

INTRODUCTION

Peter Rivière

The formal recognition of anthropology's existence at Oxford University occurred in the spring of 1905 with the promulgation of a statute creating 'a Committee for the organization of the advanced study of Anthropology, and to establish Diplomas in Anthropology to be granted after examination' (*Oxford University Gazette* (hereafter *OUG*) 1904–5: 536). The Committee for Anthropology, as it was known, met for the first time on 27 October 1905. The year 2005 thus seemed an appropriate and suitable occasion on which to celebrate the centenary of the subject at the University. This volume is composed of the contributions made to a workshop on the history of anthropology at Oxford University which was held in conjunction with the centenary celebrations.

For some years I had been planning to write a history of Oxford anthropology with a view to its publication around the date of the centenary. In the event, another major publishing commitment made it clear to me that, as a single-handed project, this was unrealisable. On the other hand, as the plans for a centenary conference developed, a session devoted to the history of Oxford anthropology was included. This volume contains the proceedings of that session held on 16 September 2005. Thus my original intention became a reality on the back of shared labour. I have no doubt that the various contributors, with their different approaches and insights, have brought to the volume a far broader, more many-sided picture than I alone would have achieved.

A criticism might be made, and, knowing academics, almost certainly will be, of the choice of contributors; that it is too much an 'insiders' history. Indeed, with two exceptions, everyone of the contributors is or has been closely associated with Oxford anthropology.¹ To a large extent this was quite deliberate as I had been aware that those whom I approached had an interest in the topic and, in some cases, had been

actively researching the specific period or individual. Basically, a chronological framework has been adopted, and it has to be admitted that the emphasis is on social anthropology, although this becomes more marked following Radcliffe-Brown's (hereafter R-B) attempts to distance social anthropology from ethnology, physical anthropology and linguistics. Before that it is much easier to treat anthropology in the round as it involved all aspects of the subject.² To compensate for this emphasis, there is a chapter devoted to physical, later biological anthropology, and another to the Oxford University Anthropological Society and the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford (JASO)*, which, rather confusingly, are unconnected.

Other than agreeing the period or topic, contributors did not receive any guidelines about how they were to tackle it or what to cover. The result has been a variety of approaches with contributors rightly concentrating on those aspects from their period which they find most significant. This has resulted in a history where the reader may well be left wondering what is going on backstage while the events on stage, those covered in the chapters, unroll. Accordingly, in this Introduction, I will try to fill out the wider picture. This approach has the advantage, at least for me, of my being able to offer some of the personal reflections that I would have included had I written my own history of anthropology at Oxford.

There does appear to be one striking omission from this volume, the Pitt Rivers Museum. This is quite deliberate for the simple reason that the Museum is the senior partner by twenty-one years and celebrated its own centenary in 1984.³ Thus, while 1905 may be identified as the formal birth date of anthropology, as with the birth of everything, there was a period of gestation; in the case of anthropology it was particularly long and difficult. As Christopher Gosden, Frances Larson and Alison Petch show in Chapter One, 'Origins and Survivals: Tylor, Balfour and the Pitt Rivers Museum: their Role within Anthropology in Oxford 1883–1905', the history of anthropology at Oxford University started many years before 1905.

An interest in anthropology in the University can certainly be traced back to the 1860s. This was a period of intense debate over geological time and biological evolutionism. Trautmann (1992) has argued that there was a simultaneous revolution in ethnological time; certainly the decade was particularly fruitful for anthropology. Maine's *Ancient Law* was published in 1861, and 1865 saw the appearance of no fewer than three seminal works in the development of anthropology. They were Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times*, McLennan's *Primitive Marriage* and Tylor's *Early History of Man*. The founding in Oxford in 1867 of an anthropological society may well have been a response to this increased interest in the subject.⁴ How long the society

survived is unknown, but there were at least two senior members of the University who had an interest in anthropology and were keen to promote it. One of these was George Rolleston, Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, and the other Henry Moseley, who after Rolleston's death, became the Linacre Professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy. Both men were members of both the Anthropological Institute and the Ethnological Society in London. Rolleston, in particular, was influential in persuading Pitt-Rivers to offer his collections to Oxford and in urging the University to accept them. It would seem that those who supported the transfer of Pitt-Rivers' collections to Oxford saw this as a means of forwarding their aim to introduce anthropology on to the syllabus.⁵ Thus, in 1881, Moseley remarked in a letter to Augustus Franks, Keeper of Ethnography (among other things) at the British Museum, that the University's acceptance of Pitt-Rivers' collection 'would be of extreme value to students of anthropology in which subject we hope all men to take degrees very shortly' (PRM, Foundation & Early History MSS: Letter 5). This was overly optimistic but at least in 1885, the year after the founding of the Pitt Rivers Museum, anthropology was made available as a Supplementary Subject in the Natural Science Final Honour School (hereafter FHS).⁶

In fact, instruction in anthropology had been available to both members and non-members of the University from the previous year, 1884, when Tylor was appointed to a Readership in Anthropology.⁷ Although Tylor was Reader, then Professor in Anthropology, as Gosden *et al.* point out, he was never the Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum. Installation and care of the collections were invested in the Linacre Professor of Anatomy, Moseley, to whom, rather than Tylor, fell the responsibility of moving the collections from London. In practice, most of the work was undertaken first by Baldwin Spencer, Moseley's demonstrator, and when, in 1886, he moved to a chair in zoology in Melbourne, by Henry Balfour. In 1887 Acland and Moseley combined to get Balfour created temporary Assistant Curator and in 1891 he was made Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum.

