Foreword

Adam Kuper

The three most influential contributions made by 'British social anthropology' to the literature on African affairs – even to the study of politics – were *African Political Systems*, E.E. Evans-Pritchard's *The Nuer* and Max Gluckman's *Analysis of Social Situation in Modern Zululand*. The theoretical perspective that informed them was laid out by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown in a presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute, 'On Social Structure' (Radcliffe-Brown 1940a).

Remarkably, all these publications appeared in 1940. One could hardly imagine a less auspicious moment. The Battle of Britain was raging. Britain was in existential danger. The future of the British Empire was precarious. On 24 October 1939, a few weeks after war was declared, the Council of the Royal Anthropological Institute 'agreed that the Institute would be prepared to act as an intermediary to make available to the government the expert knowledge of anthropologists and others, which might be of use to the national war effort'.[1] And yet there are no indications that the book was conceived and written under the shadow of a world-shattering conflict.

At the same time, British colonial policy in Africa was in crisis. The future of Indirect Rule was in question. Yet today it requires a leap of imagination to see that *African Political Systems* does touch here and there on urgent debates on colonial administration.

More immediately, the editors were preoccupied with parochial, academic concerns, notably the smouldering feud between two factions of anthropologists, the followers of Bronislaw Malinowski at the London School of Economics and the followers of A.R. Radcliffe-Brown at Oxford. 'British social anthropology' was

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

still a small, insecure field. In the early 1920s, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown displaced the old-school evolutionists and diffusionists, and recast anthropology as a social science. In the 1930s, they became rivals, scrapping with each other over jobs and grants, and becoming increasingly divided on questions of theory. The Oxford School emphasized the comparative study of social groups and roles, while the Malinowskians gave priority to 'cultural' processes and to individual strategies in competition for power and resources.

Radcliffe-Brown had been appointed to the Oxford chair of social anthropology in 1937. He became the revered clan elder. His only colleagues were two much younger men, Edward Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes, both appointed as 'research lecturers in African sociology'. They were firm allies – Fortes described Evans-Pritchard as his 'elder brother in anthropology' (Goody 1995).[2] Two other close associates were fellow South Africans and friends of Fortes. Isaac Schapera had studied under Radcliffe-Brown in Cape Town. A younger man, Max Gluckman, once a student of Schapera, had thrown in his lot with the Oxford men. 'Radcliffe-Brown has often told me that he considers Fortes and Evans-Pritchard the two best (far and away) of all the younger British anthropologists', Gluckman wrote to a friend, 'I think Brown's judgment here (unlike his account of S. African politics) quite correct' (Gordon 2018: 153).

African Political Systems was, among other things, a statement by this Oxford clique. It provided a showcase for their comparative, structural anthropology. The Oxford men were in reaction against Malinowski, who had dominated the field for the better part of two decades. His influence had been exercised in part through his weekly seminar at the London School of Economics, which was attended by virtually all the younger scholars who came into the field in the 1920s and 1930s. But Malinowski's influence also had its material side. From 1933 to 1939, the Rockefeller Foundation funded research fellowships, administered by the International African Institute in London, to study 'race relations' in British African colonies. Malinowski was effectively put in charge of recruiting and training these research fellows. A generation of Africanist anthropologists was forged in Malinowski's seminar. (In 1938–39, three of these young anthropologists, Fortes, Gluckman and Oberg, were candidates for a single research position at the newly formed Rhodes Livingstone Institute in Northern Rhodesia, directed by another former Rockefeller research fellow, Godfrey Wilson.)

Seventeen research fellowships were awarded. All the eight case studies in *African Political Systems* were written by veterans of Malinowski's seminar who had also been Rockefeller research fellows. To put it another way, just under half of the Rockefeller research fellows were recruited to write contributions to this volume. But, with the sole exception of Audrey Richards, they were no longer Malinowskians.

