

TRIBES AND TERRITORIES

Introduction

The post-war years were expansive ones for British universities and the new social sciences. There was an unprecedented expansion of the proportion of the costs of higher education borne by the British Treasury, doubling from 31 per cent in 1938/39 to 65 per cent in 1951/52. This chapter describes the growth of social anthropology in the 1950s, during what Annan calls the 'golden age of the don' (1990, 337). Yet not every anthropologist welcomed this expansion. The creation of new anthropology departments was sometimes resisted by existing centres, leading to growing rivalry and rifts amongst Firth's 'band of brothers'. I describe the establishment of departments at the University of Manchester and the School of Oriental and African Studies in London.

The discipline faced two major challenges. One was to find new sources of research funding, partly achieved by astute lobbying by social anthropologists of two government commissions (the Clapham and Scarborough commissions) looking into the social sciences during this period. The other was how best to respond to the growing popularity and expansion of sociology, especially during the 1960s. I show how, with the appointment of Peter Worsley as a Professor of Sociology at Manchester in 1964, Gluckman fulfilled his vision for a joint anthropology and sociology department. Its subsequent acrimonious divorce in 1971 typified the growing rivalry between two deeply intertwined fields. Sociology's rapid expansion and growing institutional dominance, especially in the new universities, crystallised

the diverging methodological, political and epistemological 'slots' (see Trouillot 1991) apportioned the two disciplines. Once established, this divergence was difficult to reverse, despite the continued flow of ideas and individuals across the divide.

The post-war expansion of British Higher Education

In 1945, Britain's anthropologists returned to their metropolitan universities amidst a welter of plans for the future. Post-war reconstruction was spurred on by state funding, both in the empire and in Britain. A domestic example of this was the influential 1947 Clapham commission into the provision for social and economic research in the UK (Clapham 1947). Made up primarily of London School of Economics (LSE) professors, including the demographer and LSE Director Alex Carr-Saunders, the economist Harold Robbins and R.H. Tawney, the commission marked the first of several attempts to define, coordinate and support the nascent social science disciplines now emerging within British universities.

The first step, defining the social sciences, was by no means the easiest. Noting that its practitioners 'are by no means agreed on the precise boundaries of their subjects', they decided that it was not 'necessary to give exact definitions of the fields of research covered'. Revealing their LSE roots, they made much of 'the great practical value of knowledge in these various fields', but also bemoaned the fact that 'progress in social and economic research has been very seriously hampered by lack of adequate finances', and that 'the number of universities in which there exists continuous provision for research in social questions is still extremely small' (Clapham 1947,13).

Recognising the huge contributions of the Rockefeller and other private foundations to supporting the social sciences in the UK, the commission nonetheless insisted that, for the social sciences, 'picking up what they can by appeals to outside foundations, some of which draw their funds from abroad', was not a 'satisfactory state of affairs'. Recommending a 'permanent and routine' increase in resources for social science research, the committee proposed a sum 'of at least £250,000 or £300,000 per annum'. A specialist subcommittee was to advise on how this should be spent (on which Firth represented anthropology).¹ Such advice was translated by the University Grants Committee (UGC) into a series of 'earmarked' grants, eventually amounting to £400,000 per annum.

What were anthropologists hoping for in 1947? More teaching posts were seen as a high priority. At this point, there were fewer than a dozen permanent university posts. Only four British universities,

University College London (UCL), the London School of Economics (LSE), Edinburgh and Cambridge, offered first degrees in anthropology. Evans-Pritchard was in the Oxford chair, with three other lecturers. Hutton still held the Cambridge chair, with Raymond Firth in the chair at LSE and Daryll Forde at UCL, each with roughly one lectureship apiece. They were greatly outnumbered by staffing and departments in the 'dominions' awarding anthropology degrees, including Melbourne and Sydney in Australia, and Rhodes University, Witwaterstrand and Cape Town in South Africa.

Anthropology did well out of the Clapham recommendations, with funding earmarked for a professorship and senior lectureship at Manchester, two lectureships at Cambridge, and further lectureships at UCL, Durham and Leeds. Anthropology was thus to be taught for the first time at Manchester, Durham, Leeds and Edinburgh. Progress was only hindered, according to Firth, 'by the shortage of persons with the necessary qualifications for appointments in this field'.²

In 1951 the UGC suspended these 'earmarked' grants, as they felt they had served their purpose of 'pump-priming' the new social sciences. The newly formed British Sociological Association (BSA) decided to lobby the UGC. Such lobbying marked the increasing willingness and confidence of this new social science to articulate and defend its interests. The ASA telegraphed its support to the BSA's chair Professor Morris Ginsberg, stressing that 'provision was still urgently needed if the advances made in the past five years are to be consolidated'. An ASA meeting also urged Meyer Fortes to make a further submission detailing the special needs and demands of social anthropology, such as for longer-term research funding, and argued that 'departments should be large enough to permit at least one member to be away every year in the field', for, 'without such close contact with fieldwork, there is a danger of stagnation'. The letter raised the spectre of a new American hegemony over the discipline, pointing out that the overseas research institutes 'have been obliged to recruit American personnel and still have unfilled posts'.

