

REFLECTIONS ON OXFORD'S GLOBAL LINKS

Compiled by Wendy James¹

The growth of anthropology in Oxford, along with virtually all its achievements over the last century, was possible thanks to the comings and goings of staff, students, and ideas in a complex network of two-way links with many countries and institutions across the world. A final panel at the Centenary Conference brought together a sample of people (no statistical reliability claimed!) to reflect on these links between researchers and researched, teachers and taught, in both academic anthropology and its practical applications. The participants' memories certainly testified to a network of connections developing over considerable geographical distances and successive generations.

Three strong and important links were mentioned briefly by Wendy James in introducing the panel. First, the North American, and especially the US link, fostered from the late 1940s by E-P, who spent time himself in Chicago and Stanford, and welcomed many American students and senior guests. The US link has been vital to the thriving of UK anthropology and nowhere more than in Oxford in recent decades. Second, she reminded us of the ancestrally vital connection with the French tradition of Durkheim and Mauss, kept fresh by Louis Dumont's stint at the Institute, and still represented by anthropology's active links with the British Centre for Durkheimian Studies and the Maison Française in Oxford. Third, she mentioned the continuing link with the Nile valley countries. Evans-Pritchard had taught in the University of Cairo in between his main periods of research in the

Sudan in the thirties. After the University of Khartoum was founded in the mid-1950s, several Institute-trained people took posts over the next decade in the department of Social Anthropology and Sociology (including Ian Gunnison, Talal Asad, Lewis Hill, and Wendy herself); and both E-P and Godfrey Lienhardt came out as external examiners. The main contributions to the panel, however, came from people representing a variety of less well-known links, many drawing on personal memories to enrich our celebration of Oxford anthropology's hundredth birthday.

We started by looking back nearly to the 'beginning'. Grażyna Kubica opened the panel on the theme of 'Remembering Maria Czaplicka', an early student of humble background, and of whom she is writing a biography. Czaplicka was a friend of Malinowski, and came from Poland in 1910 to study under Seligman and Westermarck at the LSE. A year later she moved to Oxford, obtaining the Diploma in Anthropology in 1912. In 1914–15, she led the Ienisei Expedition to Siberia, where she became an experienced fieldworker and collected artefacts for the Pitt Rivers Museum. She was the first female lecturer in anthropology at Oxford University (1916–19).

Of Czaplicka's time in Oxford, where she was first accepted by Somerville and later moved to LMH, Grażyna told us:

In the field of anthropology Czaplicka worked with Marett (she was one of Marett's girls, as they were called). And it was he who discovered that her linguistic and intellectual abilities could be extremely useful ... What was her theoretical profile? She was an adherent to anthropogeography ... She studied for instance the impact of climate, or broadly speaking, environment on religious beliefs ...

She was appointed to the Human Anatomy Department under Professor Arthur Thompson as substitute for a male lecturer (Dudley Buxton) who joined the army. Maria Czaplicka lectured on Ethnology and presented general descriptions of various peoples of Asia and Europe, both in social and physical anthropology (her lecture notes were later used by Beatrice Blackwood ...). This was very typical of female careers during the Great War as they replaced men who fought in the army. But the end was also typical – when the man returned the woman had to resign.

When this happened Czaplicka went to America on a lecture tour, and finally ended up in Bristol as a lecturer in anthropology and planned a centre for anthropological research there. However her difficult financial situation (she had terrible debts) and lack of collegiate support caused her tragic decision to take her life. She wanted to be buried in Oxford. I found her grave at Wolvercote Cemetery (it is in a rather dilapidated state) ...

Czaplicka had joined the RAI and the RGS, among other things, and today there is increased recognition of her contribution with a four-volume set of her works appearing in 1999. Grażyna concluded by

mentioning her own welcome in England in 1986 thanks to the Oxford Colleges Hospitality Scheme for Polish Scholars, and she had the opportunity of working under the supervision of Edwin and Shirley Ardener. At this time, coming from a communist country, she found the intellectual climate in Oxford very stimulating; and, we sensed in listening to her, she felt herself in some ways to be recreating the initial experiences of her predecessor.

Africa

Many of the overseas regions that had earlier served as the camping grounds of researchers, but, partly through the upheavals of the Second World War and movements for Independence in India and the colonies, came to be partners in the development of anthropology. Of these, the West African countries and especially Ghana stand out. It was during Meyer Fortes' first presence in Oxford in the early 1940s that this particular link began. Fortes had supervised the work of Kofi Busia, who gained his D.Phil. in 1947. Professor George Hagan, currently Minister of Culture in the Ghanaian government, spoke about the African connections, his own personal experience as a student, and the relevance of anthropology to current questions about the role of culture in development. He noted that the former Eurocentric discourse of anthropology had become a global discourse, and that Oxford had played its part in this by training students from all parts of the world to apply the discipline worldwide, producing 'a handsome crop of that strange hybrid, the African anthro-pologist' – despite the fact that Rattray's works from the colonial period are considered so authentic that many Ghanaians consider him an Asante! He suggested that Ghana holds a special place in the history of Oxford anthropology, 'not because Oxford academics produced classical ethnological works on ethnic groups in Ghana ... but because Oxford produced Kofi Abrefa Busia, a Ghanaian who became the first black African University Professor of Anthropology in the world and, in the early 1970s, the democratically elected Prime Minister of Ghana.' He then asked: 'What did Busia and his successors bring to Anthropology and to Africa?' The first part of his answer was on the 'learning culture' of the Institute.

Since the end of World War II, Oxford's relatively liberal admissions policy has enabled a stream of African students of varied backgrounds and academic qualifications to come up to Oxford to study at the Institute of Social Anthropology. Back in Africa, they filled an array of service positions ... We lived in the euphoria of the early days of independence.

Over the four years of my studies at the Institute, one encountered Nigerians, Cameroonians, Egyptians, Sudanese, Ugandans, Kenyans, and a significant number of Ghanaians. All of us saw ourselves as called to serve our nation; and Oxford offered a regime of education vaunted as much for social cultivation as for the cultivation of the mind.