The small circle around Radcliffe-Brown took charge of the production of *African Political Systems*. Radcliffe-Brown wrote the preface, which presented

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

his positivist, comparative, structural programme for 'social anthropology' (as did his presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute, also published in 1940). Fortes and Evans-Pritchard were the editors, and they wrote the introduction – Fortes apparently doing most of the work. Fortes, Evans-Pritchard, Gluckman and Schapera contributed half of the eight case studies.

The other four case studies were very different in tone and content, and did not always conform to the Oxford programme. Audrey Richards was the only loyal Malinowskian (and the only woman) to contribute a case study to *African Political Systems*. She was already a stand-out critic of Evans-Pritchard and the Oxford men. A staunch, if liberal, supporter of British colonialism, Richards was shortly to join the Colonial Office, where she served for the duration of the war (Kuper 1996). Her chapter on the Bemba is the only one in the volume that contains a policy-oriented discussion of Indirect Rule in a particular colonial province.

The remaining three contributors, Siegfried Nadel, Günter Wagner and Kalervo Oberg, had attended Malinowski's seminar, but they were by no means down-the-line 'functionalists' or 'structural-functionalists', in fact, they were hardly to be classed as 'British social anthropologists' at all. Nadel and Wagner were Central Europeans. Oberg was a Canadian, the son of Finnish immigrants. All would make their careers largely or entirely outside Britain.

Siegfried Nadel, who became a close friend of Fortes, was a graduate of the University of Vienna, where he specialized in the psychology of the perception of sound. For several years, he pursued a career in music and ethnomusicology. He was then (with Fortes and a Dutch scholar, Sjoerd Hofstra) appointed one of the first three Rockefeller research fellows. Following initial fieldwork in Nigeria, Nadel became actively engaged in British colonial administration. He was appointed Government Anthropologist of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan in 1938. During the Second World War, he became a senior officer in the British colonial forces, was Secretary of Native Affairs in the British Military Administration of Eritrea and in 1945 became Secretary of Native Affairs in the British Military Administration of Tripolitania. In 1950 he was appointed the first Professor of Anthropology at the Australian National University, where he remained for the rest of his career.

Despite his own experience as an administrator, Nadel did not write in any depth about British colonial rule. However, his contribution to *African Political Systems*, a study of the Kede riverain trading empire, a sort of state within a state, in the shadow of the Nupe polity, can be read as an implicit critique of the generalizations about African states in the editorial introduction by Fortes and Evans-Pritchard.

Kalervo Oberg wrote a dissertation on the social organization of the Tlingit Indians under the supervision of Radcliffe-Brown at the University of Chicago. In 1934 he spent a post-doctoral year under Malinowski at the London School of Economics (LSE) and was given a Rockefeller fellowship to carry out research

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

among the Ankole in southwestern Uganda, which resulted in his chapter in *African Political Systems*. He later made a career as an applied anthropologist in Canada and the United States (McComb and Foster 1974).

Oberg's account of the 'kingdom' of Ankole was also not obviously shaped by the preoccupations of the editors. As Günther Schlee argues in his chapter in the present volume:

> Oberg's Ankole kingdom is classified as belonging to Group A in the introduction to *APS* … but on a closer look, it straddles the dichotomy between this group, the state-like societies with central authority, and Group B, the societies with segmentary lineage systems. There is no monopoly of power. Clans and lineages have to sort out internal affairs themselves and interclan violence needs to be authorized by the king, but the authorized party would have to carry it out by itself. The Banyankole therefore provide a model case for the interpenetration of different logics of action.

The third of these outsiders, Günter Wagner, gave an account of local political systems in western Kenya. These appeared to be, in many crucial respects, similar to the systems on the other side of Lake Victoria, in western Uganda, described by Oberg. Tribal identities were uncertain, clan affiliations ambiguous, and political roles situational and only roughly defined. Here was another case study, based on excellent ethnographic research, which did not fit the models of 'state' and 'stateless' lineage-based societies presented by the editors of *African Political Systems*.