Another Royal Commission also looked favourably on the discipline. The 1947 Scarborough commission on African and Oriental studies boosted research capacity by recommending that the Treasury fund postgraduate scholarships. Amongst those who were awarded Treasury scholarships between 1949 and 1952 were John Beattie, Kathleen Gough, Peter Lienhardt, Rodney Needham, Emrys Peters, David Pocock and Michael Swift. The commission also recommended the expansion of area studies, but the creation of a new anthropology department at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) was a contentious affair.

‘Keeping their people from having to go down to the School’

The rivalry between LSE and UCL anthropology, or more precisely between Bronislaw Malinowski and Grafton Elliot Smith, had existed since the 1920s. Within the university, an uneasy division of labour had developed between the two departments, with LSE jealously guarding its reputation as the centre of the new ‘school’ of social anthropology. As a result, the LSE was suspicious of Daryll Forde’s efforts to revitalise the UCL department after the war. His appointment to the college’s first Chair in Anthropology led some to fear a revival of Elliot Smith’s diffusionist approach. Followers of this UCL school were mockingly labelled ‘children of the sun’, their own name for the migrants who took ‘civilisation’ out of ancient Egypt. The theoretical approach was based on an archaeological reading of a single ‘archaic civilisation’ that then diffused throughout the world (Kuklick 1991). As Firth recalls of William Perry, one of Elliot Smith’s followers, ‘he tried to convert me over tea and buns to the notion of diffusionism, without success’, whilst all the time ‘protesting that it was General Anthropology’.

Whilst Forde had done a UCL Ph.D. in prehistoric archaeology, he had subsequently been exposed to social anthropology as a postdoctoral researcher at Berkeley. So Forde’s approach at UCL was to begin to ‘convert it into a type of social anthropology’, aware that this area was attracting most funding. ‘Like everybody else,’ remembers Firth, ‘he wanted to get his students into the field.’³ By 1950, Firth and Forde were working much more closely, and jointly chairing the University of London interdepartmental seminar, though this was the subject of some criticism. Writing to Daryll Forde about this, Firth admitted that there were criticisms ‘that you and I seem more bent on getting across our respective points of view than on lending ourselves to the common aim’.⁴

This rivalry almost scuppered plans to establish teaching in anthropology at SOAS. Any changes in teaching provision at the University of London had to be agreed by the University-wide Anthropology Board of Studies, and this led to a stormy meeting of the Board in May 1948. It was here that Turner, Principal of SOAS, put forward his plans for a proposed readership in Anthropology in the Department of South-East Asia and the Islands. Raymond Firth, the Chair of the Board, pointed out the importance of ‘co-operation in the use of available teaching strength’: there were already two anthropologists specializing in the anthropology of South-East Asia, and thus the new post was not a ‘high priority’. He and other Board members feared that the post would be counted as an anthropology

post by the UGC, imperiling the Board's wishes to expand the two existing departments.

Turner explained that, as it was a readership in the languages and cultures of the area, 'the subject would be taught with specific reference to the cultural background of language'. Reluctantly the Board agreed to the post, provided it was titled 'Readership in the Languages and Culture'. The understanding was that SOAS would not seek to develop expertise in 'general' anthropology, especially if it duplicated existing provision. This guarantee would ensure LSE's primacy as a centre for theoretical anthropology.

It was a difficult promise to keep. Whilst the first teaching of anthropology at SOAS was justified as being 'only to keep their people from having to go down to the School', Firth recalled that 'he suspected what was coming'. The following year he wrote an uncharacteristically robust letter to his namesake, the linguist John Firth at SOAS, declaring 'I would certainly object to the setting up of a department of anthropology which went in for teaching general anthropology of a non-regional kind', and that 'this was only reasonable since we have already in existence two quite strong Schools of Anthropology'. He went on to bemoan SOAS's 'lack of consideration' for the agreements that were reached in appointing anthropologists in 'fields that directly overlap ours'.⁵ Writing a few months later, UCL's Daryll Forde equally vociferously protested about the possibility of a third department in the university.

Firth's predictions came true. In 1949 SOAS created a department of Cultural Anthropology after an internal reorganization (Phillips 1967). The cultural anthropologist Christoph von Furer-Haimendorf, a student of Malinowski, was made reader in the same year, and founded the new department. The sense of competition and distrust between the departments returned. Despite the Board's 1949 compromise agreement on the relationship between the provision for 'general and regional teaching of anthropology at the University', in 1950 SOAS unanimously announced plans for several further anthropology lectureships with regional specializations, and von Haimendorf was appointed to a Chair in Asian Anthropology in 1951.

Whilst SOAS gradually built up a research profile and numbers of doctoral students, the London undergraduate degree syllabus and exam papers remained the product of all three departments, and the Anthropology Board of Studies continued to coordinate this process. As a result, undergraduate students continued to attend many lectures at the LSE. Studying between 1959 and 1962 at SOAS, David Parkin recalls attending both lectures (with Raymond Firth, Maurice Freedman, Paul Stirling, Isaac Schapera and Lucy Mair) and tutorials at the LSE.⁶ New department or not, undergraduate education at the University of London continued to revolve around the LSE until the late 1960s.

Undergraduate anthropology?