I found my own days as a student of anthropology in Oxford extremely rewarding and happy. The pressure to produce, week after week, essays that could stand up to rigorous critical appraisal by masterful and highly renowned scholars was thankfully relieved by the equally relentless urge to indulge the soul with the cultural delights that were gratuitously offered on daily basis both in college and in the Institute and its adjunct pubs by these same scholars.

Profiling the Institute, George found it 'exotic' – and suggested it could have passed for the stereotype of a 'primitive' community, one clan with many lineage groups.

Attachment to the lineage heads was not for academic reasons alone. More importantly, it was for the general well-being of their broods of students. The lineage heads feasted and tended us like their own family. The pubs were the palaver huts where serious academic and thought-provoking ideas were freely mixed with exciting gossip and serious free counselling. My first ever visit to the annual Chelsea flower show was at the invitation of the father of the Ghanaian group, Godfrey; and it was an aesthetic experience bordering on the transcendental. That was indeed part of the Oxford experience ...

In the second part of his talk, George Hagan argued for the relevance of anthropology to development in Africa, specifically Ghana. It was at Oxford that he read Isaiah Berlin's book, *The Hedgehog and the Fox* (1953). In the book, using the proverb 'The Hedgehog knows one big thing; the fox knows many little things', Berlin distinguished between two kinds of historians: those, on the one hand, who see a grand design in the movement of world or human events, such as the Marxists, or even St Augustine, and those who, on the other hand, see history in episodic terms, emphasising the specificity of events in terms of time and space, context and particular causes. George claimed to have left Oxford a fox; but the need to find a way of showing the relevance of his studies to the contemporary African situation turned him into more of a hedgehog. Anthropology 'needed a response to the demands of the nationalist enterprise, just as it had evolved, at least in part, as a response to the demands of the grand enterprise of Indirect Rule.' He suggested that of the many studies of social change that came out in the 1960s and 1970s, David Brokensha's classic work, originally an Oxford thesis in social

anthropology, *Social Change at Larteh* (1966) provided a model which many African students could use.

In Ghana, at the Institute of African Studies, Hagan and his colleagues began to offer a first-year university course on Culture and Development in the early 1980s, and introduced the topic in a variety of national and international circles, including the Pan-African Anthropological Association and UNESCO. George noted that the following statement can now be found in the Constitution of Ghana: '... The State shall take steps to encourage the integration of appropriate customary values into the fabric of national life through formal and informal education and the conscious introduction of cultural dimensions to relevant aspects of national planning.' This constitutes a watershed in the application of cultural anthropology to development policy; and it also suggests that cultural anthropology might be a requirement in the tool box of the economist or the national planning officer. George Hagan concluded by mentioning a range of current research by Ghanaians which demands the attention of those concerned with practical development. Furthermore, he argued that Africa can 'gain ownership of anthropology' in another way: the 'subjective Afrocentric study of African cultures' can contribute to human enlightenment, as part of a universal discourse concerned with our common humanity and values. African students could best understand their own culture, however, by the study and understanding of other cultures, just as by the study of non-European cultures, Europeans have come to a better understanding of their own.

India

After Africa, the next strong regional link of Oxford anthropology was with India. Professor Ravi Jain, who taught at the Institute from 1966–74, gave an overview of how this had grown since Srinivas was a student of R-B in the 1940s. Ravi Jain entitled his talk 'Oxonian India(s)', and we quote from it at length.

This is the occasion of celebrating a hundred years of anthropology in Oxford, and I can hardly resist the temptation of narrating, in the first place, the personal trajectory of my involvement in social and cultural anthropology at the Institute in Oxford. I began my career at Oxford in October 1966 as University Lecturer in Indian Sociology and ended in December 1974 from my post then designated as University Lecturer in the Social Anthropology of South Asia and Fellow of Wolfson College. My position at Oxford was a link in an illustrious chain of predecessors: M.N. Srinivas, Louis Dumont and David Pocock and, let me add immediately, my worthy successors – Nick Allen and Marcus Banks ...

I should begin with Srinivas, the apical ancestor of my Oxford academic lineage, who is rightly credited with having initiated the 'field view' rather than the 'book view' of Indian society. Srinivas has himself written in several publications about the impact of Oxford anthropology on his career and ideas, for example, the influence of Africanist dominant clan and dominant lineage ideas to the study of what he conceptualised as 'dominant caste' in multi-caste Indian villages. Indian sociology and social anthropology owe certain of their foundational concepts to Oxford anthropology as transmitted via Srinivas. Let us take for a start Srinivas's *Religion and society among the Coorgs of South India* (1952). The substantive material for this work came from an earlier Ph.D. thesis completed by Srinivas under Ghurye's supervision at Bombay University. In working this material for an Oxford D. Phil thesis under Radcliffe-Brown's supervision from 1945 onwards, the teaching of the latter, to quote Srinivas, 'greatly modified my approach to the study of human society. At his suggestion, I started applying some of his ideas regarding the inter-relation of religion and society to the data I had already gathered, and this task proved exciting ...'. However Srinivas rejected R-B's alleged anti-historicism and was able to conceptualise the now famous process of 'sanskritisation' and formulate his ideas about the 'spread' of Hinduism. Subsequently Srinivas also disagreed with Evans-Pritchard's stated emphasis on 'design' rather than 'process' in social structural studies and consequently, as his cordial relationship with Gluckman's Manchester approach (grafted from Oxford) was to fructify, even in contemporary India the nuanced distinction between secularism (of political analysts) and 'secularisation' as Srinivas propounded it serves as a guide not only to social scientists but policy-makers as well.

Srinivas also paved the way (as Dumont and Pocock perceived early) for assessing the significance of the purity – impurity opposition in Hindu collective representations. The reference to Dumont and Pocock here is to their jointly authored journal *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (old series) which provided the foundation for what is even today in its New Series avatar or incarnation the leading international journal of socio-cultural anthropology in India.

