolutionist language of cultural "phases" and "original states." This evolutionism occasionally became explicit, as the "two different cultural worlds" were "separated by a wide evolutionary span."[155] Yet this evolutionist and diffusionist language was uncomfortably combined with a dogmatically synchronic approach. Malinowski insisted on the study of an atemporal present, on the basis that "[s]cientific observation can only be directed on what is; not on what might have been, or has been, even if this had vanished but yesterday."[156] This rejection of the possibility of reconstructing non-European history, combined with Malinowski's insistence on the newness of contemporary change in world historical terms, resulted in an implicit reiteration of the binary distinction between modern and primitive, in terms of their relative dynamism. Change was intrinsically modern, and the implication was that "old untouched Africa"[157] had been changeless until European contact. Despite his insistence on the dynamism of Africans within the contact situation, world-historical change was "the result of an impact of a higher, active culture upon a simpler, more passive one."[158] The native's agency was therefore reduced to the range of possible reactions to the impact of European culture. Even Malinowski's insistence on understanding Western civilization anthropologically turned out to be overly deterministic and unable to comprehend the specificity of dialectical interactions in colonial situations: Europeans in Africa were "in most of their actions determined by instructions, ideas, and forces which have their origin outside Africa."[159]

The place of history and the ontology of sociocultural investigation formed two major points of disagreement between Malinowski and those of his students who contributed to *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa*, in particular the South Africans Monica Hunter, Isaac Schapera and Meyer Fortes. Their contributions reveal a vibrant debate in the 1930s over the appropriate methods, both in the field and in the formulation of problems, for the anthropological study of change. Unlike Malinowski, his students were immersed in the realities of African societies and indeed were developing these new methods while engaged in fieldwork. They generally agreed with Malinowski on the necessity for formulating their research questions with regard to practical outcomes. They also agreed that contact should be studied as a process in itself and made central: indeed, it was from Fortes that Malinowski had taken this idea.[160] But, against Malinowski, they insisted on incorporating an historical dimension into their analysis, while also showing greater faith in the potential of the basic methods of social anthropology, in terms of the intensive focus on the local field situation through participant-observer research, albeit supplemented with other methods. As Fortes put it, they had to exploit fully "the resources of the functional method,"[161] and the necessity of understanding the contact situation in totalistic,

---

154 Mair, "Anthropology As a Public Service and Malinowski's Contribution to It".; Phyllis Kaberry in Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa*.

155 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xiv.

156 Ibid., xi.

157 Ibid., vii-ix.

158 Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* 15.

159 Ibid., 16.

160 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", xix.

161 Meyer Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process," in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 61. As Schapera put it, "There is no special technique … the methods employed are essentially the same." Isaac Schapera, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland," in *Methods of Study of*

integral terms—not in Malinowski's sense of a well-functioning organism, but in the sociological sense of understanding the concrete interactions between persons bound together within a social structure.[162]

Both Malinowski's critics and his most faithful supporters agreed that his attitude towards history was inadequate.[163] While Malinowski insisted on the study of a present with no past, Audrey Richards, for example, argued that social anthropologists must now become historians of the contemporary: "[i]n most parts of Africa cultural changes are taking place so rapidly that the anthropologist cannot study what is, without studying what was."[164] This focus on the living led directly to the study of change, and therefore the functionalist rejection of conjectural history led back to the study of history: "[t]hus, paradoxically enough, it is just those anthropologists who have turned their backs most resolutely on 'antiquarianism', to whom 'history' of one kind or other is of greatest value."[165] However there was much disagreement on exactly how to combine historical studies with anthropology. Hunter, for example, studying ritual in Pondoland, compared the contemporary situations in four different areas, which had developed from the same base "subject to different contact influences,"[166] and triangulated backwards to reconstruct a projected common starting point. Whether or not such a method was valid, it at least had the advantage of explicitly acknowledging that the change incurred by contact did not form "an evolutionary series," but could take variable paths, dependent on the nature of contact.[167] Rather than present conditions as historically determined, she advocated the study of the phenomena of "selective borrowing" and "selective conservatism."[168]

Fortes, though, was highly suspicious of such reconstructivism, both because it was speculative and because the comparison of the present with a hypothetical pre-contact situation was likely to lead to a pejorative language of detribalization and disintegration.[169] Furthermore, Hunter was working in an area of relatively recent rapid contact, whereas in West Africa, where Fortes worked, it was impossible to ignore the fact that "the exploitation of Africa by Europeans began more than five centuries ago."[170] He did however approve of "verifiable history, documenting the whole period of change,"[171] as a supplement to fieldwork, on the grounds that, despite their relatively long-term study of a single field, few anthropologists would be able to realize the necessary "temporal extension" to collect adequate data on the causes of change, which would ideally involve "continous observation over a period of years, or repeated observations at intervals."[172] The past was also an element in the present in the form of collective memory, as for example with the military pacification experienced by a previous generation, which formed a "constant topic of conversation and anecdote" among the present-day Tallensi.[173] Schapera advocated both a partial and tentative reconstruction of pre-contact history,

---

Culture Contact in Africa (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 27. Cf. Monica Hunter, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 1. In Pondoland," in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 10.

162 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 61.

163 Phyllis Kaberry, "Introduction" in Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa* vii-ix.

164 Richards, "The Village Census in the Study of Culture Contact", 47. Richards was not herself African, but she had already spent several years in fieldwork in Northern Rhodesia.

165 Ibid., 47.

166 Hunter, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 1. In Pondoland", 11.

167 Ibid., 13.

168 Ibid., 21ff.. This idea was endorsed by both Schapera and Fortes.

169 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 61.

170 Ibid., 60.

171 Ibid., 89.

172 Ibid., 90.

173 Ibid., 63.

and a "detailed study of the recent history of the tribe" in contact with specific "elements of Western civilization."[174] Again, his approach was conditioned by the specificities of his fields of study—for some Southern African tribes such as the Xhosa, even the pre-contact situation could rely on "an extensive literature."[175]

Malinowski's ontology of "cultural orders" and the analysis of institutions or culture elements was also dismissed by his peers. Following discussions with Fortes, Schapera and Gluckman at Oxford in the late 1930s, Radcliffe-Brown issued a well-known put-down in 1940;[176] Gluckman himself followed suit in 1947.[177] However the contributors to *Methods of Study* had already made the relevant objections in 1938. Fortes pointed out that "nowhere in Africa do we find the whole of European civilization in contact with the whole of a particular African culture,"[178] while Schapera noted that "culture is not merely a system of formal practices and beliefs. It is made up essentially of individual reactions to and variations from a traditionally standardized pattern; and indeed no culture can ever be understood unless special attention is paid to this range of individual manifestations."[179] This was also true from the Native's experience of the colonial situation, which involved interaction with concrete individuals, not impersonal forces. Taken together, this amounted to a rethinking of the very objects of change: "Individuals and communities react under contact; and not customs."[180]

Thus rather than the abstract clash of civilizations, the anthropologist should study contact situations in the field and analyze them totalistically. For Fortes, "to study culture contact as a dynamic process the anthropologist must work with communities rather than customs."[181] And the study of communities meant the study of the "concrete reactions of person upon person"[182] within a delimited social field. The object of study should be some "unit of common participation in the everyday political, economic and social life," whether this be a village or town. Indeed, it was only by studying communities such as the towns of the Gold Coast, that one could study "mutual adjustment between groups of diverse cultural origin."[183] Such work would involve methodological innovation, such as quantitative analysis, including census surveys, which Richards and Fortes each combined with individual case studies.[184]

The emphasis on persons included the special category of "contact agents," which Fortes claimed could be "treated as integrally part of the community."[185] So, for example, among the Tallensi, contact with Western political and legal institutions was not with "the 'Government'" in the abstract, but with "the concrete presence of the District Commissioner," who was regarded

---

174 Schapera, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland", 32.
175 Ibid., 32.
176 Radcliffe-Brown argued that the object of study should be not the interaction of "cultures", but "the interaction of individuals and groups within an established social structure which is itself in process of change." A R Radcliffe-Brown, "On Social Structure", *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 70, no. 1 (1940): 1-12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2844197, cited in Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 12. The considerable irony in Radcliffe-Brown having to remind Malinowski of the importance of individuals over sociocultural reifications is a measure of the degree to which the problem of culture contact had driven Malinowski away from his own approach in his Trobriand monographs. Radcliffe-Brown's intervention took place under the influence of the South Africans Schapera, Fortes and in particular Max Gluckman.
177 Max Gluckman, "Malinowski's Contribution to Social Anthropology", *African Studies* 6, no. 1 (1947): 41-46.;Max Gluckman, "Malinowski's 'functional' Analysis of Social Change", *Africa* (1947): 103-121; reprinted together as Max Gluckman, *An Analysis of the Sociological Theories of Bronislaw Malinowski* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968).
178 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 89.
179 Schapera, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland", 29.
180 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 62.
181 Ibid., 62.
182 Ibid., 63.
183 Ibid., 62.
184 Ibid., 75-82.; Richards, "The Village Census in the Study of Culture Contact"; See also Schapera, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland", 30.
185 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 62.

not "as an imposition upon the traditional constitution from without" but "a corporate part of native life."[186] For Schapera, "[t]he missionary, administrator, trader and labour recruiter must be regarded as factors in the tribal life in the same way as are the chief and the magician. Christianity … must be studied like any other form of cult .. [s]o too the trading store, the labour recruiter and the agricultural demonstrator must be considered integral parts of the modern economic life, the school as part of the routine educational development of the children, and the Administration as part of the existing political system."[187] For Fortes, though, culture contact did not mean just contact between Westerners and Africans, but included the dynamic interactions between various African cultures, which he found particularly in the various aspects of labor migration: in terms of its varieties, the motivations for it, and its impact on various native institutions. Ultimately, the study of culture contact was meant to answer a bigger question about the nature of social change in general.[188]

186 Ibid., 63.
187 Schapera, "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland", 27.
188 Fortes, "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process", 82.

III

It was no coincidence that so many of the contributors to *Methods of Study* were African. Malinowski's turn to the study of change, and certainly the turn to Africa, had no doubt been encouraged by the influx of a variety of African students, and students with a strong existing interest in Africa, into his seminar from the late 1920s to mid-1930s. In particular there was a large contingent of (mostly Jewish) white liberals from the universities of Witswatersrand and Cape Town, including Meyer Fortes, Isaac Schapera, Max Gluckman, Monica Wilson, Eileen Jensen (Krige) and Hilda Beemer (Kuper), who was the research assistant for *Coral Gardens*; they were joined by their compatriates the Afrikaner P. J. Schoeman,[189] and the black South African Z. K. Matthews.[190] Other black Africans included the future President of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta. Other students were either working in Africa or interested in questions of contemporary change. Non-African white Africanists included Jack Driberg, born in India but who had already served in the colonial service in West Africa for fifteen years, and Audrey Richards, who by the middle of the decade had already completed two periods of fieldwork in Northern Rhodesia.[191] African American attendees included the activist and singer Paul Robeson and his wife Eslanda, and the political scientist and later diplomat Ralph Bunche.[192] Finally, there were liberal whites from the other colonies, such as the New Zealander Raymond Firth, who had originally come to London to study economics, due to his interest in the contemporary problems of the Maori.[193]

Nor was it a coincidence that those with whom Malinowski had the most significant disagreements were from South Africa, where his approach led to problematic political consequences in the eyes of liberals, who were attempting to develop a social anthropology adequate to the specific South African situation. Social anthropology had flourished in South Africa since Radcliffe-Brown had left in 1926, at both Cape Town and the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. Two figures linked Radcliffe-Brown with the generation of the 1930s: Isaac Schapera and A. Winifred Hoernlé.

Schapera had studied under Radcliffe-Brown at Cape Town in the early 1920s before taking his PhD at the LSE in 1929. He then returned to Cape Town as Lecturer and, from 1935, Professor of Social Anthropology. His disagreements with Malinowski in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact* were based in his own experience of working on South African tribes, in particular among the broad grouping known as the Tswana. He took Radcliffe-Brown's injunction to understand South Africa as a single society to heart, but rejected his distinction between pure and applied anthropology. Generally uninterested in grand theory, he instead directed his research towards contemporary social and political problems, as defined both by government and the Tswana themselves.[194] Empiricism and dedication to the meticulous recording of what he observed through immersive contact led him—in his own eyes quite naturally—to a concern with issues of race relations, social change, and the nature of European rule in Africa.[195] In particular this led to a focus on the transformation of Tswana political economy in terms of agricultural modernization, and the labor migration predicated on regional industrialization; another project charted the emergence of distinctively modern Tswana legal

189 Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990* 119.
190 Stocking, *After Tylor* 409.
191 Ibid., 407.
192 Ibid., 409.
193 Ibid., 407.
194 Jean Comaroff, John L Comaroff and Isaac Schapera, "On the Founding Fathers, Fieldwork and Functionalism: A Conversation with Isaac Schapera", *American Ethnologist* 15, no. 3 (1988): doi:10.2307/645758.
195 Ibid.; Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa* 7.

codes and mores.[196] His student Max Gluckman later claimed that "Schapera was the first British anthropologist to set out to investigate fully how Africans had been brought into that new complex society, how they lived within it as members of a single socio-economic system, and how their indigenous cultures were affected by that situation."[197] He was also a pioneer of the use of history in social anthropology, situating contemporary developments in longer diachronic narratives, often using archival sources. He was heavily influenced by liberal South African historians, such as W. M. Macmillan, and understood the anthropologist's role as akin to that of an economic or social historian.[198]

The other institutional bastion of social anthropology in South Africa was Witswatersrand, where Agnes Winifred Hoernlé trained a new generation of liberal social anthropologists, who focused on contemporary political and social questions. Hoernlé has been called both the "Mother of Social Anthropology in South Africa."[199] and "the first trained female social anthropologist in the world,"[200] who played a "key intermediary role"[201] between Radcliffe-Brown and Gluckman's generation. While Schapera was largely uninterested in theoretical questions, Hoernlé followed Radcliffe-Brown both in a deep reading of Durkheim and other European social theorists, and in her own willingness to present anthropology as a project on a grand scale. Her own training in the human sciences was impeccable. Before World War One she had read anthropology and psychology at Cambridge under A. C. Haddon, W. H. R. Rivers, and C. S. Myers, then studied psychology in Germany with Wilhelm Wundt and Oswald Külpe, and finally sociology with Durkheim at the Sorbonne.[202] While at Cambridge she had attended Radcliffe-Brown's lectures,[203] and when he came to South Africa they collaborated closely.[204] But in many ways she also preceded him as pioneer of social anthropology in South Africa. She did not attain an academic appointment until 1923, having accompanied her husband, the idealist philosopher R. F. A. Hoernlé, to an appointment at Harvard from 1914 to 1920. But on an earlier return to South Africa from Europe in 1912 she had given lectures in Cape Town, in which she argued for a scientific anthropology, and attempted to answer anthropological problems in terms of social organization and ecological variables rather than inherent racial characteristics.[205] She also pioneered the fieldwork aspect of the nascent social anthropology in two field trips to

---

196 Isaac Schapera, *A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom: Compiled for the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration* (London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938).

197 Max Gluckman, "Anthropology and Apartheid: The Work of South African Anthropologists," in *Studies in African Social Anthropology*, ed. Meyer Fortes and Sheila Patterson (London; New York: Academic Press, 1975), 23.

198 E. g. Preface, to Isaac Schapera, *Married Life in An African Tribe* (London: Faber and Faber, 1940). Cf. Gluckman, "Anthropology and Apartheid: The Work of South African Anthropologists", 24. See Hugh Macmillan, ""Paralyzed Conservatives": W. M. Macmillan, the Social Scientists and "the Common Society", 1923-48," in *Africa and Empire: W. M. Macmillan, Historian and Social Critic*, ed. Hugh Macmillan and Shula Marks (Aldershot: Temple Smith, 1989) for Macmillan's influence.

199 See P. Carstens, "Agnes Winifred Hoernle (1885-1960): The Mother of Social Anthropology in South Africa", *Anthropology Today* 1, no. 6 (1985): 17-18; cf. Robert Gordon, "Remembering Agnes Winifred Hoernlé", *Social Dynamics* 13, no. 1 (1987): 68-72.

200 Ibid., 70., 70. Cf. Carstens, "Agnes Winifred Hoernle (1885-1960): The Mother of Social Anthropology in South Africa", xii.

201 Stocking, *After Tylor* 337.

202 Winifred Hoernlé and Peter Carstens, *The Social Organization of the Nama and Other Essays* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1985), xi-xii.

203 Stocking, *After Tylor* 337. These were the very lectures which according to Stocking were the first introduction of Durkheim to social anthropology. They are reprinted in Stocking, *Functionalism Historicized*.

204 See Stocking, *After Tylor* 337-8. The relationship is discussed in Hoernlé and Carstens, , *The Social Organization of the Nama and Other Essays* xv-xvi.

205 In arguing that "primitives were the same as civilized people in all essential mental processes" she both rejected biological and psychological modes of generating difference, and instantiated a binary distinction between primitive and civilized. See Gordon, "Remembering Agnes Winifred Hoernlé", 70. Gordon goes so far as to claim that, in the light of these lectures, Radcliffe-Brown's later influence on South African anthropology might be seen as regressive.

research various groups of the Nama.[206]

In 1933, the year of the tenth anniversary of Radcliffe-Brown's famous "charter" speech, Hoernlé was herself made President of Section E of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science.[207] Her own Presidential Address re-affirmed Radcliffe-Brown's basic conception of anthropology following the social "revolution," as an inductive and generalizing science of "the functioning of living societies and cultures,"[208] defined in contradistinction to evolutionary, culture-history and indeed Boasian approaches.[209] She reported that the academic discipline had been developing along appropriate lines, separating from physical anthropology and archaeology, as the study of specifically "living cultures ... in the present-day world."[210] She also warned that the formulation of theory must be independent from the formation of policy, while emphasizing the usefulness of anthropology to administration and that anthropological training and research should be integral to the State machinery.[211]

However Hoernlé's conception of anthropology as a grand project was closer to that of Malinowski than that of Radcliffe-Brown, as she claimed that its central concern should be the problem of social change, in all its varieties of growth, evolution, shrinkage, impoverishment, fluctuating self-maintenance, plasticity and receptivity, rigidity and refusal to adapt, ruin and decay.[212] Furthermore, she claimed that the new interest in change had "led Social Anthropology to abandon the former limitation of its field to non-civilized cultures."[213] She explained this shift in quasi-Hegelian terms, describing an epistemological development through the dialectical encounter between the West and other cultures.[214] The principal difference between the "higher" and "lower" cultures was simply that the former "contain systematic reflective study of themselves as an essential element of their own character as cultures."[215] European societies had first studied themselves, especially through history—a proclivity which itself could be understood anthropologically, as "a cultural element in our own European Culture and perhaps a few others."[216] But this kind of study (of "history ... laws, economics, religions")[217] had then been applied to the "lower" cultures as well, doing for them "what [they] have not yet learned to do for themselves."[218] The application of the historical sensibility to other cultures had produced a historicist anthropology and a diachronic framework for understanding the relationship between cultures, which in turn had given Europeans a new sense of themselves. But now that there had been a revolution in social anthropology, the understanding of European cultures also must be transformed: "[t]he comparative, inductive method, originally developed in the study of lower, non-civilised, cultures, may be applied, in return, to the higher culture itself."[219] No longer could the study of western societies be left to the historian, or student of political economy, jurisprudence or theology, each of whom confined themselves to the concepts of his own culture,

---

206 Carstens, "Agnes Winifred Hoernle (1885-1960): The Mother of Social Anthropology in South Africa", xii. The field notes for these expeditions are reproduced in Winifred Hoernlé *and others*, *Trails in the Thirstland: The Anthropological Field Diaries of Winifred Hoernlé* (Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1987).

207 A. Winifred Hoernlé, "New Aims and Methods in Social Anthropology", *South African Journal of Science* 30 (1933): 74-92., reprinted in Hoernlé and Carstens, , *The Social Organization of the Nama and Other Essays*.

208 Hoernlé, "New Aims and Methods in Social Anthropology", 4.

209 Ibid., 4-10.

210 Ibid., 2.

211 E. g. to have administrators trained in anthropology, and social reseachers supported by the State Ibid., 19.

212 Ibid., 15-16.

213 Ibid., 16.

214 The idealist elements were possibly received from her husband.

215 Ibid., 16-17.

216 Ibid., 17.

217 Ibid., 16.

218 Ibid., 17.

219 Ibid., 17.

"glancing at other types only to elucidate his own by comparison or to treat them as inferior precursors or rivals of his own."[220]

Both primitive and modern societies therefore were to be studied scientifically and anthropologically. Indeed the need to do so was pressing, especially in South Africa, "where the problem of the interrelations of different types of culture is acute."[221] The new science of society would therefore be both comparative and global, with Western civilization as one among many, subject to the same kind of investigation: "[i]n principle, the Social Anthropologist's province is the totality of culture in the world. Modern European culture is, for him, one type to be studied on its merits and as objectively as all other types he meets with anywhere in the world."[222] That such calls were being made in South Africa in 1933, by one of the discipline's leading figures, is significant. In practice, much weight came to rest on this "in principle" and Hoernlé made significant caveats. First, the salvage argument persisted: the most urgent task was still to understand the non-Western first, which ironically was changing much more rapidly than the West. Second, there would be formidable institutional barriers to the attempted colonization of the existing branches of humanistic inquiry, whereas anthropologists were already established as the scientists of primitive society.

A perhaps even more significant obstacle than these explicit caveats was Hoernlé's assumed and implied ontology of reified "societies" and "cultures." While Hoernlé referred to "the totality of culture in the world," she meant the totality of discrete cultures. And when she emphasized change, it was change to discrete cultures as entities, albeit in dialectical interaction with other cultures. As we have already seen with Radcliffe-Brown, in South Africa the question of how to conceptualize societies was always intimately bound up with high political stakes. The founding statesman of the Union, Jan Smuts, was himself a theorist of holistic thought, and his vision of a united South Africa, and his seemingly paradoxical racial politics, were intertwined in complex ways with his philosophy of ecological holism.[223] A tendency to think in terms of cultural wholes would pose a major obstacle for liberal social anthropologists' attempts to conceive of social and economic change, and South Africa as a single society.

Hoernlé herself was a prominent liberal thinker and at the heart of South African liberal intellectual networks, as was her husband, now Professor of Philosophy at Witswatersrand.[224] Her academic work was one side of a political activism, and she eventually abandoned academia in 1938 to work on welfare and social issues, and in particular race relations, becoming President of the South African Institute of Race Relations in 1948-50 and 1953-4; she also served in senior positions on the Penal Reform League, the Child Welfare movement and the Indian Social Welfare Association.[225] Earlier, she and her husband submitted numerous memos to government Commissions of Enquiry. This work has variously been assessed as attempting to "enhance the quality of life of the majority of South Africans,"[226] or as complicity in the articulation of a proto-apartheid ideology,[227] which indicates some of the dilemmas of South African liberalism in the 1930s, and its relationship to both social problems and anthropological and holistic

---

220 Ibid., 17.
221 Ibid., 17.
222 Ibid., 17.
223 See Anker, *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945*.. Indeed, Smuts coined the term "holism": see Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept From Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 24.
224 Gluckman saw her as "a great leader of liberal thought": MG to Michael Stephens, November 20th, 1955, MG RAI.
225 Gordon, "Remembering Agnes Winifred Hoernlé", 68.
226 Ibid., 71-2.. Gordon sees the Hoernlés' work in this regard as having been manipulated by the regime.
227 E.g. Paul Rich, *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism 1921-1960* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).

thought.[228]

In the 1930s liberals were confronted with a *de facto* policy of racial segregation, based in an ideology known as "adaptationism," which was supposed to be a middle way between repression and assimilation, in which African political and economic development would follow a separate path, based supposed inherent cultural differences.[229] Adaptationism was adopted by the Native Economic Commission of 1930-32 as the most "reasonable" and "economic" approach to the native question, based partly on testimony from the senior government ethnologist G. P. Lestrade, who claimed it "would take of the Bantu past what was good, and even what was merely neutral, and together with what is good of European culture for the Bantu, build up a Bantu future."[230] While Lestrade's definition could be interpreted as a more liberal and less Euro-centric mode of assimilation, it was taken by the commission itself as condoning segregation. (As Dubow points out, "adaptation" is a biological metaphor, an extension of the organic metaphor for society.[231] In fact its evolutionary implications were used by the Commission to advocate segregation, by de-metaphorizing it into biological racism *tout court*.)

Segregationism presented liberals with the threat of political irrelevance, and many felt the need to engage with it sympathetically and even accept it, as did Hoernlé's husband.[232] This immediate political problem, however, only revealed the underlying tensions in liberalism between conceiving of South Africa as a single society or as a conglomeration of qualitatively different, and inherently valuable, cultures. While recognizing discrete African cultures as organic wholes risked the slide into segregationism, ignoring them seemed to risk the obliteration of African culture and social disintegration through modernization, personified in the specter of the "detribalized native." The problem, which had persisted since Radcliffe-Brown, was at what level to deploy holism: that of African cultures, or South Africa as a single society. Paul Cocks has convincingly argued that it was precisely the continued tendency to think in terms of reified units which made it impossible for anti-segregationist liberal anthropologists such as Radcliffe-Brown and Schapera to develop a full-blown critique of segregationism or to imagine an alternative to segregration.[233] The reification of cultures therefore underwrote the crisis of liberalism in the 1930s.

But generally while liberals could be adaptationist, liberal social anthropologists were not.[234] They remained committed to Radcliffe-Brown's injunction to see South Africa as a single society, and upheld his claim that segregation was impossible.[235] R. F. A. Hoernlé's own cultural holism was derived from idealist philosophy, not his wife's anthropology,[236] while the anthropological basis for adaptationism was derived from a quite different anthropological tradition, based in the Afrikaans-speaking Universities of Stellenbosch and Pretoria, and known as *volkekunde*.[237] The existence of this tradition formed a context of refutation against which

---

228 As Martin Jay has pointed out, liberalism has often had a highly conflicted relationship with holistic thought: SeeJay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept From Lukács to Habermas* 72.

229 Rich, *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism 1921-1960*.

230 G. P. Lestrade, testimony to the Native Economic Commission in 1931, quoted in Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36,* 36.

231 Ibid., 36-37. Cf. Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-century South Africa* 75-76.

232 Rich, *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism 1921-1960*.

233 Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940", 743ff.

234 Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36,* 37.

235 Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940".

236 See Rich, *Hope and Despair: English-speaking Intellectuals and South African Politics, 1896-1976*. Rich shows how his liberal segregationism was based in "cultural idealism." Hoernlé had trained in Oxford under the British Idealists Bernard Bosanquet and T. H. Green.

237 See Robert Gordon, "Apartheid's Anthropologists: The Genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology", *American Ethnologist* 15, no. 3 (1988): 535-553.; Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa"; Robert Gordon, "Serving the Volk with Volkekunde -

social anthropology came increasingly to define itself in the 1930s. Derived from German ethnology rather than French sociology, *volkekunde* emphasized "primordial cultural identities,"[238] and argued for segregation as a way to preserve indigenous African cultures. Practitioners of this tradition soon outnumbered the social anthropologists of Cape Town and Witswatersrand, and had a far greater direct impact on government policy.[239]

The presence of a political and intellectual rival, which emphasized the absolute cultural distinctiveness of each *ethnos*, served to turn social anthropologists away from the strongest implications of cultural holism. *Volkekunde* demonstrated the dangers of cultural holism and indeed any emphasis on essential cultural difference. While at times social anthropologists like Hoernlé flirted with cultural holism, they generally came to understand their task in terms of Radcliffe-Brown's more restricted focus on a pluralistic variety of social structures, while reaffirming the commitment to immersive and empathetic fieldwork, another crucial difference with *volkekunde*.[240]

For South African liberals such as Hoernlé the ultimate proof of the inadequacy of Malinowski's culture contact approach was its compatibility with *volkekunde*,[241] due to its cultural holism and its emphasis on the "strong mutual resistances and antagonisms of the two races and cultures."[242] A simplified Malinowskian functionalism, shorn of participant-observation,[243] became an integral component of the anthropology taught at Afrikaner universities, as did American cultural anthropology, while Radcliffe-Brown's Durkheimian approach in terms of social structure was ignored.[244]

Hoernlé herself articulated her own challenge to Malinowski's approach in a lecture at the LSE, by emphasizing the need to study the total situation in terms of social and political relations, rather than focusing on cultural transmissions. According to Meyer Fortes' later account, this speech seems to have had a major impact on the shape of the debate among Malinowski and his students over how to approach culture contact:

> The prevailing view was that the processes and results of these changes could only be understood by focussing attention on the substance of what tribal peoples were taking over from the West, be it literacy and Christianity or the use of money or new tools and implements. Mrs Hoernlé clarified another, and as some of us soon realised, a more fruitful approach. She emphasized the frame of social and political structure within which the flow of cultural borrowings and transmissions took place. This meant considering what sort of a total society the mixture of peoples one was likely to find in a tropical colony constituted. It suggested asking what did it signify, for the processes of acculturation, that the representatives of the colonial power and its culture, had overriding political

---

on the Rise of South African Anthropology," in *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines*, ed. J. Jansen (Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 1991).

238 Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 6.

239 See Gordon, "Apartheid's Anthropologists: The Genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology".; Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 5-6.

240 Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 44-45.

241 Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 13.

242 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures", ix.

243 Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 45.

244 Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990,* 124-5. According to Hammond-Tooke, this was partly due to the influence of P. J. Schoeman, who had studied with Malinowski at the LSE. A version of functionalist theory was adopted by W. W. M. Eiselen, Professor of Ethnology at the University of Stellenbosch. See Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa* 13. See also Macmillan, ""Paralyzed Conservatives": W. M. Macmillan, the Social Scientists and 'the Common Society', 1923-48".

> control, as well as technological and cultural superiority. It suggested considering, therefore, how they were thus enabled to determine both the contents, and the rates and direction of social change in these areas. We were led to realize, thus, how important it was, in the course of investigating the indigenous political, legal and economic structure of tribal societies, to take into account their association in the arbitrary framework of a colonial dependency."[245]

Malinowski's own appetite for the study of contemporary Africa was sharpened by a visit to South Africa in 1934, part of a tour of South, Central and East Africa.[246] He had been invited to give a lecture at the New Education Conference in Cape Town and Johannesburg.[247] He gave several speeches to both White and Black audiences, which varied considerably in their emphases: to the former he advocated the encouragement of indigenous culture, and the education of Africans in a separate manner appropriate to their cultures and to their realistic political and economic prospects.[248] Hoernlé was disappointed by his speeches and also complained to her student Gluckman, then attending the LSE seminar, about his focus on rural rather than urban Africans: "I found Malinowski had to be forced to take note of the developments going on here in town, and I should be glad if you will take every opportunity of stressing over there that developments of many different kinds are going on here in South Africa and that all of them are of great importance to our understanding of the total situation."[249]

Hoernlé's own students were pioneers of the anthropology of both urban conditions and rapid social change in rural areas.[250] They included Camilla Wedgwood and Ellen Hellmann (*née* Koch) and Eileen Krige (*née* Jensen.), Hilda Kuper (*née* Beemer), and Max Gluckman.[251] They all produced anthropological work on contemporary conditions. As Adam Kuper has put it, "[a]s a group these students also saw their commitment to anthropology partly in political terms. At a time when their British-based contemporaries tended to avert their eyes from the realities of power and deprivation in the colonial societies, they found it difficult to ignore the context of the systems which they investigated."[252] Hoernlé's own social activism exposed her students to contemporary social problems involving non-Europeans.[253] When Hoernlé became chair of the

---

245 Meyer Fortes, *The Plural Society in Africa* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1970). It is not clear exactly when this lecture took place, but from Fortes' description, (at a time of "lively controversy about the theoretical approach best suited to the study of culture contact ... in the rapidly changing societies of Africa.") it seems to have been in the mid-1930s, just at the time of the debates between Malinowski and his South African students.

246 Kaberry, Introduction to Malinowski, *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,* vi.

247 For more details of this trip see Cocks, "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa", 30.

248 Stocking, *After Tylor,* 4. On Malinowski's further interventions into native education policy see Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa", 30-1; Cocks, "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa", 42; Hugh Macmillan, "Administrators, Anthropologists and 'Traditionalists' in Colonial Swaziland: The Case of the 'Amabhaca' Fines", *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 65, no. 4 (1995): doi:10.2307/1161132; Kuper, *Anthropology in South Africa,* 9-10.

249 AWH to MG, October 2nd, 1934, MG RAI.

250 This richly detailed ethnographic work is still used by scholars: e. g. see Jennifer Cole and Lynn M Thomas, *Love in Africa*, Web (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 32, for the range of scholars who have referred to it on gender issues.

251 MG to Michael Stephens, November 20th, 1955, MG RAI; Hilda Kuper, "Function, History, Biography: Reflections on Fifty Years in the British Anthropological Tradition," in *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology*, ed. George Stocking Jr (London, 1984), 193.

252 Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 137. Adam Kuper—himself a prominent social anthropologist as well as a pre-eminent historian of the discipline—is Hilda Kuper's nephew. To an extent he has himself continued to champion a "social" as against a "cultural" anthropology, the antagonist in this case being the US cultural anthropology influenced by literary theory and most associated with Clifford Geertz. See Ibid., 184ff..

253 For her many commitments to social welfare and human rights organizations see Max Gluckman and Isaac Schapera, "Dr. Winifred Hoernlé: An Appreciation", *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 30, no. 3 (1960): 262-263.

Indian Joint Council, Kuper became secretary, which led her to work on "housing and recreation" in slum areas; she then followed Hoernlé to the South Africa Institute of Race Relations, where as a Research Assistant she investigated the social effects of liquor laws.[254] This work led her to spend hours in jail with women who had been arrested for home brewing, liaising between them and their children left at home, "partly as researcher, partly as someone who could help them."[255]

Already in the early 1930s, Eileen Krige and Ellen Hellmann were carrying out what has been called "the first urban anthropological research in the world," [256] on urban Africans in Pretoria and Johannesburg respectively.[257] Hellmann's work on the Rooiyard slum yard was the first in-depth participant-observer ethnography of an urban African community.[258] She emphasized the transient nature of Rooiyard residents, and their sustained links with rural kin,[259] in order to challenge the concept of the "detribalized native"—a common contemporary category for representing urban Africans—which she found dangerously simplistic and inaccurate. Hellmann continued to work on race and urbanization, and later became President of the Institute of Race Relations, where she joined Hoernlé in opposing segregation from a liberal standpoint.[260] Hilda Beemer took a different appraoch towards a similar end; her Ph.D. thesis on the contemporary politics of Swaziland attempted to show how "traditional" and "modern" systems of stratification were interlocked.[261] This work led to a public clash with the Afrikaner anthropologist P. J. Schoeman over his primitivizing accounts of Swazi ritual.[262]

These developments show the extent to which South African anthropologists were beginning to produce the first substantive work which portrayed Africans as modern political and economic subjects through intensive fieldwork of specific local situations. On a methodological level, their differences with Malinowski produced a vibrant debate over how to approach such a topics. However the common project was more significant than their differences. The interchange between Malinowski's seminar at the LSE, and the thriving social anthropology at the English-speaking universities of South Africa, resulted in a clear agreement that anthropology should be the study of contemporary global change, and the nature of the interactions between different sociocultural groups in the modern world. And despite their criticisms of Malinowski, the South Africans had not fully escaped the rhetoric of "culture contact," nor found a new language with which to imagine social and cultural difference, and indeed conflict, without reifying cultures.

Interwar anthropology was not a single object which turned one way or another. Rather it was an expansive set of possibilities, which held certain methods in common but was also

---

254 Kuper, "Function, History, Biography: Reflections on Fifty Years in the British Anthropological Tradition", 195.

255 Ibid., 196.

256 Gordon, "Remembering Agnes Winifred Hoernlé", 71.

257 See Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990,* 143ff.; E. J. Krige, "Some Social and Economic Facts Revealed in Native Family Budgets", *Race Relations* , no. 1 (1934): 94-108; E. J. Krige, "Changing Conditions in Marital Relations and Parental Duties Among Urbanized Natives", *Africa* , no. 9 (1936): 1-23.

258 Ellen Hellmann, M.A. Thesis, "Rooiyard—A Slum Yard in Johannesburg" (1935), later published as Ellen Hellmann, *Rooiyard: A Sociological Survey of An Urban Native Slum Yard* (Cape Town: Oxford Univerity Press, for Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia, 1948). Hellmann had also published an article on Rooiyard in the same issue of Africa as the Audrey Richards article which was to be included in *Methods of Study*, Ellen Hellmann, "Native Life in a Johannesburg Slum Yard", *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 8, no. 1 (1935): doi:10.2307/3180398.

259 Hellmann, *Rooiyard: A Sociological Survey of An Urban Native Slum Yard* 10-11.

260 Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990* 57.

261 The thesis was drafted in 1939, published in 1947 as Hilda Kuper, *An African Aristocracy; Rank Among the Swazi* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947). See Kuper, "Function, History, Biography: Reflections on Fifty Years in the British Anthropological Tradition", 200-5. for her account of her fieldwork and writing.

262 See Ibid., 202.; Cf. Cocks, "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa", 33-5.

motivated by different research projects, differing conceptual frameworks and a variety of goals, many of which were mutually contradictory. The study of change was only one element of a social anthropology which also continued to construct the other as primitive and exotic and often involved the reconstruction of the precolonial past. Malinowski's highly influential early work was certainly primitivist; and whereas Malinowski shifted over time from a focus on the primitive to a focus on change, Radcliffe-Brown had displayed much greater ambivalance over anthropology's relation to the contemporary. While he portrayed anthropology as the study of the contemporary, his own substantive work generated an abstracted and asynchronic figure of the primitive.

However, social anthropology was in many ways intrinsically anti-primitivist, just as it was in many ways intrinsically primitivist. The turn to the contemporary was intrinsic to the discipline and not imposed by external agencies. From its very inception as a radically new approach to understanding human societies, it exhibited strong compulsions to understand colonial populations as intrinsically modern, in the sense of being contemporary with Europe and bound up in global processes. Social anthropology as a discipline was generated in a political matrix which demanded that it study the contemporary in some way. The study of change also arose from the very methods of a social anthropology which combined synchronic, totalistic analysis with an inviolable empiricism of lived experience.

Ironically, it was the social structural approach of those most influenced by Radcliffe-Brown which would provide the resources for overcoming the conceptual barriers to approaching the non-Western as fully contemporary with the Western. The most successful such attempt in this vein was the work of another student of Hoernlé's, Max Gluckman, whose work on the modern political, economic and social structures of Zululand represents a significant shift in the representation of modern Africa. The next chapter will examine the emergence of his work from his circulations between the spheres of South Africa liberalism, the LSE seminar, and the new structural anthropology being developed at Oxford.

Chapter Two

Max Gluckman and the Modern Social Situation

The anthropological study of the modern world flourished at Manchester in the 1950s, but its foundational text was a product of the 1930s: Max Gluckman's paper, "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand," originally published in 1940, and republished in 1958.[1] In his foreword to the republication, Gluckman's colleague J. Clyde Mitchell wrote: "[i]t is in these essays that Gluckman first outlined an approach to the study of social change which he has subsequently developed, and which has provided the central set of analytical concepts of the school of social anthropology he is building up at Manchester."[2] The influence of the article—which came to be known simply as "The Bridge," for reasons which will become obvious—extended well beyond Manchester and beyond this generation. Anthropologist, and historian of anthropology, Joan Vincent has called it "one of the methodological sourcebooks of political ethnography in the twentieth century."[3] As historian Hugh Macmillan has pointed out, republication also revealed the work's subterranean influence in South Africa and the USA.[4] American anthropologist Lloyd Fallers for example, declared himself "somewhat embarrassed to discover how much he had made the ideas presented here his own without remembering—and hence without acknowledging—their source" and surmised that "others will no doubt have the same feeling."[5] He praised the work, then almost twenty years old, as "the most successful application thus far of the Marxian perspective to anthropological materials and also, perhaps, our single most important study of social change in Africa."[6]

The enduring value of this text, both for the Manchester project of the 1950s, and for anthropology in the late twentieth century, indicates continuities between the interwar and the post-colonial eras and refutes many of the stereotypes of colonial social anthropology. In it, Gluckman analyzed a set of concrete situations, involving real persons and events, not an abstracted set of social institutions. Although he followed structural-functionalist orthodoxy in focusing on the problem of social integration, he applied it to the whole of South African society, rather than a reified, "primitive," tribal group. Furthermore, he saw community as generated through a complex set of antagonisms and conflicts, rather than the harmonious functioning of institutions. He wrote in the narrative past tense, not the ethnographic present; far from avoiding the question of change through time, Gluckman attempted to theorize it, and also to develop a synthesis of archivally-based history with the participant-observer method. Finally, "The Bridge"

---

1 Max Gluckman, "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand", *Bantu Studies* 14, no. 1 & 2 (1940): 1-30; 147-174; Max Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* (Manchester: Published on behalf of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute by the Manchester University Press, 1958). The republication included a third article, Max Gluckman, "Some Processes of Social Change, Illustrated with Zululand Data", *African Studies* 1, no. 4 (1942): 243-260.

2 J. Clyde Mitchell, "Foreword" to Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*.

3 Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends*. I will follow the usage of others who have written about this article and refer to it as "The Bridge."

4 Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society", 59.

5 Lloyd Fallers, "Review: Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand", *American Anthropologist* 61, no. 6 (1959): 1122. On the intellectual interchange between them, see Max Gluckman, "Book Review", *Manchester Guardian* (1957): 4. Max Gluckman, "Review of Bantu Bureacracy", *The Listener* (1957); Cf. Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends*.

6 Fallers, "Review: Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand", 1122.

stood witness to the implicit violence which underlay development colonialism.

Yet if "The Bridge" was a founding document for a later anthropology of modernity, yet was itself published in 1940, how did it come to be at all? Rather than see it in terms of its significance for anthropology in the 1950s, in this chapter I examine it as a product of the 1930s, and trace its questions and methods back to their formation in contemporary intellectual and political fields. As we saw in the previous chapter, by the 1930s a significant segment of social anthropology was dedicated to understanding African societies as they were being transformed by modern forces; yet this project was hamstrung by conflicting aims and inadequate methods. These dilemmas and tensions formed the wider context in which Gluckman was trained, both in South Africa and in England. This chapter shows how Gluckman's work arose from this matrix. Gluckman was motivated, as were many of his contemporaries, by liberal South African politics to understand the contemporary transformations of non-European peoples. However it was his training at Oxford, a place not associated with the study of the contemporary, which provided him with the conceptual tools to develop a new approach to the problem, which avoided many of the problems of Malinowski's "culture contact" paradigm.

I begin by tracing Gluckman's path through these various spheres. I then focus on the intertwined influence of A. W. Hoernlé and the Oxford anthropologists E. E. Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes. Finally, I discuss Gluckman's solution to the problems presented to him, and in particular the ways that his methodological syntheses and innovations brought the Zulu into focus as integral to the modern world.

I Circulations

Like many of the other founding figures of British social anthropology, Max Gluckman was an émigré,[7] having been born in Johannesburg (in 1911), and raised in South Africa.[8] And, like many of his fellow South African social anthropologists, he came from a particular migrant background: that of the Jewish diaspora.[9] He later noted that the "negrophilist" atmosphere of the household was "possibly strengthened by my origin from a generally despised 'ethnic-group,' the Jews, who produce more liberals than Britons or Boers towards the coloured 'inferior ethnic groups.'"[10] His parents were active in liberal political and intellectual circles. His mother Katie,

---

7 Others include Bronislaw Malinowski (Poland), Raymond Firth (New Zealand), Meyer Fortes and Isaac Schapera (South Africa), Siegfried Nadel (Austria). Of the seven most important British anthropologists of the first two generations of the academic discipline, one was European (Malinowski), three were white products of the colonies or Commonwealth (Firth, Fortes and Gluckman) and three were raised in Britain (Radcliffe-Brown, Evans-Pritchard and Edmund Leach.)

8 He was therefore—barely—born into the Union of South Africa, formed in 1910. My general sources for biographical information include archival sources such as Max Gluckman, draft *Curriculum Vitae*, 1946, MG RAI; Max Gluckman "US Visa Application," 1957, MG RAI; as well as published accounts including Max Gluckman, "The Tribal Area in South and Central Africa," in *Pluralism in Africa*, ed. Leo Kuper and M G Smith (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969); Meyer Fortes, "Gluckman, (Herman) Max (1911-1975)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: OUP, 2004); Ronald Frankenberg, *Interview with Ronald Frankenberg*, http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/450; Brown, "Passages in the Life of a White Anthropologist: Max Gluckman in Northern Rhodesia".

9 The most important social anthropologists to emerge from South Africa were all Jewish: Schapera, Fortes and Gluckman, as was Hilda Beemer/Kuper.

10 Max Gluckman, "The Research Situation," unpublished MS, undated but probably from 1946, MG RAI, 11. Cf. Hilda Kuper's suggestion that their positions as "non-orthodox Jews struggling to achieve a nonethnocentric ethical perspective" led them to an optimistic progressivism and even a non-unilineal social evolutionism, rather than a cultural relativism: Kuper, "Function, History, Biography: Reflections on Fifty Years in the British Anthropological Tradition". (Also cf. 196-7 where she describes fasting on the Day of Atonement during a fieldwork trip with Schapera, while the more secular Schapera and Gluckman ate.)

born in Odessa to a Lithuanian mother, was a leading South African Zionist, [11] while his Russian-Jewish father Emanuel was a prominent liberal lawyer, well-known for representing Africans,[12] including the trade union leader Clements Kadalie and the Abarbiwa tribe. He also published newspaper articles criticizing the treatment of Africans in the criminal justice system,[13] while his efforts to establish a defense fund for Africans led to him being "threatened by the government."[14]

Gluckman followed his father into liberal, pro-African causes, and an interest in the politics of African tribes.[15] He entered the University of Witwatersrand in 1928 to read Law, but soon discovered the nascent discipline of social anthropology, in which he completed his B.A. (Hons) in Social Anthropology in 1934. He also served as Chair of the Bantu Studies Society. At the same time, he was active in student politics, serving on the Council of the National Union of South African students, where he came into conflict with Afrikaner members over the controversial issue of "native rights."[16] He was elected from the Students Representative Council to the national Students Parliament, in which he held successive posts of "Minister for Native Affairs" and "Prime Minister" as leader of the Liberal Party. In 1937 he returned to Johannesburg from his fieldwork in Zululand, in order to work for General Jan Smuts' United Party against the Purified National Party.[17]

At Witwatersrand Gluckman trained with A. Winifred Hoernlé and Isaac Schapera; his fellow students included Hilda Kuper (*née* Beemer), Eileen Krige, and Ellen Hellman.[18] The study of social anthropology introduced him to trans-imperial intellectual and institutional networks, and in 1934 he left South Africa to continue his education in Britain. The next five years saw him circulating within these networks, between London, Oxford, Zululand and Johannesburg, before settling first in Northern Rhodesia in 1939, then returning to Oxford in 1947, and two years later permanently settling in Manchester.

From an early age Gluckman identified as British as well as South African and Jewish. No doubt this was partly because the primary social cleavage among South African Whites was between British and Afrikaner, a divide which Gluckman understood as implying a certain politics: to be British was to be more liberal and less segregationist. As he explained to some confused Zulu in 1937, "in S. A. ... Jews are English."[19] While applying for a US visa in 1957, he described himself as a "British subject by birth" and a South African national by the Statute of Westminster (1931). When the British Nationality Act of 1948 created a separate South African citizenship—it was also the year of the introduction of *apartheid* under the new Nationalist

---

11 Philip Gillon, "Katie Gluckmann," *Jewish Women: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*. 1 March 2009. Jewish Women's Archive. October 4, 2010 <http://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/gluckmann-katie>. Gluckman's immediate family later emigrated to Israel, where his brother Colin became State Attorney under David Ben-Gurion in 1952: Ibid.

12 I have generally followed contemporary usage with these categories, i. e. I use "European" or "White" to refer to those of European descent living in Africa, "African" or a more specific category such as "Zulu" to designate indigenous peoples, i.e. those whose ancestors had lived in the area concerned or had migrated there from other parts of Africa. None of these categories (including "Africa" itself) is unproblematic, and all such categories risk reifying racial or ethnic identities. One of the most valuable aspects of Gluckman's work was exactly to oppose the reification of such categories while taking them seriously as social and political realities.

13 See Gluckman, "The Tribal Area in South and Central Africa", 373-4.

14 Ibid., 374.

15 Ibid., 373-4.

16 Ibid., 374.

17 MG, US Visa application, 1957, MG RAI.

18 Hoernlé and her students are discussed in Chapter One.

19 MG, Field Diary, November 24th, 1937, MG RAI.

government—he chose to apply for registration as a "citizen of the U. K. and Colonies" rather than of South Africa.[20]

In 1934 the appeal of Britain was intellectual as well as political. As an ambitious young social anthropologist in training, Gluckman originally wanted to study at Bronislaw Malinowski's famous seminar at the London School of Economics. His teachers persuaded him to go to Oxford instead,[21] which was enabled by the award of the Rhodes Scholarship for the South African province of the Transvaal, which he took up at Exeter College.[22] However, during his four terms at Oxford he travelled to London once a week to attend Malinowski's seminar.[23] Also attending the seminar at the time were fellow Hoernlé *protégés* Ellen Hellman and Hilda Beemer, and fellow South Africans Isaac Schapera, Meyer Fortes and Monica Hunter. Other fellow students included the antipodeans Raymond Firth and Ian Hogbin, and the English Gregory Bateson and Godfrey Wilson—soon to become both Hunter's husband and first Director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.[24]

Although he admired Malinowski, and seems to have thrived at the seminar,[25] he considered the anthropology seminar at the LSE to be stagnating in functionalist orthodoxy. He compared England unfavorably to the atmosphere of collegial debate at Witwatersrand, lamenting the "bitter atmosphere where people are tied up emotionally with their ideas, and every criticism is taken as a personal attack," and adding that "[o]ne must take all without question - or be turned out as a heretic."[26] There were few new ideas: "the functionalists are still functionalists … with many people here discussion on theory is impossible," the "notable exceptions" being Evans-Pritchard, Fortes and Bateson (and even Bateson was accused of "saying old things in difficult language.")[27] Of these three "exceptions," Bateson was about to leave Britain for the USA, while Evans-Pritchard was soon to be joined by Fortes at Oxford, which during the 1930s began to supersede the LSE as the discipline's intellectual center of gravity. Gluckman later recalled, "by just good chance instead of being attached to Malinowski, I became attached to the waxing stars of E-P and Fortes."[28] Throughout his career Gluckman was to emphasize his debt to them.[29]

In this period Gluckman's politics shifted to the left. He later described himself as having been "a liberal intellectual, with socialistic inclinations," whose experience of Zululand converted him to socialism.[30] On returning to Oxford he was introduced to "dialectical

---

20 MG to Ralph Tyler, November 26, 1957, MG RAI. (The Statute of Westminster was in fact 1931; the act of 1948 was the British Nationality Act.) Cf. Gluckman, "Anthropology and Apartheid: The Work of South African Anthropologists," where he noted what he saw as Adam Kuper's overly narrow use of "British" to mean "from the United Kingdom."

21 More it seems for its all-round education than for any excellence in anthropology: "I myself when awarded a Rhodes Scholarship had wanted to go to the LSE to work with Malinowski: but I was persuaded by my teachers at Johannesburg that there was more to Oxford than a technical education - which is true ...": MG to Milton Singer, Jan 22, 1974, MG RAI.

22 The Rhodes Scholarships were—and still are—an important means for the circulation of intellectuals and ideas through the British Empire and ex-Empire. They were initiated in 1902 by the will of the arch-imperialist Cecil Rhodes, with the objective of bringing international students (originally, from British settler colonies and the U.S.A.) to study at the University of Oxford. The scholarship for the Transvaal was created during World War One.

23 MG, US Visa application, 1957, MG RAI.

24 For more details on the eclecticism of Malinowski's students, see Chapter One.

25 Hoernlé wrote to congratulate him on the news she had heard from Ellen Hellman, that "you are making your mark in Malinowski's seminar and she tells me that both you and she found yourselves fully prepared and able to take part in the discussions going on there.": AWH to MG, March 3, 1935, MG RAI.

26 MG to AWH November 11th, 1936, MG RAI.

27 MG to AWH November 11th, 1936, MG RAI.

28 MG to Milton Singer, January 22nd 1974, MG RAI.

29 See, for example, Max Gluckman and Cyril Daryll Forde, *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations* (Manchester University Press, 1963), viii; Max Gluckman, *Custom and Conflict in Africa* (Oxford,: Blackwell, 1955). In 1972 the Manchester Department published a festschrift to Evans-Pritchard in which Gluckman quoted approvingly Evans-Pritchard's characterization of Manchester as a 'colony' of Oxford: see Max Gluckman, "Introduction," in *The Allocation of Responsibility*, ed. Max Gluckman (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972).

30 MG, "The Research Situation," unpublished MS, MG RAI, 11.

materialism,"[31] by "one of [his] colleagues" at Oxford—presumably Meyer Fortes.[32] A more persisting influence in this direction came through his marriage to Mary Brignoli in 1939. She was an active socialist and Communist Party member until the mid-1950s.[33] He credited her with "clarifying" his "political outlook,"[34] and later emphasized how much this new outlook had influenced his anthropological work, and specifically the Bridge.[35]

Gluckman earned his D. Phil (Oxon) in 1936, before returning to South Africa to carry out fieldwork in Zululand, as part of a research project organized by Hoernlé. He returned to Oxford in 1938 to write up his work, at which point he engaged in a legendary series of pub seminars involving Evans-Pritchard, Fortes and Schapera, and led by Radcliffe-Brown, who had been appointed Professor of Social Anthropology in 1937.[36] In 1939 he was appointed to the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in Northern Rhodesia, directed by Malinowski's *protégé* Godfrey Wilson, who was now married to Monica Hunter. Gluckman's early career therefore traced trans-imperial institutional, personal and intellectual networks. In the following section I shall turn in more detail to the intellectual currents to which he was exposed and in which he participated, before eventually creating his unique synthesis in the Bridge.

Witswatersrand

All three of these institutions trained Gluckman in the core social anthropological methods of long-term immersive participant-observation, and totalistic analysis of a locality. At Witswatersrand, for example, Gluckman was taught that the ethnographer should "fall into line with native precepts and rituals," directly observe "everyday life," and use "native categories" and classifications, including concrete examples of native language.[37] Information should be collected from "as wide a variety and large a number of people as possible" and participant-observation should be supplemented with extensive interviews, topographical plans and genealogies.

The delineation of the subject matter of social anthropology similarly followed the new orthodoxy. The study of culture was distinct from the study of physical characteristics and "psycho-physical causes," as there was no evidence of any correlation between the "varieties of mankind" and the "varieties of organised behaviour."[38] Within the study of cultural difference, social anthropology was defined by its functional approach rather than the historical interpretations of ethnology and archaeology, and within the many possibilities of the functional study of "culture," it was Radcliffe-Brown's interests in social organization and "systems of social value" which were emphasized.[39]

The central problem for anthropology, however, was that of "culture contact," which was altering both "Native" and "European" culture, as the latter "must finally embrace [the] whole

---

31 MG, "The Research Situation," unpublished MS, MG RAI, 11.
32 MG, "The Research Situation," unpublished MS, MG RAI, 11.
33 A later draft application for a US visa dates her Party membership as 1937-39 and 1948-52: MG, US Visa application, 1957, MG RAI; various correspondence alludes to Mary's activities including travelling to Prague before the war and being involved in anti-Fascist demonstrations, see Roy Welensky to MG, February 6th, 1957, MG RAI; MG to Mary Gluckman, February 19th, 1942 MG RAI.
34 MG, Draft Foreword to "CONFLICT AND COHESION IN ZULULAND: An historical study in Social Organization" MG RAI.
35 See e. g. Ibid.; MG to Mary, February 19th, 1942 MG RAI.
36 Stocking, *After Tylor,* 425.
37 MG, notes on lecture by Isaac Schapera, "Practical Value of Anthropological Studies to Administrator, Educationalist, Missionary," Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.
38 MG, notes on lecture by Dr. Barnard, "Principles of Social Anthropology, Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.
39 MG, notes on lecture by Dr. Barnard, "Principles of Social Anthropology, Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.

world." As taught by T. T. Barnard, this project was put in Malinowskian terms of three cultures to be studied: "European, natives & hybrid cultures."[40] Although European and Bantu were two "essentially different cultures," and the Bantu were represented as "simpler" though with a "complex history," neither of these cultures should be regarded as static, as both were being transformed as "all people" were being drawn into the "net of European culture." In order to understand the contemporary world, it would therefore be necessary to understand "blending values," and "transference of systems of social value."

