

INTRODUCTION

On Tuesday, 25 October 1955, Isaac Schapera, then Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics, announced the end of Alfred Radcliffe-Brown's life. In a telegram to his colleague Raymond Firth, Hotel des Familles, Geneva, Suisse. he wrote:

RB DIED YESTERDAY MORNING, FUNERAL SATURDAY MORNING,
SENDING REEF FOR YOU AND ALSO DEPARTMENT – ISAAC.¹

The seventy-four-year-old man had died from a heart condition and respiratory failure at the University College Hospital, merely a few blocks away.

Radcliffe-Brown's only child, Cynthia Pyke, arranged his funeral service at the Golders Green Crematorium. About twenty anthropologists attended and many more sent their condolences. From Chicago, Fred Eggan posted a sheath of bronze chrysanthemums against a background of breach leaves in the name of his department. He also generously offered to meet any outstanding costs concerning Radcliffe-Brown's illness.² Cynthia Pyke appreciated their presence and wrote to thank Raymond Firth for the flowers: 'Would you also convey my thanks [and] also say how contented father would have been to see so many old friends and students at the service?'³

At Cambridge, Meyer Fortes cancelled all social anthropology lectures as a sign of mourning and wrote to Daryll Forde.⁴

Sonia [his wife] and I were so depressed by the funeral that we could not bear to stay around ... For me, this is a historic turning point in anthropology. Tacitly, I realise I have for years thought that there was always RB in the background. In doubt, one could refer an idea or an article to him. Now we have to act on our own.⁵

At Manchester, Max Gluckman expressed the view that Cynthia Pyke had inappropriately converted her father's memorial service into a religious one, 'inadequate for a man such as RB'.⁶ During the social anthropology seminar, he organised an alternative event.

I cleared the mantelpiece of everything except his photograph, put a vase of flowers next to it, and paid tribute to him. We then stood for a minute. All my people were deeply moved. Afterwards, everyone drank a toast to his memory and work in the pub and 'started to talk anthropology.

Later, all members stood in honour of their former life president at the Association of Social Anthropology (ASA) winter meeting in London. Because the office had been so personal to him, they decided somebody should not fill it for now. The Association proposed establishing a memorial fund to assist young anthropologists in his name.⁷

Many obituaries written during the mourning period celebrated the end of a new beginning in the history of anthropology.⁸ An obituary in *The Times*, probably written by Evans-Pritchard, described Radcliffe-Brown as 'the leader of British social anthropologists'. 'He and Malinowski were for some twenty years the outstanding figures in social anthropology in this country, and after Malinowski died in 1942, Radcliffe-Brown's pre-eminence was acknowledged by all. 'He established Social Anthropology Departments at the Universities of Cape Town, Sydney and Oxford. He held chairs at Chicago, Yenching (China), São Paulo (Brazil), Manchester, Alexandria (Egypt), and Grahamstown (South Africa).' The obituary writer also commended Radcliffe-Brown's work as President of the Anthropology Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, President of the Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) and Life President of the Association of Social Anthropology (ASA): 'There is certainly no anthropologist in the British commonwealth who is not directly or indirectly greatly indebted to Radcliffe-Brown.'⁹

Changing Representations of Radcliffe-Brown

After his death, Radcliffe-Brown's works still exerted some influence on the development of social anthropology. Fortes wrote appreciative reflections on Radcliffe-Brown's contributions across his career (Fortes 1955, 1956, 1973), and Mysore Srinivas (1958) and Adam Kuper (1977) edited collections of his previously unpublished and less accessible writings. Fred Eggan and Max Gluckman (1965) dedicate a four-volume series of essays by American and British anthropologists to Radcliffe-Brown. Following his lead, they present anthropology as an ally of sociology and political science rather than psychology and economics, Malinowski's old hobby horses. In Kuper's *Anthropologists*

and *Anthropology* (1983), the most widely read text on the history of anthropology, Radcliffe-Brown still looms large as one of the two founding fathers of the British school.

However, today, the letters of his epitaph on East Wall, Bay 22, in the remembrance garden of Golders Green Crematorium have faded and are barely legible. New generations of scholars often remember Radcliffe-Brown as a curious figure, as a misplaced positivist and colonial conservative whose social and intellectual contributions were of dubious value. For many, it seems more apparent why he has become a negative countertype in revisionist critique than why scholars once celebrated him as an illustrious founder of modern social anthropology.

Memories of his personality, assessments of his professional contribution and comments about his work's ethical and political orientation are sometimes excessively negative. Some contemporaries recall that Radcliffe-Brown was often isolated and lonely. Raised in an orphanage on the western outskirts of London, he had to make his way on his own without the help of influential kin. They postulate that he adopted the persona of an English intellectual aristocrat to compensate for his modest upbringing. For example, he changed his surname from the more commonplace Brown to the hyphenated Radcliffe-Brown (Leach 1984: 21).

Adolphus Elkin (1956), Raymond Firth (1956) and Edmund Leach (1984) write that his intellectually conceited, sometimes arrogant personality earned him many enemies. In an interview, Leach recalled taking tea with Radcliffe-Brown towards the end of his life:

He seemed a pathetic figure ... I found R-B very pompous. I could not stand the way he would continually teach other people their business. The 'society as organism' model, which he seemed to have taken with complete seriousness during his Chicago period, stuck me as absolute rubbish. (Leach, cited in Kuper 1986a: 377)

John Barnes, who visited Oxford University as a graduate student in 1939, was struck by Radcliffe-Brown's pretentiousness and excessive awareness of his conduct:

He gave me the impression of a sort of repertory actor, waiting between trips. He had this air about him of ... playing a part all the time. He was a very odd creature. In a way ... one can understand why it was that his period in Sydney was the height of his career, in so much as there he could play a part on a small provincial stage much more effectively than he could in either Oxford or Cambridge ... I don't know what happened in Chicago. Perhaps there was no stage to play on there at all.¹⁰

Critics, in turn, feel that the quality of Radcliffe-Brown's fieldwork was undesirable. Unlike Malinowski, they allege that he did not get off the veranda and live among the natives, and never attained fluency in the vernacular. He reportedly researched near Port Blair on the Andaman Islands and in a lock-up facility for Aboriginal people suffering from syphilis on Bernier Island, off the Western Australian coastline (Kuper 1983; Hastrup 2012).