The ambivalence towards teaching undergraduates is exemplified in Evans-Pritchard's changing attitudes to the topic at Oxford. For the first four years after his appointment to the Oxford Chair, Evans-Pritchard and the other Oxford lecturers (including Meyer Fortes and Beatrice Blackwood) campaigned hard to establish an undergraduate final honours course in anthropology. Over an endless series of meetings extensive and detailed drafts of the proposed course syllabi were prepared. Working closely with the Professor for Archaeology and staff at the Pitt Rivers Museum, the proposed syllabus also recognised the contribution of biological anthropology, with compulsory papers on 'social evolution', the 'biology of man' and the 'comparative study of human institutions, and a whole variety of archaeological and anthropological option papers.⁷ The proposal strongly echoed a similar initiative led by Radcliffe-Brown ten years earlier, and placed itself within the long history of such attempts in Oxford to found an honours school, seeing it as providing a 'sound educational background ... for understanding man's place in nature'. Surprisingly, given the emerging post-war political settlement, it also played the empire card, noting 'the contribution in this important field which the university can rightly be expected to make to the future development of the Empire will be seriously curtailed if men and women cannot be attracted to it'. The proposal carefully argued that there were now enough teachers in the university to make the degree feasible.⁸

In considering the proposal, the university's General Board asked for the opinions of all the other faculties. Whilst some, such as psychology, welcomed the proposal, the *Literae Humaniores* faculty was unsupportive, dwelling on the likely demands on the professor and on tutors in archaeology of thirty undergraduates each year. They were also concerned that a 'new Honours school should only be founded if it will offer those who take it an education, and not merely the technical training'. Confident in their position as guardians of scholarship, the classicists felt that 'an Honours school in which less anthropology than in the school now proposed was combined with some study of civilised man would be one for which it could be more confidently claimed that it provided an education'. The General Board used this reasoning to justify turning down the anthropologists' proposal. The Board argued that 'it seems neither to provide a strict scientific training nor alternatively, a humanistic education'. As a result the 'material used in the school will hardly ever be first hand' such that undergraduates 'will be driven to rely on opinions expressed in lectures', and that 'it is not clear that a satisfactory education can be

obtained from a school so predominantly confined as that envisaged by the present plan to the study of man in a primitive or uncivilised state'. Instead the Board recommended that the 'course of study which the new school is intended to provide is essentially postgraduate in nature', and recommended that the 'co-ordinating and harmonising' of anthropological studies be effected at a graduate level.

Initially Evans-Pritchard expressed disappointment about the rejection of undergraduate studies, feeling that the role of social anthropology in giving people an understanding of social life was as important as the organisation of professional research. However, his freedom from undergraduate teaching commitments resulted in the creation of a dynamic research culture at the institute. By the end of the 1950s, Evans-Pritchard viewed the university's rebuff rather differently: 'I was always of two minds in the matter and now I am most glad the University refused our request. I am now convinced that ... in the present state of social anthropology, an undergraduate school is undesirable' (Evans-Pritchard 1959, 121). He went on to bemoan the fact that 'we have more students than we can adequately teach' and that 'a drop to half our present numbers would be most welcome'. In a swipe at over-formalised training, he went on to note how 'meaningless' he finds the question of 'how anthropology is, or should be, taught to postgraduates' (ibid., 121). 'Anthropology not being remotely like an exact science,' he added, 'you can do little more than tell him which books and papers you think he will profit most by reading' and 'make him feel that what he is doing is really worthwhile'. His views were influential, and led many to question whether the new discipline's ideas were appropriate for undergraduates.

The view from Dover Street

The story of Max Gluckman's founding of the Manchester department in 1949 reveals the swiftness with which anthropology's theoretical principles and academic practice diverged during this period. The University of Manchester advertised for a Reader in Social Anthropology in 1949 in the new Faculty for Economic and Social Science, specifying that 'candidates should be interested in both modern and primitive societies'. A glittering appointment panel of Manchester professors was set up. However after receiving applications, and on advice from Raymond Firth, they decided to interview only two people, W.H. (Bill) Stanner and Max Gluckman, though Gluckman had not actually applied for the job. Bill Stanner was an Australian anthropologist who had studied with both Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski. Max Gluckman was a South African

who had studied anthropology at Witwaterstrand before coming to Oxford to do a DPhil. under Radcliffe-Brown. By 1949 he held a research lectureship in Oxford.

Gluckman agreed to have a discussion 'without prejudice'. Max Gluckman subsequently wrote to the Vice Chancellor, suggesting that the reason he had not originally applied was because he had felt the proposed readership 'was too ambitious, in that it seemed to integrate the new department with other branches of the social sciences too rapidly'. He went on to note that 'at least three years of straight teaching of social anthropology, as it has developed as a specialized study of primitive peoples would be required before branching out'. The Vice Chancellor hastened to assure him that his views were 'extremely sensible' and he invited Gluckman to discuss his position with the committee.⁹

The conversation was clearly productive, for, soon after their meeting, Gluckman wrote to thank the Vice Chancellor 'for the honour you have done me in raising the proposed readership to a chair', and accepted the position he had been offered. Aware of the risk of being seen to compete with established departments, he went so far as to reassure the Vice Chancellor of 'Evans-Pritchard's and Fortes' enthusiasm for the establishment of the chair', and to convey their view that it was 'one of the most important steps in the history of our subject'. Less grandiosely, he also began to plan for the department's future, writing at length about the 'patent shortage of social anthropologists', and the importance of appointing additional lectureships in order to make 'Manchester the centre in Britain for African problems'. His first choice was Elizabeth Colson, a Harvard-trained student of Clyde Kuckhohn, and by then Director of the RLL. She was appointed in 1951. He also made clear his desire to ensure that his students have 'a training in the technology of primitive and possibly modern societies' to ground the students by handling tools and understanding their mechanisms.¹⁰

Writing to one of his students a few months later, Gluckman had his own version of events:

I went to Manchester to advise them about a proposal to establish a Readership. I advised them too well and they offered me a Chair which after a tremendous struggle I wanted to reject because I feel it is early in my career and the subject cannot yet carry it. You can see how tempting it was. Finally EP and Meyer and I discussed it and we decided I ought to take it so I am off in October ... Beyond this Manchester is keen on developing the study of modern communities in England.