But these general principles were modified by the specific South African situation, which was understood as unique in its "combination of University facilities & the heart of a tremendous problem."[41] Malinowski's separatist leanings were emphatically rejected: the "destruction of native culture in organisation and systems" was certainly outpacing their replacement by "European" institutions, but the idea of "developing [the] Native on his own lines" was a "monstrous and dangerous doctrine." In one lecture Gluckman tersely noted an echo of Radcliffe-Brown's famous pronouncement of 1921: "Segregation impossible."[42]

Under the influence of teachers such as A. W. Hoernlé and Isaac Schapera the culture contact approach was challenged in various ways. The view from South Africa was not of traditional native cultures intersecting with an exported European culture in order to produce a third hybrid culture. For South Africans, the study of "European culture" in South Africa was not the study of a "hinterland," it was the study of the dominant aspect of "the whole Union of South Africa setting," to which African societies were also integral.[43] Gluckman later recalled that Schapera had taught him to see "the tribal areas of South Africa as part of a whole Union and world system."[44] Another major difference with Malinowski was an insistence on the importance of history and the complex history of African tribes, as shown in the conflict between Malinowski and his South African students in Chapter One.

While they agreed with Malinowski on the "practical value" of anthropology, the rationale, as taught by Schapera to Gluckman, was to represent the interests and values of Africans, in order to critique and reform government policy.[45] Schapera advocated the anthropological study of native law and land tenure, since the usual method of information gathering—the South African system of Government commissions—was "expensive, troublesome & inefficient." Participant-observation would allow the ethnographer to reach a sympathetic and accurate understanding of native institutions, and through the education of European agents (including administrators, educators, missionaries, traders and employers of labor) would mollify the worst effects of "foisting European government on natives."[46]

Oxford

When Gluckman arrived at Oxford, anthropology there was still an ecumenical discipline, incorporating prehistory, material culture and physical anthropology. The sub-discipline labeled "social anthropology" was a synthetic, armchair subject taught by the senescent Ranulph

---

40 MG, notes on lecture by Dr. Barnard, "Principles of Social Anthropology, Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.

41 MG, notes on lecture by Isaac Schapera, "Practical Value of Anthropological Studies to Administrator, Educationalist, Missionary," Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.

42 MG, Notebook 1, MG RAI, Bx 63/IV. Radcliffe-Brown's anti-segregationism is discussed in Chapter One.

43 MG to Adam Kuper, July 20th 1974, MG RAI.

44 MG to Adam Kuper, July 20th 1974, MG RAI.

45 MG, notes on lecture by Isaac Schapera, "Practical Value of Anthropological Studies to Administrator, Educationalist, Missionary," Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.

46 MG, notes on lecture by Isaac Schapera, "Practical Value of Anthropological Studies to Administrator, Educationalist, Missionary," Notebook 1, Bx 63/IV, MG RAI.

Marett.[47] At that time the LSE was still the only British university dedicated to a social anthropology defined by immersive participant-observer fieldwork, functional analysis, and a disciplinary separation from the other branches of anthropology.[48] Over the course of the 1930s Evans-Pritchard and his colleagues revolutionized the subject at Oxford, in a similar manner. Yet they did more than recapitulate Malinowskian developments.[49] For a theory of society and method of analysis they turned to Radcliffe-Brown's work on social structure and social values—an influence which was intensified when Radcliffe-Brown assumed the Chair in Social Anthropology in 1937.[50]

Their work of the 1930s would result in some of the most influential ethnographies of the postwar era,[51] including Evans-Pritchard's *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (published in 1937) and *The Nuer* (1940),[52] Meyer Fortes' Tallensi monographs, (1945 and 1949)[53] and the edited collection *African Political Systems* of 1940.[54] After the war Evans-Pritchard became the single most important figure in British social anthropology, dominating the profession both intellectually and institutionally.[55] Fortes became Professor of Anthropology at Cambridge in 1950. Oxford established itself as the new center of intellectual gravity of British anthropology and developed what Adam Kuper has called "the new paradigm that was to guide British social anthropology throughout the 1950s."[56]

Unlike Gluckman's teachers at the LSE and Witwatersrand, the exponents of this paradigm were not concerned with problems of "culture contact," nor indeed of modernity as a direct

---

47 At the end of his first period at Oxford, Gluckman complained to Hoernlé that Marett was "absolutely useless. I don't think I have had an idea from him in two years." MG to AWH, November 11, 1936, MG RAI. However, before World War One Marett—trained as a classicist—had in fact been somewhat of a pioneer in shifting anthropology from a Frazerian preoccupation with comparative mythology towards an engagement with French sociology, to the extent of anticipating some of Evans-Pritchard's later anti-intellectualist arguments. See Ibid., 163ff. He also had begun to make plans for a reconfiguration of the subject even before the arrival of Evans-Pritchard: Mills, *Difficult Folk* 39.

48 Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 80.

49 Both Evans-Pritchard and Fortes had studied with Malinowski, and both had broken with him under the influence of Radcliffe-Brown. Evans-Pritchard was in fact one of Malinowski's first students, having "caused a stir" by leaving Oxford to study at the LSE in 1924: see Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 30. However, he had soon fallen out with Malinowski, with whom he subsequently held a highly ambivalent relationship: Ibid., 36. Fortes was among Malinowski's first cohort of African Institute Fellows, forming with Siegfried Nadel and Sjoerd Hofstra the trio Malinowski dubbed "the Mandarins": see Stocking, *After Tylor,* 408. Like Evans-Pritchard, he had endured a stormy relationship with Malinowski, and had also fallen under Radcliffe-Brown's spell, if with less lasting effect than Evans-Pritchard: see Ibid., 422-5.

50 Mills, *Difficult Folk* 41-2; generally see Ibid., Chapter Three. for the difficult and drawn-out process of converting Oxford to social anthropology.

51 Because of the hiatus caused by the war, much of the work of the 1930s was not fully received until the late 1940s and 1950s. See J. C. Mitchell, "Preface" to Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*.

52 E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937). E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1940).

53 Meyer Fortes, *The Dynamics of Clanship Among the Tallensi, Being the First Part of An Analysis of the Social Structure of a Trans-Volta Tribe,* (London; New York: Pub. for the International African Institute by the Oxford University Press, 1945). Meyer Fortes, *The Web of Kinship Among the Tallensi: The Second Part of An Analysis of the Social Structure of a Trans-Volta Tribe* (London, New York: Pub. for the International African Institute by OUP, 1949). Gluckman called Fortes, *The Dynamics of Clanship Among the Tallensi,* "one of the most important books in our literature": Max Gluckman, "An Advance in African Sociology" reprinted in Max Gluckman, *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa: Collected Essays with An Autobiographical Introduction* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), 83. According to Adam Kuper, "[a]fter Radcliffe-Brown, Fortes was "the most important figure in the development of kinship theory [in the 1940s]": Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 91.

54 Meyer Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *African Political Systems* (London,, 1940).

55 After the war, Evans-Pritchard became the founding Chairman of the Association of Social Anthropologists, and Radcliffe-Brown's successor as Professor in Social Anthropology at Oxford. Fortes was also a founding member of the ASA and a member of its five-man executive committee, while also becoming Reader in Social Anthropology at Oxford. Fortes became Professor of Anthropology at Cambridge in 1950, thus bringing social anthropology to the last bastion of "a more traditional generalist ethnology": Stocking, *After Tylor,* 430.

56 Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 81.

object of study.[57] Rather, they were interested in non-European societies precisely for the ways in which they radically differed from the anthropologist's own. But Evans-Pritchard's early work shows that his primary goal was to destabilize the dichotomy between modern and primitive, as it had recently been defined in terms of rationality, by thinkers such as Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who had opposed a rational modernity to an irrational primitive mind.[58] Evans-Pritchard claimed that such work was accomplished by piecing together fragments of observed behavior and information from informants into an abstract system, which was then compared not to Western everyday life and the beliefs of ordinary people, but to Western science. The incoherence and internal contradictions of such a "pre-logical" system were then held up as evidence of the irrationality of the primitive, whereas they were in fact a result of the investigators' methods.

Evans-Pritchard claimed both that modern society was saturated with irrationality, and that so-called primitive society was much more rational than had been assumed.[59] In order to demonstrate the rationality of beliefs radically alien to the investigators' own, it was necessary to understand them as they were actually lived, rather than as an abstract system. Abstracting a belief system created contradictions which did not arise in the living of it: belief was lived, not formulated, and it was lived within particular social structures and in concrete situations. An intimate understanding of everyday life was therefore crucial. This program was put into ethnographic practice with the early masterpiece *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*—a hugely influential work across many disciplines, in which Evans-Pritchard argued that the Azande's beliefs in the reality of witchcraft were coherent and rational once they were understood as a lived reality within a structure of social relations.[60]

Evans-Pritchard's early work thus marked a fundamental shift away from a dichotomy between modernity and "primitive mentality," through the understanding of belief in terms of everyday life.[61] On the one hand, this was a vindication of Malinowskian participant-observer method, and indeed Evans-Pritchard was himself to become one of the great fieldworkers of the discipline's myth.[62] But in interpretation and inscription of the material, Evans-Pritchard and his colleagues sought to transcend Malinowskian functionalism, which they considered inadequate as an approach to the Durkheimian problem of "social integration."[63] They turned instead to Radcliffe-Brown's focus on the structural relations between persons within a system. They elaborated this approach in perhaps their most lasting achievement: the invention of political

---

57 As we saw in the last chapter, Fortes was a key contributor to Malinowski's culture contact collection, but in his Tallensi monographs there were only a few pages devoted to the changes engendered by British rule and consumer capitalism. He also made some contributions to applied anthropology for administrators.

58 E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "The Intellectualist (English) Interpretation of Magic", *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* I, no. 2 (1933): 1-21. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "Lévy-Bruhl's Theory of Primitive Mentality", *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* II, no. 2 (1934): 1-26. For a discussion of these early papers see Mary Douglas, *Edward Evans-Pritchard* (Penguin Books, 1981), Chapter Three.

59 Regarding the irrationality of the modern, see E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "Science and Sentiment: An Exposition and Criticism of the Writings of Pareto", *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* III, no. 2 (1936): 163-192.

60 Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande*. I discuss this work in more detail below.

61 Mary Douglas has suggested close similarities in this regard between Evans-Pritchard's work in this regard and the contemporary work of Ludwig Wittgenstein. See Douglas, *Edward Evans-Pritchard*, 31-34.

62 Along with Audrey Richards and Isaac Schapera, he was one of the first social anthropologists to do fieldwork in Africa.

63 Their dissatisfaction with Malinowski was on the grounds of his inadequacy on the level of holism: his functionalism was a field method and a "literary device", rather than a serious exploration of the problems of social integration. As Evans-Pritchard put it after the war: "if functional anthropology meant more to him than a principle of field techniques it was as a literary device for integrating his observations for descriptive purposes. It was not, properly speaking, a methodological concept, and he never showed himself capable of using it with any clarity when dealing with the abstractions of general theory." E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Social Anthropology and Other Essays: Combining Social Anthropology and Essays in Social Anthropology* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 53-4.; cf. p. 123.

anthropology, through the comparative study of so-called "stateless societies."[64] This work involved analysis of the complex ways in which kinship structures intersected with political structures, and of the "segmentary" nature of such societies, in which complementary processes of "fission and fusion" produced "equilibrium" in a social structure.[65] However, as we shall see, in focusing on the otherness of their subjects, rather than on their "contact" with the modern world, Oxonian structuralism was ironically to provide Gluckman with the tools to develop a much more successful approach to "culture contact" than either his South African peers or Malinowski.

Gluckman's own work as a student throughout the 1930s shows him oscillating between these two possible anthropological projects: a study of the interaction between Western and non-Western cultures on the one hand, and the study of cultural difference on the other. The very titles of his two BA theses at Witwatersrand indicate these two very different projects: "Magic and Religion of the South-Eastern Bantu," and "A Comparative Study of the Economic Position of the Chief in Certain South Bantu Tribes."[66] The aim of the latter was to study "the change in Bantu environment under the influence of European contact, and ... how the chief, in his economic function, had reacted to this change"[67]: specifically, how the position of Bantu chiefs was undermined directly by European rule and indirectly by the introduction of consumer capitalism, by which ordinary natives were transformed by new wants.[68] Tellingly, it was the thesis on traditional magic and religion which he rewrote at Oxford for his D. Phil. thesis. Oxford had removed him from the contemporary political and economic concerns of South Africa, and took him even further from the realities of the field—the thesis was based on library, not field, research.

However this thesis, and the three articles drawn from it, which he published in the late 1930s, also reveal Gluckman experimenting with questions and methods derived from Durkheim through Evans-Pritchard and Radcliffe-Brown. He explored Bantu ritual not, as J. G. Frazer had done in *The Golden Bough*, for comparative evidence about primitive belief, but for what it revealed about social structure. In this regard, the turn away from the problems of culture contact held the advantage of also enabling him to transcend the naive functionalism of his BA theses, in which Bantu society was understood as a normally unchanging "delicately-adjusted machine,"[69] the interdependence of the various parts of which made it vulnerable to the disruptive, dynamic modern, as "[a] breakdown or alteration of the workings of one part may throw the whole machine, or much of it, out of gear."[70]

Gluckman corresponded regularly with Hoernlé throughout his time at Oxford. Her continuing influence ensured that he thought through developments at Oxford and the LSE in terms of South African liberal commitments, and would eventually return him to contemporary problems, rather than the more primitivist and comparativist possibilities encouraged at

---

64 The key works included those on the Nuer and Tallensi cited above, and Fortes and Evans-Pritchard, *African Political Systems*. These works taken together were not only crucial in articulating a new "paradigm" for British social anthropology, but invented the field of political anthropology in general, and were highly influential outside Britain. For discussion see Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 80-96. See also Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends, passim*.

65 See Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 86-7.

66 Both found in MS, MG RAI.

67 MG, "A Comparative Study of the Economic Position of the Chief in Certain South Bantu Tribes," ii.

68 Ibid., Ch. 1.

69 Ibid., Ch. 1.

70 Ibid., Ch. 1

Oxford.[71] He oscillated between the two poles of Oxford and Johannesburg, both metaphorically and literally. After his initial two years at Oxford, 1934 to 1936, he returned to South Africa to carry out fieldwork in Zululand; he then returned to Oxford in 1938-9 where he began writing up his findings, and also produced his contribution to *African Political Systems*, which he wrote while in the field.

In many ways Hoernlé agreed with the approach which Gluckman was being taught at Oxford, and in particular the aim to transcend Malinowskian functionalism. Her letters reveal a respectful suspicion of Malinowski, to whom she compared Evans-Pritchard favorably.[72] While Malinowski's functionalism provided the best approach to fieldwork, as an analysis of culture it was "muddled."[73] She agreed with Evans-Pritchard that it was only a preliminary stage on the way to understanding social integration.[74] In this regard she approved of Gluckman's reports of methodological developments at Oxford: specifically, the synthesis of Durkheim with long-term fieldwork.[75] She asserted that "Durkheim's approach from the angle of structure is the correct one, [because] the structures in a society are the working of the living groups—the actual behaviour." However because Durkheim had studied such groups "when dead" rather than "alive," as did social anthropologists, he missed what they could see: that many social groups—including "many African economic groups" were "occasional"—in other words constituting themselves in particular situations rather than being permanent, immutable categories.

However, her own anthropological project differed radically from that of Evans-Pritchard. Like Malinowski, she emphasized the importance of studying contemporary social problems, and of engaging in research which would be applicable to problems of South African governance. In this regard, her notion of the totality appropriate to social anthropology was much more expansive than the Oxonian focus on a delimited alien society. The "specific task" of anthropology was to explain social phenomena in terms of "the total situation," "the total reaction"[76] or "the total setting of the culture."[77] This "total setting" was diachronic as well as syncronic, involving the use of "accurately documented" historical data, which "extend the field of one's facts."[78] Indeed, as we saw in the previous chapter, she believed that the "central problem" for current anthropology was to understand "the principles of culture change and culture growth."[79] But her notion of totality was also more synchronically expansive than the Oxonian goal of understanding a non-Western society as a whole system in isolation. She

---

71 According to Gluckman, she was one of the central influences on his work, "from the time I was 18 until I was in my middle 30's," supervising his field research, reading his reports when he returned to Johannesburg, and corresponding with him when he was writing up his fieldwork on the Zulu. MG to Adam Kuper, July 20, 1974, MG RAI.

72 For examples of her approval of Evans-Pritchard, often in comparison to Malinowski, see AWH to MG, October 2, 1934; AWH to MG, March 3rd, 1935; AWH to MG August 27, 1935 (in which she expressed a "hankering" to have him come to Wits rather than Oxford), all MG RAI.

73 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.

74 AWH to MG, March 3, 1935, MG RAI.

75 "Evans-Pritchard is quite right in his demands for 'real contexts' in the study of social anthropology, and I do think Malinowski is weak on this aspect of Anthropology. I told him so when he was out here and he did not like it." AWH to MG, August 27th, 1935, MG RAI.

76 AWH to MG November 3, 1936, MG RAI.

77 AWH to MG, March 3, 1935, MG RAI.

78 AWH to MG, March 3, 1935, MG RAI. She believed that "even Malinowski" was coming to understand the importance of history. For methods for the study of culture change she recommended the work of Paul Radin and F. C. Bartlett, and also gave a qualified approval to Arnold Toynbee's *Study of History* as the "first attempt ... on a grand scale" to do what she had always felt should be done: "an analysis of the principles underlying the greater civilisations ... on the same lines as our analysis of principles underlying the simpler cultures." For his part, Gluckman reported that Evans-Pritchard was "becoming keener and keener on anthropological reference to the known data of development in history." MG to AWH, October 29, 1935. After the war Evans-Pritchard was famously to turn from a scientistic understanding of social anthropology, to asserting that anthropology was one branch of history.

79 AWH TO MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.

insisted on the study of both urban Africans and the modern political, economic and legal systems in which all Africans found themselves implicated.[80]

Just as Durkheim's sociological investigations into social cohesion were motivated by his hopes and fears for the Third Republic, so Hoernlé's agenda was specifically political: to find a way to conceive of all groups, white and black, in a single frame of reference: that of South African society. Hoernlé rejected the idea of assimilation; instead a new "general South African system" was being created through the "absorption" of Africans.[81] The task of anthropology then was to understand specific changes in terms of the overall changing system. This included understanding new categories in the economic system, such as "labour tenant," and the understanding of native legislation as "modifications of our system brought about by our attempts to absorb the Africans."[82] There was a normative, or utilitarian, aspect to understanding the kind of system which was being developed, which, she claimed, "could be so evolved as to include a very great deal of African thought and custom, and will, whether we wish it or not, have to be so evolved as to suit the Africans as well as ourselves!"[83]

The project was pressing, because the "evolution" of society was not necessarily progressive. Citing the German ethnologist Richard Thurnwald, she distinguished between the "irreversible accumulations of knowledge" characteristic of Western science, and the "pendula swings between a limited number of possibilities, indicating no necessary advance or progress at all," which were characteristic of Western social and political organization.[84] Social anthropology presented itself as a possible way forward, as the "scientific study of the forms of social organization" and in order to generate resources for social and political "experimentation."[85] If the idea of a comparative science of society, in the interests of social engineering, was reminiscent of Radcliffe-Brown, her emphasis on "human needs" was more reminiscent of Malinowski. In this regard she approved of Gluckman's continued study of Bantu ritual: not for its intrinsic interest, but as the key to understanding "the emotional needs of modern man, and ... how to give expression to them," in the interests of humanity's "spiritual development."[86] Hoernlé had been directing her students' attention to the "really remarkable amount of ritual that goes on from day to day in [Johannesburg] … and how ineffectual and sterile most of it is, uncoordinated, spasmodic, with no harmony to be seen running through the whole."[87] Her stance was neither anti-modern nor simply romantic; rather the aim was to supplement or guide modernity through an understanding of what had been lost.

In their correspondence Hoernlé and Gluckman informally applied such broad comparativism on ritual to contemporary global political projects. Hoernlé fretted that "Russia is failing here, like the rest of the world ... one of the greatest ritual objects today in Soviet Russia is Lenin's tomb, yet I doubt whether the leaders understand the significance of that." Gluckman concurred, comparing the slow advance of Communism in Russia to the way that Nazism had swept Germany, and suggesting that "it must be because Hitler has ritualised his whole movement ... making a god of every German" while "the Soviet preaches 'man.'" He lamented that "[e]very detail of German life is being ritualised in relation to National Socialism ... [i]t does

---

80 AWH TO MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.
81 AWH TO MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.
82 AWH TO MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.
83 AWH TO MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.
84 "[w]e have not discovered the social forms best suited to the satisfaction of special human needs; we have not discovered the best type of political organisation: we swing from one form to the other, each time thinking the change a marvellous new progression!" AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.
85 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.
86 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.
87 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.

show, somewhat disastrously, what can be done by ritual, and the tragedy of Liberalism is that is can never make the same emotional appeal."[88]

II The Bridge

Zululand

Hoernlé also had more specific plans for Gluckman, and by March 1935 was encouraging him to carry out fieldwork in Zululand. She herself had been working there, and had become well acquainted with both the local colonial officers and the Zulu elite, who had asked her to analyze their ritual systems in order to explain them anthropologically.[89] She wanted Gluckman to attain a total overview of the Zulu: "to make a thorough survey of their present position, and of all the influences that are at work among them."[90] However, a close reading of her correspondence to Gluckman reveals two different uses of the language of totality, corresponding to different political ends.

The first of these was to understand the Zulu as part of modern South Africa, in terms of the interactions between traditional Zulu modes of organization and the "modern economic, legal, and governmental system."[91] She particularly lamented current ignorance of "the interrelations of the Native judicial system with the European": for example, there was no understanding of which cases were settled in local Zulu courts, which were sent to the Chief, and which were sent to the (White) Magistrate.[92] Another system of interactions to be studied was between the Zulu political structures and "European administration," and how they "overlap, fulfill different functions, or, if at all, strain against one another."[93] The project underlying such investigations was Hoernlé's vision for South Africa's future as a hybrid and ecumenical one, involving a plurality of non-exclusive groups with a universality of potential membership, universal citizenship and universal membership of political institutions at all levels—albeit with the standard liberal caveat that such inclusion would take place when the natives were "ready." [94]

However she also used the language of totality in a more restricted sense, to refer to the means of integration or social cohesion within Zulu political culture. While the focus was still on the contemporary situation, this version of totality was more akin to a stereotypical structural-functionalist organicism. Its political aim was to discover the ways in which existing Zulu structures could be used as forces for social cohesion.[95] She was concerned about the problem of "submerged forces," which would well up if given the opportunity, stressing the need "to mould them ... so that ultimately we get a completely harmonised new growth." She had been trying to convince Braatvedt, the magistrate at Nongoma, the value of "available resources of energy for maintaining social life," such as traditional native institutions. In this regard she agreed with the famous French colonial administrator, Marshal Lyautey,[96] "that it is foolish not to use forces of

---

88 MG to AWH, September 13, 1935, MG RAI.

89 "We went to the Zulu ihlambo ceremony, I wrote a short account for the papers, and now the Zulu want me to write some more articles "to explain their customs to them!" AWH to MG, October 2, 1934, MG RAI.

90 AWH to MG, March 3, 1935, MG RAI.

91 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.

92 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.

93 AWH to MG, October 13, 1935, MG RAI.

94 "[U]ltimately there should be no hampering or hindrance to any citizen to enter into any grouping which exists in the country, i.e. there should be no mutually exclusive groups, and it should be possible for the African to enter into full South African citizenship, and play his part in institutions developed in towns, Provinces, and Union as he is ready for them." AWH to MG, October 13, 1935, MG RAI.

95 As she put it, "Native methods of maintaining social order." AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.

96 Louis-Hubert Lyautey was first Resident-General of French Morocco, from 1912 to 1925, and proponent of "indirect" forms of colonial rule.

cohesion that are already present within a social organisation." To this end she recommended that Gluckman study the part that native institutions, such as the chieftainship and the *iButho* regimental system, were playing "in modern Zulu life." She admitted that the chieftainship had to be handled carefully, as in the past it had been "the centre of anti-white revolt" but with proper education and guidance, it could be harnessed "for the good of the people." This different sense of totality was strongly paternalist and even repressive, equating "the good of the people" with good governance and lack of conflict. Ultimately this local totality would be synthesized with the broader, in order to understand "[h]ow far we can use African institutions as alternative South African institutions within one complex South African system."[97]

In Hoernlé's eyes, Oxford was "the place" for Gluckman to find out what he could about "comparative policy, and comparative methods of administration"; she advised him to "draw them at Oxford on Colonial policy" and also to "teach them to think on some subjects," in order that he might return to make "a real contribution" to South Africa.[98] She worked towards this goal, and in 1935 helped him to win a research grant from the South African government's new Social and Educational Research Council (her husband, the philosopher R. F. A. Hoernlé was on the grant committee.)[99] Although the funds derived ultimately from the Carnegie Corporation, they were allocated by the government. This marked the beginnings of a significant shift in the control of the funding of social anthropology, which previously had been administered by research institutes like the International African Institute (IAI, discussed in Chapter One): as Hoernlé pointed out to Gluckman, the IAI were now short of money, due to Rockefeller funding being withdrawn from anthropological research.[100] And although the project was funded by the South African government, it was significant not only within South Africa, but more broadly as part of the reform of British imperial ideology from indirect rule to development. Indeed the project had had attracted the interest of no less than Sir Malcolm Hailey, then engaged in his landmark African Research Survey.[101] Hoernlé told Hailey about the proposed research in Zululand, and reported "he was very keenly interested [and] thought it most important" and that her husband would be able to quote his "strong support" of the project in gaining funding.

A set of intersecting problems had therefore been generated for Gluckman. The specifics of his grant required him to study "the modern economic, political, and legal systems of Zululand."[102] And specifically "[t]he interrelation of Zulu and European systems of control"[103] While the move to Oxford had pulled him away from contemporary problems and towards the study of "traditional" ritual, the move back to South Africa pushed him in the opposite direction. As he later explained when attempting to have his PhD thesis published after the war, his program of research was set for him as "the modern polity and economy of Zululand," and as far as ritual was concerned, he was forced to concentrate on issues such as "the relation of the beliefs of separatist sects to the colour-bar, rather than on the relations of beliefs to technological practice." When Hoernlé heard that Gluckman, still in Oxford, might be getting "stale on the Zulu," she wrote to restate the agenda in crystal-clear terms:

> The research grant which we obtained for you is given by a body not

97 AWH to MG, October 13, 1935, MG RAI.
98 AWH to MG, August 8, 1934, MG RAI.
99 AWH to MG, January 31, 1936, MG RAI. R. F. A. Hoernlé was on the committee, and the two guided Gluckman through the application process. AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.
100 AWH to MG, August 27, 1935, MG RAI.
101 See Chapter One.
102 MG, "Application for lectureship in social anthropology," September 6, 1945, MG RAI.
103 AWH to MG, June 1, 1936, MG RAI.

> primarily interested in Anthropological research but in educational, social and administrative problems, and you got the grant because of the specific interest in the problem we put before them. The interrelation of Zulu and European systems of administration and control is one which especially interested Mr Hofmeyr [Jan Hofmeyr, then Minister for Education, Interior and Public Health] who realised that it might give valuable information to the government if they were wise enough to act on it, it also interested Sir Malcolm Hailey who is studying the whole situation in Africa from the developmental point of view as you know."[104]

But if the subject for investigation was initially set by a South African governmental agenda, and more broadly the new British imperial agenda of development, Gluckman's approach to it was conditioned by other factors. Liberal politics, and his South African teachers, required him to understand South Africa as a total situation, while the requirements of social anthropology demanded that he do so through intensive immersion in a local culture. The example of segregationist *Volkekunde* pushed him away from the study of cultural difference, just as the influence of Oxford pulled him towards an emphasis on the social. His approach was also inflected by his own socialism, and his reading of Marx (and, indeed, Freud) attuned him to the centrality of conflict and social change over an extended period of time.

These various elements were brought together in a unique synthesis in Gluckman's paper "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand," initially published in the South African journal *Bantu Studies* in two parts in 1940.[105] The stated aim was to understand the "the social structure of modern Zululand"[106] (a "native reserve" within the Union of South Africa) in terms of the total situation of modern South African society: to determine "how, and how far, the reserve is interlocked in the Union's social system."[107] Primarily, this meant the "interdependent relations between and within colour-groups as colour-groups," as South Africa was "constituted basically by its division into colour-groups of varying status."[108] Understanding "what within the reserve are African-White relations, and how these relations are affected by, and affect, the structure of each colour-group," would, however, involve a broader analysis of "economic, political and other relations"[109] with the rest of the Union.

While Hoernlé had advised him to study the interrelations between formal Zulu and European political and legal institutions, both his training at Oxford and his field experience also led Gluckman to understand politics in a broader sense, in terms of the ways in which power saturated all social relations.[110] As dictated by the Malinowskian template for fieldwork,

---

104 AWH to MG January 31, 1936, MG RAI.

105 I am indebted to the detailed discussions of "The Bridge" in Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940" and Hugh Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society," *African Affairs* 94, no. 374 (1995): 39-65. Regarding the origins of the paper, Macmillan emphasizes the critique of Malinowski, Cocks the importance of the South African context. I have attempted to synthesize their accounts with the other key influences on Gluckman, as revealed in his personal papers which were under embargo until recently. I am particularly indebted to Cocks' insight into the link between Gluckman's methodological innovations and his ability to conceptualize South Africa as a single society, though rather than his suggestion that the main impetus to do so came from the historian W. M. Macmillan, my account emphasizes the importance of A. W. Hoernlé in motivating, and Oxonian structuralism in enabling, Gluckman's approach.

106 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 9. All citations are to the republished version from 1958.

107 Ibid., 1.

108 Ibid., 1.

109 Ibid., 1.

110 Both the historian Hugh Macmillan and Gluckman himself have suggested his fieldwork experiences were crucial in informing his approach in "The Bridge." See *Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society",* 43; Gluckman, *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa: Collected Essays with An Autobiographical Introduction* 379ff.

Gluckman had spent an extended period in the field, living in a hut in Zulu kraal for a total of sixteen months,[111] between November 1936 and July 1938: attempting "to think and act in Zulu idiom" and trying to attain "a subjective picture of Zulu life" by participating in it as much as possible.[112] However this was no remote island or isolated village. Gluckman found himself enmeshed in, and constrained by, a highly sensitive set of political conditions, and had to negotiate delicate relations with various others: most importantly, the Zulu elite and South African government officials, but also other Zulu and Europeans, including Afrikaner anthropologists. The political situation in Zululand was sensitive, and anthropologists were tolerated with suspicion on all sides. Initially the Zulu took him for a "government spy,"[113] while government itself became increasingly disconcerted by his transgressions of racial boundaries. While he was largely successful in negotiating these perils—at least in the sense of being able to gather enough material to publish—eventually he failed, and in 1939 was banned from Zululand.[114]

Gluckman's training at Oxford had provided him with resources with which to interpret these experiences. Oxonian political anthropology examined the ways in which social structure could also be political structure, and had also developed various analytical tools to study the intertwinings of the two. Gluckman presented his work as the first application of Oxonian methods to the problem of "culture-contact;"[115] later in his career he described how working with Evans-Pritchard and Fortes in the 1930s had prepared him "to find more than a straightforward governmental apparatus among the Zulu [and] had sharpened my insight into the significance of conflict and cleavage, fusion and fission, in political systems.[116] Yet while keeping the notion of social structure central, he projected Oxonian social thought onto a much broader canvas—that of South Africa as a whole—and also reworked its concepts, beginning with the idea of a "social situation."

Situations

The themes of the paper revolved around Gluckman's concept of the "modern social situation." I will first discuss Gluckman's concept of the "social situation," before turning to his analysis of particular situations in terms of their modernity. Referring to Evans-Pritchard's and Fortes' work of the late 1930s, he explained that "social situations are a large part of the raw material of the anthropologist," from which "social structure, relationship, institutions, etc." were abstracted, and through which the truth of generalizations was checked.[117] Following the Durkheimian orientation of Oxford anthropology, a set of situations was studied specifically as social—not, for example, as psychological—"so that the analysis reveals the underlying system of relationships between the social structure of the community, the parts of the social structure, the physical environment, and the physiological life of the community's members."[118]

During Gluckman's first period of training at Oxford, from 1934 to 1936, he and his colleagues had begun to rethink the social in what they called "social situations" or "real

---

111 MG "Foreword" for a proposed book on Zululand, no date (c. 1946), MS, MG RAI; MG to AWH November 7, 1939; E. J. Braatvedt letter of reference for MG, April 2, 1939, MG RAI.

112 MG, "Anthropology at Close Quarters," MS, no date, MG RAI. This was possibly a draft of the script for a radio broadcast he gave from Durban while still working in Zululand. Internal evidence indicates it was written during his field research.

113 MG, "Anthropology at Close Quarters," MS, no date, MG RAI.

114 I will return to this ban, and the politics of Gluckman's field experence in Zululand generally, in Chapter Four.

115 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand,* 3.

116 Gluckman, *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa: Collected Essays with An Autobiographical Introduction,* viii.

117 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand,* 3.

118 Ibid., 9.

contexts."[119] For Gluckman and Fortes, this was initially a more satisfactory way to understand a social totality than Malinowski's institutional approach, which Gluckman felt failed to give an idea of "the facts as a whole," due to his lack of treatment of everyday life, "so we never know just what [the Trobrianders] do or how they live."[120] Understanding the social situations in which ritual events, for example, occurred, led one to a more accurate understanding of that society as a functioning entity. With Evans-Pritchard's encouragement, Gluckman developed a situational analysis of Bantu ritual in his PhD and published papers, in which he analyzed ritual situations in thick context in order to understand the dialectical relationships between belief and social structure.

Evans-Pritchard himself had been developing a radically new approach to the social through the analysis of situations, which he presented in his *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*, published in 1937.[121] Situations were important for Evans-Pritchard in several ways. Most basically, they were the raw material through which the anthropologist could perceive the relationship between belief, behavior and social structure, as embedded in the practice of everyday life. But they also allowed the anthropologist to understand how seemingly contradictory beliefs could be reconciled, when a belief system was understood as a lived reality spread across a multiplicity of situations. In his critique of Lévy-Bruhl's approach, Evans-Pritchard claimed that "primitive thought as pieced together in this manner by European observers is full of contradictions which do not arise in real life because the bits of belief are evoked in different situations."[122] This was because situations were also real and significant for the agents themselves, and their utterances could only be understood contextually. The seeming contradictions between beliefs were obviated through "situational selection," whereby "[a] man in one situation utilizes what in the beliefs are convenient to him and pays no attention to other elements which he might use in different situations."[123] Evans-Pritchard therefore proceeded, as Gluckman put it in his D. Phil. thesis, "by considering the situations and manner in which the Azande direct attention to mystical notions."[124] Once situational selection was taken into account, non-European belief-systems could be understood as "intellectually consistent,"[125] while seemingly irrational beliefs could be understood as responses to social structure: witchcraft accusations, for example, were both a way of explaining misfortune and of expressing and regulating interpersonal relations.

Situational selection took on a new significance in the Oxonian study of so-called "segmentary societies," as in Evans-Pritchard's *Nuer* and *African Political Systems*. In such societies, the very structure of society was situational. The tribe was divided and subdivided into units of decreasing size, which would unite or divide under different circumstances. As Adam Kuper has summarized it, "[t]he segments operate only in opposition to other like segments. If a man in one village killed a man in another, the two villages would mobilize to settle the debt. If a man in one of these villages killed a man in another district, the two villages would unite with other villages in their district against the villages of the other district. Evans-Pritchard termed these processes of division and coalition 'fission and fusion.'"

Although he attacked Lévy-Bruhl's particular mode of abstraction, Evans-Pritchard agreed

---

119 E. g. MG to AWH, no date (1935), MG RAI.

120 MG to AWH, no date (1935), MG RAI.

121 Gluckman's papers include extensive notes from Evans-Pritchard's lectures on the material from 1934, MG RAI.

122 Evans-Pritchard, "Lévy-Bruhl's Theory of Primitive Mentality", 28-9., discussed in Douglas, *Edward Evans-Pritchard,* 27.

123 E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic Among the Azande* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 221. (This and other citations are to the abridged edition of 1976.)

124 MG, "The Realm of the Supernatural among the South-Eastern Bantu," D. Phil (Oxon) thesis, MG RAI, viii.

125 Ibid., 222.

that “unless we make abstractions we cannot even commence to study phenomena.”[126] The Oxonian approach to situations therefore also involved abstraction. As Evans-Pritchard put it, the goal was "not to describe in full every social situation in which magic, oracles, and witchcraft are to be found, but to study the relations of these practices and beliefs to one another, to show how they form an ideational system, and to inquire how this system is expressed in social behaviour.”[127] Situations were therefore presented in the text as general categories rather than concrete instances.[128] A total belief system of a particular kind was reconstructed through comparison between the ways in which beliefs were invoked in different types of situation. In as much as specific, concrete events were presented in the text it was as typical cases illustrating general points.[129] Furthermore, the belief system was not considered in relation to other spheres of reality, such as economic activity: this was partly a reaction to the seemingly unending interrelatedness of institutions and activities in Malinowskian functionalism.[130]

These abstracting moves, however, had unintended consequences. Oxonian ethnographies were written in the ethnographic present and depicted their objects of study in synchronic atemporality. They also participated in other aspects of what the anthropologist Jonathan Spencer has called "ethnographic naturalism," which he claims was dominant in British anthropology precisely in the heyday of Oxonian structuralism in the decades following World War Two. Ethnographic naturalism involves "the creation of a taken-for-granted representation of reality by certain standard devices."[131] The "raw data" of ethnographic experience is suppressed in the use of free indirect speech: instead of recording "[a]n old man told me at a sacrifice, 'This is a kind of bargain with God'" the ethnographer writes, "Through the sacrifice man makes a kind of bargain with his God."[132] This example makes clear many of the problems with ethnographic naturalism. The de-temporalization of the subject is only one aspect. The “native” is also homogenized through generalization from a single informant to a practice or belief assumed to be normal for a given population. This flattening out of individual variation into a generalized “*homo anthropologicus*” also helps to primitivize the subject, as "consensus has been taken to be a defining feature of primitive society, at least since Durkheim's mechanical solidarity, while difference is read as the sign of the modern."[133]

Ethnographic naturalism effaces persons, and therefore agency: both the ethnographer and the subjects of the ethnography. The narrator is made "invisible and omniscient,"[134] and more generally, the particularity of the anthropologist's research experience is denied. The effacing of the raw data of the ethnographer's experience is supposed to substitute scientific objectivity for autobiographical subjectivity, but instead makes the ethnographer irrefutable, and therefore

---

126 Ibid., 2.

127 Ibid., 2.

128 To use terminology from analytic philosophy, Evans-Pritchard's and Fortes's situations were types rather than tokens; Gluckman's were tokens not types. See Linda Wetzel, "Types and Tokens," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/types-tokens/).

129 For a useful list of such instances see Cocks, "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940", 739-740, footnote 1. Tellingly, Evans-Pritchard used the ethnographic present, except when he presented actual cases to illustrate his points, when he shifted to the past tense and first person (e. g. pp. 114-116.)

130 Kuper, *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School,* 69-70, 78.

131 Jonathan Spencer, "Anthropology As a Kind of Writing", *Man* 24, no. 1 (1989): doi:10.2307/2802551. Johannes Fabian also situates the ethnographic present within a broader array of techniques: see Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. I largely follow Spencer in the rest of my account here.

132 Jonathan Spencer, "Anthropology As a Kind of Writing," The example is also used in Dan Sperber, *On Anthropological Knowledge: Three Essays* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 14-19; the example was drawn ultimately from E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956).

133 Jonathan Spencer, "Anthropology As a Kind of Writing," 153.

134 Spencer, "Anthropology As a Kind of Writing".

"substitutes an unchallengeable subjectivity for a challengeable subjectivity."[135] Often the use of the ethnographic present in the third person has been interleaved with the "autobiographical" past tense in the first person in order to establish the ethnographer as ultimate authority on the native society in question, without revealing the actual personal experience.[136] This approach is at least partly a response to a fundamental tension in ethnographic work between the particular, personal experience of events during fieldwork, and the impersonal presentation of generalizations in the published ethnography.

While the work of his Oxonian colleagues is certainly well described in terms of this ethnographic naturalism, Gluckman's work on Zululand took a radically different approach. Gluckman had long been interested in ethnographic "methods of presentation."[137] In his BA theses he was highly self-conscious about taking an abstracted, timeless, panoramic viewpoint, and sought to justify it through the use of Bantu idiom: "I propose, therefore, to take some ideal ... season of the year; to sit above a Native village like 'the man on the mountain,' as the Bantu would say; and to describe briefly the life in the village below."[138] He also struggled with tense: "a highly organised, patriarchal society which is (or rather was) often cut across, yet solidified, by age-grades,"[139] and alternated throughout between the ethnographic present tense, with its implications of changelessness, and the past tense, with its implications of concrete historicity.

In "The Bridge" Gluckman set out to avoid such problems through methodological innovation. He began with a very different approach to situations. Rather than abstracting the situations he experienced into a set of categories, related in an system, he presented a series of concrete situations in his text. The paper began with a long, detailed narrative description of the chain of events which Gluckman experienced on a single day—the 7th of January, 1938.[140] The day's central event was the opening of a bridge over the Black Umfolosi River in the Mahlabatini District in Northern Zululand. Beginning with his own journey to the event, accompanied by a diverse cast of Zululanders, Gluckman narrated the various activities at the bridge, largely involving a variety of actors congregating and separating in various groupings for a series of formal and semi-formal rituals. This event was followed by a meeting of 200-300 Zulu with the magistrate at Nongoma, a nearby village.

Rather than alternate between the ethnographic present for the depiction of others, and the autobiographical past to assert his own authority, Gluckman consistently used the first person and narrative past tense, and described the actions of named persons, motivated by both personal and group values. He recounted the events of the whole day in painstaking detail. Gluckman explicitly stated that he was presenting his data so that his conclusions could be refuted and his material re-analyzed. But the presentation of the concrete situation did more than invite

---

135 Ibid. Spencer contrasts the ways ethnographies efface their raw data with historiography's use of footnotes to cite sources, which "allows the possibility of empirical challenge to both the description and the interpretation found in the main text," 151.

136 George W Stocking, *Observers Observed : Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).

137 MG to AWH, no date (1935), MG RAI.

138 MG, "A Comparative Study of the Economic Position of the Chief in Certain Southern Bantu Tribes," B. A. Thesis (Witswatersrand), MG RAI, Chapter Two.

139 MG, "A Comparative Study of the Economic Position of the Chief in Certain Southern Bantu Tribes," B. A. Thesis (Witswatersrand), MG RAI, Chapter One. Cf. the first paragraph of Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific; An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*, which twists from present to perfect to pluperfect and back to present tense within the space of the first three sentences.

140 The published text remained remarkably close to Gluckman's field diary for the day, with some minor omissions. However there seems to be one discrepancy: Gluckman did not attend the first part of the magistrate's meeting at Nongoma, which was therefore reconstructed from other witnesses' accounts. A close reading of the text shows that in fact he did not claim to have been present, although this was certainly implied. MG, Notebook "N1," MG RAI.

reanalysis. It showed how the events were experienced, and situated them concretely—both on the side of the anthropologist and on the side of his subjects.

Gluckman used the first person to thematize the complexities of his presence as an anthropologist. He certainly situated himself as a particular kind of expert, pointing to the unique role he played in the social structure, which gave him a special, albeit limited, ability to cross racial boundaries: "I, as an anthropologist, was in a position to become an intimate friend of Zulu as other Europeans could not, and this I did in virtue of a special type of social relationship, recognized as such by both races."[141] But rather than authenticating the authority of the ethnographer, he used the first person to expose the limits to his knowledge, for example pointing out when he had failed to take adequate notes of a conversation.[142] Likewise he pointed out the ways in which this privileged access depended on the assistance of local political authorities—both colonial and Zulu—to do his work.[143] And he lamented that despite this privilege, "Yet I could never quite overcome the social distance between us."[144]

This use of the first person plural to include both himself and the Zulu indicates how more generally, Gluckman depicted himself, and both European and African subjects, in the same spatio-temporal frame, and enmeshed in the same society. For example, in narrating his journey to the opening ceremony, Gluckman repeatedly used the first-person plural with regard to the various and changing groupings he formed with other Europeans and Africans, and his relationships to them, including the *induna* Matolana (his host in Zululand), Gluckman's Christian Zulu servant, the leader of a Zulu Christian sect, and a government veterinary officer. He revealed that both he and veterinary officer with whom he traveled to the bridge had a "personal interest" in it, as they had both gone to school with the Government engineer who directed the building of the bridge."[145] Once at the bridge opening, he emphasized his own movement between the various groups. He therefore presented himself not as an explorer not of the remote and exotic, but of the lines of connection and cleavage within his own society. In these various interactions Gluckman showed what he would later argue: that South Africa formed a single society, and that he was therefore engaged in auto-anthropology.

To be sure, this was hardly ethnography in the highly self-reflexive and "confessional mode" which began to emerge in the 1960s.[146] Some of the limits to Gluckman's self-reflexivity can be perceived through unpublished manuscripts in which he discussed the political complexities of his position in more detail than in “The Bridge.” In fact the role of anthropologist was not at all a well-established role in White society, let alone one recognized by the Zulu, who at first assumed he was a Government spy.[147] Only after a long time did he manage to win a place in the Zulu social structure, and even then, he admitted, “a lot of the Zulu, like most Europeans, think I am fairly harmless but a little crazy."[148] In another manuscript he discussed his awareness of the “latent political power” which he represented to the Zulu as a White, and of the fact that they saw him as a political resource to be exploited.[149] Ultimately Gluckman was unable to keep himself out of the struggles which ensued, resulting ultimately in his being banned from Zululand—none of this was discussed in “The Bridge.”

---

141 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand,* 19.
142 Ibid.
143 Ibid.
144 Ibid.
145 Ibid., 3.
146 See James Clifford, “Introduction” to *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 14.
147 MG, “Anthropology at Close Quarters,” MS, MG RAI, 1.
148 MG, “Anthropology at Close Quarters,” MS, MG RAI, 1.
149 MG, "The Research Situation," unpublished MS, MG RAI, 11.

Despite these lacunae, Gluckman's rejection of ethnographic naturalism exposed some of the limits of the epistemology of anthropological work. More importantly, perhaps, the events presented by Gluckman revealed the denizens of Zululand as a diverse cast of real, named persons—even characters mentioned in passing often had their proper names attached to their social role—rather than ethnographic naturalism's undifferentiated *homo anthropologicus* or even the social personae used in more abstract structuralist ethnographies. Apart from the disparate group of friends with whom Gluckman traveled to the bridge opening, the ceremony itself involved a broad cross-section of Zululand society—both "European" and "African." Europeans present included H. C. Lugg, the Chief Native Commissioner for Zululand and Natal; the local magistrate, who had organized the event; government officials and office staff; government technical officers such as the district surgeon, the veterinary officer and a road engineer; missionaries; hospital staff; traders and labour recruiting agents, and others such as a local cattle auctioneer. The Zulu were led by the Chief Mshyeni, the Regent of the Zulu Royal House, and included "local chiefs and headmen and their representatives; the men who had built the bridge; Government police; the Native Clerk ... and Zulu from the surrounding area."[150]

These agents were depicted as associating in a changing variety of ways: coming together as one group, separating, and reforming as another kind of group. Yet this society was also beset by schisms, so that in certain situations certain groupings and co-operation was possible, but not in others. When Gluckman's group arrived at a hotel for breakfast, the Europeans and Zulus had to separate due to the color bar. Such narrative elements added a dimension of pathos to the account—the enforced segregation contrasting with friendly, joking and mutually helpful relations between the group of friends.

Most often separation was along color-lines: the Zulu sang the clan-song of the local chief, the Europeans sang a hymn in English; the Europeans separated for tea and cake, the Zulu to slaughter ceremonial cattle. Gluckman attempted to portray the rituals on each side of these contrasting pairs in similarly distanced terms. The obvious cleavage between "European" and "Zulu" was also mollified and complicated in various ways. First, there were important differentiations within each color-group. Second, there were ties which cut across the race-line, as evidenced by a group of Zulu Christians singing hymns with the Swedish missionary (Mshyeni himself was a Christian.) Third, all the people involved came together to co-operate in the day's events, and to discuss their common interests.

Throughout, Gluckman recorded personal interactions between individuals, which he related to structural positions in South African society. A Zulu warrior stood in war-dress, on guard at the arch of branches at one end of the bridge, where Lugg would break the tape with his car. Rossiter, the Government Veterinary Officer, wandered up to him to chat about affairs at the local cattle dip, and then introduced him to Gluckman so the latter could explain his work and request assistance.[151] Gluckman drew out the characters' relations to one another and to the power structures in which they were enmeshed, as well as their (often critical) attitudes towards those structures.[152] The overall impression was a highly complex and sophisticated system of social and political relations in the form of the relationships between named individuals and their membership in cross-cutting groups.

---

150 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand,* 5.

151 Ibid., 5.

152 E. g. when the group's departure was delayed by the arrival of a Zulu policeman with a handcuffed prisoner, Matolana took the opportunity to complain about Government's lack of support for him in his role in policing the district.

The Modern Situation

Gluckman's innovative "methods of presentation" opened up a space in which he could put into practice a new kind of anthropology of modernity. The rhetorical force of his opening narrative was to present a very modern event as normal within Zululand. Indeed the modernity of Zululand saturates his account to an extent beyond that which he explicitly analyzed: for example, in the detailed description of the clothing which Matolana the Zulu *induna* wore for the ceremony, not "native" dress but "khaki uniform jacket, riding breeches, boots and leather gaiters."[153] Through the specific details of the day's events, Gluckman then explored this modernity in terms of the dialectical relations between various levels of contemporary social reality, from the micro-politics of personal relations to the forces which shaped South Africa as a whole. Furthermore the use of the narrative past tense and first-person situated this situation in historical time, which led him to a diachronic analysis of the ways these various levels of social structure had been generated in the specific context of the area—most importantly the colonial encounter and the introduction of a money economy.

The choice and presentation of this particular concrete set of situations was linked to the specific version of modernity which Gluckman constructed. The central situation of the bridge-opening was significant in various ways. Most obviously, it was a development project. The opening of a bridge, on the way to a European hospital, signified the modernity of industrial technology in the service of infrastructure development. But Gluckman's choice of situation also radically reconfigured the object of anthropological study, the kind of locality which the anthropologist studied. If the typical object of study was a self-contained traditional "culture," situated in a village or set of villages, here Gluckman was studying instead a one-off event which was intrinsically modern. The locality was not even at a place of habitation: people had gathered here only for a specific ceremony on this day. Therefore this was not simply the adding of a broader context to the kind of local society generally studied by anthropologists. The immediate objects of study were occasions, which could only be understood processually and in terms of broader structures: in the case of the bridge opening, of the specific processes which were taking place in contemporary Zululand, which demonstrated how it was interlocked with a modern national economy and even global structures of capital and colonialism. Above all, "modernity" meant this interlocking.

A further purpose of Gluckman's exposition was to show contemporaneous interaction within a single community of different social structures within a common community of white settlers and Zulu. The narration and exposition of the scale and variety of the cast of characters itself made one of Gluckman's key arguments before he articulated it: the ecumenism of Zululand society, and the ability and willingness of people, riven by conflicts, to co-operate in a broader community, symbolized by the communal celebration at the bridge.[154] The political meetings showed Europeans and Zulu as engaged in contemporary political projects involving conflict and co-operation. Ultimately, then, the analysis of situations as modern meant putting the Zulu and Europeans into a single frame of reference, and exploring the central mystery of how it was that such a "community" could exist:

> [t]he existence of a single African-White community in Zululand must be the starting point of my analysis. The events at Malungwana bridge—which was planned by European engineers and built by Zulu labourers, which would be used

153 Ibid., 2.
154 Ibid., 9.

> by a European magistrate ruling over Zulu and by Zulu women going to a European hospital, which was opened by European officials and the Zulu Regent in a ceremony which included not only Europeans and Zulu but also actions historically derived from European and Zulu cultures—must be related to a system at least part of which consists of Zulu-European relations."[155]

"Community" did not mean homogeneity, either of culture or of interest. What, then was this "single community", and given the conflict permeating South African society, how could it hold together as a system? The question led Gluckman to consider social structure in terms of political economy and colonial governance. In this regard modernity was understood as a set of power relations between Europeans and Africans, rather than a categorical relation within a stadial history or as one pole of a modern-primitive binary.

The Modern Political Economy

The situations at the bridge opening and the political meetings revealed the underlying structural cohesion of Zululand. Even "[t]he subsidiary, unplanned patterning of the day's events took form according to the structure of modern Zululand society,"[156] which in turn was structured to a large degree by its political economy. The two major forces for cohesion were not cultural but political economic: "Government" (including military force, the judicial sphere and administration via expertise) and the economy. These factors came into view only by representing the Zulu as agents: agents highly constrained by structures to be sure, but the structures which constrained them were those of a very modern political economy.

The organization of the day's events revealed how the power of Government underlay the social structure. Both Government and the Zulu Regent were "important organizing forces today," and the Zulu Regent was able to organize his own feast at the Bridge, thereby stealing the celebration from the Europeans.[157] But the day as a whole had been organized by the local magistrate, the power to do this came from his position as a representative of Government, "and it was Government who built the bridge."[158] Ultimately, it was "the organizing power of Government in the district which gave a particular structural form to the many diverse elements present."[159] Indeed, the whole social system was predicated on Government's "ultimate sanction of force,"[160] both military and judicial. The former underwrote the system as a whole: "[f]orce established White rule and the threat of force maintained it [and the] threat of force remains one of the dominant factors in Zululand equilibrium."[161]

The bridge was part of a contemporary project of infrastructural development, which Gluckman considered primarily not as a stage of history, nor in terms of modern rationalization, but rather in its political aspects. The bridge was "the first bridge built in Zululand by the Native Affairs Department under the new schemes of Native development."[162] Gluckman defined "development" as Government's policy towards the "ecological" domain of social structure, meaning "all activities directly related to the physical environment—agriculture, mining, etc.—

155 Ibid., 10.
156 Ibid., 12.
157 Ibid., 11.
158 Ibid., 11.
159 Ibid., 11.
160 Ibid., 13.
161 Ibid., 42.
162 Ibid., 4-5.

or to the physiology of people—health, death, etc."[163] Again, Government played a key role in this domain: building infrastructure, paying for it by taxing the Zulu, and administering it through various experts, including medical, agricultural, engineering and veterinary officials. Development was a domain of conflict between Government and Zulu values. Whereas Zulu could share Government values when it came to law and administration—for example the value of peace—they generally did not share European values on the question of development, and "on many occasions the people consider it to be the duty of their chiefs to oppose Government projects."[164]

However this opposition was mediated through various aspects of the social structure, and Zululand society was saturated with mechanisms promoting social cohesion. Zulu chiefs were in a complex position of being both "Government bureaucrats and centres of opposition to Government."[165] He observed that where social conflicts center within, rather than between, persons, conflict is more easily resolved without open breach.[166] More generally, White government simultaneously undergirded and undermined the power of the Zulu royal family and its officials through the judicial and administrative machinery: for example the power which coalesced around the local magistrate, whose favour was directly curried by local subalterns, subverting the power of the chief. The magistrates represented the rule of Government, but also won the allegiance of individual Zulu by representing and satisfying their "interests and values" in certain situations.[167] Thus individual Zulu would happily "transfer their allegiance from chief to magistrate, and from magistrate to chief, according to the values determining their conduct, or the advantages they desire, in a particular situation."[168] Finally—as I shall discuss in more detail below—social cohesion was maintained by the membership of individuals in cross-cutting groups.