Even Radcliffe-Brown's sternest opponents commend the lucidity and clarity of his writings and the innovations he brought to the study of kinship. Nevertheless, they quickly remind us that he published less than his contemporaries. According to Firth (1956: 298): 'He wrote with difficulty, and it would not be easy to know how he became so outstanding a figure in the anthropological world were one to consider his writings alone.' He credits Radcliffe-Brown with developing the concept of social structure, but highlights other defects:

Some of his generalisations, neat in verbal form, are thin and tautologous when gratefully examined. His explicit systematic method for the scientific study of society had in it too little philosophical sophistication to command full support. Some of his psychological assumptions now seem jejune. The theory of social systems, as he put it forward, with no proper allowance for change. At its worst, his systematisation sometimes gave the impression of an artificial construction dangerously akin to playing with words. (Firth 1956: 302)

Just as serious, and more damning today are assertions about the ethical and political orientation of Radcliffe-Brown's work. Needham (1971) devotes an entire monograph to expose his alleged intellectual charlatanry. Radcliffe-Brown, he argues, misleadingly claimed to have discovered the Kariera kinship system and freely plagiarised from the manuscript of the amateur ethnographer Daisy Bates. Langham (1981), in turn, claims that he invoked scientific credentials to create false impressions of empirical achievements and browbeat intellectual opponents.

In 1987, the Oxford-based anthropologist Godfrey Lienhardt asked Raymond Firth to explain in a brief note why he thought Radcliffe-Brown once commanded influence and authority. Lienhardt observed that contemporary anthropologists had fierce reactions against him: 'I am rather baffled by how, on the whole, Malinowski remains a great figure in his profession while RB is scarcely considered.'¹¹ Firth responded that his powers of argument and notion of structure might explain his earlier influence, but concurred that Radcliffe-Brown had fallen into relative obscurity.¹² The younger generation, he wrote,

found Levi-Strauss structuralism more sophisticated and appealing, and could more easily reconcile their reflexive attitude towards ethnography with Malinowski's tendency to expose himself than Radcliffe-Brown's aloofness.¹³

Then there is the issue of Radcliffe-Brown's crude objectivism. Some of his statements suggest a complete absence of empathy. In 1928, during a debate on the fate of Aboriginal people, he reportedly told an audience at the Sydney Museum: 'The work of the anthropologist is entirely objective. He treats human natives as the chemist treats his substance. If he admits human interests and sympathies, he impairs the validity of his work' (Radcliffe-Brown 1928a: 68). Grimshaw (2001) writes that the vision of the Enlightenment, to which Radcliffe-Brown subscribed, the world is 'an object out there', rendered transparent through the systematic application of precise theoretical concepts. This vision, she argues, is intimately linked to political control. The eye of observation easily evolves into one of surveillance. He needed more insight from his research participants. Therefore, his work 'does not stimulate the imagination in the manner of his predecessors' (2001: 57). Rosaldo, too, criticises Radcliffe-Brown's intellectual distance; his analysis of weeping on the Andaman Islands blatantly devalues the feelings of people struggling to cope with tragic events (Rosaldo 1988:12).

Scholars on the political left portray Radcliffe-Brown as a 'paralysed conservative', closely allied to colonial governments (Macmillan 1989: 215). At best, he was oblivious to the repressive contexts in which his analysis subjects lived (Langham 1981); at worst, he actively perpetuated their subjugation. In Stauder's (1974) opinion, Radcliffe-Brown's anthropology met all the requirements of British imperialism. He deliberately provided colonial agents with the necessary information about social integration. Moreover, his vision of traditional societies as well-balanced accorded with the requirements of indirect rule. 'Social change and anti-colonial struggles', writes Stauder (1974: 35), was an underlying source of worry to colonialists and colonial anthropologists: 'They sought to arrest the disintegration of traditional societies, not only for the sake of people living in them but to preserve the British empire itself' (1974: 36).

Considering negative evaluations, Radcliffe-Brown's scholarly career seems like a nasty skeleton in an ugly anthropological closet. The less said about him and the intellectually sterile and politically suspect period in the discipline's history, the better. These assumptions explain why, in an age of reflexivity and inquisitiveness about our

discipline's roots, no scholar has, to date, completed a full biographical study of Radcliffe-Brown's life and works.

An Intellectual Postmortem

This biography is born from a refusal to join the choir of condemnation before considering the facts. I believe that we have moved too fast in excising Radcliffe-Brown from anthropology's disciplinary history. My hesitancy arises from my experience of studying social anthropology in South Africa during the 1980s, where, despite his warts and defects, Radcliffe-Brown was still revered. For social anthropologists of a liberal-left persuasion, who opposed racial segregation and apartheid, he appears as a ground layer of progressive thought. His view that social structure rather than culture should be the prime object of study led him to conceptualise South Africa as a single social system. In a well-known essay, he argued that the interactions of various cultures did not characterise the South African situation:

but the interaction of individuals and groups within an established structure, which is itself in process of change. What is happening in a Transkeian tribe, for example, can only be described by recognising that the tribe has been incorporated into a wide political and economic structural system. (Radcliffe-Brown 1940c: 202)

This perspective inspired Gluckman's (1940) seminal essay on the opening of a bridge in modern Zululand, which revolutionised our understanding of social situations, such as those on the rapidly changing African continent (Cocks 2001; Frankenberg 2005).

In contrast to this strain of argument, intellectual apologists for apartheid – such as the Afrikaner nationalists Werner Eiselen, P.G. Schoeman and P.J. Coertze – saw culture as the unique expression of the *ethnos* of a people (*volk* in Afrikaans), and self-evident unit of analysis (see Sharp 1981; Gordon 1988). Their perspective was much closer to that of Malinowski, who also understood the modern African situation as one of 'culture contact'. Malinowski, unlike Radcliffe-Brown, sympathised with Afrikaner ethnic nationalist concerns, advocated indirect rule, called for greater consistency in the implementation of the colour bar and made a passionate plea for segregated education for black South Africans (Malinowski 1930b, 1931a, 1936).¹⁴

The South African experiences suggest that intellectual closure was premature, resulting in a poor understanding of his life and works and a crucial period in modern social anthropology. His South African legacy raises questions about how his anthropological work played out in other countries and contexts in which he worked. It also provides some rationale for opening his proverbial closet to conduct a postmortem examination of the skeleton inside.