My own approach to teaching Indian Sociology at Oxford was fairly eclectic. I had not been 'groomed' as Srinivas was by R-B and E-P or Pocock by Dumont into the structuralist mould. But the tutorial system at the Institute fascinated me. There were those tremendously exciting, though differently nuanced textbooks of social anthropology by my Oxford colleagues – Evans-Pritchard, John Beattie, Godfrey Lienhardt and David Pocock. The last named of these being 'foundational' was my bible in the sense that the philosophical rooting/routing of social anthropology in that little book gave me a direction to prepare myself. The fact that Rodney Needham was located physically in the room next to mine in the Institute was a source of counsel and inspiration.

My B.Litt. and D. Phil. students were truly like peers. It was in that spirit that I embarked upon the exciting task of editing, emanating from the decennial meeting of the ASA, the volume called *Text and Context: The*

Social Anthropology of Tradition. I think subliminally I was in the midst of a powerful academic tradition, and I must have wished to synthesise the very rich and mature tradition of Indic society with the intellectual heritage of the European analysts. This I did in my own limited way and with full support of my students and colleagues. Two of my collaborators are here today: Veena Das and Wendy James. Michael Herzfeld at Harvard is another star of that team, and I think his initial training in Indian Sociology and full-blown expertise in studies of Greece later also speaks of the blending or synthesis that I mentioned ...

While making all these observations, I cannot claim to be comprehensive. The latest chapter in Oxonian India(s), for example, is the study of Indian diaspora which engages my full attention now. And, let me remind you, this is nothing new for Oxford. I may not have studied, while in Oxford, say the Indian automobile workers there but I was part of a heritage (having just completed my Ph.D. on Tamil plantation workers in Malaya) which Pocock had initiated with his characteristic sensitivity and erudition. I often tell my pupils in India about the kind of dynamic, contemporary researches that go on inside the mediaeval facade of many Oxford colleges, and if you need an example of this from social anthropology in Oxford just look at the work of Steve Vertovec and his team of Global Networks.

In India we bypassed the currents of nervousness and anxiety, which accompanied the post-modern, 'crisis of representation' in the West. We kept making empirical studies with due regard to reflexivity and the role of agency in human affairs. In relation to Oxford anthropology, though our graduates still study the classics like *The Nuer* and *The Andaman Islanders*, as advanced students they undertake field studies – intensive and fine-grained like they/we have always done – in sociology/anthropology departments in Britain or in India. There is one change though. We do not have the colonial hangover like R-B telling Srinivas at the end of the latter's D. Phil. thesis 'You are not yet ready to teach in India; you still need an apprenticeship of another year of teaching in Oxford.'

Mediterranean

Of the Mediterranean links of Oxford anthropology, Greece was the first, with the appointment of John Peristiany in 1950. The Greek connection has been continuous and important to Oxford ever since, especially with the appointment of John Campbell to a Fellowship at St. Antony's College. Professor Roger Just, originally from Australia, and now of the University of Kent at Canterbury, reflected on the comings and goings. He himself had started with classical Greece, and reminisced on his unlikely arrival at Oxford in 1973, 'as some sort of Australian country boy' on a three-year grant. It was eleven years before he returned, having spent this time between studying in Oxford,

doing fieldwork in Greece, and later working at the British School at Athens, all of which he enjoyed.

But I've got a confession to make – I never applied to go to Oxford University, actually I didn't want to go to Oxford University. 1973 was the tail end of the Vietnam war, which had been a radicalising experience for a whole generation of Australian students. Gough Whitlam and the Labour party had just been elected after some decades of conservative and obsequiously royalist government. And I think we all thought we were radicals, even those of us who were probably God's conservatives by nature. And from afar, Oxford looked like the bastion of privilege, and the centre of empire. Besides which, I had just finished reading *Brideshead Revisited*. I was damned if I was walking round the place with a teddy bear stuck under my arm.

So Roger applied to the LSE and to SOAS, but neither would take him because he had no undergraduate degree in anthropology – the subject was not taught at Melbourne until 1986 (although it was already established at Sydney and the ANU). In fact the only place in the UK that would take him to study anthropology, starting with a postgraduate conversion course, was the Institute, where one started with the Diploma. So Roger did end up in Oxford, and clearly relieved, admitted that 'the teddy bear problem never materialised'. He commented on the surprising variety of people he met.

... The fact that [The Institute] didn't have an undergraduate programme, made it a curiously open community, a community that allowed people such as myself to enter it. It was not only geographically cosmopolitan, but as it were intellectually cosmopolitan – in the variety of intellectual backgrounds from which people came – I was surrounded by linguists, psychologists, historians, zoologists. In a funny way, it was also the centre of an erstwhile empire, but I think it was a curiously transformative centre, that drew its peripheries into itself, to become part of itself, and which also acted as a sort of revolving door through which people passed, met, interacted, and were changed.

Roger's Diploma tutor in 1973 was Ravi Jain, even then with extensive contacts and whose own doctoral studies had been in Australia. Roger decided on fieldwork in 'modern' Greece for his own doctorate, and was supervised by Campbell. He left armed with a letter of introduction from Godfrey Lienhardt to Peristiany, now himself in Greece after teaching at the Institute largely on the basis of his African research. Peristiany had been Campbell's own supervisor – another example of the successive academic generations which underlie Oxford's global links.

Now all this may be sounding dangerously like an old school tie network, and I suppose to an extent it is that. But in academe the links that are forged, and the influence that is exerted at least relate to ideas, to knowledge, to forms of intellectual enquiry, more than – at least I think so – to actual position. And one way of testing that would be to look at the indirect, rather than the direct, links that Oxford anthropology has made and the influence that it has thereby exerted in Australia and Greece. It would be foolish to say that Australian academe, or Australian anthropology, in any sense has been dominated by actual people who were at Oxford. What's more interesting is the degree to which Oxford anthropology plays its part in Australia despite that.