But that was not the only incongruity in a classic, foundational text of 'British social anthropology'. As Jan de Wolf (2003) remarks, the life of Günter Wagner was 'disconcerting'.[3] Born in Berlin in 1908, Wagner began his anthropological studies in Freiburg and Hamburg. His professor sent him to study for a year with Franz Boas at Columbia University. Directed by Boas, he made a field study of the Peyote cult among the Yuchi and completed a thesis on the topic for his doctorate at Hamburg University. He then carried out further fieldwork in North America, among the Comanche, and spent some time at Berkeley with Kroeber and Lowie. He was therefore a fully accredited Boasian. In 1933, he was appointed to an International African Institute Rockefeller-funded fellowship. He attended Malinowski's seminar at the LSE and then carried out two years of fieldwork in Kenya.

During a break from fieldwork, Wagner visited Evans-Pritchard at Oxford, and he wrote to Boas that he hoped to take part in the new research programme that Radcliffe-Brown was starting up there.[4] He participated alongside Radcliffe-Brown, Evans-Pritchard and Fortes in an Oxford University Summer School for Colonial Administration. Then Britain declared war. Wagner returned

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

to Germany, He was now technically an enemy alien, and Fortes had to apply to Oxford University Press to get special permission for Wagner's chapter to be published in *African Political Systems*.[5]

In December 1939, Wagner joined an organization run by the Nazi Ministry of Propaganda called the Antisemitische Aktion. He later joined the Nazi Party and was appointed to the colonial policy departments of the Propaganda Ministry and of the Nazi Party. He completed his *Habilitation* under two well-known ethnologists who were deeply implicated in Nazi colonial projects, Richard Thurnwald and Dietrich Westermann. (In a letter to me, Andre Gingrich writes: 'I tend to qualify both Westermann and Thurnwald as leading figures of German "Völkerkunde" under Hitler. Neither was an active Nazi party member – but you didn't have to be one in order to support the Nazi terror regime and make it "work" in theory and practice as long as it lasted') (Gingrich 2010).[6]

After the war, Wagner was designated a 'fellow traveller' of the Nazi Party. This made it difficult for him to get an academic appointment in Germany, although, according to Udo Mischek, Wagner's main problem was that he was too closely identified with the British anthropologists![7] In any case, de Wolf writes that 'Wagner appealed against this decision and got many of his colleagues, among them Evans-Pritchard, Fortes, Forde and Nadel, to write testimonials confirming the impartiality of Wagner's ethnological work before the war' (2003: 468). In 1947, Radcliffe-Brown invited him to apply for a post at Oxford, but Godfrey Lienhardt was appointed. In 1949, Wagner was appointed Assistant Government Ethnologist at the Department of Native Affairs in Southwest Africa (modern Namibia, which had been a German colony until the First World War and then came under South African administration). He served as an *apparatchik* of the apartheid system until his death in 1952.

The 'Introduction' to *African Political Systems* by Fortes and Evans-Pritchard classified African polities into two types: 'Group A' and 'Group B', state and stateless political systems. This distinction was clearly relevant to the system of Indirect Rule, which depended on 'chiefs'. However, the broad characterizations of the two types derived from established, broadly evolutionist ideas about clans and early states – ideas associated with Morgan, Robertson Smith, Maine and Durkheim, with perhaps a sidelong glance at Marx, at least in the contribution of Gluckman. Some of the assumptions made about African states drew on the work of C.G. Seligman (1934) on 'divine kingship', which had particularly influenced his two most loyal students, Evans-Pritchard and Schapera. The emphasis on lineages seems to have its origins in a suggestion of Radcliffe-Brown. 'I was present on this occasion'. Fortes recalled. 'Evans-Pritchard was describing his Nuer observations, whereupon Radcliffe-Brown said, as he stood in front of the fireplace: "My dear Evans-Pritchard, it's perfectly simple, that's a segmentary lineage system, and you'll find a very good account of it by a man called Gifford"' (Fortes 1979: viii)

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

This classification of political systems into states and the lineage-based stateless societies has been subjected to generations of commentary and criticism. As Aleksandar Bošković notes, the first wave of reviews of *African Political Systems* highlighted several of the issues that were to feature in later debates. Theories of 'early states' and the 'conquest theory' of state formation are expertly reviewed here by Petr Skalník. Other contributors tackle questions of the nature and even the reality of 'tribe', 'clan' and 'lineage'.