There are at least three further, interrelated reasons for trying to trace the life course of this now outdated and obscure intellectual. First, unlike most of his contemporaries, Radcliffe-Brown's favoured mode of intellectual engagement was the spoken word – as in lectures and public talks – rather than the written word – as in essays and monographs (Barnard 1992: 2). This means that consideration only of the portion of his work available in printed form in the standard university libraries will invariably result in a partial understanding of ideas, theories and arguments that helped shaped modern social anthropology. To form a complete picture of his intellectual work, it is imperative that we also consider seriously his correspondences, notes that students took of his lectures, and newspaper articles of his public talks. This operation reveals another Radcliffe-Brown, whose life and career contradict present-day stereotypes. Evidence from these quarters suggests that he was deeply engaged in the social and political issues of the day. This aspect of his work has evaded acknowledgement by his earlier supporters and latter-day critics. Such evidence also reveals a scholar with far more significant intellectual influence in teaching and mentorship than has previously been recognised.

A second, perhaps more compelling reason for a postmortem pertains to the contexts in which Radcliffe-Brown worked. His career comprised a series of journeys through different parts of the colonial world, where he bore witness to the unfolding of events and processes during a pivotal part of human history. He conducted fieldwork in the Andaman Islands, then administered by the British government of India and, subsequently, in the settler state of Western Australia. In both countries, he worked among Indigenous people, who had been dispossessed of their land and driven to virtual extinction by violence and disease. During the First World War, he worked as a teacher at a prestigious Sydney high school and gained direct experience as a colonial administrator by serving as director of education in Tonga. Here, and in other islands, he witnessed the ravages of the Spanish flu, brought by a European ship to Polynesia. Hereafter, his anthropology work took him to South Africa; to New South Wales, where he

administered a research programme on Indigenous people in a tense political climate; to Chicago during the Great Depression and prohibition, and to China, at a time when Japanese forces occupied large parts of the country. Radcliffe-Brown planned to serve out the final phase of his career in Oxford. However, the Second World War disrupted his tenure, and he felt compelled to seek work in the Brazilian city of Sao Paulo. Whilst retired, he again took the road to lecture in revolutionary Egypt and South Africa. A life lived in more diverse colonial settings is hard to imagine.

By following Radcliffe-Brown's physical and intellectual journeys, we can gain deep and nuanced insights into different social, political and economic contexts that shaped the making of modern social anthropology and the connections between them. Such insights are vital, given angry calls by a younger generation of scholars for anthropology's abolition, burning and decolonisation (Mafeje 1998; Allen and Jobson 2016; Bejarano et al. 2019; Jobson 2020). These debates call for detailed and accurate evidence on how anthropology was colonial and which routes were wrong.

A third important reason for reconsidering Radcliffe-Brown's career is his attempts to formulate a 'natural science of society'. Within two decades of his death, anthropologists seemed to have reached a consensus about the undesirability and unattainability of this ideal. In the band of anthropology promoted by Geertz, the pursuit of 'an experimental science in search of law' gave way to 'an interpretive one in search of meaning' (1973: 5). The Foucauldian knowledge/power equation cast further doubt about the scientific enterprise. Critics assert that claims to knowledge and truth are expressions of hegemony and domination (Sahlins 2002).¹⁵

However, the emergence of what some commentators call a 'post-truth' society challenges the perception that science is an unshakable ally of the ruling classes. Today, populist politicians readily challenge scientific knowledge about the impact of human activity on climate change, the existence of HIV and coronavirus, and the efficacy of antiretroviral drugs and COVID-19 vaccines. George W. Bush and Tony Blair confidently proclaimed that Afghanistan was responsible for the 9/11 attacks and that Iraq harboured weapons of mass destruction. Manto Tshabalala-Msimang, South Africa's Minister of Health repeatedly described antiretroviral drugs as poisonous and peddled beetroot, garlic and African potato as more appropriate treatments for AIDS. Similarly dismissive of science was Donald Trump, who claimed that wind turbines cause cancer, COVID-19 would disappear by

summer and that there would be fewer infections if we did no testing. Trump touted hydroxychloroquine, and possibly also a domestic disinfectant, as cures. He also pronounced that he had won a presidential election in which he secured seven million votes fewer than his rival. More recently, Vladimir Putin sent hundreds of thousands of young Russian soldiers into Ukraine to depose its 'LGBTQ-Nazi' rulers.

The existence of nonsense in the highest echelons of government has deadly consequences: the invasion of foreign countries at the cost of untold suffering and trillions of dollars, rising temperatures threatening livelihoods across the globe, and millions of early preventable deaths. Here, science and objectivity are progressive counterhegemonic forces. These examples raise uncomfortable questions for anthropological theory. Indeed, there is more to the truth than its social and ideological construction (Hacking 1999). Indeed, there are limits to approaches dedicated solely to interpreting subjective meaning (Gellner 1992; Kuper 1999). Today, pursuing objective knowledge seems much less futile than it was a few decades ago. The way forward could be clearer. Nevertheless, a careful reconsideration of Radcliffe-Brown's attempts to formulate general theories that stand independent of any observer, mood or cultural context, and their testing by methods of controlled comparisons, is one way to do so.

Colonialism and the 'Intercalary' Anthropologist

A central contention of this book is that a contextual study of Radcliffe-Brown's life and works can bring a deeper, more nuanced understanding of anthropology and the colonial encounter. The existing literature on this topic relies on bifurcated points of departure. Some historians and critical theorists see anthropology as deeply complicit in European colonialism. As a discipline founded on the study of so-called 'primitive' and 'savage' peoples on the margins of European empires, they argue, anthropology helped construct discourses of racial superiority that legitimated colonialism. Kuklick (1991) describes how Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown regularly appealed to colonial governments for financial support on the grounds that knowledge of indigenous customs and social structures was indispensable for governance. Scholte (1974: 41; 1975: 45) reportedly heard Max Gluckman say during a seminar in Manchester that he 'had the privilege of serving His Majesty's government'. African nationalists such as Mafeje (1997, 1998) see anthropology as 'incompatible with

the political project of independent Africa'. In South Africa, Webster (2018, 2021) alleges that anthropology was a mechanism for conquest and argues that scholars such as Radcliffe-Brown silenced the historical realities of conquest, enslavement, theft and violence. The 'objectification of black alterity' is still a hallmark of the anthropological enterprise. In the United States, Anderson (2019) acknowledges that Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict cultivated a liberal anti-racist attitude. However, at the same time, he argues, they helped solidify whiteness as standing for the nation. The discipline constructed racism as a problem *in*, rather than *of*, the United States.