Development took place within a broader economic context, which formed the second major cohesive force alongside political structures: the "economic integration of Zululand into the South African industrial and agricultural system dominates the social structure."[169] Community arose from common interests and common activities: ultimately, based on the introduction of European political economy: "[t]he small groups of Whites in Zululand derive their control over the Africans from their technical superiority, but it was money, rather than the Maxim gun or telephone, which established social cohesion, by creating common, if dissimilar, interests in a single economic and political system, though it is one with many irreconcilable conflicts."[170]

Gluckman explored the modern history of the Zululand political economy in detail to show how a "single system was established by the underlying drives in European states, of the Boers for more land, of the British for trade, and of the Natal colonists for labour," and, on the side of the Zulu, "an increasing desire for European goods,"[171] and the requirement to pay taxes to support the new administration. The military strength of the Zulu had meant that "forcible conquest was required to absorb Zululand into the expanding industrial and agricultural organization of South Africa." The Zulu mode of production was then changed from subsistence to one of farming and wage labor, and concomitant migration outside Zululand to towns or

163 Ibid., 13, footnote 1.
164 Ibid., 14.
165 Ibid., 44.
166 Ibid., 44.
167 Ibid., 45.
168 Ibid., 45.
169 Ibid., 14-15.
170 Ibid., 42.
171 Ibid., 42.

mining compounds. Large-scale changes in Zulu life took place "due to the cumulative effects of peace, the labor flow, the introduction of taxes and money, the adoption by Zulu of some of the more efficient White material culture, evangelization and the opening of schools, numerous statutory regulations and alterations of Zulu common law." [172] As a result, "[t]he dependence of the Zulu on the new African-White community rapidly increased."[173]

The keystone of the South African industrial system was mining. Present at the bridge opening was a labor recruiter for Rand Gold mines, representing an external force which was having an extraordinary effect on Zulu society: "[t]he labour flow includes practically all able-bodied Zulu; at any moment about one-third of the men in Nongoma district are away at work."[174] Labor migration was having radical effect on both Zulu and Government. For the Zulu laborers it meant the possibility of a new political consciousness and new political organization. Tribal affiliations were being eroded in the labor centers: both by the recognition of common interests with other Africans, and the lack of chiefly authority in the compounds: "[a]t the labour centres the chiefs have no legal status over the people: the legal authorities are White magistrates, location superintendents, police, compound managers and employers." The combination of mutual interest with other Africans, and direct subordination to whites, was leading to the beginnings of class consciousness through the rise of "location boards, social groups, and trade unions"[175] as against tribal affiliations.[176] Trade unions were "not yet an effective political force," and White trade unionists were not co-operating with Africans, but the latter were bargaining for better working conditions and beginning to resist European domination "in industrial terms."[177] At present there was little conflict between labor and tribal allegiances, as the life of the migrant laborer was "sharply divided" between the distinct situations, and African workers were able to overcome contradictions through situational selection. Yet Gluckman predicted increasing conflict between the two.

Meanwhile the labor flow involved Government in various contradictions. First, there was the contradiction between the need for labor and anxieties about African urbanization: "the labour needs of the Whites" (i. e. private mining corporations) had to be met without allowing Africans to settle permanently in the cities. The solution was for migrant laborers to leave their family in the reserves and shuttle between reserves and labor centers. This then led to a contradiction between the values of development and labor supply. The State had been deliberately developing the reserves "since 1931,"[178] but was being thwarted by the effects of migrant cash labor: not only due to the drain of labor but also because it provided the Zulu with money which allowed them to neglect their own agricultural production. The demands of South African mines for industrial wage labor, coupled with the Zulu need for cash to pay taxes and purchase Western goods, were undermining the agricultural productivity of Zululand. Gluckman concluded that at present "development is secondary to the labour flow and national demands": in other words Government valued the interests of the mining corporations more highly than the development of reserve agriculture.[179]

---

172 Ibid., 41.
173 Ibid., 41.
174 Ibid., 15.
175 Ibid., 16.
176 Ibid., 15-16. Even in the reserves, those who worked for Europeans were under their authority rather than that of the chief, who had no "say in matters involving his tribesmen and Europeans," 15.
177 Ibid., 17.
178 Ibid., 15. “Health, veterinary and a few other services” had started earlier, 15.
179 As we shall see in Chapter Four, the question of labor was a huge political issue while Gluckman was in Zululand, and he himself was called to testify to a Government Commission on the subject in 1937.

The Modernity of Race

The most obvious feature of Zululand society, as revealed by the day's events, was the racial dichotomy. Thus the discussion of the bridge-opening in terms of a modern political economy led to the consideration of race as itself a specifically modern phenomenon. Events at the ceremony showed that, although individual relationships between Whites and Black were not only possible but necessary, as groups "they assembled at different places and it is impossible for them to meet on equal terms."[180] The events at the bridge showed the inequalities of the two groups on many levels, from the most obvious political disparities of the dominance of White Government to less obvious asymmetries of mobility and access to information.[181] Furthermore, this cleavage was understood by the Zululanders themselves as categorical, rather than relative and situational.[182]

However, in line with the teachings of liberal South African social anthropology, Gluckman's analysis was a refutation even of the possibility, let alone the desirability, of segregation. He claimed that the division into two absolute categories of "Zulu" and "European" was politically advantageous to those who advocated "the policy of so-called 'segregation' and 'parallel development'": terms which, he claimed, his own analysis exposed as vacuous.[183] The central problem, therefore, was to represent the stark facts of racial segregation and political inequality, while avoiding the reification of racial groups, and demonstrating the contingency of existing conditions. His solution was to recast race as a social relation, rather than cultural difference (the third possibility, biological difference or "scientific race" was rejected out of hand in a footnote.)[184] Rather than accept the distinction as absolute, he redefined it as "the primary cleavage" in the Zululand social structure. The notion of the primary cleavage allowed him to dissolve the essentialist concept of race, while keeping the stark racial asymmetries in focus. He then denaturalized it further, by showing how this cleavage had been produced from a specific political economy, which itself was a product of a specific history.

Gluckman traced the invention of the modern conception of race specifically in relation to the history of political economy and colonial power. The racial cleavage in Zululand was not simply the case of two pre-established culture groups forming a new society. In the earliest stage of co-existence the British had become part of the Zulu system, trading with them and becoming subsumed into the Zulu political structure. By the middle of the nineteenth century, both British and Boer formed neighboring states in Natal and the Transvaal, comparable to African (Bantu) polities, yet increasingly technologically and politically dominant. It was through the introduction of industrial capitalism into Zululand itself that race had been re-invented as caste system:

> The political system which included Whites and Zulu changed from one of territorial though unequal states into one of economic groups based on race and colour, of which the Zulu were unskilled labourers and primitive peasants. Zulu territorial groups were absorbed into the system as administrative units. Africans and Whites were divided into two sharply dichotomized groups, almost castes, with fixed standards of living, modes of work, degrees of citizenship, endogamous barriers and

180 Ibid., 12.
181 Ibid., 11.
182 Ibid., 12.
183 Ibid., 12.
184 Ibid., 17, footnote 1.

social ostracism, but which were held together in the cohesion of a common economic system.[185]

Thus race, far from being an *a priori* category determining the shape of cultural contact, had been generated from the specific ways in which Zulu and European political economies became integrated. Race had then "extended and ramified into other fields,"[186] becoming the primary cleavage determining the structure of Zulu society, as a complex intertwining of skin color, culture, political history and economic caste. Over time this cleavage had intensified, as "fundamental drives in the South African economy have sharpened the opposition of Africans and Whites" until, in the present, "[i]ncreasing pressure on Zulu land and the stress of life at labour centres have made White domination more oppressive."[187] Understood thus in terms of political economy, the racial cleavage could be seen as a potent source of complex interactions involving both co-operation and conflict. The dominance of Europeans over Zulu appeared exactly when "individuals of the two groups meet on the ground of common interest."[188] The racial nexus involved "association, indeed co-operation" as "though Zulu and Europeans are organized in two groups at the bridge, their presence there implies that they are united in a matter of mutual interest."[189] This interest was primarily economic, as "[t]he Zulu desire for the material goods of the Europeans, and the Europeans' need for Zulu labour and the wealth obtained by that labour, establishes strong inter-dependent interests between them. It is also a potent source of their conflict."[190]

The reification of race was further undermined by Gluckman's turn to social structure, in the sense of the various groups and sub-groups of Zululand society, and in particular the ties and cleavages which cut across them. Race was the primary, but far from the only, cleavage in Zululand society, which allowed Gluckman to explore the ways in which it was mitigated in terms of both other cross-cutting social relations and internal variations among each group. The two colour-groups were highly internally varied, [191] while the primary cleavage was cut across by non-racial ties. The leading example was the way that the Christian-pagan divide cut across the European-Zulu divide: "a special relationship between Zulu and Europeans which also constitutes a social division within the African group."[192] This schism was activated or de-activated depending on the situation, and was crossed by "ties of kinship, colour, political allegiance and culture."[193]

These observations led to a general principle: "[t]he conflicts between groups in any changing society tend to be balanced by co-operation of the members of those groups in other groupings."[194] Here Gluckman drew on and adapted the concepts of fission and fusion as used by Evans-Pritchard and Fortes, supplemented with "the theories of dialectical materialism and Freud's theory of ambivalence."[195] Each social category depended on "latent conflict"[196] with

185 Ibid., 43.
186 Ibid., 43.
187 Ibid., 43.
188 Ibid., 13.
189 Ibid., 12.
190 Ibid., 19.
191 Internal differentiation among the Zulu included "distinct interest groups" including "polygynists who need much land, men with large herds of cattle, men who ardently desire European wealth, and others," Ibid., 19.
192 Ibid., 20.
193 Ibid., 21. "The group of Christian Zulu in certain situations, on certain criteria, is associated with the group of Europeans and opposed to the group of pagans, though on other criteria and other situations they are part of the Zulu group as a whole opposed to the European group as a whole," 21.
194 Ibid., 45.
195 Ibid., 26, footnote 2.

other groups in order to define itself; but because these categories cut across each other, the vectors of conflict also cut across society. In this way latent conflict between potential groupings resulted in social stability rather than disintegration.

Gluckman then applied the concept of situational selection onto this culturally heterogenous field. Individuals were members of potentially conflicting groups, and therefore had to select which group they were acting as a member of in a particular situation. Situational selection allowed individuals to "live coherent lives by situational selection from a medley of contradictory values, ill-assorted beliefs, and varied interests and techniques."[197] This was a radical new use of situational selection. It was no longer a question of selecting which belief to invoke from within a system, but which social persona to adopt; not a question of choosing which level of segmentation to adopt within a broader structure, but which kind of structural identity (religious, kin, racial, etc.) to behave as in a given situation. This made modern persons of the Zulu in the social scientific gaze: not as simple subjects of liberal politics and political economy, but as individuals living their lives in the interstices between the industrial economy of the West and "tradition" (which, as we shall see, itself turned out to be at least partly an artifact of modernity.)

However, neither situational selection nor cross-cutting ties necessarily ensured a harmoniously functioning system. In Zululand the relative importance of the primary cleavage was rising, as was the frequency of situational conflicts: "[t]he contradictions become conflicts as the relative frequency and importance of different situations increase in the functioning of the organizations … the dominant situations are becoming those involving African-White relations, and more and more Zulu behave as members of the African group opposed to the White group." Meanwhile the meaning of Zulu identity was being transformed from one of opposition to other Bantu nations, to one of associating with those other Bantu groups as "African" in opposition to "European": "[i]n more and more situations Zulu act as Africans as opposed to Whites, rather than as Zulu opposed to other Africans. They are even Zulu largely in so far as they are not White."

The Invention of Tradition

To an extent Gluckman's treatment of social structure was the projection of Nuer-like segmentary society onto the total situation of South Africa. But for the Nuer and Azande, Evans-Pritchard had been able to assume cultural homogeneity, which was obviously not the case for Zululand considered as a whole.[198] Gluckman's "community" was political, social and economic rather than cultural (indeed this unconventional use of the term confused other anthropologists and led to a debate with Phyllis Kaberry, the editor of Malinowski's posthumous work on culture contact.)[199] As we have seen, Gluckman had good political reasons for being reluctant to deal with cultural specificity, the domain which we might assume normal to the anthropologist. In the context of South African anthropology, culture was the province of *volkekunde* and an instrument of segregationist politics.

Such politics were enabled, claimed Gluckman, by the failure to consider "the processes of

---

196 Ibid., 47.
197 Ibid., 26.
198 See J. H. Van Doorne, "Situational Analysis: Its Potential and Limitations for Anthropological Research on Social Change in Africa", *Cahiers d'études africaines* 21, no. 84 (1981): 479-506.
199 See Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 35.

change which have produced present-day customs."[200] Zulu customs should by no means be taken to be primordial, or opposed to European culture in binary primitive-modern terms. Instead, historicization revealed that "Zulu customs as they exist today are very different from the Zulu customs of a hundred years ago, owing to contact with Europeans and succeeding internal developments."[201] When he did deal with culture in "The Bridge," Gluckman considered it as a set of modern phenomena, produced by contemporary power relations as generated through a longer diachronic process. In so doing, he also thematized cultural difference in its significance for the subjects themselves, rather than as a category of the anthropologist.[202]

Considered in the abstract, Zulu and European cultures were radically different, to be sure: "[t]he two groups have on the whole different modes of life, customs and beliefs."[203] But they were also mutually adaptive, "at every point affected by [the] presence" of the other,[204] as observed in personal interactions at the bridge opening. This adaptation was dialectical and dynamic: in fact, cultural difference was becoming a more important social fact, as the racial cleavage became more stark. The primary cleavage of racial opposition had various effects: in the creation of separatist Zulu churches, "a reflex of Christianity's inability to give the Blacks equality,"[205] and the growth of industrial and urban organizations in which Zulu "associate with other Bantu workers and even workers of other colour-groups."[206] However, while these new allegiances potentially posed challenges to chiefly authority, for the moment at least racial opposition had in fact heightened allegiance to the chiefs and especially the King, a development which was helped by their lack of real power to abuse. The cultural expression of loyalty to the Zulu nation therefore became an idiom of resistance to European rule: "[i]ncreasing opposition has heightened resistance to White innovations and revived old customs."[207] Meanwhile, educated Zulu were also turning to "old customs," in this case due to the frustration of their attempts to participate fully in modern South African society. [208]

Recognition of the increasing opposition by race, coupled with a suspicion of the genetic fallacy derived from his functionalist training, therefore led Gluckman to a crucial insight: Zulu "tradition" in the present day was a reaction to modern circumstances, and in particular to domination by Europeans. The Zulu were not romantic about their own past.[209] Just as race was a modern construction, so Zulu "traditional" culture was a form of modern political resistance. Furthermore, this traditionalism only seemed to be a "turning back."[210] Its goals were to push forward into history, not backwards. Whereas nineteenth-century rebellions had aimed "to drive the Whites into the sea," now "opposition is no longer directed backwards in time ... [i]n so far as their opposition is formulated, they want more advantages."[211] Gluckman compared this phenomenon to "the change from machine-breaking to trade unionism in Europe."[212] However, in Zululand trade unionism itself was only one form of modern politics for the Zulu, along with traditional culture and separatist Christianity. Indeed of the triad of "chiefs, churches and trade

---

200 Ibid., 18, footnote 2.
201 Ibid., 18, footnote 2.
202 What anthropologists sometimes refer to as "emic" rather than "etic" phenomena. See Marvin Harris, "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5 (1976): 329-350.
203 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 18.
204 Ibid., 18.
205 Ibid., 44.
206 Ibid., 44.
207 Ibid., 43.
208 Ibid., 44.
209 Any nostalgia they did express was for the early period of British rule, see e. g. p. 43.
210 Ibid., 44.
211 Ibid., 44.
212 Ibid., 44.

unions,"[213] it was the first two which were at present most significant.

However such resistance was largely ineffective, achieving only "psychological satisfaction" and failing to check increasing European domination.[214] It expressed itself mostly through violence, which in turn was violently repressed.[215] Indeed, the revival of supposedly traditional customs was doubly tragic. Not only did it fail to achieve its goals, but it played into the hands of the oppressors. Gluckman noted that a revival of supposedly traditional "old customs" was "encouraged by Government as part of the policy of segregation and parallel development,"[216] and part of this encouragement was the nurturing of *volkekunde*, "which records the vitality of Bantu culture without reference to its causes."[217] For Gluckman those causes were contemporary, not primordial: "This vitality may be ascribed to an attempt to bridge the gap between Christians and pagans, to the revulsion of educated Zulu from the White civilization they are denied, and to the politically safe means it offers of expressing Zulu pride and hatred of the culture to which they dare not aspire."[218] Thus Zulu culture, romanticized by segregationist anthropology, was vital not as a primitive survival, alien to European culture, rather it was generated by contemporary European-Zulu relations, as revealed through historicization.[219]

The Diachronic Analysis

As much of the above has indicated, Gluckman was not content to understand Zululand as a totality only in its synchronic dimension. Having initially presented the "modern situation" in both its concreteness and synchronic totality, Gluckman sought also "to relate [the] cross-section study to [the] study of change."[220] As noted in Chapter One, the founders of British social anthropology had moved decisively away from diachronic modes of explanation, with the rejection of evolutionist and diffusionist paradigms as "conjectural history." Malinowski had insisted that all explanations of social institutions should involve only synchronic factors, independent from the course of historical development. In general, social anthropologists had continued to shy away from the study of history. The exceptions, as noted in the previous chapter, were the South African contributors to Malinowski's edited collection on "culture contact."[221] Malinowski had criticized them heavily, and his own approach to the anthropology of the contemporary world insisted on synchronous explanation. Oxonian structuralism likewise eschewed historical explanations—in fact the use of the ethnographic present to depict a reconstructed present as an ongoing situation made actual historicization impossible.

For Gluckman, historical reconstruction was an "essential part of our understanding of the present—of why things are as they are,"[222] because social reality was dynamic, and developed dialectically. Historical perspective enabled Gluckman's most perceptive analysis of the politics of contemporary Zululand, as discussed above, including his most radical critique of

---

213 Ibid., 17.
214 Ibid., 17.
215 Ibid., 17, 45.
216 Ibid., 44.
217 Ibid., 44.
218 Ibid., 44.
219 This same insight, garnered from the South African situation of the first half of the twentieth century, was later applied to the structure of British imperialism in the 1950s, when Gluckman became involved in a very public debate about the nature of rituals in the Mau Mau uprising—which Gluckman argued were a modern phenomenon rather than atavistic. Thus South Africa synecdochically represented the structure of British imperialism as a whole, but in a delimited local situation.
220 Ibid., 26.
221 Malinowski, "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures".
222 Gluckman, *An Analysis of the Sociological Theories of Bronislaw Malinowski,* 105.

segregationism; the determining power of economics and "ecological" considerations; the role of "force" in maintaining equilibrium; and the meaning of Zulu culture and traditionalism as a mode of resistance. This was not merely a question of adding a historical gloss to contemporary observations. Gluckman situated the contemporary situation in an extensive longer history of transformations of Zulu, and other Bantu, society in the area, in which the modern era or "equilibrium" was one in a series, produced by universal historical processes, but without any particular teleological development.

Inspired by "sociological historians," such as R. H. Tawney and Elie Halévy, Gluckman's approach to the diachronic was highly empirical, using his own archival research, including magistrate records and Parliamentary reports (blue books), as well as secondary sources and "clan histories."[223] However, historical investigation provided "data for the analysis of social processes,"[224] which were scientific, generalizable and uniform across different historical periods. For Gluckman, the meaning of a social institution was still its "functional value," or "relation to the total equilibrium,"[225] but he saw functionalism and diachronic explanation as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. He was at pains to point out that he was not seeking either "origins," or survivals, as had earlier evolutionist and diffusionist anthropologies. The persistence of an entity through time did not entail a fixed social meaning, or "functional value"— a principle which had been demonstrated by Beatrice Webb's "discovery of the changed functioning of the Poor Law of England."[226] The goal therefore was to understand the persistence of certain entities over time in terms of their changing significance within the total social field, which they also helped to "evolve."[227]

Through a combination of structural-functional analysis and careful historical reconstruction—a kind of genealogical functionalism, or functionalist genealogy—the development of Zulu society could be described in terms of "punctuated equilibrium," in which periods of rapid change alternated with periods of relative social stability, or "repetitive equilibrium," during which change was slow and non-structural.[228] Both involved conflict;[229] indeed, the most general principle of the social was "the universal presence of conflict and its (attempted) resolution."[230] In periods of equilibrium, cross-cutting difference created stability, while conflicts were "resolved by changes in the actual constituent parts of the system but not its character, or the pattern of their interdependence."[231] This could involve the fission and fusion of social groups, or the change of personnel within a structure. In periods of rapid change, social structure itself was transformed until a new equilibrium was reached. Just as stability involved change, so periods of revolutionary change involved structure, as "[t]he lines of change, and the form of the new pattern, are determined by the original pattern."[232] Rapid change tended to be driven by a single primary cleavage.[233] In political terms, the distinction between periods of repetitive equilibrium and rapid change could also be understood as the distinction between "rebellion" and "revolution."

---

223 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 44. Cf. MG, "The Research Situation," MS, MG RAI.
224 Gluckman, *An Analysis of the Sociological Theories of Bronislaw Malinowski,* 105.
225 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 34.
226 Ibid., 49. An example from Zululand was that of the "tribe": pp 34-5.
227 Ibid., 49-50.
228 Ibid., 28.
229 Ibid., 26-7.
230 Ibid., 47.
231 Ibid., 46.
232 Ibid., 47.
233 Ibid., 46: "a changing social system tends to continue developing along the lines of its greatest conflict and to hypertrophy till it is altered."

Gluckman's theory of historical change was developed alongside, and intertwined with, his historicization of Zululand, in terms of alternating periods of equilibrium and rapid change over several centuries. This longer history reframed the radical shifts of the modern period. The two states of equilibrium and change were not mapped onto a primitive-modern binary. Zulu history showed that rapid and revolutionary change had occurred before the modern era. In fact, the Zulu had experienced radical revolutionary change twice in the history Gluckman was able to discern from archival sources. The first was the shift from small tribes to kingdoms, which was triggered by an increase in population density, which Gluckman traced in clan histories from about 1775.[234] The second radical rupture was the shift from these small kingdoms to the hegemony of Shaka Zulu.[235] Nor indeed did contact with Europeans initially lead to transformation. For most of the nineteenth century Zulu social structure had remained fundamentally unchanged, as alien elements, such as early British settlers, were "absorbed largely into the pattern of the existing equilibrium," often becoming pawns in Zulu political games.[236] Gluckman therefore undermined the idea of a timeless, unchanging and passive primitive, transformed only by contact with the modern European. Instead he portrayed a dynamic, complex area of interacting social groups, undergoing a series of demographic, social structural, political and technological transformations. This structural, regional and anti-Eurocentric approach proved to be highly influential, and, according to one analysis of changing constructions of Shaka, "marked a turning point in Zulu historiography."[237]

Not only had the Zulu experienced radical transformations—a real history—before European contact, but the radical changes of the present moment were but one example of a more general historical phenomenon. Specifically, the modern period was an example of a rapid type of change associated with political domination, and conflict involving inherent inequality between social groups. It was for this reason that "[f]orce [was] necessary to maintain the system."[238] This is not to say that the particularities of the modern period were not acknowledged. The Zulu were written into a modern, global history of industrial political economy. This again disrupted the primitive-modern binary, as Gluckman showed how Zulu culture and social structure as observed in the present were the products of a long, complex historical development, including the transformations associated with industrial economy, colonial administration, and military and judicial force.

Conclusion

In "The Bridge," Max Gluckman developed a specifically anthropological approach to the study of the modern world. His goal was the same as that outlined in a recent collection entitled *Anthropologies of Modernity*: "not to come up with some grand, general account of

---

234 Increasing population did not in itself explain the shift from tribal fission to more centralized authority. In the absence of decisive archival evidence, Gluckman claimed the shift must have been due to the confluence of terms of political economy, ecology, and political structure: "the interrelations between the Nguni mode of farming (shifting cultivation and unlimited expansion over more land), the quantity of land available, and the Nguni hierarchical political organization," which taken together precluded political fission. At this point individuals could effect radical change, as strong leadership, tactical ability and social-military innovations—combined with numerical advantage—allowed some tribes to conquer others. Cf. Daphna Golan, *Inventing Shaka: Using History in the Construction of Zulu Nationalism* (Boulder: L. Rienner, 1994), 94-6.

235 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand* 31.

236 Ibid., 35. They became both pawns in Zulu politics and "the King's chiefs in Natal," though the are under their control also served as a haven for Zulu fugitives.

237 Daphna Golan, *Inventing Shaka: Using History in the Construction of Zulu Nationalism* 91-92, 85.

238 Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand,* 48.

modernity but to analyze its concrete manifestations."[239] Rather than a theory of modernity, he analyzed the total social structure of an actually-occurring set of events, anchored in his own experience through participant-observation. In doing so, he de-stabilized contemporary sociological categories of the modern and its others. His was a very different sense of the modern than the modern-primitive binary, or stadial theories in which the modern was the *telos* of historical development. Instead, "modernity" and its supposed others (the primitive, community, tradition) intersected with and generated each other.

The major achievement of this work was to represent a non-European people as intrinsically modern in the broadest sense of the term. It was the first successful attempt to do so. Motivated by a keen sense of the political dangers of romanticism, primitivism and an emphasis on cultural difference, Gluckman showed how Zulu social structure was dialectically interrelated with a broader matrix of modern political economy and force-backed governance. Contemporary Zulu society was a site of complex social structures and cleavages and interactions, produced through a long historical interaction between Zulu and European in a modern world-system.[240] Certain aspects of Zulu culture were more obviously modern, such as separatist Zulu Christian churches, and nascent trade unions. But even the seemingly natural category of race, and the seemingly primitive, such as Zulu traditional culture, were shown to be modern phenomena. Race was a product of the modern political economy, while that which seemed to be atavistic tradition was in fact an idiom of resistance to the modern political and economic regime. Despite their relative lack of power, the Zulu were the Zulu were represented as modern political and economic agents.

Any categorical opposition of modern and primitive was further undermined by Gluckman's theory of diachronic change. The longer history of Zulu social structure, and the theory of punctuated equilibrium, challenged the idea of the modern as radical change, set against primitive timelessness. Seen as an epoch of historical development, the modern era was instead one particular instance of a rapidly changing social structure. Gluckman's genius in this regard was to re-introduce a diachronic dimension to structural-functional anthropology, which was neither stadial or teleological. Instead, it seemed to fulfill Radcliffe-Brown's plea for a truly evolutionist anthropology: one which described social development in terms of the interactions between laws, rather than as a succession of stages on an analogy to geological time.[241] The significance of this approach lies not only in its relation to British social anthropology, but in its contrast to the new stadial, teleological narrative of modernization theory, which was to become a central component of Western views of the non-West in the 1950s and 1960s.[242]

In terms of specific characteristics the modern era was characterized by a lack of cultural homogeneity, a marked inequality of groups, and domination across the primary cleavage of race, with the concomitant use of force to ensure social cohesion. Capitalist political economy, as it took place in the colonial encounter, had produced a historically specific primary social cleavage of race as economic caste. Gluckman's approach to this situation emphasized the centrality of power, which infiltrated and underlay all social relationships. The situation was also modern in the extent to which the local situation was interlocked in a set of broader regional and

---

239 Jonathan Xavier Inda, ed., *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics* (Malden, MA, 2005).

240 In fact his work seems to have been an early influence on world-systems theory. In 1966 Immanuel Wallerstein published a reader on colonial social change, based on Gluckman's conception of the unit of study as the whole colony as a single social field, as articulated against Malinowski's continued focus on the tribe or other "traditional" political unit. *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*, ed. Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein (New York: Wiley, 1966). See especially pp. 1-2. Along with Gluckman, Wallerstein also singled out Georges Balandier as having developed an anthropology adequate to the colonial situation.

241 See Chapter One.

242 Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*.

even global situations. The modern was the site of contemporary socio-political relationships within a heterogeneous, culturally cosmopolitan political economy, characterized by intertwined conflict and co-operation. However this cosmopolitan space was also saturated with inequality and repression; ultimately, it was held together both by shared economic interests and government violence, real and potential, through the military and judicial system.

"The Bridge" was enabled by Gluckman's circulation through imperial intellectual and institutional circuits: between Johannesburg and London, Oxford and Zululand. It was generated by synthesizing elements from various core strands of British and South African social anthropology. Gluckman was trained in South African liberalism and historicism, Malinowskian culture contact theory, and Oxonian structuralism. He took up Malinowski's project in order to fulfill South African political aims; but he rejected Malinowski's methods. This led to his methodological innovations in terms of his mode of presentation, the overcoming of ethnographic naturalism, and the development of situational analysis. His radically anti-organicist approach to the social allowed him to apply the core social anthropological methods of participant-observation and totalistic analysis to an intrinsically "modern" situation. Gluckman's synthesis was unique, but the text emerged from the broader social anthropological concerns of the time. Gluckman brought together the two competing anthropological projects of the 1930s, delineated in Chapter One: the Malinowskian turn to "culture contact," or the study of contemporary interactions, and the Oxonian development of structuralism, which was itself originally part of the primitivizing comparative science of humanity advocated by Radcliffe-Brown. Gluckman's work therefore shows that the study of the modern other was not precluded by the Oxonian paradigm, which was to become central to the discipline after World War Two. More broadly, Gluckman's work was also of its time in attempting to apply anthropological research to contemporary concerns about the value and direction of Western Civilization, in the wake of World War One and the economic, political, social and intellectual crises of the interwar years.

These circulations took place within a British imperial structure which cannot be conceived in terms of a metropole-colony dyad. Specifically, it was not simply the application of metropolitan science to colonial domains. Creole anthropologists such as Gluckman were central to the formation of British social anthropology, as were European migrants such as Malinowski. In South Africa, networks of such anthropologists were supported intellectually and materially by local academic and governmental institutions. Gluckman considered himself to be doing auto-anthropology when working on South Africa—and the fact that he did so was central to his project. His starting position was that South Africa was a single society—therefore he as anthropologist was part of the social structure that he was studying, despite being culturally and racially other to the Zulu, and marginal to White society by virtue of his Jewishness.

As we shall see in the following chapter, the circulations did not end in Zululand. After seven years at the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in Northern Rhodesia, Gluckman would eventually be appointed first Chair of Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester in 1949. The "Bridge" would then become the foundational text for the branch of British social anthropology which carried the "modernist" project into the postwar era. However, as we shall see in the following chapter, this project became increasingly difficult to sustain under the new political conditions of the Cold War and impending decolonization.

Chapter Three

"The Power to Exclude": political persecution and the shaping of social anthropology, 1939-1960

In the late 1960s and early 1970s theorists began to draw attention to the limits of the European understanding of colonial peoples, and the complicity of the social sciences in the colonial project.[1] A central claim of this post-colonial critique was that the social anthropology of the colonial era depicted its objects of study as primitive, in the sense of essentially non-modern.[2] This primitivism, it was claimed, excluded colonial populations from modern economic and political structures—even from historical time—and thereby justified the colonial status quo.[3] So, in the seminal collection Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter—published in 1973—Talal Asad wrote that in the colonial era, "social anthropology could and did define itself unambiguously as the study of primitive societies."[4] Asad's generation saw primitivism as endemic to colonial anthropology: it was only—so the story went—in the 1970s, after decolonization, that anthropology began to understand non-Europeans as modern. To a large extent these claims have become a basic element of the received view of the politics of British anthropology in the colonial era.[5] Therefore the earlier project of understanding non-Europeans as intrinsically modern, which emerged in the 1930s, had become, by the end of Empire, largely forgotten.

The reason that this critique was plausible was that in many respects its claims were true of the social anthropology of the 1960s. The history of the discipline was then written teleologically, with the recent past projected back onto the colonial era as a whole. The blame for primitivism was then placed either on the heads of the anthropologists concerned, or it was claimed to be a logical corollary of the of the discipline's methods.[6] This chapter shows that the modern-oriented project of the 1930s continued during and after World War Two, and explains what happened to it in the 1950s, by showing how political pressures defined the limits of the sayable in social anthropology. By tracing those limits through time, I also attempt to overcome a binary opposition of "colonial" and "post-colonial": showing the complexities of the former and continuities between the two. The key moment in the exclusion of modernity from the discipline was the mid-1950s, through another form of exclusion: of certain kinds of research,

---

1 See David Goddard, "Limits of British Anthropology", *New Left Review* I, no. 64 (1969): 79-89; Jairus Banaji, "The Crisis of British Anthropology", *New Left Review* I, no. 64 (1970): 71-85; *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*., Gérard Leclerc, *Anthropologie Et Colonialisme: Essai Sur L'histoire De L'africanisme* (Paris: Fayard, 1972).

2 I use the term "primitive" here in the very specific, limited and negative sense of "essentially non-modern." Likewise I use "primitivism" to indicate a narrow focus on the non-modern aspects of a given object of research.

3 On the exclusion from historical time see the highly influential Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*.

4 *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter,* 11.

5 While to an extent the question of complicity has been nuanced by historians of the discipline, the charge of primitivism has stuck. A signal exception is Vincent, "Functionalism Revisited: An Unsettled Science". See also Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends*. Recently Peter Mandler has discussed American cultural anthropology's shift to "complex" societies in two articles: Mandler, "Margaret Mead Amongst the Natives of Great Britain", Mandler, "One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology".

6 As one historian of anthropology has stated, "[c]riticism of colonial anthropology has sometimes been linked to an epistemological critique of the functionalist model, but it has most often been expressed in political and ethical terms, in the context of questioning the responsibility of the anthropologist": de L'Estoile, "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development".

and of certain kinds of researchers from the field. By looking at the cases of anthropologists who did attempt to study non-Europeans as modern in the 1950s, I demonstrate how political coercion made such work impossible.

In the 1950s anthropologists based at the University of Manchester continued to insist on the study of non-Europeans as modern—as political and economic agents enmeshed in a wider contemporary world of industrial capital and colonialism. In their hands social anthropology became a tool to understand contemporary social, economic, and political relations, and to relate local situations to global developments. These anthropologists were also heavily persecuted by various government authorities. This chapter considers the complex relations between their politics, the kind of work they were attempting to undertake, and the persecution they underwent. More broadly, it considers the ways in which social anthropology was shaped, over time, by the political frames in which it was generated—and because social anthropology was uniquely positioned as the dedicated social science of the non-European world, this chapter traces the limits of how non-Europeans could be represented in British social science in the late Empire. In the 1950s British anthropology was effectively prevented from studying non-Europeans as modern subjects, through the persecution of anthropologists trying to do such work.

The persecution of Manchester anthropologists offers insight into the creation of a British global security empire, the effect of that security empire on intellectual freedom and the development of the social sciences in the Empire and Commonwealth, and the character of Britain's Cold War and its complex relationship with decolonization. An extensive literature has developed on the Cold War context of the social sciences in the USA; there is little comparable for the British case.[7] In the case of anthropology, this is partly because the post-colonial critique has obscured other questions. To a certain extent this chapter aims to fill that gap. However the British case differs from the American in important ways: for example, while anti-communism was certainly a factor in the persecution of anthropologists, it was intertwined in complex ways with decolonization.

Research and Reaction: 1930s and Wartime

Resistance to the anthropology of the contemporary began in the 1930s. As described in Chapter One, one of the central projects of social anthropology in the 1930s was the study of cultural change under the conditions of colonialism and industrialization—both at Bronislaw Malinowski's seminar at the London School of Economics, and among liberal South African anthropologists at the Universities of Witwatersrand and Cape Town. This project was encouraged by governments in London and Pretoria, and was linked to a more general shift towards justifying Empire in terms of development. Max Gluckman's research in Zululand, which began in 1936, was sponsored by the South African government, and the project's stated goals—specifically, "[t]he interrelation of Zulu and European systems of control"[8]—were derived from governmental desiderata. As we have seen, Gluckman's project was also endorsed by Sir Malcolm (later Lord) Hailey, whose landmark *African Survey* was published in 1938, the same year Gluckman finished his fieldwork in Zululand.[9] Leaning heavily on the work of anthropologists such as Audrey Richards, Hailey's work became the keystone of the new doctrine of development colonialism.

---

7 See Introduction for details of the historiography.
8 AWH to MG, June 1st, 1936, Max Gluckman Papers at the Royal Anthropological Institute, MG RAI.
9 See Chapter Two.

However, opposition to this program soon appeared, as governments sought to keep certain researchers, and certain kinds of research, from the field. This was partly due to fears of the perceived effects of anthropological research on native subjects, and partly due to ingrained attitudes among colonial elites, who were often resistant both to the new technocratic strain of social research, and to the new breed of researchers.[10] Anti-communism and anti-Semitism also played a part in individual cases.

All of these factors first became apparent in South Africa, where they were joined by specific domestic concerns. While South African liberals were aligning themselves with the shift towards a policy of development, domestic politics in South Africa were becoming less progressive.[11] Liberalism, itself highly conflicted over segregation, was being confronted by a growing nationalism. These shifts came to a head in late 1939, when Gluckman was barred from returning to Zululand to continue his research. This decision was made by the national Secretary for Native Affairs, Douglas Smit, on the recommendation of H. C. Lugg, the Chief Native Officer of Natal.[12] Gluckman's work had become intolerable to the very government which was sponsoring it.

Gluckman's research had unnerved both Zulu and government elites. The Zulu Regent Mshiyeni, who had fallen out with Gluckman, complained to officials that Gluckman was challenging the *status quo* by asking the Zulu whether they felt taxes were too high, and whether they felt oppressed by European rule.[13] He added ominously, "I think he is working for someone undisclosed. In fact, the man may be a Communist who we are warned against."[14] As Mshyeni was well aware, the spread of communism was a substantial fear in the 1930s. LSE anthropologists Paul Kirchoff and Meyer Fortes (temporarily) were also both barred from their fieldsites due to a combination of anti-communism and anti-Semitism.[15]

In Gluckman's case, however, what made officials uneasy was not his socialism (about which officials on the ground were unsure and unconcerned.)[16] Rather, it was his closeness to the Zulu, and the unsettling way in which the participant-observer anthropologist upset standing racial *mores*. According to Evans-Pritchard, officials felt that Gluckman's presence was disruptive because "the Zulu could not fit [him] into their accustomed patterns of behaviour to whites."[17] Mshiyeni had indeed complained to officials about anthropologists in general asking the Zulu about "their intimate affairs."[18]

Gluckman himself saw the underlying reason for the ban as a shift in the relationship between government and anthropology. He wrote to Hoernlé that rather than anthropology offering a critique of policy, policy would determine the kinds of anthropological work which could be done. Specifically, segregation would be justified by reference to the Afrikaner cultural anthropology known as *volkekunde*,[19] which was growing and gaining in political influence.[20] He

---

10 On the cultural clash between administrators and experts see Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism*.

11 See Chapters One and Two.

12 Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society", 41. I draw here on Macmillan's reading of government records in Zambia, as well as my own research on Gluckman's correspondence at the RAI.

13 M. Langfield to Lugg, November 9th, 1939, NTS 53/378, cited in Ibid., 42.

14 M. Langfield to Lugg, November 9th, 1939, NTS 53/378, cited in Ibid., 42.

15 See Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970,* Chapter Three.

16 See Macmillan, "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society", 42-3.

17 MG to Hilda Kuper (HK), July 23rd, 1943, MG RAI. Cf. Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 27.

18 AWH to MG, November 3rd, 1939, MG RAI.

19 See Chapter One.

20 *Volkekunde* became fully dominant after the War with the establishment of apartheid. See Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990*; Gordon, "Apartheid's Anthropologists: The Genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology".

repeated rumors that P. J. Schoeman had been made Professor at Stellenbosch because his anthropology was based on "Christian, Afrikaner lines (or Nazism)," and that Smit, a friend of Schoeman, was arranging for Schoeman to train future native commissioners. (Gluckman also claimed that Schoeman and his students had slandered him to the authorities.)[21] *Volkekunde* was both ideologically and methodologically more acceptable than social anthropology, as it was uninterested in questions of contemporary political economy, and did not rely on participant-observation. It was ultimately the use of participant-observation in order to understand contemporary political and economic relations which was intolerable. Hoernlé informed Gluckman in 1939 that Smit considered the experiment of allowing Gluckman to live in a native *kraal* to have been "disastrous," and that he had instructed all South African universities that students would not be allowed to do so in future.[22] The nascent discipline of social anthropology was being squeezed out, and Gluckman was banned for doing the very work the government had commissioned.

Gluckman's early work was written up at the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI), in Northern Rhodesia, where he served from 1939 to 1947. The RLI, established in 1937 as a regional institute for research into contemporary social problems associated with industrialization, was consonant with the movement within anthropology towards the study of "culture contact," and institutionalized the human sciences as a component of a development empire.[23] However, the Institute's existence was also highly contingent, in the face of ambivalence, and indeed outright hostility, from the Colonial Office, local settlers, the legislative council, and mining corporations.[24] In the absence of any local academic institution, the board was made up from colonial and local elites with no particular interest in social science, and who were often hostile to the kind of work anthropologists wanted to do.[25]

The fate of the first Director of the Institute, Godfrey Wilson, shows how research on modern problems was likely to be intolerable to local settlers. Wilson and his South-African wife Monica, who had both been students of Malinowski in the mid-1930s, saw the study of urban, industrial Africans and labor migration as central to the anthropological project.[26] In 1940 Wilson was banned from working on the mines at Broken Hill, explicitly because the mines feared that his methods—i.e. immersive participant-observation—could "cause discontent and unrest" among African miners, and undermine their respect for European mineworkers.[27] The war brought further problems: as a conscientious objector, Wilson was informed that he could not associate with the "natives," as his views might affect morale and recruiting.[28] He resigned in 1941, and committed suicide in 1944.

---

21 All MG to AW Hoernlé (AWH) July 11th, 1939, MG RAI. See also MG to HK, July 23rd, 1943, MG RAI. Cf. Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 42.

22 AWH to MG, November 3rd, 1939. MG RAI. The ban resulted in Hilda Kuper being barred from Vendaland in 1943, a decision the administration justified by reference to Gluckman: HK to MG, no date, c. June or early July 1943, MG RAI.

23 See Ibid.

24 This is a central argument made by Richard Brown, "Anthropology and Colonial Rule: Godfrey Wilson and the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute," in *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*, ed. Talal Asad (New York: Humanities Press, 1973), 175-185.

25 The Governor of Northern Rhodesia was *ex officio* president of the board, and nominated two further members; they were joined by two more civil servants (the provincial commissioner and financial secretary), and two settlers (the mayor of Livingstone and the local member of the national legislative council.) Ibid., 186.

26 See e. g. "Preliminary Plan of Research," quoted in Ibid., 189. The theme runs through much of Wilson's published work, including that co-authored with his wife Monica. See e.g. Godfrey Wilson, *An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia* (Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1941).

27 Confidential minutes of 14th meeting of RLI trustees, October 27th, 1940, quoted in Brown, "Anthropology and Colonial Rule: Godfrey Wilson and the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute", 191-2.

28 Ibid., 192.

Wilson's heir apparent, Audrey Richards, was heavily criticized by white mineworkers after she put her name to a joint article which suggested that a recent commission on disturbances on the Copperbelt had been swayed by the mines and white trade unions, and proposed that white labor should be prohibited from migrating to the Copperbelt so that African labor could be advanced.[29] This enraged Roy Welensky, future Prime Minister, then a leader of the Railway Workers' Union and serving as Northern Rhodesia's Director of Manpower, who told Gluckman that "he would not have that woman in the country."[30]

Gluckman's experiences at the RLI show how the political conditions under which anthropology took place were transformed by World War Two.[31] Political sensitivities and security concerns were initially heightened by the outbreak of war and such concerns were the reason Gluckman had felt the need to ask for permission to return to Zululand.[32] Gluckman's socialism was reframed by the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact signed in August, 1939. Suspicions about his politics culminated in a summons to the Governor for making anti-British remarks, and apparently for discussing political issues such as the war with the Lozi elite.[33] Under wartime conditions the Gluckmans assumed their private letters were subject to inspection by government censors,[34] and issues of the *Guardian* newspaper posted to them were opened and inspected.[35] More dangerous perhaps was the more informal surveillance of gossip networks: Gluckman was accused of being a "Fifth Columnist" by a local settler as late as 1942,[36] and such suspicions seem to have been a factor in his Directorship being not made permanent in that same year.[37]

However in general the war changed conditions in such a way that Gluckman was able to reposition himself and his work. His socialism was completely revalorized after the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941, while the war effort promoted an active ideology of development through the need for Government intervention into spheres such as labor. In both Gluckman's own mind and the minds of at least some of his peers, his enthusiasm for the Soviet Union was now compatible with support of the British Empire.[38] For Gluckman the British Empire was a means to two ends: the defeat of Fascism, and the creation of an international socialism after the war; anthropological research was to play a part in both of these goals.[39] Gluckman was also highly motivated by guilt at not serving as a combatant, and comforted himself that his work at the RLI was in some way useful to the war effort.[40] During the war

---

29 Gluckman described the article as "The Anti-slavery Committee's Report on the Copperbelt Disturbances Report," first published in *The New Statesman*, and reprinted in the *Livingstone Mail*. MG to Mary Gluckman, January 13th, 1942, MG RAI.

30 MG to Mary Gluckman, January 13th, 1942, MG RAI.

31 There has been very little written on the subject of World War Two and British anthropology. On US anthropologists and the War see David Price, "Lessons From Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, Persuasive and Ignored Contributions", *Anthropology Today* 18, no. 3 (2002): 14-20; Mandler, "Margaret Mead Amongst the Natives of Great Britain"; Mandler, "One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology." On the impact of the war on British imperial ideology and social research more generally see Lewis, *Empire State-building: War & Welfare in Kenya, 1925-52*; Wolton, *Lord Hailey, the Colonial Office and the Politics of Race and Empire in the Second World War: The Loss of White Prestige*; Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism,* Chapter Six.

32 MG to HK, July 23, 1943, MG RAI.

33 See e.g. Brown, "Anthropology and Colonial Rule: Godfrey Wilson and the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute," 529.

34 For references to censorship see in particular MG to Mary Gluckman, March 22nd and March 25th, 1942; see also December 19th, 1941; January 13th, 1942, MG RAI.

35 Mary Gluckman, diary entry for August 2nd, 1940, MG RAI.

36 MG to Mrs D. Rudge, November 10th, 1942, MG RAI. Apparently the comment was provoked by his criticism of the British interwar governments for failing to deal with social problems such as slums and poverty.

37 MG to Mary Gluckman, January 9th, 1942, MG RAI.

38 See e.g. Reverend George Norton to MG, January 30th, 1942; MG to Mary Gluckman February 18th, 1942; MG to Mary Gluckman February 24th, 1942; MG to Mary Gluckman, March 25th, 1942; Roy Welensky to MG, September 22nd, 1942, MG RAI.

39 MG to Mary Gluckman, February 26th, 1942; May 17th, 1942, MG RAI Cf. MG to "Harry", no date, c. 1942, MG RAI.

40 See e. g. MG to Mary Gluckman, February 27th, 1942; March 6th, 1942; March 22nd, 1942; April 10th, 1942; Mary Gluckman to MG, undated, c. November 1942, MG RAI.

Gluckman worked for the administration in various ways, for example advising them on the mobilization of Lozi labor for the war effort, and working on pro-war propaganda.[41] He also advised white Army officers on the tribal cultures of their African troops—work which he hoped would not only be useful to the war effort in itself, but might lead to an attachment to the regiment as a civilian advisor.[42] As well as the work he produced himself, he acted as an informal technical advisor to Gordon Read, the Provincial Commissioner for Barotseland (Mongu), helping him to understand reports written by other technical officers.[43]

Therefore while the war made political sensitivities more acute, especially around where and when fieldwork could be done, it also encouraged a certain kind of applied anthropology. This in turn was due to the unique character of the RLI as an applied research institute, and the willingness of the authorities in Northern Rhodesia to keep it open during the war.[44] The war's most important effect on anthropology in general, however, was quite different: it caused a major hiatus. Gluckman was the only major anthropologist to continue fieldwork through the war, which was to give his post-war department in Manchester a unique continuity with the modern-oriented anthropology of the 1930s. However as we shall see, the political conditions under which such work was undertaken were very different in the 1950s.

The 1950s: Anthropology and the Security Empire

The 1930s was, then, a time of balance between various forces, both promoting and obstructing work on modern social problems. The 1940s was inevitably highly conditioned by the war, which both encouraged applied anthropology in some respects and curtailed it in others. Under the very different political conditions of the 1950s, the balance began to shift, squeezing out the anthropology of the contemporary and re-primitivizing the social scientific understanding of non-Europeans.

Anthropology was directly affected by major shifts in the ideology of Empire during and after the war. The shift to a development empire came to full fruition in the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940, which led to the creation of the Colonial Social Science Research Council (CSSRC) in 1944. The CSSRC provided hitherto unprecedented levels of funding for research centers and individual research fellowships. Its goals were the investigation of contemporary social, economic and political conditions across the Empire, including government and colonial law, the effects of migrant labour, and political development.[45] This multi-disciplinary project was dominated by anthropology, which was considered the basis for the other social sciences which would be involved.[46]

The development Empire therefore increased and stabilized funding for anthropologists, and encouraged the anthropology of contemporary social problems. But the period of CSSRC funding, which was also a period of academic expansion, was also the period when British anthropology turned away from the study of non-Europeans as modern. This has generally been explained in terms of anthropologists' fundamentally being uninterested in the goals of the

---

41 See e.g. MG to Provincial Commissioner, Southern Province, September 4th, 1941 "Comments on 'Memorandum concerning the improvement of recreational and economic conditions in "subsistence" areas"; MG to Chief Secretary, Lusaka, July 28th, 1942; MG to Mary Gluckman, February 20th, 1942; MG to Provincial Commissioner, Mongu, February 22nd, 1942, "Tribute in Barotseland"; MG to Governor, Northern Rhodesia, January 19th, 1943 "Agricultural Development in Barotseland," MG RAI.

42 MG "Northern Rhodesian Tribal Prejudices in relation to the Northern Rhodesian Regiment" (MS); MG to Mary Gluckman, April 8th, 1942, MG RAI.

43 MG to Mary Gluckman, February 24th, 1942.

44 See Ibid.

45 See Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 78.

46 See Ibid., 77.

CSSRC, and paying lip-service to development goals in order to secure funding.[47] It is true that many anthropologists were not primarily interested in contemporary problems; however, it is equally true that many were. To understand the demise of the anthropological study of modernity we have to understand another shift of the 1950s: the growth of a security empire.

The new governmental system of funding meant that anthropologists were now subject to formal approval by government officials at various levels.[48] This approval included security screening. Under pressure from the USA, Labour Prime Minister Clement Attlee had introduced the screening of civil servants in 1948 (the so-called "Purge Procedure".)[49] A bureaucratic apparatus was then developed to prevent spying and subversion, motivated in particular by fears over nuclear secrets.[50] Once in place, however, the apparatus developed for the vetting of nuclear scientists could be used to control social scientists. The justification was no longer a fear of spying, but of spreading Communist propaganda, or even, as we shall see, of "subversion" unrelated to communism *per se*.

Screening was only one aspect of a greatly expanded imperial security system which increasingly curtailed the possibilities of anthropology in the 1950s. The two co-ordinating agencies were the Colonial Office (CO), and the Security Service (MI5), which after World War Two became responsible for security across the whole Empire.[51] The modern British security services had long held imperial pretensions,[52] which began to be fulfilled in the 1950s, partly through the responses to the Malayan and Kenyan emergencies.[53] MI5 also created, trained and sometimes controlled the Special Branches[54] of local police forces and liaised with regional security services such as the ASIO in Australia and DIB in India.[55] It also advised the CO on security across the Empire.

All of these developments were partly fueled and justified by the global Cold War, and to a large extent British anti-communism was driven by American pressure.[56] The Cold War also introduced an ethos of security, in which state persecution of individuals without due process could be justified by the imputation of communism. Secrecy—long a hall-mark of British governance[57]—also became newly valorized.

---

47 See, e.g., Ibid., 84ff. Jack Goody argues that because anthropologists were in control of the CSSRC, they were able to operate largely independently of official oversight. Goody, *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970,* 10.

48 The CSSRC replaced the earlier system of funding for anthropology by private US foundations such as Ford and Rockefeller, discussed in Chapter One.

49 Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5,* 385. Screening was secretly extended in 1949 to private workers on classified government contracts.

50 By 1955, 11, 000 of the 18,000 government workers who had been positively vetted were working in nuclear science. See Ibid., 395.

51 The Security Service is the agency often referred to as MI5. I use the terms interchangeably. I use "security services" to denote both MI5 and other agencies involved in security work.

52 Indeed as early as 1934 the deputy head of MI5 declared it to be an imperial rather than national organization. See Ibid., 138.

53 Ibid., 458-9. In the twenty-five years after World War Two, MI5 officers and staff spent "a quarter to a third" of their careers in the Empire and Commonwealth: Ibid., xix.

54 Special Branches were sections of local police forces specifically dedicated to security issues.

55 This Security Empire survived decolonization, not least through the continuing relationship between MI5 and local security forces. MI5 kept "Security Liaison Officers" (usually secretly) in every decolonized Commonwealth nation, including India and even Ghana under the strongly socialist premier Kwame Nkrumah: Ibid., 442ff., 454. Nkrumah accepted the SLO gratefully as aid against the "imperialism" of the Soviet Bloc as represented in Africa by Nasser's Egypt, which he feared was sponsoring subversion in Ghana. The one national security service which MI5 had major qualms about assisting was the South African, and there was no SLO in Pretoria:Ibid., 444.

56 See Giora Goodman, "The British Government and the Challenge of McCarthyism in the Early Cold War", *Journal of Cold War Studies* 12, no. 1 (2010): 62-97.

57 See David Vincent, *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain, 1832-1998* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

However, in the mid-1950s neither domestic nor global communism was seen as a particularly pressing threat by the British. Attlee himself felt by then that the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) was under complete control and had "utterly failed."[58] By 1952 MI5 was confident that it had identified 90% of current CPGB members, and had the Party leadership under close surveillance.[59] There was very little concern over possible Communist activity in sub-Saharan Africa, and communism there was perceived to be unorganized and only a minor contributing factor to the real threat, which was nationalism and demands for self-government.[60] This position made explicit in General Sir Gerald Templer's 1955 report on security across the Empire and Commonwealth, which stated that, while Britain's enemy in the Cold War was communism, "in the Colonies this threat is for the most part indirect and intangible; it operates, if at all, through the medium of other anti-British manifestations which would be present even if the Communist Party had never been invented."[61] Outside of Malaya and British Guiana, the immediate impact of Communism was considered to be "small or non-existent."[62]

The imperial security apparatus was partly motivated by anti-communism, but only to the extent that Communists were to be feared as one form of "subversive." It was subversion in general, rather than communism *per se*, which was feared: subversion not of empire, but of the end of empire—not of imperial rule, but of orderly decolonization in the interests of existing colonial elites, and white settlers in particular.[63] The real concern was the management of decolonization. In contrast to the USA, which was an expanding geopolitical empire in competition with the Soviet, Britain was a contracting empire with powerful entrenched colonial settler elites. The Cold War however strengthened the conceptual connection between "subversion" and "Communism," so that fears regarding the potential course of decolonization tended to be expressed in an anti-Communist idiom.