Perhaps the most powerful early critique, though largely implicit, was Edmund Leach's *Political Systems of Highland Burma.* Published in 1954, this was (among other things) a counterblast to the whole genre of 'tribal', timeless, equilibrium models. Leach showed that the *gumlao* and *gumsa* political systems in the Burmese Highlands were intricately interconnected. Moreover, they were in a constant state of flux. And they were not to be divided into two enduring types – the states and the lineage-based systems – rather, leaders of dominant 'lineages' manipulated marriage alliances to construct small-scale 'states', but these statelets regularly collapsed back into rivalrous kinship networks. There were echoes here of the political processes sketched for East Africa by Oberg and Wagner in *African Political Systems*. However, Leach did not relate the petty politics of the Highland tribes to the imperial ambitions of their Burmese and Chinese neighbours, or to the machinations of British colonial officers, but then ethnographies that were written on political structures during colonial times usually left the colonial structure itself out of the picture.

The system of Indirect Rule in British African colonies was designed to deal with 'chiefs' and 'tribes'. It was based on the premise that African populations were divided into geographically demarcated and culturally homogeneous tribes. These tribes were presumed to represent the primary focus of individual identity and loyalty. They were ruled by 'chiefs' and 'headmen' who supposedly commanded unquestioned respect and obedience from their followers. It followed that the colonial administration should divide colonies into tribal districts and rule through the chiefs. As a Provincial Commissioner in Tanganyika summed up the policy in 1926: 'Each tribe must be considered a distinct unit. Each tribe must be under a chief. Each tribe must be entirely within the borders of a district' (Graham 1976: 4).

This administrative set-up seemed to offer rich opportunities to the anthropologists, who could offer expertise on 'tribes' and 'chiefs'. Skimming through Lord Lugard's *Dual Mandate*, the foundational text of Indirect Rule published in 1927, Malinowski scribbled a triumphant note to himself: '[Lord Lugard's] Indirect Rule is Complete Surrender to the Functional Point of View' (Cell 1989: 483). Obviously, problems arose when administrators had to work with ethnically diverse, politically amorphous populations. Confronted with what seemed like anarchy – even 'ordered anarchy' – colonial administrators were inclined to invent 'chiefs' and 'tribes'. It helped that anthropologists could describe how

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

these systems worked, as Evans-Pritchard did for the Nuer, Meyer Fortes did for the Tallensi and Günter Wagner did for the 'Bantu Kavirondo'.

But by the late 1930s, the Colonial Office was coming to recognize that Indirect Rule was a drag on economic development and that its focus on rural, 'traditional' populations could not be sustained as the towns grew, and an educated, Christian elite pressed for political representation. A colonial grandee, Sir Malcolm Hailey, was commissioned by the Colonial Office to conduct a thorough survey of Britain's African colonies, with instructions to come up with recommendations for administrative reform. Assisted by Audrey Richards, Lucy Mair and Marjorie Perham, three women who had been stalwarts of Malinowski's seminar and beneficiaries of the Rockefeller programme, Hailey delivered his report to the Colonial Office in August 1938. Published by Oxford University Press under the title *An African Survey: A Study of Problems Arising in Africa South of the Sahara*, running to over 1,800 printed pages, this report formed the basis of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act 1940, and five years later, at the end of the Second World War, the Colonial Development and Welfare Act 1945. These established a new framework for research and administration in the African colonies.

If African societies were in the throes of change and if administrative priorities were shifting, perhaps functionalist anthropologists were no longer going to be very helpful. As Hailey remarked: 'The problem of the maladjustments in African society created by the extension to it of Western economic or political institutions is no more amenable to treatment by the anthropologist than by anyone else' (1938: 59–60). Critics pointed out that static equilibrium models could not account for social change, that they downplayed conflicts within communities and political systems, and that they assumed, against all the evidence, that social and political interactions took place only within strict geographical boundaries.