In another letter, Gluckman foregrounded his commitment to the discipline, saying, 'I did not want to take it but in the end was

persuaded by EP on the ground that though it might be bad for me undoubtedly it was good for the subject.'¹¹ Oral histories and the Vice Chancellor's files tell a more self-interested account. Gluckman was offered a Readership but managed to persuade Manchester to make it into a Chair.

The ebullience expressed by Gluckman in 1949 glosses over the growing intellectual differences within the 'band of brothers'. If everyone agreed on the need for more research funding, there was less consensus about expansion, or even over social anthropology's theoretical development. Gluckman's efforts to develop anthropology's interdisciplinary links were unique amongst his peers. His correspondence with his students gives a glimpse into the pedagogic cultures he created during this period. Max Gluckman was a charismatic teacher who inspired great loyalty amongst his students, such as the South African J. Clyde Mitchell (who had trained in sociology in South Africa before coming to work at the Rhodes Livingstone Institute in 1945) and the British-born John Barnes. He became godfather to both their children. Gluckman's extensive correspondence with Clyde Mitchell began as a way of advising him about his research after the former left Northern Rhodesia to take up a post in Oxford in 1946. Such letters were Gluckman's way of building his students' confidence, but also played the role of keeping the RLI camaraderie alive, and developing a similar aura around the new 'Manchester school'.

Despite having studied under Radcliffe-Brown before coming to London, first in South Africa and then in Oxford, Max Gluckman's advocacy of empirically grounded social science strongly echoed that of his former LSE teacher – Bronislaw Malinowski. He was very explicit about the importance of training and of remaining attentive to the power dynamics within the fieldwork situation (Schumaker 2001). When he was appointed to the directorship of the Rhodes Livingstone Institute in 1941, he built its reputation, and subsequently that of the Manchester department, partly through directly training his students. He advocated a team-based approach to field research and the importance of reanalysing earlier anthropological work. Max Gluckman's letters to his students often discussed the relative merits of his colleagues as teachers and lecturers, and asserted the importance of a careful and thorough period of research training.¹²

In his 1945 report as RLI director, Gluckman details his hands-on approach, noting that 'I was planning to take our new officers into the field for a short time, to introduce them to African life, and to show them certain field-research techniques.' These included 'an analysis of demographic data, budgets, and of labour migration figures' (Gluckman 1945, 70). The field site chosen was the Lamba reserve in

Ndola province, and, whilst Gluckman was quickly called away to meetings in Lusaka, his report noted that 'it has proved a most useful exercise in training us to collect quantitative data in a single scheme, and in developing a method of analysing such facts as matrilocality, divorce rates, type of kinship organisation within a village, on a quantitative basis' (ibid., 70). The research was later published, albeit with a critical commentary by Gluckman (Gluckman 1950; Mitchell and Barnes 1950). Mitchell acknowledged the fundamental importance of this field trip, and the training/data analysis that followed at Cape Town under the South African Isaac Schapera, writing that 'not only did the Institute provide the finances for academic and disinterested research, but it also created the framework in which a group of sociologists, of divergent interests and backgrounds, could work on common problems' (Mitchell 1956a, ix). Schumaker (2001, 109) describes how during this field school Gluckman impressed upon the group the 'necessity of collecting sufficiently detailed data that would enable one to analyse it later from angles not anticipated while in the field'. For Gluckman, the exercise posed 'problems of what data we can measure and how to measure them, and above all, of whether we are measuring the correct things' (Gluckman 1950, 18). He also felt it helped set lines along which 'the institute officers, as a team, can collect comparable data in their different areas' (ibid.). This focus on collaboration, and the resulting comparable and controlled statistical data collection is equally characteristic of the work of Mitchell, Barnes, Colson and even of the first half of Turner's *Schism and Continuity* (1957). It is a less well-remembered methodological contribution of the Manchester school.

Gluckman's letters to Mitchell from Oxford in 1948, show how he had to defend his close supervision and intellectual involvement with his students to Evans-Pritchard. 'EP said to me (after our third pint)', he wrote, "Don't you think you've done too much work for them?" and I replied with well-lit spontaneity "they've done more for me".¹³ The letter continues, stirring, 'remember that we are brotherhood with a tradition to respect and that those old blokes were not all pampoen [*sic*], so one day have a go at reading Tylor, Maine, Engels and the others'.