The next serious attempt to promote the interests of anthropology occurred in 1895 when Tylor and his supporters petitioned for anthropology to become a full FHS. This proposal was rejected, but such attempts are a recurring theme throughout this volume. Virtually every contributor records a move to establish an undergraduate degree in anthropology, something that was not achieved until its involvement in Human Sciences in 1970 and Archaeology and Anthropology in 1992.⁸ David Mills, in Chapter 4, 'A Major Disaster to Anthropology? Oxford and Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown', suggests that this was not an entirely bad thing, and

that Oxford's relative dominance in the decades following the Second World War was partly owing to the lack of the distraction of undergraduate teaching.

The difficulties that anthropology faced in getting accepted clearly reflected doubts in many minds about the nature of the subject. If seen as the study of humankind in its broadest sense it was too wide and threatened the territories of some already established subjects. On the other hand, if the boundaries of the discipline were drawn too narrowly and it was limited to the study of past and present 'primitive' people, then it was barely an appropriate subject for an undergraduate degree. There was, however, more to it than this, for anthropology fell victim to an essential debate within the University, which in one form or another has still to be resolved. Gosden *et al.* refer to it as a tension between the humanities and the sciences, but it was also and remains a tension between the University and its departments on the one hand and the colleges on the other. Today this tension takes many forms, from disagreements when making appointments between departments needing specialist researchers and colleges requiring generalist teachers to disputes over fund-raising and who has the right to approach possible benefactors.

The place of anthropology within the universities had been greatly enhanced in the late 1890s by the Cambridge University's Torres Straits expedition. Furthermore the scheme in 1905 was to introduce anthropology as a graduate qualification, a marginal activity at the time, and to deal solely with 'primitives'; these compromises meant that no vested interests were threatened. Accordingly the Committee for Anthropology came into being with little fuss, and once it had completed its first task, to design the Diploma course, there were thirty years of remarkable stability. This period is dealt with by Peter Rivière in Chapter 2, 'The Formative Years: the Committee for Anthropology 1905–38'. Whereas, at the introduction of the subject, lectures and instruction were listed as being available from a wide range of people, including the professors of jurisprudence, Sanskrit, philology, Celtic and Russian, this gradually declined and the subject came to be dominated by a triumvirate. They were Arthur Thomson, Dr Lee's Professor of Human Anatomy who, until his death in 1935, was responsible for physical anthropology; Henry Balfour, Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum until his death in 1939, who looked after the archaeological, ethnological and technological aspects of the Diploma; and Robert Ranulph Marett, Reader in Social Anthropology and Rector of Exeter College, who covered the sociological side.

To obtain the Diploma candidates had to satisfy the examiners in anthropology writ large, that is to say physical anthropology, ethnology and archaeology and social anthropology, although a

Certificate was available in any one of the specialisations. Thus while the subject had a disciplinary unity it was spatially dispersed. Physical Anthropology was located in the Department of Human Anatomy, where, from 1927 it became known as the Laboratory of Physical Anthropology, with Leonard Dudley Buxton as Reader in the subject. The Department of Ethnology,⁹ which came into being in the nineteenth century as a sort of adjunct of the Pitt Rivers Museum, was located with it in the University Museum. Social Anthropology had a much more nomadic existence. To begin with, because of the few involved, space was found in Exeter College, but the numbers outgrew that and in 1914, the year in which permission to use the name Department of Social Anthropology¹⁰ was given, its home became Barnett House, 26 Broad Street. From there, in 1920, it joined with the Geographers in Acland House, 40 The Broad (see Figure 3), and in 1936, when Acland House was to be demolished to make way for the New Bodleian, it followed the Geographers to 1 Jowett Walk, on the corner of Mansfield Road, where, until this year (2005), the School of Geography has remained.

The interwar years saw stagnation, if not decline, in anthropology both at Oxford and Cambridge. The active centre of anthropology had moved to London, where, to oversimplify, theoretical positions divided the functionalist London School of Economics, ruled over by Bronislaw Malinowski, from the diffusionist University College London, home to Grafton Elliot Smith and William Perry. If the former proved more successful, this was, as Goody has pointed out (1995: Chapter 1), because of his access to financial resources, specifically his close relationship with the Rockefeller Foundation. It was through this Foundation's support for the International African Institute that Malinowski was able to attract through research funding many of those who rose to the top of the subject after the Second World War. Oxford anthropology basically missed out on the largesse available from the Rockefeller Foundation except in one very important respect; it was Rockefeller which funded the research lecturership that Evans-Pritchard (hereafter E-P) took up in 1935.

It is the case that by the 1930s the triumvirate at the heart of Oxford anthropology was growing old and the question of the succession loomed. Nor was anthropology's future secure, as with the possible exception of Balfour, teaching anthropology was neither Thomson's nor Marett's day job. Thomson died in 1933 and Balfour in 1939, the former to be succeeded by Wilfred Le Gros Clark and the latter by Thomas Penniman. The other posts in anthropology were those of Buxton as Reader in Physical Anthropology and Beatrice Blackwood as Demonstrator in Ethnology. There was, however, no statutory post in social anthropology for Marett's official position was

held at Exeter, and after a certain amount of toing and froing the University agreed to create a statutory readership to replace Marett. It was here that All Souls College stepped in and offered to put up the money to convert this into a chair. How this came about is the topic of John Davis's contribution, 'How All Souls got its Anthropologist' (Chapter 3). To understand this Davis has had to move well outside the sphere of Oxford and anthropology and the cast of characters he introduces are figures on the much wider stage of empire. All Souls' interest in anthropology was directly related to colonial and imperial administration, and the college's links led to Whitehall, Westminster and beyond.