When in 1990 I finally joined an anthropology programme at the University of Melbourne, my senior colleague was a Texan, though someone who has now spent more of his life in Australia than in Texas. We met, we became good friends, and in the universal manner of academics we sniffed around each other's bookcases and we were both surprised. He had an awful lot of books on Southeast Asia that I didn't, and I had a lot of books on southern Europe that he didn't. But there was a strangely similar core, and in a sense a quite recognisable one: Durkheim, Mauss, Hertz, Hocart, Evans-Pritchard, Fortes, Douglas, Dumont, etc. And then of course the penny dropped. My colleague had never been to Oxford, but he had been taught by Professor Jim Fox! And Professor Jim Fox had been taught by Rodney Needham. And Rodney Needham had taught – amongst very many other people – myself. We shared, across continents, across actually quite different intellectual careers and pasts, a common intellectual capital whose source was the Institute.

I think much the same could be said for anthropology in Greece. I haven't counted up the number of Greek anthropologists who were trained in Oxford; they're not really so very many although a steady stream passed through the hands of John Campbell. I suspect as many went to UCL and LSE. But that lineage of Oxford-trained anthropologists, John Peristiany, his student John Campbell, his students Juliet du Boulay, Renée Hirschon, Michael Herzfeld, plus Renée herself teaching for many years at the University of the Aegean. And through their writings, through *Honour, Family and Patronage*; *Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village*; *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe*, and Michael's whole library of books has been really established an 'Oxford position' in Greek anthropology, regardless of where people have actually studied. Thank you.

Other regions of the circum-Mediterranean basin also received visiting Oxford anthropologists quite early, with the completion of doctoral theses by Paul Stirling on Turkey and Emrys Peters on Cyrenaica in 1951–2 and by Julian Pitt-Rivers on Spain the following year. In fact Spain has never been far behind in its relation to Oxford, and Professor Carmelo Lisón Tolosana reminded us of the way that the anthropological tradition developed there; his talk was entitled 'The Gardener of Keble Road'. Carmelo spoke of the consolidation of social

anthropology as a 'great intellectual creation' of the past century, and an achievement of humanism in bringing together critical reflection on the life of the spirit, through personally-collected ethnography and on the linguistic character of everything human. The Institute in Keble Road struck him as more of a community than an institution.

I came to anthropology by reading the German diffusionists and the *History of Ethnological Theory* (1937) by Lowie. My anthropological career began at UCL, where I was assigned to a lady tutor, with whom I was not acquainted, called Mary Douglas. She later advised me to transfer to Oxford, where Professor Peristiany taught Anthropology of the Mediterranean.

She wrote to Godfrey Lienhardt and to Professor Evans-Pritchard, and I travelled to Oxford where the Professor had summoned me. On arriving map in hand at 11 Keble Road, I saw a dishevelled man in corduroy trousers pruning a rosebush in the garden. On entering I mentioned to the secretary that the gardener had told me that this was the Institute of Social Anthropology. She interrupted me to explain that it was not the gardener, but Professor Evans-Pritchard. There, though I did not know it, Godfrey Lienhardt was expecting me and invited me to lunch, and it was he who interviewed me, though I did not realise it at the time. Later, he accompanied me to the Professor's office.

I was received kindly: E-P asked about my interest in anthropology and about the existence of the subject in Spain ... Michael Kenny was kind enough to install me in the digs that Dylan Thomas had occupied a few years earlier. With great interest I followed the lectures of John Beattie, who exuded personal experience and serene pragmatism. He taught me the value of detail ... More important still, he suggested that my anthropological education at Oxford also had a moral dimension, which incited me to return to Spain and initiate Anthropology in the University there ...

I never missed the lectures of Evans-Pritchard, whose plural personality impressed me from those first dual encounters in the garden and in his office. In class, he would pass easily from the authoritative gravitas of the professor who has a profound knowledge of the subject he teaches (on entering he would close the door, and nobody was allowed to come in afterwards), to an unexpected and bubbling humour. However, what I really appreciated in his teaching was the dissection and coherence of the ethnographic data, and his comprehension of the sense of the past (which was not appreciated by all his colleagues, but I was a history graduate), as well as his semantic-hermeneutic view of the subject. He recommended me to read Dilthey, with whom I was already acquainted ... He urged me to do fieldwork in Turkey ... I told him I would prefer to go to another region of Spain ... He often spoke of history after one occasion when I mentioned the pirate Drake: 'Pirate?' he asked in surprise. Another time I talked about the Peninsular War, giving a version in which the adventures of Wellington did not appear ... So equipped by Oxford I went to Madrid, where after eight years I was able to institutionalise the subject in the University, following the basic scheme of the Institute regarding subject-matter and content, but

also taking account of the historical legacy and abundance of sources in all regions of Spain, as well as the riches of a colonial past with hundreds of ethnographic accounts of the Americas dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In order to strengthen this anthropological orientation towards Oxford, which at that time I judged to be the most interesting and promising one available, I sent several students to be trained in England ... I started the Library of the Department, with a predominance of English bibliography: works by Evans-Pritchard, Lienhardt, Beattie, Peristiany, Leach and Douglas soon appeared in Spanish ... Those by Evans-Pritchard and Lienhardt are actively recommended today by professors in the Universities of Granada, Corunna, Saragossa, Santander, Madrid, Comillas, San Pablo CEU, among others. With the assistance, at first, of the British Council, I invited up to a couple of dozen British colleagues ...

To summarise: I have had more than sufficient reasons to consider Oxford as my anthropological *alma mater* and the Institute of Social Anthropology as the spring from which I drank ... the most attractive and promising Anthropology, for which I felt, and feel, the greatest affinity and gratitude.

Contacts with the wider Spanish-speaking world spread too, and we were very pleased that Professor Juan Ossio had come all the way from Peru to help celebrate our centenary. It is impossible not to mention too the Oxford – Portugal connection, represented importantly by the work of José Cutileiro and João Pina-Cabral; nor the ventures of Oxford social anthropology into Lowland South America, pioneered by Peter Rivière.

Across the North Sea

The extension of British anthropology in general to the northern European countries, and the Oxford link in particular, developed a little later. Robert Paine studied the Lapps quite early on, with a D.Phil. in 1957. E-P had once offended the Norwegians, by declining to pass Fredrik Barth's Oslo thesis on the Iraqi Kurds, on account of the brevity of the fieldwork and the lack of knowledge of the local language. Barth's subsequent work on the Swat Pathans was awarded a Ph.D. by the LSE, and while Wendy James did spend a period teaching in Bergen (because of the connection established by Barth with the University of Khartoum), it was only after E-P's death that Barth agreed to visit Oxford. There have since been many two-way movements between Oxford and Norway, but the Denmark link has been the most travelled route. Kirsten Hastrup, now Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Copenhagen, reflected on the story.