A subsequent letter to Mitchell reveals a growing difference of intellectual opinion between Gluckman and Evans-Pritchard over just what it meant to be a social anthropologist:

We've been having rather a battle this term in seminars with an idealistic wave – it started with Mrs Bohannan in a discussion of Malinowski's Argonauts saying that sociological theories were just attempts of the mind to bring order, and there is no way of testing between theories. Then EP, Lienhardt and others said there were no facts about a people, only what the

observer wrote in his notebooks. Meyer and I are fighting hard for our scientific attitude: the facts are public, DCs and Barotse read what I write about the Lozi and it has meaning for them, the facts are checkable in the subject so that I told Lienhardt that even if he wanted to lie about the Dinka he couldn't get away with it. That we have a series of propositions which are being tested all the time etc. And more and more I feel I am a social anthropologist, and I must stick to my last.¹⁴

Soon after arriving, Gluckman began to write about 'starting the new RLI at Manchester' as it had been 'an important experiment in sociological research' that needed to be furthered. He encouraged Mitchell to leave Northern Rhodesia and come and join him, admitting that 'though you would have fewer contacts with social anthropologists, you would have more to do with economists, political scientists, general sociologists. And they are all good men.'

Gluckman thought strategically about how to consolidate his position at Manchester and to begin to shape a new form of anthropology. In particular, he championed the case-study method that he had used in his influential account of the ritual surrounding the opening of a new bridge in Zululand (Gluckman 1958 [1940]). Skirting around its origins within Sociology and Psychology (Platt 1996), he gave the case-study method a distinctively anthropological history, repeatedly promoting it as a Manchester-based methodological innovation (Mills 2005b) within forewords to his students' work (e.g. Van Velsen 1964). He also took the task of promoting anthropology enormously seriously, involving schools and forging links with local teacher training colleges, but also with the cognate social sciences:

I'm well aware of the danger of degenerating into human relations as they have in the US. But I think our discipline is sufficiently clear in Britain for these tie-ups to be intellectually profitable. Beyond that as I see it we must have these links to make social anthropology a general teaching subject filtering through other subjects into the schools (particularly through educational psychology and geography and into general thought through law history etc.) ... I can argue that there are all these demands besides those of my own dept – hence I need a large staff though at the moment I've not got a degree or many students.¹⁵

By 1950 he was confident of a second chair in social anthropology: 'It won't be called that, but something like Social Studies, though I shall aim for a title like comparative sociology or experimental sociology.' In his letters to Mitchell, he went on to outline his vision for an anthropology of modern society:

It will be specifically for the study of modern communities (western family and kinship, neighbourhoods, factories etc) and will be a chair to provide

the academic background and research, with its equivalent of colonial administrators in the people we call social administrators – welfare workers, social workers, personnel managers etc ... These are not just idle dreams of mine, though they are uncertain in that to some extent university politics is keen on these modern studies, and my faculty colleagues want the new chair.

Gluckman increasingly voiced his dissatisfaction with the theoretical direction of the Oxford department, especially Evans-Pritchard's 'turn' to history in his 1949 Marett lecture, and his Third Programme broadcasts, which Max saw as 'full of contradictions'. In one letter he suggested that 'Oxford is moving into sterility.' His comments on the poor quality of the work of Evans-Pritchard's students led him to define his brand of anthropology as developed at the RLI and Manchester as increasingly occupying the disciplinary mainstream, building on the ethnographic empiricism of Malinowski himself (Gluckman 1961b, 1966), whose reputation he and others sought to restore (e.g. Firth 1957, Kaberry 1957). This became clear in his letters:

Now all we were doing was honest to god social anthropology without frills. Above all we were not trying to be historians, or students of comparative religion, or what have you, but to work within our distinctive discipline, acknowledge the limitations of technique data and problems, but dealing with those in the way we can best do so.¹⁶

The same letter is also full of derogatory remarks about the other departments, with Meyer Fortes (in a new Chair at Cambridge) viewed as being 'hamstrung by his staff, and will have a hell of a job', and London also 'useless and sterile'. Gluckman can then conclude that 'Manchester will become a centre for postgraduate study, preferred to London and Oxford and Cambridge by a number of people fairly soon.' Again he emphasises the interdisciplinary atmosphere, noting how 'I've now got on good and co-operative terms with the Professor of Psychiatry, historians, lawyers etc' and his plans for weekend schools to 'prepare training college teachers for giving courses on social studies for teachers'. His optimism is expansive. 'I can do the same in geography and psychology any day when I feel I can cope. I'm sure the university is ripe for the development and expansion of social anthropology.' By 1952 Max talks of the 'wide demand' for the subject, that anthropology had become compulsory for all doing an honours degree in politics and economics and how even the Vice Chancellor had told him 'he'd heard how much the subject was adding to the university'.¹⁷

This optimism is reflected in Manchester's expansion during the 1950s. By 1958 it had five posts, with a wide programme of undergraduate teaching. During the same period, established departments had increased their tenured posts by only one or two positions. Oxford went from five to six posts, Cambridge from five to six, UCL from six to eight, LSE from six to eight, Edinburgh from two to four. In 1951, a one-year postgraduate diploma in anthropology was launched, and the department continued to expand during the 1950s, with Tom Lupton (who went on to shape the new field of business studies) and William Watson appointed in 1957 as the first lecturers in sociology within the Department of Social Anthropology. It soon became a joint department, and by the end of the 1950s the sociology courses outnumbered anthropology courses. In 1957 Gluckman himself taught courses on industrial sociology, field sociology, the sociology of India and sociological texts and problems. The titles often belied anthropological themes. Gluckman was by this point Dean of Faculty, leading a growing but cohesive group of left-leaning students and lecturers that now included Emrys Peters and Ian Cunnison, both of whom had trained at the RLI.¹⁸