This is possibly a convenient point at which to consider a little more closely the relationship between Oxford anthropology and colonial rule, as this is a subject that crops up in several of the chapters. As Rivière shows, one of the arguments advanced for the introduction of the Diploma in Anthropology at the very beginning of the twentieth century was its value to overseas administration. He also refers to the frequent attempts between 1896 and 1921 to set up national centres of applied anthropology whose purpose was to help with the government of empire. These efforts, in which Oxford was directly involved, got nowhere and the provision of courses for overseas administrators was left to the individual university departments. From 1908 onwards these administrators formed an important component of the anthropology graduates at Oxford. That the right to teach them was a valuable asset is made quite clear by Davis who also shows how the Royal Anthropological Institute (hereafter RAI) tried to muscle in on the business on the side of London University. Indeed, it is possible to see the creation of the Chair in Social Anthropology at Oxford as associated both with the attempt by London University to monopolise the teaching of colonial cadets and with the failure to found an African Institute at Oxford.

Nor after R-B took up his chair at Oxford in 1937 did this matter go away. As Mills documents, both in Oxford, in his dealings with Nuffield College, and as President of the RAI, he found himself concerned with anthropology's interest in colonial affairs. A bid to the University Grants Committee in 1944 for increased resources for anthropology was argued on the basis of a need for such expertise in the colonies following the war. The teaching of colonial cadets continued after the Second World War, but, with the disappearance of the Empire and thus the need for overseas administrators, the course was terminated in 1962. Remarks on some of the consequences of this will be taken up later in this Introduction.

The arrival of R-B as the first incumbent of the new Chair in Social Anthropology seriously disturbed the comfortable routine into which

the subject had lapsed, as Mills describes in Chapter 4. Even before his arrival, he engaged in a discussion with the Committee for Anthropology on the introduction of a FHS. Unfortunately their views on the nature of this degree did not coincide. The members of the Committee devised the FHS with a similar academic content to the Diploma, a general anthropology. R-B, however, wanted to reform anthropology in line with his own views on the subject; he wanted the degree to specialise in social anthropology. At the same time he wanted to change the format of the Diploma in a not dissimilar way in order to allow increased specialisation. Unable to change the view of the Committee for Anthropology on the FHS, he concentrated on reforming the Diploma. What he proposed was four separate Diplomas, one each in social anthropology, human biology, prehistory, and comparative technology. This scheme was put forward and rejected in 1938–9, as was an almost identical proposal the following year, on the grounds that effort should rather be put into devising a FHS in Anthropology. In 1940 – and it is amazing that anyone was worrying about the nature of a diploma in anthropology that year – a new format was agreed, whereby all candidates would sit two papers and a practical examination on general anthropology and then further papers and a thesis in one of three specialisations, physical anthropology, or prehistoric archaeology and comparative technology, or social anthropology (*Examination Statutes*, 1940: 374). The outbreak of war and R-B's absence in São Paulo prevented any further changes that he might have had in mind. He returned to Oxford in late 1944, by which time he was too close to retirement in 1946 to have any further impact.

While R-B was away, Daryll Forde, then Professor at Aberystwyth but seconded to the Foreign Office Research Department in Oxford, looked after the Institute. Among other things he prepared in 1944 the bid, already mentioned, to the University Grants Committee. He argued that because of changing colonial conditions anthropology would have an even more important part to play after the war. He therefore proposed an establishment of a professor, a reader, one senior lecturer, one junior lecturer, a secretary/librarian, and a £2500 research fund. Although the staff did increase later in the decade, in the last year of R-B's tenure, the Institute was still very small, consisting of the professor, one lecturer, a secretary – librarian, and seven students.

Evans-Pritchard succeeded R-B in 1946. It is the former's years as professor in Oxford which form the topic of Wendy James's chapter, 'A feeling for form and pattern, and a touch of genius'. This was the period that is so often regarded as the Classical or Golden Age of Oxford social anthropology, but James argues that the myth-makers have

been at work to obscure some of the realities. For example, she argues that the Institute was not so much a place of fermenting new ideas, but one where the full implications of E-P's earlier works received proper recognition and application. Furthermore, even if Oxford anthropology had achieved a central role in the subject both in Britain and abroad, it was still seen as marginal within the university. E-P's attempt to introduce a FHS in the subject was dismissively snubbed and Sociology, which would not get its own chair for many more years, turned its greedy eyes, in the name of relevance, on that of Social Anthropology. There is no doubt, however, that by the time E-P retired in 1970, the Institute was on a secure foundation, many times the size, in both staff and students, that it had been in 1946.

It had in this period found a relatively permanent home. When E-P took over, the social anthropologists were still housed with the geographers at the Mansfield Road/Jowett Walk site, but increasing demands for space by the latter soon saw the former on the move again. In 1948, Social Anthropology moved to Museum House on South Parks Road which had been Tylor's home (see Figure 4). These premises were rather more spacious and provided room for a library, periodicals room, lecture room, and rooms for the secretary/librarian and five teaching staff. Once again, however, Social Anthropology was only one step ahead of the demolition crew, and in 1952 it moved to 11 Keble Road to make way for Inorganic Chemistry. This proved no more permanent, for by the 1960s there were plans to demolish all the houses on the north side of Keble Road for an extension of Physical Sciences. These houses were saved and a vastly extended 11 Keble Road is now the Computing Laboratory with a Parks Road address. However, the decision not to demolish the houses was only made after the Institute had moved, which it did in the winter of 1965–6, to 51–3 Banbury Road.¹¹

During E-P's reign, there was a steady turnover, and increase, in staff. Fortes came and went to Cambridge; and Gluckman came and went to Manchester. Other people who held posts for longer or shorter periods included Franz Steiner, M.N. Srinivas, Louis Dumont, David Pocock, Mary Douglas (then Tew), Paul Bohannan and John Peristiany. Those who had arrived and were still there when E-P retired were John Beattie, Godfrey and Peter Lienhardt, Rodney Needham, Edwin Ardener and Ravi Jain, with John Campbell as a Fellow of St Antony's College.