In Denmark anthropology was first established as a sub-division of geography in 1945. It was largely based on German culture-history and was located at the National Museum, in keeping with a long tradition of focusing on material culture and linking up with museum ethnography. It grew out of Danish expeditions to central Asia and to the Arctic ... Around 1960, ... the subject was established as an independent discipline in the University of Copenhagen with the establishment of a chair in 1965. The first professor was Johannes Nicolaisen who had worked with the pastoral Tuareg, and who had spent a couple of years at the LSE and had been absolutely smitten by the British way of doing anthropology.

Since then, the royal Oxonian line from Tylor through Radcliffe-Brown to E-P figured prominently on the reading lists. When I started doing anthropology in Copenhagen in the late 1960s, the British functionalist school as it was known to us was supplemented also by French structuralism ... and by slight doses of the Marxism that was to grow in the 1970s.

The first personal link with Oxford, Kirsten explained, was made by Mette Bovin, in the late 1960s a student at the new department of ethnography at Aarhus.

Mette visited Oxford and enthusiastically invited E-P to go back and visit Aarhus. She was completely unimpressed by rank and I think her enthusiasm actually made E-P come. He came back several times, and to this day a guest-room in the very pretty department located outside Aarhus bears his name. There are some wonderful photos of E-P wandering about in the parks of this place ... Since then, what was important for these early links was that to other students in Denmark, Oxford appeared to be a real place with real people and not simply a mythological space somewhere we don't reach.

One year, when E-P was not well enough to go, Wendy went instead. Around this time in the early 1970s, Kirsten saw a notice in *Man* about the launching of *JASO*, and took out a subscription. She also noticed the publication of Edwin Ardener's 1971 edited volume *Social Anthropology and Language*, and 'became aware of a kind of theoretical thinking that went beyond the classification of theories as they were taught in Copenhagen.' Edwin visited Copenhagen in 1973, to help provide an intensive course with other anthropologists and linguists on 'the relation between reality and culture and language and what have you'. Shirley came with him, and Kirsten confessed '... my academic fate was made. In 1974 I came over, and from the first day I marvelled ... I simply marvelled at what I met here.'

First of all, the system of tutorials and supervision, as others have already commented, offered the possibility of concentrated intellectual exchange

that allowed one to grow in one's own direction ... And in some sense the vocation to become an anthropologist became personalised through these encounters. Then there were the Friday seminars, and Wednesday coffee mornings, allowing you to talk with people about important matters – or of course less important matters; it all fused into one big experience. There were the fellow students, many of whom are here in this room, and with whom enduring friendships were made ... There was also the Women's Group, established by Shirley, which was a sheltered place where people like myself, who could not always live up to those frightful rhetorical standards of the typical Oxford male, could give a sheltered presentation for the first time ...

In short, and perhaps at a more general level, what I experienced here was an intellectual space that was both generous and supportive of individual ambition. There was, I think, a distinct style of reasoning, starting from an empirical problem and ending at very important theoretical and epistemological issues. I still find that here, to which this very conference has testified, and that I still cherish a lot. There is an openness, a freedom to explore new fields. In my case, it required a shift from studying tribes in India to studying mediaeval Icelandic history for my D.Phil. subject. Everything was possible. And I think perhaps the fact that the departmental identity had become more elusive in the 1970s, which Jonathan Benthall talked about on Friday [see Chapter 8 in this book], provided a window of opportunity for a person like myself to experience anthropology as a total intellectual commitment, even a form of life, where everything mattered and nothing human was beyond interest.

Kirsten, whose own fieldwork has now stretched as far as Greenland, still considered Oxford a point of orientation in her work, and wanted to acknowledge the personal link in education – 'It is through the encounter with real people that one's own academic growth takes shape'. She considered that the Institute taught her that it is very important, in a department, to make room for individual students to develop their own talents, not simply to make them read particular reading lists. 'And I am convinced that the success during the 1990s of my own department in Copenhagen, to which I came in 1990 as the second occupant of the chair of social anthropology in Denmark, is owed not simply to happy conjunctures in Denmark but also to a vision of anthropology which I owe to Oxford.'

Southeast and East Asia

A focus on research methods and dominant questions emerging from thinking at Oxford marked Jim Fox's talk. Under Needham's supervision he found his initial interest in Indonesia; and his commitment to the comparative study of social structure. Since then,

his career has blossomed in both predictable and unexpected ways. Jim had come equipped with a professional Powerpoint presentation, but started off by recalling the atmosphere of the Institute in the early sixties, when he first arrived.

Because for me it was a most exciting time, I had come from Harvard and it was altogether different, the style of teaching, and the strongest memories – as has been often said here in different contexts, were of the pub culture. And at that time in 1962 E-P was in full florescence, and would regularly, I mean regularly, almost every day, go around about twelve o'clock and round up all the students to tell us which pub he would be drinking at and where we had to be in attendance. That was a regular feature throughout the Diploma year. He gave me one piece of advice that I took to heart, it was something he said one time when he was rounding us up, he said 'To get on in your career, never appear to work' – 'but when you're not working, be sure to bother your colleagues'. So he went round and we all went to the pub and usually the afternoons were lost.

But for me ... there were all sorts of exciting ideas at that time ... elementary structures were going to tell us about the fundamentals of society; Lévi-Strauss was still very current and in fact one of the interesting things were the connections that Rodney was building both to Paris and to Leiden University. At the end of Michaelmas Term, with Rodney's urging I went off to Paris, and managed to hear Lévi-Strauss at the Collège de France. He was just beginning the *Mythologiques*, and I sat for three or four lectures totally baffled about how the *cochon sauvage* would relate to elementary structures – and I came back with the word that we were into savage pigs and jaguars and things like that.