Malinowski had anticipated this concern with social change. In 1929, he published a paper entitled 'Practical Anthropology' in the journal *Africa*, calling for 'an anthropology of the changing native' (Malinowski 1929). The 'changing native' was to be understood as a product of 'culture contact'. In 1938, introducing a series of essays entitled 'Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa', Malinowski insisted that it was impossible to recover the precontact 'baseline' African cultures. The investigator was faced rather with a process, in which three foci could be identified: a complex of traditional institutions, beliefs and practices, that were, however, probably far removed from the preconquest institutions; the powerful, intrusive Western culture; and a hybrid culture that was emerging in the cities and that would spread into the country districts, fostering a new way of life for the whole society.[8]

This cultural model was challenged by Fortes, Schapera and Gluckman, three South Africans. In South Africa, the conflicts between the white ruling caste and the rest of the population was more stark, extreme and explosive than in British

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

African colonies. And political and academic debates were fraught and urgent. In the 1920s, a leading historian, W.M. Macmillan, attacked local anthropologists as 'paralysed conservatives', unable to see that Southern African 'tribes' could only be properly understood as creations of the South African state, their people living as deprived minorities within an unequal, oppressive and modern 'common society'. There was no way back to 'traditional' tribal life (Macmillan 1989). In 1921, in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Cape Town, Radcliffe-Brown took a similar radical line. The social systems of the African peoples in South Africa had been transformed by European interventions: 'we inaugurated something that must change the whole of their social life'. From the principles of structural-functionalism, an ineluctable conclusion followed: 'Segregation is impossible' (Gordon 1990).[9]

As undergraduates at the University of Cape Town, Schapera and Fortes had taken social anthropology courses from Radcliffe-Brown. They agreed with Macmillan and Radcliffe-Brown that a 'common society', shot through with conflicts, had come into being in South Africa. The lives of 'tribal' populations were being shaped by the overarching institutions of a powerful state and an industrializing economy. As Schapera wrote:

> The 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, in so far as it has been accepted, must be studied like any other form of cult … So, too, the trading store, the labour recruiter and the agricultural demonstrator must be considered integral parts of the modem economic life, the school as part of the routine educational development of the children, and the Administration as part of the existing political system. (Schapera 1935: 315)

In 1940, in his presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute, Radcliffe-Brown made the argument in more general terms. The situation in African colonies could not be understood in terms of 'culture contact', as Malinowski proposed. It was imperative to think in terms of social structures:

> Let us suppose that we wish to study and understand what is happening in a British or French colony or dependency in Africa, at the present time. Formerly the region was inhabited by Africans having their own social structure. Now a new and more complex social structure has been brought into existence. The population now includes a certain number of Europeans – government officials, traders, missionaries and, in some instances, settlers. The new political structure is one in which the Europeans have a large measure of control, and they generally play an important part in the new economic structure. The outstanding characteristic

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

> of this kind of social structure is that Europeans and Africans constitute different classes, with different languages, different customs and modes of life, and different sets of values and ideas. It is an extreme example of a society compounded of heterogeneous elements. (Radcliffe-Brown 1940a: 10)

The only contribution to *African Political Systems* to follow through on some of the obvious implications of the 'common society' model was Gluckman's chapter on the Zulu. Best read as a companion piece to his 'Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand' (Gluckman 1940),[10] the presentation was organized historically, setting out various 'stages' of Zulu history, and in a quasi-Marxist manner, it indicated strains and conflicts in each stage. (The history was drawn from a single source, A.T. Bryant's *Olden Times in Zululand and Natal*, which had just been published, in 1938.)[11]