By contrast, scholars such as Goody (1995) and Lewis (2014) argue that anthropology played an insignificant part in colonialism. In the substance of their work, Lewis (2014: 81) writes, American anthropologists did not 'fit the profile of the tools of colonialism'. The Bureau of American Ethnology conducted 'salvage anthropology' on Native American communities in the service of historical reconstruction, museum displays and formulating theories on the dynamics of culture. Some scholars, such as Mooney (1991 [1896]), documented how broken promises, starvation and the massacre of the Sioux at Wounded Knee precipitated an outbreak of the ghost dance. During the New Deal, anthropologists worked for the Indian Affairs Department to improve native conditions. However, after the Second World War, decolonisation had already begun when they were let loose upon the rest of the world (Lewis 2014: 80).

In Britain, the colonial service preferred the administrative expertise of 'practical men' to that of scholars. Between 1900 and 1940, the government of British Tropical Africa hired only ten anthropologists, and very few of its thousands of officers ever took courses in anthropology.¹⁶ The administrators who turned to anthropology, such as Robert Rattray (1881–1938), found that their work had less appeal to administrators than to later generations of scholars and Ashanti nationalists. The British government of Sudan hired Seligman to conduct ethnological surveys and sponsored Evans-Pritchard's fieldwork among the Azande and Nuer. Nevertheless, no official ever asked for their advice (Evans-Pritchard 1946: 97). Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown were more successful in securing money from the Rockefeller Foundation than the colonial office. Their graduate students included Jamaican, Indian, Chinese, African and African-American scholars. The Colonial Social Research Council (CSSRC) established anthropological research institutes in Africa and the West Indies during the 1940s. However, the researchers they employed

saw their task as assisting the movement towards independence (Lewis 2014).

Neither side of the debate acknowledges the diversity of anthropologists' political engagements.¹⁷ Moreover, their presentist orientation is a formidable obstacle to understanding the work of anthropologists during colonial times. Glazier argues that a presentist orientation might open up new areas of investigation:

But the historian's more formidable and compelling challenge is to look beyond the sensibilities of the present and recent past to an unblinkered view of the social environment of another time or place. Absent that sustained effort at temporal immersion, the observer risks entrapment by the historical equivalent of ethnocentrism and smug moral superiority. (Glazier 2020: 90)

A more nuanced understanding is that of Ferguson (1999), who suggests that, socially, anthropologists of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI) were part of the liberal fringe of white colonial society in Northern Rhodesia. This small class also included whites with African spouses, a few senior civil servants and some persons connected with African education. Their intellectualism, politics and sometimes Jewish ethnicity alienated them from mainstream settler society. Settlers and government officials raised eyebrows about their intimacy with Africans and had little regard for their research. Nevertheless, Ferguson, writes: 'Their position was one that existed within white colonial society, not against it: it was a position that found its definition and moral purpose in its opposition to the white settler conservative, the ignorant racist settler' (1999: 32). The RLI anthropologists saw themselves as vehicles for bringing African interests to the table, and they treated Africans as the grounds – not the subjects – of debates. However, they were defensive when Africans, such as Magubane (1971), challenged the right of white liberals to represent them.

Again, the heterogeneity of political opinions among the RLI anthropologists undermines any definition of their position as a 'liberal' fringe of settler society. Some were liberals, but there were conservatives, socialists, African nationalist sympathisers, communists and even the odd anarchist (Kapferer 2000). Some certainly did not envision a radical alternative to colonial society; others were firmly committed to this ideal. The RLI anthropologists claimed to represent African interests. However, on the balance of probabilities, they did not oppose African nationalists who spoke for themselves. Their disagreement with Magubane was about the meanings of cultural forms such as dress and dance on the Copperbelt.

Gluckman's concept of the 'intercalary' better captures the positionality of anthropologists during colonial times and enables us to envision the broader assemblage of forces and dependencies that enabled the production of anthropological knowledge. Gluckman (1940) argues that the stark social divisions in colonial situations did not preclude bonds across the colour bar. He shows how the village headman was a focus of contradictory demands. An unpopular, alien colonial bureaucracy commanded him to administer their policies. However, at the same time, subjects expected him to fulfil his responsibilities towards them and, if necessary, challenge the government on their behalf (Gluckman et al. 1949). The headman also mediated between the interests of his kinship group, who wanted him to favour them, and those of other subjects, which required him to act without bias. For Gluckman, this position was untenable. He cites the example of a Zulu chief praised by colonial officials, but condemned by his people for refusing to build a cattle paddock to prevent soil erosion (Gluckman 1963: 172–73).

Anthropologists occupied an intercalary position of a different kind. During colonial times, their position was a point of convergence for multiple shifting networks, each offering valuable resources while imposing restrictions and constraints. Anthropologists certainly saw themselves as 'legitimate children of the enlightenment' (Firth 1975: 29), who pursued their professional interests to construct scientific knowledge about human culture and society. This pursuit was guided as much by a will to meaning as by a will to power (Argyrou 2002: 92–119). First and foremost, they depended on collegial scholarly networks for training, advice, access to the printing press, attentive listeners and readers, and status. However, these networks were neither unitary nor stable. Since the turn of the twentieth century, there have been schisms between those interested in the evolution of social institutions and others more concerned about the diffusion of customs across the globe, between English intellectualists and French sociologists, and between those who held different positions on the status of biology in human behaviour.

Before the Second World War, anthropology was weakly institutionalised and lacked a solid institutional base in museums and universities (Kuklick 1991). Given this situation, anthropologists depended on privately accumulated wealth and the support from learned societies, governments, and philanthropies to meet fieldwork expenses and sustain themselves. Agents of colonial governments, such as African District Commissioners, Australian Aboriginal Protectors and, in

some cases, mission societies, also served as gatekeepers who facilitated and denied access to the field (Straube 2020).¹⁸

Since the Torres Straits Expedition of 1898, anthropologists also came to depend directly on colonised people as the primary sources of ethnographic information and as companions during fieldwork. Colonial subjects came to participate in the production of anthropological texts as interlocutors, interpreters, informants and more remotely connected research participants. Indeed, anthropologists frequently saw society and culture through the eyes of their interlocutors. Casagrande (1964) describes the relationship between anthropologists and research participants as long, intimate and wide-ranging. Insofar as colonial subjects guided and taught the anthropologist, fieldwork subverted colonial hierarchies. However, published texts rarely recognise the contribution of Indigenous intellectuals and their relations with visiting anthropologists.