But the other element I wanted to emphasise was the idea instilled in all of us that it was a comparative effort. You did ethnography to build towards comparison. And that is really what I took as a major mission, wherever I've gone. In my case, and at Rodney's urging, Eastern Indonesia was the place where all sorts of comparisons could be done. There had been a study, based entirely on mission records and other things in the thirties, a thesis written by a man called van Wouden ... a precursor in many ways to Lévi-Strauss's *Elementary Structures*, and we were all obliged to read that. And that forged the Leiden link. And I remember it was very, very important when the professor from Leiden, Patrick Josselin de Jong, visited Oxford during my Diploma year. It was particularly memorable because at the dinner that Rodney put on for him he announced, before telling me, where I was going to go and do my fieldwork. That's when I first learned that I was going to this island of Roti to do fieldwork. At the time, Clark Cunningham, who went back to the University of Illinois, had done a study on Timor. Rodney had done some limited research on Sumba, and Rodney felt that by sending me to Roti, I would find something in between Sumba and Timor. As it turned out, and it was probably my redemption, I was able to discover in two weeks on the island that we didn't have any of these elementary prescriptive systems, and I could put that aside and do other kinds of ethnography.

Jim then spent a few years in Harvard, where David Maybury-Lewis (another student of Rodney Needham's) was developing a broad comparative study of the peoples of Central Brazil. Moving thence to ANU, Jim has promoted a whole series of comparative studies of the peoples of eastern Indonesia, broadening the concept of what comparison might be by taking into account varieties of the language of social relations within the Austronesian language family as a whole. Doug Lewis (who turned out to be Roger Just's 'Texan colleague') pioneered the series, which continues to this day (as Jim illustrated with detailed maps on the Powerpoint). Jim ended, however, with an ironic story.

I saw my job as carrying out research in eastern Indonesia, the grand comparative effort in eastern Indonesia, but my first student at the ANU when I arrived in 1975 was a man with the marvellous name of Zamakhsyari Dhofier. He wrote a book on ... the Muslim traditional form of schooling, in Java. He went back to Indonesia, and translated it into Indonesian. It happened to sell well, it sold over a hundred thousand copies. And on the first page of his book is this statement, which proclaimed that what he learned was from me, which was hardly true – I guided the thesis, but that produced a flow of students from Indonesia all seeking wisdom at the ANU. In the end I turned out to supervise far, far more theses on Indonesian Islam, on Javanese Islam, than on eastern Indonesia. Now why I say that is because most of the students who came to do preliminary work ... would take a reading course that I gave, and the first and foremost reading in that course was Evans-Pritchard's *Sanusi of Cyrenaica*. And I can't tell you how popular that book has become in Indonesian Islamic circles. That is something that has struck, it resonates with a very strong chord, it's greatly appreciated and I believe an Indonesian translation is now under way.

Oxford's eastern links go even further. A China connection was initially made by the appointment of Maurice Freedman to the Chair in 1970. His premature death meant that Chinese studies remained dormant for some time, but with the appointment of Frank Pieke to the new Institute of Chinese Studies in Oxford in the early 1990s, and later that of Elisabeth Hsu to a new post in medical anthropology, the link was revived.

In the case of Japan, the senior scholar Professor Nagashima Nobuhiro pointed to the early dominance of the American anthropological tradition in that country, but indicated how the link with British anthropology, and particularly Oxford, had become strong and significant in recent years. In 1954 two departments were founded, of Social Anthropology at Tokyo Metropolitan University and of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tokyo. In 1960 some postgraduates at these Universities formed a group of Africanist

researchers: Yamaguchi Masao was the leader and Nagashima himself a member. They read extensively in the literature on Africa, much of which came from British social anthropologists, and many of them from Oxford. This period saw a good number of translations of their works into Japanese (including R-B, E-P, Godfrey Lienhardt, Rodney Needham, David Pocock and John Beattie).

The first link with Oxford was through William Newell, one of the last students of R-B, who came to chair the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at International Christian University, Tokyo. Both Yamaguchi and Nagashima himself worked with Newell as his assistant, before leaving for Ibadan and for Oxford respectively. Nagashima was the first Japanese student to come to the Institute in Oxford, and he recalled that in the Japanese *Journal of Ethnology* his own writings were among the few which discussed British social anthropology as a distinctive tradition. By the late 1960s a younger generation of Japanese anthropologists was conducting field research all over the world, its work showing influence from various British scholars.

In 1972 Nagashima Nobuhiro himself founded Social Anthropology at Hitotsubasi University. By the early 1980s the Oxford – Japan link was flourishing; Yoshida Teigo of the University of Tokyo spent half a year in 1983–4 as a Visiting Scholar at the Institute and has remained a useful link ever since. The main counterparts in Oxford who have developed the link are Roger Goodman and Joy Hendry; both have spent long periods in Japan both doing research and teaching. Among Oxford anthropologists who have visited Japan to give lectures or conference papers, we could include Rodney Needham, Robert Barnes, Wendy James, and David Gellner. There has been a steady flow of students in both directions; one Japanese student for example doing fieldwork in the Scottish borders for her D.Phil. (Kaoru Fukuda). It was a particularly interesting development when Akira Okazaki was invited to deliver the first series of Evans-Pritchard commemorative lectures at All Souls College in 1999, on the subject of his own fieldwork in the Sudan on the Ingessana (Gamk) people, originally visited by E-P in 1926.

Kwang-Ok Kim, who had originally arrived in Oxford in 1974, focused on the experience of himself and his wife Okpyo Moon in trying to establish an Oxford tutorial approach in two universities in Korea, where most of their colleagues were trained in American anthropology. Kwang-Ok pointed out that since there were only three Oxford trained anthropologists out of about fifty working in Korea, to talk about any link with Oxford itself seems a little far-fetched. Most had done their post-graduate work in the US. When he returned from Oxford to Korea and started teaching anthropology in the early 1980s,

he noticed a number of differences between himself and his colleagues who had been to the States, both in the teaching style and in their approaches to the subject. It was only by noticing those differences, and struggling with them at times, that he began to learn more about some of the distinct features of what may be termed an Oxford tradition, its merits and demerits. Kwang-Ok had been particularly struck by the intensity of the weekly tutorial, backbone of the Institute's teaching. He had been taken aback by the stressful and sometimes humiliating experience of reading an essay aloud to one's tutor, whose role was of course to provide criticism. Against this ordeal, there were more positive experiences.