The Manchester School

These developments soon affected Max Gluckman and his students at the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester, founded in 1949 with Gluckman as first Chair. The department was explicitly established to study both "primitive" and "modern" societies.[64] Gluckman himself was determined to continue research into the contemporary transformations of social life in Africa and beyond; in this he was aided by his continuing close connections with the RLI. By 1950 the new department was attracting mostly left-wing students who wanted to work on modern Africa. Social anthropology was still a small discipline: Manchester was the first department outside Oxford, Cambridge and London. A certain division of labor was established whereby Manchester (and, to a lesser extent, a later new department at

---

58 Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5,* 395.

59 Ibid., 402.

60 Ibid., 452f.

61 Sir Gerald Templer, Security Service Archives, quoted in Ibid., 459.

62 Sir Gerald Templer, Security Service Archives, quoted in Ibid., 459. The designated Chief of the Imperial General Staff, Templer had been head of military intelligence at the War Office immediately after World War Two, and had been responsible for the quelling of the Malayan Emergency as joint High Commissioner and director of military operations there, which according to Christopher Andrew, "gave him greater power than any British general since Oliver Cromwell." Ibid., 449.

63 Cf. John Darwin, *The End of the British Empire: The Historical Debate* (B. Blackwell, 1991), 76: "For the British, everything turned upon the delicate phase when the prospect of self-government began to transform the politics of their colonies." Darwin places the transition to a "hotter" British Cold War around 1959-60, 77.

64 "Particulars of Appointment of Reader in Social Anthropology," 1949, VCA/7/87, Vice-Chancellor's Archive, RYLANDS.

Edinburgh) became the wing of the discipline which focused on industrial and urban anthropology.[65]

A decade after Gluckman's appointment, the eminent Oxford anthropologist Mary Douglas announced, "it is evidently time to salute a 'school' of anthropology, whose publications are developed through close discussion, and where each individual's work is enhanced by his focus on a common stock of problems."[66] The work she was reviewing—William Watson's Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy—was part of a wave of Manchester monographs published in and around 1957-8, many of which were the first books by Manchester-trained anthropologists. These included Victor Turner's *Schism and Continuity in an African Society*, Peter Worsley's *The Trumpet Shall Sound*, Ronald Frankenberg's *Village on the Border*, J. Clyde Mitchell's *The Kalela Dance*, A. L. Epstein's *Politics in an Urban African Community*, and F. G. Bailey's *Caste and the Economic Frontier*.[67] Although these works addressed a broad array of local situations in Northern Rhodesia, Melanesia, Wales, and India, Douglas was right in attributing them to a school, which worked on similar problems and used methods developed dialectically within an unusually close-knit seminar culture. This work was characterized by a focus on conflict and the micropolitics of social process; the transformation of both urban and rural localities under colonial capitalism; and the relation of the local situation to regional, national and global political economies. They also extrapolated Gluckman's "situational analysis" into "extended case analysis," which considered a series of situations involving the same persons—the most famous version of this was Victor Turner's "social drama," which I discuss in more detail in the following chapter.[68]

The new department was established with funds received from the government's Clapham Fund, which was set up to stimulate social research in the interests of postwar reconstruction.[69] Yet although the British government was ultimately sponsoring the new department, Gluckman's greatest problems would be with government agencies in Britain and in various British colonies. In fact, the careers of Manchester anthropologists in the 1950s involved a constant battle with various administrations, settler groups and security services across the Empire, from the West Indies to Central Africa to the South-West Pacific. In order to convey the complexities of the various political factors at work, the rest of this chapter will discuss these problems in some detail, focusing on the stories of four of these anthropologists: Ronald Frankenberg, A. L. "Bill" Epstein, Peter Worsley, and Gluckman himself.

---

65 For a comparison of Manchester and Edinburgh see Mills, *Difficult Folk*. See also C. Waters, ""Dark Strangers" in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963", *The Journal of British Studies* 36, no. 2 (1997): 207-238. and Bailkin, *The Afterlife of Empire*.

66 Mary Douglas, review of Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy by William Watson, Man, Vol. 59. (Sep., 1959), 168.

67 Victor Turner, *Schism and Continuity in An African Society: A Study of Ndembu Village Life* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957); Peter Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "Cargo" Cults in Melanesia* (London,: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957); Ronald Frankenberg, *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community* (London: Cohen & West, 1957); J. Clyde Mitchell, *The Kalela Dance: Aspects of Social Relationships Among Urban Africans in Northern Rhodesia* (Manchester: RLI/Manchester University Press, 1956); A. L. Epstein, *Politics in An Urban African Community* (New York,, 1958); F. G. Bailey, *Caste and the Economic Frontier* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957)

68 For a useful basic discussion see Hannerz, *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward An Urban Anthropology,* 131-3. For a detailed analysis of the extended case method and other aspects of their work see Evens and Handelman, eds, *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology*. See also Richard Werbner, "The Manchester School in South-central Africa", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13 (1984): 157-185; Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology*; Mills, *Difficult Folk*.

69 J. Clapham, *Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research (the Clapham Report)* (London: House of Commons Official Reports, 1947). On Clapham and anthropology, see Mills, *Difficult Folk* 94-5.

"The Power to Exclude": Ronald Frankenberg

A first sign of trouble occurred in 1950, when Gluckman was attempting to have his first students assigned to the RLI to do their fieldwork. He had envisaged and planned a complementary relationship between the RLI and Manchester, with himself and former RLI staff training a new generation of students in Manchester, which in turn would be based at the RLI for fieldwork, before returning to Manchester to write up their results.[70] But he immediately ran into problems getting his first two students, Victor Turner and Peter Worsley, accepted for the RLI.

The Director of the Institute, Elizabeth Colson, was reluctant to hire Turner, partly because she was worried by rumors that he was a Communist (which he was.)[71] Gluckman conceded that his students would not be hired if they did indeed turn out to be Party members, but protested that Turner should not be condemned on the basis of a "secret accusation," and pointed out that Turner had already passed "a severe screening" for an earlier job (which he did not take up) in Tanganyika.[72] In the event Turner passed a second screening, overcame whatever reservations Colson may have had, and by the end of the year was in the field with Mitchell.[73] However the general situation perturbed Gluckman, and he feared that the RLI might not be able to survive in the new geopolitical climate, "with the cold war steadily forcing Britain into an impossible defensive position in the colonies."[74]

While Turner passed his screening and was appointed to the RLI, Peter Worsley was less fortunate. Worsley had been a Communist since his days in the army in World War Two. When he joined the infamous East African Groundnut Scheme in Tanganyika after the war, his mail was opened and security officers attended the Swahili classes he was teaching.[75] Worsley had also been previously turned down for an RLI post to research race relations in Southern Rhodesia when he voiced his unconditional opposition to the color bar.[76] Now he and another candidate, Mervyn Jaspan (whom Gluckman was also supporting and who would later teach at Manchester), were both denied RLI posts; Gluckman told Worsley he had been appointed, but blocked by MI5.[77] A final attempt to "circumvent British colonialism" by getting Worsley to Angola on a grant from the independent Royal Anthropological Institute, on an "eminently apolitical topic" also failed.[78] It was gradually becoming apparent—to Gluckman's disgust and Worsley's dismay—that he would not be allowed to work anywhere in Africa.[79]

Another of Gluckman's earliest students was Ronald Frankenberg, a Londoner from a Polish-Jewish background, who had read Natural Science and then Anthropology and Archaeology at Cambridge. Frustrated by the rather eccentric and dated teaching of anthropology

---

70 He formulated this plan almost immediately on being offered the Manchester Chair. See MG to Mansfield Cooper, Registrar, University of Manchester, July 19th, 1949: "in effect Manchester would be the British centre for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute. That would give us a nucleus around which to build up a strong research department." See also Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 150-1.

71 MG to JCM, July 20th, 1950, JCM RH. The issue led to a temporary falling out between Colson and Gluckman. On Turner's communism see Edith Turner, *Heart of Lightness: The Life Story of An Anthropologist* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005).

72 MG to JCM, July 20th, 1950, JCM RH. The issue led to a temporary falling out between Colson and Gluckman.

73 Ironically, Mitchell was soon complaining that Turner was too much of a crude materialist Marxist.

74 MG to JCM, July 20th, 1950, JCM RH.

75 Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Australian Kinship," in *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*, ed. Christine Gailey (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992), Vol. 2, 26. Cf Alan Macfarlane, *An Interview with Peter Worsley*, http://www.sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1139306. On the Groundnut Scheme, a disastrous British government development project which attempted to farm groundnuts in Tanganyika, see Hodge, *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism* 209ff. Cf. J. S. Hogendorn and K. M. Scott, "The East African Groundnut Scheme: Lessons of a Large-Scale Agricultural Failure", *African Economic History* , no. 10 (1981): 81-115.

76 Peter Worsley, *An Academic Skating on Thin Ice* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 69.

77 Ibid., 77. Cf. MG to JCM, September 2nd, 1950, JCM RH.

78 Ibid., 77.

79 MG to JCM, September 2nd, 1950, JCM RH; Ibid., 77.

there, he was delighted to discover Gluckman's early articles on Zululand, which particularly impressed him with their use of Marx and Freud.[80] He secured a studentship at Manchester, having told Gluckman that he was the only anthropologist "with any insight on the problems of modern Africa."[81] As with many of Gluckman's early students, Frankenberg's wish to study modern social problems was linked to his socialism. He had been a Socialist Zionist in Cambridge, and at Manchester joined the Socialist Society, a left-wing alternative to the Labour Club which was proscribed by the Labour Party. He had resisted overtures from the student Communist association as he was "a Zionist and violently anti-Party."[82]

Frankenberg's attempts to secure a research position or funding for PhD fieldwork all failed; these attempts included applications to the RLI, and for posts in Rwanda, Uganda, and Nigeria. There were ostensible reasons for all these failures, including bad interview performances, and the fact that he had not completed his national service. However his inability to secure either funding or a research post was in fact overdetermined by factors unknown to himself and to Gluckman. According to his secret Security Service file, he was "known" to have been a member of the Communist Party since 1950, and it was asserted that "there would be a risk to security were he to have access to secret information or were he to be employed in a position where he could engage in Communist propaganda."[83] Frankenberg was automatically blacklisted from consideration for research posts at the RLI and the West African Institute of Social and Economic Research in Nigeria. Regarding his failure to obtain a grant to work in Uganda, the file reveals that the grant was in fact given, but that the Ugandan government—apparently acting on Security Service advice—had "decided that in no circumstances would he be allowed to work there."[84] In effect, he was secretly banned from working overseas, and especially in the British colonies, on a false and secret piece of information.[85]

The nature of these bans was such that both Frankenberg and Gluckman were oblivious to them. Something of the political reality began to dawn when Frankenberg finally secured funding, from non-governmental sources at the University of Manchester and the Nuffield Foundation.[86] The project was a study of the effects of unemployment on family life in the West Indies, which Frankenberg was to investigate through participant-observer fieldwork on the island of St. Vincent, in the Federal Colony of the Windward Islands.

The genealogy of Frankenberg's project lay in a longer American tradition of thought about the family in the African diaspora. The US cultural anthropologist Marshall Herskovits had famously explained the "matrifocal" structure of the African-American family in terms of

---

80 Ronald Frankenberg, "Village on the Border: A Text Revisited," inRonald Frankenberg, *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community* (Waveland Press, 1990), 169. Gluckman's Zululand articles, originally published in 1940 and 1942 and collected in Gluckman, *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*, are discussed in detail in Chapter Two.

81 MG to JCM, August 12th, 1952, JCM RH.

82 RJF to MG, March 24th, 1953, MG RAI. On the conflict between Zionism and Communism see John T. Callaghan, *Cold War, Crisis and Conflict : The History of the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1951-68* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2003), 56ff.

83 CO 1035/135, TNA (emphasis in original). With Orwellian logic, it was explained that although he was a member of the Communist Party, Frankenberg did not carry a Party registration card because he intended "to apply for an appointment in the Colonies."

84 CO 1035/135, TNA.

85 In fact, it is still officially a secret. The only reason I have been able to find this information, almost sixty years later, is that the security report's contents were copied into the briefing papers for the Parliamentary debate on Frankenberg's case (marked "Secret: Not to be used in debate".) The adjacent file, CO 1035/67 and further extracts from CO 1035/135 are closed and my Freedom of Information request was turned down on the grounds that they contain information which was received from the security services.

86 The latter being expedited by the University's Chancellor, Lord Stopford, who was also Chair of the Foundation.

cultural survivals from African cultures.[87] The African-American sociologist E. Franklin Frazier, seeing Herskovits' cultural relativism as politically dangerous, had supplied a different historical explanation in terms of the experience of plantation slavery.[88] These questions were taken up in the late 1940s and early 1950s by British social scientists seeking to explain the high rate of illegitimacy in the West Indies. Frazier's historical framework was applied to the West Indies by Fernando Henriques, born in the West Indies and trained in social anthropology at Oxford by Radcliffe-Brown and Meyer Fortes.[89] Henriques agreed with Frazier that contemporary kinship in the diaspora was structured by the experience of plantation slavery. Meanwhile other British social scientists, such as T. S. Simey and Madeline Kerr, had bemoaned the lack of a proper investigation of the contemporary, rather than historical, aspects of the phenomenon.[90]

Gluckman had originally planned to take up this challenge himself, having previously worked with his RLI team on similar problems in Northern Rhodesia.[91] However he was so impressed with Frankenberg's own analysis of the problem that he decided that Frankenberg should take over the project. In his MA exam, with Henriques as external examiner, Frankenberg had refuted both the Frazier-Henriques and Herskovits approaches and instead, inspired by Friedrich Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England,* gave an explanation in terms of contemporary socio-economics: specifically, the high rate of male unemployment in the Caribbean.[92] He also drew comparisons to urban areas in contemporary southern and central Africa (based on his knowledge of RLI work.)[93] In the funding application Gluckman extended this range of comparison to Western industrialization in general, and even suggested that such work would be good preparation for "the more difficult task" of studying British kinship organization.[94]

This approach in terms of contemporary socio-economics was entirely compatible with social anthropology and with the direction of social research in the West Indies, which had recently been boosted by the creation of the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University College of the West Indies in Jamaica (ISER.) This was one of three such regional interdisciplinary social research institutes, modeled on the RLI, which were set up under the CSSRC (the other two being in Ibadan, Nigeria and Makerere, Uganda.) The head of ISER, H. D Huggins, was anxious for Frankenberg to connect with the current researchers: M. G. Smith and Raymond Smith,[95] both of whom were trained social anthropologists working on contemporary issues.[96]

---

87 Melville J Herskovits, *The Myth of the Negro Past* (London: Harper & Brothers, 1941). On Herskovits and race see Jerry Gershenhorn, *Melville J. Herskovits: And the Racial Politics of Knowledge* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004).

88 Edward Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States* (The University of Chicago Press, 1939). To an extent the Herskovits-Frazier debate therefore mirrored the clash between relativistic cultural anthropology and relational social anthropology in South Africa in the 1930s. The pathology or functionality of the "matrifocal" African-American family under the conditions of modernity continued to be a key concern for both sociology and social policy in the USA in the 1960s and 1970s. See Francis Pine, "Family," in *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (New York: Routledge, 1996).

89 See Fernando Henriques, *Family and Colour in Jamaica* (London,: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1953).

90 T. S. Simey, *Welfare & Planning in the West Indies* (Oxford,: The Clarendon Press,, 1946) and Madeline Kerr, *Personality and Conflict in Jamaica* (Liverpool,: University Press, 1952).

91 See Max Gluckman, "The Research Project - A Study of Domestic Associations in a West Indian Island," August 19th, 1952, MG RAI. See also MG to The Right Honourable Oliver Lyttleton, Secretary of State for the Colonies, 13 Jan. 1953, MG RAI.

92 "Village on the Border: A Text Revisited," in Frankenberg, *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community,* 170.

93 MG to JCM, August 12th, 1952, JCM RH.

94 Max Gluckman "The Research Project," August 19th, 1952, MG RAI.

95 H. D. Huggins, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies to MG, October 10th, 1952; M. G. Smith, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies, to MG, 8 Oct. 1952, MG RAI.

96 M. G. Smith had trained at University College, London under C. Daryll Forde, and Raymond Smith at Cambridge under Meyer Fortes.

Having secured funding and the support of ISER, Frankenberg tried to find out what official permission he would require to work in the West Indies. The politically transitional nature of the period is shown by the fact that neither academics nor colonial officials knew what kind of permission Frankenberg should seek, or indeed from what authority it should be sought. The West Indian Association assured him that "politics were no object" and that with a British passport he needed no entry permit.[97] However he followed the advice of Sally Chilver, Secretary at the CSSRC, to seek special permission for research from the local authorities in the islands he wished to visit.[98] The Administrator of St. Vincent gave Frankenberg permission to enter the colony for twelve months for purposes of research, and the island's Educational Officer wrote to Frankenberg to say that he would be "responsible" for him while there.[99] Meanwhile Gluckman, based on his African experiences, and anxious as ever to secure the good-will and assistance of the elite, wrote independently to the Governor of the Windward Islands.[100] Over the course of some garbled communications it then gradually emerged that the Governor had refused permission, seemingly in ignorance of the Administrator's earlier decision.[101]

Frankenberg embarked in late 1952 with the matter unclear. On arrival in Barbados he was informed that he had been barred from the Windward Islands. He was then refused permission to fly to Jamaica, to meet up with the ISER academics, and eventually he was deported from Barbados itself,[102] having spent two weeks in a hotel "considered suitable for Jews," and under surveillance from local plain-clothes police.[103] A British citizen by birth and a British passport holder, he was given no reasons for these bans from British colonies, no due process, and no opportunity to appeal the decision.

Gluckman's reactions to the ban show how painfully aware he was of the political limits to fieldwork, while his new institutional position within academia seems to have contributed to his cautiousness. When Frankenberg was asked to leave Barbados, Gluckman assured the Colonial Secretary that Frankenberg could work somewhere else "should the carrying out of the original project be likely to embarrass the Government of the Windward Islands in any way," and that Frankenberg's research would be of theoretical interest only.[104] On Frankenberg's return Gluckman also had to deal with the political frameworks of academic institutions, in negotiations with the University Administration and Nuffield Foundation. Gluckman continued to support Frankenberg and considered he had been badly treated, but he also conceded that Frankenberg may have been "indiscreet in his associations," and at one point scolded Frankenberg for jeopardizing his anthropological career by getting involved in politics.[105]

Following subsequent inquiry by Gluckman, the Colonial Office responded that the "restrictions were imposed on security grounds, and that, as the grant of permission to enter these

---

97 RJF to MG, October 4th, 1952, MG RAI.

98 MG to E. M. Chilver, September 23rd, 1952, MG RAI; E. M. Chilver to MG, September, 1952, MG RAI.

99 W. F. Coult, Administrator, Government Office, Saint Vincent, to RJF, October 30th, 1952; MG to W. A. Sanderson, January 19th, 1953.

100 MG to the Chief Secretary, Governor's Office, Windward Islands, Ocobter 1st, 1952, MG RAI. At first he stated his understanding that "all students going to do research in the colonies are now screened." He later wrote to retract this, saying his assumptions had been based on his experiences in N. Rhodesia, "where it was necessary to secure the Governor's permission for anthropologists to work in tribal territory." MG to the Chief Secretary, Governor's Office, Windward Islands, October 28th, 1952, MG RAI.

101 See L. Lartique (?), The Chief Secretary, Governor's Office, Windward Islands, to MG, October 15th, 1952; Chief Secretary, Windward Islands, to MG, November 14th, 1952 (telegram and letter); MG to Chief Secretary, Windward Islands, December 2nd, 1952; Chief Secretary to MG, December 11th, 1952; RJF to MG, December 18th 1952.

102 See H. D. Huggins to MG, January 13th, 1953.

103 "Village on the Border: A Text Revisited," Ibid., 171.

104 MG to The Right Honourable Oliver Lyttleton, Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 13th, 1953, MG RAI.

105 Alan Macfarlane, *An Interview with Ronald Frankenberg*, http://www.sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1116760.

and other British Caribbean territories lies within the discretion of the local authorities, Mr. Lyttelton [Secretary of State for the Colonies] regrets that he is unable to intervene."[106] Frankenberg decided to pursue his case both in the media and through his Member of Parliament. The national Sunday newspaper *The Observer* published his letter outlining the case,[107] and a few months later the story became front-page news in another national Sunday newspaper, the left-wing *Reynolds News and Sunday Citizen*: the story "Witch-Hunters Creep into Britain" described how Frankenberg's "career was shattered" by British McCarthyism.[108]

In July 1953 Frankenberg's Member of Parliament[109] brought the matter to the House of Commons; the matter was finally debated in 1954, a full two years after the event. The Under-Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. John Foster), deputizing for the absent Colonial Secretary, once again refused to justify the decision. He explained that, "Crown Colonies have the statutory power to exclude persons from entering the Colony from abroad"[110]; no reasons need be given, there was no right of appeal and no due process. Labour MPs compared this to "McCarthyism" and "Hitlerism" and pronounced it "alien to the normal form of British life."[111] They also pointed out that there was no corresponding arbitrary power to prevent West Indians from entering Britain.[112]

The actual reasons for the ban remained opaque. The Colonial Secretary informed Griffiths that the ban was because Frankenberg was considered to be "a bad security risk."[113] Several of Frankenberg's contacts in Barbados told him that the Governor was both anti-Semitic and hostile to social research.[114] A secret memo in the Secretary of State's briefing papers for the debate makes clear that the official reason for the ban was Frankenberg's alleged communism. Students who wished to travel were now being screened—and even the fact of the screening was secret: a set of additional briefing notes stated, "The fact that some students have been refused entry because of their association with Communists and that all students are now 'security vetted' may NOT be given."[115] The CO itself did not even know for sure whether any other British students had been excluded in a similar way, as there had been "no recent enquiry of Colonial Governments."[116] They believed that Frankenberg's case was unique. Gluckman believed that a dozen students had been excluded secretly from different colonies.[117] *Reynolds News* claimed that eight students had been banned from the colonies in 1953.[118] At least two non-Manchester Marxist students working on contemporary topics were also banned from their fields. Frank

---

106 Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office, to Max Gluckman, 9th February 1953, MG RAI.

107 *The Observer*, June 7th, 1953. Ironically, his letter was partly changed without his permission when an editor called Gluckman to check the facts: MG to RJF, June 5th, 1953, MG RAI.

108 "The Witch-Hunters Creep into Britain," *Reynolds News and Sunday Citizen*, October 18th, 1953.

109 Will Griffiths, seconded by H. Morgan of Warrington. Frankenberg had canvassed for the socialist Griffiths (RJF to MG, March 24th, 1953, MG RAI.) Griffiths was also one of several Labour MPs who were suspected to be Communists by MI5: Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5* 411-5.

110 Hansard, HC Deb, 24 February 1954, vol. 524, c534.

111 Hansard, HC Deb, 24 February 1954, vol. 524, c531.

112 Throughout the 1950s there had in fact been an ongoing debate, or a periodically re-raised issue, about the arbitrary powers of deportation and rustication of colonial governors. Previously the issue had been the use of these powers on political undesirables indigenous to the colony. Frankenberg's case was new because it involved a British citizen.

113 CO 1035/135, TNA.

114 "The governor in question is so true blue that even high civil servants in the WI are critical of him. He believes in letting the natives be and none of this social research tomfoolery. The names Gluckman and Frankenberg do not inspire confidence in such a man. This is not merely my opinion but was suggested to me by more than one person in Barbados. Others said that even the terms of the research plan would be anathema to him and enough to secure my exclusion if my name had been Churchill and yours Cavendish. Add to this that, unknown to us, there were riots in Grenada and the threat of more in St. V." RJF to MG, March 24th, 1953, MG RAI.

115 CO 1035/135, TNA.

116 CO 1035/135, TNA.

117 MG to VC, June 9th, 1953, MG RAI.

118 "The Witch-Hunters Creep into Britain," *Reynolds News and Sunday Citizen*, October 18th, 1953.

Girling, a Communist, was expelled from the field in Uganda, and only succeeded in having his work published by excising from it both his discussion of the colonial situation of the Acholi, and his discussion of Engels' theory of the family.[119] Clifford Slaughter was also informed he would not be permitted to do fieldwork in the colonies.[120]

The ban from the West Indies was instigated by a colonial Governor, acting on information from the Security Service. In 1956 the CO itself orchestrated a final ban on Frankenberg, from the Gold Coast. When CO officials discovered that David Balme, Principal of the University College of the Gold Coast, wanted to hire Frankenberg, they first pressured Balme to change his mind, and, when that failed, instructed the Governor of the Gold Coast to declare Frankenberg a "prohibited immigrant."[121] In this way a British subject and citizen was secretly banned from a British colony[122] by the local colonial administration, at the behest of the CO, without having attempted to travel there, or even having applied for entry, and without his knowledge. Frankenberg's career as an anthropologist was over due to his being banned from all corners of the empire, based on a false and secret accusation of being a Communist Party member.

"Dangerous People": A. L. Epstein, the RLI, and decolonization

While Worsley and Frankenberg were persecuted because of their politics, the case of A. L. "Bill" Epstein—described by Gluckman as "no left-winger"[123] and "politically neutral"[124]—shows that the kind of research being undertaken could be just as problematic. While the Communist Turner was able to escape scrutiny by working on a rural area and on non-politically sensitive topics, Epstein was persecuted solely due to the nature of his work, on the political life of urban Africans. His case is also particularly important because, unlike Worsley and Frankenberg, he was banned from his fieldwork site while already engaged in research, on which he was able to publish important work. Therefore while all Manchester work of the 1950s ran up against the limits of how modern non-Europeans could be represented, Epstein's book, *Politics in an Urban African Community*, sits right on the threshold of the sayable.

Epstein was a Jewish law graduate from Northern Ireland. He came to anthropology via a CSSRC fellowship, under which he trained at the LSE for a year, before being sent to study African urban courts in Northern Rhodesia.[125] His report, *The Administration of Justice and the Urban African*, was generally well received by both the Colonial Office and the local administration and led to job offers in the Departments of Information and African Courts.[126] It was also well received in academic social science and even in the mainstream press, serving as the basis for a leader article in the *Manchester Guardian*.[127] Local officials in Northern Rhodesia

---

119 Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Australian Kinship," in *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond* Vol. 2, 27.

120 Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Australian Kinship," in Ibid., Vol. 2, 27. A letter from ALE to MG in 1959 mentions a "Friedland" who was refused a visa for Northern Rhodesia at the last minute, ALE to MG July 23rd 1959, MG RAI. Something similar may have happened with John Rex's appointment to Sierra Leone in 1953, see Hansard, HC Deb, 15 July 1953, vol. 517, cc2036-7.

121 SECRET INWARD TELEGRAM TO SEC STATE COLONIES FROM GOLD COAST (Sir C. Arden-Clarke), CO 1035/135

122 The Gold Coast became Ghana in 1957 with Queen Elizabeth II as head of state represented by a Governor-General; it became an independent Republic 1960.

123 MG to JCM, August 12th, 1952, MG RAI.

124 MG Memo to JAB, 1959, MG RAI.

125 Kevin A Yelvington, "An Interview with A. L. Epstein", *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 2 (1997): 289-299; MG Memo to JAB, 1959, MG RAI. (This memo was prepared by MG for use by JAB when Epstein was barred from entering New Guinea in 1959.)

126 MG to JCM, February 16th, 1955, MG RAI.

127 MG Memo to JAB, 1959, MG RAI.

were less enthusiastic, due to its portrayal of frictions between themselves and African court members.[128]

Epstein was then appointed to the RLI in 1953 to conduct participant-observer research on problems of African urbanization, including the rise of African trade unions on the Northern Rhodesian Copperbelt. According to Gluckman, this project was supported by both Government and the mining companies.[129] The direct impetus came from the Director of the RLI, Gluckman's protégé J. Clyde Mitchell, who was determined to develop urban anthropology. While Mitchell himself was refining and employing survey and statistical methods, he wanted a fieldworker to do participant-observer research on a single mining town.

Epstein began his fieldwork in July 1953, just as Northern Rhodesia was being brought into Federation with Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, after protracted negotiations and bitter opposition from Northern Rhodesian Africans.[130] Federation was an attempt to manage decolonization in the interests of white settlers, who dominated Southern Rhodesia but were relatively few in Northern Rhodesia. It lasted until 1963 and Northern Rhodesia became independent Zambia in 1964. Decolonization in Central Africa was a long, drawn-out process.

The political situation was highly fraught. Epstein noted "a profound sense of betrayal among Africans" at the imposition of Federation, and found himself dealing with "an intense suspicion of Europeans."[131] His research required him to win the trust of African mineworkers in this highly charged atmosphere. He managed to build friendly relations with leaders of the union and the African National Congress, and was able to live in close contact with African mineworkers.[132] Doing so, however, put him in a precarious position regarding the administration and the mines. When visiting the local District Commissioner, and in the presence of no less than the Secretary for Native Affairs, he casually mentioned a strike which had been called for the following day. The administration, it turned out, was completely unaware of the strike, and that evening at the Mine Club Epstein was approached to spy on the unions.[133] He refused, and from then on was considered to be a "subversive," even to the extent of being suspected of organizing strikes himself, due to his presence at mine union meetings.[134]

Epstein was banned from the mining compound; the Chair of the Chamber of Mines told Mitchell that the mine management was afraid that Epstein might interfere in and influence the union.[135] However no official reasons were given, and—contrary to the policy Gluckman had established at the RLI after Wilson's problems—no inquiry was held giving Epstein a chance to defend himself. Mitchell unsuccessfully lobbied the Governor of Northern Rhodesia, but found that the mines were "much more powerful than the administration."[136] Meanwhile Epstein was put under surveillance. He was followed, Special Branch officers interrogated his African research assistants about their own and his movements, and an undercover detective tried to get a job with him.[137]

---

128 A. L. Epstein, *Scenes From African Urban Life: Collected Copperbelt Papers* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 16-17.

129 MG, Memo to JAB, 1959, MG RAI.

130 The Bill to establish Federation passed the House of Commons on March 24th, 1953. The Federation was "a going concern" by that autumn: A. N. Porter and A. J. Stockwell, *British Imperial Policy and Decolonization, 1938-64* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), Vol. 2, 56. For details of the politics of the Federation see Darwin, *Britain and Decolonisation*, 194-202.

131 Epstein, *Scenes* 6.

132 He managed to build friendly and reciprocal relations with Lawrence Katilungu, President, and Robinson Puta, V-P of both the Union and the ANC: Ibid., 7-9.

133 Ibid., 6.

134 MG Memo to JAB, 1959, MG RAI; Yelvington, "An Interview with A. L. Epstein", 294.

135 Epstein, *Scenes* 9-10.

136 Yelvington, "An Interview with A. L. Epstein", 294.

137 Ibid., 294.

Having been banned from his field-site, Epstein soon left the Copperbelt, and after a month in Lusaka returned to Manchester. He was allowed to return to Northern Rhodesia for a second period of research in a non-mining town, showing that his problems lay with the mining companies and local authorities in Luanshya, rather than with the Colonial Office or security services. However, he was now marked with both a police record and a burgeoning reputation. In Lusaka a friendly colonial officer was berated by his senior for associating with Epstein, "a known subversive who was deeply involved in the recent troubles on the Copperbelt."[138] The original local ban by a private corporation had developed into a national reputation among colonial officers, and, as we shall see, would develop further into an international security record.

Although Epstein's work was commissioned and initially sanctioned by governmental and mine-funded institutions, in the era of decolonization there was always the fear among settlers that research on urban politics could prove more useful to Africans than to themselves. The Northern Rhodesian settler press attacked Epstein's CSSRC work on African urban courts due to fears that it would lead to a unified African legal code, and therefore enable Africans to unite against white rule.[139] To a certain extent their fears were justified. Africans certainly saw Epstein as an ally against the mine management and administration, and wanted to strike on his behalf when he was banned from the mine in Luanshya.[140] While he himself was desperately trying to steer clear of political situations in Ndola, they were seeking him out for assistance. He was asked to make a study of a union's organization, and to act as an assessor in a mine arbitration dispute.[141] He felt incompetent to give the kind of help which was asked of him. When he told Africans he would return to England after the Ndola study, they became angry that he was deserting them.[142] Meanwhile the RLI had started making their research findings available to Africans.[143]

In 1955 Gluckman attempted to have Epstein succeed Mitchell as Director of the RLI. He wanted to make sure that the RLI retained an academic approach and status in academic social anthropology,[144] as well as continuity of the relationship with Manchester (and his own continued influence.)[145] Mitchell, however, felt that Epstein was an impossible choice due to the "terrific" hostility to him on the Copperbelt.[146] He believed that the Trustees would refuse to appoint a Director to whom the mines were opposed.[147] Mitchell also felt that the anti-Semitism and political conservatism of the European Community in Lusaka would make it impossible for someone considered a "subversive" Jew to keep the Institute alive: "[i]t's what the Europeans mutter over their cocktails in the long run which determines how long we can carry on. They've got the money."[148] Meanwhile the RLI itself was coming under pressure from Government and the mines. Mitchell reported to Gluckman that "we are losing funds because the situation has

---

138 Epstein, *Scenes,* 15-16.
139 *Central African Post*, December 8th, 1949, discussed in Ibid., 2-3.
140 Yelvington, "An Interview with A. L. Epstein", 294.
141 ALE to JCM, February 10th 1956, JCM RH.
142 ALE to JCM, February 10th 1956, JCM RH.
143 Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 171.
144 ALE to JCM March 15th, 1955, JCM RH.
145 He constantly emphasized the necessity of hiring an RLI person, and "the dangers of breaking up the fellowship." MG to JCM, February 16th, 1955, JCM RH.
146 JCM to MG, February 1955, MG RAI.
147 JCM to MG, February 1955, MG RAI.
148 JCM to MG, February 1955, MG RAI. The RLI was now located in Lusaka, the administrative capital of Northern Rhodesia. Mitchell pointed out that Lusaka in the 1950s was very different from Livingstone in the 1940s. The situation was in fact not helped by the great animus to Gluckman still lingering in Northern Rhodesia, which was not helped by Gluckman's prominence as a politically-motivated public intellectual: JCM to MG, March 7th, 1955, JCM RH.

hardened here ... liberal thought is being edged out." The Beit Trust, a charitable foundation established by a mining magnate,[149] were withdrawing funding because they because they felt RLI work done had "criticized public authority [and] criticized the established order."[150] The mines were using their influence to shape the kind of work being published, and were preventing Mitchell himself from publishing a paper on trade union membership.[151] According to Mitchell the trustees were trying wrest control away from academics, "for the obvious reason that academics in their devotion to scholarly standards in spite of political expediencies, are dangerous people ... I am afraid that we have lost out to the settler ideology ... RLI - RIP"[152]

Eventually the Trustees agreed to appoint Epstein Acting Director,[153] but the Governor intervened to block the appointment.[154] Evans-Pritchard had started spreading rumors in Oxford and at the CSSRC that Epstein was a Communist, and this information had apparently reached Northern Rhodesia.[155] Evans-Pritchard had long opposed the regional research centers, and was apparently now using the Cold War idiom to undermine Epstein's credentials (Gluckman claimed that Evans-Pritchard wanted to control the RLI himself or simply have it collapse.)[156] Sally Chilver, Secretary of the CSSRC, assured Gluckman that nobody at the CO took Evans-Pritchard's jibes seriously, and that they were seen as "joking accusations" about rival "clans" of anthropologists. "However," she added, "you yourself know very well that the position of anthropologists in the Fed now is bound to be tricky: anthropologists are evidently a sort of witch."[157] Thus Epstein's transformation was complete, from uncooperative researcher, to "subversive", to "Communist." When Mitchell then tried to hire Epstein at the University College in Salisbury, the question of his security record was raised.[158] The University complied in consulting secretly with government before announcing the decision, and Epstein was blacklisted.[159]

Henry Fosbrooke, a government sociologist and administrator, was appointed Director of the RLI.[160] Fosbrooke discouraged academic concerns with method and theory.[161] Mitchell later lamented that while Fosbrooke was a "great success" in terms of consulting with Government and being treated by them as "the leading authority on local affairs,"[162] basic research was being phased out and "more and more the problems are becoming defined in terms of administrative problems."[163] He also complained that there was no more "independent research" and no more

---

149 Established in the will of mining magnate Alfred Beit in 1906.

150 JCM to MG, March 7th, 1955, JCM RH. They had specifically objected to Boris Gussman's work on the new migrant communities of Bulawayo: Boris W. Gussman, *African Life in An Urban Area: A Study of the African Population of Bulawayo* (Bulawayo: Federation Office, 1953).

151 JCM to ALE, August 16th, 1955, JCM RH.

152 JCM to MG, October 21st, 1955, JCM RH.

153 JCM to MG, June 24th, 1955, JCM RH.

154 ALE to MG, July 9th, 1955, MG RAI.

155 MG to JCM, July 15th, 1955, MG RAI; cf. MG to JCM, July 20th, 1955, JCM RH.

156 MG to JCM, February 16th, 1955, MG RAI. Much later Gluckman told Firth that Evans-Pritchard had confused Epstein with Worsley: MG to Raymond Firth, August 16th, 1973, MG RAI. For further details of this feud with Evans-Pritchard, see Mills, *Difficult Folk,* 105-6.

157 Sally Chilver to MG, no date, MG RAI, mentioned in MG to JCM July 23rd, 1955, JCM RH.

158 MG to JCM, December 19th, 1956, JCM RH.

159 It seems likely that Epstein was not given the job for academic reasons, however Mitchell was in no doubt that even if he had been appointed he would not have been given an entry permit: JCM to MG, March 28th, 1957, JCM RH.

160 To a certain extent Gluckman and Mitchell's concerns over Fosbrooke himself were misplaced, as he was himself a proponent of African nationalisms and resisted direct governmental control of the Institute; he also continued to co-operate with Gluckman and Manchester, for example in the matter of publications. However he also brought a colonial administrator's sensibility to the running of the RLI, to the dismay of African research assistants and European anthropologists alike. See Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 224-6.

161 Schumaker 2001@225}

162 JCM to MG, March 28th, 1957, JCM RH.

163 JCM to MG, March 28th, 1957, JCM RH.

criticism of government policy; meanwhile the researchers that Gluckman was training in Manchester were being kept out of Central Africa.[164]

By the time his Salisbury application was refused Epstein had already decided not to return to Africa.[165] Even apart from the overt bans and blacklisting, Epstein recorded how political pressures infected him with paranoia, and he found himself "shrinking more and more from the field situation."[166] Eventually he felt that he had to "get out or crack up,"[167] and the sustained psychological strain had severe effects on Epstein's mental health which continued after he had returned to Manchester.[168]

Epstein's case shows how urban participant-observer fieldwork became increasingly impossible under the conditions of decolonization.[169] This in turn undermined the representation of colonial subjects as modern. While Manchester anthropologists themselves did not map the urban/rural distinction onto the modern/primitive one, it was an easy conflation to make.[170] At the very least, while the urban could hardly be studied as primitive, the rural often could be.

This is not to say that the social scientific study of urban Africans ceased. It was participant-observation which was driven out of the city, not social investigation *per se*. The RLI's work on social surveys and "sociographic" methods such as poverty datum line surveys continued, but social anthropological work was gradually phased out and later replaced by psychology.[171] This suited the mines well, as industrial psychology "focused on the worker as worker, rather than as a member of African society either urban or rural" and had the added advantage of categorizing workers racially (by tribe) thus cutting across possible class solidarity.[172] To a large extent urban Africans were no longer represented as agents, but as quantified social and economic problems to be managed.

A glimpse of what was lost is available to us in the form of Epstein's book on the Copperbelt, *Politics in an Urban African Community*, based on his PhD thesis and published in 1958.[173] Though banned from the mines Epstein was still able to work in the parts of town not under mine jurisdiction.[174] Through the continued support of the District Commissioner as well as the work of his research assistants he was able to piece together enough data to complete his dissertation on his return to Manchester.[175] Not only were anthropological methods conducive to the representation of Africans as modern, but the work was accepted unquestioningly within the discipline as being social anthropology.[176]

The book shows the very limits of what could, for a brief moment, be said. Epstein analyzed the shifts in urban African in Luanshya from the 1930s to 1950s. He traced the creation and

---

164 JCM to MG, March 28th, 1957, JCM RH.

165 ALE to JCM, March 24th, 1957, JCM RH.

166 ALE to JCM, February 10th, 1956, JCM RH.

167 ALE to JCM, February 10th, 1956, JCM RH.

168 See ALE to JCM, March 30th 1955; ALE to JCM, February 10th 1956; ALE to JCM, March 24th, 1957; JCM TO MG March 28th, 1957; MG to JCM March 29th, 1957, JCM RH. Cf.Epstein, *Scenes,* 9-11. Mitchell's health was also affected: JCM to MG, February 1955, MG RAI; WW to JCM, October 13th, 1955, JCM RH.

169 See ALE to JCM, March 30th 1955, JCM RH.

170 See for example Jaap van Velsen to the Editor, *Nyasaland Journal*, December 28th, 1957, enclosed in van Velsen to JCM, January 8th, 1958. Cf James Ferguson, "The Country and the City on the Copperbelt", *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1992): 80-92.

171 Schumaker, *Africanizing Anthropology,* 226, 228.

172 This preference had been established earlier in South Africa: Ibid., 159-160. Cf. Gluckman's comment when trying to get Epstein appointed to the RLI in 1952: "I wonder why the C.O. and Hudson are so keen on Orlansky? Can it be because his record shows that he will not really do fieldwork among Africans? - I suspect this," MG to JCM August 12th, 1952, MG RAI.

173 Epstein, *Politics in An Urban African Community*.

174 Luanshya was split into a mining town and a municipal town. See Epstein, *Scenes,* 11.

175 Ibid., 11.

176 Reviewed favorably, for example, in *Man*, the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute: Michael Banton, "Review of 'Politics in An Urban African Community' by A. L. Epstein", *Man* 59 (1959): 33-4.

development of new political groupings, institutions and agencies through the struggle between various sources of power and constituencies, including the mine management, municipal administration, central government (represented by the District Commissioner), tribal authorities, European miners, and, most importantly, Africans as new and protean subjects of modernity. New groupings were created out of struggles to resolve various conflicts, of which the most important was that between traditional forms of social organization and *mores*, as represented by tribal authorities, and more modern forms of urban association—most importantly those formed through labor. Epstein drew an intimate picture of the dynamism of urban African politics on the eve of decolonization. Yet the debate over federation was only one new element in a long and ongoing story of shifts under the colonial regime driven largely by urbanization and industrialization. Epstein argued that Africans were deeply and increasingly committed to permanent urban settlement, and were rejecting the authority of tribal authorities in favor of new forms of political association which could more adequately formulate and resolve the problems of urban, industrial life.

Australia

Worsley and Epstein both attempted to revive their anthropological careers in Australia but were unable to escape their security files. Gluckman ran into similar problems on a visit in 1960. All three were banned from Australian New Guinea on the basis of secret security reports which followed them from Africa. These Australian episodes show the conflict between two global networks: the academic social sciences and the security state, both of which expanded rapidly in the 1950s.

The social sciences expanded exponentially in Australia in the late 1940s and 1950s.[177] By the 1950s Australian universities formed a kind of regional metropole (a situation somewhat similar to South Africa in the 1930s.) A new Faculty of Social Sciences was established at the Australian National University in Canberra. It was headed by Raymond Firth, who offered Worsley a research position to work in the Central Highlands of New Guinea. Worsley and his wife arrived in Australia in November, 1951. The Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies had just attempted to ban the Australian Communist Party, a move which had been very narrowly rejected in a national referendum.[178] While in Britain anti-communism was a non-partisan and relatively minor issue, in Australia it was highly partisan and used by the (conservative) Liberal Party for political advantage. Menzies, Prime Minister from 1949 to 1966, was eager to exploit the fear of communism, and in 1954 set up a Royal Commission on Espionage, used to smear liberal intellectuals and left-wing politicians.[179] In this he was aided by the fact that the domestic Australian security service, the ASIO, had a close working relationship with MI5.[180]

---

177 The number of social scientists in Australian universities doubled second half of 40s and again 50s. See Stuart Macintyre, "The Social Sciences in Australia: An Unrequited Instrumentalism", *Thesis Eleven* 95, no. 1 (2008): doi:10.1177/0725513608095797.

178 As Worsley arrived in Australia, it was announced that the proposal had been rejected by 50.56% to 49.44%. Information at Parliament of Australia website, http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22handbook%2Fnewhandbook%2F2008-12-19%2F0067%22, recovered April 10th, 2011.

179 More details on the political conditions in Australian academia and in the culture more broadly are given in Peter Worsley, ""The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship"," in *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond*, ed. Christine Gailey (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992).

180 Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5* passim, e. g. 369-373.

After spending a year at Canberra preparing for the trip, Worsley was refused an entry permit for New Guinea,[181] which was administered by Australia under mandate from the United Nations (and did not win independence until 1975.) Demanding an official explanation, Worsley was told only that the decision had been made personally by Paul Hasluck, the Minister for Territories from 1951 to 1963.[182] Hasluck's policy was a paternalistic one of carefully managed economic and political development of New Guineans, with a wary eye to the powerful white settler population.[183]

Again the reasons for the ban were not disclosed. There was a complete lack of support from senior figures at the ANU.[184] The ANU Council capitulated and accepted Hasluck's authority in the matter, conforming to a longer history of complicity between Australian academia and the security state.[185] (Worsley was however actively supported by students and junior colleagues, including protests by the ANU Students' Association.)[186] Considering his anthropological career to be over, Worsley took the story to the press. He was hounded by the media, and his photograph appeared on the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. The growing scandal eventually reached Parliament, where Hasluck claimed that Worsley's "political affiliations" might cause him to "impede or distort" Australia's mission "for the advancement of native peoples."[187]

The problem was therefore the intersection between Cold War and decolonization. Worsley was targeted because of a security record based on his Communist Party membership, but it was the colonial situation which made his presence unacceptable in New Guinea. He was allowed to switch his research to Australian Aborigines on Groote Eyland in the Gulf of Carpentaria, which was within Australia proper.

Yet even Australian Aborigines were increasingly off limits to researchers who emphasized their contemporary political and economic situation, as industrial exploitation led them to organize politically. Industrial capitalism and (minimum) wage labor had arrived, and just as in Northern Rhodesia, mining was key.[188] Worsley's friend Fred Rose, an ex-civil servant and expert on Aboriginal kinship systems, was banned from aboriginal territories after attempting to

---

181 Information for this section is taken from Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship"; Macfarlane, *An Interview with Peter Worsley*, and Worsley, *Thin Ice*.

182 Geoffrey Gray, "(This Often) Sympathetic Collaboration: Anthropologists, Academic Freedom and Government, 1927-1952", *Humanities Research* , no. 2 (1998): 37-61.

183 See Paul Hasluck, *Australia's Task in Papua and New Guinea* (Hobart, 1956). According to Hasluck, the settler population was estimated at 1.75million in 1956.

184 Macfarlane, *An Interview with Peter Worsley*. Cf. Worsley, *Thin Ice* 83; Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship", 27. Worsley later commented on the chilling effect of surveillance and persecution, “as a profession[anthropologists] never risked criticizing colonial authorities, an avoidance based, I felt, on the fear that open objection to the exclusion of one person might result in a blanket exclusion of fieldworkers everywhere.” Worsley, *Thin Ice,* 126.

185 Gray argues for the complicity between the academic establishment and government in the repression of Communist anthropologists, both in the interwar period and the Cold War. He sees the replacement of funding by private institutions such as the Rockefeller Foundation by academic structures directly funded by government as exacerbating this problem, Gray, "(This Often) Sympathetic Collaboration: Anthropologists, Academic Freedom and Government, 1927-1952", passim, e. g. 40-1.

186 The Students Association passed a motion supporting Worsley and condemning the decision July 4th and wrote to Hasluck demanding an explanation. See Worsley's security service (ASIO) file, A6119/431, barcode 658563, National Archives of Australia.

187 Quoted in "(This Often) Sympathetic Collaboration: Anthropologists, Academic Freedom and Government, 1927-1952," 50. Hasluck was also partially quoted in various newspapers, e. g. *Melbourne Age*, August 15th, 1952.

188 Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship", 57.

work on Aborigines' nascent political activities,"[189] while another anthropologist working on the Groote Eyland aborigines, David Turner, was also later excluded from the territory.[190]

On his return to Canberra in 1954, Worsley was caught up in an anti-Communist witch hunt sparked by the defection of Soviet diplomat Vladimir Petrov. His home was put under surveillance, and he and his friends began burying their Communist literature in their gardens.[191] The surveillance followed Worsley on his journey back to Britain, as two detectives trailed him in Ceylon, where he had been invited to give a radio talk for the Ceylonese Broadcasting Commission.[192] On returning to Manchester he made one last application to the RLI, which was vetoed by the security services, and he concluded that he "would never be allowed to do fieldwork again in territories controlled by the Colonial Office."[193] His anthropological career was finally over.

Before reinventing himself as a sociologist,[194] Worsley wrote *The Trumpet Shall Sound*, which considered the cargo cult phenomenon of Melanesia as a form of anti-colonial resistance.[195] One reviewer criticized both what he perceived as an overly Marxist analysis, and the lack of participant-observer research, complaining that it was "unfortunate that Dr. Worsley was unable, when in Australia, to visit New Guinea to study at least one of these Cults in the field and so gain an understanding at first hand of the interplay of natives, administration, settlers and missionaries."[196] Such intimate knowledge was a luxury not afforded to overt Marxists.

In Epstein's case the security network reached from Northern Ireland to Australia via Central Africa. When he was being screened by the Central African Federation in 1956-7, police in Northern Ireland approached friends of his family to ask them about his political views.[197] After being blacklisted for that job, he returned to Manchester. Denied the ability to work in urban situations in colonial areas, he developed research proposals to work instead on urban and industrial topics in Britain and India.[198] In the end he was awarded a research fellowship at the Australian National University, where John Barnes, one of Gluckman's research assistants at the RLI in the 1940s, had been appointed Professor of Anthropology and Sociology. Like Worsley, having spent a year in Australia prepared for his fieldwork, Epstein was refused an entry permit

---

189 Ibid., 54. Cf. J. A. Barnes, "Politics, Permits, and Professional Interests: The Rose Case", *The Australian Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1969): 17-31., discussed in Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship", 55ff.. The case has recently been revisited in Valerie Munt, "Australian Anthropology, Ideology and Political Repression: The Cold War Experience of Frederick G. G. Rose", *Anthropological Forum* 21, no. 2 (2011): doi:10.1080/00664677.2011.582832.

190 Worsley, "The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship", 56-7. Turner satirized the Administration as the paranoid and opaque "Nimda" tribe, David H. Turner, "Nimda Rites of Passage: A Comparative View," *Anthropological Forum* 3 (2): 112-135; see also David H. Turner, "Fieldwork," in David H. Turner and Gavin A. Smith, eds, *Challenging Anthropology*, 17-26.

191 Ibid., 53.; Worsley, *Thin Ice* 96. Details of the quite comprehensive surveillance operation, and officials' discussions on restricting his movement, are available in Worsley's security service (ASIO) file, A6119/431, barcode 658563, National Archives of Australia.

192 Ibid., 98.

193 Ibid., 126.

194 Worsley was able to move into sociology, parlaying his anthropological experience into a global sociology of modernity, most famously through his early investigation of the Third World movement—indeed he introduced the term "Third World" into English: Peter Worsley, *The Third World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964). He also became a significant figure in the New Left. See Dworkin, *Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left, and the Origins of Cultural Studies*.

195 Worsley, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "Cargo" Cults in Melanesia*. Gluckman had pushed Worsley in this direction, having become interested in the topic of "movements of protest among colonial peoples." Gluckman had organized a weekend seminar on political resistance and millenarian movements, out of which came not only Worsley's book, but also Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959) and Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: A History of Popular Religious and Social Movements in Europe From the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Century* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957).

196 A. P. Elkin, "Review of 'The Trumpet Shall Sound' by Peter Worsley", *Oceania* 28, no. 3 (1958): 242-244.

197 MG to Roy Welensky, October 4th, 1957, MG RAI; ALE to JCM, 24.4.57, JCM RH; MG to JAB memo, MG RAI.

198 A. L. Epstein, "The judicial system in an English urban community," research proposal, MG RAI; ALE to JCM, January 1958, JCM RH; C.N. Vakil, Director, UNESCO Research Centre, Calcutta, to MG, January 29th, 1958; MG to Dr Vakil, February 3rd, 1958; C.N. Vakil to MG, February 22nd 1958; MG to Dr Vakil, March 3rd, 1958, MG RAI.

to New Guinea, apparently due to the police record which had followed him from Central Africa.[199] Gluckman made his views clear to Mitchell: "[s]ickening the way those special branch ignorant bastards in Central Africa are able to damn their betters - Epstein - the completely apolitical."[200] Epstein's refusal to spy for the mining companies in Luanshya was now blocking him from entering any colonial area.[201]

If anything New Guinea was an even more sensitive area at the end of the 1950s than it had at the start of the decade. Hasluck, still Minister for Territories, had recently attempted to introduce income tax into the territory, and had come under fire from separatists. There had been demonstrations against Hasluck and for independence. He was apparently afraid of the negative feelings settlers would have about the Epsteins.[202]

Barnes lobbied Hasluck extensively behind the scenes and convinced him to go against the advice of his Department.[203] The Epsteins were allowed to meet with Hasluck and were eventually allowed to enter New Guinea, having given extensive assurances that they would "not participate in any political activities, nor encourage … informants to express anti-government sentiments."[204] The decision was also contingent on Gluckman dropping his stated intention to go public and use Epstein's case to expose the secret workings of the security services.[205]

Gluckman himself had become subject to those workings. He pursued various public left-wing political activities during the 1950s.[206] He knew himself to be both politically suspect and subject to anti-Semitism (a "Jewish Red") at the Colonial Office in the 1950s, just as he had been at the RLI in the 1940s.[207] What he did not know was that the CO and Security Service erroneously believed him to be a Communist himself.[208] He was also remembered with suspicion among settlers in Northern Rhodesia; and memories were rekindled by his highly public intervention into the debate on the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya.[209] (Gluckman had debated the Governor of Kenya in the pages of the Guardian, and appeared on BBC radio to argue that Mau Mau was a modern, rather than atavistic, phenomenon, and a product of colonialism.)[210] He was nevertheless shocked to discover that he himself was banned from Northern Rhodesia, a fact which only came to light in 1957 when he wrote to his old friend Roy Welensky, now Prime Minister of the Federation. He had written to complain about the treatment of Epstein and other researchers, and mentioned that he was thinking of returning to Northern Rhodesia during his

---

199 ALE to JCM, May 17th, 1958, JCM RH. He added, "[w]e are now fighting the issue, but the prospects seem pretty bleak. It seems that all my field-work has to be preceded or accompanied by a continuous dog-fight."

200 MG to JCM, April 30th 1959, JCM RH.

201 As Gluckman described it, "[w]hen Epstein was at the last minute refused entry to New Guinea, it was obvious that this was done on a report on him from Central Africa ... the original implied decision that he was badly treated by the Roan Antelope - implied in the decision to reappoint him to work in Ndola - had by this time been forgotten, and all that is remembered is that he was forbidden to work on mine property. During the acrimonious years after Federation, with an expansion of security activities, it was marked that he was friendly with African leaders - as he was required to be, to do his job. All this has mounted into an unfavourable report on him as a security risk in colonial areas, which is laughable to anyone who knows him." MG, Memo to JAB, MG RAI.