By the mid-1950s, the institutional and intellectual rivalry between Gluckman and Evans-Pritchard had become increasingly bitter. With the research base and access to the field offered by the Rhodes Livingstone Institute (RLI) being key to Manchester's success at attracting new students, Gluckman began to fear for its future funding, fearing that Evans-Pritchard was determined to sabotage the RLI. 'E-P has the will only to exploit the RLI for his students,' wrote Gluckman in 1955 to Clyde Mitchell, and 'would be pleased if the show broke up and was a failure – since he has publicly stated that research cannot be done well from the Institutes but only from universities. Since in fact the RLI is turning out far better work than Oxford, it would suit him to get a bad Director who would break the show up.'¹⁹ The same year Gluckman accused Evans-Pritchard of spreading a rumour about one of his students' political sympathies (making him therefore unacceptable as an employee to the RLI trustees). Max announced in one letter his estrangement: 'I've broken with E-P', declaring that 'he is spreading rumours that Bill Epstein carries a communist party card'.²⁰

Whether or not Evans-Pritchard was behind such a slander, Gluckman took the matter deadly seriously, writing at great length to the Northern Rhodesian Governor, head of the board of RLI trustees. His fear was that the rumour might be used as a pretext for wresting control of the institute from the anthropological community. He failed. Liverpool-born Bill Epstein was refused further research permission and subsequently passed over for the RLI directorship, in favour of a

scholar-administrator called William Fosbrooke. Fosbrooke had been a government sociologist in Tanzania, and had an authoritarian reputation. Meanwhile the Colonial Social Science Research Council (CSSRC) had been putting pressure on the institute to develop a closer relationship with the university. The institute's trustees used the events as a way of appointing a director who would be less independent and more amenable to government influence at a time of growing political unrest in the territory. Fosbrooke was the ideal candidate. Gluckman, Mitchell and others were dismayed, recognising that the academic freedom of the institute would be increasingly limited. As Mitchell wrote, rather despairingly, 'In a real test situation like this the CSSRC is powerless for the simple reason that the trustees decided that they would not consult the CSSRC – for obvious reasons: they knew it would recommend someone on academic grounds not on extraneous grounds – RLI – Rest in Peace.' Two years later, as Gluckman finally accepted that his influence had waned and that the 'RLI is going to become an adjunct to government', he decided to withdraw all support for and contact with the institute.²¹

By this time he had other matters to deal with. He had founded a highly successful and expanding department in Manchester, and many of his students were working on research projects within the UK. Gluckman now had less need of the RLI, even if he continued to make intellectual capital from its past. His success in getting research funding for UK-based research projects meant that the RLI steadily faded in significance for him. 'The development of the department in the industrial and other fields', he wrote in 1956, 'has turned me from a happy-go-lucky companion in research to a querulous and overworked business executive. I am asking for three more telephones to be installed.'

Though it was to end in recriminations, Gluckman continued to have an expansive vision for anthropology. His department was now a Department of Anthropology and Sociology, and his reputation had led to his appointment as President of the Sociology Section of the British Association in 1961. He was by now a regular fixture on the lecture and media circuit, and was asked by a number of the newer universities (including Belfast, Reading and Sheffield) for advice on setting up sociology or anthropology departments.

Too much can be made of his interdisciplinary ambitions. When Bill Epstein proposed doing an ethnographic study of a Manchester Jewish community in 1951, Gluckman apologised for his 'apparent lack of enthusiasm'. He regularly recommended to his students that they should cut their teeth on 'primitive societies'. Clyde Mitchell wrote to console Epstein, saying, 'Personally, I should say, go for modern studies every time. I think that social anthropology is disappearing as

a discipline and that the future lies in modern studies. However primitive society is so much easier and much more pleasant. Max is conservative and I shall tell him so.'²²

Gluckman's own view, as he later wrote to Mitchell, was of 'how important it is to work on these problems in Africa ... I am convinced that the complexity which we work out now on tribal systems derives from our attack on the problems of more complex societies'. For Gluckman, studies of industrial society served primarily to benefit and inform the 'real' work of the anthropology on rural African societies (Gluckman 1961a). Not everyone agreed. Many of his students went on to develop a field of urban anthropology, with first Clyde Mitchell (1956b) and later Abner Cohen (1969) making important contributions to the study of symbolic use of ethnic identifications in complex urban situations.

Frankenberg (1988) suggests that Gluckman was not the only one to be making links outside the discipline during this period. 'Firth and Gluckman in very different ways, both saw Social Anthropology as a firm base from which to co-operate with other social sciences. EP and Fortes, perhaps reflecting the situation at Oxford and Cambridge, turned more inwards.' Yet Manchester's proselytising approach was isolated. Ironically the department was by now becoming a formidable training ground for students who would subsequently find employment in sociology departments, including John Barnes, Peter Worsley, Max Marwick, Clyde Mitchell, Michael Banton, Tom Lupton and William Watson. No other department followed Manchester's example of involvement in teacher training colleges and schools. On the contrary, Evans-Pritchard's view that social anthropology should be a graduate subject was increasingly influential.

It is too easy to emphasise the differences, and to present each department as having a distinct intellectual atmosphere. The discipline remained a close-knit network of scholarly patronage and loyalty, bonded by the obligatory sociality of annual ASA conferences. The dominant view was that anthropology's moral relativism was risky for unformed minds. The intellectual security of the ASA and the funding buffer of the UGC led senior figures to disparage calls for change.