As already mentioned, the course for overseas service cadets was discontinued in 1962. As James comments, the expectation was that this would result in a decline in anthropology's fortunes as arguments in support of the subject's practical value weakened. In fact, the opposite happened and the following two decades, approximately until 1980, were a boom time for anthropology across the United Kingdom.

It was a period, as I remember it, when there was little discussion about the practical relevance of the subject and rarely was it called upon to justify itself in this way. Existing departments expanded and new departments were created.¹² Research money was relatively easy to come by and there was a plentiful supply of graduate studentships available from the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) following its formation in 1965. Oxford, as the only department in the country which concentrated solely on graduate students, did very well out of this. In 1970, it received thirteen new SSRC studentships and between 1975–80 it produced forty-three doctorates, compared with Cambridge's thirty-three, and as many as the LSE, SOAS and UCL combined (see Webber 1983). This situation, however, was already radically changing by 1980 with an ever growing number of departments opening graduate courses and demanding studentships, and thus threatening Oxford's relative dominance in the production of professional anthropologists.

During this period, as James describes, there was a further unsuccessful attempt to introduce a FHS in Anthropology. The proposal envisaged an anthropology writ large, and its failure seems to have resulted in the abandonment of this aim¹³ and a return towards the reform of the Diploma that Radcliffe-Brown had tried to introduce before the Second World War, with separate diplomas for each anthropological specialisation. Although this was not fully achieved during E-P's tenure of the chair, between 1962 and 1974 there were numerous attempts to modify the format of the Diploma, all of them unsatisfactory. The details can be safely left to one side, but the important changes were the following: in 1964, the single Diploma in Anthropology was replaced by four diplomas, in Human Biology, Prehistoric Archaeology, Ethnology, and Social Anthropology but they all retained one paper in common.¹⁴ At the same time the Certificate was scrapped, which had anyhow become little more than a consolation prize (*Examination Statutes*, 1964: 526–30). After various other modifications, finally, in 1974, four completely independent diplomas came into existence. This struggle for separate diplomas was to a large extent driven by the social anthropologists, but how far this still reflected a pursuit of R-B's views and how far it was part of a numbers game, it is difficult to ascertain. Certainly, in the latter, social anthropology came out much better than the other subjects. For example, in 1966, there were thirty-four people reading for the Diploma in Social Anthropology, two for that in Human Biology, two for Ethnology and one for Prehistoric Archaeology. This pattern was fairly typical of the decade.

After James's chapter, the volume veers away from its chronological course and takes up two topics that are important in the history of

Oxford anthropology. The first is Geoffrey Harrison's 'Oxford and Biological Anthropology'. Physical or Biological Anthropology made its formal appearance at Oxford in 1885 when Anthropology became a Supplementary Subject in the FHS of Natural Science. Although the subject included components on archaeology, philology and cultural development it was predominantly physical anthropology. Furthermore it was two successive professors of human anatomy who happened to have an interest in physical anthropology that kept the subject alive as a part of the Department of Human Anatomy. It took a tentative step towards an independent existence in 1927 when Leonard Dudley Buxton was appointed to a Readership in Physical Anthropology and the Laboratory of Physical Anthropology, still under the auspices of Human Anatomy, was founded. Full autonomy was delayed until 1976 when the Department of Biological Anthropology, headed by Harrison himself, was created and moved to 58 Banbury Road.¹⁵ In 1990 the Department changed its name to the Institute of Biological Anthropology (IBA) as part of a re-organisation that saw the creation of a School of Anthropology and Museum Ethnography, consisting of IBA, the Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology (ISCA) formed from the Department of Ethnology and Prehistory and the Institute of Social Anthropology, and the Pitt Rivers Museum.

IBA's autonomy has, however, proved fleeting. On Harrison's retirement in 1994, the new professor, Ryk Ward, a geneticist, had an entirely different academic agenda and increasingly allied the Institute of Biological Anthropology with the Department of Zoology. Ward's sudden and premature death in 2003 and a series of moves by other staff have left Oxford Biological Anthropology virtually moribund. The rump of the department is now physically and administratively under the wing of Zoology and still awaiting the appointment of a new professor. As Harrison points out, it is not clear what the future holds for Biological Anthropology, and he sees the current syllabus as a similar if modernised version of that for the Diploma in 1905. On the other hand, the association of the Lecturers in Human Ecology (Stanley Ulijaszek), originally located in IBA, and in Medical Anthropology (Elizabeth Hsu) with ISCA has done much to advance the return to a holistic anthropology that was another theme of the centenary conference (see Parkin and Ulijaszek, 2007).

Robert Parkin's account of the Oxford University Anthropological Society (OUAS) and the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* (JASO) covers the history of two other aspects of the vitality of Oxford anthropology. The existence of an anthropological society in Oxford in the 1860s has already been mentioned but it seems to have been short-lived, and the present OUAS dates from 1909. JASO – and the

'Society' of its title, as Parkin explains, has only a tangential connection with that in OUAS – first appeared in 1970. Although *JASO* has often suffered from slippage in its publication date, it survived until the centenary year as one of the longest running student anthropological journals. Whereas, from its outset, *JASO* was very much a student affair, the OUAS was for much of its life dominated by senior members of the university and its membership spread well beyond the limited numbers reading or teaching anthropology. After a period of hibernation at the end of the twentieth century, in its present, revived form, the OUAS is very much a junior members' initiative for junior members.