202 All JAB to MG, August 10th, 1959, MG RAI.

203 JAB to MG, July 22nd, 1959; JAB to MG, August 10th, 1959, MG RAI.

204 ALE to JCM, August 20th, 1959, JCM RH.

205 JAB to MG, 22 July 1959, MG RAI; ALE to MG, July 23rd, 1959, MG RAI; JAB to MG, August 10th, 1959, MG RAI.

206 Details in Mary Gluckman, US Visa Application, MG RAI.

207 MG to JCM, December 11th, 1950; MG to JCM February 16th, 1955.

208 SECRET AND PERSONAL MEMO from SEC STATE COLONIES to OFFICER ADMINISTERING GOVT OF GOLD COAST, July 9th, 1956, CO 1035/135.

209 Mitchell had recently had to bite his tongue when insulted at a Government House party, over Gluckman's *Guardian* article on the Mau Mau, JCM to MG, March 7th, 1955, JCM RH.

210 Max Gluckman, "The Mau Mau Rituals: Tribal Religion and Witchcraft" *Manchester Guardian*, March 19th, 1954; "The Mau Mau Oaths," Leader article, *Manchester Guardian*, March 19th, 1954; Max Gluckman, "The Magic of Despair", *The Listener* LI, no. 1313 :724-5, 737. (Based on BBC Radio Third Programme Broadcast); Sir Philip Mitchell, "The Mau Mau Rituals: Fancy and Fact," *Manchester Guardian*, May 10th, 1954.

upcoming sabbatical. Welensky, himself a highly sympathetic former socialist and trade union leader, now sheepishly informed Gluckman that he would be deemed "an undesirable inhabitant or visitor, on information received from [a] Government through official or diplomatic channels."[211] Gluckman then attempted to use his sabbatical to take up a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto. This time his wife's visa was repeatedly delayed until it was impossible for him to come, due to her previous membership of the Communist Party.[212]

Gluckman himself visited Australia in 1960. One of his goals was to visit Australian New Guinea, partly to see how Epstein was doing. However Gluckman was also refused permission to enter, with, as usual, no reason given.[213] Gluckman's senior status led to a wave of publicity, including a huge amount of press coverage in Australia, Britain, South Africa, and even Indonesia, and also television coverage.[214] Gluckman in fact become something of a *cause célèbre*, his popularity enhanced by his physical presence and athleticism.[215] Newspapers even began reporting on his anthropological work, including lectures he was giving on the anthropology of Britain.[216]

On television Gluckman suggested that the affair might benefit Australian political life, by encouraging Australians to reassert their civil rights.[217] It certainly had some effect. *The Age* attributed the hostile reaction to proposed new security legislation to "the tension generated by the Government's handling of the Professor Gluckman affair."[218] In the parliamentary debate on "the Gluckman affair," as the new legislation was announced, one of the most fervent anti-Communists in the House, William Wentworth, disquieted by possible injustice done to Gluckman, and the loss of Australian international prestige, proposed a new tribunal system. He suggested that any time that executive action was taken on the basis of a security report, persons affected should have the right of appeal in advance of the action, and in advance of publicity, to a permanently established tribunal *in camera*, and then a further right of appeal to a judicial review. In general the affair led to a public debate on the balance between security and due process, and in particular the *de facto*, and unconstitutional, executive status of the Security Service.[219] Furthermore, unlike in the Worsley case, the Council of the ANU publicly expressed

---

211 Roy Welensky to MG, January 22nd, 1958, MG RAI.

212 See MG to George Homans, November 8th, 1957; MG to Ralph Tyler, November 11th, 1957; MG to Meyer Fortes, November 12th, 1957; MG to Ed Shils, November 26th, 1957; MG to George Homans, January 15th, 1958; MG to Alan Ford, Office of the Legal Adviser, US Department of State, January 15th, 1958; Alan Ford to Max Gluckman, March 24th, 1958; MG to George Homans, April 3rd, 1958; MG to Alan Ford, May 19th, 1958; Ed Shils to Max Gluckman, May 26th, 1958; Wanda Lee to MG, June 3rd, 1958; MG to Ralph Tyler, June 23rd, 1958; MG to Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, June 30th, 1958; MG to Ralph Tyler, July 14th, 1958; Ralph Tyler to MG, July 21st 1958; MG to Ralph Tyler August 8th, 1958. MG RAI; MG to Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, October 21st, 1958, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS.

213 J. A. Barnes, *Humping My Drum* (Print-on-demand, 2007), 283ff.

214 See various articles in *The Age* (Melbourne), *The Sydney Morning Herald*, *The Sun-Herald* (Sydney), *The Canberra Times, The Brisbane Courier-Mail*, *The Kalgoorlie Miner*, *The South Pacific Post* (Port Moresby, Papua-New Guinea), *The Times* (London), *The Guardian* (Manchester), *The Daily Telegraph* (London), *The Observer* (London), *The Times of Indonesia* (Jakarta), August 27th to September 27th, 1960. The Melbourne Herald even covered the expansion of the Manchester department the following year: "Barred from NG: Now he's honored" Melbourne Herald, August 19th 1961. Some of these clippings are collated in Gluckman's papers at the RAI, others in the International African Institute's archive at the LSE. Coverage in South Africa mentioned by Leo Kuper to MG, November 24th, 1960, MG RAI.

215 Newspaper photographs showed him walking tanned and barefoot with John Barnes (*Sydney Morning Herald* September 3rd, 1960), and bowling at the Brisbane Cricket Ground under the headline, "The Professor is a Pace Man: He bowled with zest," *Brisbane Courier-Mail*, September 20th, 1960.

216 "Most 'Teddy Boys' Are Respectable--Scientist" *Melbourne Age*, September 13th 1960.

217 Reported in "Dutch Permit for Professor Gluckman," *Manchester Guardian*, September 6th, 1960. Cf. MG to W Mansfield Cooper, Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, 24 Aug. 1960.

218 "Tightening up Australia's Security Service," *The Age*, September 14th, 1960.

219 "Tightening up Australia's Security Service," *The Age*, September 14th, 1960.

its concern over the Gluckman ban, and later met with Hasluck in order to ensure that academic freedom would not be threatened in the future.[220]

The issue was debated both in the media and in Parliament. Hasluck and the Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, defended the decision, which seems to have been made by the Administrator of Australian New Guinea, acting on advice from the Australian Security Service (ASIO).[221] An opposition (Labour) Member of the House of Representatives, L. C. Hayden, called the ban "McCarthyism."[222] Menzies was indeed continuing to use anti-communism for electoral gain. Later in September the Prime Minister claimed that Communists were waging a "virulent campaign" against the security services, and that any opposition to new security legislation would be due to Communist propaganda attempting to undermine Australian security.[223]

However Gluckman himself felt that the most likely cause for the ban was not a belief that he was a Communist but a report from British security regarding his opposition to apartheid and the Central African Federation.[224] He publicly stated that although he had never been a Communist, his wife had before 1956, and that he opposed both apartheid and the British government's actions in the Nyasaland emergency.[225] However Gluckman was told by the media magnate Frank Packer "and other newspaper people" that the concern was specifically to do with Gluckman's attitude to trade unions.[226] Gluckman had indeed publicly lectured on the beneficial effects of trade unions in Central Africa, and the newspapers had reported the lecture. Gluckman had drawn on Epstein's work to claim that "[t]he formation of trade unions had created a bond of harmony among the tribes of Central Africa ... [and] that the promotion of industrial consciousness was the wisest way to assist under-developed countries to attain stable self-government." He described how in Central Africa "the old system of a council of tribal elders did not work satisfactorily in times of crisis. During the depression uprisings, the trade unions and not the tribal elders, emerged with the confidence of the workers."[227]

As in Central Africa, trade unions were a particularly sensitive subject in New Guinea in the 1950s, and stood at the nexus of Cold War and decolonization. In 1960 the colonial administration was planning to allow the first trade unions with indigenous members, and were afraid that Gluckman might upset their careful management of the situation by radicalizing the unionists.[228] Communist infiltration of unions, and possible associated industrial unrest, had been a domestic fear in Australia[229] and even in Britain, where earlier in the 1950s trade unions were the one sphere where politicians and the security services feared CPGB action (though by the mid-1950s this was assumed to be under control.)[230] The ways in which trade unions figured in the persecution of these anthropologists shows that these fears was spilling over into colonial situations. However in the colonial situation the fear was not simply of Communist infiltration, but, more broadly, fear of losing control of decolonization to autonomous indigenous political groupings. Although New Guinea would not achieve independence until 1975 (as part of Papua New Guinea), the question was very much in the public eye at exactly the time of Gluckman's

---

220 "Prof. Gluckman Case: University Concern Over Ban," *Sydney Morning Herald*, September 14th, 1960.
221 Ibid., 285-6.
222 "Mr Menzies Accused: Prof. Gluckman Storm Grows," *Daily Telegraph*, September 1st, 1960.
223 "Virulent Campaign by Communists," Unattributed newspaper clipping, September 26th, 1960, MG RAI.
224 MG to W Mansfield Cooper, Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, 24 Aug. 1960.
225 "British Security Service Blamed," *Manchester Guardian*, September 2nd, 1960.
226 Ibid., 286.
227 "Unions Aid Harmony, Says Gluckman," *Canberra Times*, September 14th, 1960. The lecture was given at the University College in Canberra.
228 Ibid., 286.
229 See F. K Crowley, *Modern Australia in Documents, Volume 2: 1939-1970* (Melbourne: Wren, 1973), 233f.
230 Andrew, *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5* 406ff.

visit: in June Menzies had suggested independence might be imminent, in August Hasluck spoke in Parliament to quell such hopes, and in September he introduced political reforms.[231] The security empire, and anti-Communist idiom, became tools by which the British sought to control the futures of the areas they were on the verge of decolonizing. They recognized these areas as having many different possible futures, and sought to close down the ones they (and in particular white settlers) found unacceptable. This radically anti-democratic stance made the anthropological representation of African political agents and parties, such as trade unions, unacceptable.

Conclusion: Primitivism and Persecution

This material shows how political coercion shaped the British social sciences at the crucial moment of decolonization. Manchester anthropologists pushed the limits of the sayable under the conditions of colonialism—as shown by how those limits pushed back. They were vetted, blacklisted and banned from colonies, pressured and put under surveillance, by a global network of interlinked political regimes and secret security apparatuses.

While there were always colonial sensitivities to anthropological work, it was under the specific conditions of impending decolonization, within the context of the Cold War, that various colonial and capitalist interests blocked certain avenues of research, and channeled anthropology into safer areas. The security situation was created by the conjunction of Cold War ideological paranoia with the threat of impending decolonization and anxieties about how to manage it. Certain politics were suspect not because of the fear of the spread of global communism but because they were potentially subversive—not subversive of empire but of the orderly management of decolonization in the interests of white settlers. Anti-Communism, driven partly from across the Atlantic, provided an idiom and an apparatus of repression; but it was often fears over the management of decolonization motivated British repression. More scrutiny was therefore applied to any researchers working on potentially politically volatile areas and sensitive topics than was applied to socialist researchers working on less volatile areas.

Persecution was systemic but not systematic: while there was no deliberate, systematic policy of excluding certain kinds of work, this was indeed the effect of the system as a whole. Persecution was not centrally organized; rather, it was instigated by local white settler government officers and commercial interests across the Empire—albeit with Colonial Office complicity, and via an emergent trans-national network of security agencies. Anti-communism and anti-Semitism each played a part, but a primary fear was of contact between social anthropologists and new political associations, which threatened the orderly management of decolonization. The sphere in which the Cold War and decolonization came together in the most focused way was exactly the subject of Epstein's work, and the reason for Gluckman's Australian ban: trade unions. Trade unions and other modern political associations among the colonized were a common denominator both in the work which these anthropologists wanted to do, and in the political preoccupations of the various regions from which they were banned.

The effect of these bans was not simply to exclude Communists, Marxists, or subversives, but to derail the anthropological study of modernity. This absence can be seen from opposite perspectives: the first internal to the discipline as the loss of certain sites, problems, and personnel; but the second from outside the discipline, as the loss of anthropological methods from the discourse on non-European modernity.

---

231 See Crowley, *Modern Australia in Documents, Volume 2: 1939-1970* 396f.

The study of urbanization and social change was marginalized within social anthropology, as anthropologists were driven out of sensitive fields and sometimes out of the discipline altogether.The 1930s project to develop an anthropology of modernity was closed down, as the discipline was reshaped by political persecution. Instead, the other major project of the 1930s—the comparative science of humanity (now transformed into a humanistic idea of "cultural translation," or, for a time, into Lévi-Straussian structuralism) triumphed. Anthropology as a discipline was driven towards the study of non-Europeans as primitive. This enforced primitivism stands in contrast to the social anthropology of the 1930s, which insisted on studying non-Europeans as modern, and as enmeshed in colonial and capitalist power structures. The boundaries of how non-Europeans could be studied and represented were therefore constrained by the values and bureaucratic structures of the Colonial Office, the Security Service, colonial governments, local police, private corporations, and white settler societies.

This exclusion was not endemic to the methods or interests of the discipline, rather it rested on another exclusion: of anthropologists from the fields and subjects they wanted to study. Social anthropology was not inherently primitivist, but it was inherently vulnerable to political conditions. The core methods of social anthropology—participant-observer fieldwork and totalistic analysis—both drove it towards the study of the contemporary and made it unacceptable as a mode of social research in areas of imminent and ongoing decolonization; the same methods also made it highly susceptible to political coercion of various kinds.

The loss to social anthropology was of certain fields and subjects. But seen from the perspective of the social sciences in general, the loss was of social anthropological methods in the study of non-European modernity. First, participant-observer fieldwork, with its long-term, immersive, intimate and sympathetic contact with its subjects, its potential for radically destabilizing the cultural assumptions of the researcher, and its commitment to understanding the particularity of the local situation. Second, social anthropology's totalistic mode of analysis, which attempted to understand the interrelations of different spheres of social reality—to understand a whole way of life—and in particular to understand the relationship between agency and structure. Finally, the specific Marxian methods developed by the Manchester School, which focused on conflict, process and micro-politics in historical context.

It has sometimes been assumed that decolonization deprived British anthropologists of their former fields, due to the hostility of newly independent national regimes. In fact such regimes were welcoming of the very social scientists banned by the colonial authorities. Significantly, these "dangerous people" were allowed to return to Africa *after* decolonization. After independence, Gluckman and Frankenberg were were allowed into Zambia, while Worsley was finally allowed to return to African when he traveled to newly independent Tanzania. It was not newly independent regimes which banned British anthropologists, but colonial ones. What was lost, then, was the application of anthropological methods to the long moment of decolonization, with all of the possibilities which lay within it for the re-imagining of modernity itself: possibilities which themselves were closed again in the post-colonial era of global aid and development, which re-inscribed the West as the Modern, and non-Europeans as modern only in as much as they approximated the West.[232] The study of Africa as modern was left to other disciplines, with their very different disciplinary gazes. (This lacuna appeared at a crucial time, not just in terms of decolonization, but also for the institutionalization of the social sciences in

232 See Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* (New York: New Press, 2007).

British academia, and the formative period of academic African Studies in Britain.)[233] Ultimately what was lost was the willingness and ability to represent non-Europeans as political subjects operating in historical time, enmeshed in global power structures yet struggling to create their own future.

233 Anthony Kirk-Greene describes 1953-1963 as the formative decade for African Studies, which he says came of age in the early 1960s: Anthony Kirk-Greene, "The Emergence of An Africanist Community in the UK," in *The British Intellectual Engagement with Africa in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Douglas Rimmer and Anthony Kirk-Greene (New York: St Martin's Press in association with the Royal African Society, 2000), 26.

Chapter Four

Social Anthropology and Social Democracy: The Manchester School and the Anthropology of Britain

> As late as 1908, Marett argued that the real value of accounts of exotic cultures to anthropologists was in providing material to reconstruct the evolution of European society and culture. But by the late 1890s this position had already begun to change: increasingly, distant savages seemed worthy of study in themselves, and the focus of anthropological attention shifted away from Europe ... The ranks of the social anthropologists grew, but their attention was focused on distant areas of the British Empire and on issues other than ethnological speculation.
>
> James Urry[1]

As James Urry has pointed out, social anthropology's break with earlier paradigms involved both a methodological rupture and a shift away from the study of Britain itself. By the 1920s, anthropology as an academic discipline had turned its gaze away from British subjects, and this shift was bound up with the development of a specifically social anthropology, distinct from both "conjectural history," and from formerly closely associated modes of knowledge such as physical anthropology, archaeology, and folklore.[2]

There were several different respects in which Victorian anthropology was "about" Britain. Britain was both the *telos* and the *explicandum* of social evolutionism, which sought to explain why Britain was modern and the rest of the world was not.[3] A conflation of spatial and temporal distance allowed anthropologists to fit all societies—including contemporary Britain, ancient Britain and contemporary savages—into a single framework of unilinear progress. Victorian anthropology was also methodologically eclectic, and included folklore, archaeology and anthropometry, all of which were easily conducted in Britain, while anthropological *topoi* were reworked by Henry Mayhew and other qualitative social investigators.[4] This work often involved exoticizing and primitivizing the subjects of research, such as "Celts," the urban working-classes, women and children, while seemingly irrational elements of contemporary Britain were explained as "survivals" from early stages of development.

Social anthropology marked a break in all these respects. Britain was no longer central to

---

1 James Urry, "Englishmen, Celts, and Iberians: The Ethnographic Survey of the United Kingdom, 1892-1899," in George Stocking, Jr., ed., *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology*, (Madison, 1984), 101.

2 The exception which proves the rule was the anthropology found at the RAI and in the pages of its journals, which was both ecumenical in method and maintained an interest in the study of Britain. To an extent this was replicated in the popular understanding of anthropology, as for example as reported in the pages of *The Times*. Anthropology at University College, London, also maintained something of these aspects, first under the diffusionists Grafton Elliot Smith and William Perry, and later under C. Daryll Forde who was both an anthropologist and geographer, and who as we shall see played an important role in the anthropology of Britain in the 1950s.

3 See Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*.

4 E.g. Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor* (London: George Woodfall, 1851).

anthropological inquiry, either as a society to be understood through comparison to others, nor as a site for investigation. The new methods, at least initially, were accompanied by an exclusive focus on the exotic. The Malinowskian fieldwork paradigm meant long-term, immersive participant-observation, involving the insinuation of the anthropologist's person into an alien society for long enough to grasp its way of life. Totalistic analysis meant that societies were to be studied as integrated units or functioning organisms, rather than in terms of the relationship of abstracted culture-elements to a universal history. This meant a focus on societies which could be plausibly isolated, and, preferably, which seemed to change little from generation to generation. The aspects of social anthropology which pushed it towards primitivism, such as the salvage imperative and Radcliffe-Brown's comparativism, discussed in Chapter One, also pushed it towards exoticism.

However, by the end of the twentieth century, “more British anthropologists listed Britain as a fieldwork area than any other."[5] How, then, did social anthropology come home, to study Britain itself? How could such an activity be possible, if social anthropology defined its objects of study as small-scale 'primitive' societies (using functional analysis), and as alien 'others' (using participant-observation immersion in the alien, exotic culture)? A standard explanation has been to understand the anthropology of Britain as occurring after the demise of "paradigmatic" structural-functional social anthropology, in the 1970s and 1980s. The shift is then linked to the loss of Empire in the most direct way, the assumption being that anthropologists turned to Britain as they were excluded from newly independent national states in Africa and elsewhere.[6]

This chronology is inaccurate, and the standard story represses an earlier history. From the 1930s to the 1960s, during the period of "classic" British social anthropology—and the late British empire—there were many instances of social anthropological research on Britain. Exoticism, like its close cousin primitivism, was not a necessary condition for social anthropology, and once the discipline had established itself, it began to turn back towards the study of Britain. Already by the 1930s social anthropologists and others were beginning to advocate the anthropological study of Britain, and several such projects appeared in the 1950s. On the standard account these have been dismissed as "exceptions," or "limbering up exercises,"[7] but when approached from a less presentist angle are revealed as a vibrant and sophisticated auto-anthropology.

By far the most extensive such project, which studied a wide range of problems and fieldsites, and which most seriously brought core social anthropological methods to bear on the study of everyday life in modern Britain, took place at Manchester. This chapter approaches the history of the anthropology of Britain from the perspective of the Manchester project. In Part One I show how the project came to take place, and give an overview of the work. In Part Two I discuss the specific form, among many possibilities, which Manchester auto-anthropology took, through a discussion of a key work, Ronald Frankenberg's *Village on the Border*. In Part Three I look in detail at three further major research projects, and discuss what kind of subjects and categories were generated, and what kind of gaze was constructed through the use of their methods. When applied to Britain, Manchester problematics and methods led to highly innovative work on postwar, late industrial British society, including the nature of community,

---

5 "By the end of the 1990s, more British anthropologists listed Britain as a fieldwork area than any other." Sharon Macdonald, Jeanette Edwards and Mike Savage, "Introduction", *The Sociological Review* 53, no. 4 (2005): doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00585.x.

6 See e. g. Ibid., 595.

7 Nigel Rapport, "Best of British!: an Introduction to the Anthropology of Britain," in Rapport, ed., British Subjects: an Anthropology of Britain (Oxford, 2002), 4; Anthony Cohen, "The 'Best of British'—with More to Come …" in Ibid., 324.

the behavior of British industrial workers, the new constellations of class, and the meritocratic education system produced by social democracy.

I The Genesis of the Project

The Manchester School's turn to the study of Britain was partly related to decolonization, but not because newly independent nations were closed to Western social science. As discussed in the previous chapter, Manchester anthropologists were more welcome under independent regimes than they had been under colonial ones: for example, they were admitted to Zambia after independence, having previously been banned from Northern Rhodesia. It was the restrictions on their work in the late colonial period, due to the growth of an imperial security apparatus, under the conditions of the Cold War and imminent regime change, which pushed Manchester anthropologists, and some others, to turn to the study of Britain in the 1950s, well before independence.

The first Manchester anthropologist to work on Britain was Ronald Frankenberg. Having been deported from the West Indies, and under a *de facto* ban from the colonies in general, Frankenberg managed to retain his research studentship by transferring his dissertation project from the Caribbean to Wales. Similarly, when Peter Worsley had first been blacklisted from his RLI appointment in 1950, Gluckman had suggested that he could work on Israel (which Gluckman called "the last free country"), Scotland or Wales.[8] When A. L. Epstein was blacklisted from Salisbury in 1956 Gluckman made plans to have him study Lancashire, and Epstein produced a prospectus for a comparative study of African and British judicial systems.[9]

But while political restrictions were the proximate cause of the first Manchester work on Britain, the move was overdetermined and had long been anticipated. It had in fact always been a stated goal of the Social Anthropology department. The original announcement for the post of Reader in Social Anthropology, in 1948, required that "[c]andidates should be interested both in Modern and in Primitive Societies, but their main interests may lie in either field."[10] At his interview for the post in 1949, Gluckman was told that the hiring committee wanted the new Department "to start as soon as possible to develop research in England."[11] Gluckman himself was highly apprehensive about what he saw as an overly ambitious project; indeed, for this very reason he had not applied for the post, and consented to meet with the committee only if they agreed to discuss modifying their plans. As he explained to the Vice-Chancellor at Manchester, he considered their plan to rapidly "integrate the new department with other branches of the social studies" to be too ambitious and that at least three years of straight social anthropology "as a specialized study of primitive peoples" would be required before branching out.[12] This language indicates his own dalliance with a more primitivist and comparative approach, having spent the previous two years teaching at Oxford, after leaving the RLI in 1947. Under Evans-Pritchard's influence he had flirted briefly with the idea of anthropology as cultural translation, a turn which had provoked about a scathing response from J. Clyde Mitchell and a subsequent

---

8 MG to JCM September 2nd, 1950, JCM RH; MG to JCM October 14th, 1950, JCM RH.

9 MG to JCM June 26th, 1956; MG to JCM December 19th, 1956, JCM RH.

10 "Particulars of Appointment of Reader in Social Anthropology," 1949, VCA/7/87, RYLANDS.

11 MG to the Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, no date, c. March 1949, MG RAI.

12 "[I]n that it aimed to integrate the new department with other branches of the social studies too rapidly. It seemed to me that at least three years of straight teaching of social anthropology, as it has developed as a specialized study of primitive peoples … would be require before branching out. … were your Committee prepared to discuss my views I should be glad to meet it on the day and at the time you suggest." MG to Vice-Chancellor, March 21st, 1949, MG RAI.

climb-down by Gluckman.[13]

Gluckman was therefore hired despite, rather than because of, his attitude towards "modern" studies, and the initial impetus towards the anthropology of Britain came not from him but from the hiring committee. The Social Anthropology Department was being established with grants received from the fund set up by the government's Clapham Commission of 1947,[14] which had called for huge government investment in domestic social research, in the interests of social planning for post-war reconstruction and the building of a welfare state.[15] The fund set up by the Commission became something of a domestic equivalent to the Colonial Social Science Research Council, distributing £400, 000 *per annum* to universities via the University Grants Committee.[16] The problem for the universities was what to do with the money, in the face of the parlous state of the social sciences. As Mike Savage has recently demonstrated, at the end of the 1940s, Economics was the only social science with a national presence,[17] while there was an "almost complete absence of sociology,"[18] in the sense of a specialized academic discipline which allied empirical investigation to theoretical, rather than administrative, problems. What did exist was either synthetic evolutionist sociology, or empirical social surveys in the tradition of Victorian and Fabian reforming social investigation, represented at the LSE by Maurice Ginsberg and David Glass respectively.[19] Oxford and Cambridge remained in the grip of a "gentlemanly"[20] humanism and were quite hostile to the social sciences.[21] Cambridge rather bemusedly responded to the provision of Clapham funds by importing American sociologists and anthropologists, including Talcott Parsons and Lloyd Warner, as "Visiting Professors in Social Theory."[22]

Conditions were different at Manchester, which embraced the ethos of a new postwar "technocratic national mission,"[23] and its demands for a research-driven social science. The new social sciences were enthusiastically championed by Lord Simon, industrialist and social reformer, Chair of the university's Council from 1941 to 1957, and responsible for negotiating

---

13 When Gluckman promoted the developing Oxford line that the task of anthropology was really the translation of terms from one language to another, Mitchell was scathing: "What is this new racket about languages? On the basis of this I can predict some rather surprising examination answers. How do you study social structure? I ask the informants all the words he knows dealing with social structure and write their meanings down? The point is of course that our job is certainly not to study language but to observe behaviour called by the natives by a particular term. I think this is what you mean in your letter. You say translating the significance of native terms into sociological language. I suppose 'significance in sociological language' is another way of saying observing social behaviour."JCM to MG, January 12th, 1949, MG RAI. Gluckman quickly backed down, and further related how he was fighting an "idealistic wave" at the Oxford seminar, and that he and Fortes were defending a "scientific attitude" against the epistemological relativism of Evans-Pritchard and his other students. MG to JCM, January 22nd, 1949, JCM RH; MG to JCM, February 12th, 1949, JCM RH.

14 Resolution of the Committee for the Readership in Social Anthropology, April 27th 1949, VCA/7/87, RYLANDS.

15 J. Clapham, *Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research (the Clapham Report)*. On Clapham generally see *Demands for Social Knowledge: The Role of Research Organisations* 70ff.. On Clapham and anthropology, see Mills, *Difficult Folk* 94-5.

16 See Ibid., 94.

17 Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 121f.

18 Ibid., 121. On the dearth of an empirical, academic sociology in the interwar and postwar years see Ibid., Chapters Four and Five, e. g. 105ff, 119ff.. Reba Soffer, "Why Do Disciplines Fail? The Strange Case of British Sociology", *The English Historical Review* 97, no. 385 (1982): doi:10.2307/568786. See also the chapters by Bulmer, Halsey and Shils in *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*; Perry Anderson, "Components of the National Culture", *New Left Review* I, no. 50 (1968): 4-57.

19 Savage has in fact argued that a synthetic, evolutionist sociology was resurgent in the decade after World War Two. Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 105f.

20 On the "gentlemanly" tradition in British social research see Ibid., Chapters 2-4.

21 See *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research,* 25-27.

22 See Ibid., 25.

23 Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 126.

the phase of rapid postwar expansion.[24] (Simon would personally fund many of the Anthropology Department's activities, including its Visiting Fellows.[25]) The Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences was a major beneficiary of Clapham money, and expanded rapidly in the immediate postwar years.[26] The professors in the Faculty who hired Gluckman formed a tightknit and brilliant cohort, which included the economists Ely Devons and W. A. Lewis, the political scientist W. J. M. Mackenzie, and chemist turned Professor of Social Studies, Michael Polanyi. They had all been appointed to their Chairs, many of which were founding chairs of new departments, in the previous two years.[27] These professors were mostly outsiders to the culture of Oxbridge humanism,[28] committed to a new kind of social science involving interdisciplinary discussion, empirical research into contemporary, changing Britain, and theoretical innovation. In the following years they would work closely together, and were constant presences at Gluckman's weekly social anthropology seminar.[29]

This new cohort decided to use the Clapham money, designated for social research on Britain, to create a social anthropology department.[30] In doing so, they were acting on a general sense that social anthropology, long seen as potentially useful for the governance of the colonies, should now be turned to the study of British society. Anthropology was seen as a thriving and respected discipline, which married empirical investigation of both everyday life and social structure to a theoretical sophistication and deep knowledge of American and European sociological traditions. In 1937 the authors of the manifesto *Mass-Observation* had called for "an anthropology of ourselves," pointing to the lack of social psychology or sociology in Britain: the only empirical study of British society came in the form of social surveys, and "no social survey in this country has tackled the ordinary behaviour, superstitions, and ideas of those surveyed."[31] In one way or another it was seen as necessary to do something similar for Britain as had been done for primitive societies. As the eminent scientist Julian Huxley put it in his introduction to the same volume:

> Within the social sciences, social anthropology holds an essential place. Yet,

---

24 Ibid., 126. See also Brendon Jones, 'Simon, Ernest Emil Darwin, first Baron Simon of Wythenshawe (1879–1960)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36095, accessed 21 Feb 2012.

25 Through the Simon Fellowships and use of his house (personal communication from RJF). See also *History of the University of Manchester, 1951-1973*, 22; Worsley, *Thin Ice* 74.

26 MG to JAB, August 6th, 1949, MG RAI: "The Faculty of Economic and Social Science has expanded quickly with Clapham money, but he has no idea what will happen in the new quinquennium."

27 W. J. M. Mackenzie (Scottish) had been appointed to the new Chair in Government in 1948, from which he became a pioneer of empirical and comparative British political science. Ely Devons (Welsh), trained at Manchester, had served as Director of Planning in the Ministry of Aircraft Production, and was appointed first Professor of Applied Economics in Britain in 1947. W. A. Lewis (West Indian), Professor of Political Economy 1948, trained at the LSE, was the first Black professor in Britain; trained at the LSE, he pioneered development economics, for which he won the Nobel Prize in 1979. Michael Polanyi (Austrian), had given up his Chair in Chemistry, also in 1948, to take up a personal Chair in "Social Studies"; his work on "tacit knowledge" dates from this time. Both Mackenzie and Lewis would become advisors to decolonizing governments.

28 The partial exceptions being Mackenzie, and Gluckman himself, both of whom studied at Oxford, but both as "outsiders." This new department therefore supports Savage's argument about the creation of a new social scientific (and technocratic) intellectual identity in the 1950s, displacing the old elitist "gentlemanly culture" of Oxbridge humanities, and committed to empirical research into rapid social change: Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 133-4.

29 RJF, personal communication. On the cohort see William James Millar Mackenzie, *Explorations in Government: Collected Papers, 1951-1968 / W.J.M. Mackenzie* (London: Macmillan, 1975). Another constant presence at the anthropology seminar was Dorothy Emmet, Professor of Philosophy since 1946.

30 In fact they originally decided to appoint a Reader in Social Anthropology. Despite not applying for the post, Gluckman was invited to explain his views to the hiring committee, and despite his concerns he was immediately offered not the Readership, but the founding Chair of a new department of Social Anthropology—the first outside London and Oxbridge. The speed of this decision seems to indicate that it had already been intended, at least by a faction of the committee, possibly Devons and Mackenzie. See e. g. MG to EC, May 6th, 1949, MG RAI.

31 Charles Madge and Tom Harrisson, *Mass-Observation* (London: F. Muller ltd., 1937), 36.

> with a few exceptions, it has started to choose its material from among primitive and out-of-the-way peoples. Here again the trend must be from the remote to the near at hand. Not only scientifically but practically it is urgent to obtain detailed and unbiased information as to the mode of thinking of the larger, more powerful and economically more important groups of human beings. Most urgent of all is to obtain such knowledge about our own group, the English people.[32]

The social historian and public intellectual R. H. Tawney put it somewhat more pithily in 1933, "[T]here is no reason why savages should have all the science."[33] Not only were anthropological methods seen to be valuable for the study of Britain, but no intrinsic obstacle was seen to such a move. The Manchester hiring committee obviously had no qualms about anthropology being either exoticist or primitivist; nor did anthropologists. Bronislaw Malinowski had already begun advocating for a social anthropology of Britain in the 1930s, for which he reason he and others had endorsed Mass Observation.[34]

Members of the Faculty of Economics told Gluckman that they felt that social anthropologists would be better able than sociologists to teach undergraduates in theories of the structure of society.[35] In this they were apparently successful, and not only in teaching students: Mackenzie, the Professor of Government, later recorded that "I learnt political sociology from a social anthropologist [Gluckman] not from a sociologist."[36] In disseminating a structural approach to the study of British society, Gluckman was fulfilling Tawney's suggestion that social anthropology should serve as a model for other disciplines, such as economic history and sociology, which could ultimately study "economic and social organisation—forms of property, class structure, economic enterprise—in some modern period with the same detachment and objectivity as anthropologists bring to the investigation of similar phenomena in more primitive societies."[37] Gluckman agreed that the association with politics and economics was the proper place for anthropology,[38] and social anthropology assumed a central place in the social sciences at Manchester.[39]

The new department was therefore supposed to fill multiple functions: the teaching of both social anthropology as a specific discipline and general sociological theory, the training of new social anthropologists as graduate students, research in traditional anthropological fields overseas, and the creation of a program of research on Britain itself.[40] The most difficult of these, in Gluckman's view, was the last. When the hiring committee told Gluckman that "they were keen to develop studies of modern communities," he responded that there was "no-one available in England to do this kind of work," and suggested that "the only way of doing it unless we should get an American, is to get someone like Clyde [Mitchell] who has had experience in

---

32 Julian Huxley, “Foreword” to Ibid., 5.
33 R. H. Tawney, "The Study of Economic History", *Economica* , no. 39 (1933): 1-21.
34 Indeed he became a member of its Advisory Panel, see Madge, Harrisson and Malinowski, , *First Year's Work, 1937-38* 62.
35 MG to George Stocking, Feb 5th 1974, MG RAI.
36 Mackenzie, *Explorations in Government: Collected Papers, 1951-1968 / W.J.M. Mackenzie*.
37 Tawney, "The Study of Economic History", 20.
38 MG to Elizabeth Colson [EC], May 6th, 1949, MG RAI. Cf. MG to George Stocking, Feb 5th 1974, MG RAI.
39 According to Savage, under Gluckman, anthropology at Manchester came "to command sway over the social sciences as a whole." Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 149.
40 Regarding the teaching of social theory see MG to JCM, October 14th, 1950, JCM RH, which lays out plans to teach Weber and Simmel; this must have been some of earliest teaching of the two in Britain.

Africa" and give him several years to develop work on Britain.[41] After appointing Gluckman to the Chair, the University then appointed him two lecturers, one of whom was “to start studies of modern communities": ultimately the aim was to establish a separate anthropology Chair for modern communities, and also for the anthropology department to eventually establish a "school of sociology."[42]

In the event Gluckman's predictions were borne out, and it proved difficult to find personnel. Gluckman initially tried to persuade Mitchell (his former RLI colleague) to come to teach modern studies and research in Lancashire.[43] He also tried to bring his old Witswatersrand classmate Hilda Kuper (*née* Beemer) to Manchester to do research in Coventry.[44] When Bill Watson came to Manchester, Gluckman urged him to study England rather than go to the RLI.[45] In June 1952 Gluckman was still writing to Mitchell that he hoped “in a couple of years to be able to start building up on the ‘Western community’ side."[46] However it was only seven months later that the decisive event catalyzed the Manchester anthropology of Britain: Frankenberg was banned from the West Indies by the colonial adminstration, and instead put to work on Wales. Frankenberg, who had been deemed too dangerous to work in the colonies, was now funded by the British state to study Britain itself.

The particular political and intellectual conditions of postwar Britain therefore presented an opportunity for a social science based on social anthropology, which had been developed in the colonies. This meant that the systematic social science of everyday Britain came with certain anthropological conceptions, developed in the colonial encounter, built into it. But if the application of anthropological techniques to the study of Britain was overdetermined, the form this epistemological transfer would take was not. A wide variety of projects were eventually actualized which in some way or other claimed to study Britain anthropologically, but what this meant varied considerably. Different projects took different aspects of what they assumed anthropology to involve, while abandoning others. Much of this work took place outside anthropology departments and the academic discipline, and was usually carried out by non-anthropologists. I discuss the work known as "community studies" in more detail below. But even such work which took place within anthropology departments generally applied one aspect of the disciplinary paradigm, while ignoring others. Much of this work focused on specific localities or populations which could be delimited as relatively primitive or exotic, whether it be isolated, relatively "primitive" rural communities, as in the work of American anthropologists Conrad Arensberg's and Solon Kimball, or racial minorities, as in the work of the Edinburgh Department of Social Anthropology.[47] Or, as in the work on British kinship studies at the LSE, investigators focused on a single theme typical of social anthropology.[48]

---

41 MG to EC, May 6th, 1949, MG RAI.
42 MG to EC, June 19th, 1949, MG RAI.
43 See e. g. MG to JCM, May 6th, 1949.
44 MG to JCM, September 2nd, 1950, JCM RH.
45 MG, Reference for W. W. Watson, no date, MG RAI.
46 MG to JCM ,June 27th, 1952, JCM RH.
47 On the “Edinburgh School” see Waters, ""Dark Strangers" in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963"; Bailkin, *The Afterlife of Empire*; Mills, *Difficult Folk*.
48 See Raymond Firth, *Two Studies of Kinship in London* (London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956); Jane Hubert, Anthony Forge and Raymond Firth, *Methods of Study of Middle-class Kinship in London: A Working-paper on the History of An Anthropological Project 1960-65* (London,, 1968); Raymond Firth, Jane Hubert and Anthony Forge, *Families and Their Relatives; Kinship in a Middle-class Sector of London: An Anthropological Study* (New York: Humanities Press, 1970). A later kinship project was started by Audrey Richards at Cambridge as a way to train graduate students; this work was later written up as Marilyn Strathern, *Kinship at the Core: An Anthropology of Elmdon a Village in North-west Essex in the Nineteen-sixties* (Cambridge ; New York: University Press, 1981).

The Manchester anthropology of Britain was distinctive in its scope, in its objects of study, and in its methods. It was by far the most extensive and sustained such project, which studied a wide range of problems and fieldsites, and which most seriously attempted to apply social anthropological methods to bear on the study of everyday life in modern Britain. During the 1950s Gluckman and his research staff developed and oversaw a wide range of fieldwork in Britain, which was both resolutely non-exoticist and deeply committed to long-term, immersive participant-observation. Frankenberg began his fieldwork in Wales in 1953, which led to the highly influential *Village on the Border*, published in 1957, and discussed in detail below. While this work resembled a typical social anthropological ethnography, involving a single anthropologist working on a single local community, most of the following Manchester work more closely resembled the team-based approach established by Gluckman and his colleagues at the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute. Making use of funding from the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Medical Research Council, Manchester anthropologists developed a series of interlinked multi-site, multi-researcher projects. Two successive teams studied Manchester factories, an interdisciplinary team investigated social mobility in the nearby town of Leigh, and a final team produced the first ethnographic studies of British secondary schools. I discuss these projects in detail below.

Apart from these team projects, there were several miscellaneous and related research strands. Gluckman recruited his old RLI colleague John Barnes as a Simon Research Fellow, and encouraged him to work on a "modern" society.[49] Barnes responded with his pioneering work on social network theory in Bremnes, Norway.[50] This work inspired Elizabeth Bott, based at the Tavistock Institute, but a regular visitor to the Manchester seminar, to develop her own pioneering work on network theory, based on her work on families in London.[51] There were some other miscellaneous projects by students which I do not discuss further here, including Kathleen Stone's testing of Gluckman's claims about Barotse juridprudence in a magistrate's court in Norborough, and Joyce Ward's work on a women's prison.[52] Finally, there were proposed projects which did not come to fruition—including A. L. Epstein's proposed studies of Jewish communities and the judicial process respectively and, intriguingly, Victor Turner's proposed study of Christianity in British churches.[53]

The anthropology of Britain was regarded as a central component of the department's identity.[54] Frankenberg, in fact, was awarded the first PhD in the department for his work in Wales. By 1960 Gluckman was beginning to worry that work on other areas might suffer, as it was so much easier to gain funding for work on Britain. He considered such work to be both important and necessary in itself, and an essential part of the overall Manchester project, telling Mitchell in 1960 that he was "convinced that the complexity which we work out now on tribal

---

49 See Barnes, *Humping My Drum,* 205f.

50 The first publication was J. A. Barnes, "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish", *Human Relations* 7 (1954): 39-58.

51 Elizabeth Bott, *Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1957).

52 For details of these miscellaneous projects see *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. Ronald Frankenberg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982).

53 Victor Turner, "The Study of Religious Congregations in Britain: a Scheme of Research," GLU/10/1, RYLANDS. Epstein's Jewish community project was first mentioned in JCM to MG November 7th, 1950, JCM RH. A. L. Epstein, "The judicial system in an English urban community: research proposal," November 21st, 1957, MG RAI.

54 The integral nature of the anthropology of Britain was marked by the group appearance at the ASA conference in Edinburgh in 1957, which led to an edited collection covering Mancunian anthropology in Britain, and both urban and rural fields in Central Africa and India: *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naïvety in Social Anthropology*, ed. Max Gluckman (Aldine Transaction, 2007).

systems derives from our attack on the problems of more complex societies."[55]

Anthropologists of Britain were also an integral part of the departmental seminar: indeed, because their fields were nearby, they were more present at the seminar than those working in fields overseas. The seminar was also a point of contact with researchers on contemporary Britain from other disciplines: professors from the Faculty of Economic and Social Science, including Devons, Lewis, Mackenzie, Polanyi and Emmet, were regular attendees, while short and long-term visitors to the seminar included American sociologists including George Homans, Edward Shils (who was asked to give a course of seminars on Max Weber),[56] and Erving Goffman, and the Europeans Viola Klein and Zygmunt Bauman.[57] The anthropology of Britain was also a major component of undergraduate teaching. Tom Lupton was appointed Lecturer in Industrial Sociology in 1956[58] and by 1958 courses were also being given in "British Social Groups (both rural and urban)" and "Field Sociology."[59] The anthropology of Britain was also taught and examined as part of the general Social Anthropology II course, alongside the anthropology of India, the Trobriands and Central Africa.[60]

The Manchester approach to the anthropology of Britain was also methodologically distinct, in two ways. First, it was the most rigorous application of the core methods of social anthropology as developed in the colonies. Second, it involved a particular colonial exchange: the importation of the specific methods developed by Gluckman and his students working in Central Africa. I discuss the application of these methods in detail below, with regard to Frankenberg's *Village on the Border.*

Gluckman presented his conception of the character and value of the anthropology of Britain to a general audience in public lectures in the mid-1950s. In 1956 he wrote "Social Anthropology in Africa and Britain," which was to be his "touring" lecture for the following academic year.[61] He expanded this work into a series of nine lectures on the anthropology of Britain as practiced at Manchester, and at least some of this material was reworked into radio broadcasts for the BBC.[62] The introductory lecture, only two partial drafts of which survive, laid out the ways in which the methods developed "in the study of African and other tribal societies" could bring an innovative approach to the study of British society, as opposed to "the older disciplines of history, moral philosophy, political science, jurisprudence, economics, and more latterly sociology" and approaches from the arts, in particular the "social novel."[63] Through the specifics of its historical development and peculiar intellectual heritage, social anthropology had developed methods different from, and complementary to, "the social survey, the political analysis [and] the sociological analysis."[64]

Gluckman portrayed the development of British anthropology as a synthesis of Durkheimian

---

55 MG to JCM, February 3rd, 1960, JCM RH.
56 MG to JCM June 20th, 1952, MG RAI.
57 RJF, personal communication.
58 Department of Social Anthropology Newsletter, May, 1956, JCM RH.
59 Emrys Peters to Ely Devons, November 12th, 1958, MG RAI. Cf. Emrys Peters to C. Wright-Mills, February 3rd 1959, MG RAI.
60 Emrys Peters to Ely Devons, November 12th, 1958, MG RAI; Final Exam paper for Social Anthropology II, May 29th, MG RAI.
61 MG to JCM, June 26th, 1956. Two partial drafts for the lecture are in MG RAI.
62 Max Gluckman, "How Foreign Are You?", *The Listener* (1959), broadcast on the Third Programme, and Max Gluckman, "Football Players and the Crowd", *The Listener* (1959), broadcast on the North of England Home Service. His previous broadcasts on the Third Programme, collected as the highly popular Gluckman, *Custom and Conflict in Africa*. had prepared the ground by drawing many parallels between African societies and Britain, but at that point he had no Manchester work on Britain to refer to--except for Ely Devons, *Planning in Practice: Essays in Aircraft Planning in Wartime* (University Press, 1950).
63 MG, "Social Anthropological Studies in Africa and Britain," draft TS, MG RAI, 1-2.
64 Ibid., 3.

social theory with the study of the alien and primitive through immersive participant-observer fieldwork. Because anthropologists had begun by working on alien societies, they had come "to accept that the bizarre and apparently pathological were often normal facts of social life."[65] The empiricism and realism of social anthropology demanded that the facts as found must be accepted and explained rather than judged, in a way which may appear to be "inimical to commonsense."[66] Through the study of alien societies, social anthropologists had developed a non-moralizing acceptance of seemingly irrational behaviors and beliefs: "every event is part of reality and therefore of the system of regularities which are contained in social life."[67] It had been easier for anthropologists, "studying very alien and exotic societies ... to adopt this objective attitude."[68] The paradigm of this attitude, alluded to by Gluckman, was Evans-Pritchard's acceptance of the reality of witchcraft in Azande society, and his explanation of the belief in witchcraft as rational once Azande social structure had been understood.

However the development of immersive participant-observation fieldwork had meant a shift away from the focus on the most "strange and unusual"[69] aspects of alien societies, to the study of "custom," which meant understanding the complexities of everyday life as actually lived, which was so strange in those societies that it had to be explained.[70] Fieldwork also introduced a new awareness of the complexity of tribal life, and produced a vast and complex amount of data of various kinds, which social anthropologists approached, due to the Durkheimian heritage, by understanding the social as an autonomous system of regularities.[71] Working on "small-scale societies" had attuned anthropologists to observe the totality of social relations: for example, how social institutions had "multiple roles in the system" in a way that was harder to see in modern society. Finally, certain specific interests developed in the study of small-scale tribal societies, primarily "kinship relations and ritual actions" influenced how anthropologists approached "economic and political problems."[72]

Social anthropology had therefore developed an attitude towards the social that involved both a distanced, estranged gaze, and an assumption of regularity underlying seemingly paradoxical behaviour. It emphasized the value of studying the most banal of everyday processes, and involved an implicit cultural comparativism. It understood the social as total and systemic. It arrogated to itself the ability to discern the true meaning of custom, in contradiction to common-sense explanations. When it was applied back onto Britain itself, it allowed a certain alienated gaze to be applied to the most familiar material. By taking everyday British life as an appropriate object of anthropological study, Manchester anthropologists studied Britain as strange, rather than exotic. The researcher and audience were estranged from their own society being studied. Modern spaces were shown to be irrational and saturated with conflicts arising from social structure, and custom. Everyday behavior was mysterious: common sense was not an appropriate tool for judging it, rather anthropological study was necessary to explain it: "the role of an event or custom within a social system is not always its immediately obvious or ostensible purpose, and indeed that what happens is not necessarily what people think is happening."[73] Finally, while universal processes and phenomena could be detected, there was a wide variation

65 Ibid., 7.
66 Ibid., 8.
67 Ibid., 9.
68 Ibid., 8.
69 Ibid., 5.
70 Ibid., 9-10.
71 Ibid., 7.
72 Ibid., 10.
73 Ibid., 9.

between local situations, which could be used to gain a comparative foothold by which to gain a critical perspective.

II Community of Failure: Ronald Frankenberg's Village on the Border

The Problem of "Community"

The earliest Manchester work on Britain was Ronald Frankenberg's study of a large village on the Welsh border with England. Frankenberg's central problem was inspired both by contemporary Manchester work on Central Africa and contemporary work on the question of community in Britain. He began his fieldwork in 1953, after being banned and deported from the West Indies. Under the terms of keeping his Research Studentship, he was required to leave his research problem intact.[74] This was possible because his original research project was "Unemployment and Family Life on a West Indian Island," an intrinsically modern problem, which, as discussed in the previous chapter, was generated in the discourse over families of African descent in the southern United States and West Indies. The topic was easily transferred to the British Isles, by simply changing "on a West Indian Island" to "in a Welsh Village."[75] A problematic from the colonies was therefore directly transposed onto Britain: not by discovering the primitive at home, nor by exoticizing a Welsh community,[76] rather because the original approach to the colonial situation was to understand it as modern. The new research scheme also incorporated a key theme from the anthropology of Central and Southern Africa: "the effect of labour migration and industrial development on family and traditional organisation and culture."[77]

As he moved his project to Wales, Frankenberg joined and confronted a rapidly developing and disparate set of empirical studies of British localities known as "community studies." The term covers a wide range of projects and institutions, including famous studies by the Institute for Community Studies (ICS) in London. While this work was highly varied, there was a general concern to understand what was happening to "community" under the conditions of late industrialism and social planning: from rapidly vanishing rural cultures, to the transformations in urban working class life wrought by both the decline of manufacturing industry and the relocation of urban populations to newly-built housing estates.[78] This work was fuelled by the

---

74 Vincent Knowles, Registrar, to Members of the Committee on Research Studentships in Economic and Social Studies, March 10th, 1953, MG RAI.

75 On the genesis of the original problem, see Chapter Three. The fact of this transfer in itself refutes claims about the inherent asynchronicity of social anthropology.

76 Frankenberg himself has suggested that his choice of fieldsite was limited by two factors: the Vice-Chancellor insisted that he remain within a day's drive of Manchester, and Gluckman insisted that he work in a foreign language Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited" in Frankenberg, *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community,* 171-2. It may well be that Gluckman felt that a foreign language would be useful for someone who had not had the opportunity to work in the colonies, and he may also have felt that a certain level of cultural difference would help. However, he had also considered placing Frankenberg somewhere in England, possibly Derbyshire, (MG to Trustees of Nuffield Foundation, February 1953, MG RAI) and the Department would soon begin studying industrial situations in Manchester itself. Frankenberg himself has noted that "logic" of Mancunian anthropology "demanded eventual study of home institutions in the same depth and attention to the imponderabilia of everyday life" as Malinowski's Trobriand work: "A Text Revisited," 177.

77 RJF Draft Research Scheme 1953, enc. RJF to MG March 18th, 1953, MG RAI.

78 There is a broad literature on these projects. See for example Colin Bell and Howard Newby, *Community Studies; An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972); Ronald Frankenberg, *Communities in Britain* (Harmondsworth,: Penguin, 1966); Jennifer Platt, *Social Research in Bethnal Green: An Evaluation of the Work of the Institute of Community Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1971); Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

"demands for social knowledge" stemming from postwar reconstruction and the creation of the welfare state:[79] much of this work was funded by the government via the Clapham Fund and other bodies such as the Department of Social and Industrial Research. As Mike Savage has emphasized, in many ways this work continued an older moralizing and administrative British tradition of delineating social problems and problematic populations.[80] But although much of this work was funded by government, it displays a wide range of political affiliations and implications, and could involve the critique of social planning and government intervention both from the left and the right of the political spectrum.

In studying something called "community" in Britain, such work often claimed to be doing anthropology. Often the word served simply as a short-hand for the investigation of locally-delimited populations, rather than referring to any methodological impact. The ICS, for example, did little participant-observer fieldwork, and little analysis in the style of social anthropology.[81] In other cases anthropological methods were more directly applied, sometimes involving trained anthropologists. However this move was not without its problems. A brief discussion of two very different works of the mid-1950s, both of which were important for Frankenberg, will illuminate some of the pitfalls and problems of applying anthropology to Britain, and the problems of conceptualizing British community, which I will claim Frankenberg did something to overcome.

Coal is Our Life, published in 1956, was a study of a Yorkshire mining by Norman Dennis, Fernando Henriques and Clifford Slaughter; Henriques and Slaughter were both trained anthropologists.[82] Their problem was a quintessentially modern one: conflict in the coal-mining industry. They argued that conflict between management and miners grew out of the specific conditions of the nationalization of the coal industry, rather than the survival of inefficient pre-modern customs of miners. They saw social anthropology's functional analysis of social structure as ideally suited to this emphasis on contemporary power relations. However they drew on Malinowski in a way which might be termed "local-functionalism," delimiting their field of study to the functional relations between social institutions—such as family, work, and leisure activities—in a locally-defined community.[83] As the authors admitted, this approach made it impossible for them either to integrate the local with the national or global, or to deal with social change. [84]

In contrast, both the national culture and the problem of change (and the relation between them) were central issues for the Welsh branch of community studies, which originated before the war at the University College of Aberystwyth, where C. Daryll Forde held the unique

---

79 *Demands for Social Knowledge: The Role of Research Organisations*. For a contemporary acknowledgement see the Introduction to *Neighbourhood and Community: An Enquiry Into Social Relationships on Housing Estates in Liverpool and Sheffield* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1954).

80 Savage, *Identities and Social Change* passim, e. g. 145ff on Simey and Liverpool.

81 In a *New Society* article, Frankenberg commented that using participant-observation rather than the questionnaire method would have changed their findings. R. J. Frankenberg, "Participant Observers," *New Society* March 7, 1963, reprinted in *Village on the Border*, 197.

82 Henriques was the West Indian sociologist who had contributed to the debate on family structure in the West Indies (and who had sat on Frankenberg's MA panel), discussed in the previous chapter. Clifford Slaughter had trained with Meyer Fortes at Cambridge, and had, like Frankenberg, been forced to turn to the study of Britain through being banned from the colonies due to his Marxism.

83 See e. g. Henriques, Introduction to the Second Edition of Norman Dennis, Fernando Henriques and Clifford Slaughter, *Coal Is Our Life: An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community* (New York,: Tavistock Publications, 1969).

84 "The demonstration of consistency between different aspects of Ashton's life is not meant to suggest independence of external factors. The principal reason for our neglect of the major question of social change, for example, was the clear fact that in a community which is part of a wider economy and culture, the sources of change are operating at a higher level than the functioning of the community itself." Ibid., 249.

position of Professor of Geography and Anthropology.[85] Under Forde's student Alwyn Rees the department carried out a series of studies of Welsh regions between 1945 and 1950.[86] Rees' own research was carried out over a period of eight years starting in 1939, and resulted in the seminal *Life in a Welsh Countryside*.[87] The book was saturated with social anthropological language, ideas, and references. Rees drew on Forde's anthropological experience, including his fieldwork in Nigeria, to conceptualize the "scope and method" of his work on Wales, as well as in developing a distanced perspective on his own culture.[88]

However, Rees did not study an assumed "local community" through participant-observation, rather he studied a region as a human geographer.[89] In an isolated rural parish, consisting of a network of farmsteads with no central nucleus, he claimed to find "a pattern of community life"[90] involving the "cohesion of family, kindred and neighbours."[91] These values were based on a historically developed Welsh culture: "a heritage from the tribal past,"[92] which had survived due to the lack of urbanization and centralization. However, now modern British culture, or rather a modern British lack of culture, was encroaching, bringing the "social atomisation which is general in Western Civilisation."[93] Indeed, rather than assume that all societies operate functionally, he claimed to find functional community in Wales, but not in England, and therefore opposed a Welsh functional decentralised holistic community to an English non-functional anomic bureaucratic modernity: Wales was functional, while Britain was dysfunctional. Whereas *Coal is Our Life* depended on local-functionalism reminiscent of Malinowski's early work, unable to deal with problems of change and broader structures, Rees' work was similar to Malinowski's culture contact approach.[94] Rees presented rural Wales as a site of contact between two national cultures, leading to a destruction of the indigenous, traditional and rural by an external, anomic modernity. As with *Coal is Our Life*, the method underpinned a political position—in this case, an attack on technocratic state planning: "[t]he failure of the urban world to give its inhabitants status and significance in a functioning society, and their consequent disintegration into formless masses of rootless nonentities, should make us humble in planning a new life for the countryside. The completeness of the traditional rural society—and its capacity to give the individual a sense of belonging, are phenomena that might well be pondered by all who seek a better social order."[95]

---

85 Daryll Forde trained originally as a geographer, pursued fieldwork in Nigeria in the 1930s, and after the War became a major presence in both social anthropology and African studies. From 1945 to 1969 he was both Professor of Anthropology at UCL, and Director of the International African Institute.