There were lectures given at the Institute, but they were not mandatory. In my case, the most awaited moment was the Chinese Seminar on Thursday afternoon organised by the late Professor Maurice Freedman at All Souls. There, I was able to meet and listen to many important scholars working on China, both in England and abroad. After the seminar, we were served splendid afternoon tea with scones and cream, an experience that had impressed me as very British indeed.

I had stayed at Oxford for six years altogether, of which nearly two years were spent among the Taiwanese highland aborigines, Taruko, about whom I wrote my doctoral thesis. I had wanted to study mainland Chinese culture, but Koreans were not yet allowed to enter the Communist China for fieldwork in the late 1970s. It was only since the early 1990s that I started visiting the country regularly for research. Okpyo did her fieldwork in Japan slightly later at the beginning of the 1980s ...

What I want to stress here is that what Oxford offered then was one of the most unsystematic types of teaching, and this put me really at a loss when I started teaching anthropology myself in 1980 back in Korea. ... Compared with me, my colleagues returned from the States at once overwhelmed me with seemingly very sophisticated and systematic lecture syllabuses they brought from the places they studied. They were usually composed of specific weekly topics organised for the whole term and were supplemented with reading lists that appeared to be intimidatingly up-to-date. During my Diploma year, – may be this is just Professor Freedman's own liking – but I was required to read mainly monographs that included such names as Durkheim, Mauss, Hertz, Hubert, Lévy – Bruhl, Dumont, E-P. Mary Douglas, Max Gluckman, Raymond Firth, Edmund Leach, Balandier, and so forth. American-trained colleagues' reading lists, on the other hand, consisted mostly of recent journal articles and a few book chapters. It seemed that an important part of a teacher's work was to guide the students which specific chapters of a book they are supposed to read.

Naturally, I was not very popular among the Korean students at the beginning. ... Moreover, many students seemed to have difficulties adjusting to my emphasis upon lucid but coherent writing rather than extravagant verbal discussion. As time went by and as I was becoming a bit more able to devise my own ways of teaching, I realised and thus became

more appreciative of the fact that the experiences of Oxford tutorials with emphasis upon monograph reading and essay writing had enabled me to develop independent thinking and a more comprehensive grasp of the subject. The painful experiences of exposing oneself to the ruthless criticisms of the supervisor every week, I later realised, effectively trained students to see and accept the exact weaknesses of their arguments.

Kwang-Ok then pondered the apparent gap between the 'heavily metaphysical nature of Oxonian anthropological concerns' and the reality of Korea, liberated from Japanese colonial rule at the end of the Second World War only to be plunged into post-colonial turmoil, and now pursuing rapid development. Korean social scientists were mainly concerned with economic issues such as the elimination of absolute poverty or political ones dealing with the constant instability within the country. However, following the first anthropology department established in 1960, there are now ten. The first focus was on archaeology and folklore studies, but as more anthropologists emerged with American degrees, 'personality studies, economic anthropology and ecological anthropology' dominated the scene. In the 1980s, political anthropology, with notions of dependency, neo-colonial exploitation, and the world system, became key terms that drew most of the students' attention. In this context,

... talking about symbolic systems, religious rituals, oral traditions, stateless societies of remote people appeared as something very far away from Korean reality, something morally irresponsible and something that may interest only hobby-seeking dilettantes. I believe that students began to learn that symbols, rituals and religion are issues that are not too removed from reality as they assumed, that they can be important areas for understanding the dynamic relationship between state power, ideological struggles and people's resistance, and that religion and folk beliefs can be investigated as arenas of history and politics. I believe that it was part of my contribution, as the first Korean student who came to Britain and Oxford to study anthropology when everybody went to the United States, to introduce a different kind of tradition – though it is simply my own version of Oxford anthropology – to Korean students. I am pleased to tell that more and more students have become interested in political anthropology, religious anthropology, symbolic anthropology and so forth.

Kwang-Ok concluded by pointing to the fact that very few others followed them from Korea to Oxford, though every year several excellent students leave for the US for higher degrees in anthropology. The problem is the lack of financial support. The network of connections with the UK is a fragile one. In Korea, they tend to write mainly for the Korean audience. However, Kwang-Ok and Okpyo put forward the suggestion that scholars in anthropology across the region

could perhaps form a sub-area networking basis in East Asia given the fact that increasingly more students seem to be coming to Britain and Oxford from Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong and Japan in recent years.

Varieties of indigenous anthropology: Maori and Muslim perspectives

Anthropology undeniably has its roots partly in the colonial past of Europe, and this was as true of the Oxford variety as of any other, perhaps even more so. But it was the survival and transformation of anthropology in the 'post-imperial' world that ran as a connecting theme through many of our conference contributions. It was the key concern running through the concluding presentations by Ngapare Hopa and Mai Yamani, reflecting on their role as 'indigenous anthropologists' from New Zealand and the Middle East respectively.

Ngapare ['Pare'] Hopa asked in her presentation: 'What happens to research when the insect looks back and the researched become the researchers?' – a question originally posed by the film-maker Merata Mita in 1989. Having toured meetings of the global community of 'indigenous peoples' for some time, and tuning in to their 'voice', and the resulting discourse and critique, she considered what 'the insect' is now doing in New Zealand. She explained it was a serious discourse, the product of many indigenous scholars from around the world, on the effects of colonialism and imperialism on indigenous peoples; on the central role of 'science' and scientific methods, and on the rise of political consciousness that produced the 'modernist resistance struggle' of the post-war years and of the 1960s in particular. She explained how in New Zealand, 'Maori students and scholars of anthropology have come to realise the complicity of "colonial anthropology" and of "colonial history" in the subjugation of our people.' There is emerging in New Zealand a field of research called 'Kaupapa Maori Research' (KMR) that privileges Maori concerns and practices and Maori participation as both researchers and researched, and Pare suggested that this approach means that 'we are no longer the "objects" or insects but the subjects, active in conceptualising our world and concerns.'