Gluckman insisted on the oppressive nature of South African rule over the Zulu, but he set out the ways in which brute force was embedded in more accommodative, and legitimate, structural relations. As Radcliffe-Brown noted in his preface to *African Political Systems*: 'Dr Gluckman's essay on the Zulu shows how the former system of a balance between the power of the chief, on the one side, and public sentiment, on the other, has been replaced by one in which the chief has to maintain as best he can some sort of balance between the requirements of the European rulers and the wishes of his people.' This was in keeping with his insistence that 'the political constitution must also be studied as an equilibrium system' (Radcliffe-Brown 1940b: xxiii). In his account of the feud among the Nuer, Evans-Pritchard claimed that it sustained a balance between rivalrous tribes and clans. But Gluckman later confessed: 'I was still thinking in crude functional terms of institutions – even civil war, which after all can be an institution – contributing to the maintenance of a rather rigidly conceived social structure' (Gluckman 1963: 20). Evans-Pritchard would himself write a powerful, historical account of a segmentary society that was united only in its struggle against the Italian colonial regime (*The Sanusi of Cyrenaica*, published in 1949).

The most common criticism of *African Political Systems* has been that it largely failed to confront the crisis in colonial government and did not address the sweeping, destabilizing social and economic changes that Africans were experiencing. The International African Institute had promised that the Rockefeller research fellows would concern themselves with colonial policy and social change (Richards 1944). In 1932, the Institute set out an ambitious programme in the form of a 'Five Year Plan' (bizarrely echoing the Soviet jargon). As Daryll Forde glossed the prospectus: 'This was the first study, at once large-scale and intensive, to be undertaken of the structure of African societies and the changes taking place in them, particularly under the impact of western ideas, techniques, and economic forces' (Forde 1951). In practice, however, the contributions to *African*

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

Political Systems were only occasionally relevant to debates about 'race relations' and colonial policy. Political and social change was generally dealt with briefly, if at all, in the concluding sections of the ethnographic chapters.

According to Max Gluckman, Evans-Pritchard 'had sworn he would never touch "Culture Contact" or "Culture Change"' – but he [Gluckman] himself found modern politics more interesting and important'. Gluckman commented to Fortes that 'other anthropologists were blind' (Gordon 2018: 116–17). Evans-Pritchard was not blind, but he did argue that the study of change was less interesting, even less urgent, than studies of traditional systems. There were also divisions in principle over engagement in 'applied anthropology'. The Radcliffe-Brown faction at Oxford was inclined to take a purist line on 'science', while the Malinowskians were ready, even willing, to work with the Colonial Office.

'The racket here is very amusing', Evans-Pritchard wrote to Fortes at the end of the Second World War:

> It would be more so if it were not disastrous to anthropology. Everyone is advising government – Raymond [Firth], Forde, Audrey [Richards], Schapera. No one is doing any real anthropological work – all are clinging to the Colonial Office Coach. This deplorable state of affairs is likely to go on, because it shows something deeper than making use of opportunities for helping anthropology. It shows an attitude of mind and is I think fundamentally a moral deterioration. These people will not see that there is an unbridgeable chasm between serious anthropology and Administration Welfare work. (Goody 1995: 73)[12]

This had not always been Evans-Pritchard's view. When he was preparing to study the Nuer in the field, their prophets were being hanged by the British, and Nuer resistance was ruthlessly being suppressed. Soon, as Douglas H. Johnson records, 'a vigorous new attempt to administer the Nuer would begin, with the building of roads, dispensaries, and administrative centres, and the organization of the Nuer into a new administrative system under government appointed chiefs' (Johnson 1982: 231). Evans-Pritchard offered his services to the Sudan administration, writing to a senior colonial official in 1929: 'If I can be of any assistance in furthering this work by making investigations amongst the Nuer I shall be glad to do so' (ibid.: 232).

A decade later, Evans-Pritchard was still sometimes willing to consider applied research projects. Robert Gordon has discovered that Evans-Pritchard and Fortes submitted an unsuccessful funding application in March 1940, with a strong covering letter from Radcliffe-Brown, bidding for £6,000 to study modern political development in Africa: 'This project took as its basis the approach they had adopted in the soon-to-be-published *African Political Systems*, which

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

emphasized that the British colonial policy of "indirect rule" required a comprehensive knowledge of indigenous political institutions' (Gordon 2018: 152).