86 Four of which eventually published in 1960 as *Welsh Rural Communities*, ed. Elwyn Davies and Alwyn David Rees (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1960).

87 Alwyn D Rees, *Life in a Welsh Countryside: A Social Study of Llanfihangel Yng Ngwynfa* (1951).

88 Ibid., v-vi.

89 The book was structured as a human geography area survey, beginning with separate chapters on Economy, Home and Hearth, and moving towards Family, Kindred, Youth, Neighbours, Religion, Recreation and Entertainment, Status and Prestige, and Politics.

90 Ibid., 108.

91 Ibid., 170.

92 Ibid., 81.

93 Ibid., 168.

94 Discussed in Chapter One.

95 Ibid., 170.

The Village of No Work: Community and Social Structure

Frankenberg was in contact with many of these other researchers, including Henriques, Rees, Simey, and Michael Young at the ICS.[96] He was particularly close to Slaughter, who had also been banned from working in the colonies due to his Marxism; the two "corresponded continually while in the field and critiqued one another's work chapter by chapter."[97] Although his fieldsite was in Wales, his interests were closer to those of *Coal is Our Life* and the work on housing estates than that of Rees and his students.[98] He too wanted to foreground "the problem of what constitutes a 'community' in industrial society,"[99] but this was to be done through the intensive study of a single large village.[100] His selected fieldsite was neither remote nor rural, nor intended to be typically Welsh. Glynceirog was a large village (pop. c. 1000) near the border with England, with a long industrial history. The collapse of local mining and quarrying industries had forced the men of the village into daily labor migration, traveling outside the valley to work on building sites and in factories in nearby towns. This situation presented a problem for the villagers themselves to overcome: how to recreate and maintain community in the face of the loss of their one communal activity, shared work. This problematic therefore synthesized typical community studies themes—the Welsh border, postindustrialism, locality—with that of labor migration, a typical theme from Mancunian work on Central and Southern Africa. In distinction to both Rees and the housing estate studies, Frankenberg targeted not the physical transposition of a set of people by misguided planners, but the transformation of a locality by capitalist political economy. Frankenberg set out to discover "what happens to an existing community that is transformed into the equivalent of a housing estate."[101]

While taking community as its central problem, Frankenberg's approach distinguished itself from community studies work by its rigorous application of social anthropological methods, such as long-term participant observation and totalistic analysis. But it combined these core Malinowskian attributes with a typically Mancunian rejection of local-functionalism, culture contact theory and a romantic salvage sensibility. Mancunian methods were particularly adaptable to the study of Britain and allowed Frankenberg to generate new perspectives on the problem of community and the study of British society in terms of social structure.[102]

Frankenberg's approach was derived in the first instance from Gluckman's "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand." Indeed, it was the discovery of these texts which had

---

96 Henriques was well-known at the Manchester seminar, had been Frankenberg's MA examiner and had helped to inspire the West Indies project.

97 Their disagreements took place in a revolutionary Marxian idiom: "I argued that he underestimated the latent power of women … he argued that my obsession with similarity at the expense of difference was a betrayal of the task of revolutionary social science to point to the specific as the potential means of social change, compounded by an emphasis on the merely superstructural." Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited," 178. Slaughter and Henriques visited Gluckman's seminar in the Winter of 1954, RJF to MG, November 23rd, 1954.

98 Savage has suggested that Frankenberg's work be seen as part of a sociology of the Welsh marches, but his main use of Welsh community studies was as "basic descriptions of traditional Welsh life" against which to gauge his own very different interests. RJF, Draft Research Scheme, 1953, enc., RJF to MG March 18th, 1953, MG RAI. He also defined his more "sociological" approach against Rees' culturalist interests, see "A Text Revisited," 176.

99 RJF, Draft Research Scheme, 1953, enc., RJF to MG March 18th, 1953, MG RAI.

100 Partly to distinguish his work from that of Rees, but also because of the expense of covering multiple locations while committed to participant-observation rather than survey methods: RJF to MG, March 4th 1953, MG RAI.

101 RJF Draft Research Scheme 1953, enc. RJF to MG March 18th, 1953, MG RAI.

102 While others have seen Village on the Border as a precursor to a later anthropology of Britain (Anthony Cohen), or a step on the development of British post-war sociology (Mike Savage), I therefore consider it primarily as the application of Mancunian social anthropology in the specific milieu of the 1950s. Anthony P Cohen, "Village on the Border, Anthropology at the Crossroads: The Significance of a Classic British Ethnography", *The Sociological Review* 53, no. 4 (2005): doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00586.x.; Savage, *Identities and Social Change*.

prompted Frankenberg to make contact with Gluckman in 1949.[103] Although he did not know it then, they would prove particularly useful to him as an anthropologist of his own, modern, society; Frankenberg later characterized the "Analysis" itself as auto-anthropology.[104] Several aspects of Gluckman's method were particularly important for Frankenberg, including the basis in political economy, the concern with the relationship between local social structures and wider forces, the situating of observable social change in longer historical narratives, and the focus on social structure rather than culture, in terms of interlocking relationships of conflict and cohesion. Gluckman's central method of situational analysis allowed Frankenberg to relate the local to the extra-local by focusing on the social rather than the cultural, and by understanding the social as the totality of social relations pertaining in a given social situation, not in a reified "society" or, indeed, local "community."[105] The social was found in interaction between persons within a single social field, interaction which was largely constituted by intertwined processes of conflict and cohesion, which revealed the ways in which the local situation was enmeshed in broader structures.

The distance between Gluckman's approach, and the application of anthropology by community studies, can be seen in his use of the word "community." In the "Analysis" this denoted not a local *gemeinschaftlich* cultural homogeneity, but the interlocking of Zulu social structures into the political economy of South Africa as a whole, through dialectical relations of conflict and cohesion. Frankenberg drew heavily on this understanding of community as the interlocking of a local, lived situation with a broader political economy, rather than a local cultural whole. However he was also interested in what we might term the phenomenological side of community. Community was an explicit and self-conscious category of lived experience for the villagers, and a stated goal. It was also experienced in time, involving life history, memory and anticipation of various possible futures.

The whole of *Village on the Border* was informed by productive tensions between these two very different senses of "community." Integration into a wider political economy had brought about the very challenge to community which the villagers faced. Frankenberg contrasted the villager's integration into a wider political economy with their experience of isolation and their expectations of community:

> The village seen from the air or from the hills looks like an isolated community; villagers feel that it is isolated. They also consider that it ought to be a united community and behave as if it were. ... But in fact their isolation is in most senses an illusion. Geographically, economically and historically, the village is part of a larger whole.[106]

This raised broad questions about the relationship between the local and the extra-local, and between the structural and phenomenological aspects of community. In order to answer them, Frankenberg drew on, and participated in, the development of situational analysis which came to be known as the "extended-case method." In particular he drew on Victor Turner's version of extended-case method—"the social drama"—which Frankenberg understood as a model for approaching the social through "[t]he analysis of a cycle of dramatic incidents within their

---

103 R. J. Frankenberg, "A Bridge Over Troubled Waters" in Evens and Handelman, *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology,* 204.
104 R. J. Frankenberg, "A Bridge Over Troubled Waters" in Ibid., 207.
105 See Chapter Two.
106 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border* 9.

historical and geographical setting."[107] In Frankenberg's words, Turner identified the process by which, "a breach of social norms is followed in turn by a crisis, then redressive action and either reintegration or recognition of schism."[108] Breach and crisis revealed the fault lines which lay under the surface of village social life. Frankenberg understood this attention to process as being the major contribution of anthropological methods to the study of Britain.[109]

At the heart of the book lay an examination of the interplay of conflict and cohesion through the analysis of extended cases, set in a richly textured description of everyday life as conflict-ridden process, revealing the broad array of strategies and tactics by which local actors generated community through the constant struggle with potential schism. Frankenberg described several of these crises in narrative detail, involving conflicts regarding local administrative politics, religion and education, and attempts to revitalize village community through recreation activities. In these narratives breach was instigated by external forces, leading to rupture along pre-existing but suppressed lines of cleavage, which themselves often derived from extra-local categories. He traced the process of schism, breach and reconstitution and reaffirmation of village solidarity in the face of external pressures which threatened schism along lines of cleavage.

Frankenberg's primary units of social analysis were therefore not the social institutions of functional analysis, but cleavages and cross-cutting ties. Analysis in terms of cleavages allowed Frankenberg to link the contemporary social structure of the village to broader synchronic and diachronic totalities, as external and historical conflicts and forces reached deep into the social structure of the village itself. The village was saturated with conflict and riven with cleavages, including class, gender, national identification and language (English/Welsh) and religion (Anglican "Church"/Nonconformist "Chapel.") Normally such cleavages were suppressed,[110] and indeed were ambiguously valued.[111] However there was a constant threat of schism along a line of cleavage in a crisis situation.[112] Cleavages presented possible schisms, but such schisms were most often provoked by crises engendered by political or economic forces external to the village. Conflict was always generated locally, but the impetus for such crises often came from outside the village.

In the face of potential schism, various forces produced social cohesion. The most important was conflict itself. Following Gluckman's analysis in "The Bridge," cross-cutting ties were a universal means of social cohesion.[113] Multiple cross-cutting cleavages produced social stability. Each social category was cohesive partly through oppositional conflict with its other, and therefore the cohesion of each category depended on conflict. Because these categories cut across each other, and these cross-cutting ties bound the social together, conflict was an intrinsic part of social cohesion. Cohesion was because of, not despite, partial conflicts. Categorical cleavages were also cut across by other ties such as kinship and intermarriage,[114] personal friendships and alliances, and "common social and economic interests."[115] The villagers also

---

107 Ronald Frankenberg, *Communities in Britain* (Penguin Books, 1966), 293.

108 Ronald Frankenberg, "British Community Studies: Problems of Synthesis," in *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, ed. Michael Banton (London: Tavistock Publications, 1966), 143.

109 Ibid., *passim*.

110 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border,* 15-17.

111 E. g. regarding ambivalence towards the Welsh language see Ibid., 29.

112 Ibid., 15.

113 Discussed in Chapter Two. Frankenberg quoted John Barnes, "There may be conflicts because of the duties and rights a person has in the various groups in any one series, and there may be conflicts because of his interests in a different series. This is true of all societies." Ibid., 156.

114 On kinship see Ibid., 49ff.

115 Ibid., 17.

conciously and unconsciously avoided open breach through the strategic manipulation of outsiders and strangers, as discussed below. Going beyond Gluckman, and drawing on the network analysis being developed by his colleague John Barnes, Frankenberg also suggested that modern society be understood in terms of a complex web of overlapping personal networks: each person was the centre of a personal network of those who have "obligations towards him and claims on him. No two villagers are the centre of the same group and the groups surrounding each other each overlap and intermesh."[116] This was one of the earliest examples of the application of social network theory to Britain.

I now turn to some specific ways in which the application of these Mancunian methods led Frankenberg to specific insights into specific aspects of British society in the 1950s.

Gender and Class

From the perspective of the discipline's internal history, *Village on the Border* has been seen as a pioneering attempt to understand class anthropologically.[117] But in terms of the social study of Britain more generally, Frankenberg's more original contribution was the way in which his anthropological approach led to the decentralization of class *per se*. Class was one element of social structure, cut across by, and implicated in, other cleavages and identities. While in the past—and in Wales generally—there had been a clear-cut dichotomy between two ideal types (English-Anglican-Middle Class and Welsh-Nonconformist-Wage Earning), in the contemporary village respective cleavages of nationality, language, religion and class cut across each other.[118] Furthermore, with the alienation of the place of labor from the place of residence, "[t]he basic clash of economic interests now occurs outside the village altogether."[119]

While labor migration had served to mollify class conflict within the village, it exacerbated another division, to the extent of making it the "primary cleavage."[120] This was neither class nor nationality, but gender. Despite its rural setting, Pentre was more typical of the industrial world than of Welsh or rural areas generally. Anthropologists had found that in "traditional," rural areas, the complementary gender roles within the elementary family forged "an organic unit,"[121] which participated as a social unit in village life.[122] Such was not the case in Pentre, where instead complementary roles led to the radical gender segregation in both physical and social space.[123]

This cleavage stemmed in the first instance from the work situation.[124] The men were daily labour migrants, travelling outside the village into a wider world. The women stayed in the village and associated closely in gossip and social networks with their kin and friends.[125] The women remained dedicated to the idea of village community and had the means to re-create it, while the men's "daily enforced co-operation with non-villagers"[126] was increasingly orienting

---

116 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border*, 64.
117 See, e. g.Cohen, "Village on the Border, Anthropology at the Crossroads: The Significance of a Classic British Ethnography".
118 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border* 149-150.
119Ibid., 149.
120 Gluckman had used this concept with regard to race in the “Analysis”; Frankenberg was also influenced by Mao Tse-Tung’s advice to look for the “principal contradiction.” See Frankenberg, “A Text Revisited,” 186.
121 Ibid., 54.
122 Ibid., 51. Cf. p. 151. Frankenberg cited Rees and Arensberg and Kimball among others, see p. 151, footnote 1.
123 For examples see Ibid., 51-4.
124 Ibid., 19-20.
125 Ibid., 53-4.
126 Ibid., 56.

them away from the village and towards the "amusements and problems of the world outside."[127] The gender situation resulted from the "uneasy contradiction" between the village's small-scale rural industrial past and its "present integration into industrial Britain."[128] It was one result of a "second industrial revolution" taking place in Wales during and after World War Two: a shift towards increased material prosperity, labour migration, mechanization and the bifurcation of working and living spaces, and away from participation in community activities and communal spaces.[129] Women opposed this shift; men tended to welcome the increased wages and were less nostalgic.[130] Indeed many were anti-nostalgic: the older men remembered the harshness of life in the 1930s, while the younger men were happy to travel to town for work and recreation. Thus two separate cultures grew up, with two separate sets of values, which threatened to doom any attempt at total community activity to failure. Clashes of opinion over community activities tended to divide along gender lines[131] This divide was so radical that "there seem to be two villages."[132]

The extension of the segregation of gender roles to public and private spaces outside the household had further implications for women in the contemporary world. Women were informally excluded from professional and indeed any independent work, and from political activity, by informal sanctions of shaming, ridicule and sarcastic gossip: female GPs, for example, were referred to as "Lady doctors" and were mistrusted.[133] Close observation of village life made it clear that while there were women who wished to participate at public meetings, they were shamed from doing so by "sarcastic reference to their presence."[134] Women were therefore prevented from participating in the democracy which the parish and district councils supposedly and formally granted them, through everyday sanctions observable only by participant-observation.

The more general limitations of the operations of local politics formed a major part of Frankenberg's study. Local political systems were a central preoccupation of the Manchester School, and indeed the sphere of their greatest international influence and recognition.[135] Frankenberg's work in this vein constituted one of the earliest empirical studies of British local government,[136] involving an integrated study of both formal structures and the everyday processes of gossip, and manipulation through informal sanctions, which surrounded them.[137] Through various painstakingly-traced extended case narratives, Frankenberg charted both the agency of the working-class villagers and the limits to their attempts to exercise political power, as they struggled through various crises engendered outside the village, such as those over attempts to bring work to the valley, or to re-organize the village's schools.[138]

---

127 Ibid.
128 Ibid., 151.
129 Ibid., 54ff.
130 Ibid., 55f.
131 Ibid., 53.
132 Ibid., 51.
133 Ibid., 56.
134 Ibid., 56.
135 See Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends* passim. In particular the influence of Gluckman, Barnes and Mitchell's work on local politics can be seen in Frankenberg's analysis of local politics in Pentre. Frankenberg, *Village on the Border,* 13-14.
136 In this he was aided by A. Birch and Professor W. J. M. Mackenzie of the Department of Government at Manchester; Birch's own study of politics in a locality was later published as Anthony Harold Birch, *Small-town Politics: A Study of Political Life in Glossop* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), while Mackenzie pioneered empirical and comparative methods in British political science, and later became an advisor to decolonizing governments. See Mackenzie, *Explorations in Government: Collected Papers, 1951-1968 / W.J.M. Mackenzie*.
137 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border,* 71.
138 Ibid., 80ff.

These struggles took place within the formal local government structure of Parish, Rural District, and County Councils, which could be imagined as a series of concentric circles encompassing village, surrounding area, and region. It was in this specifically political sphere that class opposition was most acute. The parish council was Welsh-speaking, wage-earning, Nonconformist and powerless in the wider world; while the village's representatives on the more powerful organs of local government were "outsiders" (paradigmatically English-speaking, salaried and Anglican.) The former most closely represented the interests of the villagers, yet was almost completely powerless to effect external change; indeed, the villagers mistakenly believed the Parish Council to be their true representative in the wider world and part of an ascending hierarchy of political structures.[139] The villagers were suspicious of the more distant councils, and indeed their representatives were alienated from their true interests:

> The class structure of local government and the relative lack of power of the parish council means that those who are most closely affected by external changes in economic and social conditions are the least able to alter the trend of events. Conversely, County Councillors and Members of Parliament, especially in rural districts, are the last to become personally aware from their own direct experience of the effect of national and county policies on the people they represent. In rural North Wales at least, this was true of Labour and Liberal party candidates for office as it was of Conservatives.[140]

Reflecting both his anthropological training, and his aborted trip to the West Indies, Frankenberg viewed the village as a "colonial situation"[141]—indeed he described it to Gluckman as "a decayed Island Colony," drawing explicit comparisons with the situation he had observed in the West Indies.[142] He developed this line of thought in his presentations to the Manchester seminar, which led to a heated argument with Emrys Peters, a Welsh member of the anthropology faculty and later second Professor of Social Anthropology, who resented the implications this made about the Welsh.[143] In the published text Frankenberg avoided the concept of colonialism, although he made it clear that the local community was forced into various actions by the larger power structures within which it was enmeshed. (He also compared Pentre to Ireland.)[144] Presumably Frankenberg also avoided the concept as it invoked the kind of binary cultural categories suggested by Rees, rather than the more complex nested and cross-cutting power-structures. While there was certainly an asymmetrical power relationship, for Frankenberg it was also dialectical, and the locality was an integral and constitutive part of the whole.[145]

---

139 Ibid., 13-14, 181.
140 Ibid., 86-7.
141 Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited," 180.
142 RJF to MG, October 17th, 1953, quoted in Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited," 181.
143 "[H]e averred that he didn't feel like a colonial. I retorted that that was unsurprising for a socially climbing, detribalized, petty bourgeois national and class traitor." Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited," 180.
144 Ibid., 149. The concept of "internal colonialism" was later applied to British history in Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), though the concept was, appropriately, first used with regard to South Africa, in Leopold Marquard, *South Africa's Colonial Policy: Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Council of the South African Institute of Race Relations* (Johannesburg: The Institute of Race Relations, 1957).
145 "The economic and social class divisions of Wales are reflected in the social life of Pentrediwaith, and the class divisions which arose in the course of the internal development of Pentrediwaith play their part in determining the social structure of the whole of England and Wales." Frankenberg, *Village on the Border,* 11.

The Community of Failure

Frankenberg's final extended case study most clearly showed the process of the reaffirmation of village unity in the face of breach and possible schism. It also directly addressed community phenomenologically: as a category of experience, set of expectations and value for the villagers themselves. The villagers themselves expected the village to be a community, and in the face of the challenges and threats to it attempted to create a sense of community through communal activity.

In his work on the Ndembu, Victor Turner had described how social cohesion was articulated through the process of the social drama, involving a four stage process of breach, crisis, redressive action and either schism or reintegration. But this social process alone was not enough to avoid schism, and had to be supplemented with a shared symbolic and ritual culture, which produced what Turner termed a 'community of suffering' among the Ndembu. Pentre too required some kind of cultural activity to bring the village together:

> Despite all the cross-cutting divisions, a group such as the Swazi or the Tale people or a Zulu village has symbolic activities which are expressive of its unity. So, too, if a village in Wales is a village it undertakes activities which are village activities. All individuals are expected to join in independently of their relations with one another. …. if there are no such activities we have a housing-estate and not a village. …. some form of 'ceremonial' in the sense of joint symbolic activities is necessary to maintain group loyalty in an acephalous community.[146]

But unlike the kinds of societies which anthropologists usually studied, there was no single shared traditional culture for the village as a whole. Villagers instead self-consciously organized a succession of communal activities drawn from Welsh and British national cultures, such as traditional Welsh music and poetry, brass band, Coronation festivities, a carnival, and a village football team.

However, Frankenberg made no analysis of the cultural forms of these activities in terms of the values or ideology inherent in activities' content or form, or the reasons why particular activities were chosen.[147] This was because the affirmation of community took place not in the success of these activities, but through their successive failure. To a certain extent recreational activities were symbolic of the village to the external world, but they were never symbols of unification within the village. It was not the content of the activities which expressed the totality of the community to itself in a unifying ritual, rather the ritual took place within the organizational process—which was in fact a special case of the social drama, albeit played out in a special sphere specifically concerned with the construction of community. The villagers generated community not in shared cultural forms, but in the micro-politics of social relations, which Frankenberg termed "the politics of recreation."[148]

In contrast to the lack of traditional shared cultural forms, the villagers had developed their own very specific and highly ritualized processes for the carrying out of communal activities.[149] Each had to be based broadly in public interest ascertained by informal discussion, which was then formalized into a committee with specific structure and elements. The committee then

---

146 Ibid., 154.

147 His analysis was therefore in striking contrast to the approach of later cultural anthropologists, as in e. g. Clifford Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight", *Daedalus* 101, no. 1 (1972): 1-37.

148 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community,* 100ff.

149 This was true of the committees set up with regard to local political initiatives as well as recreation activities.

became the medium for the expression of personal disputes, which led to fractures along lines of cleavage such as religious affiliation, class, or language. In the short term, acute crises would be resolved by bloc resignations from the committee. But the aggrieved parties would then continue their opposition outside the committee, in the informal public sphere. Eventually the snowballing schism would be resolved by abandoning the activity altogether, often with blame for the failure being put on a scapegoat.

After a time, a new activity would be proposed and initiated. Individuals who refused to participate in anger or disgust over previous disagreements were pressured to participate through "the sanction of public disapproval."[150] The cycle of attempt and failure concentrated the attention onto such activities in a way it would not be if they simply succeeded and became routinized, thus reaffirming them as the appropriate site for the expression of conflict.[151] Recreation thereby became the medium for the expression of disputes and latent schisms, which were sublimated through the sacrifice of the activity. True community of interest in the face of personal disagreement, and village unity in the face of structural cleavages, were thereby re-affirmed, thus preserving village unity by raising it to a higher value than the recreational activities themselves: "[w]hen an activity is abandoned the conflicts within the village are, temporarily at least, suspended at the same time as the activity they have killed. Thus village unity is emphasized and maintained."[152]

A key mechanism in this process was the role of the stranger, or, more accurately, the uses to which strangers were put by the villagers.[153] The egalitarian tradition of Welsh culture precluded strong leadership of one's peers (thus even the captain of the soccer team was a West Indian from a neighbouring village.) So strangers were elected to positions of responsibility in committees, and almost always served as the Chairs of committees. The stranger in this position of supposed authority was then manipulated into making unpopular decisions, which he or she felt were the will of the people around him. When activities failed, it was the stranger who became the scapegoat. Thus the failure of activities had a doubly cohesive effect: first, by ending the schism-generating activity, and second by blaming the schism on a non-villager.

Frankenberg himself became involved in this way, which helped to solve some important methodological issues to do with the auto-anthropology of a modern society. On the one hand, it has been claimed that participant-observation poses a problem for the auto-anthropologist because he has no cultural difference to overcome.[154] On the other, modern life can prove frustratingly opaque to participant-observation. In an article in the magazine *New Society*, Frankenberg confessed: "when I first went to Glynceirog and saw its housing estate with each family shut up in their little box I thought despairingly and enviously of my teachers' African villages where everything happened (or so they told me) in the sunny open air."[155] His participation as a stranger in committees offered him the access he required, while allowing him to emphasize both his participation and his distance from the villagers.[156] His first-person

---

150 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border,* 155.

151 Ibid., 155.

152 Ibid., 154.

153 While "outsider" was an objective, structural category, "stranger" was relative and designated situationally; however, usually the person selected to be a stranger in a given situation was an outsider. See Ibid., 18-19, 43-44.

154 For a very useful discussion of methodological issues raised by auto-anthropology, see Timothy Jenkins, *Religion in English Everyday Life: An Ethnographic Approach* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999).

155 R. J. Frankenberg, "Participant Observers," *New Society* March 7, 1963, reprinted in *Village on the Border*, 197.

156 In fact in many ways Frankenberg was very strange to the villagers, and they made him feel so, with the result that considered himself unproblematically different. He was a radically socialist, Jewish academic with a suspiciously foreign-sounding name, whose wife worked outside the village while he spent his days gossiping in the village, thus perfectly inverting the village's

account also disrupted the superior epistemological viewpoint implied by the various ironies implicit in his analysis, for example between the villagers' view of the village as isolated and its actual implication in various totalities. Frankenberg's casting of himself as one of the villagers' pawns disrupted the superior, distanced, expert gaze of the anthropologist by complementing it with the tacit knowledge and strategic manoeuvring of the villagers: he understood the principles and the form of the process, while they knew how to manipulate him within it.

Frankenberg compared the use of strangers in Pentrediwaith to parallels in the canon of social anthropology: Evans-Pritchard's leopard skin chief amongst the Nuer, and the Sanussi in Cyrenaica, Elizabeth Colson's joking-partners among the Tonga of Northern Rhodesia, and Meyer Fortes' ancestor oracles among the Tallensi. However Frankenberg drew "a sharp distinction between the practices of Africa and those of Pentrediwaith":

> The stranger in Africa, whether human or spirit, acts through mystical sanctions to prevent the divisions inherent in a formal structure from breaking into open conflict. In Pentrediwaith the stranger has no ritual power or licensed freedom to protect him. He is merely removed from the informal conflicts which, with his help, may be resolved without awakening open hostilities."[157]

The stranger was a social role rather than a culturally-designated meaning, and the use of strangers involved the consensual manipulation of social structure rather than a shared belief system or culture.

As in the case of strangers, the British case displayed the same social process as the tribal, but lacked its cultural and ideological resources. Frankenberg's dramatic process seemed at first to be circular like Turner's, but threatened to turn into a downward spiral. So far the processes which Frankenberg had described were holding the village together and successfully recreating community anew each year. But such success was precarious, and it seemed likely that the very mechanisms they were using would lead to its collapse. Conflicts were carried over into the next activity, while conflicts in recreational disputes could also spill over to generate new conflicts in other spheres of everyday life. Furthermore, the social basis for unity (ie crosscutting ties) was itself being gradually eroded, as improvements in transport and communications, and emigration in search of opportunities, "decrease the number of cross-cutting ties which bind Pentre people into a community."[158] As the social basis was eroded, the danger grew that cumulative failures would lead to irreparable schism: "[i]n the past the villagers worked together, played together and lived together. … [n]ow only the women work together, and each successive failure of a social activity makes the next one more difficult to start."[159] In the final pages of the book the stakes became starkly highlighted. Returning to the specter of the housing estate in the final sentence of the book, Frankenberg's prognosis was bleak: "[a]s many of the older villagers fear, the time may come, if these developments continue, when the village ceases to be a village community and becomes merely a collection of dwellings, housing some of the industrial workers of Great Britain."[160]

It was no accident that this sentence was quoted by Richard Hoggart in his appreciative

---

standard gender roles. He was suspected of being both a government worker (*Village on the Border*, 81) and a German spy ("A Text Revisited," 174), and at one point the village policeman called to ask why he had not registered as an alien: Ibid., 175.

157 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border* 156. On the anthropology of strangers, see Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), Chapter One.

158 Frankenberg, *Village on the Border* 157.

159 Ibid., 157.

160 Ibid., 157.

review of the book in *New Statesman*,[161] as it was wholly compatible with his own argument in *The Uses of Literacy,* published almost simultaneously in 1957. However Frankenberg's work also differed from Hoggart's, not least because it explored social structure in terms of the micro-politics of cross-cutting identities, rather than the culture of a homogenous class—an approach which as we shall see was pursued further by later Manchester anthropologists of Britain. Frankenberg did not lament the loss of a particular class culture, so much as the loss of the social interaction out of which community was built. *Village on the Border* was not nostalgic so much as declinist, with the end of industrialism bringing about the enforced dislocations of labour migration, mirroring those of contemporary industrialization in Central Africa. Nor was it romantic in the vein of Rees. Frankenberg saw the problem not as the coming of industrial society to the country, but as the dislocation of labor—the separation of the place of labor from the place of living—which, when combined with existing gender differentiations, tore the village in two. But given that an organic version of community was no longer possible, Frankenberg stressed the agency of the villagers in attempting to construct their own self-conscious version of community; meanwhile, he showed that conflict, schism and even the failure of communal activities could each play a part in a social drama which cyclically recreated social connections. He showed how new forms of community continued to form in modern Britain and showed that in the face of perceived threats, local community had become a self-conscious and explicit value.

III Social Anthropology and Social Democracy

Following Frankenberg's pioneering work, over the next fifteen years anthropologists at Manchester further developed the application of Mancunian methods to the study of Britain, through the team-based ethnographic study of a wide-ranging set of situations and problems in British towns. However they moved away from the problem of community to explore other specific issues generated within the public discourse of contemporary Britain. The issues on which they focused were both burgeoning sociological problems and matters of both public interest and of urgent concern to social democratic policy makers, such as the behavior of industrial workers, the construction of new managerial and expert classes, social mobility, and the critique of the meritocratic education system.

Like Frankenberg they understood their work as integral to a broader Mancunian project, and were heavily influenced by both Gluckman and their contemporaries working overseas. They sought to understand specific problems through long-term participant-observation, and situational analysis of social structure/process, with an emphasis on the relationship between conflict and cohesion. They continued to explore the relationship between the local and extra-local. The locality of the field was still central: not as the site of locally-generated community, but rather as a spatial and social field in which behavior could be explained in terms of the specific set of local and extra-local forces acting on it: a set which was unique for each respective locality.

They built on Frankenberg's work in developing new understandings of class as one component of social structure in social democratic Britain, producing new explanations of working-class behavior, critiques of the concepts of a unified working class and social mobility, and new ideas about class formation. The rejected the prevalent approach to the study of class,

161 Richard Hoggart, "The Need for Roots", *New Statesman* (1957).

which one sociologist has described as the tradition of Fabian "political arithmetic,"[162] instead generating new anthropological perspectives on various facets of class in British localities. This work was highly influential and innovative yet is something of a forgotten strand in the history of thought about British class.[163] It took Mancunian anthropologists into the first long-term immersive participant-observation research in British factories and schools, marking a new level of penetration into everyday life by qualitative social science, and the construction of everyday British life as the subject of new forms of expertise. Although many of them were from working-class backgrounds, their position as social researchers was quite alienated from their subjects; and while many were on the left of the political spectrum, the discourse as a whole was shaped not only by their own politics, but by the technocratic structures of the government agencies which were funding them.

Reason on the Shop Floor

The first Mancunian team research in Britain took place on the factory floors and workshops of local industry. This pioneering and highly influential industrial ethnography was led by Tom Lupton, who had previously worked on one of the first empirical studies of a housing estate, at the University of Liverpool in 1950-1.[164] Lupton was joined by Sheila Cunnison (*née* Smith) and C. S. Wilson. The three of them studied five factories over four years beginning in 1955; much of the work was published in Lupton's *On the Shop Floor* and Cunnison's *Wages and Work Allocation*.[165] This work was followed and elaborated by a second team of Isabel Emmett, D. H. J. Morgan and Michael Walker.

Their work was initially inspired by the American historian and sociologist George Homans' year-long visiting professorship at the Manchester seminar in 1953-4.[166] Homans had recently published influential work on the theory of small groups, drawing on primary research from various disciplines, including American social psychology and industrial sociology, Chicago School urban ethnography, and British social anthropology.[167] The specific problem which Homans bequeathed to Manchester was known as "the restriction of output," which asked why factory workers on piece-work rates set their own production levels—not only in defiance of management standards, but also in seeming contradiction of their own economic interests by restricting their own earnings.[168]

---

162 Rosemary Crompton, *Class and Stratification: An Introduction to Current Debates* (Cambridge, UK; Cambridge, MA, USA: Polity Press, 1993), 32..

163 The history of thought about class postwar Britain is somewhat murky: new British work on class is generally deemed to have begun at the end of the 1950s: see Ibid., 32-35.; Dennis L Dworkin, *Class Struggles* (Pearson, 2007), 37ff.

164 This work was published in *Neighbourhood and Community: An Enquiry Into Social Relationships on Housing Estates in Liverpool and Sheffield*.

165 Wilson did not publish her work, but both Cunnison and later Manchester industrial ethnographers were heavily influenced by her unpublished dissertation. See Sheila Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies," in *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. Ronald Frankenberg (Distributed in the USA by Humanities Press, 1982). Isabel Emmett and D. H. J. Moran, "Max Gluckman and the Manchester Shop-floor Ethnographies," in *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. Ronald Frankenberg (Distributed in the USA by Humanities Press, 1982).

166 See e. g. Sheila Cunnison, *Wages and Work Allocation: A Study of Social Relations in a Garment Workshop* (Tavistock Publications, 1966), xv; Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies", 94ff.

167 George Homans, *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950). The book was a key contribution to the theory of small groups, or "groupism," an important component of US mid-century social science, For an overview of this key movement in mid-century American thought see Daniel Immerwahr, “The Quest for Community: The United States, Community Development, and the World,” PhD Dissertation, U. C. Berkeley (2011), Chapter One.

168 The phrase comes from F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939). See Homans, *The Human Group* Chapter Three. For an overview of industrial social research see M. Burawoy, "The Anthropology of Industrial Work", *Annual Review of Anthropology* (1979): 231-266.

The personal connection with Homans signals a broader British interest in American "human relations" approaches to problems of industrial relations and efficiency, encouraged and supported by successive British governments, through the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research/Medical Research Council Joint Committee on Human Relations in Industry.[169] The American connection was financial and political as well as intellectual: research under the Joint Committee, including that at Manchester, was partly financed by Counterpart Aid funds derived from United States Economic Aid, a legacy of the Marshall Plan.[170] The specific problem of restriction of output also became a matter of public concern in Britain in the 1950s, being an issue in a prolonged strike at Rolls-Royce's Scottish factories,[171] and there were media reports of cases where individuals had been ostracised by their colleagues for exceeding group output norms.[172]

While Lupton and his colleagues took their initial problem from American industrial research, they rejected its social psychological methods, which depended on meticulously-designed, controlled experiments, involving observation of workers under carefully-managed conditions in a designated, isolated space. The most famous of these was the "Bank Wiring Observation Room" experiment, which was one of a series of industrial researches carried out by Elton Mayo and other Harvard researchers between 1927 and 1932. [173] Lupton and his colleagues also rejected the correlational and statistical methods being used in British industrial research.[174] Instead they modeled their approach on the work of their colleagues in the social anthropology department.[175] Eschewing controlled experiments, they became long-term participant-observers on real factory floors, and instead of explanation in terms of individual or group psychological traits, they analyzed behavior in terms of social structure both within and, increasingly, outside the factory walls. Lupton and his colleagues were employed as full-time factory workers, in the first long-term immersive participant-observation in British industry. The first team worked for six-month stretches in five different factories over four years.[176] Following the RLI legacy of co-ordinated team research, they each worked as lone participant-observers in separate fieldsites, but co-ordinated their research and collaborated closely.[177] The second team later worked on management and two workshops in a single factory.[178]

Lupton advocated participant-observation partly in positivistic terms, as a finely-tuned tool to understand "the subtlety of the sanctions employed to enforce conformity."[179] It was the most appropriate mode for investigating real behavior, rather than stated attitudes, in particular because it allowed the researcher to understand everyday behavior diachronically, as ongoing

---

169 Nick Tiratsoo and Jim Tomlinson, *Industrial Efficiency and State Intervention: Labour, 1939-51* (London; New York: Routledge, 1993).; Nick Tiratsoo and Jim Tomlinson, *The Conservatives and Industrial Efficiency, 1951-1964: Thirteen Wasted Years?* (London; New York: LSE/Routledge, 1998).

170 Tom Lupton, *On the Shop Floor: Two Studies of Workshop Organization and Output* (Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press, 1963), vii.; Cunnison, *Wages and Work Allocation: A Study of Social Relations in a Garment Workshop,* xiii.

171 Tom Lupton, "Social Factors Influencing Industrial Output", *Man* 56 (1956): 55-59.

172 Lupton's 1956 application to the DSIR for a second research grant mentioned “considerable Press publicity” for recent cases. Tom Lupton, “Proposals for future research work in industry,” VCA 7/404, RYLANDS. Cf. MG "Restriction of Output," Draft TS, MG RAI, in which he mentions extensive press coverage of the ostracision of workers at a Rolls-Royce plant in Derby.

173 See Homans, *The Human Group* Chapter Three.

174 TL, "Industrial Studies," MS Memo, found inside MG draft lecture "Social Anthropological Studies in Britain." No date, c. 1958, MG RAI.

175 See Lupton, *On the Shop Floor,* vii. Turner and Gluckman were mentioned as particularly influential.

176 Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies", 96.

177 E. g. Tom Lupton and Sheila Cunnison, "Workshop Behaviour," in *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naïvety in Social Anthropology*, ed. Max Gluckman (Aldine Transaction, 2007).

178 Emmett and Moran, "Max Gluckman and the Manchester Shop-floor Ethnographies", 149ff.

179 Lupton, *On the Shop Floor* 2. Lupton was working-class, and had served an apprenticeship in an engineering workshop in the 1930s, where he had personally experienced "the influence of customary workshop standards of conduct upon individual behavior," Ibid., 2.

"social *process.*"[180] However there was also an anti-positivistic dimension to participant-observation, which acknowledge that "the values of the investigator influence the method of approach and conclusions."[181] As members of the second generation later put it, participant-observation allowed the dialectical generation of research problems through the long-term "interaction between ethnographer and field."[182] They relied on an intimate understanding of "the language of the shop floor" or native categories through which workers' behaviour was mediated, in order "to avoid imposing external managerially or academically defined categories."[183]

Lupton considered the Bank Wiring Room approach to be intrinsically "management-oriented," not only because management categories were carried into the research, but because the goal was to assist management in "a process of social control in which workers are expected to modify their behavior to meet the requirements of the production plan."[184] He also described existing British industrial research as designed "to help management to manage, not to advance understanding of industry as a social process."[185] To his anthropological training at Manchester Lupton attributed the ability to perceive "social relationships" as systems, to see the relationship beween conflict and continuity in those systems, and to understand the limitations which social structures imposed on top-down planning.[186] He therefore recognized that "there may exist real conflicts of interest and viewpoint between managers and workers"[187] and saw output as "the focus of dispute."[188] Instead of casting the problem in terms of the failure of workers to implement managerial norms, Lupton therefore aimed "to map out ... the field of social forces"[189] in the workshop and understand behavior as a "moving resultant of the interplay of social forces in a field of economic, technical and administrative, and customary controls."[190]

The anthropological approach also paid close comparative attention to the variety of local situations in Britain, utilizing the comparative discovery of difference, rather than the attempt to discover universal processes through experiment. Lupton himself studied two different factories in two different industries; and, crucially, discovered collaborative output norms in one but not the other. He found that differences in output behavior could not be explained in cultural or psychological terms, but rather in terms of structural-processual differences internal to the factory, such as the system of wage payment[191] and production methods, including "the layout of the job, the pattern of the work flow, the system of job allocation, and the length of the operation cycle."[192]

In *On the Shop Floor,* Lupton set forth a meticulously detailed case-driven ethnographic

---

180 Lupton's emphasis. Ibid., 202.
181 Ibid., 7.
182 Emmett and Moran, "Max Gluckman and the Manchester Shop-floor Ethnographies", 142.
183 Ibid., 141.
184 Lupton, *On the Shop Floor,* 8.
185 TL, "Industrial Studies," MS Memo for MG in MG RAI, found inside MG draft lecture "Social Anthropological Studies in Britain," no date, c. 1958.
186 TL, "Industrial Studies," MS Memo for MG in MG RAI, found inside MG draft lecture "Social Anthropological Studies in Britain," no date, c. 1958.
187 Ibid., 188. This was a rejection of one class perspective in favor another, but it was also a rejection of an essentially administrative social problem approach in favor of a sociological one, and therefore analogous to a rejection of "applied" anthropology in the colonial situation in favor of "pure" sociological research. (This did not of course mean that the research was not assumed to be ultimately "useful" to government and employers, but that its problematic was a sociological one rather than social.)
188 Ibid., 202.
189 Ibid., 10.
190 Ibid., 10.
191 Ibid., 190.
192 Ibid., 192.

analysis of social structure and process in workshops in two British factories.[193] Lupton used Mancunian conflict theory, and Turner's social drama, to delineate ongoing everyday processes of conflict and accommodation. He traced the expectations, goals and values of a broad cast of characters, portrayed in depth of biographical detail. He also traced the internal micro-economy of workflow, labor and wage payment through quantitative and spatial analysis.

Lupton rejected the very term "restriction of output." Instead he used the workers' term: "the fiddle," which referred to their "elaborate techniques of manipulating the system of wage payment in order to serve their own interests."[194] Using case narrative, diagrams and tables he painstakingly traced the details and contexts of this mostly tacit practice. The details here were particularly important, as once the complexities of the social systems of the workshops were understood, and once workers' true values were revealed, workers' behaviour could be seen as a set of rational and systematic responses to irrational circumstances: as "a rational means to ends which are valued."[195] The factory workers' primary goal was not maximization of earnings. Household demands and other reasons led them to value control and stability over simple maximization of earnings on a daily basis. This goal was threatened by the inefficiencies, irrationalities and errors of management, including interruptions in the workflow, delays in equipment supply, bad designs and faulty drawings and materials.

When the vagaries of the production system met the demands of the domestic situation, the workers' decision to adhere to output norms was shown to be quite rational, even when it meant working more slowly than possible, and therefore making a smaller bonus than they might have in a given day. The fiddle allowed the workers to control their weekly wage in the face of workflow obstructions due to management failures and achieve "a stable relationship between effort and reward ... stable earnings from week to week, defence against rate-cutting and against management shortcomings or the influence of factors outside the control of workers and managers."[196] Lupton demonstrated, through painstaking quantitative analysis, that the fiddle did actually succeed in achieving these goals and successfully stablized weekly wages.[197]

For Lupton, therefore, the social anthropological approach challenged existing ideas about the rationality of the factory space, and of the workers within it. He contrasted his own use of anthropological methods with the ways in which the Bank Wiring room investigators had simplistically applied "knowledge" of human behavior gleaned from social anthropology.[198] Their explanation of workplace behavior referred to a universal, primitive and unconscious human urge to organize into small groups, and they understood the restriction of output as "the discrepancy between two logics": management attempted to impose a rational "logic of efficiency," which workers resisted because they adhered to a "logic of sentiment."[199] Lupton instead revealed the workers behaviour as rational, within the irrational environment in which they acted.

In arguing in this way, Lupton and his colleagues were following in the British anthropological tradition of explaining apparently irrational behaviour in terms of social structure: like Evans-Pritchard's Azande, the industrial workers of Manchester were shown to be

---

193 As ever, synopsis of such detailed ethnographic work robs it of some of its power, because ethnography argues by showing as well as saying.
194 Ibid., 139.
195 Ibid., 172.
196 Ibid., 174.
197 Ibid., e. g. 174, Figure 12.
198 Ibid., 173. See also Burawoy, "The Anthropology of Industrial Work", 234ff.
199 Lupton, *On the Shop Floor* 39.

acting rationally once social structure was understood.[200] Social psychology had fallen into an older anthropological set of tropes explaining the irrationality of the working classes by equating them with primitives. In Manchester industrial anthropology the equation was maintained but transvalued: rather than the working classes being as irrational as primitives, they were as rational as the Azande. In a public lecture presenting Lupton's work, Gluckman claimed that his initial motivation for encouraging this work was that British workers were being criticized in the press and elsewhere as lazy, irrational and spoiled, in the same way that he had heard Africans criticized in Northern Rhodesia and South Africa.[201] Just as in African anthropology, it was necessary to counter common-sense assumptions and moralizing judgments with deeper research into social structure, which revealed an inherent reasonableness in the mysterious actions of the other.

However, unlike rational choice theory, in which individuals made egoistic decisions maximizing personal gains,[202] the workers' rationality was that of the group, and individuals benefitted when they submitted to group customary norms, even when they did not fully understand them.[203] The research problem had now been shifted 180 degrees: from why workers irrationally restricted output, to why workers sometimes irrationally acted as individuals, and accommodated themselves with management rather than acting corporately. Lupton's explanation was in terms of the different social structures of the respective workshops, which in turn were influenced by the political economies of their respective industries.[204] This led him to postulate two "clusters" of variables, which functioned somewhat like Weberian ideal types, as poles of a continuum:

> [I]t is in industries with small firms and intense competition that one would probably find lack of mechanization, high labour cost, women workers and weak Trade Union organization. In an industry with large firms and little competition one would probably find mechanization, low labour cost, men workers and strong Trade Union workshop organization.[205]

The former were more likely to lack the collective output norms, the latter to exhibit them.[206]

Cunnison and Wilson discovered more such clusters and aimed to map out various "patterns of accommodation" between workers and management, including what Cunnison termed "aggressive individualism."[207] They explained these phenomena largely in terms of the positions of workers in multiple overlapping structures in the wider society, such as kinship, class or

---

200 See Chapter Two.

201 Max Gluckman, "Restriction of Output," TS, MG RAI.

202 Homans in fact was one of the originators of rational choice theory, see George Homans, *Social Behavior* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961).

203 Only three workers "fully understood" the whole of the rate manipulation scheme. However Lupton claimed that "the workers had enough understanding of the scheme to operate 'the fiddle' as a rational means to certain economic ends ... One does not need to have detailed knowledge of such a scheme to manipulate it." Lupton, *On the Shop Floor* 171. It is surely no coincidence that Michael Polanyi was at this time both a regular attendee of Gluckman's seminar and developing his ideas about "tacit knowledge." See Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958).

204 Lupton, *On the Shop Floor* 197.

205 Ibid., 199.

206 Ibid., 198.

207 Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies", 109.

gender relations.[208] Modes of authority were both imported and constructed internally using the existing social distinctions. For example, understanding "the industrial work situation as an important point of articulation between domestic and industrial organization"[209] allowed Wilson to show how modes of authority and subservient behavior within the factory were transposed from the workers' experience of domestic structure. The intersection of "industrial organisation, class and family organisation" produced a micropolitics in which "the sources of authority which the manager wielded over the girls, and conversely, their acquiescence to his demands, were partly familial and sexual in nature."[210]

This expansive understanding of the political, achieved through ethnographic fieldwork, stands in contradistinction to well-known sociological work on British class in the 1960s and 1970s, which operated by interviews and attempted to uncover "attitudes," often in order to explain the apparent conservatism of the working classes. [211] Lupton and his colleagues attempted to explain "patterns of accommodation" not in terms of attitudes, but in terms of social structure and everyday process, using Mancunian concepts of intercalary roles, cross-cutting ties and situational selection, the last of which they took from from Epstein's work on Central Africa.[212] Participant-observation also gave them access to acts of "day-to-day struggle,"[213] which they argued should be seen as class conflict; they later claimed that macro-sociology was blind to such informal class conflict and therefore seriously underestimated the political agency of workers, and that the working classes were not as politically apathetic as industrial sociologists had indicated.[214] However, their own politics and critical edge were ultimately blunted by institutional factors. Lupton moved to the Department of Industrial Administration at the Birmingham College of Advanced Technology (later to become Aston Business School within Aston University).[215] He brought with him a large grant awarded for the study of shop floor behavior, which was now instead turned towards the study of management.[216] Lupton himself later became first Director of the Manchester Business School. He carried anthropological techniques into the nascent field of business studies, but in the process became "management-oriented": exactly the position he had started out critiquing.

---

208 Ibid., 96f., 135f. Lupton had pointed in this direction, but admitted the limitations of his analysis with regards to the roles that workers played in multiple overlapping social systems. Lupton, *On the Shop Floor* 200. Cf. Lupton and Cunnison, "Workshop Behaviour".

209 Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies", 102.

210 Ibid., 101-2.

211 The authors of the *locus classicus* admitted the shortcomings of their interview method, and the need for less "impressionistic" research into actual behaviour. John H. Goldthorpe *and others*, *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 6.

212 Cunnison, "The Manchester Factory Studies", 131-2.

213 Emmett and Moran, "Max Gluckman and the Manchester Shop-floor Ethnographies", 152.

214 They referred to the fact that Goldthorpe *et. al.* had depicted workers at the Vauxhall plant in Luton as politically acquiescent shortly before a massive strike at the plant. Emmet and Morgan suggested that if they had used participant-observation they may have realized the workers were engaged in constant struggle. Similarly, they poured scorn on later explicitly Marxist studies of the workplace which again failed to get close to the day-to-day experience of work. Ibid., 157ff..

215 Derek Pugh, "How Management Research Came to Aston" , http://www.abs.aston.ac.uk/60th/derek-pugh.asp (accessed March 5, 2012).

216 Ibid.

Spiralism

William ("Bill") Watson is something of a forgotten figure in the history of the Manchester School and the British social sciences in general.[217] He was a key member of the first generation of Gluckman's students, and it was his contribution to the *annus mirabilis* of 1957-8, *Tribal Cohesion in a Monetary Economy*, which had inspired Mary Douglas to proclaim the advent of a true "school" at Manchester.[218] Watson's early career reveals some of the postwar intertwinings of social anthropology and sociology, and of work on Africa and work on Britain. After active service in World War Two, he studied with Meyer Fortes at Cambridge,[219] where his Master's thesis was an ethnographic study on the social development of children in a Scottish mining village.[220] When he came to Manchester for his Ph.D., Gluckman encouraged him to work on Britain. Watson, however, felt that he should work overseas "in order to qualify for 'respectability' among his fellow-anthropologists,"[221] and he was appointed as a researcher at the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, where his work, "following up the lines he began to develop in Scotland,"[222] focused on the contemporary situation of Africans becoming part of a wage-labor economy, during the politically volatile period of looming Federation.[223] The resulting book was written in Manchester, where Watson had returned as Lecturer in Sociology within the Social Anthropology Department. He taught both Central African anthropology and the industrial and urban anthropology of Britain.[224] Gluckman greatly valued his dual expertise, and also had Watson teach in other departments where he felt it might be exploited, including Education and Public Health.[225]

Watson's work on Britain offered a new anthropological approach to the study of class in general and in particular social mobility, which had previously been understood in terms of Fabian "political arithmetic"[226] at the LSE, where David Glass had produced statistical analyses of mobility between national categories of occupational class. Watson's approach was distinctive in several ways: its fusion of geographical and social mobility in a special version of labor migration, its focus on the interaction between national and local systems, the rejection of the idea of a national class system except as a plurality of local sub-systems, and the use of history.

The problem had emerged from Watson's early fieldwork in the Burgh in Scotland, which had led him to realize the necessity of understanding the relationship between local and national systems. Specifically, while this small mining town had its own local system for the evaluation of social prestige, individuals were also involved in a national education system; those who were successful in it were then subject to a "discontinuity in occupational and social status"[227] with their parents; furthermore the occupations and "mode of life"[228] for which they were now trained

---

217 He is barely mentioned in key recent volumes on the Manchester School and British sociology. Evens and Handelman, eds , *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology*; Savage, *Identities and Social Change*.

218 Mary Douglas, "Review of 'Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy' by William Watson", *Man* 59 (1959): doi:10.2307/2796779.

219 His undergraduate degree was English and Social Anthropology, followed by an M.Sc.

220 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

221 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

222 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

223 WW "difficult circumstances" for fieldwork as "the proposals for Central African Federation were then under discussion, and all the anthropologists in Central Africa at the time had to cope with deep suspicion not only from Africans, but also from Whites." MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

224 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter),

225 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter),

226 Crompton, *Class and Stratification: An Introduction to Current Debates* 32., referring to D. V. Glass, *Social Mobility in Britain* (London: Routledge & Paul, 1954).

227 William Watson, "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities," in *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naïvety in Social Anthropology*, ed. Max Gluckman (Aldine Transaction, 2007), 129.

228 Ibid., 129.

were not available in the local community. These young people were therefore dislocated from their local communities both spatially and in terms of social status. It was therefore necessary to go beyond the local limits of fieldwork, in order to understand the locality fully.

To this end Watson reworked his ethnographic material, and that of others,[229] to develop an overarching theory of the relationship between local and national, through a focus on the intertwining of geographical and social mobilities. His paper "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities," written in 1957, made two main arguments: first, that class was neither a national system nor based solely in occupation, but generated in local prestige-systems; second, that there was an increasingly prevalent national system of intertwined social and geographical mobility, which he termed "spiralism."[230]

Watson noted a radical historical shift in the period from the 1920s to the mid-1950s, which had seen the "emergence of large-scale national organisations of production, exchange, consumption, services, etc,"[231] including the massive expansion of the British state, the rise of national and multi-national corporations, and the creation of new professional and managerial cultures.[232] The impact of national trends could be seen in the empirical investigation of localities, which had seen a general shift in the local structure of occupational class: away from a pyramidal structure, with local industry-owning aristocracy at the top, to a tripartite division between wage-earners, "burgesses" (local middle class) and "spiralists."[233] Yet the emergence of national organizations had not produced a homogenous national class structure, let alone universally applicable class hierarchies. Watson therefore rejected both the national universalized view of the census, with its finely-graded class categories applied to the nation as a whole, [234] and sociological conceptions of class with their assumption or implication of national homogeneity.

Instead he advocated an anthropological approach, which paid adequate empirical attention to the local, while recognizing its implication in extra-local structures and processes. Class was intrinsically local: it happened locally, and happened differently in each locality.[235] Nor was this simpy a question of local variation, or of class being experienced locally; rather it was actively constructed by the actors in the locality. Local class systems emerged from the particular constellation of elements which had developed historically in specific localities. Occupational class was only one element in the local system, which also took into account independent variables such as property ownership and level of education, as well as behavioral elements and interpersonal relations. In contrast with the unilinear gradations of the census, ordinary people assigned class to each other through the assessment of complex sets of variables, which involved the use of paradigms or ideal types, "by which to assess the social prestige of people whose occupational, economic, and social differences are not nearly so distinct."[236] Therefore in one example, "[a] skilled worker who owns his home and motor car, who is a deacon of the Church,

---

229 Such as his colleague, the Manchester political scientist A. H. Birch, published as Birch, *Small-town Politics: A Study of Political Life in Glossop*.

230 Watson, "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities".

231 Ibid., 131.

232 In private industry 20% of workers were now employed by firms of more than 10, 000 employees, while state-owned corporations now employed 2, 000, 000, and the Civil Service had doubled in size in the twenty years since 1938. Ibid., 131.