This raises another aspect where the history of Oxford anthropology reflects changes in anthropology more widely, namely the degree of specialisation that has occurred in the subject. The professionalisation of the subject has been plotted on the national level by Kuklick (1991) who sees it as but one manifestation of a changing occupational structure. Gosden *et al.* subtitle one section of their paper 'Participatory anthropology', in which they indicate just how much the collections of the Pitt Rivers Museum derive from the activities of people who were not only not anthropologists, but not academics at all. Alongside this professionalisation, there had been increasing specialisation. For social anthropology this has its roots in Malinowski's LSE, and we have seen how it was taken up by R-B in his attempt to introduce a specialised social anthropology qualification at both graduate and undergraduate level. R-B's presidency of the RAI, as Mills describes, saw an internal dispute over an attempt by social anthropology to obtain a monopoly over the teaching of colonial cadets. This failed, but after the war social anthropologists, led by E-P, declared at least semi-autonomy by founding their own professional body, the Association of Social Anthropologists (ASA). The ASA had strict criteria of eligibility for membership, and its annual vetting of new members regularly defined or re-defined the nature of the subject.¹⁶

A further symptom of this move to increasing specialisation is also to be found in a decision by the ESRC (as the SSRC was re-named in 1982) to concentrate on providing further training for those with anthropological qualifications and not to fund conversion courses. The list of anthropologists whose first degrees were in a different subject and who then converted to anthropology is long and illustrious. The Diploma, and its successor the Master of Studies (M.St.), was quite specifically a conversion course and during the second half of the twentieth century drew in people with academic qualifications of every sort and none.¹⁷ James refers to the increasing interaction with history, philosophy and theology during the years of E-P's tenure, and

this is further evinced by the number of Diploma students with just those backgrounds. That this was good for the health and development of the subject, there can be no doubt. The number of studentships provided by the ESRC is now so few that this decision in itself may not have an impact on the number of enrolments, but it has closed the door to a source of excellent future anthropologists and narrowed the field.

The Oxford University Anthropological Society appears to have followed a similar trajectory. As Parkin notes, it was in the beginning a genuinely university-wide society and remained so until after the Second World War. Its officers and those who were members and attended its meetings were drawn from a cross-section of interested people. It was only later that it became increasingly a society for senior and junior members of the university who were also anthropologists. In its most recent manifestation, a society mainly for anthropology graduates, it seems on occasion to operate as a kind of 'alternative institute'. Although, perhaps this is too recent for it to be possible to have a proper perspective on it, this may reflect an increasing distance between staff and students within ISCA as a result of the growing pressures, often externally derived but internally exerted, which allow less and less time for the socialising that was such a feature of the Institute, not simply during the post-Second World War decades, but even from the earliest years, as Wallis (1957), quoted by Rivière, indicates.

Finally, to return to the Pitt Rivers Museum on this topic, although the work has not been done, the members of the Relational Museum team are of the impression that since 1945, though there are still a large number of donors from a wide variety of backgrounds, there are probably fewer than there were prior to 1945. Their guess is that collecting has become a more specialist activity.

The final period, the thirty-five years since the retirement of E-P, presents particular difficulties. During this time there have been four different professors and between 1977 and 1990 the Institute was overseen by a Management Committee, which was a committee of the Anthropology and Geography faculty board. It was composed of the permanent members of the ISCA academic staff, one of whom was elected as chairman and was responsible for the day-to-day running of the Institute,¹⁸ together with the chairman of the board and one other member. As well as this there has been a number of administrative re-organisations which have continued into Oxford anthropology's second century. It was clear to me that it was essential to get an outsider to cover this period as most of the insiders had lived through those years and were participants in its events. Nor was it that easy to identify a suitable and willing outsider¹⁹ when I was struck by the

lucky idea of approaching Jonathan Benthall. As Director of the RAI for most of the period, without any particular departmental loyalty and a frequent visitor to Oxford, Benthall was well placed to see those years with a relatively dispassionate eye. In his chapter, entitled 'Since 1970: through Schismogenesis to a New Testament', he provides a clever and diplomatic survey of the past three decades.

By the time E-P retired in 1970, Oxford anthropology, particularly social anthropology, had grown enormously. By that date there were six posts including the Chair and over one hundred students. Ethnology had shown a similar increase with the creation of two Assistant Curatorships, later to be combined with University Lecturerships in Ethnology and then, when the curator was retitled Director, the posts followed suit and became Curatorships. Physical Anthropology's expansion, as described by Harrison in Chapter 6, followed in the 1970s; first, in 1972, with the creation of a second lecturership, and then, in 1976, when the Department, renamed Biological Anthropology, finally attained its independence from Human Anatomy.

Maurice Freedman took up the chair in 1970 and Beattie departed for Leiden. Rivière was appointed to the latter's post in 1971 and the following year Wendy James obtained a newly created lecturership. Jain returned to India in 1975 and was replaced by Nick Allen. With Freedman's sudden and premature death in 1975, Needham was elected to the chair the following year and his lecturer's post was filled by Robert Barnes in 1977. The next ten years saw no change in staff, and then in 1986, Peter Lienhardt died and his post, a faculty lecturership, was abolished. The following year Ardener died suddenly and unexpectedly and Marcus Banks was appointed at short notice to a temporary lecturership to fill his place. Banks then stayed on as departmental demonstrator and was finally confirmed in a tenured lecturership in 1995. Godfrey Lienhardt retired at the end of the 1987–8 academic year and Paul Dresch arrived in 1989. John Davis replaced Needham in 1990, and on his appointment as Warden of All Souls in 1995 was succeeded by David Parkin the following year. In the final years of the Oxford anthropology's first centenary, Allen took early retirement and Rivière reached retirement age – the former to be replaced by David Gellner and the latter by Elizabeth Ewart. As already mentioned, new posts have also been created – a lecturer in medical anthropology (Elisabeth Hsu) and another in human ecology (Stanley Ulijaszek) – and as the centenary year closes a second Chair in Social Anthropology has been advertised and a new University Lecturership in Social and Cultural Anthropology created.²⁰