From this perspective, the production of anthropological knowledge requires the researcher to navigate between different and contradictory interests carefully. Some examples suggest that anthropologists found it virtually impossible to strike an appropriate balance. Heeding too closely to the requirements of colonial authorities could compromise the validity of one's research, whilst identifying too closely with the interests of colonial subjects could lead to expulsion from the field. For example, the Broken Hill Development Corporation refused Godfrey Wilson access to the labour compounds and withdrew his permission to work in the township. White miners had complained that he had transgressed colonial etiquette. Wilson fraternised with Africans, visited their homes, smoked with them, gave African women rides and befriended a retired colonial official with several African wives (Schumaker 2001: 62; Gordon 2018: 265–69; Straube 2020: 402). These impositions sometimes rendered the sincere ethnographic inquiry into black lives impossible.

Did those who occupy intercalary positions have at least some room for manoeuvre? On this issue, Kuper (1970) disagrees with Gluckman. He observed that new power sources sometimes strengthened the headman's hands in the Kalahari Desert. Headmen could manipulate District Commissioners and the police into intervening on their side against local people. At the same time, they could mention the demands of their people to avoid carrying out government orders. Only through extended case studies can we discern how headmen negotiated between conflicting interests to pursue their interests (Kuper 1970). Much the same applied to anthropologists

during colonial times. There was no authoritative script for mediating between conflicting interests, and anthropologists pursued diverse and deeply personal strategies. These ranged from invoking the authority of science to bargain for autonomy to employing hidden forms of resistance, such as feigning compliance with colonial authorities, pretending friendship with research participants, and learning to keep quiet and speak strategically. Anthropologists also invested in different sets of relations during different phases of research.

These negotiations often had unpredictable outcomes. During Gluckman's fieldwork in Zululand in 1938, he offended the Zulu regent by intervening to stop the flogging of a drunkard, and he irked the Native Commissioner by living in a hut, wearing a *beshu* when he visited town, and by asking questions about taxation. Consequently, the Commissioner banned him from his field site. However, as Gordon shows, by burning his bridges and severing his relations of dependence, Gluckman won a unique opportunity to write critically about its administrative structures (Gordon 2018: 106–11). He subsequently advised students to keep their eyes and ears open, but their mouths shut during fieldwork (Werbner 2020: 23).

Being positioned on the threshold of colonial boundaries had profound psychological implications, particularly for maintaining personal integrity. In Sachs' (1996 [1937]) remarkable psychoanalytic study of John Chavafambriwa, a research assistant who mediated between Ellen Hellman and the community of the Rooiyard slum, he analyses the ambivalent feelings of affinity and hatred towards self and others in colonial situations. Though located on the privileged side of the colour bar, anthropologists, too, experienced great ambivalence. For example, Morrow (2016) explores how engaging with contradictory interests in colonial Southern Africa during wartime generated unbearable tensions that contributed to the suicide of the brilliant and sensitive young anthropologist Godfrey Wilson.

In attempting to reconstruct the trajectory of Radcliffe-Brown's life and works, this biography seeks to show how his dedication to anthropology as a natural science of society, his aloof yet authoritative persona, excessive self-consciousness, minimalism and seemingly contradictory political statements played out in the diverse settings of the colonial world. In general, it seeks to understand how, despite numerous failures along the way, he maintained some integrity and significantly contributed to the creation and professionalisation of modern social anthropology.

Can We Study Radcliffe-Brown?

Is an in-depth study of Radcliffe-Brown's life possible? To date, his life has eluded the attention of anthropology's biographers. Oral history is out of the question, as there currently exists no recoverable memories of him among his descendants and today's generation of anthropologists. Also, there is no compressed archive of his documents. Throughout his life, Radcliffe-Brown travelled lightly and often and amassed few papers. Then there is the factor of his introversion. Unlike Malinowski, he kept no dairies and revealed little about himself and his private thoughts in his letters, even those to close friends, such as Lloyd Warner. Philip Mayer, who interacted closely with Radcliffe-Brown towards the end of his life in South Africa, described him as 'not easy to get to know' and as 'a person of great reserve'.¹⁹

Despite being the most innovative and influential thinker on kinship, Radcliffe-Brown mostly lived alone, outside networks of relatedness. The few relatives that he did have primarily resided in different countries. They had only sporadic contact with him and possessed only the most cursory knowledge of his life. Radcliffe-Brown married Winnifred Lloyd in 1910. However, their relationship was distant and lasted only sixteen years. The couple lived together in Sydney, Nuku'alofa (Tonga) and Cape Town, but separated in 1925. He returned to Sydney, she to England, and Cynthia, their twelve-year-old daughter, to Switzerland, where she spent much of her youth. Cynthia was tall and handsome like her father and studied international law. She gave birth to a son, Paul Fronteras, whose father was a racing car driver, and later married Allan Pike, a civil engineer, with whom she had a daughter, Jacqueline Pike. Cynthia died in 1997, in Battersea Bridge, at the age of eighty-four. Paul worked for the merchant navy, and Jacqueline became a ballet dancer and mime artist. She married a French count to live in Escaroles (Maddock 1998).

Radcliffe-Brown's siblings, Maud and Herbert Radcliffe-Brown, emigrated from England to South Africa. Here, Maud died in her thirties without any progeny. Herbert married three times. Nevertheless, it was only from his last marriage to Phyllis Churchill that he fathered a daughter, Phyllidia. She was well acquainted with her paternal uncle, particularly during the early 1950s when they were both at Rhodes University in Grahamstown: he was a professor and a student. After her marriage, Phyllidia moved to Queensland, Australia, to live under the surname Danaher. Phyllis followed her daughter from

South Africa and died in Queensland in 1996 at the age of eighty-five (Maddock 1998).

There are only fragmentary memories of Radcliffe-Brown among today's senior generation of anthropologists. Whilst in Sydney, he advised researchers they could only obtain reliable information about precolonial forms of social organisation within a period of fifty years after contact. When research for this biography started, this period had elapsed. During a conversation over dinner in Durban in 1999, McKim Marriot relayed that a boy he met, Radcliffe-Brown, in Chicago. At the time, Marriot was under the care of his sister, who dated an anthropology student, and rather than miss out on an anthropology party at a swimming pool, they took him along. He recalled conversing with a curious Englishman, sitting underneath a sun umbrella in a bathrobe, drinking gin and tonic, and reading a newspaper with a monocle. The encounter left a profound impact, which he claimed influenced his subsequent career choice. Jan Vansina attended a talk Radcliffe-Brown gave in London during the 1950s, which he found boring and unilluminating. Jean La Fontaine's impressions were very different. When Radcliffe-Brown taught her at Cambridge, she observed his lack of condescension and patience with students struggling to understand the intricacies of Australian kinship. She also recalled that he joined some male students, such as Nur Yalman, in the Cambridge pubs. Although interesting, such memories differ from the sources we use to write biographies.