233 Ibid., 133-8, 147.

234 Ibid., 138-142.

235 "Social 'classes' as distinct permanent groups ... do not exist. The social-prestige structure of local communities is based on a number of social groups and of individuals who compete with one another for prestige ... the standards vary from one community to another, and these standards may vary considerably." Ibid., 140-1.

236 The concept of "reference-groups" was taken from Robert King Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949).

and whose son is a university student, regards himself, and is regarded by others, as 'middle class,'" because in every way but his actual occupational class, he more closely conformed to the paradigm of the "mode of life of the professional classes."[237]

The national class-system was made up of a plurality of local sub-systems: "[t]he whole social system may therefore be envisaged as a plurality of prestige structures ... each with its own particular standards of evaluation."[238] Therefore, although there were certainly some nation-wide structures and values, "we can only determine a national class system in the broadest sense, for social standing is largely an outcome of the prestige systems of limited social groups."[239] Even the valorization of occupational classes varied by locality, according to the particular historical constellation of occupations present.[240] A locality could therefore never be a microcosm, although it did participate in nationally-observable trends at a sufficient level of generalization. Furthermore, even at that level of national generalization, class could not be understood as a simple hierarchy. At a national level it was made up of a plurality of local sub-systems each involving a complex calculus of prestige, in which occupational class was only one element.

Increasingly, though, local prestige systems involved interaction with the extra-local value-system of the spiralists. Spiralists were professionals employed by "large-scale enterprises,"[241] which provided new opportunities for social mobility, utterly unlike the highly restricted possibilities for wage-earners and burgesses within a locality.[242] Spiralists included "scientific" and "non-scientific" professionals, including engineers, teachers, surveyors, civil servants, accountants, local government officers and academics. Many of these professions were long-standing but their numbers had risen dramatically—e. g. technical experts in colonial service—and new opportunities for mobility were provided by the new "productive and administrative structures of large-scale enterprises."[243] Bureaucratic organization provided established hierarchies through which to rise, and the "generic culture and ideology ... based partly on common liberal values."[244] The somewhat interchangeable nature of the new professions made it possible for experts to move between similar firms—especially once they had moved beyond their narrow realm of expertise into generic management positions.[245] Shifts between firms, and the national and often international scope of organizations such as Imperial Chemicals, Unilever, and the Foreign and Colonial Service, meant that upward mobility often required geographical mobility. The term "spiralism" indicated "this characteristic combination of social and spatial mobility."[246]

The organizations which employed spiralists promoted mobility not only as a policy but as a value. A telling graduate recruitment advertisement for Unilever described the species "*Avis Unileverensis (Managerialis)*, Plumage: highly variegated, Habits: too varied to list, Habitat: the world."[247] Potential mobility was increased by the provision of "free homes, furniture, cars, etc." to administrators willing to move, while "some firms forbid their executives to take place in local

---

237 Watson, "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities", 140.
238 Ibid., 156.
239 Ibid., 134.
240 In the Burgh, for example, "the standards by which social prestige are measured arise partly from the historical dominance of coal-mining in the area." Ibid., 139.
241 Ibid., 145.
242 Ibid., 148-150.
243 Ibid., 145.
244 Ibid., 144.
245 Interchangeable bureaucratic hierarchies were made up of "managers, technicians, supervisors, accountants, administrators." Ibid., 145-6.
246 Ibid., 147.
247 Ibid., 151.

affairs, for this could ... reduce their potential mobility."[248] Spiralists did indeed experience conflict between their local and spiralist values and commitments. This gave them a different attitude towards their local communities than those of non-spiralists, and sometimes they would be forced to choose between the two sets of values.[249] (Ironically, Watson prophesied his own fate, when he gave the example of an academic blocked from promotion in his own locality, and forced to choose between promotion and "local attachments and interests."[250])

However despite this potential conflict, spiralists were members of local communities. Indeed their presence was now a major component of local prestige-systems. The specific kind of social mobility which marked the spiralist was also taken to be a marker of status, as was their higher education. Thus spiralists tended to become one of the "reference-groups" or ideal types through which class structure was articulated in the locality. Spiralists by definition were always near or at the top of a local prestige system, although they themselves were also judged within the spiralist national value system. In this way spiralist mobility, and the higher education which was a prerequisite of it, themselves became values for non-spiralists.

The topic of social mobility was of intense personal interest to Watson, who had grown up in Depression-era Glasgow, and described himself as "aggressively working-class."[251] Gluckman attributed Watson's bouts of depression, during which he became aggressively hostile to Gluckman himself, to his being "a sufferer in our modern system of social mobility, a sufferer whose difficulties have been heightened by his war experience," when he was exposed to a humiliating clash of class cultures in the Royal Air Force.[252] His feeling that he had "deserted his own kind"[253] was enhanced by guilt at improving his social position via the war in which comrades had died. Watson himself credited his background with inspiring his earlier Communism (which he had abandoned by the late 1950s) his "passion against injustice" and "sympathy with Africans and the poor," his suspicion of the middle-class and "hatred of power," and ultimately to his interest in the politics of social structure and social mobility.[254]

The phenomenon of social mobility in postwar, social democratic Britain, as personified by the "grammar-school boy," was of huge public and intellectual interest in the 1950s.[255] It had been addressed in both literature and film, and was soon to be complemented by the burgeoning field of cultural studies, with the publication of Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy* in 1957. Mike Savage has pointed out that while Hoggart, Raymond Williams and others championed literature and the humanities as the appropriate means for understanding class and social mobility in the 1950s, they bequeathed a certain "melodrama of class mobility" to a cadre of new social scientists who either studied or worked at Cambridge, and who imported into sociology in the 1960s a "rags to riches" narrative involving loss as well as gain and therefore valorizing the working class background left behind.[256]

Watson also studied at Cambridge, although as a contemporary of Williams rather than as

---

248 Ibid., 151-2.
249 Ibid., 150.
250 Ibid., 152.
251 WW to MG, July 8th, 1959, MG RAI. Biographical details are taken from this correspondence, letters of reference which Gluckman wrote for Watson, and "Death Notices", *Anthropology News* 35, no. 6 (1994): 70-73. For further biographical details see WW to MG, July 8th, 1959; MG to V-C, Leicester, n. d., MG RAI (draft letter).
252 MG to V-C, Leicester, n. d., MG RAI (draft letter).
253 MG to V-C, Leicester, n.d., MG RAI. (draft letter). Interestingly the first draft of this letter instead called him "a sufferer from the War."
254 WW to MG, July 8th, 1959, MG RAI.
255 The phenomenon itself was of course not a purely post-war one. Watson himself attended grammar school in the 1930s.
256 Savage, *Identities and Social Change* 184-5.

part of the later cadre influenced by him.[257] The literary approach certainly appealed to Watson. He himself also had written an unpublished novel whose protagonist was a self-destructive working-class Glaswegian, and in order to explain his own background to Gluckman, Watson gave him a copy of George Blake's novel on Clydebank shipworkers.[258] He also lectured at Manchester on the wave of British postwar novels of social mobility.[259]

However, Watson's social scientific approach to understanding the phenomenon was very different from the literary mode. Rather than focusing on the life histories of working-class individuals, spiralism was a theory of the abstract form of social and geographical mobility. It involved no melodrama, and no sense of loss or nostalgia. This lack of sentimentality also derived from Watson's unique focus on spiralism as a middle-class identity rather than on upwardly-mobile working-class subjects. Not only was this unusual at the time, but most sociological research which followed also focused on the working class. In 1972 J. M. Pahl and R. E. Pahl *Managers and their Wives* took Watson's ideas as their starting point and used the term 'spiralists,' while bemoaning the fact that the term had not been superseded, which they found "symptomatic of the scant material on the middle class."[260] Pahl and Pahl suggested the lack of study of the middle classes was partly due to the difficulty of securing funding, and partly due to the romanticism of studying the working-class based on social scientists' preference for studying "social situations or occupational groups with which they are not familiar."[261]

This was a pioneering paper which served to open up a range of questions both about the relationship between the locality and the supra-local, and the appropriate way to combine ethnographic fieldwork with sociological analysis. However as a positional paper suggesting avenues for further research, it left many issues unaddressed. In particular, Watson's theory was only relevant to localities in which some kind of local community did in fact exist: the kinds of small town or large villages that he, Birch and Frankenberg had all researched. Watson admitted that "[n]aturally the constellations of people with varied occupations are greater in the large towns and conurbations, and here the rating of social prestige is much more difficult and obscure."[262] This lacuna was especially serious given his recognition that Britain was now largely made up of six great conurbations.[263] The reason for it, however, was that Watson's work was based on empirical studies, and the urban ethnography simply had not been done. He therefore pointed to the need to study the professional suburbs.[264] In the meantime, Watson's focus on smaller towns and settlements showed how national structures had penetrated all of British society, not just the urban, so that "there are few isolated communities whose economic, social and political relationships are ... contained within specific boundaries."[265]

---

257 They were both socialist working-class boys who studied at Cambridge in 1940s and served in the war.

258 WW to MG, July 8th, 1959. MG RAI. George Blake, *The Shipbuilders* (London: Faber & Faber, 1935).

259 Novels he lectured on included Kingsley Amis, *Lucky Jim* (New York: Viking Press, 1958). and John Braine, *Room at the Top* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957). MG Reference for WW, n.d., MG RAI.

260 J. M. Pahl and R. E. Pahl, *Managers and Their Wives: A Study of Career and Family Relationships in the Middle Class* (London: Allen Lane, 1971), 22.

261 Ibid., 214.

262 Watson, "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities", 139-140.

263 Ibid., 131.

264 Ibid., 151.

265 Ibid., 155.

The Leigh Project

Watson's recognition of a lack of British urban ethnography led to the creation of the Manchester School's most ambitious research project, which was also its greatest failure: an interdisciplinary team investigation of the nearby town of Leigh.[266] The original proposal for the scheme included projects by both Epstein and Victor Turner, who proposed applying the insights of his work on the social aspects of ritual among the Ndembu to the study of British religious congregations.[267] These plans demonstrate how Gluckman intended to bring more of the School's anthropologists of Central Africa to work on Britain. In the end funding restrictions meant that only Watson's central component on "the relation between local communities and general patterns of social mobility"[268] was accepted. However the project then expanded to include a highly ambitious plan of co-ordinated research between social scientists and medical researchers from the Manchester Medical School.[269] Watson found himself directing an interdisciplinary team of six fieldworkers, funded by the DSIR, the Mental Health Research Fund and the Nuffield Foundation,[270] which in 1959 began investigating multiple field sites including factories and other workplaces, women's organizations, schools and youth clubs.[271]

The central issue for Watson was the investigation of "a new 'class' alignment" opposing spiralists to a "core culture" of local families, which cut across the old division between the working and middle classes.[272] Core-culture families were found to have certain advantages in the micropolitics of the locality, due to "their extensive social networks," and involvement in local political organizations, but had virtually no opportunities for social mobility.[273] Watson's earlier tripartite division into wage-earners, burgesses and spiralists was modified in two ways. On the one hand there was a sharpening primary cleavage between the first two (both core-culture) and the spiralists. On the other hand, there was more differentiation within the categories, through the analysis of kinship patterns, using anthropological concepts of matrilocal and patrilocal residence to develop a "system of family types."[274] The researchers also discovered a fourth group of non-university-educated "junior officials in local authorities, government services, large-scale industry, and certain recreational fields," which they dubbed "sub-spiralists."[275]

The contrast between the core culture and the spiralists was explored through extensive research into various aspects of social structure: for example, samples of children and young adults from all the town's secondary schools were interviewed in order to discover how certain children ended up in certain jobs. Most remarkable was the groundbreaking attempt at co-ordinating social with medical research. One of the Leigh researchers, Derek Allcorn, had in fact

---

266 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

267 See MG to Vice-Chancellor, Manchester University, January 31st, 1958. V. W. Turner, "The Study of Religious Congregations in Britain: A Scheme of Research," MS, GLU/10/1, RYLANDS. They also attempted unsuccessfully to hire Rosemary Harris, a social anthropologist at London University who instead went to Queen's, Belfast and who had already carried out fieldwork in Northern Ireland, later published as Rosemary Harris, *Prejudice and Tolerance in Ulster: A Study of Neighbours and "Strangers" in a Border Community* (Manchester, Totowa: Manchester University Press, Rowman and Littlefield, 1972).

268 However Epstein and Turner were still expected to work on the project. MG to Farrar-Brown, Trustees of the Nuffield Foundation, January 31st, 1958, RYLANDS.

269 MG to the Editors, *Staff Comment*, n.d., c. 1964, MG RAI.

270 Gluckman and Watson had originally applied to the Ford Foundation in 1957 with a much more ambitious scheme. MG to Ford Foundation, July 25th, 1957, RYLANDS. When this proposal was turned down, they turned to the Nuffield Foundation, who years previously had asked Gluckman to submit a scheme for research in British towns. MG to VC November 1st, 1957, RYLANDS.

271 Leigh Research Project: Second Progress Report, June 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

272 Leigh Research Project: Summary of Second Progress Report, June 28th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

273 Leigh Research Project: Summary of Second Progress Report, June 28th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

274 Leigh Research Project: Second Progress Report, June 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

275 Leigh Research Project: Second Progress Report, June 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

produced his PhD at Manchester in 1954 based on his application of ethnographic methods to a medical problem.[276] After studying anthropology at Cambridge he had become attached to a unit of the Medical Research Council studying the prevalence of duodenal ulcers in young men. Allcorn conducted ethnographic research in Acton, trying to understand this medical issue in terms of the stress inflicted on the men by their membership of various social networks, and the conflicting social principles to which they were subject. In Leigh, medical and anthropological research were co-ordinated in order to explore "the correlation of social and medical phenomena."[277] The aim was to discover physical and medical differences in the children of spiralist and core culture families. Medical researchers examined all children in the local primary schools.[278] They also examined a sample of one in every five children between five and fifteen in a study of enuresis, or bed-wetting, a process which included x-raying the children.[279] The results were then correlated with information on the occupation, education and "social status" of their families, in order to establish whether the disorder was correlated with social mobility.[280]

One product of this collaboration was Watson's own pioneering comparative work in the sociology of medicine. He co-authored *Sociology in Medicine* with M. W. Susser, a Lecturer in Social and Preventive Medicine at Manchester, who also worked on the Leigh project.[281] The book drew on both the anthropology of both Africa and Britain (including the work of Gluckman, Epstein and Frankenberg), and became "a fundamental text in public health" both in Britain and the U.S. over the following decades.[282]

The Leigh Project aroused interest from the media, including from the BBC, Independent Television, and newspapers, and Watson began appearing regularly on television.[283] However despite Gluckman's high expectations, no final report was produced,[284] and no further anthropological research was carried out after Watson left Manchester in 1962. Ironically, it was Watson's own spiralism which led to the demise of the project: he had fallen out with Gluckman after being passed over for promotion,[285] and instead moved to the University of Virginia as Professor of Anthropology in 1963, becoming Chair of the Sociology Department at the University of Oklahoma in 1969.[286]

The increasing mobility of academic staff proved problematic for this kind of long-term research, especially in this era of rapid expansion of the social sciences:[287] we have already seen that Lupton also moved, taking his research grant with him.[288] Another problem was funding. The Leigh project was always short of funding, and found it hard to attract senior staff under its budget constraints. Funding was largely dependent on government enthusiasm, which waxed and waned. At first government agencies were highly enthusiastic. As we have seen, the research was

---

276 This thesis was never published but was circulated and became well-known as pioneering piece of auto- and medical anthropology, “Obituary: Derek Allcorn,” *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Jun., 1987), 19. Gluckman discussed it in his lectures on the anthropology of Britain, and as late as 1974 was showing it to Sir Roger Bannister (they were colleagues on the Sports Council), as an example of what social research could achieve. MG to Derek Allcorn, October 14th, 1974, MG RAI.

277 Leigh Research Project: Summary of Second Progress Report, June 28th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

278 Leigh Research Project: Second Progress Report, June 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

279 Leigh Research Project: Summary of Second Progress Report, June 28th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

280 Leigh Research Project: Summary of Second Progress Report, June 28th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS

281 MG to Registrar [Leicester], n.d., c. 1959 (draft letter), MG RAI.

282 “Obituary: William Watson,” *Anthropology News*, Vol. 35, No. 6 (Sep., 1994), 72-3. A third revised edition was published in 1985, Mervyn Susser, William Watson and Kim Hopper, *Sociology in Medicine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

283 WW to MG, July 8th, 1959; MG to the Editors, *Staff Comment*, n.d., c. 1964, MG RAI.

284 "Obituary: Derek Allcorn," *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Jun., 1987), 19.

285 MG to Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, March 7th, 1962, RYLANDS.

286 “Obituary: William Watson,” *Anthropology News*, Vol. 35, No. 6 (Sep., 1994), 72-3.

287 The Leigh research was particularly slow, partly because of all the relationships which had to be built up with local government, schools, businesses and other local agencies involved.

288 MG to the Editors, *Staff Comment*, n.d., c. 1964, MG RAI.

partly funded by government agencies including the DSIR and MRC. Watson and Gluckman were also approached by the British Productivity Council to work on a film to be shown in factories,[289] while Gluckman served on the Human Sciences Committee of the DSIR.[290]

When the Home Office heard about the Leigh project they approached Gluckman to discuss associating it with a proposed national program for research into juvenile delinquency.[291] They were considering setting up a research unit in Leigh to benefit from the Watson's existing program. Gluckman and Watson visited the Home Office to discuss this July 1959.[292] However the proposals brought the two into conflict, which reflects the delicacy of administering such collaboration between government, a university department and university central administration. Gluckman was reluctant to commit either his department or the university to a major project, and wanted any proposal to come from the government to the university and not *vice versa.* He also had doubts over Watson's ability to administer such a project. Watson meanwhile drew up just such a scheme without Gluckman's knowledge, which he proposed to the Home Office. Both appealed to the Vice-Chancellor, and who in the end allowed Watson to continue negotiations with the Home Office but without any commitment from the university.

Meanwhile government enthusiasm for long-term academic research waned. Watson attended a four-day Home Office Conference on research into the causes of delinquency in January 1960, which brought together eminent social scientists from various disciplines[293] with officials from six government departments, including Education, Health and Housing, and Local Government. Gluckman did not attend, despite being asked by the Home Office to speak about "the methods of social anthropology in studying community problems and their possible application to delinquency research."[294] The other academics present offered a plethora of disciplinary options for national approaches to the question, including criminological, sociological and psychological surveys. Only Watson argued for "intensive studies of particular areas," for which he advocated social anthropological methods.[295] There was little agreement among the officials about which direction to take, and generally they were disappointed in the social scientists' insistence on long-term research.[296] Moreover, due to "public and political pressure" they were more anxious to make "an immediate attack" on the problem "on the lines of 'war-time' operational research," possibly through national surveys with a statistical basis.[297] In the end the "youth problem" was most immediately addressed through the Albemarle Report later that year, which instigated a radical reform of the Youth Service, based on "common-sense" assumptions rather than empirical research.[298] Anthropologists were not invited to conduct

---

289 MG To Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, November 6th, 1958, RYLANDS.

290 MG to Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, October 5th, 1959, RYLANDS.

291 R. A. Butler, architect of the 1944 Education Act, had as Home Secretary proposed long-term research into delinquency, and the Home Office were now looking into setting up 10-year research units across the country. MG to V-C, December 31st, 1959, RYLANDS.

292 MG to V-C, December 31st, 1959, RYLANDS. Unknown to Gluckman, Watson then proposed to the Home Office that he run such a unit, independently of the University but connected to it.

293 Including David Glass of the LSE. (Gluckman, Karl Mannheim and Richard Titmuss were all invited but did not attend). WW, "Report on Home Office Conference," RYLANDS.

294 C. P. HIll , Home Office, to MG, January 6th, 1960, RYLANDS.

295 WW, "Report on Home Office Conference, RYLANDS. Watson had also previously suggested to the Home Office that research should focus on sociological rather than social problems. WW to Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester, December 23rd, 1959, RYLANDS.

296 MG to Vice-Chancellor, January 20th, 1960, VCA/7/404, RYLANDS.

297 WW, "Home Office Conference on Research into Causes of Delinquency: Summary of Main Points of Discussion," January 1960.

298 Smith, M. K. and Doyle M. E. (2002) 'The Albemarle Report and the development of youth work in England and Wales', *the encyclopedia of informal education*, http://www.infed.org/youthwork/albemarle_report.htm. Richard Hoggart and Pearl Jephcott were on the committee.

delinquency research themselves, although Watson was appointed to the Youth Service Advisory Council,[299] and as an advisor to the Medical Research Council's Social Medicine Research Unit's studies on juvenile delinquency in East London.[300]

The Ethnography of Education

One legacy of Watson's time at Manchester was a keen interest in the education system, which was a major component of his original fieldwork in Scotland, and continued in his work on social mobility. He had noted that it was now Government policy to speed up the expansion of tertiary education in order to create more professionals.[301] Indeed he claimed that the centrality of the education system to British society was such that "the social system can almost be specified in terms of the educational structure alone."[302] From a comparative anthropological perspective, Watson joined a contemporary debate about the new meritocracy, which he saw not a transparent, neutral system for selecting the most able, but a system which generated and enforced a specific liberal ideology,[303] while creating a "a discontinuity of culture" between the children of wage-earners and their parents.

These issues were explored ethnographically in the last major team project on Britain initiated by Gluckman, which implemented the first immersive participant-observer fieldwork in British schools. The first wave of fieldwork took place between 1962 and 1966, and was organized by Gluckman, Worsley, Frankenberg and Pons.[304] Again government support was crucial: the research was funded by the Ministry of Education,[305] and announced by the Minister in Parliament as part of a high-profile new initiative into "educational research."[306]

The first three researchers were Colin Hargreaves, Colin Lacey, and Isabel Lambart, who did fieldwork in three separate schools; a second generation included Lacey's students Colin Bell and Stephen Ball.[307] Their work, which included Lacey's *Hightown Grammar* and Hargreaves' *Social Relations in a Secondary School*,[308] established a strong tradition of ethnographic work in

---

299 WW to MG, June 28th, 1960, RYLANDS.

300 F. Rushton, Medical Research Council, to Vice-Chancellor, August 5th, 1960, RYLANDS.

301 Watson, "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities", 133.

302 Ibid., 152.

303 Ibid., 144, 153. For example, he brought Margaret Mead into an already established conversation about the cultural values implicit in the newly constructed meritocracy, referring to M. Mead, "Our Educational Emphases in Primitive Perspective", *American Journal of Sociology* (1943): 633-639; J. E. Floud, A. H. Halsey and F. M. Martin, *Social Class and Educational Opportunity* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1973); and Glass, *Social Mobility in Britain*.

304 Colin Lacey, *Hightown Grammar: The School As a Social System* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970), xii.

305 Ibid., xi-xiii; cf. MG to the Editors, *Staff Comment*, n.d., c. 1964, MG RAI. The initial stimulus seems to have come from Gluckman and Albert Cherns, with the original research proposal written by Frankenberg and Valdo Pons.Colin Lacey, "Freedom and Constraints in British Education," in *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. Ronald Frankenberg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), 185, footnote 2.

306 Hansard, House of Commons Debates, April 19th 1962, vol 658, cc673-4; a debate on the subject followed. See Hansard, House of Commons Debates, April 19th 1962, vol 658, cc723-51. This money was due both to the perceived dearth of both research into the education system, and as part of an effort to fund research in the new social sciences. The research policy followed the lament of the government's Crowther Report on secondary education of 1959 that "In view of the very large sums of money that are spent on education every year, the expenditure on educational research can only be regarded as pitiable. If there is to be a consistent programme of educational development, almost the first step should be to review the provision for statistics and research." See Hansard, House of Commons Debates, March 21st, 1960, vol 620, c103.

307 On the second generation see Ibid., 184, footnotes 1 and 3; Walford, G. (2007) “Educational ethnography” accessed online at http://www.bera.ac.uk/educational-ethnography/; Stephen J Ball, *Beachside Comprehensive: A Case Study of Secondary Schooling* (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

308 David Hargreaves, *Social Relations in a Secondary School* (London & New York: Routledge & K. Paul; Humanities Press, 1967); Lacey, *Hightown Grammar*; Audrey Lambart, "The Sisterhood," in *The Process of Schooling: A Sociological Reader*, ed. Martyn Hammersley and Peter Woods (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Open University Press, 1976); Audrey Lambart, "Expulsion in Context: A School As a System in Action," in *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. Ronald Frankenberg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982).

British education research, and was highly influential both in departments of Education[309] and on Paul Willis' work at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.[310] They are still regularly discussed in work on educational ethnography and cultural studies,[311] and Lacey's, Hargreaves' and Ball's work has been called "the backbone" of the extensive corpus of ethnographic work on working-class academic failure produced between the mid-1960s and mid-1980s.[312]

The original over-arching research proposal, written by Frankenberg and Valdo Pons, identified a lacuna in the existing work on the British education system.[313] Previous studies had taken a "macroscopic" approach to the central topics of "the relation between education, social class and occupational opportunities, and the processes of selection within the educational system,"[314] and had either analyzed the education system as a whole, or taken a statistical approach to understanding the relationships between variables, such as "the effect of social class ... on educational attainment."[315] The Manchester project would complement this work through "analyses of interaction processes and day-to-day behaviour within given situations."[316] No work of this kind had been done in Britain.[317] Inspired by the success of the factory floor ethnographies, they aimed to "harness some of the skills and techniques developed in intensive studies of communities and small-scale societies, to the study of modern institutions."[318]

The goal was to understand each school as "a dynamic system of social relations through an intensive study of interaction processes and day-to-day behaviour within the school."[319] The emphasis therefore was on long-term study of the everyday through immersive participant-observation, which would be supplemented with "statistical and other techniques of extensive enquiry (tests, questionnaires, essays.)"[320] An initial focus on "everyday behaviour" would lead them "to isolate certain elements in the total situation and to trace these back to the problems ... in the larger society."[321] The seriousness with which they took participant-observation can be seen in Lacey's research agenda.[322] He first spent two months observing the school, making himself familiar to staff and pupils, and observing each of the school's teachers in the classroom.

---

309 See Walford, G. (2007) Educational ethnography. London: TLRP. Online at http://www.bera.ac.uk/educational-ethnography/

310 Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 150-1.

311 Recent examples include John Whelen, *Boys and Their Schooling: The Experience of Becoming Someone Else* (New York: Routledge, 2011), which includes a sustained discussion of the Manchester work, pp. 60ff, as does David Mills, "Anthropology and Education," in *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, ed. Sara Delamont (Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar, 2012), 33-48; Ivor Goodson and Colin J Marsh, *Studying School Subjects* (London; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press, 1996), which makes use of Lacey's ethnographic material, pp. 21ff.; Chris Jenks, *Subculture: The Fragmentation of the Social* (London; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005), which discusses Lacey's particular use of the concept of "subculture" pp. 105ff.; Mike O'Donnell and Sue Sharpe, *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, Ethnicity and Class in Contemporary Britain* (London: Routledge, 2000), which draws on Hargreaves', Lacey's and Ball's respective depictions of the social construction of masculinity; and Susan Hart, *Learning Without Limits* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2004), which draws on Lacey's and Ball's discussions of streaming, pp. 24f.

312 O'Donnell and Sharpe, , *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, Ethnicity and Class in Contemporary Britain,* 40.

313 V. Pons and R. Frankenberg, "Proposal for the sociological study of grammar schools in Manchester," c. 1961-2, RYLANDS. The draft is anonymous but see Lacey, *Hightown Grammar* xvii, footnote 6.

314 V. Pons and R. Frankenberg, "Proposal for the sociological study of grammar schools in Manchester," 1.

315 Ibid., xiii.

316 V. Pons and R. Frankenberg, "Proposal for the sociological study of grammar schools in Manchester," 1.

317 See, e. g., Ibid., xii-xiii.

318 Ibid., xiii., discussing V. Pons and R. Frankenberg, "Proposal for the sociological study of grammar schools in Manchester." Lambart specifically was influenced by Jaap Van Velsen's work in Northern Rhodesia, see Lambart, "Expulsion in Context: A School As a System in Action", 207, footnote 2.

319 Hargreaves, *Social Relations in a Secondary School,* vii.

320 Pons and Frankenberg, 5. Lacey for example used two ongoing "questionnaire studies" (continuing to at least 1970) which gathered information on "value orientations and career aspirations" and "family background, school career and peer group affiliation." Lacey, *Hightown Grammar,* xiv.

321 Pons and Frankenberg, 5.

322 Ibid., xiii-xv. Hargreaves' research agenda was very similar. See Hargreaves, *Social Relations in a Secondary School* ix. See also Ibid., Appendix I. for a detailed discussion of methodological problems arising from participant-observation.

He then became a teacher himself for eighteen months,[323] teaching twelve classes a week and observing other teachers for another twelve classes a week. He also took part in extra-curricular activities, for example coaching a cricket team. He even lived "within 300 yards" of the school.

The ways in which this intensive, long-term study of a single school yielded particular kinds of insight can clearly be seen in Lacey's *Hightown Grammar*. He aimed to generate a "multi-dimensional view" showing the interrelations between various aspects of the school: "its changing function over the last fifty years; its position within the present educational structure; the way in which selection and anticipatory socialisation affect the pupils; the process of sub-culture formation within the student body, and the staff and staff-pupil relationships."[324] However at the core of the book lay a specific problem—the relatively poor performance of working-class pupils in grammar schools—which was answered not only through a total approach, but specifically through a focus on ongoing, everyday processes within the school. Lacey aimed to "explain the disappointing performance of working-class boys in grammar schools since the 1944 Education Act" through the study of "social mechanisms."[325]

Lacey historicized the problem by tracing "the changing function of the Grammar School" in British society.[326] The social meaning of grammar schools, and indeed secondary education generally, had been transformed in the postwar period. In the 1930s the middle classes did not need grammar school certificates. Middle-class families therefore used the grammar school as a "finishing school," rather than as a means to the end of attaining professional status, while for the working-class boys certified academic success was a means to social mobility. Furthermore the boys were formally categorized as either working-class "scholar" or middle-class "fee-paying" pupils, which resulted in a "working-class scholar reference group associated with academic success, and an important middle-class fee-paying contingent associated with anti-school attitudes."[327] The correlation between class and academic success was therefore the opposite of the post-war period.

The postwar period saw two major shifts, which radically transformed the social meaning of the education system, and the grammar schools in particular. The first was a transformation in political economy: "from predominantly locally based, locally owned industry with relatively low levels of technical expertise and small managerial elites to predominantly nationally and internationally based companies, with high degrees of expertise and division of labour, and large, powerful, highly qualified managerial elites."[328] The replacement of local, family owned firms by national professionalized bureaucratic corporations changed the function of the school for the middle class, from a “finishing school” to a professionalizing school. The Grammar's school's primary function now was as a route to higher education. The second shift was the 1944 Education Act, one of the cornerstones of British social democracy, which had established the provision of free education for all children, in a system in which pupils were streamed into Grammar, Secondary Modern or Technical schools, according to assessment of their academic ability at the age of eleven. This transformed the Grammar School to a site of intense internal competition and stratification.[329] Working-class pupils were now at a major disadvantage, for reasons which will be discussed below. This dual shift had dramatically raised the stakes of performing well at Grammar School, while at the same time making it harder for working-class

323 According to the research proposal, Lacey and Lambart both had experience as full-time teachers in secondary schools.
324 Lacey, *Hightown Grammar,* xi.
325 Ibid., xi.
326 Ibid., 49.
327 Ibid., 188.
328 Ibid., 186.
329 Ibid., 188.

children to do so.

While the historical framing highlighted the injustice and contingency of the present, Lacey's main concern was over potential undesirable continuity between the present and the future. The stakes of understanding the reasons for the class disparity were raised by the impending replacement of the tripartite system, with a new system in which all children would attend "Comprehensive" schools.[330] Assessment at age eleven, and streaming into different kinds of schools, was to be abolished. The impending reform of the school system acknowledged that a system designed to create opportunity was itself leading to new forms of social stratification. This new system was supposed to address the inequalities of the present system and replace them with equality of opportunity. Lacey and his colleagues hoped to influence the implementation of the comprehensive system by discussing the real reasons for the failure of the tripartite system, which they felt would not be addressed by the comprehensive system. As Hargreaves put it, "the social system of the school includes many basic social processes which may be independent of, or little affected by, comprehensive reorganization."[331]

To this end Lacey aimed to show how social stratification took place not only through the tripartite system, but through everyday processes of "differentiation" and "polarization" internal to the school. By following one cohort through the school over four years, he was able to trace the "relentless, slow, grinding process" by which working-class boys percolated down the ladder of academic achievement, through the normal operation of the school as a system.

"Differentiation" meant "the separation and ranking of students according to a multiple set of criteria which makes up the normative, academically orientated, value system of the grammar school."[332] In their first year the boys were socially isolated from one another, having been separated from their junior school friends, which resulted in a uniform allegiance to the school's values and culture irrespective of background. But at the end of the first year they were streamed into four classes according to academic ability, for which the pupils were assessed continuously and graded ordinally within their stream. Relative failure was therefore built into the system. Alongside this formal stratification was a constant stream of short-term gratifications, which the school culture provided those boys who conformed to its values and were academically successful. The system was only able to provide a limited amount of such rewards, and was therefore a space of intense competition for prestige. Boys were subject to a constant stream of judgments and awarding of either prestige or negative attention, from peers and more importantly from teachers.[333]

Differentiation produced a vicious downward spiral due to various positive feedback mechanisms. There was a dialectical, mutually reinforcing relationship between academic performance and behavior.[334] Boys succeeding academically behaved in such a way as to support the school culture which was providing them with high status, while boys who were "failing" relatively tended to behave badly in order to reject the school system.[335] Once a negative reputation was assigned to a boy, further judgments were made on that basis, leading to constant criticism and punishment. Everyday, trivial negative judgments accumulated and led to stereotyping. Teachers' subjective judgments about behavior also conditioned their judgment of

---

330 The architect was Harold Wilson's Education Secretary, Anthony Crosland, also the author of Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism* (London: J. Cape, 1956).

331 Hargreaves, *Social Relations in a Secondary School* ix.

332 Lacey, *Hightown Grammar* 57.

333 "[T]eacher behaviour, conditioned by the reputation of the pupil, is one of the central factors producing differentiation." Ibid., 178.

334 Ibid.

335 Ibid., 82.

academic performance, a point which Lacey proved by statistical analysis.[336] Statistical and network analysis showed how boys selected their friends from classmates in their own stream, and friendships between academically successful and academically unsuccessful boys were cut off by streaming.[337]

Boys who deemed themselves to be failing became intensely demoralized—particularly those sorted into lower streams, and the lower half of the highest stream, of which expectations were particularly high. This "streaming reaction"[338] began as psychological trauma, with symptoms including crying, insomnia, bedwetting and even medical problems.[339] However these subjective reactions were soon replaced by the formation of "group attitudes."[340] Those boys who were demoralized and found themselves unable to compete successfully within the school's gratification system turned to an alternative source of gratification in the rejection of school values.[341] As the cohort of students moved through the school system, differentiation led to polarization of the boys into two groups, "pro-school" and "anti-school."[342] The "anti-school group" took compensation for their failure in terms of the school values by creating a new prestige-system, in which they were awarded prestige and short-term gratification by their anti-school peers for the rejection of school values.

Lacey rejected culturalist explanations of the failure of working-class pupils, prevalent among politicians and social scientists alike, which blamed pupils' failure on cultural values inherited from their class background. The idea that working-class culture was somehow inimical to education could take various forms, for example the idea that working-class families did not value education, or that working-class boys were unable to defer gratification.[343] Indeed the overarching research proposal for the Manchester schools research had envisaged focusing on "problems deriving from the contact and conflict within schools in modern society between different 'cultures'": most importantly, "the conflict between middle-class and working-class culture."[344] Peter Willmott of the Institute for Community Studies pointed out in 1966 that there had been virtually no empirical research to test such ideas;[345] Lacey's work was therefore pioneering, and his findings undermined these explanations. He found that working-class parents were generally pro-education, while the boys had all succeeded in being admitted to grammar school from junior school, and in their first year they all exhibited pro-school values. Likewise he showed that far from demanding the deferral of gratification, the school system itself depended on a stream of immediate and short-term gratifications.

Another common culturalist explanation for working-class failure, again marked for investigation in the Manchester research proposal, was that delinquency was caused by the clash "between the adult and adolescent cultures."[346] Again, Lacey found that working-class failure was better explained in terms of social structure and micro-political process internal to the school, rather than a broader set of cultural forms. He did use the word "subculture" with regard

---

336 Ibid., 82ff.
337 Ibid., 78ff., 80-82.
338 Ibid., 66.
339 Ibid., 59.
340 Ibid., 61.
341 Ibid., 192.
342 Ibid., 85.
343 Ibid., 189ff.
344 Pons and Frankenberg, 2.
345 Willmott claimed there had been virtually no research in the US or Britain to test the theory that "the origins of delinquency are to be found in the contrast between the values of a prosperous and democratic society and the lot of the working-class boy within it." Peter Willmott, *Adolescent Boys of East London*, 165-6.
346 Pons and Frankenberg, 2.

to the anti-school group; but this meant an alternative local prestige-system rather than participation in in a broader adolescent or delinquent culture, involving specific cultural forms perceived as rebellious, such as pop music and fashion.[347] Lacey did explore some of the interactions between youth culture and anti-school group. Although broader cultural elements could certainly by appropriated by the anti-school group, and such participation could certainly be a positive factor in gaining a prestigious position within it, they were merely one set of resources to be used to express difference, and neither necessarily adopted nor in any way causal. The only necessary "cultural" element for the anti-school group was simply the inversion of pro-school norms, as with one group of second-year boys who had "become popular for the very reasons they were unpopular in their first year."[348]

None of this was to deny "the established correlations between social class and academic achievement"; rather it was to account for them in terms of "detailed social mechanisms and processes" internal to the school, rather than in terms of a clash between external cultures.[349] It was the internal social organization of school which led to the demoralization of one segment of pupils and the formation of an anti-school subculture.[350]

To a certain extent working-class boys did face cultural disadvantages. They were judged differently by teachers due to cultural attributes such as accent, perceived lack of confidence or inability to converse in a "satisfactory" manner.[351] Teachers were not consciously prejudiced against working-class boys, but lacked sufficient time to deal with problematic behaviour and instead relied on stereotyping.[352] Working-class boys were also more exposed to alternative value-systems outside the school, while middle-class boys were more often isolated from them.[353]

However the major disadvantage for working-class boys lay in the interaction between two small-scale social systems: the family unit, and the school. As we have seen, the school was a system of intense competition for a limited set of rewards, in terms of both academic success and positive reinforcements. Lacey came to see the competitors not as the individual boys, but the family units to which they belonged, which he investigated through interviews, questionnaires, teachers' notes and diaries kept by the boys. Nominally all were equal but they varied greatly in the amount of psychological, social and cultural resources available to them. Generally working-class families could not provide the same emotional, financial and material support as middle-class families (for example, the ability to provide a quiet space for homework.) More significantly, they lacked the necessary "cultural resources," which here meant not a set of values or attitudes, but the cultural background—including their own education level—to be able to interpret and manipulate the position of their child within the school as system.[354]

Lacey recorded a number of cases in which "articulate, ambitious, middle-class parents who were able to manipulate the ideology of the school interceded successfully on their child's behalf."[355] Through a broad range of case studies he showed how "[p]arents' ability to interfere

---

347 HIs use of the term was therefore very different from later cultural studies investigations into subculture, the *locus classicus* of which was Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London; New York: Routledge, 1979). Also unlike cultural studies, Lacey's work made no comment on race or the impact of postcolonial immigration on youth culture.

348 Lacey, *Hightown Grammar,* 63.

349 Ibid., 57.

350 "[T]he erosion [of morale and competitive ability] comes from the competitive process brought about by the organisation of the school, *not* from a lack of differential rewards outside the school." Ibid., 192.

351 See Ibid., 178ff. for examples.

352 Ibid., 181.

353 Ibid., 122, cf. 86.

354 Ibid., 125ff.

355 Ibid., 76.

with this process on their children's behalf is related to their ability to present the problem in terms of the school's ideology, and is linked to social class."[356] For example, in the formal process of academic streaming, marginal cases were subject to a certain amount of negotiation by intervening parents. In a revealing analysis, Lacey showed how, on the basis of so-called "intangibles," academically marginal middle-class pupils were much more likely to be streamed upwards, working-class downwards: of twenty middle-class borderline cases, thirteen were "upgraded," while seven were "downgraded"; of twelve working-class cases, all but one were downgraded.[357] Middle-class parents were able to manipulate the system, while teachers were also liable to assume that middle-class families would be more able to take advantage of a higher stream.

Potential failure cases also required the deployment of family resources for successful intervention. In a series of detailed case studies, Lacey demonstrated the differing reactions of middle-class and working-class families to problems with their children. As we have seen, for various reasons failure was self-perpetuating, and one period of anti-school behavior could lead to a downward spiral. Middle-class families had the resources to intervene and prevent this downward spiral. Working-class families often did not even understand the problem, let alone have the cultural resources to solve it. They lacked the resources to interpret what was happening with their child in the school system, and were instead dependent on the boy's own interpretation of what was happening. This often led to the boy realizing that he was the only source of information and manipulating it in order to stay out of trouble with his parents; in doing so, however he had cut himself off from the possibility of parental help. In such situations, when the inevitable crisis came and parents were confronted with the facts, they would side defensively with their child and blame the school. Therefore they could maintain a "positive orientation to education"[358] in general, while becoming hostile to the specific school and teachers in it.

Concentrating on the local school-family system, therefore enabled Lacey to see working-class failure not in terms of an abstract idea of working-class culture, but rather in the specific processes of interaction between family resources and the system of the school. The cultural problem involved neither working-class attitudes towards education, nor the inability to defer gratification, but the unconscious prejudice of teachers, and the inability of working-class families to interpret and intervene when their children had problems within the school.[359] Meanwhile the ethnographic view of the school brought to light a world of everyday processes and systems which led to stratification. None of these factors would be affected by reform at the level of the tripartite system, as everyday processes within schools would not be affected. Internal streaming, for example, continued to be the norm in comprehensive schools.[360] Taken together, these arguments amounted to a powerful critique of the meritocratic educational settlement, which, as Lacey and his colleagues feared, were exacerbated rather than ameliorated by the transition to the comprehensive system.[361]

---

356 Ibid., 77.
357 Ibid., 182, Table 60.
358 Ibid., 151.
359 Although Lacey himself did not make this link, his work could be seen in the same anthropological tradition as Lupton, showing that behavior attributed to irrationality based in cultural difference, was in fact due to social structure.
360 Tim Brighouse, "Comprehensive Schools Then, Now, and in the Future", *The Caroline Benn, Brian Simon Memorial Lecture* (September 28, 2002). retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2002/sep/28/secondaryschools, October 24th, 2012.
361 Lacey, "Freedom and Constraints in British Education", 178.

Conclusion: The Auto-Anthropological Moment

In 1968 the Marxist theorist Perry Anderson issued a well-known lament regarding the continuing absence of true sociological inquiry in Britain.[362] Sociology in his day continued to exist only in a "withered half-life,"[363] and, despite recent expansion in the universities, remained "largely a poor cousin of 'social work' and 'social administration,' the dispirited descendants of Victorian charity."[364] The state of sociology contrasted with a "brilliant and flourishing" social anthropology,[365] which Anderson claimed was absolutely differentiated from sociology by its subject matter: the former studied only overseas, primitive, small-scale societies, and certainly not Britain itself.[366] Anderson thereby ignored the various postwar attempts to generate a social anthropology of Britain, including the Manchester School's auto-anthropology of the 1950s and 1960s. It was ironically the very lack of sociology in Britain, and the contrasting intellectual and institutional success of social anthropology, which enabled this development. As the young sociologist John Rex put it in 1958, in making a plea for the importation of anthropological methods to a new British sociology: "the best hope for the future lies in a careful and considered application of the anthropologists' techniques to the analysis of the problems of large-scale societies."[367]

As we have seen, this project, which had been advocated by anthropologists and other intellectuals since the 1920s, had begun to be realized in the 1950s, in order to answer the social democratic state's "demands for social knowledge."[368] Still, it was by no means inevitable; nor was the form that it would take pre-determined. Gluckman was uniquely able to establish the study of everyday British life in a broad range of situations, as an integral component of a department of social anthropology. His success was enabled by the "technocratic" ethos at Manchester, but it was also made possible by his unique experience in dealing with government in running a colonial social research center in the 1940s. As in the colonial situation, it was the state which enabled and sustained such social research. In the case of Manchester, the department was established through Clapham funds, while specific participant-observation research projects were funded through grants from various bodies, including the Department of Social and Industrial Research, the Medical Research Council, and the Department of Education. This funding made the anthropology of Britain possible, but also channeled it in particular directions. The specific investigations undertaken came about from the conjunction of anthropological and governmental areas of interest: labor, class and social mobility, and education.[369]

These possibilities took place in a very specific moment in the study of Britain, lasting roughly from the late 1930s to the mid-1960s, and more narrowly from the Clapham Report of 1947 to the Robbins Report of 1963. The latter called for a dramatic expansion of tertiary

---

362 Anderson, "Components of the National Culture", 7.

363 Ibid., 7.

364 Ibid., 8.

365 As one anthropologist-historian has put it, "[o]ne of the advantages of studying small, semi-enclosed, communities was that it allowed a "total" approach to human institutions. The interweaving of levels of action and thought, of the economic, religious, political, legal, and other facets of human existence, laid bare connections which were impossible to perceive in the highly differentiated modern communities from which investigators came. This "total" approach has been stressed by most anthropologists." Alan Macfarlane, "Historical Anthropology", *Cambridge Anthropology* 3, no. 3 (1977).

366 Anderson, "Components of the National Culture", 47.

367 John Rex "Is Sociology Doing Its Job?", Listener Vol LX. No 1535. Aug 28 1958. (pp. 305, 308), 305d. Rex was a South-African born radical who moved to Britain after World War Two and became an eminent sociologist.

368 I take the phrase from *Demands for Social Knowledge: The Role of Research Organisations*.

369 In other words, certain projects were enabled, while others were not. It is perhaps telling that Epstein's and Turner's proposed studies of religion were among the latter.

education, which included the full-scale creation of sociology as an academic discipline. Sociology expanded rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s, absorbing staff trained in many other disciplines.[370] Anthropological techniques became only one set among others for the study of Britain; new methods turned towards a more abstract understanding of the social.[371] Social anthropology, meanwhile, turned away from the study of Britain again. This was probably partly due to funding, as government realized that participant-observation research took too long to be useful, but probably had more to do with institutionalization and discipline-formation, as social anthropology redefined itself against the new sociology.[372] Many social anthropologists who had worked on Britain became sociologists, leaving anthropology once more to the study of the exotic. This tendency was probably exacerbated by the return to primitivism in the 1960s and 1970s which I discussed in the previous chapter: when study of the modern other was excluded from the discipline, the study of modern Britain became even less paradigmatic and harder to justify in disciplinary terms. It was not until the 1980s that a new wave of auto-anthropology came into existence.[373]

The split between social anthropology and the new sociology was exacerbated by its politicization in the late 1960s, as the rise of new left politics brought about the critique of anthropology as an inherently colonial project, while sociology was associated with radical politics and the student movement's challenge to existing power structures.[374] The split is shown in developments at Manchester. The department was first renamed "Social Anthropology and Sociology," and first Worsley (in 1964) and then J. Clyde Mitchell were appointed as Professors of Sociology.[375] But in the latter half of the decade the huge popularity of sociology among undergraduates made the structure unworkable and, in the midst of acrimonious disagreement between Gluckman and Worsley, Sociology was established as a separate department.[376] A joke subsequently emerged concerning the fact that at the top of the staircase to the previously combined department, one now turned left for Sociology, and right for Social Anthropology.[377]

However, anthropological modes of knowledge remained important for the study of Britain, and continued to disseminate outside the discipline. As indicated by the appointments of Worsley and Mitchell at Manchester, in the initial phase of the expansion of academic sociology in the mid-1960s, social anthropology was a major contributor of staff.[378] Many Mancunian anthropologists became professors of sociology at other universities, including Frankenberg (Keele), Watson (Oklahoma), John Barnes (Cambridge) and Max Marwick (Stirling). This transfer of personnel introduced a strong ethnographic dimension to British sociology, establishing an important counter-tradition.[379] This was certainly true at Manchester itself, where there were continuing close links between anthropology and sociology, and much of the research

---

370 J. Spencer, "British Social Anthropology: A Retrospective", *Annual Review of Anthropology* (2000): 1-24.

371 See Savage, *Identities and Social Change* passim, e. g. 163. A similar shift can be discerned in the contemporary discourse regarding homosexuality, see C. Waters, "The Homosexual As a Social Being in Britain, 1945-1968", *Journal of British Studies* 51, no. 3 (2012): 685-710.

372 See for example Savage on Colin Bell, Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 155.

373 See Anthony Cohen, "The Social Anthropology of Britain, and the Question of 'Otherness'", *Anthropology Today* 2, no. 6 (1986): doi:10.2307/3032834.

374 See for example Worsley, *Thin Ice,* Chapter Six.

375 See Ibid., Chapter Six.

376 See Ibid., 152-155.

377 Jean Comaroff, personal communication.

378 See Spencer, "British Social Anthropology: A Retrospective".

379 Savage lists the Manchester School among various sociologists who began "from a critique of the kinds of 'variable centred' [*sic*] social science which came to predominate in the post-war period." His others include the Chicago School, Pierre Bourdieu, Andrew Abbott, Harrison White, Daniel Bertaux and Paul Thompson: Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 15.

conducted by the sociology department had a strong fieldwork basis,[380] as did that under Frankenberg at Keele.[381] When British auto-anthropology re-emerged in the 1980s, Frankenberg in particular was taken as a key forebear.[382]

The intellectual influence of Mancunian auto-anthropology was felt in both sociology and anthropology. To take just two examples, the work of Lupton, Cunnison and their colleagues was a major influence on industrial sociology in Britain and beyond, including Africa, in the work of Bruce Kapferer and Michael Burawoy in post-independence Zambia;[383] while Watson's work on spiralism was influential on both the sociology of social mobility in Britain, and Joan Vincent's work on local politics in Uganda.[384]

The influence of Mancunian auto-anthropology can also be found in more oblique vectors of dissemination. Lupton introduced the ethnographic method into business studies, first at Aston and then as Director of Manchester Business School. Watson made an anthropological component central to the emerging fields of medical sociology and public health. Hargreaves and Lacey's work was a major influence on cultural studies in the work of Paul Willis,[385] and also established the strong ethnographic tradition in British educational research.[386] Many Mancunian auto-anthropologists were also well-received in a more popular, middle-brow sphere. They were major contributors, for example, to the new magazine *New Statesman and Society*, a key conduit for the transmission of social thought to a broader audience.[387] They were also in demand by the media: Frankenberg appeared on radio, the book was serialized in one newspaper and the subject of articles in others, while a television crew was sent to interview the villagers of of Glynceirog about the book.[388] Watson appeared regularly on television, published on spiralism in another magazine, *Twentieth Century,*[389] and his theory of spiralism was taken up by the journalist Anthony Sampson in his best-selling *Anatomy of Britain*.[390]

The auto-anthropological moment involved both the application of categories developed in the colonial situation, and some form of implicit comparison between Britain and the rest of the world. However, the kinds of knowledge-production which were imported varied considerably. The Manchester seminar of the 1950s was the site of a particular contemporary dialogue between

---

380 Worsley, *Thin Ice,* 155.

381 Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 154-9.

382 See Cohen, "Village on the Border, Anthropology at the Crossroads: The Significance of a Classic British Ethnography".

383 Michael Burawoy, personal communication. See Bruce Kapferer, *Strategy and Transaction in An African Factory: African Workers and Indian Management in a Zambian Town* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972); Michael Burawoy, *The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines, From African Advancement to Zambianization* (Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Institute for African Studies, University of Zambia, 1972).

384 For Watson's influence on British social mobility studies see Stephen Edgell, "Spiralists: Their Careers and Family Lives", *The British Journal of Sociology* 21, no. 3 (1970): doi:10.2307/589136.; Geoff Payne, "Typologies of Middle Class Mobility", *Sociology* 7, no. 3 (1973): doi:10.1177/003803857300700306; Joan Vincent, *African Elite: The Big Men of a Small Town* (New York,: Columbia University Press, 1971).

385 Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 150-1. Cultural studies itself has long been conspicuously silent on its debt to British social—as opposed to American cultural—anthropology. See, for example, the new introduction to Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain* (London ; New York: Taylor & Francis, 2012), which represents cultural studies, in opposition to a crude caricature of functionalist social science, in terms strikingly similar to the Manchester School own self-representation. The very title of the volume, regarded as a *locus classicus* of subcultural work at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, and originally published in 1975, very closely echoes Max Gluckman, *Rituals of Rebellion in South-East Africa* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1954).

386 See O'Donnell and Sharpe, *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, Ethnicity and Class in Contemporary Britain,* 40ff.

387 On the signficance of *New Society*, launched in 1962, see Savage, *Identities and Social Change* 112-9; Frankenberg, Worsley, Emmet and Lupton were all contributors.

388 Frankenberg, “A Text Revisited,” 177. Cf. Cohen, "Village on the Border, Anthropology at the Crossroads: The Significance of a Classic British Ethnography", 613.

389 W. Watson, "The Managerial Spiralist," *The Twentieth Century*, cited in Frankenberg, "British Community Studies: Problems of Synthesis".

390 Anthony Sampson, *Anatomy of Britain* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

anthropologists working on Britain and various other parts of the world, including Central Africa, India and Melanesia. Their general insistence on the contemporaneity of their subjects led to the development of techniques which were as applicable to the study of modern Britain as to any other "modern situation." Although this certainly involved the application of modes of knowledge developed elsewhere, Mancunian auto-anthropology was also the latest episode in a longer set of circulations, of both modes of knowledge and personnel, within a specific set of imperial circuits. These circulations, stretching back to the 1920s, generated a very specific version of social anthropology, based ultimately in Gluckman's work in South Africa, which itself deliberately claimed, for political reasons, to be auto-anthropology.

For Anderson, the stakes of the absence of a "classical sociology" lay in the British inability to form a critical notion of social totality.[391] In developing a totalizing social anthropology of exotic, small-scale societies, Britain had, in effect, "exported its totalizations, onto its subject peoples."[392] As we have seen, this posed a crucial problem for auto-anthropology, as core social anthropological techniques had been developed precisely in order to deal with local societies which could be imagined as locally confined, not modern nation-states. The Mancunian solution lay in its specific notion of "the total social situation," which, far from being exported from Britain, was developed in South Africa for South African reasons, in dialogue with both British social anthropology and European social theory. However, the epistemology of the social situation was strongly anti-functionalist, anti-organicist, and anti-culturalist, rejecting the idea of societies as discrete, organic entities. Thus the nation itself could not be conceptualized as an organic or integral cultural whole; nor, *a fortiori*, was the locality understandable as a "microcosm" of the nation. This work therefore cannot be explained in terms of recent work on auto-anthropology, which has presented it either as the search for such a microcosm, or for a specifically English culture as one among many in the world.[393]

This particular version of totality would, however, seem to fulfill the purpose of the concept for Anderson, for whom "the very demarcation of a social totality places it under the sign of contingency."[394] The various forms of situational and processual analysis were ways of achieving an alienated perspective on British everyday life, using techniques developed in the study of colonial subjects, including a combination of participant-observation with social theory and an implicit comparative framework, involving the researcher in a complex dialectic of insinuation and alienation. The result was both critically enabling and technocratic, as this same process which made everyday British life into an appropriate object for anthropological inquiry, simultaneously created a new social scientific gaze, and a new expertise about everyday life. Rather than identifying selected populations as marginal or problematic within British society (as in the work on race at the University of Edinburgh), Mancunian auto-anthropologists were remarkably successful in bringing social scientific inquiry into the most mundane and everyday of British situations, which they perceived as lying at the core of social democracy and late industrial society. As Frankenberg put it, they followed Gluckman in attempting "to emphasize not the exotic custom but the familiar process."[395] The familiar was to be made strange, as opposed to earlier and alternative auto-anthropologies which discovered the exotic amidst the

---

391 Anderson, "Components of the National Culture", 7. The other crucial absence in this regard, in contrast to continental Europe, was an indigenous Marxism.