If that was really the goal of the editors of *African Political Systems*, the book was not an unqualified success. But, in any case, it is not read today as a guide to the stresses and strains of Indirect Rule. So far as the editors themselves were concerned, the volume had a wider purpose. In their 'Introduction', Fortes and Evans-Pritchard wrote: 'We believe that the eight societies described will not only give the student a bird's-eye view of the basic principles of African political organization, but will also enable him to draw a few, perhaps elementary, conclusions of a general and theoretical kind' (1940: 4). These were significant claims, and they were largely justified. The editors were right to insist that political theory could not in good faith ignore the real-world variety of political systems, or fall back on the fantasy anthropology of Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau or Karl Marx. The comparative ambition of Radcliffe-Brown was also vindicated, to some degree at least. The typology set out by the editors has been very influential, albeit subjected to serious criticisms.

Perhaps most importantly, the editors brought together a set of pioneering, authoritative, ethnographic accounts of African political traditions. Remarkably, some of these case studies are helpful in understanding contemporary African politics. As Simon Simonse and Robin Palmer demonstrate in their contributions to the present volume, these range from the civil war in Southern Sudan to the position of 'traditional authorities' in South Africa. But the most enduring achievement of this volume was that it has helped to launch an ethnographically informed political anthropology and, as a consequence, to broaden the horizons of political theory.

Adam Kuper has taught anthropology in universities in Uganda, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States. He was most recently Centennial Professor of Anthropology at the LSE and a visiting professor at Boston University. His latest books are *The Chosen Primate: Human Nature and Cultural Diversity*; *Culture: The Anthropologists' Account*; and *Incest and Influence: The Private Life of Bourgeois England* (all published by Harvard University Press). He is now writing a history of museums of anthropology.

Notes

1. https://www.therai.org.uk/archives-and-manuscripts/archive-contents/census-of-british-anthropologists-a71 (retrieved 3 September 2021).
2. See Chapter 4, 'Personal and Intellectual Friendships: Fortes and Evans-Pritchard', and Chapter 6, 'The Oxford Group'.
3. This is an extended review of a doctoral thesis: Mischek (2002).
4. See de Wolf (2003: 465); Mischek (2002: 74).
5. See Wolf (2003:466; Mischek (2002: 77–78).

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

6. On Thurnwald, see Gingrich (2005: 106, 121–23, 130).
7. In *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists 1920–1990*, W.D. Hammond-Tooke cites a letter written to him by Mischek expressing this view (Hammond-Tooke 1997: endnote, p. 209).
8. A series of papers originally published in the journal *Africa* were collected and issued in 1938 with an introduction by Malinowski: *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa*, Memorandum (no. XV) of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, London.
9. Inaugural Lecture, *Cape Times*, 25 August 1921. Reprinted as an Appendix in Gordon (1990).
10. For excellent commentaries on this classic text, see Macmillan (1995); and Gordon (2018).
11. See Wright (1991).
12. Letter written in July 1945. Cited in Goody (1995: 73).

References

Cell, John W. 1989. 'Lord Hailey and the Making of the African Survey', *African Affairs*, 88: 481–505.

De Wolf, Jan. 2003. 'A Disconcerting Life', *Africa*, 73(3): 461–72.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E., and Meyer Fortes. 1940. 'Memorandum on a Plan of Research into Problems of Modern Political Development in Africa' (with an introduction by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown), *Hebdomadal Journal*, 175: 185–96.

Forde, Daryll. 1951. 'International African Institute 1926–1951, Report of the Administrative Director', *Africa*, 21(3): 226–34.

Fortes, Meyer. 1979. 'Preface', in Ladislav Holý (ed.), *Segmentary Lineage Systems Reconsidered: The Queen's University Papers in Social Anthropology*. Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, Department of Social Anthropology, pp. vii–xii.

Fortes, Meyer, and E.E. Evans-Pritchard. 1940. 'Introduction', in Meyer Fortes and E.E. Evans-Pritchard (eds), *African Political Systems*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–24.