Prior to 1990, the date when ISCA came into being, the ethnology curators/lecturers from the Department of Ethnology and Prehistory

had been Audrey Butt (1955–83), Ken Burridge (1959–68), and Peter Gathercole (1968–71). After 1990 these posts, were, for teaching purposes, treated as part of ISCA. At that time, the ethnologists²¹ were Schuyler Jones, who had followed Brian Cranstone as Director of the Pitt Rivers Museum in 1985,²² and Howard Morphy and Donald Tayler. Jones was succeeded by Michael O'Hanlon during the academic year 1997–8, and Morphy and Tayler by Clare Harris and Laura Peers at the beginning of the next academic year.

If we widen the perspective we find a number of anthropologists appointed in other departments with specific area interests, such as Michael Gilsenan (Middle East), Roger Goodman (Japan), Frank Pieke (China) and Charles Ramble (Tibet), who maintained or maintain close ties with the School, as has the holder of the post in Development Anthropology at Queen Elizabeth House, formerly David Sneath and then Laura Rival. Also associated with Queen Elizabeth House are the Centre for the Cross-cultural Research on Women (now International Gender Studies) and the Refugee Studies Centre, both of which have always had a strong anthropological presence. A more recent and important development has been the founding, with a substantial grant from the ESRC, of the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) with Steven Vertovec as its Director. It forms part of ISCA and occupies 58 Banbury Road, the former home of the Institute of Biological Anthropology. In the first year of anthropology's second centenary, this roll call was added to by a West African post to be shared with Area Studies (David Pratten) and by a Lecturer in Migration Studies to join the staff of COMPAS (Katherine Charsley).

The relatively affluent period of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s came to an abrupt halt in the final years of that last decade. A financial squeeze was placed on the whole university system and expansion turned into contraction. The social sciences were particularly hard hit, although social anthropology weathered the storm remarkably well. It was by the standards of other social sciences, such as economics and sociology, very small, did not cost much money and had the reputation for harmless if slightly eccentric scholarship. The subject did not go entirely unscathed, although it was mainly in joint departments of sociology and social anthropology that it suffered worst.²³ Another problem was that it brought an end to the ready supply of jobs in new and expanding departments. There was much soul-searching over what sort of employment there would be for the relatively large number of doctoral students coming on to the labour market. If there had been little discussion in the previous decades about the practical use of social anthropology the topic now returned with a vengeance. With the harsher climate within the universities and funding bodies, the search for relevance became important again. Despite the gloomy

outlook, the winter did not last that long in Oxford. The cuts the department suffered were not severe and the 1980s was a period of stability rather than contraction.²⁴

During the past quarter-century there have been considerable changes, mainly as result of external pressures, to the degrees on offer at the Institute. The Diplomas finally disappeared in the academic year 1982–3, to be replaced by a M.St., both in Social Anthropology and in Material Anthropology and Museum Ethnography. This was merely a change in name, not in format, and was made in response to the re-titling of similar qualifications in other universities because, not surprisingly, a 'Masters' degree sounded much better than 'Diploma' to would-be students. The M.St.'s lasted until 1998 when they gave way to M.Sc.'s, which were twelve-month rather than nine-month courses and included the submission of a dissertation. At the same time a Diploma was re-introduced for those who wished to do a nine-month course, sit the written papers but not prepare the dissertation.²⁵ This change was made in response to outside pressures, this time from the ESRC which declined to recognise a nine-month course as providing adequate research training.

In 1981 a two-year M.Phil. was introduced as an alternative route to the D.Phil. from that of Diploma plus M.Litt. (re-titled from B.Litt. in 1979) which had been the conventional and more leisurely path.²⁶ This was also done in response to external factors, in this case the enormous increase in graduate fees, especially for overseas students, that was put in place in the late 1970s. The advantages of the M.Phil. are that fees paid for it count towards those for the D.Phil., and the 30,000-word thesis that it involves can be incorporated into the doctoral thesis. In recent years, the number of different taught Masters, both M.Sc.'s and M.Phil.'s, has proliferated and are now available in specialisations such as Medical or Visual Anthropology and Migration Studies.

It has been noted that many of these changes were driven by outside forces; competition for graduate students, increases in fees and changes in fee structure, and to requirements of the ESRC. In 1982 the SSRC had its name changed to ESRC.²⁷ This change involved the abolition of the subject committees, of which social anthropology had been one, which formed a vital link between the departments and the bureaucrats. The result has been a bureaucratisation which has impinged badly on anthropology because, as with most bureaucratic cultures, there is little appreciation of variation and the same size is expected to fit all. Thus the ESRC has interfered inappropriately in both anthropological training and research with the imposition of unnecessary requirements and penalties for non-fulfilment. The ESRC itself has also seen a decline in its funds and this is most visible in the

drop in the number of studentships available for British graduates. Within the past quarter-century the fall in the number of studentships it has made available for social anthropology has seriously affected the nationality profile of most British departments. In recent years, British students at ISCA have become a minority, and those from the USA in a distinct majority, though there has been some increase from EU countries.

Another major change has been one from a majority of men to one of women students, a shift which has been matched in recent years among the staff with more women than men being appointed to full-time university lecturerships within the School of Anthropology.