392 Ibid., 47.

393 Savage, *Identities and Social Change* Chapter Six.; Esty, *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England*.

394 Anderson, "Components of the National Culture", 47. In this regard Anderson drew on Hegel's (mis)quotation of Spinoza: "*Omnia determinatio est negatio.*"

395 Frankenberg, "A Text Revisited," 175.

mundane.[396] Rather than relativizing English or British culture, local situations were shown to participate, in all their concrete specificity, in universal social processes.[397] In this way British society, far from being the *telos* of modernity, was shown to be a set of situations as strange, yet ultimately as understandable, as any other in the contemporary world.

---

396 On the rise of the everyday as a category of twentieth-century social thought, see Ben Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2002). Of the figures discussed by Highmore, this aspect of Mancunian auto-anthropology perhaps comes closest (in some respects) to Simmel's "microscopic" approach, in which "[t]he everyday must be made to reverberate with the interactions, networks and force of social life ... to register vividly the social life from within.": Ibid., 37.

397 Mancunian auto-anthropology was however not concerned with what Savage has suggested was the mode of investigating the everyday through *cultural* strangeness: the discovery of a banal, ordinary national culture. Savage indicates that this project was early advocated by Orwell; he also cites Michael Billig on this kind of project as a component of contemporary nationalism; and links his own analysis to that of David Matless on the cultural work of the English landscape: Savage, *Identities and Social Change,* 148.

Conclusion

In July, 1973, the *Times Literary Supplement* published a special issue on "The State of Anthropology." The lead article, by E. E. Evans-Pritchard, now the patriarch of British anthropology, reviewed "fifty years" of the distinctive social anthropology instigated by Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown.[1] His article was accompanied by others on the past, present and future of the discipline by senior anthropologists from Oxford, Cambridge, UCL and the LSE, including Mary Douglas, Lucy Mair, and Edmund Leach.[2] Leach's article, titled "Ourselves and the Others," cast the history of anthropological thought since the Victorians as a kind of cultural narcissism, by which "[t]he Exotic Oriental or the Noble Savage, as the case may be, was used to demonstrate either the rational superiority or the moral depravity of the heirs of Ancient Greece."[3] Contemporary social anthropology, although "less ethnocentric" than its forebears, was still essentially narcissistic: "[t]he social anthropologist looks at other cultures as in a mirror, the better to understand his own."[4] Even the recent valorization of the "savage mind" at the expense of the modern depended on a dichotomy between "ourselves" and "the others."[5] Through a potted history of the discipline's past failures, he suggested how social anthropology was at last beginning to develop the appropriate techniques by which to "elucidate … 'otherness.'"[6] Anthropologists had come to understand that "the essential problem is one of translation"[7]—translation that is, under the influence of Claude Lévi-Strauss, of the deep structure of another culture's "grammar."[8]

Four weeks later the TLS published a response from Max Gluckman. He took exception to Leach's passing "misrepresentations" of the Manchester School. But more generally he objected to what he saw as the "solipsistic" claims made by Leach, Evans-Pritchard and Needham, and criticized the "developing introspection" which was leading anthropology to the paralyzing conclusion that "one demeans people by trying to understand them."[9] For Gluckman, Leach's question of cultural translation was indeed a "cardinal problem,"[10] but was only one aspect of the work of social anthropology. To make it the basis of all anthropological investigation was radically misguided, and, as Gluckman put it in another paper written that year, not just "restricting in scholarship," but "politically dangerous," because in focusing solely on difference it made impossible another project: to analyze "ourselves" and "the others" as a *single* social system.[11] Referring to the institutional homes of Leach and Needham, he thundered, "[i]t is possible in the cloistered seclusion of King's College, Cambridge (or Merton College, Oxford

---

1 E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "FIfty Years of British Anthropology", *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3722 (1973).

2 Leach had moved to Cambridge from the London School of Economics in 1953 (his undergraduate degree was also at Cambridge); he had been awarded a personal professorship in 1972. "The Provost of King's". Douglas studied with Evans-Pritchard at Oxford, and had been teaching at UCL since 1951, and as Professor of Social Anthropology since 1970. Needham also took his diploma in Social Anthropology at Oxford, and had been a lecturer and fellow there since 1956; he would be awarded the Oxford chair in social anthropology in 1976.

3 Edmund Leach, "Ourselves and the Others", *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3722 (1973).

4 Ibid., 771.

5 Ibid., 771. He was of course referring to the reception of Lévi-Strauss, of whom he was one of the earliest British conduits.

6 Ibid., 771.

7 Ibid., 772.

8 Ibid., 772.

9 Max Gluckman, "The State of Anthropology", *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3724 (1973).

10 Ibid., 905.

11 MG "Anthropology and Apartheid," in *Studies in South African Social Anthropology*, 29.

…) to put the main emphasis on the obstinate differences: it was not possible for 'liberal' South Africans confronted with the policy of segregation within a nation into which 'the others' had been brought, and treated as different—and inferior."[12] The experience of South and Central Africa, and later their progressive politics, had led Gluckman and his colleagues at Manchester to pursue an anthropological project which emphasized dynamic interaction, rather than the analysis of cultural difference.

However, despite Gluckman's objections, by 1973 it was becoming increasingly plausible to represent the domain of anthropology precisely as the concern with "otherness." The dominance of Oxbridge structuralisms in the *TLS* shows that anthropology had increasingly become defined in these terms, both in the public eye and as an academic discipline. It was also in 1973 that Talal Asad's *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* was published. While the volume in fact contained several nuanced and complex analyses of particular colonial situations, the effect of the postcolonial critique taken as a whole was to cast anthropology as the "handmaiden" of colonialism, constructing a primitive "other" to Western modernity, and unable to conceive of the other as in interaction with the West. The shift to a new form of understanding the non-West was claimed to belong to a new, postcolonial generation. As the evidence given by the anthropologists themselves in the *TLS* reveals, to a large extent this critique was justified, in as much as it applied to the anthropology of the 1960s. However the critique then conflated the recent past (the 1960s) with the hazier 1930s, and created a simple narrative of ethical progress culminating in the work of Asad's own generation. This narrative is still often uncritically repeated as the basic narrative of the development of sociocultural anthropology in the twentieth century.[13]

Against this story, I have argued that a concern with contemporary global interactions was a constitutive element of social anthropology from the beginning. The 1930s was a time of experimentation, of methodological innovation, and of a high level of self-awareness about the political frameworks within which anthropological knowledge was produced. Social anthropology was a broad church, involving a wide range of goals, projects and methods. These included both an emphasis on cultural difference, in the interests of a comparative science of society, and a genuine interest in the interactions between Western and non-Western subjects within a new global sphere. The latter project flourished further in the 1950s, yet became politically impossible in the era of impending decolonization, and by the 1960s had been sufficiently marginalized within the discipline as to become invisible, so that it could be reinvented by a new generation.

Several factors pushed anthropologists to focus on contemporary interactions rather than difference. The course of social research was partly driven by the demands of the organizations which funded it: governments, philanthropic institutes, and capital—for example the mining corporations of the Rhodesian Copperbelt. Their concerns lay in problems of governance, the articulation of social problems (such as "detribalization"), and the efficient management of labor. However, these questions were not pursued solely as technocratic exercises, as they were taken up by anthropologists whose politics led them to critique the colonial situation itself: at first, liberal South African anthropologists, concerned with the unique political space of the interwar South African polity; later, left-wing researchers, socially and politically marginal to the Oxbridge and London establishment, who came to Manchester specifically to work on such

12 MG "Anthropology and Apartheid," in *Studies in South African Social Anthropology*, 29.

13 For a recent example see Paul Rabinow and George Marcus, *Designs for An Anthropology of the Contemporary* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

problems.

These motivations worked with, rather than against, the radically new methods of social anthropology: long-term immersive participant-observation, and totalistic analysis of a delimited social field. These new methods defined the discipline—initially against earlier "conjectural history" and armchair analysis, and later against other new academic disciplines, in particular sociology. They also made a particular approach to the contemporary possible, and indeed necessary. Participant-observation was a radically empirical method of research, as the personal experience of the fieldworker was to be transformed into data for social analysis. This made it harder to ignore what was actually happening in the present, in contrast to Victorian "armchair anthropology," which parsed out certain aspects of social reality from accounts received from missionaries, settler and officials. Immersion also made anthropologists sympathetic to the contemporary problems of their subjects, while the long-term nature of the research attuned anthropologists to the processual interactions of which social structure was composed. Structural-functional analysis, which aimed to understand specific elements or institutions of a culture as part of a whole—could not easily ignore any aspect of the research field, including those aspects which were contemporary: missionary, settlers and officials were now to become part of the analysis. This was enhanced by the emphasis on qualitative rather than abstract, quantitative, statistical analysis—although the latter was often used in order to supplement qualitative analysis and inscription, it was always a supplement and no more.

To be sure, there were many aspects of the new set of research practices as articulated by its founding figures which also pushed towards the study of difference. Indeed certain aspects—such as totalistic analysis—could push in either direction. But the two poles of a comparative science of society, and the study of contact and interaction between social structures, were ideal types rather than distinct projects. They were intertwined and developed dialectically. This dialectic emerged through the physical movement of anthropologists, who circulated through interconnected academic networks and fields of study. In Gluckman's case, South African political motivations were thus brought to bear on a synthesis of Malinowski's culture contact project and the structural and political anthropology at Oxford, in order to create a new set of methods for the analysis of the modern social. Gluckman rejected the organic analogy, which involved understanding societies or cultures as discrete, functioning units. Instead the analysis of the totality of social forces acting in a given situation, through the understanding of cross-cutting lines of conflict, allowed the finely-grained texture of the local, concrete situation to be understood in terms of its dialectical interrelations with regional, national and even global forces and structures. This analysis of the relationship between local and extra-local was combined with diachronic analysis, both historical and processual, while social structure was understood as micropolitics; in fact culture itself was political.

These attributes were further developed in the exchange between anthropologists working on Central Africa, India, Melanesia and the Middle East, at Gluckman's seminar in Manchester in the 1950s. Through this work certain kinds of subjects, certain figures, came into view: Africans, Indian villagers, and Melanesian cargo cultists as modern political and economic agents, situated in local social fields, which were cut across by forces generated in national and global political economic forces, and world historical change. A further exchange took place as the Manchester School developed a social anthropology of Britain, a project enabled by the fact that Mancunian methods had been designed for the study of the contemporary, and could therefore be imported from the colonial situation. The idea of auto-anthropology was nascent in Gluckman's work on South Africa as a single social field. The Mancunian anthropology of

Britain then involved a complex dialectic of sameness and otherness, as it brought an ethnographic sensibility and the methods of social anthropology to the postwar British social sciences. Gluckman oversaw a range of studies on British urban and industrial situations, such as factory floors and secondary schools. This led to highly influential, if now somewhat forgotten, work on the nature of post-industrial community, new constellations of class and social mobility, and a critique of the meritocratic education system produced by social democracy.

These new approaches—both the core methods and the Mancunian innovations—enabled the development of a unique anthropological approach to modernity, quite distinct from both classical sociology and contemporary modernization theory. The modern and primitive were not opposed as binary others but shown to be dialectically interrelated: for example, in the perception that both race and tradition were modern inventions. Mancunian anthropology of modernity differed from modernization theory in two major respects. First, a history based in the unfolding of social conflicts under specific political circumstances replaced modernization theory's teleological meta-narrative of progression through stages of development. Second, the colonial situation could not be simply analogical to earlier stages of European development, as attention was paid to the combination of cultural difference and political inequality characteristic of colonial capitalism. Comparison showed that the Rhodesian Copperbelt was radically different to industrial cities in nineteenth-century Britain.

This work was highly influential throughout the social sciences in the 1950s. Its influence was broad both inside and outside anthropology, in Europe, in Africa and in the USA.[14] The Manchester School was acknowledged as pioneering an anthropology of modernity in the 1950s and 1960s—even, occasionally, by those arguing for a new, postcolonial anthropology.[15] According to Joan Vincent, it was Manchester which demonstrated "that rigorous anthropological research could be carried out in modern, rapidly changing complex societies across the globe."[16] After the hiatus of decolonization, Manchester-trained anthropologists, including Abner Cohen, Bruce Kapferer, and Jean and John Comaroff, once again took up this challenge, while Gluckman established social anthropology in Israel through the so-called Bernstein project, again focusing on contemporary issues such as migration.[17] Mancunian methodological and conceptual innovations for the study of the social were highly influential in the development of a political dimension to anthropology, and an anthropological dimension to the study of politics, in the US as well as the British world.[18] Their impact also stretched well beyond anthropology, into other disciplines including history,[19] philosophy,[20] sociology[21] and

---

14 Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends* 283. In 2000, João de Pina-Cabral referred to it as "at the root" of many of "the methodological practices that have guided us for so long." Pina-Cabral, "The Ethnographic Present Revisited", 341. On the influence in anthropology in general, see Maurice Bloch, *Marxism and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship* (Psychology Press, 2004), 143-4; Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture* (New York: Crowell, 1968), 554-560.

15 Kathleen Gough, "New Proposals for Anthropologists", *Current Anthropology* 9, no. 5 (1968): 403-435.

16 Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends,* 340.

17 See Shlomo Deshen, *Immigrant Voters in Israel: Parties and Congregations in a Local Election Campaign* (Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1970); Emanuel Marx, *A Composite Portrait of Israel* (London: Academic Press, 1980); *Perspectives on Israeli Anthropology*, ed. Esther Hertzog, Orit Abuhav, Harvey Goldberg and Emanuel Marx (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2010); Moshe Shokeid, "Max Gluckman and the Making of Israeli Anthropology", *Ethnos* 69, no. 3 (2006): doi:10.1080/0014184042000260035.

18 Vincent, *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends* 337ff. Several conveyed this influence through emigration to the US—including most famously Victor Turner but also F. G. Bailey and Bill Watson.

19 Most obviously the historiography of Central Africa, but also in a more general and extensive influence on social and cultural history. See for example Suzanne Desan, "Crowds, Community and Ritual in the Work of E. P. Thompson and Natalie Davis," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).; Eric Hobsbawm and David Kertzer, "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today", *Anthropology Today* 8, no. 1 (1992): 3-8; Keith Thomas, "History and Anthropology", *Past & Present* , no. 24 (1963): 3-24.

political science.[22] Their anthropological studies of power, from the micro-politics of social process to the analysis of local situations in terms of regional, national and global political economies, have had a particularly broad impact.[23] Perhaps their most important contribution lies in their reception by theorists and ethnographers of global modernity, influencing and offering conceptual and substantive material for figures such as S. M. Eisenstadt,[24] Immanuel Wallerstein,[25] Michael Burawoy,[26] George Balandier[27] and Eric Wolf.[28]

However, the very methods which enabled their insights also made Manchester anthropologists vulnerable to political intervention. Tracing their circulations, and the ways these circulations were blocked by the circulation of information about them, shows how vulnerable this kind of research was. Participant-observation required the ability to travel, the co-operation and goodwill of local authorities, and the trust of subjects. It made anthropologists suspect, as they crossed racial lines and associated closely with local political leaders. The particular politics of the anthropologists engaged in this kind of work only added to their problems. Their project was suppressed under the combined conditions of impending decolonization and an increasingly paranoid Cold War geopolitics. While governments and corporations had initially encouraged and sponsored anthropological research into urban and industrial situations, that which had been initially encouraged came to be feared, while the fact that anthropology was now funded by government subjected anthropologists to security screening introduced originally to catch spies. This persecution was not directed by any one agency, nor indeed was the shaping of the human sciences a deliberate political goal. Rather, it emerged from the interactions of two late imperial networks: that of the interconnected institutions and field-sites of the anthropologists, and that of a new imperial security apparatus. The latter was a sprawling emergent bureaucracy which connected MI5, the Colonial Office, local police Special Branches, private corporations, immigration officials, Colonial Governors, Colonial Secretaries and Prime Ministers from the West Indies to Central Africa to Australia. This apparatus became increasingly concerned about the potential course of impending decolonization, and trade unions in particular became forbidden territory for social research.

This material leads to a reassessment of the relationship between colonialism and anthropology. Certainly there were conceptual limits to the work of these anthropologists, particularly in their failure to pursue the anthropology of colonial officials and corporations. But while the Manchester anthropologists who managed to work on urban situations may have been more liberal than radical, and incapable of challenging the system *per se*—to the disappointment

---

20 *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis: A Collection*, ed. Dorothy Emmet and Alasdair MacIntyre (Macmillan, 1970).

21 See Chapter Four.

22 Meyer Aronoff and Jan Kubik, *Anthropology & Political Science: A Convergent Approach* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012).

23 See *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory, and Critique*, ed. Joan Vincent (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 30-33. for a discussion of the influence of Gluckman's, Turner's and Bailey's work on political anthropology and global ethnography.

24 E. g. S. N. Eisenstadt, *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities* (Leiden; Boston: BRILL, 2003).

25 Wallerstein, ed., *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*.

26 Michael Burawoy, *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

27 Sally Falk Moore, *Anthropology and Africa: Changing Perspectives on a Changing Scene* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994), 101; T. O. Beidelman, *The Culture of Colonialism: The Cultural Subjection of Ukaguru* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 7. Balandier was an enthusiastic conduit of RLI work to French anthropology: See MG to Henry Fosbrooke, November 4th, 1957 and December 18th, 1957, MG RAI. Early in his career, Balandier's compatriot Pierre Bourdieu acknowledged an affinity, if not direct influence: Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 202, footnote 37.

28 Eric Wolf, "Distinguished Lecture: Facing Power—--old Insights, New Questions", *American Anthropologist* 92, no. 3 (1990): 586-596.

of later critics and commentators[29]—if they had done so their work would not exist at all. More politically radical anthropologists were driven from the field and indeed from anthropology. Tracing their lives, careers, and works shows the limits of what could be said. Ultimately, participant-observer fieldwork could not be combined with radical critique of the late colonial situation.

This dissertation has charted the ways in which the non-West came to be thought of as part of the modern world in the late British Empire, how that project became politically unfeasible during decolonization, and how colonial social anthropology was brought to bear on Britain itself in the 1950s. In the late colonial era social anthropologists began to combine participant-observer fieldwork, and totalistic analysis of a locality, with the understanding of the world's cultures in interaction with each other, rather than in terms of their comparative difference. This colonial anthropology of modernity emerged within a complex matrix of institutional geographies. The branch of that project instigated by Max Gluckman involved circulations not only between metropole and colony, but crucially within the specific regional situation found in South Africa. Through these circulations Gluckman was led to develop new tools for the understanding of the social as globally modern, which were further developed by his colleagues at Manchester, and which became highly influential on new understandings of a global modernity. These tools were imported from the colonial situation to bring a vibrant and productive anthropological dimension to the study of British society in the 1950s: a project which was instigated, funded, and shaped by the demands of social democracy and the construction of a welfare state. However the participant-observation of late colonial modernity, and in particular the processes of decolonization, became impossible under the demands of an emergent security apparatus. Social anthropology's methods were not intrinsically primitivist, but they were dependent on the circulation of anthropologists and their ability to live in fieldsites for extended periods of time, forging intimate links with their subjects. This made the anthropology of modernity both unacceptable and highly vulnerable in the era of decolonization, and allowed the discipline's subject matter to be conditioned by political coercion. Thus we can see the complex ways in which a variety of political circumstances shaped, constrained and channeled the understanding of global modernities at the end of the British Empire.

29 See James Ferguson, *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

Bibliography

Abella, Alex. *Soldiers of Reason: The Rand Corporation and the Rise of the American Empire.* Orlando: Harcourt, Inc., 2008.

Amadae, S M. *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Amis, Kingsley. *Lucky Jim.* New York: Viking Press, 1958.

Anderson, Perry. "Components of the National Culture." *New Left Review* I, no. 50 (1968): 4-57.

Andrew, Christopher M. *Defend the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5.* New York, 2009.

Anker, Peder. *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945.* Harvard University Press, 2001.

Anonymous. *Neighbourhood and Community: An Enquiry Into Social Relationships on Housing Estates in Liverpool and Sheffield.* Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1954.

Aronoff, Meyer, and Jan Kubik. *Anthropology & Political Science: A Convergent Approach.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Asad, Talal, ed. *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities Press, 1973.

Ashforth, Adam. *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-century South Africa.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Bailkin, Jordanna. *The Afterlife of Empire.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

Ball, Stephen J. *Beachside Comprehensive: A Case Study of Secondary Schooling.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Banaji, Jairus. "The Crisis of British Anthropology." *New Left Review* I, no. 64 (1970): 71-85.

Banton, Michael. "Review of 'Politics in An Urban African Community' by A. L. Epstein." *Man* 59 (1959): 33-4.

Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the World Wars.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____., ed. *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Barnes, J A. "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish." *Human Relations* 7 (1954): 39-58.

———. *Humping My Drum.* Print-on-demand, 2007.

———. "Politics, Permits, and Professional Interests: The Rose Case." *The Australian Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (1969): 17-31.

Beidelman, T. O. *The Culture of Colonialism: The Cultural Subjection of Ukaguru.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Bell, Colin, and Howard Newby. *Community Studies; An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Bennett, Brett M, and Joseph Morgan Hodge, eds. *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science Across the British Empire, 1800-1970.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Birch, Anthony Harold. *Small-town Politics: A Study of Political Life in Glossop.* London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Blake, George. *The Shipbuilders.* London: Faber & Faber, 1935.

Bloch, Maurice. *Marxism and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship.* Psychology Press,

2004.
Bott, Elizabeth. *Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families.* London: Tavistock Publications, 1957.
Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
Braine, John. *Room at the Top.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957.
Brighouse, Tim. *The Caroline Benn, Brian Simon Memorial Lecture.* September 9, 2002.
Brown, Alfred Reginald Radcliffe. *The Andaman Islanders.* Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1922.
Brown, Richard. "Anthropology and Colonial Rule: Godfrey Wilson and the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute." In *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter.* Edited by Talal Asad. New York: Humanities Press, 1973.
———. "Passages in the Life of a White Anthropologist: Max Gluckman in Northerm Rhodesia." *The Journal of African History* 20, no. 4 (1979): doi:10.2307/181776.
Bulmer, Martin, ed. E*ssays on the History of British Sociological Research.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
Burawoy, Michael. "The Anthropology of Industrial Work." *Annual Review of Anthropology* (1979): 231-266.
_____. *The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines, From African Advancement to Zambianization.* Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Institute for African Studies, University of Zambia, 1972.
———. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
Burrow, J W. *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
Burton, John W. "Shadows at Twilight: A Note on History and the Ethnographic Present." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 132, no. 4 (1988): 420-433.
Callaghan, John T. *Cold War, Crisis and Conflict : The History of the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1951-68.* London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2003.
Carstens, P. "Agnes Winifred Hoernle (1885-1960): The Mother of Social Anthropology in South Africa." *Anthropology Today* 1, no. 6 (1985): 17-18.
Clapham, J. *Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research (the Clapham Report).* London: House of Commons Official Reports, 1947.
Clifford, James and George Marcus, eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
Cocks, Paul. "The King and I: Bronislaw Malinowski, King Sobhuza II of Swaziland and the Vision of Culture Change in Africa." *History of the Human Sciences* 13, no. 4 (2000): doi:10.1177/09526950022120854.
———. "Max Gluckman and the Critique of Segregation in South African Anthropology, 1921-1940." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27, no. 4 (2001): doi:10.2307/823411.
Cohen, Anthony P. "The Social Anthropology of Britain, and the Question of 'Otherness'." *Anthropology Today* 2, no. 6 (1986): doi:10.2307/3032834.
———. "Village on the Border, Anthropology at the Crossroads: The Significance of a Classic British Ethnography." *The Sociological Review* 53, no. 4 (2005): doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00586.x.
Cohen, William B. *The French Encounter with Africans: White Response to Blacks 1530-1880.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996.
Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: A History of Popular Religious and Social Movements in Europe From the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Century.* London: Secker & Warburg, 1957.
Cole, Jennifer, and Lynn M Thomas. *Love in Africa.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
Comaroff, Jean, John L Comaroff, and Isaac Schapera. "On the Founding Fathers, Fieldwork and Functionalism: A Conversation with Isaac Schapera." *American Ethnologist* 15, no. 3 (1988): doi:10.2307/645758.
Cooper, Frederick. *Decolonization and African Society: The Labor Question in French and British Africa.* Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
———. "Development, Modernization, and the Social Sciences in the Era of Decolonization: The Examples of British and French Africa." *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines* , no. 1 (2004): 9-38.
Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1997.
Crawford, Elisabeth T, and Norman Perry. *Demands for Social Knowledge: The Role of Research Organisations.* London; Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, 1976.
Crompton, Rosemary. *Class and Stratification: An Introduction to Current Debates.* Cambridge, UK; Cambridge, MA, USA: Polity Press, 1993.
Crosland, Anthony. *The Future of Socialism.* London: J. Cape, 1956.
Crowley, F. K. *Modern Australia in Documents, Volume 2: 1939-1970.* Melbourne: Wren, 1973.
Cunnison, Sheila. "The Manchester Factory Studies." In *Custom and Conflict in British Society.* Edited by Ronald Frankenberg. Distributed in the USA by Humanities Press, 1982.
———. *Wages and Work Allocation: A Study of Social Relations in a Garment Workshop.* Tavistock Publications, 1966.
Darwin, John. *The End of the British Empire: The Historical Debate.* B. Blackwell, 1991.
"Death Notices." *Anthropology News* 35, no. 6 (1994): 70-73.
Davies, Elwyn and Alwyn Rees, eds. *Welsh Rural Communities.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1960.
Dennis, Norman, Fernando Henriques, and Clifford Slaughter. *Coal Is Our Life: An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community.* New York,: Tavistock Publications, 1969.
Desan, Suzanne. "Crowds, Community and Ritual in the Work of E. P. Thompson and Natalie Davis." In *The New Cultural History.* Edited by Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
Deshen, Shlomo A. *Immigrant Voters in Israel: Parties and Congregations in a Local Election Campaign.* Manchester: Manchester U.P., 1970.
Deutsh, Jan-Georg, Peter Probst and Heike Schmidt, eds. *African Modernities.* Oxford: James Currey, 2002.
Devons, Ely. *Planning in Practice: Essays in Aircraft Planning in Wartime.* University Press, 1950.
Dirks, Nicholas B. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Douglas, Mary. *Edward Evans-Pritchard.* Penguin Books, 1981.
———. "Review of 'Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy' by William Watson." *Man* 59

(1959): doi:10.2307/2796779.
Dubow, Saul. *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
Dworkin, Dennis L. *Class Struggles.* History: concepts, theories and practice. Pearson, 2007.
———. *Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left, and the Origins of Cultural Studies.* Post-contemporary interventions. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
Edgell, Stephen. "Spiralists: Their Careers and Family Lives." *The British Journal of Sociology* 21, no. 3 (1970): doi:10.2307/589136.
Edgerton, David. *Warfare State: Britain, 1920-1970.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Eisenstadt, S N. *Comparative Civilizations and Multiple Modernities.* Leiden; Boston: BRILL, 2003.
Elkin, A. P. "Review of 'The Trumpet Shall Sound' by Peter Worsley." *Oceania* 28, no. 3 (1958): 242-244.
Emmet, Dorothy and Alasdair MacIntyre, eds. *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis: A Collection.* Macmillan, 1970.
Emmett, Isabel, and D H J Moran. "Max Gluckman and the Manchester Shop-floor Ethnographies." In *Custom and Conflict in British Society.* Edited by Ronald Frankenberg. Distributed in the USA by Humanities Press, 1982.
Epstein, A. L. *Politics in An Urban African Community.* New York,, 1958.
———. *Scenes From African Urban Life: Collected Copperbelt Papers.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
Esty, Jed. *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004.
Evans-Pritchard, E. E.. "FIfty Years of British Anthropology." *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3722 (1973).
Evans-Pritchard, E E. "The Intellectualist (English) Interpretation of Magic." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* I, no. 2 (1933): 1-21.
———. "Lévy-Bruhl's Theory of Primitive Mentality." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* II, no. 2 (1934): 1-26.
———. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People.* New York : Oxford University Press,, 1940.
———. *Nuer Religion.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
———. "Science and Sentiment: An Exposition and Criticism of the Writings of Pareto." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, University of Egypt* III, no. 2 (1936): 163-192.
———. *Social Anthropology and Other Essays: Combining Social Anthropology and Essays in Social Anthropology.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
———. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937.
Evans-Pritchard, E E, and Eva Gillies. *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic Among the Azande.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
Evens, T M S, and Don Handelman. *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.
Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
———. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Fallers, Lloyd A. "Review: [untitled]:New Series." *American Anthropologist* 61, no. 6 (1959): 1122.
Federici, Silvia. *Enduring Western Civilization: The Construction of the Concept of Western Civilization and Its "Others".* Westport: Praeger, 1995.
Ferguson, James. "The Country and the City on the Copperbelt." *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1992): 80-92.
———. *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
Firth, Raymond. *Man and Culture; An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski.* London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1957.
———. *Two Studies of Kinship in London.* London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956.
Firth, Raymond, Jane Hubert, and Anthony Forge. *Families and Their Relatives; Kinship in a Middle-class Sector of London: An Anthropological Study.* New York: Humanities Press, 1970.
Floud, J E, A H Halsey, and F M Martin. *Social Class and Educational Opportunity.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1973.
Fortes, Meyer. "Culture Contact As a Dynamic Process." In *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa.* London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
———. *The Dynamics of Clanship Among the Tallensi, Being the First Part of An Analysis of the Social Structure of a Trans-Volta Tribe,.* London; New York: Pub. for the International African Institute by the Oxford University Press, 1945.
———. "Gluckman, (Herman) Max (1911-1975)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National BIography.* Oxford: OUP, 2004.
———. *The Plural Society in Africa.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1970.
———. *The Web of Kinship Among the Tallensi; The Second Part of An Analysis of the Social Structure of a Trans-Volta Tribe.* London, New York: Pub. for the International African Institute by OUP, 1949.
Fortes, Meyer, ed. *Social Structure: Studies Presented to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown.* Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1949.
Fortes, Meyer, and E E Evans-Pritchard, eds. *African Political Systems.* London,, 1940.
Frankenberg, Ronald. *Communities in Britain.* Harmondsworth,: Penguin, 1966.
———. *Communities in Britain.* Penguin Books, 1966.
———. *Interview with Ronald Frankenberg.*
———. *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies.* British Community Studies: Problems of Synthesis, edited by Michael Banton. London: Tavistock Publications, 1966.
———. *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community.* London,: Cohen & West, 1957.
———. *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community.* New ed. Waveland Press, 1990.
Frankenberg, Ronald, ed. C*ustom and Conflict in British Society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.
Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough.* London: Macmillan, 1890.
Frazier, Edward Franklin. *The Negro Family in the United States.* The University of Chicago Press, 1939.
Gailey, Christine, ed. *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond.*

Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992.
Geertz, Clifford. "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight." *Daedalus* 101, no. 1 (1972): 1-37.
Gershenhorn, Jerry. *Melville J. Herskovits: And the Racial Politics of Knowledge.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.
Gillon, Philip. *Jewish Women: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia.*
Gilman, Nils. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America.* New studies in American intellectual and cultural history. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
Glass, D V. *Social Mobility in Britain.* London: Routledge & Paul, 1954.
Gluckman, Max. "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand." *Bantu Studies* 14, no. 1 & 2 (1940): 1-30; 147-174.
———. *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand.* Manchester: Published on behalf of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute by the Manchester University Press, 1958.
———. *An Analysis of the Sociological Theories of Bronislaw Malinowski.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.
———. "Anthropology and Apartheid: The Work of South African Anthropologists." In *Studies in African Social Anthropology.* Edited by Meyer Fortes and Sheila Patterson. London; New York: Academic Press, 1975.
Gluckman, Max. "Book Review." *Manchester Guardian*, January 1, 1957.
———. *Custom and Conflict in Africa.* Oxford,: Blackwell, 1955.
———. "Football Players and the Crowd." *The Listener*, 2 February 1959.
———. "How Foreign Are You?" *The Listener*, 1 January 1959.
———. "Introduction." In *The Allocation of Responsibility.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972.
———. "The Magic of Despair." *The Listener* LI, no. 1313 :724-5, 737.
———. "Malinowski's Contribution to Social Anthropology." *African Studies* 6, no. 1 (1947): 41-46.
———. "Malinowski's 'functional' Analysis of Social Change." *Africa* (1947): 103-121.
———. *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa: Collected Essays with An Autobiographical Introduction.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
———. "Review of Bantu Bureacracy." *The Listener*, 1957.
———. *Rituals of Rebellion in South-east Africa.* The Frazer lecture,. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1954.
———. "Some Processes of Social Change, Illustrated with Zululand Data." *African Studies* 1, no. 4 (1942): 243-260.
———. "The State of Anthropology." *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3724 (1973).
———. "The Tribal Area in South and Central Africa." In *Pluralism in Africa.* Edited by Leo Kuper and M G Smith. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
Gluckman, Max and Ely Devons, eds. *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naivety in Social Anthropology.* Aldine Transaction, 2007.
Gluckman, Max, and Cyril Daryll Forde, eds. *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations.* Manchester University Press, 1963.
Gluckman, Max, and Isaac Schapera. "Dr. Winifred Hoernlé: An Appreciation." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 30, no. 3 (1960): 262-263. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1158309.

Goddard, David. "Limits of British Anthropology." *New Left Review* I, no. 64 (1969): 79-89.
Golan, Daphna. *Inventing Shaka: Using History in the Construction of Zulu Nationalism.* Boulder: L. Rienner, 1994.
Goldthorpe, John H, David Lockwood, Jennifer Platt, and Frank Bechhofer. *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
Goodman, Giora. "The British Government and the Challenge of McCarthyism in the Early Cold War." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 12, no. 1 (2010): 62-97.
Goodson, Ivor, and Colin J Marsh. *Studying School Subjects.* London; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press, 1996.
Goody, Jack. *The Expansive Moment: The Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918-1970.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Gordon, Robert. "Apartheid's Anthropologists: The Genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology." *American Ethnologist* 15, no. 3 (1988): 535-553.
———. "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa." *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 15-48.
———. "Remembering Agnes Winifred Hoernlé." *Social Dynamics* 13, no. 1 (1987): 68-72.
———. "Serving the Volk with Volkekunde - on the Rise of South African Anthropology." In *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines.* Edited by J Jansen. Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 1991.
Gough, Kathleen. "New Proposals for Anthropologists." *Current Anthropology* 9, no. 5 (1968): 403-435.
Grafton, Anthony, Nancy Siraisi, and April Shelford. *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery.* Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992.
Gray, Geoffrey. "(This Often) Sympathetic Collaboration: Anthropologists, Academic Freedom and Government, 1927-1952." *Humanities Research* , no. 2 (1998): 37-61.
Grob-Fitzgibbon, Benjamin John. *Imperial Endgame: Britain's Dirty Wars and the End of Empire.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
Gruen, Erich S. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011.
Gunn, Simon and James Vernon, eds. *The Peculiarities of Liberal Modernity in Imperial Britain.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
Gussman, Boris W. *African Life in An Urban Area: A Study of the African Population of Bulawayo.* Bulawayo: Federation Office, 1953.
Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
Hall, Ian. *Dilemmas of Decline: British Intellectuals and World Politics, 1945-1975.* 2012.
Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson. *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain.* Second, revised ed. London ; New York: Taylor & Francis, 2012.
Hammond-Tooke, W. D. *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1997.
Hannerz, Ulf. *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward An Urban Anthropology.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
Hargreaves, David H. *Social Relations in a Secondary School.* London & New York: Routledge & K. Paul; Humanities Press, 1967.
Harris, Marvin. "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction." *Annual Review of*

Anthropology 5 (1976): 329-350.
———. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture.* New York: Crowell, 1968.
Harris, Rosemary. *Prejudice and Tolerance in Ulster: A Study of Neighbours and "strangers" in a Border Community.* [Manchester, Totowa: Manchester University Press, Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
Hart, Susan. *Learning Without Limits.* Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2004.
Hasluck, Paul. *Australia's Task in Papua and New Guinea.* Hobart, 1956.
Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style.* London; New York: Routledge, 1979.
Hechter, Michael. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
Hellmann, Ellen. "Native Life in a Johannesburg Slum Yard." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 8, no. 1 (1935): doi:10.2307/3180398.
———. *Rooiyard: A Sociological Survey of An Urban Native Slum Yard.* Cape Town: Oxford Univerity Press, for Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia, 1948.
Henriques, Fernando. *Family and Colour in Jamaica.* London,: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1953.
Herskovits, Melville J. *The Myth of the Negro Past.* London,: Harper & brothers, 1941.
Hertzog, Esther, Orit Abuhav, Harvey Goldberg and Emanuel Marx, eds. *Perspectives on Israeli Anthropology.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2010.
Highmore, Ben. *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory: An Introduction.* London: Routledge, 2002.
Hobsbawm, Eric. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
Hobsbawm, Eric J, and David J Kertzer. "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today." *Anthropology Today* 8, no. 1 (1992): 3-8.
Hodge, Joseph M. "British Colonial Expertise, Post-colonial Careering and the Early History of International Development." *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 24-46.
Hodge, Joseph Morgan. *Triumph of the Expert: Agrarian Doctrines of Development and the Legacies of British Colonialism.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 2007.
Hoernlé, A Winifred. "New Aims and Methods in Social Anthropology." *South African Journal of Science* 30 (1933): 74-92.
Hoernlé, Winifred, and Peter Carstens. *The Social Organization of the Nama and Other Essays.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1985.
Hoernlé, Winifred, Peter Carstens, Gerald Klinghardt, and Martin Elgar West. *Trails in the Thirstland: The Anthropological Field Diaries of Winifred Hoernlé.* Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1987.
Hogendorn, J S, and K M Scott. "The East African Groundnut Scheme: Lessons of a Large-Scale Agricultural Failure." *African Economic History* , no. 10 (1981): 81-115.
Hoggart, Richard. "The Need for Roots." *New Statesman*, 10 October 1957.
Homans, George. *The Human Group.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.
Homans, George Caspar. *Social Behavior.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.
Hubert, Jane, Anthony Forge, and Raymond Firth. *Methods of Study of Middle-class Kinship in London: A Working-paper on the History of An Anthropological Project 1960-65.* London,, 1968.
Hunter, Monica. "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 1. In Pondoland." In

Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
Inda, Jonathan Xavier. *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics.* Malden, MA, 2005.
Jay, Martin. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept From Lukács to Habermas.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
Jenkins, Timothy. *Religion in English Everyday Life: An Ethnographic Approach.* New York: Berghahn Books, 1999.
Jenks, Chris. *Subculture: The Fragmentation of the Social.* London; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005.
Kapferer, Bruce. *Strategy and Transaction in An African Factory: African Workers and Indian Management in a Zambian Town.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972.
Kerr, Madeline. *Personality and Conflict in Jamaica.* Liverpool,: University Press, 1952.
Kirk-Greene, Anthony. "The Emergence of An Africanist Community in the UK." In *The British Intellectual Engagement with Africa in the Twentieth Century.* Edited by Douglas Rimmer and Anthony Kirk-Greene. New York: St Martin's Press in association with the Royal African Society, 2000.
Krige, E J. "Changing Conditions in Marital Relations and Parental Duties Among Urbanized Natives." *Africa* , no. 9 (1936): 1-23.
———. "Some Social and Economic Facts Revealed in Native Family Budgets." *Race Relations* , no. 1 (1934): 94-108.
Kuklick, Henrika. "The British Tradition." In *A New History of Anthropology.* Edited by Henrika Kuklick. Oxford, 2008.
———. "Personal Equations: Reflections on the History of Fieldwork, with Special Reference to Sociocultural Anthropology." *Isis* 102, no. 1 (2011): 1-33.
———. *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Kuper, Adam. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School.* Third revised and enlarged ed. London: Routledge, 1996.
———. *Anthropology in South Africa: An Inside Job.* African Studies Center, Boston University, 1998.
———. *The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a Myth.* London; New York: Routledge, 2005.
———. "'Today We Have Naming of Parts': The Work of Anthropologists in Southern Africa." In *Empires, Nations and Natives: Anthropology and State-Making.* Edited by Benoît de L'Estoile, Federico Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2005.
Kuper, H. "Function, History, Biography: Reflections on Fifty Years in the British Anthropological Tradition." In *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology.* Edited by George Stocking Jr. London, 1984.
Kuper, Hilda. *An African Aristocracy; Rank Among the Swazi.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.
Lacey, Colin. "Freedom and Constraints in British Education." In *Custom and Conflict in British Society.* Edited by Ronald Frankenberg. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.
———. *Hightown Grammar: The School As a Social System.* Manchester: Manchester

University Press, 1970.
Lambart, Audrey. "Expulsion in Context: A School As a System in Action." In *Custom and Conflict in British Society.* Edited by Ronald Frankenberg. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982.
———. "The Sisterhood." In *The Process of Schooling: A Sociological Reader.* Edited by Martyn Hammersley and Peter Woods. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Open University Press, 1976.
Leach, Edmund. "Ourselves and the Others." *Times Literary Supplement* , no. 3722 (1973).
Leclerc, Gérard. *Anthropologie Et Colonialisme: Essai Sur L'histoire De L'africanisme.* Paris: Fayard, 1972.
Lemov, Rebecca M. *World As Laboratory : Experiments with Mice, Mazes, and Men.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2005.
L'Estoile, Benoît de. "The "Natural Preserve of Anthropologists": Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development." *Social Science Information* 36, no. 2 (1997): 343-376.
_____. "Internationalization and Scientific Nationalism: The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures (IIALC) Between the Wars." In *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge.* Edited by Helen Tilley and Robert J Gordon. New York: Palgrave, 2007.
_____. "The 'natural Preserve of Anthropologists': Social Anthropology, Scientific Planning and Development." *Social Science Information* 36, no. 2 (1997).
L'Estoile, Benoît de, Federico G Neiburg and Lygia Sigaud, eds. *Empires, Nations, and Natives: Anthropology and State-making.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
Lewis, Joanna. *Empire State-building: War & Welfare in Kenya, 1925-52.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 2000.
Lupton, Tom. *On the Shop Floor: Two Studies of Workshop Organization and Output.* Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press, 1963.
———. "Social Factors Influencing Industrial Output." *Man* 56 (1956): 55-59.
Lupton, Tom, and Sheila Cunnison. "Workshop Behaviour." In *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Nai□vety in Social Anthropology.* Edited by Max Gluckman. Aldine Transaction, 2007.
Macdonald, Sharon, Jeanette Edwards, and Mike Savage. "Introduction." *The Sociological Review* 53, no. 4 (2005): doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00585.x.
Macfarlane, Alan. "Historical Anthropology." *Cambridge Anthropology* 3, no. 3 (1977).
———. *An Interview with Peter Worsley.* University of Cambridge. Film Interviews with Leading Thinkers. http://www.sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1139306.
———. *An Interview with Ronald Frankenberg.* University of Cambridge. Film Interviews with Leading Thinkers. http://www.sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1116760.
Macintyre, Stuart. "The Social Sciences in Australia: An Unrequited Instrumentalism." *Thesis Eleven* 95, no. 1 (2008): doi:10.1177/0725513608095797.
Mackenzie, William James Millar. *Explorations in Government: Collected Papers, 1951-1968 / W.J.M. Mackenzie.* London: Macmillan, 1975.
Macmillan, Hugh. ""Paralyzed Conservatives": W. M. Macmillan, the Social Scientists and "the Common Society", 1923-48." In *Africa and Empire: W. M. Macmillan, Historian and Social Critic.* Edited by Hugh Macmillan and Shula Marks. Aldershot: Temple Smith, 1989.

———. "Administrators, Anthropologists and 'Traditionalists' in Colonial Swaziland: The Case of the 'Amabhaca' Fines." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 65, no. 4 (1995): doi:10.2307/1161132.
———. "Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society." *African Affairs* 94, no. 374 (1995): 39-65.
Madge, Charles, and Tom Harrisson. *Mass-Observation.* London: F. Muller ltd., 1937.
Madge, Charles, Tom Harrisson, and Bronislaw Malinowski. *First Year's Work, 1937-38.* London: L. Drummond, 1938.
Mair, Lucy. "Anthropology As a Public Service and Malinowski's Contribution to It." In *Man and Culture; An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski.* Edited by Raymond Firth. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1957.
Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific; An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea,.* London; New York: G. Routledge & Sons; E.P. Dutton & Co., 1922.
_____. "17. Kinship." *Man* 30 (1930): 19-29.
———. *Coral Gardens and Their Magic; A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands.* New York: American Book Co., 1935.
———. *The Dynamics of Culture Change; An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa,.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
———. "Introductory Essay: The Anthropology of Changing African Cultures." In *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa.* London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
———. "Practical Anthropology." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 2, no. 1 (1929): doi:10.2307/1155162.
———. *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-western Melanesia : An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage and Family Life Among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea.* New York; London: H. Liveright ; G. Routledge & Sons, 1929.
Mandler, Peter. "Margaret Mead Amongst the Natives of Great Britain." *Past & Present* 204, no. 1 (2009): 195-233.
———. "One World, Many Cultures: Margaret Mead and the Limits to Cold War Anthropology." *History Workshop Journal* 68 (2009): 149-172.
Mantena, Karuna. *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Origins of Indirect Rule.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
Marquard, Leopold. *South Africa's Colonial Policy: Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Council of the South African Institute of Race Relations.* Johannesburg: The Institute of Race Relations, 1957.
Marx, Emanuel. *A Composite Portrait of Israel.* London: Academic Press, 1980.
Matera, Marc. "Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain." *Journal of British Studies* 49, no. 2 (2010): doi:10.1086/649838.
Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour and the London Poor.* London: George Woodfall, 1851.
McCarthy, Thomas. *Race, Empire, and the Idea of Human Development.* Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Mead, M. "Our Educational Emphases in Primitive Perspective." *American Journal of Sociology* (1943): 633-639.
Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-century British Liberal Thought.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Merton, Robert King. *Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949.
Metcalf, Thomas R. *Ideologies of the Raj.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Mills, David. "Anthropology and Education." In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education.* Edited by Sara Delamont. Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar, 2012.
———. *Difficult Folk?: A Political History of Social Anthropology.* Methodology and history in anthropology ;. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.
Mitchell, J. Clyde. *The Kalela Dance: Aspects of Social Relationships Among Urban Africans in Northern Rhodesia.* Manchester: RLI/Manchester University Press, 1956.
Moore, Sally Falk. *Anthropology and Africa: Changing Perspectives on a Changing Scene.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994.
Munt, Valerie. "Australian Anthropology, Ideology and Political Repression: The Cold War Experience of Frederick G. G. Rose." *Anthropological Forum* 21, no. 2 (2011): doi:10.1080/00664677.2011.582832.
O'Donnell, Mike, and Sue Sharpe. *Uncertain Masculinities: Youth, Ethnicity and Class in Contemporary Britain.* London: Routledge, 2000.
Overy, R J. *The Morbid Age: Britain Between the Wars.* New York: Allen Lane, 2009.
Pagden, Anthony. *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
Pahl, J M, and R E Pahl. *Managers and Their Wives: A Study of Career and Family Relationships in the Middle Class.* London: Allen Lane, 1971.
Payne, Geoff. "Typologies of Middle Class Mobility." *Sociology* 7, no. 3 (1973): doi:10.1177/003803857300700306.
Peace, William J, and David H Price. "The Cold War Context of the FBI's Investigation of Leslie A. White:New Series." *American Anthropologist* 103, no. 1 (2001): 164-167.
Pels, Peter, and Oscar Salemink. *Colonial Subjects: Essays on the Practical History of Anthropology.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
Pina-Cabral, João de. "The Ethnographic Present Revisited." *Social Anthropology* 8, no. 3 (2000): 341-348.
Pine, Francis. "Family." In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology.* Edited by Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer. New York: Routledge, 1996.
Pitts, Jennifer. *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
Platt, Jennifer. *Social Research in Bethnal Green: An Evaluation of the Work of the Institute of Community Studies.* London: Macmillan, 1971.
Pocock, J G A. *Barbarism and Religion: Volume 4: Barbarians, Savages, and Empires.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-critical Philosophy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
Porter, A. N, and A. J Stockwell. *British Imperial Policy and Decolonization, 1938-64.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World.* New York: New Press, 2007.
Price, David. "Lessons From Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, Persuasive and

Ignored Contributions." *Anthropology Today* 18, no. 3 (2002): 14-20.
Price, David H. *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
———. *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
Pugh, Derek. *How Management Research Came to Aston.*
Rabinow, Paul, and George Marcus. *Designs for An Anthropology of the Contemporary.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R.. "Anthropology As a Science." *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 35-39.
Radcliffe-Brown, A R. *The Andaman Islanders; A Study in Social Anthropology.* Cambridge: The University press, 1922.
———. *Method in Social Anthropology: Selected Essays.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
———. "On Social Structure." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 70, no. 1 (1940): 1-12.
———. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society, Essays and Addresses.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.
Rees, Alwyn D. *Life in a Welsh Countryside : A Social Study of Llanfihangel Yng Ngwynfa.* 1951.
Rich, Paul B. *Hope and Despair: English-speaking Intellectuals and South African Politics, 1896-1976.* New York: British Academic Press, 1993.
———. *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism 1921-1960.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
Richards, Audrey. "The Village Census in the Study of Culture Contact." In *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa.* London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
Rimmer, Douglas and Anthony Kirk-Green, eds. *The British Intellectual Engagement with Africa in the Twentieth Century.* New York: St. Martin's Press in association with the Royal African Society, 2000.
Roethlisberger, F J, and W J Dickson. *Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.
Rose, Nikolas. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
Sampson, Anthony. *Anatomy of Britain.* New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
Satia, Priya. *Spies in Arabia: The Great War and the Cultural Foundations of Britain's Covert Empire in the Middle East.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Savage, Michael. *Identities and Social Change in Britain Since 1940: The Politics of Method.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Schapera, Isaac. "The Appointment of Radcliffe-Brown to the Chair of Social Anthropology at the University of Cape Town." *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 1-14.
———. "Contact Between European and Native in South Africa: 2. In Bechuanaland." In *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa.* London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
———. *A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom: Compiled for the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration.* London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

———. *Married Life in An African Tribe.* London: Faber and Faber, 1940.
Schumaker, Lyn. *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.
Shokeid, Moshe. "Max Gluckman and the Making of Israeli Anthropology." *Ethnos* 69, no. 3 (2006): doi:10.1080/0014184042000260035.
Simey, T. S. *Welfare & Planning in the West Indies.* Oxford,: The Clarendon Press,, 1946.
Slezkine, Yuri. *The Jewish Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
Soffer, Reba N. "Why Do Disciplines Fail? The Strange Case of British Sociology." *The English Historical Review* 97, no. 385 (1982): doi:10.2307/568786.
Spencer, J. "British Social Anthropology: A Retrospective." *Annual Review of Anthropology* (2000): 1-24.
Spencer, Jonathan. "Anthropology As a Kind of Writing." *Man* 24, no. 1 (1989): doi:10.2307/2802551.
———. "Modernism, Modernity and Modernization." In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology.* Edited by Alan Barnard. New York: Routledge, 1996.
Sperber, Dan. *On Anthropological Knowledge: Three Essays.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
Stocking, George W. *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888-1951.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.
———. *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology.* University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
———. *Observers Observed : Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork.* Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.
———. "Unfinished Business: Robert Gelston Armstrong, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the History of Anthropology at Chicago and in Nigeria." In *Central Sites, Peripheral Visions.* Edited by Richard Handler. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.
———. *Victorian Anthropology.* New York: Free Press, 1987.
Stone, Dan. "Nazism As Modern Magic: Bronislaw Malinowski's Political Anthropology." *History and Anthropology* 14, no. 3 (2010): doi:10.1080/0275720032000143356.
Strathern, Marilyn. *Kinship at the Core : An Anthropology of Elmdon a Village in North-west Essex in the Nineteen-sixties.* illustrated ed. Cambridge ; New York: University Press, 1981.
Susser, Mervyn, William Watson, and Kim Hopper. *Sociology in Medicine.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
Tawney, R H. "The Study of Economic History." *Economica* , no. 39 (1933): 1-21.
Thomas, Keith. "History and Anthropology." *Past & Present* , no. 24 (1963): 3-24.
Thomas, Lynn M. "Modernity's Failings, Political Claims, and Intermediate Concepts." *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 3 (2011): 727-740.
Thomas, Martin. *Empires of Intelligence: Security Services and Colonial Disorder After 1914.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
———. *Out of Time: History and Evolution in Anthropological Discourse.* Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Thompson, Leonard Monteath. *A History of South Africa.* New Haven: Yale University Press,

1990.
Tilley, Helen. *Africa As a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
Tilley, Helen, and Robert J Gordon. *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism and the Politics of Knowledge.* New York: Palgrave, 2007.
Tiratsoo, Nick, and Jim Tomlinson. *The Conservatives and Industrial Efficiency, 1951-1964: Thirteen Wasted Years?* London; New York: LSE/Routledge, 1998.
———. *Industrial Efficiency and State Intervention: Labour, 1939-51.* London; New York: Routledge, 1993.
Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other.* New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
Turner, Edith L. B. *Heart of Lightness: The Life Story of An Anthropologist.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.
Turner, Victor. *Schism and Continuity in An African Society: A Study of Ndembu Village Life.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957.
Urry, James. *Before Social Anthropology: Essays on the History of British Anthropology.* Chur; Philadelphia: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1993.
Van Doorne, J H. "Situational Analysis: Its Potential and Limitations for Anthropological Research on Social Change in Africa." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 21, no. 84 (1981): 479-506.
Vincent, David. *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain, 1832-1998.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Vincent, Joan. *African Elite: The Big Men of a Small Town.* New York,: Columbia University Press, 1971.
———. *Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990.
———. "Functionalism Revisited: An Unsettled Science." *Reviews in Anthropology* 13, no. 4 (1986): doi:10.1080/00988157.1986.9977795.
_____, ed. *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory, and Critique.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. *Social Change: The Colonial Situation.* New York: Wiley, 1966.
Waters, C. ""Dark Strangers" in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963." *The Journal of British Studies* 36, no. 2 (1997): 207-238.
———. "The Homosexual As a Social Being in Britain, 1945-1968." *Journal of British Studies* 51, no. 3 (2012): 685-710.
Watson, William. "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities." In *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Nai□vety in Social Anthropology.* Edited by Max Gluckman. Aldine Transaction, 2007.
Werbner, Richard P. "The Manchester School in South-central Africa." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13 (1984): 157-185.
Wetzel, Linda. "Types and Tokens." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition).* Edited by Edward N Zalta. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/types-tokens/.
Whelen, John. *Boys and Their Schooling: The Experience of Becoming Someone Else.* New York: Routledge, 2011.

Wilson, Godfrey. *An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia.* Livingstone, Northern Rhodesia: Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, 1941.

Wolf, Eric R. "Distinguished Lecture: Facing Power—--old Insights, New Questions." *American Anthropologist* 92, no. 3 (1990): 586-596.

Wolff, Larry and Mario Cipollini, eds. *The Anthropology of the Enlightenment.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Wolton, Suke. *Lord Hailey, the Colonial Office and the Politics of Race and Empire in the Second World War: The Loss of White Prestige.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Worsley, Peter. ""The Practice of Politics and the Study of Kinship"." In *Dialectical Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Stanley Diamond.* Edited by Christine Gailey. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1992.

———. *An Academic Skating on Thin Ice.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.

———. *The Third World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

———. *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of "cargo" Cults in Melanesia.* London,: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957.

Yelvington, Kevin A. "An Interview with A. L. Epstein." *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 2 (1997): 289-299.