Gingrich, Andre. 2005. 'Ruptures, Schools, and Nontraditions: Reassessing the History of Socio-cultural Anthropology in Germany', in Frederik Barth et al. (eds), *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 59–153.

———. 2010. 'Alliances and Avoidance: British Interactions with German-Speaking Anthropologists, 1933–1953', in Deborah James, Evie Plaice and Christina Toren (eds), *Culture Wars: Context, Models and Anthropologists' Accounts*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 19–31.

Gifford, E.W. 1926. 'Miwok Lineages and the Political Unit in Aboriginal California', *American Anthropologist*, 28: 389–401.

Gluckman, Max. 1940. 'Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand': (A) 'The Social Organisation of Modern Zululand' and (B) 'Social Change in the History of Zululand', *Bantu Studies*, 14: 1–30, 147–74.

———. 1947. 'Malinowski's "Functional" Analysis of Social Change', *Africa*, 17(2): 103–21.

———. 1963. *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa*. London: Routledge.

Goody, Jack. 1995. *The Expansive Moment: Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918–1970.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

Gordon, Robert J. 1990. 'Early Social Anthropology in South Africa', *African Studies* 49: 15–48.

———. 2018. *The Enigma of Max Gluckman: The Ethnographic Life of a 'Luckyman' in Africa*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Graham, I.D. 1976. 'Indirect Rule: The Establishment of "Chiefs" and "Tribes" in Cameron's Tanganyika', *Tanzania Notes and Records*, no. 77.

Hailey, William Malcolm, 1938. *An African Survey: A Study of Problems Arising in Africa South of the Sahara*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hammond-Tooke, W.D. 1997. *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists 1920–1990*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Johnson, Douglas H. 1982. 'Evans-Pritchard, the Nuer, and the Sudan Political Service', *African Affairs*, 81(323): 231–46.

Kuper, Adam. 1996. 'Audrey Richards', in Edward Shils and Carmen Blacker (eds), *Cambridge Women: Twelve Portraits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 221–44.

Macmillan, Hugh. 1989. '"Paralysed Conservatives": W.M. Macmillan, the Social Scientists and the "Common Society", 1923–48', in Hugh Macmillan and Shula Marks (eds), *Africa and Empire: W.M. Macmillan, Historian and Social Critic*. London: Institute of Commonwealth Studies, pp. 72–90.

———. 1995. 'Return to the Malungwana Drift: Max Gluckman, the Zulu Nation and the Common Society', *African Affairs*, 94(374): 39–65.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1929. 'Practical Anthropology', *Africa* 2(1): 22–38.

McComb, Marlin R., and George M. Foster. 1974. 'Kalervo Oberg, 1901–1973', *American Anthropologist*, 76(2): 357–60.

Mischek, Udo. 2002. *Leben und Werk Günter Wagners (1908–1952)*. Gehren: Escher.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1940a. 'On Social Structure', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 70(1): 1–12.

———. 1940b. 'Preface', in Meyer Fortes and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *African Political Systems*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. xi–xxiii.

Richards, A.I. 1944. 'Practical Anthropology in the Lifetime of the International African Institute', *Africa*, 14(6): 289–301.

Salamone, F. 2000. 'The International African Institute: The Rockefeller Foundation and the Development of British Social Anthropology in Africa', *Transforming Anthropology*, 9: 19–29.

Schapera, Isaac. 1935. 'Field Methods in the Study of Modern Culture Contacts', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 8(3): 315–28.

Seligman, C.G. 1934. *Egypt and Negro Africa: A Study in Divine Kingship.* London: Routledge.

Wright, John. 1991. 'A.T. Bryant and "The Wars of Shaka"', *History in Africa*, 18: 409–25.

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican

Map of ethnic groups and kingdoms mentioned in this volume (Jutta Turner, © Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology)

African Political Systems Revisited
Changing Perspectives on Statehood and Power
Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Günther Schlee
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BoskovicAfrican