Not everyone agreed. At an ASA meeting in 1962, Gluckman emphasised once again the need for disciplinary expansion. 'No new departments had been created in Britain since those at Manchester and SOAS in 1949,' he pointed out, 'though individual lectureships in other types of departments had been set up.' The meeting only agreed to 'think over the position of "isolated" lecturers in the subject and see if the ASA could do anything to help them'. More significantly, he insisted that the meeting agree that 'the committee and all members should consider all ways of using their influence to get the subject

established in new universities, though it was clear that the ASA could not write officially to the Vice Chancellors of these universities about this matter'.²³

Sussex was one of the only new universities to prioritise anthropology, and its Vice Chancellor approached Evans-Pritchard for advice. He responded with a pithy summary of the discipline, acknowledging that it 'can be said to be a branch of Sociology', and that it increasingly attended to 'urban communities and to problems of industry and medicine' but that 'we have always been insistent on field studies'. As to establishing it anew in an institution, he declared himself in favour of 'starting it off at the lowest level and let it work its way up to a readership and a Chair in course of time rather than the other way around', the exact opposite of Manchester's approach. The advice was disregarded. The School of African and Asian Studies was established at the University of Sussex the following year, and Frederick Bailey, one of Max Gluckman's students, was appointed as Professor of Anthropology in 1964. With the blessing of Raymond Firth, Paul Stirling left the LSE to a professorship in the new Sociology Department at Kent in 1965.²⁴

Sociology and anthropology: we'll show them a real discipline

Did the two disciplines ever work together? There were several attempts at interdisciplinary dialogue in the 1960s, such as a 1961 joint British Sociological Association and ASA conference at LSE on 'Family and kin ties in Britain and their social significance' convened by Firth, and coming out of research he had done in Bethnal Green. Yet even Firth had to get permission to invite those sociologists who were not ASA members to this meeting. Collaboration was not the priority of every anthropologist. Peter Worsley recalls Meyer Fortes leaning conspiratorially towards him at the opening reception, saying 'We'll show them what a real subject looks like.' Given that Worsley had been told that as a card-carrying communist he would never be able to get a job in British anthropology, he was unsympathetic.²⁵

Subsequently plans were made to host another joint conference on teaching, and Paul Stirling was appointed to the BSA education committee. However, nothing came of this plan, or of attempts to publish ASA occasional papers in the *British Journal of Sociology*. The issue of disciplinary identity also arose at the ASA's own discussions about teaching anthropology in schools. Frankenberg recalls how one 'Mr Tyler from Bristol, who taught overseas teachers, was unwise enough to conflate social anthropology and sociology, bringing down

upon his head the polite but firm wrath of Meyer Fortes, who reiterated that difference was all, between societies as well as disciplines' (Frankenberg 1988).

The efforts by individuals such as Gluckman and Banton to forge interdisciplinary alliances had little lasting impact on intellectual debates. During the 1960s there was a boom in demand amongst undergraduates wishing to study a social science that addressed pressing issues of class conflict and political economy in industrial societies (Platt 2003). As sociology grew and became more diverse, its relationship with anthropology became steadily less important. Nor did all anthropologists see any strategic value in a closer alliance with sociology. As Barnes commented, 'the relationship between anthropology and sociology was far too sensitive a political matter to discuss openly – sometimes it was convenient to argue that one was a branch of the other, or that they were the same thing, or that they had nothing in common – it all depended on who was providing the funding'.²⁶ The differing fortunes of the two disciplines were also reflected in their hiring practices in the early 1960s. Social anthropology departments tended to staff themselves with other social anthropologists; sociology departments were staffed with whoever was available. As one commentator puts it, 'the issue of professional or disciplinary coherence was raised after – rather than during – the period of expansion' (Spencer 2000, 5). This is confirmed in the careers of anthropologists turned sociologists such as Peter Worsley, Michael Banton and Tom Lupton. Worsley reminisced that 'Sociology exploded: all the sociology departments did. I had five chair offers in one week. "Please can you come?" they would say.'²⁷ Whether despite or because of their shared origins as intellectual half-siblings (Peel 2005), sociology and anthropology increasingly developed antagonistic personalities.

As a result, Gluckman's commitment to a dialogue with sociology faltered. During the 1960s he backed away from his earlier efforts to persuade anthropologists to do research in industrial societies, and to do sociology in an anthropological way. Barnes described how 'Max's plans for me were to go to Norway and turn myself into a sociologist, but then Max found that there were no jobs for me in Manchester.' Barnes subsequently held the first Chair in Sociology at Cambridge, much to the consternation of existing sociologists.

Peter Worsley's personal recollections about his appointment as a Professor of Sociology in Manchester and his growing rift with Gluckman are revealing:

He appointed me as his pupil – the only concern he had was that Sociology wouldn't overtake anthropology. Three quarters of the faculty students wanted to do sociology – we had 700 students, and they only had 40. I agreed to a limit to expansionism, but Max pushed for more concessions. We came to a showdown and went to faculty. Other departments got

involved, and it was reluctantly agreed that we should split the departments. The compromise was to split the first year course, so students could opt for either option – but he still wanted to keep them separate. He was not prepared to recognise the decline of anthropology to a small enclave in sociology.