Malinowski is undoubtedly a more appropriate biographical subject. He left an extensive collection of well-consolidated papers, currently housed in the archives of the London School of Economics and Stirling Memorial Library at Yale University (Young 2004). In Stocking's words, Radcliffe-Brown 'left manuscript traces that are relatively few and widely scattered' (1995: 304). At his death, his records and personal library comprised only half a dozen boxes stored in the Anthropology Department at University College London. Evans-Pritchard, his literary executor, decided to store two boxes at the Institute for Social and Cultural Anthropology at Oxford and ship those dealing with Australia to the University of Sydney. John Barnes, then Chair of Anthropology in Sydney, wrote:

I would be very glad to have these papers in this Department which R-B built up ... The papers will be of historical and sentimental interest here, and there may be some details of ethnographic interest to be gleaned from them, particularly in the view of the complete disappearance of indigenous Aboriginal society from most of Australia.²⁰

Barnes later acknowledged safe receipt of these and offered to reimburse Evans-Pritchard from departmental funds for their packing and shipping: "Thank you very much for sending these off to us ... I think that if anyone wanted to work through the material covered by R-B's papers on Australia he would find these field notes invaluable."²¹

The quest to reconstruct details of Radcliffe-Brown's life thus started in the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford, which contained two boxes of papers with a few letters and material relating to research in the Andaman Islands. At the Fisher Library at the University of Sydney, I found Radcliffe-Brown's surviving Australian field and research notes, nearly ordered and arranged by the tribe. They comprised extensive genealogies and notes on kinship terminologies. There were also unpublished notes of lectures he gave on Australian religion and a surprisingly large body of correspondence he undertook as Chair of the Anthropology Section of the Australian National Research Council (ANRC).

Subsequently, I found much more material on Radcliffe-Brown in the papers of other anthropologists with whom he corresponded. These included those of Alfred Haddon, W.H.R. Rivers and Meyer Fortes at Cambridge University; Isaac Schapera and Reverend Norton at the University of Cape Town;²² Winifred Hoernlé at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg; Bronislaw Malinowski, Raymond Firth and Audrey Richards at the London School of Economics; Max Gluckman at the Victoria University of Manchester; Fay Cooper Cole, Fred Eggan, Lloyd Warner, Baur Jackson, Sol Tax, Milton Singer and Buford Junker at the University of Chicago; Henry Myers at Oxford University; William Fagg at the Royal Anthropological Institute; and Victoria Watson and Phileo Nash at the Smithsonian Institute, Washington DC. His correspondence gives the impression of someone who maintained strict personal boundaries and seldom expressed strong emotions. Firth and Eggan's papers were the most elaborate and contained material they collected in preparation for biographical essays (Firth 1956; Eggan 1985). Eggan began research for an entire monograph on Radcliffe-Brown, but died before he could complete this task.

As a contemporary biographer, I benefited enormously from sophisticated digital search engines, particularly for newspaper articles. The search engines provided at least some compensation for the drawbacks of working on an elusive biographical subject. The best engine was the Australian TROVE system, which unearthed 253 relevant articles. British, American and Brazilian search engines generated thirty-six,

fourteen and three articles, respectively. However, I had to scour the South African newspapers – the *Cape Times*, *The Argus* and the *Rand Daily Mail* – and the *Egyptian Gazette* by hand. To the contemporary historian, the series of interviews Alan Macfarlane conducted with John Barnes, Philip Mayer, Lucy Mair and Ronald Frankenberg and shared on YouTube proved to be a valuable source.²³

Finally, I was able to draw on a wide range of secondary sources from earlier historians of anthropology, who had researched and written about Radcliffe-Brown's life and works. Langham (1981), Kuper (1983, 1986b, 1988), Stocking (1984a, 1995) and Gray (2007) make creative use not only of published sources but also of archival material. Kuper (1986b, 1988) and Stocking (1977, 1978, 1984b, 1993a and 2003) have reproduced rare sources pertinent to Radcliffe-Brown's biography in publications such as *Canberra Anthropology*, *Anthropology Today* and the *History of Anthropology Review* for the benefit of contemporary researchers. Watson (1946) and Maddock (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1998) provide rare insights into the more personal aspects of Radcliffe-Brown's life. Grant Watson relays memories of his friendship with Brown (as he was then known) at Cambridge University and experiences accompanying him during the first part of his fieldwork expedition to Western Australia between 1910 and 1911. The Australian anthropologist Ken Maddock interviewed Radcliffe-Brown's surviving kin – notably his daughter, Cynthia Pike, and his niece, Phyllidia Danaher – during the 1990s. He also wrote short essays on Radcliffe-Brown's schooling, anarchism (a political philosophy he shared), change of surname, relations of women, and kin. Maddock died in 2003 before he could complete any fuller study. Without these sources, any meaningful account of Radcliffe-Brown's life would have been impossible.

Despite the benefits of these sources, the resultant biography contains gaps, shortcomings and limitations. The most significant blind spots are the periods Radcliffe-Brown spent living in Birmingham after completing his West Australian fieldwork from 1912 to 1914 and teaching at the University of Alexandria from 1947 to 1949. Radcliffe-Brown did correspond with colleagues from Egypt, but he commented more about his health and the weather than his thoughts about the rise of Arab nationalism, the Egyptian revolution and the war with Israel in 1948. I never discovered why he purchased a cottage in Wales shortly after he arrived in Oxford in 1937, and my account of the time he spent in São Paulo between 1942 and 1945

needs to be more detailed. COVID-19 and successive lockdowns precluded travel to Egypt and Brazil.

However, these inconsistencies preclude the writing of this biography. Bernault (2015: 217) reminds us that academic history is 'essentially a labour of incomplete archives'. As a historian of Africa, she argues that the idea of well-ordered and organised, comprehensive, integrated archives is illusory. Neither would such an archive be particularly desirable, for it threatens to constrain the creative mind and to suffocate irrelevant questions. 'If we found everything we were looking for', she writes, 'our histories may not be worth crafting' (2015: 272). The challenge is to flesh out and give meaning to fragmentary evidence. Of particular significance are seemingly bizarre nuggets of information, such as the odd misplaced document, that make us rethink old storylines and generate new interpretations. The power of such incongruous oddities comes precisely from their intrusive nature and irritating lack of wholeness (2015: 257).