KMR has been defined variously. Here are some examples. KMR is research that is 'culturally 'safe'; that involves the mentorship of elders; research that is culturally relevant and appropriate while satisfying the rigours of method, and which is undertaken by a Maori researcher, not a researcher who happens to be Maori ...

Another approach says that KMR 'addresses the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority' which pervade our social, economic and political

institutions. This is a model framed by the discourses related to the Treaty of Waitangi and by the development within education of Maori initiatives which are 'controlled' by Maori. Framing KMR within the Treaty allows space for the involvement of non-Maori in support of Maori research.

Pare summarised the main feature of this approach by saying that KMR is 'related to "being" Maori'; it is connected to Maori philosophy and principles, and takes for granted the validity of Maori language and culture; it is concerned with the 'struggle' for autonomy over the cultural well-being of the people. As part of the wider context, KMR has been located within the wider project of *Kaupapa Maori*, of which the basic elements/principles include: respect for extended family structure, cultural aspirations, and the aim of a collective vision.

A final point Pare put forward about KMR is its relation to critical theory, in particular to the notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation. It has led to situating Maori research within the anti-positivist debate raised by critical theory and to the declaration that

... intrinsic to Kaupapa Maori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Maori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist within society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of 'common sense' and 'facts' to provide *ad hoc* justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Maori people.

We will appreciate, she concluded, how much this approach appeals to the insect!

The theme of 'anthropology at home' rounded off the panel presentations, with a poignant description by Mai Yamani of her work as a Saudi Arabian anthropologist able, at first, to study only the elite of her own country; but then to move into international research and inevitably encounter the political turmoils of the wider world.

Anthropology has changed; Islam also has changed. We have witnessed tremendous developments in anthropology. Anthropology is no longer simply the western study of the other, but has become a part of how all cultures understand themselves ...

I would like to offer my experiences, as an Arab Muslim, on an anthropological mission to reveal the vibrant diversity in the Arab world – a diversity that is under constant threat of suppression. Perhaps it would be elucidating if I offer myself as a case study. I came to Oxford in 1979 as a postgraduate student. I saw myself, I saw my identity, as a Muslim, Saudi, Iraqi woman – Iraqi mother, Saudi father of Yemeni origin born in Cairo; and I grew up in Mecca, in the Hejaz – so that is Arab diversity. My life as a student of anthropology at the Institute in Banbury Road became divided

between the library and the Horse and Jockey pub. Although I originate from Mecca, the melting pot of the Muslim world, the ethnic diversity that I encountered in Oxford was of a deeper awareness and understanding. At Oxford we celebrate our differences. As I sat with Peter and Godfrey Lienhardt, my supervisors later – first Peter and then Godfrey, who in his own words inherited me – discussing the tribes of the southern Sudan, the tribes of the Arabian peninsula, oral traditions, cargo cults, leopard skin chiefs, over traditional English refreshments, Islam was undergoing revolution, revival, and war. In Iran, Khomeini leading a Shi'a revolution was threatening the hegemony of the Wahhabi Sunni neighbours in Saudi Arabia, and questioning their custodianships of Mecca and Medina. The Saudi rulers retaliated by launching an aggressive, militant Sunni Wahhabi Islam. Saudi Arabia intensified its religious dogma. School curricula became more Islamic; radio and television programmes carried more Islamic messages, and members of the official committee for the ordering of the good and the forbidding of the evil, the ... religious police, were unleashed on citizens with renewed vigour. They patrolled in their jeeps the streets of the kingdom, searching for sin. Sins were not hard to find ...

I left Oxford in 1981 after completing the Diploma in Anthropology, to become a lecturer in social anthropology at King Abdul Aziz University in Jeddah. I was the first woman, Saudi woman lecturer, to lecture to women, according to the strict segregation of the University in Jeddah. I tried with all the growing interest and enthusiasm to introduce ideas of respect and of cultural diversity. I got in all the books I found translated into Arabic from Oxford, such as Evans-Pritchard's *Social Anthropology*. Although so many of my female students responded to these exciting and exotic themes and concepts, official censorship was stifling. And the compulsion there became heavier and heavier, both physically and emotionally. So I came back to Oxford in search of academic freedom and the opportunity to understand my own background.

Mai's subsequent D. Phil. thesis on the Hejazi identity, she explained, was both an academic pursuit and a personal quest. She then continued research in Saudi Arabia, developing a deepening connection with the minorities. The Shi'a in the eastern provinces, who are discriminated against; the Hejazis, who also are marginalised; the youth in that country. Her books, published in London, breached the official lines of censorship, and were banned; as was she. As a research fellow of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, she is nevertheless continuing her research, at present on Muslim communities in Britain, and pursuing her 'mission of defending cultural dignity and freedom of expression'. Mai is often recruited, too, as a commentator on British, and worldwide, radio and television news programmes.

The dilemmas of Mai Yamani's position reminded her listeners of the way that Maria Czaplicka found a voice for her own work on

coming to Oxford in 1910 and finding the breadth of possibilities offered here; not to mention her biographer, Grażyna Kubica's experience of visiting from communist Poland in the 1980s. Roger Just, who presented himself as something of a country boy from the Australian outback, had expected to find Oxford in the 1970s a bastion of colonial empire and its ageing defenders, and was surprised to find that the empire had collapsed on itself and Oxford was full of lively and ambitious people from all over the world. George Hagan testified to the importance of the warmth and personal support that he and other students from Africa had found in Oxford, at the Institute in particular. Testimonies of this kind reminded us of the most important reason why we undertook the Centenary celebrations in the first place—not only as an academic event but as a reunion and a chance to take the older connections forward. The testimonies included here from the living 'diaspora' also complement the main chapters of this volume which deal with the internal 'past' history of the discipline, as a teaching and research tradition, managing, if only just, to put down roots and survive institutionally over the span of a century in Oxford itself.

Note

1. In compiling this account I have drawn on written notes prepared by several speakers at the final panel of the Centenary Conference, and also a video recording of most of the event made by Alan Macfarlane.