Mention has been made of the various attempts to introduce a FHS in Anthropology, but after the rebuff in 1948–9, the enthusiasm for such a degree waned. Even so anthropology found itself finally involved with undergraduates via another route, through its participation in Human Sciences, which FHS was introduced in 1970 and in which Biological Anthropology in particular has played a central role. The involvement with undergraduates was taken a step further in 1992 with the introduction of the FHS in Archaeology and Anthropology.²⁸ The picture is not, however, entirely rosy. There is a looming threat to Human Sciences, and with much talk of a switch in emphasis from undergraduates to graduates within the University, it will be interesting to see how much effort is made to save it.²⁹ The degree in Archaeology and Anthropology may never have been approved under such a policy, but at the moment it appears to be under no threat. The decline in undergraduate applications noted by Mills (2003a) has not yet occurred at Oxford, the intake remaining consistent at around twenty-five a year, but it is possible that the current enthusiasm for archaeology is maintaining the buoyancy and keeping anthropology afloat.

The last fifteen years of anthropology's century has seen two major administrative changes. The creation of the School of Anthropology and Museum Ethnography, composed of IBA, ISCA, and the Pitt Rivers Museum, has already been mentioned. Then, in 2000, as a result of a university-wide re-organisation into academic divisions, the School of Anthropology was placed in the Life and Environmental Sciences Division, and the Faculty Board of Anthropology and Geography was abolished. The School now consists of the ISCA which incorporates COMPAS, the Pitt Rivers Museum, and the Institute of Human Sciences. Whereas membership of the Life and Environmental Sciences Division suited anthropology, because it had a considerable voice within it, other subjects soon found the arrangement unsatisfactory. Further re-organisation in the first year of its second century placed the School of Anthropology in the Social Sciences

Division, but the subject starts that century with a far greater presence than might have been imaginable during certain periods of its first.³⁰

Reflections on Oxford's global links

Finally, a few words should be included in this Introduction about the Appendix, although Wendy James, who was responsible for organising the session from which she has distilled this memoir, has provided its own introduction. Those who attended on the morning of Sunday, 18 September were treated to a fascinating array of comments, memories, and anecdotes from a range of past Institute members drawn from all over the world. It seemed an enormous pity to restrict such fascinating material to those there, so it was decided to include a report on the session as an appendix to this history volume – a place where it obviously belongs. Regrettably the demands of space have meant that only highly abbreviated versions of the various talks can be included and much of the richness of the originals has been inevitably lost. Despite that it adds an invaluable, personal touch to some of the chapters that have gone before.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Simon Bailey, the Oxford University Archivist, both on my own behalf and on behalf of most of the contributors to this volume. His assistance has been invaluable in putting this history together. I received helpful comments on a draft of this Introduction from many of the contributors. Gina Burrows and Rohan Jackson were invaluable at every stage of the organisation of the workshop, and Heather Montgomery and Mike Morris, the Tylor librarian, uncomplainingly checked references for me. As always, any sins of commission or omission remain mine.

Notes

1. Of the twenty-four contributors to Volume VIII of *The History of the University of Oxford: the Twentieth Century* (ed. B. Harrison, Oxford, 1994), just six did not hold Oxford University posts. This is exactly the same proportion as originally in this volume. It might be noted that since the original typescript was submitted in early 2006, David Mills has moved from Birmingham University to Oxford and a Preface by Alan Macfarlane has been added.
2. After a gap of two-thirds of a century, the return to a holistic anthropology now seems on the cards. For arguments in favour of this, see *Holistic Anthropology*, edited by Parkin and Ulijaszek, a volume which arose from another session that

- formed part of the centenary conference and is to be published at the same time as this one.
3. The occasion was marked by the publication of *The General's Gift* (see Cranstone and Seidenberg 1984). A great deal has been written and published about different aspects of the Pitt Rivers but a full length history remains overdue.
 4. The only evidence I have seen for its existence is to be found in a short notice in *Anthropological Review*, 5 (1867): 372–3 (see Anon 1867). The range of its interests was very wide and it heard papers on such diverse topics as 'The influence of Wyclifism on the national development,' 'The principles of war' and 'The statistics of crime'.
 5. In a sense the Pitt Rivers Museum was to Oxford anthropology as, in the decade of the 1890s, the Torres Straits expedition was to Cambridge anthropology.
 6. Few, if any, candidates sat the Supplementary Subject. The syllabus was large and equivalent to taking a full second FHS.
 7. Tylor reported yearly in the *Gazette* the numbers who attended his lectures. In 1900 it was three to ten members of the University and three to eight non-members. In 1901 the figures were five and ten (the latter being described as 'lady students and visitors'), and the following year there were fourteen altogether (*OUG* 1900–01: 672; 1901–02: 650; 1902–03: 548).
 8. These dates are the years in which undergraduates were first admitted to read for the degrees. The actual establishment of the degrees was in each case a year earlier; 1969 for Human Sciences and 1991 for Archaeology and Anthropology.
 9. There is a problem here because there is some doubt about what constitutes a 'department'. The title 'Department of Ethnology' is found in the *Oxford University Gazette* in 1891 where an authorisation for the Chest to make a payment to it is published (*OUG* 1890–91: 503). The name is used regularly from then on but it was not until 1935 that its statutory status as a department was confirmed. This was in the context of the appointment of Beatrice Blackwood to a Demonstratorship in Ethnology. She had previously held this post in the Department of Anatomy but in order for her to take up the post in the Department of Ethnology it had to be officially recognised and assigned to a Head of Department, the Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum (I am grateful to Frances Larson of the Pitt Rivers Museum for this information).
 10. The name was changed from 'Department' to 'Institute' in 1940 at the request of Radcliffe-Brown and by permission of the Chest and the General Board (see Mills, this book). The problem mentioned in the previous endnote concerning the status of the Department of Ethnology is even worse with reference to Social Anthropology. The permission to use the name, for it to have staff, premises and a budget did not give it official existence as a department, as Marett found out in 1935 when the Registrar and the Secretary of the Chest firmly stated it had not (see Davis, this book). James notes the same difficulty many years later (see this book). The problem became particularly acute in the late 1970s, when it was found that the Professor, while responsible for the Tylor Library, had no such duties with regard to the Institute. Between 1978–90 the Institute was managed by a committee of the Anthropology and Geography faculty board. In the latter year general supervision of the Institute (or, in the words of the *Statutes* 'make provision for the lighting, warming, water supply, and cleansing') reverted to the Professor, but only five years later the *Statutes* were changed again so that 'a director' would be responsible for these duties. For much of its life, the Department/Institute was what is called a 'unit of academic administration' and nobody seems to know what its present status is.
 11. The house in Keble Road had been home to Warden Spooner of New College who had been one of the most vehement critics of the proposed FHS in Anthropology in 1895.