Outline of the Chapters

Chapter 1 considers the earliest experiences of Rex Brown as he was first known. As a young man, he invested in education to overcome the disadvantages of his early childhood and learned to see science as a means of social improvement. He studied natural sciences, languages and the arts at a Middlesex orphanage. Later, he learned to speak confidently on public affairs by participating in Birmingham's King Edward IV School debating society. I identify three layers of influence in his post-school reading. While working at the Birmingham Public Library, he read the works of anarchist philosophers and went to meet the exiled Russian revolutionary Pyotr Kropotkin and the English social reformer Havelock Ellis. He completed psychology, political economy and philosophy courses at Cambridge University. His most significant influences were Heraclitus, who argued that phenomenal reality comprised events and relations between them; Montesquieu, who identified general laws in the development of society; the English inductive philosopher William Whewell; and the social evolutionist Herbert Spencer. Rex accepted Spencer's argument that similar processes – such as the diversification of original types and the growth of complex forms marked by the specialisation of parts – occur in both organic and social life. Later, he studied anthropology under W.H.R. Rivers and Alfred Haddon, who were veterans of the field expedition

to the Torres Straits Islands in 1898. He was partially attracted to the new discipline by the promise that disseminating ethnological knowledge could curb the worst excesses of colonial rule. In 1905, he attended the South African meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science and observed social transformations in this country.

In Chapter 2, I challenge the notion that Brown was not a field researcher. I show that his experience of 18 months' fieldwork in the Andaman Islands (1906–8), and a further eleven months traversing Western Australia (1910–12) was pivotal to his career and also to the history of method in anthropology. Brown rejected the earlier division of labour between fieldworkers and theorists. During fieldwork, there were two transformations in his thinking. Initially, his approach was strictly evolutionary. He sought to plot the distribution of cultural traits and search for fundamental similarities through rigorous comparisons. Traits with the widest distribution, he assumed, were older and indicated the lives of common ancestors, and those that occurred only among some groups were recent adaptations to specific environments. But when Brown published his first essays, his focus shifted to the synchronic study of social systems. Another change was from a broad concern with skulls, physiques, tools, implements, vocabularies, and mental expressions to a narrower focus on social organisation. Brown relied on colonial authorities for access to the field and resources, but observed some of the most devastating consequences of colonial rule. His perception that European conquest and diseases were leading to the extinction of Indigenous people strengthened his resolve to record information about their rapidly disappearing modes of life.

Chapter 3 examines the seven years after the completion of Brown's fieldwork. Unable to secure funding for additional research or a regular university lectureship, he wrote up his research material in Birmingham, worked as a replacement teacher in Sydney and served as Director of Education in Tonga. From the margins of the academic world, he began to pioneer a minor revolution in anthropology. Working towards synthesising Spencer's social evolutionism and Durkheim's sociology, his concern shifted from ascertaining the chronological steps by which institutions had come to be towards analysing the mechanisms of their evolution, their functions and connections with other institutions (Fortes 1953: 17, 31). At the 1914 British Association for the Advancement of Science meetings, he and Malinowski allied against diffusionist theorists. In his monograph

The Andaman Islanders (Brown 1932 [1922]), he analysed ritual and myth, not in terms of their hypothetical history, but what they express about broader systems of ideas, sentiments and moralities. In Tonga, he gained insights into the nature of a hierarchically organised society. He also observed the ravages of the Spanish flu and wrote an angry letter, criticising the indifference of the New Zealand administration of Samoa towards the pandemic.

The next four chapters focus on Radcliffe-Brown's tenure in the Universities of Cape Town, Sydney, Chicago and Oxford. Chapter 4 builds on earlier essays by Gordon (1990), Schapera (1990) and Campbell (2014), which challenge earlier perceptions of Radcliffe-Brown (to which he changed his surname) as an active participant in the South African government's attempts to enforce a system of racial segregation. Moreover, Gordon (1990) shows the significance of his South African experience for the building of anthropological theory. I engage more fully with the archival record, in particular with Radcliffe-Brown's correspondence. I contend that he moved to South Africa for a healthier climate and more congenial employment. Here, in a country where the 'native problem' was an issue of cardinal concern, his efforts to market anthropology paid slow dividends. In 1921, he was appointed Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Cape Town and advocated a scientific approach to social problems. Because segregation was impossible, he argued, Europeans and Africans had to form a single society. Anthropology was vital for future guidance and ensuring that laws aligned with the dictates of native conscience. At the same time, he argued for the importance of liberal knowledge that developed proper use of the intellect. Radcliffe-Brown reasoned that he could do more for research by training students in the theory of science than by doing fieldwork himself. He taught both 'General Anthropology' and the 'Ethnography of Africa', and wrote essays on anthropological methods and on the mother's brother in South Africa', which outlined the central features of his approach. To promote anthropology, he organised vacation schools for officials and missionaries, lectured magistrates and chiefs, and regularly wrote to the press. He served as vice-chair of the Cape Peninsula Native Welfare Association and Joint Council, promoting mutual collaboration between black and white people. In 1924, after the electoral victory of J.B.M. Hertzog's National Party, which called for the retribalisation of Africans, he protested government policies by calling for more land, better education and better economic opportunities for black South Africans.

Commentators see Radcliffe-Brown's period in Sydney (1926–31) as the pinnacle of his career. Here he chaired the University's Social Anthropology Department, taught colonial cadets and administered substantial research funds for the Australia National Research Council (ANRC). He also established and edited the influential journal *Oceania* and became a spokesperson for Sydney's modern artists. As a public speaker, he extolled the virtues of Aboriginal social organisation and vocally condemned injustices perpetrated against Indigenous people. He drew attention to the deaths of many Aboriginal people by calculating that Australia's pre-colonial population comprised at least 300,000 persons and not 90,000 as previously estimated. His seminal work 'The Social Organisation of Australian Tribes' (Radcliffe-Brown 1930/1931) synthesised research undertaken by different fieldworkers. His attempt to elucidate structural forms underlying social interaction resonated with minimalism and abstraction in the modern art he admired. He left not due to innate wanderlust, but rather in response to threats by state governments to withdraw financial support for teaching and research. His outspokenness and constant criticisms by ANRC researchers of settlers and police contributed to these threats.

Radcliffe-Brown was drawn to the University of Chicago by the continued availability of Rockefeller funds during the Great Depression. In the United States, where anthropology was well established, he styled himself as the harbinger of a new theoretical approach centred on the comparative study of social structure. He poured great effort into teaching and supervised a generation of excellent students working on Native American social organisation. He fiercely debated adherents of the old Boasian paradigm over the status of history, the concept of function, kinship terms in California, lineages, social sanctions and the law. In his public talks, he drew attention to the failure of the United States to combat crime and to the destructive rise of individualism. He also condemned doctrines of racial superiority. He briefly visited China and contributed to the advent of community-based studies of 'complex societies in North America, Europe and Asia. These interventions profoundly shaped the development of the Chicago School of Sociology.