Worsley also described setting up a joint seminar with Gluckman, where they would invite speakers on alternate weeks: 'Gluckman first invited Lester Hiatt to a talk on spear-carrying amongst Aboriginals, and then I invited a biographer of Rosa Luxemburg. You should have seen the anthropologists glaze over.' Tensions mounted, and by the end of the 1960s, Manchester's Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology had split in two.

A rather different problem faced anthropology in Oxford during the 1960s. Sensing the growing importance of sociology as a discipline, a committee of Oxford intellectual glitterati (including Professors Ayer, Beloff, Berlin, Habbakuk and Trevor-Roper, as well as Evans-Pritchard) was convened to appoint a new Readership in Sociology. No one candidate could be agreed upon, and, after much infighting, Evans-Pritchard wrote to the Vice Chancellor with a proposal to remedy the situation. Acknowledging that the appointment was anticipated as being within the Department of Social Studies, he wondered 'whether it is understood how remote the sociology of today is from most of what goes on in Social Studies', and that "'sociology" has been taught in Oxford under the name of "social anthropology" since 1910' such that 'it would be very difficult to determine between what I and my five colleagues do in the Institute of Social Anthropology and what is called "sociology"'. In another memorandum, he was more explicit still: 'Why not a department of sociology the professor of which should always be a professor of social anthropology?'²⁸

He also revealed his deeper feelings about the new discipline: 'Since a lot of nonsense has been written in the name of sociology, sociology may have a bad name, and, after all, 'social anthropology is and always has been regarded as comparative sociology'. He bolstered his campaign by asking Max Gluckman to send down copies of his exam syllabuses and questions to show the affinities between the two disciplines as they had developed at Manchester. Yet his attempt to capture the professorship for anthropology came to nothing. Ten years later, tension between the two departments returned when, just before Evans-Pritchard's retirement, the Social Studies Board repaid the compliment by seeking to take over the Chair in Social Anthropology for Sociology.'²⁹

Conclusion

Since the 1940s social anthropology has depended on the patronage of the British state for its institutional survival. It repeatedly sought to emphasise its disciplinary uniqueness in order to bolster that funding. This uniqueness was reinforced by its endogamous approach to intellectual reproduction – no sociologists were offered jobs in anthropology departments, and anthropologists getting jobs in sociology departments were seen as ‘leaving’ the discipline. Partly because of a shortage of qualified staff, expansion into the new universities, most of whom were keen to establish sociology departments, was not actively pursued during the 1950s and 1960s. At Oxford and elsewhere, a continuing legacy of intellectual elitism ensured the prioritisation of postgraduate training and research over the development of undergraduate teaching.

Max Gluckman and Raymond Firth were exceptions to this rule. They did most to spearhead a ‘modern’ anthropology that sought a dialogue with its closest cognate – sociology, as opposed to history. There is little doubt that Gluckman’s vision had a major impact on the discipline (e.g. Parkin 1966). Yet his inclusivity had its bounds. As sociology became increasingly powerful at the end of the 1960s, he became increasingly embittered about the institutional divergence of the two disciplines, despite their shared intellectual heritage and concerns. Anthropology’s ‘expansive moment’ (Goody 1995) seemed to be at an end.

Notes

1. Clapham Commission Cmd Paragraph 2.
2. *Ibid.*, p127.
3. LSE Archives, Firth interview with Maurice Bloch, 1988, BLPES.
4. Firth Archives, 1/14 Letter to Daryll Forde 14.11.50.
5. Firth Archives, 1/14 Letter to Sir John Firth 5.11.49.
6. David Parkin, personal communication, July 2006.
7. The syllabus also had parallels with the human sciences degree, created in Oxford in the 1970s.
8. Myres MSS 81.
9. Vice Chancellors files (Vca), University of Manchester, Vca/7/87 Chair of social anthropology, Gluckman to VC 21.3.49, VC to Gluckman 22.3.49.
10. Vca/7/87, Gluckman to VC 21.4.49, 22.5.49.
11. Mitchell Archives, 5/1 f44 letter from Gluckman to Mitchell 17.9.48.
12. Clyde Mitchell Archives, Rhodes House, Oxford.
13. Mitchell Archives 5/1 f25.
14. Mitchell Archives, letter from Gluckman to Mitchell 5/1 38 12.2.49.
15. Mitchell Archives, 5/1 f127.
16. Mitchell Archives MG to Clyde Mitchell, 11.12.50.

17. Mitchell Archives, 5/1 letters from Gluckman to Mitchell 1951–52.
18. Commonwealth University Yearbooks, 1949, 1955, 1959.
19. Mitchell Archives, Gluckman to Clyde Mitchell 16.2.55, Mitchell MSS box 2 fo. 56, Rhodes House.
20. Mitchell Archives, 5/1 f72, letter from Gluckman to Mitchell 15.7.55.
21. Gluckman to Clyde Mitchell 8.7.1957, Mitchell MSS box 2 fol. 206.
22. MSS Mitchell, letter from Mitchell to Epstein 5/3 f11 28.5.51.
23. ASA Archives, BLPES, ASA committee minutes 1.1.
24. ISCA archives, Evans-Pritchard papers 2/2/11.
25. Interview, London, 8.5.00
26. Interview with John Barnes, Churchill College, Cambridge 23.7.00.
27. Interview with Peter Worsley, 8.5.00.
28. ISA Archives F2/9 Sociology, Oxford University Archives.
29. Ibid.