12. One such new department was that at the Oxford Polytechnic, to become Oxford Brookes University in 1992. Anthropology had started there in the 1960s at what was then a college of technology, teaching anthropology for London University external BA's. Following the college's re-foundation as a polytechnic in 1970, modular courses in both social and biological anthropology, representing up to half a degree, were introduced. The department has grown greatly in the past decade, but from the start it was a sort of colony of Oxford University anthropology, with a large proportion of the staff having obtained their doctorates at the latter. I am grateful to Renate Barber, who was there through the earliest days, for this information.
13. Perhaps it was a case of sour grapes, but I heard E-P more than once declare that anthropology was not an undergraduate subject.
14. This was Paper II, entitled 'Ecology, Economics, and Technology', although the various Diplomas put their own gloss on it in the regulations. Thus, in both Prehistoric Archaeology and Ethnology 'Ecology and Technology' was added in parentheses, for Human Biology 'Human Ecology', and for Social Anthropology 'Ecology and Economics'.
15. Although, as in the case of Social Anthropology, it appeared to be a 'Department' it was in fact a 'unit of academic administration'.
16. For many years new members were elected at the AGM and this item on the agenda often resulted in long and heated debate on the qualifications of certain candidates. After a while this method proved so unworkable that the Committee of the ASA took over the vetting of candidates and putting before the AGM, for ratification, its list of approved new members. This usually speeded up the process, but occasionally the AGM would dispute a name. In the 1980s I can remember someone who is now a well-known social anthropologist having her candidature challenged on the grounds that her doctoral supervisor was an archaeologist.
17. There was a small but steady flow of people who were accepted to read for the Diploma who had no formal academic qualifications but whose careers were judged to provide a suitable background. For example, someone without a first degree whom I taught in the 1960s had been a qualified UN interpreter and has since gone on to be a distinguished anthropologist.
18. In practice members of the Institute took the chair in turn. My personal view is that, during those years, the Institute operated well, both administratively and socially.
19. One person with whom I broached the subject muttered something about a 'poisoned chalice'.
20. These posts were offered respectively to Harvey Whitehouse and Inge Daniels.
21. The archaeological curators were also included as part of ISCA until the further re-organisation in 2000 when they became part of the School of Archaeology.
22. Thomas Penniman, who had succeeded Balfour as Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum in 1939, retired in 1963. The post was then held by Bernard Fagg (1963–75), who was followed Brian Cranstone (1976–85).
23. An obvious example is Aberdeen which got rid of all its anthropologists. In the long run, this may have been to anthropology's advantage as the subject was resurrected there in 1999 with a department of its own.
24. This period also coincides with the existence of the Management Committee of Social Anthropology and it may be difficult to separate out the effects of one from the influence of the other. I was involved and may be too close to have a proper perspective on what was going on. With that caveat my personal view is that during this period the Institute worked well but there was a lack of academic leadership. This does not mean that no one who occupied the rotating chairmanship was capable of providing such leadership, just that we did not think

- it our job. We were all brought up in a tradition that subscribed to the idea of individual scholars getting on with their own work, and the idea of research agenda, research groups and research programmes (except on a very small scale) was alien to us. In retrospect, and given what was beginning to happen in the wider academic world, this was myopic but luckily did no lasting damage and the situation was rectified before the processes affecting academic funding started to bite.
25. The Diploma is also a consolation prize for those who fail the final of the M.Phil. The papers sat for the M.Phil. Qualifying Examination, taken at the end of the first year, are the same as those for the M.Sc. and Diploma.
 26. Very few people now register for or complete an M.Litt. which has almost become a 'failed' D.Phil. This is a pity because, as James (this book) relates, some very substantial pieces of work, later published, were submitted for it.
 27. This was said to result from the prejudice of the then Secretary of State for Education who among other things objected to the use of 'social science' in the title on the ground that it was not a science. In fact, the SSRC was lucky to survive in any form given the government's prejudice against 'social science'.
 28. Although the input to this degree was originally intended to be equally weighted between the two subjects, in practice the emphasis has tended to be on archaeology. This has resulted as much from student preference as the respective commitment by archaeologists and anthropologists. Two years running I gave talks to groups of pupils from comprehensive schools brought to Oxford under the Sutton Trust scheme to encourage applications from such schools. They were nearly all more interested in archaeology than anthropology and their interest in the former had been aroused by the television series *Time Team*. Robert Parkin tells me that this fits with his experience of interviewing candidates for Archaeology and Anthropology for Keble College – most applicants have an archaeological interest, many having been on 'digs'.
 29. Among other things colleges are showing an increasing unwillingness to admit undergraduates to read for Human Sciences. The size of the intake, but not the demand, has dropped from forty-four to twenty-six over two years. I suspect this is a response by colleges without tutorial fellows who can teach the subject to the externally imposed reduction in college fees paid for undergraduates.
 30. Rodney Needham died in December 2006 while this book was in press.