In 1936, Radcliffe-Brown became Chair of Social Anthropology at Oxford University and, following Malinowski's departure to the United States, became Britain's pre-eminent anthropologist. Here the social structural approach became the dominant theoretical paradigm. He was elected President of the Royal Anthropological Institute

(RAI) and Life President of the Association of Social Anthropologists (ASA). He wrote influential essays on taboos, joking relations, social structure and kinship terminologies. However, success came at the cost of bitter conflicts with an earlier generation of scholars committed to a boarder understanding of the discipline. During the Second World War, he served as a visiting professor in São Paulo. He drew attention to the devastation caused by Japan's invasion of China and called for the partition of Germany after the war. He participated in colonial issues through the Applied Anthropology Committee of the RAI. The Committee submitted memoranda to appeal against the establishment of the Rhodesian Federation, the transfer of High Commission Territories to South Africa, and the exploitation of Aboriginal people.

Chapter 8 addresses the period from Radcliffe-Brown's retirement in 1946 to his death in 1955. He initially retired to a cottage in North Wales, where he wrote a long introduction to and edited *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage* (Radcliffe-Brown and Forde 1950). However, he soon re-entered the lecturing circuit for money and companionship. During this period, he relied on the assistance and support of his former colleagues and students – Schapera, Firth, Evans-Pritchard, Fortes and Gluckman – who had come to occupy the most prestigious professorships in the United Kingdom. Radcliffe-Brown secured visiting appointments in Alexandria (Egypt), Manchester and Rhodes University (South Africa). Whilst fiercely debating established scholars on kinship, he found conviviality among students. Through the ASA, he campaigned against universities employing unqualified officials from the disappearing colonial service to teach applied anthropology. In his last public lecture, he pointed to growing social dislocation, as evident in violence, demoralisation and crime in South Africa. He described letting native people develop along their own lines as nonsense, given that the traditional system had been hacked to pieces. The invaders and the conquered, he argued, had to create a new society without the colour bar. He also emphasised the role of the intelligentsia in emancipation.

The conclusion reviews the biographical evidence and discusses its implications for revising stereotypical representations of Radcliffe-Brown's life and career in the current anthropological literature. I emphasise his quest for personal integrity in difficult situations and suggest that the contemporary generation of anthropologists, faced with new sets of challenging restrictions to scholarship, can learn much from these historical experiences.

Notes

1. Telegram, I. Schapera London, to R. Firth, Geneva, 25 October 1955, Firth Papers, London School of Economics (LSE) Archives.
2. Letter, D. Forde, London, to Fred Eggan, Chicago, 31 October 1955, Eggan Papers, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.
3. Letter, C. Pyke to R. Firth. Firth Papers, LSE Archives.
4. Oral testimony, R. Abrahams, then an anthropology student at Cambridge.
5. Letter, M. Fortes, Cambridge, to E. Evans-Pritchard, Oxford, 1 November 1955, Radcliffe-Brown Papers, Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.
6. Letter, M. Gluckman, Manchester to M. Fortes, Cambridge, 1 November 1955, Fortes Papers, Cambridge University Archives.
7. Association for Social Anthropologists (ASA) Winter Meeting, March 1956, ASA Secretary Files 1, LSE Archives.
8. The obituaries for Radcliffe-Brown include those written by Fortes (1955, 1956), Goodwin (1955), Peristiany (1955), Eggan and Warner (1956), Elkin (1956), Firth (1956) and Forde (1956).
9. 'Prof Radcliffe-Brown, Leader of British Anthropology', *The Times*, 27 October 1955, p. 14.
10. Interview with John Barnes by Jack Goody, 19 December 1983, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JhlmqUGZk_8 (retrieved 27 March 2024).
11. Letter, G. Lienhard, Oxford, to R. Firth, LSE, 30 June 1987, Firth Papers, LSE Archives.
12. Letter, R. Firth to G. Lienhard, Oxford, 6 July 1987, Firth Papers, LSE Archives.
13. Letter, R. Firth, to G. Lienhard, 6 July 1987, Firth Papers, LSE Archives.
14. See Gluckman (1947) and Niehaus (2017) for a critical take on Malinowski's views.
15. As Sahlins (2002: 20) puts it: 'Now, however, "power" is the intellectual black hole into which all kinds of cultural contents get sucked, if before it was "social solidarity" or "material advantage".'
16. Only six of the 393 men in the Sudanese Political Service read anthropology at university (Tilley 2019: 282).
17. During the height of apartheid, South Africa's anthropologists fell on the sides of both system and struggle. Piet Koornhof earned a Ph.D. from Oxford and served as a National Party cabinet minister from 1972 to 1984. The anti-apartheid activist David Webster, my former colleague at the University of the Witwatersrand, was assassinated by a government-sponsored hit squad in 1989.
18. Godfrey Wilson was dismissed from his field site at Broken Hill, whilst director of the Rhodes Livingstone Institute, in 1940, and Gluckman was banned from Northern Rhodesia during the 1950s (Brown 1973; Gray 2020). Peter Worsley was denied entry to the Australian colony of Papua New Guinea in 1952, Jeremy Beckett in 1956, Bill Epstein in 1958 and Max Gluckman in 1960 (Gray 2020).

19. Interview with Philip Mayer by Alan Macfarlane, 13 July 1983, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yHzYwSEvGtc> (retrieved 27 March 2024).
20. Letter, J. Barnes, University of Sydney, to E. Evans-Pritchard, Oxford, 13 June 1956, Radcliffe-Brown Papers, Archives of the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.
21. Letter, J. Barnes, to the Secretary, Institute for Social Anthropology, Oxford, 2 November 1956, Archives of the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.
22. In April 2021, a fire destroyed over 85,000 items on African Studies lodged in the Reading Room of the Jagger Library at the University of Cape Town, including original copies of the material I consulted.
23. Interviews with John Barnes, Philip Mayer and Ronald Frankenberg by Alan Macfarlane, 5 July 1983, www.youtube.com/watch?v=NvIScRAnuz8 (retrieved 27 March 2024); interview with Lucy Mair by Jean La Fontaine, 29 October 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=E1WhUMTFfLg&t=2466s (retrieved 27 March 2024).